

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

May 4, 2015

* * * *

* * * *

ANDREW HIPPI SLEY, CHAIR

ALICE CHRIST, VICE-CHAIR

KATE SEAGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

LISA GRANT CRUMP, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

* * * *

HIPPI SLEY: I'd like to call the meeting to order, please. Thank you very much for showing up at 2:00 so we can get an extra hour here, we will try to have as efficient a meeting as possible, and I really would appreciate your cooperation in that.

Welcome to the 4th of May, 2015 Senate, the last Senate of the session. A time-honored tradition, please click if you are here and you are present.

GROSSMAN: It's not working.

UNIDENTIFIED: It's not working.

HIPPI SLEY: In the meantime, please make sure everyone who is a senator has this bundle of GR amendments submitted by nine different people. They're all in the back and they're for senators only, at this point. If there are any leftovers, others can have them. But please make sure you have that for about 3:00 when we move on to GR action.

We're going to start without that for the moment. Let's start with the fact that there were no corrections received for the minutes for April the 13th. So unless

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt

there are objections now the minutes from April 13th, 2015, will stand approved and distributed by unanimous consent.

CHRIST: (Inaudible) absent.

HIPPISLEY: One single correction. Thank you, Alice.

We are, of course, a body charged with formulating and implementing educational policy and our real heroes and pioneers on this are the excellent teachers that we have.

And I would like to announce the list of the Provost Outstanding Teaching Award winners, and if any of them are in here, please stand up: Matthew J. Beck, Daniel S. Morey, Mark A. Williams, Heather A. Campbell-Speltz, Holly S. Divine, Debbie L. Keen and Sarah D. Kercksmar. None of them are here. But what would you do without them? They're a great example to us.

The Provost shared with Senate Council last week an early draft of the strategic plan and solicited feedback and announced Town Halls. And I want to remind you when these are. One is going to be on Wednesday from 9 to 11 in the Lexmark Room. Another one is going to be on Thursday, and that will take place here at 10:30. I know there's going to be one on the 13th of May at 10 a.m. to 12 in the Bio-Pharm Complex in Room 234-B.

Please remember that Ernie Bailey is our man, as it were, on the strategic plan. So if you have any questions or concerns about what you've seen in the draft, maybe it's best to get in touch with Ernie Bailey, at this stage.

I would like to also say that one of (inaudible) actions was that Senate Council approve the required use of a new form for graduate certificate proposals which will arrive next year.

Senate Council approved nominations, but they haven't been (inaudible) for two committees: The Student Survey Coordination Committee and Teaching Effectiveness Committee.

The Teaching Effectiveness Committee is the result of our deliberations about the common 8 TCE questions, and we also -- we need a Joint University Senate Committee, so that's been created and there are number of senators that will be on there.

I know Lisa O'Connor is here today, she is nominated and she's going to want accept it to (inaudible). Are you here, Lisa? Yes, there she is. She's going to be involved in that.

I'd like to hand over to Secretary Christ. She's going to tell us some positive (inaudible).

CHRIST: The Outstanding Senator, Third Annual Outstanding Faculty Senator Award. The Selection Committee, John Wilson, Paul

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt
Kraemer and me, met April 27th to evaluate four excellent nominees.

The unanimous result on the basis of effectiveness in generating and effecting the Senate's larger agendas, notable substantive contributions, working with the faculty at large on important issues that impact the faculty, and active and exemplary service on one or more committees, including the Budget Model Committee, the Graduate Education Funding Committee, Senate Council, for the (inaudible) as vice chair, Presidential Evaluation Survey, Senate Rules and Elections, currently as chair. There's too many more to mention. Professor Connie Wood.

WOOD: Thank you. Thank you, all. It's been a pleasure.

CHRIST: If any one of those other nominations is disappointed, please do try again, because they were all worthy nominations.

HIPPI SLEY: Do we have a Parliamentary Report from Kate?

SEAGO: No.

HIPPI SLEY: Do we have a Faculty Trustees Report from Bob and John?

WILSON: None.

HIPPI SLEY: So this will probably at this point be a show of hands. I would like to talk about our first list of degree recipients, and please be good to us, and only elected faculty vote on this. We have two people to add to a brand new list, called the In Memoriam Posthumous Degree list.

This is for students who have passed away, haven't complete the 120 credits, but were in the process when they passed away. And we have two candidates, which is a sort of sad thing to have to announce.

One is from Arts and Sciences and one is from Nursing. If we would start with Arts and Sciences. Is Anna here? If you could just tell us a little bit about this.

UNIDENTIFIED: If I could just read a few words that were submitted by a faculty member who knew the student. Jamie Danielle Carty, born 5/9/1991 died 11/20/2014, was born in Morgantown, North Carolina, lived in Roanoke for most of her childhood and moved to Meadowview, where she graduated from Patrick Henry High School in 2009.

Jamie was a senior majoring in chemistry at the University of Kentucky at the time of her death. A soft spoken young woman, the first impression one had of Jamie was of a sweet nature and quiet poise. Jamie was smart, modest and quietly determined to succeed in her classes and in the pursuit of a degree in chemistry.

Above all, Jamie was courageous. When life dealt her a difficult hand, her

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt

bravery in remaining focused and determined as ever not to lose sight of her goals, and her demonstrable willingness to continue to work towards them was remarkable.

Jamie deserved the life that she so resolutely was working towards. Her tragic and much too early loss has been felt deeply by those around her whose lives she touched with her charm, humor and quietly intelligent outlook. She will be greatly missed.

HIPPI SLEY: So the recommendation coming from Senate Council is that the elected faculty senators approve Jamie as the recipient of an In Memoriam Posthumous Degree for May 2015, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees as the recommended degree to be conferred upon Jamie Carty.

Is there any questions or discussion? I'm afraid it's going to be the old fashioned way of voting. All those in favor of approving this recommendation, elected senators only. All those against? Abstained? Motion carries.

We have a second parallel situation, and I would like to ask Joanne, if she's here, to --

HEATH: I'm not Joanne, but I'll represent the College of Nursing. I'll just ask that you respect me to read the full words that faculty staff and students wrote.

They've been relentless in their efforts to honor the life of Taylor Ann Davis, who tragically died last year in February. She was a junior BSN student.

Taylor was born and raised in Southern California in a family who loved her dearly. As a result of that environment, she believed that life was meant to be experienced in as many ways as possible.

She was a daredevil and free spirit, evidenced in part by her 19th birthday celebration spent skydiving. The smile never left her face from suit up to landing. Her adventurous spirit led her to pursue a nursing major.

As a nursing student, Taylor made her mark among her classmates and the faculty and staff in the College of Nursing. She noticed the people around her and offered her smile and warm greeting quickly upon meeting.

To her classmates, she was the one who could make the duller classes fun because she brought enthusiasm to the task at hand. To the faculty, she was a good student who worked hard, but knew when enough was enough.

Among her friends were the custodian who cleaned the classrooms and a groundskeeper, that she saw as she rode her skateboard to work at Starbucks every morning.

The customers at Starbucks were met with warmth and kindness, and it seemed like

everyone who worked in Kentucky Clinic knew her.

To the patients, Taylor was the one who made a difference. One of her last patients was a teenager who was facing a long day of uncomfortable treatment that he was trying to postpone or avoid entirely. He had been contentious with most of the staff and deemed difficult.

Taylor was coached by her faculty instructor that he would try to negotiate with her and that she could not cave in to his plan. Not only did she not cave in, she was able to get him to agree to do everything prescribed without a fight.

Her instructor was outside the door and overheard the conversation, firm but kind and mature beyond her experience. Later he reported to her faculty instructor that Taylor made him feel better because she listened to him.

Taylor loved her family and friends, country music and riding around in her truck. She was always on the go because there was just so much cool stuff to do.

Her wonder-filled life came to an end one night on a rain-slick and curvy country road while she was doing what she loved, sharing time with her friends.

The flood of responses, immediate and profound, spoke for the volume and intensity of this loss. This was a young woman who wanted to make a difference at work, and she did. Thank you.

HIPPI SLEY: Thank you, Janie. So this is a recommendation coming from Senate Council that the elected faculty senators approve the May 2015 In Memoriam Posthumous Degree list with Taylor added, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees as the recommended degree to be confirmed by the Board.

Is there any discussion now? All those in favor? All those against? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you. And both -- representatives of both families will be coming to Rupp Arena on Saturday.

So I would like also to put on the floor another recommendation from Senate Council. This is that the elected faculty senators approve the revised May 2015 degree list for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees as the recommended degrees to be confirmed by the Board.

All those in favor? Elected. All those against? Abstained? Motion carries.

This is another one that we do in early August. The recommendation from Senate Council that the elected faculty senators approve the revised early August 2015 degree list for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees as the recommended

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt
degrees to be conferred by the Board.

Hearing no further discussion, all those in favor? All those against? Motion carries.

And one last item, which was petitioned by Arts and Sciences based on an administrative error. We get these quite frequently, unfortunately. This one is slightly complicated.

A student was not advised that they could have two degrees, so they applied for a double major instead. And we did this back in December.

The motion in this particular situation is the recommendation that the Senate amend the December 2014 degree list adopted at the December 8th, 2014 Senate meeting in one small detail, by rescinding the BA Political Science and the second major is International Studies for this student, AC41, and its place, granting upon AC41, a BA in Political Science and a BA in International Studies.

This is a recommendation that comes from the Senate Council. If there are any questions, we have the Dean's representative here. Senator Tagavi?

TAGAVI :

Kaveh Tagavi.

Did you consider just giving him the second degree? I think of rescinding, it's just not in good taste. And because of having this double major with the person (inaudible) you are giving him the degree, to me looks like a lesser of the two evils. I just want to know if you considered just giving him the second degree.

HIPPI SLEY:

We considered that. If the second degree was in International Studies, they would have a double major (inaudible).

TAGAVI :

Yes, (inaudible).

HIPPI SLEY:

Any other questions? Hearing none, all those in favor of this, to approve this motion? All those against? Abstained? Motion carries. It'll be on the May Board of Trustees list.

I would like to invite Margaret Schroeder, who has done heroic work for us, who is going to give her reports.

SCHROEDER:

All right. Bear with me today, we've got five.

This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new BS degree Neuroscience, in the Department of Biology within the College of Arts and Sciences.

This is the proposal or a partnership between College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Medicine to offer a new degree in Neuroscience, which will give students the opportunity to engage in multi-disciplinary topics such as anatomy and

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt
neurobiology, biology and psychology.

Students in the program will develop critical thinking, communication and independent study skills with broad, multidisciplinary training in basic and applied scientific aspects of neuroscience.

Students will have the opportunity to receive extensive training in applied aspects of neuroscience, including such topics as central nervous system injury, drug addiction, ageing, and delivery of therapeutic agents using nanotechnologies.

There is a need for the program. Nearly three-quarters of our benchmark universities offer a major in neuroscience. There are currently 70 students in the declared minor -- or declared in the minor of neuroscience at the University of Kentucky.

It's expected that a majority of these students will declare the major once the degree is approved. Many more also have indicated interest in the program.

HIPPISLEY: The motion is on the floor, as you see, it comes straight from committee, it doesn't need a second.

Anyone want to speak for the motion or wants to speak against the motion? Okay. Hearing no further discussion, all those in favor? Anybody who's a member of Senate can vote. All those against? All those abstained? Motion carries. I'm sad I don't have to do this.

SCHROEDER: Okay. This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new undergraduate certificate in Distillation, Wine, and Brewing Studies in the Department of Horticulture in the College of Agriculture, Food, and Environment.

This is a collaboration between the Departments of Animal and Food Sciences, Bio-Assistance and Agricultural Engineering Chemistry, Chemical and Materials Engineering, History, Horticulture, Plant and Soil Sciences, Retailing and Tourism Management, Writing, Rhetoric and Digital Studies.

Students will comprehend the breadth of the career opportunities in this industry. Students will be able to identify key technical methods and analytical skills required in the industry. Students will be capable of outlining the history of the industry and clearly explain how this relates to human cultures.

There are two key reasons for offering the program. First, the industry represents the science of one of the oldest products linked to human civilization, thus, education opportunities span aggressive discipline. Secondly, this is a local industry that provides a wide and interdisciplinary range of careers.

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt

The curriculum was developed due to an urgent need to train people in this area as unidentified by the local industries. Bluegrass is home to nearly 95 percent of one of the world's premier distilled spirits, of course, bourbon. There are over 70 wineries in the area as well, in addition to numerous large and small breweries.

Current estimates suggest Kentucky employment may now number 10,000 within the bourbon industry alone. Further, approximately 25 new craft and full-scale distillers are opening in the coming year with a shortage of trained analogical infrastructure identified recently as a major role to growth. I think that's it.

HIPPI SLEY: The recommendation comes from the committee. It doesn't need a second. Anyone who would like to speak for the motion? Anyone like to speak against the motion? Hearing no further discussion, all those in favor? All those against? Abstentions, none. Motion passes. Thank you.

SCHROEDER: All right. This is a recommendation that the University of Senate approve the establishment of a new 3+3 Program, BA History, BA Political Science, or BA English, and a JD Law within the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Math.

The purpose of this program is to attract and retain the best and brightest students who all -- who are already interested in a legal education, highly motivated, and who are often going to other universities and law schools for their education.

The combination of a reduced number of years to a law degree, with the resulting reduction in tuition, will help keep some of these stellar students at UK as an undergraduate and then at the College of Law.

The program will benefit students by allowing them to complete their education in an accelerated manner. It will benefit the departments by allowing recruitment of especially strong and motivated undergraduates, and it will benefit the University by providing an exciting and innovative program to perspective applicants who, without this program, may well have chosen another university other than UK.

It will benefit the UK College of Law by allowing law school faculty to participate in the mentoring of select, highly motivated undergraduates during the students' undergraduate careers, thus increasing the preparedness of top candidates to the College of Law.

This program will enable high achieving and strongly motivated students to earn the BA in JD in six years, thus reducing by one year, the customary time to complete both degrees.

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt

It provides an expedited career path and significant financial savings to motivated students. The expected number of students per year in this program is 5 to 10 and they share 30 credit hours their fourth year.

HIPPI SLEY: Thank you. This comes from committee and doesn't need a second. Anyone like to speak for the motion? Anyone want to speak against the motion?

BROTHERS: Do you mind to try the electronic voting for this one?

HIPPI SLEY: No amendments were made so this slide is not needed. Let's move to vote. No.

BROTHERS: Sorry.

HIPPI SLEY: All those in favor? All those against? One against. Abstentions? One abstention. Motion carries.

There was no recommendation from the SAPC on the graduate certificate (inaudible).

SCHROEDER: Okay. This is a recommendation that the University of Senate approve the establishment of a new graduate certificate Biostatistics in the Department of Biostatistics within the College of Public Health.

There is an increasing need for research-oriented health professionals who will be qualified to conduct population-based research and clinical trials in the next several decades.

There has been an intense demand for scientifically training data analysts who can address the issues in conducting studies, which include large amounts of complex data.

The Neurosciences Surveillance and Computation of Biology are expected to be growth areas which will demand a complex integrated skill set of a new group of professionals.

The graduate certificate in Biostatistics provides a mechanism for students admitted to the graduate school to enhance their competency and skills in biostatistics without undertaking another graduate degree.

It is also uniquely different than other graduate certificates and statistics, specifically, the graduate certificate in Applied Statistics here at UK, in that the courses and audience will be focused on specific methodological issues in medical and health applications. For example, statistical genetics clinical trials.

The certificate will be accessible to students enrolled in the graduate school and will be valuable to future researchers in a variety of fields of study.

We did look specifically at the graduate certificate in Applied Biostat -- or Applied Statistics to make sure there was not

overlap, and the Department of Statistics agreed to the courses listed on the account that SDA570 may be substituted for one of the beginning courses, and then SDA580, which is already cross-listed in with CPH580.

HIPPISLEY: Thank you, Margaret. Motion comes from committee, it doesn't require a second. Anyone like to speak for the motion? Anyone like to speak against the motion? Okay. Hearing no discussion further, we will -- oh, Connie?

WOOD: Connie Wood, Applied Statistics. I know that Heather's here. It says here that SDA570 may be substituted for 580 with the permission of a statistics director. Does it require permission?

BUSH: It doesn't have to require permission because of a letter from Arnie that talked about (inaudible). So this is (inaudible) require permission.

WOOD: Okay. I just wanted to get that (inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: Any other questions? Hearing no further questions or discussion, all those in favor of the motion? All those against? Abstention? Motion carries. Thank you.

SCHROEDER: Last one. This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new undergraduate certificate, Directing Forensics in the School of Library Information Science within the College of Communication and Information.

The Division of Instructional Communication and Research proposes offering an undergraduate certificate that will prepare students to teach and coach competitive forensics at the middle school, high school and collegiate levels, and serve the growing demand for forensics coaches.

Currently, over 300 colleges and universities sponsor this activity at the state, regional and national levels. Over 100,000 students and 3,500 coaches also compete annually in high school competitions across the nation.

This certificate would serve both current undergraduate students who wish to enhance their ability to teach public speaking, and post-baccs seeking additional training or continuing education credits.

To (inaudible) apply for a (inaudible) certificates will prepare students to immediately enter forensics classrooms as coaches and educators.

The certificate meets the UK requirement of the spirit of the undergraduate certificate under the -- to the acquisition of a defined set of skills or expertise that will enhance the success of the student upon graduation.

Coaching competitive forensics requires a specialized set of skills that is currently not offered by any academic program

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt
at the University of Kentucky. Thus, this program will fill a void for educating individuals who seek to develop and improve their abilities to teach and coach competitive speech and debate.

HIPPISLEY: Thank you, Margaret. This comes committee, there's no need for a second. Anyone like to speak for this motion?

GIANCARLO: Matthew Giancarlo, Arts and Sciences.

I just have a point of clarification. What distinguishes an undergraduate certificate from, say, a certificate? Would this mean that this certificate would not be open for post-baccalaureate students?

SCHROEDER: I believe it is open to post-baccalaureate students as long as they're visiting undergraduate students. No? Connie?

WOOD: It is open to students who are post-bacc status and the SRAT has just issued an interpretation that it would also open to students that are admitted to a graduate degree program.

GIANCARLO: Thank you.

HIPPISLEY: Any other questions? Discussion points? All those in favor of the motion? All those against? Abstentions? None. Motion carries.

This is a Margaret Schroeder slide. This is the work she's done. She's got her -- these are her members of her fantastic committee. They're all there. They have processed 20 new programs this year. That takes a lot of work. Thank you so much.

Okay. I'd like to invite Ernie Bailey, Chair of Academic Organization and Structure's.

BAILLEY: We had a handful of name changes this year, which is not nearly as much, but I'm amazed at all (inaudible).

The proposal that we have is for a name change for a Multi-Disciplinary Research Center, the Center for Interprofessional Health Education, Research and Practice to the Center for Interprofessional Health Education.

Our committee dealt with this by email. James Norton is the director of the center and the author of the proposal.

It was designed to promote interprofessional education for the students pursuing education in the College of Communication and Information, Dentistry, Health Science, Medicine, Pharmacy, Public Health, and Sociology.

The defined IP is education training or teachers involved in more than one profession enjoined for interactive learning, and is a program that is common in many health centers around the country.

The center was approved in 2010.

At this point, they would like to make a change in the name, largely because the most significant contribution to this program is educational aspects for all the research and the practice components are better served by other programs that are there.

Basically the name more accurately reflects the activity.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. So the motion from Ernie's committee is that the Senate endorse the change in the name of Center for Interprofessional Health Education, such practice to Center for Interprofessional Health Education. The motion is on the floor. Connie?

WOOD: Question. This program, I believe, was originally approved as an MDRC, Multi-disciplinary Research Program. Am I correct in that you are removing the research component?

BAILEY: We aren't removing the research component. We were asked to look at the name, and so the name more accurately reflects what they're doing.

This thing was made as a research unit. I think in our discussions, we've talked about whether this belongs as an MDRC, or whether it should be an administrative center, and that's something that I think that we should consider later. It would be easier to consider that in the name change.

WOOD: The reason -- may I?

BAILEY: Yeah.

WOOD: The reason why I bring this up is in your letter it says that they feel that the research component could be better served in another unit, which means that -- it just seems like they want to move it out. Is that part of the program? Is it still an MDRC?

BAILEY: Dr. Norton?

NORTON: I think the focus is that our researchers kind of go through (inaudible) one practice. We really don't study interprofessional process, we study the process of educating people for professional practice.

And the Centers for Health Systems Research is a much better decision to study interprofessional (inaudible). So I don't see as (inaudible) to research activity, rather focusing the research on pedagogy as opposed to clinical care.

HIPPISLEY: Any other questions? Any other discussion points? The motion is on the floor. All those in favor? All those against? Abstentions? Two abstentions.

I'd like to invite Dr. Greg Graf. Oh, Dr. Greg Graf is not here. He was going to (inaudible). Anyone from Greg's committee here?

Anyone from Senate Council willing to talk about this? Bob?

GROSSMAN: I think this is fairly simple.

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt

It's fairly simple, the College of Law -- or currently, the admissions policy for the College of Law, which is encoded in the Senate Rules, say that they only consider applicants who already have a bachelor's degree.

This change in admissions policy, the change is that they consider student (inaudible) bachelor's degree, or who have gone through the UK Blue Program, which you all have just approved. Okay, so without this change in admissions policy, the UK Blue Program is moot.

HIPPISLEY: This is a motion that comes from committee. It doesn't require a second. Any questions for Bob, or for me, or for Senate Council? Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of the proposal to change the SR? All those against? Abstentions? Motion carries.

GROSSMAN: I didn't agree to the other one.

HIPPISLEY: Okay, Greg Graf again.

GROSSMAN: I don't remember this one. Perhaps someone from nursing could help us.

HIPPISLEY: Well, the motion from the committee is that Senate approve the change in admissions policy for BS Nursing Early Admissions, which is an SR 4.2.2.1. Maybe someone from nursing --

SCOTT: All right. I will try to muddle through this. Leslie Scott with the College of Nursing.

Basically, what we're wanting to do is change the admission criteria within the BSN program. Increasing the minimum -- well, there were actually three items that we brought forth.

One was increasing the minimum standards for enrollment management and adding an ACT math requirement that needs a prerequisite for chemistry, which is Chemistry 103.

We wanted to raise high school GPA from 2.75 to 3.25, and specify a minimum ACT composite of 22, with a minimum of 19 ACT (inaudible).

We also have through the College of Nursing, we have an early admission policy, and we wanted to actually change or raise the minimum high school cumulative GPA from 3.5 to 3.6 and the ACT would remain the same. And then raise the UK freshman GPA from 3.25 to 3.6.

And then finally, admission into the BSN major between the freshman and sophomore year, increasing the minimum standard to be (inaudible) nursing programs by raising the minimum cumulative and (inaudible) GPA from 2.75 to 3.0.

We were finding that we were offering a lot of positions to students and we have very limited space (inaudible) program, and so we were trying to raise

standards (inaudible) incoming classes.
HIPPI SLEY: That's page 10 of that handout
(inaudible). Any questions?

PRATS: Yeah. I was on the committee, we met with the people from the College of Nursing. I was of the understanding that these three different changes were going to be sorted out into specific proposals.

Now, that it's being summarized, I find that it is essentially the same program that we had questions about, and I never received anything from Greg saying that this have been sorted out.

So I'm wondering what came out of that meeting, that for an hour and a half, we were trying to understand the current version of the program and to understand the proposal, to proposed changes for no -- no reason that was made evident.

There was also in the proposal a -- the matter of reserving places for out-of-state students, and of essentially guaranteeing admission for high school students out of, you know -- into the program. I just don't see what happened to those concerns that we had.

HIPPI SLEY: Anybody that can answer any of those concerns?

SCOTT: I was in the same meeting, and I thought we had addressed everything, and I guess I'm not sure what's the point with out-of-state.

PRATS: I believe part of the conversation involved guaranteeing places for out-of-state students, and I had questions about that.

What I am saying, however, is simply that I don't know that anything -- any firm proposal came out of that, and especially not in the sense that the three different proposals of the college were bound in one -- in one vote.

I am not sure that that has sorted out in any way to disentangle those three things from each other into a clearer proposal. I never heard anything else. That's all I'm saying.

SCOTT: Okay. I agree. I didn't have any -- I don't remember any follow-up emails from the committee. And I fear that the folks coming from -- that are directly involved at the undergraduate level aren't here until 3:00. They were going to come to answer questions.

I'm in support for this. We're just trying to not offer false pretenses to incoming students.

This is more for retention so that we're not offering students -- and we're not delaying admission for students based on (inaudible). We're trying to make sure that we're getting the best and the brightest and that we're not falsely representing ourselves to the college.

HIPPISLEY: Would it be fair to say what you're doing is you're changing values in the ACTs and GPA scores? Fundamentally, is that what you're doing?

SCOTT: We are, just so that it better matches the classes that are already -- we're already receiving students at that level.

We're just trying to make sure that we're not offering a false sense of admission to folks that may have lower GPAs. Did that make --

WOOD: Just a point of information. I want to -- on the next page of your handout, you have a proposed change to a early admissions policy and you've got a high school GPA of 3.6.

A student will be required to maintain a 3.6 GPA of each semester of their first year, and a (inaudible); is that exclusively -- is that clear in what we are being asked to approve?

SCOTT: Yes, in summary. What page are you on?

WOOD: Next page.

SCOTT: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED: Page 8 of the rationale where the changes --

WOOD: Well, it's a proposed change in the bulletin. It seems like that contains more information than what is (inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: Your worry is that the proposal is missing (inaudible).

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.

Can you give us an idea of what percentage of the last admitted class was at this level?

SCOTT: I really wish I were on the admission committee and at the undergraduate level. I've been teaching at the graduate level, so I'm not -- and I was in that meeting.

They ran through how many students (inaudible). I can tell you historically when we're reviewing students, typically they'll declare a nursing major when they come in their freshman year, and we may have 900 students that declare nursing as their major.

Well, each class we only have -- each year we only have 140 slots. Granted, we probably -- of those 900, we may only have 300 apply, but we don't have to go very far down the list.

I think our last class, the GPA, I'm guessing, was 3.75 was as low as we went. So we're just trying to (inaudible) proposal. This is where (inaudible).

So for 2014-15 there were 132 students admitted who met the conditions for the provisional admission and 44 were Kentucky residents. That's on page 8.

HIPPISLEY: What would be helpful to know is what's missing from page 10 and 11, which is what we're going to vote on.

SCHROEDER: Andrew, I'm sorry, what's on page 10 and 11 is, my understanding, is one part of the proposal. I think that was what one of the committee members was talking about was that it seemed like it was hard to vote on it when it was all together.

And each piece of this was addressing -- 10 and 11 was only the admissions policy. Does that make sense?

HIPPI SLEY: The standard admission (inaudible).

ILAHIANE: Hsain Ilahiane, A and S.

This is just a -- this is a common global health action, and they -- and I wonder if you thought about the implications of -- of this increasing the values that you're talking about are in cases in terms of recruiting or producing nurses that are -- there is a shortage in this country. It's very well known, okay.

So what would be the implication of that if the -- if these indicators are way too high and they're also the Third World there. So I think about the Third World because when we don't produce enough nurses in this country, the federal government does not fund enough nursing schools, we go to the Third World to recruit nurses and other -- and other medical core and that has a negative impact on the health systems in this country.

This is just a global (inaudible). So I'm worried about if it's (inaudible) then there might be because (inaudible) I and grant University is Kentucky and the nation and the world. So I want to think globally about this issue, particularly when it comes to global health as well.

SCOTT: Well, our problem is we also have a commitment when students come in that if we promised them a slot, that we actually have a slot for them.

And we have limited resources for their clinical experience. We can didactically teach them. We can teach hundreds of them at a time.

It's when we put them into hands-on into the clinical setting that we have very limited resources. And that's -- we only have so many slots and that's what our -- that's what we keep running up against.

And so we're not trying to -- we're trying to keep ourselves from offering false hope to potential students that may not make it because we have such a large pool to pull from.

Have I answered your question? I totally understand your comment, and I agree with you, but we're looking at resources.

UNIDENTIFIED: Just to echo what -- I'm Peggy (inaudible), College of Nursing.

Just to echo what Dr. Scott is saying, we're constrained with one faculty member and ten students in a clinic setting,

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt
and so that we will limit the number of
students that we able to take into the
program. Just a clinical consideration.

HEATH:

And if I could just add --
Janie Heath, Dean of Nursing.
It's just not a College of Nursing
ratio (inaudible) national regulatory
requirement that we have to meet.

So we understand the concern. You
know, the other piece with this is that we
know that 50 percent of these students will
be matriculating into the College of Nursing
in their second year of their experience at
UK.

We have history that shows -- data
that shows 30 percent of them really want to
still be a nurse. So unfortunately, they do
look at other programs and study outside of
UK. The other 20 percent will stay at the
University of Kentucky and look at another
health profession track.

And we're trying to build up the
success for these students and retain them
here at UK, but we have a moral imperative to
be in alignment of what we've been doing with
what we've got written in our admission
process, and right now, we have not been. So
we feel like it's way past time to get
congruent with what we've been doing and what
(inaudible).

HIPPISLEY:

Hearing no further discussion or no
further points of information -- Connie?

WOOD:

I don't know if this is out of
order, but in the interest of efficiency and
clarity, on page, I believe it's 7 or 8 of
the proposal. My iPad is showing 7.

Proposal centers on three areas
(inaudible) of the admissions criteria,
admission to pre-nursing and early
admissions, admission to BSN.

I propose that we vote on the
admissions policies, but not the rest of the
document because it's not clear what we're
voting on.

Part of the other things in the
document are dismissal, probation, and
suspension issues, and are different issues
from the admissions to the program, okay?

That could be considered to be an
amendment or --

HIPPISLEY:

It could be an amendment. Bob?

GROSSMAN:

Second, Bob Grossman, A and S.

HIPPISLEY:

So the amendment that is being
moved and seconded is that we change the
recommendation to recommendation the Senate
approve the change in admissions policy only.
Is that correct, Connie, the BS Nursing?

WOOD:

Yes.

HIPPISLEY:

All in favor of this -- any
discussion of this amendment? All those in
favor of putting only (inaudible) restricted.
All those against? Abstentions? One, two,
three, four, five, six, seven abstentions.

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt

Motion carries.

So now we have a -- have on the floor the recommendation from the committee, which is the Senate approved the change in admissions policy only for BS Nursing.

Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of this motion amended -- as amended. All those against? One against. Any Abstentions? Five abstentions. Motion carries. Thank you very much. It will do.

President Capilouto hasn't arrived yet so we have time for a two minute break to try and get this (inaudible).

(SHORT BREAK IS TAKEN)

HIPPISLEY: I'd like to reconvene the body and welcome the Chair of the University Senate, President Capilouto is also the President of the University, to tell us how the year is going.

CAPILOUTO: Eighteen days ago one of our students lost his life just a few blocks from our campus. That frozen moment in time for our University family remains hard to grasp and nearly impossible to understand.

Words cannot provide a just description to the depth of pain such tragedy creates among Jonathan's family, his friends, his future. I heard it in the voices of his parents and I saw it in the faces of his colleagues at the Kernel.

But even in the midst of our anguish, when comfort elusive, I was so inspired stories of compassion and community that rise to meet the challenge of such a awful moment. We owe our gratitude to lots of people.

To the UK first responders were on the scene within 90 seconds of the shooting without full information or without concern for their own safety.

To the staff of our Counseling Center immediately went into action, were working in the predawn hours and constantly in the hours and days forward to reach out to Jonathan's family, and for the strong circles of supportive students who rallied immediately with aid and comfort in whatever way they could imagine to hold close their friends who were touched most vividly by Jonathan's tragic death.

And to the development officers who worked through the weekend to establish a immediately the Jonathan Krueger Memorial Scholarship Fund that now totals nearly \$30,000.

And I also want to thank the faculty who were worrying that students in their classes were hampered by the strain of grief, provided immediate assurance that their well-being was all that mattered, and that course requirement would be dealt with at a different time, with heart-driven

understanding.

And like times past when we've lost students before their time, there were faculty who spoke with Jonathan's parents, in sharing vignettes about his time in class, to help someone make another step towards closure.

I am grateful to live in a community such as ours that stretches far beyond this campus. From the alumnus in New York, who sent me an email the morning of the shooting, donating \$5,000 in hopes of easing the Krueger's grief.

He told me he did so because he was reminded of a grief he's never forgotten when a Marine Colonel and Chaplain showed up to visit at his home, decades ago, to let his family know that his brother had been killed in Vietnam.

And then there's the parent who lost a child in the crash of Flight 5191 on that fateful August morning of 2006 at Bluegrass Airport, who called me and said, I am here for the Kruegers.

So I know this place is a family bound by 1,000 acts of loving kindness. I told Jonathan's parents and his brother, Will, who has moved here -- moved here to start a job on the day of Jonathan's shooting, and he moved here to be with Jonathan, that they will always be part of the UK family and our doors are open, always open to them.

So I'm grateful to the Senate, because recently you developed a process that allows our University to award Posthumous degrees to our students who pass away before our work with them is complete.

The awarding of the Posthumous degree provides, I hope, some comfort to the families who lose their children too young, but they can nevertheless feel the unique joy of accomplishment and community that comes with commencement.

We will honor two of our students on this Saturday in that way and honor their families. And I trust when the moment comes, we'll honor Jonathan Krueger and his family.

We will remain vigilant in ensuring the safety of our students, faculty and staff on this campus. We always have work to do, but days like that day reminded me we are all our brother's keeper.

I want to thank Andrew for his work and the work with the Student Council. They have been effective partners with me during this past year, and I want to share with you some of the progress I think we've made.

It's a conversation that will give you a University update. Outlined is the proposed operating and capital budget that we take to the Board in June and some work on the strategic plan that you've heard

about.

And I also want to share with you some small stories that move me from day to day. The finest place for our faculty, staff and students, our alumni, patients, and scores of visitors who come to be part of us every day.

In February, we spent a week recognizing our 150th anniversary, and it was part of a year-long series that recognized those who came forth and what they made possible.

During that week, I had the opportunity to join a cadre of our top donors. Many are alumni and some are ardent supportive of our institution. All of them share a special connection to the University of Kentucky.

So during development trips, I often say, I am fortunate to close on the gifts when an ask was made decades ago. It's because of somebody who was touched by somebody during their time here.

So I want to share with you part of what I said to this group of donors and historic alumni. I recently completed Frank McVey's biography.

And I learned that in the wake of the first World War, President McVey believed that the University needed to be viewed as more than an economic asset. It served, in fact, as an essential component of well-being of the state, and in that position it needed to be free to seek truth.

In his words he concluded, what will save this nation after the war -- and then we just called it the Great War, we didn't expect another one -- but what would save us would be university.

So the circumstances of this time offer familiar parallels today. Excuse me, I want to share some of these with you. So it was a time when the state legislature, year after year, awarded more capital projects to the Commonwealth's other schools, Eastern and Western, than its fastest growing flagship university.

It was a time when every effort for ten years went to the legislature to include increased tax revenues (inaudible) defeat. And at the time when his most significant initiatives were at stake, he was diverted by the efforts, he had to leave to stop an anti-evolution bid.

And it was a time when he wanted to construct academic buildings, but guess what? There was stronger interest, especially from alumni, to build a basketball gym and a football stadium. That's why we were in (inaudible).

And it was a time when opening a university was questioned because we were in the midst of the depression. But he found

a way forward.

Let me share some of this. He did the first public private partnership. Went to a bank, borrowed money, worked out an arrangement to build a residence hall. He raised funds for a credit union so that faculty could secure low interest loans to survive the great depression. And he never stopped dreaming and planning.

In the 1920's, he was telling people the University needed to set aside land for a College of Medicine and (inaudible).

So today we've got our own challenges and we're setting equally ambitious priorities because of that inspiration of all of those who came before us. It is a precious legacy that we hold in our hands.

So I feel like the year's been successful, thanks to you, and there's several hallmarks to this progress that I would like to share.

For the first time, our enrollment surpassed 30,000 students this past fall. Among those students were 113 national merit, national Cuban and national Hispanic scholars, bringing the total to nearly 300 in the last three years, that puts us in the top ten of all public research universities in the country.

For the class of 2015, numbers are still coming in, we received more than 22,400 applications, 10 percent ahead of last year, for the first time we passed 22,000 applications.

We are ahead of our total number of admitted students by 12 percent that we had at this time last year. And among those admitted students, the average ACT and high school GPA is ahead compared to this time last year. We will understand more about the class as the summer moves on. And I hope, as we have done in the last three years, the diversity of our class will remain strong.

Housing applications are up 22 percent. Now, three years ago at this meeting someone asked me, do you know if we'll have enough students to fill these resident halls.

So this past year, we're going to open in the fall, an additional 1600 beds. Still the demand for those beds is 130 percent. We're exceeding the demand. We're exceeding our supply by 30 percent.

So it's a strong signal that we're continuing to (inaudible) University, the top choice of Kentucky and the region.

And as all of you know, the graduate numbers, in terms of applicant submissions and so forth, will not be complete until later, but Dean Carvalho tells me that admissions are running ahead of where

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt

they are -- were last year.

At the same time, we're graduating more students. This is essential, that a student comes here and leaves with a degree. We're graduating more students than any time in our history.

On Friday, the Board of Trustees, with the recommendations from you, will confer nearly 5,000 undergraduate and graduate professional degrees. That's on top of the 1,900 we conferred in December.

And I don't know the diversity breakdown for this current group, but looking over the last several years, especially among African American, black and Latino students, the trend is very positive. Very positive.

So we have made substantial progress in addressing some of our infrastructure needs. We now have completed, underway, soon to start, 1.71 billion dollars in campus facilities related to quality of life, healthcare infrastructure, student success in academics.

Through philanthropy, through philanthropy and creative partnerships, we're building in ways to keep a UK degree accessible and affordable. Our building is to better serve our students and our patients that keeps us competitive in an environment that increasingly calls for us to be self-sufficient when it comes to generating revenues.

I was glad to see this past week, signs that the economy in Kentucky is bouncing back. For the first time I see that we are projecting a surplus this fall of 46 million dollars in our general fund budget for the year. That's a good sign.

But I have to be a realist. Nationwide and in Kentucky, the predictions of the increasing costs for all states for future health insurance for their employees and to the Medicaid program, and the new state pension cost, which is not a problem at the University of Kentucky, foreshadow little room for consideration of other funding priorities. That's why we have to be more self-reliant.

So there's 1.71 billion dollars; it covers 4.9 million square feet of space to be built on campus. Included in this is a \$265 million research building approved this spring that we are financing in partnership with support from the state.

They're going to fund half of it; we're responsible for the rest. Now, this is no small feat. Twice we've gotten the budget -- we've gotten the governor and the legislature to open the budget in a non-budget year for the University of Kentucky.

Two years ago it was to allow us to spend our own money, money that we raised largely through philanthropy, for our

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt
Academic Science Building, the Gatton College
of Business, and Commonwealth Stadium.

But this year we asked them to spend their money. When you spend your time in Frankfort and you see that the budget's going to open just for a second, everybody wants to rush in.

So I'm grateful to the legislature, who through all of those demands, opened the door just wide enough for the University of Kentucky, and I want to tell you why they did.

Lisa Cassis and I, when we talk to legislators and groups, we've shown them about four or five slides. One showed the life expectancy for males and females in Kentucky compared to the rest of the nation.

The other was a slide that Tom Frieden, the CDC director, showed in Eastern Kentucky that showed hundreds and literally thousands of preventable deaths every year if we were just like a typically healthy community.

And then the third slide has the greatest impact. I said, this shows the values of the University of Kentucky. Because when you take those top five killers, Lisa's office generated data, we showed that currently, we had over 300 active grants totaling over \$330 million, tackling those issues.

Faculty get to choose the questions they want to answer. But I told them, look at the questions we need to answer. They're about Kentucky's most (inaudible), and we are out of all the space to continue working.

I also appreciate the work we are doing, both at the staff and faculty level to improve our work life policies. We have more work to do. I appreciate GT Lineberry and his office, Kim Wilson and her group, for our pre-committee report that we still are making progress on.

But I think the greatest mark of success for me are when people want to come (inaudible). Increasing number of students want to come to the University of Kentucky.

I am pleased that over the last few years more and more faculty want to come to the University of Kentucky. We've added over 200 new tenure and tenured faculty.

And then the staff. What a dedicated group of people. I want to share a couple stories with you. So that 17 inch snow day, when you live on campus, you can hear everybody working around the clock.

But that morning when you went around campus, guess what? Some family somehow made it in for their campus tour. And I had to break the news to them. I said, our snow removal program is watch it melt.

But anyway, the gentleman that is

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt
in charge of maintenance, works in the
Patterson Office Tower. So he's outside
shoveling snow. I mean, it's tough. So what
does he do when he sees this family? He
says, come with me.

And he takes them up to the
penthouse of Patterson Office Tower and he
gives them a tour of the University of
Kentucky and I am proud to say that student
is coming to the University of Kentucky. So
everybody has a responsibility
here.

And then on our snow day, since I
live on campus and it's easy to walk down to
the hospital, I think I shook 2- or 300
hands, thanking people.

And this is what I learned
from these dedicated folks. First of all,
it's not just that they got there and stayed
there, but when I heard the stories about how
UK PD picked them up to get them to work, how
I heard that their families got up at 2 or 3
in the morning and drove into the hospital so
that they could treat patients.

Someone shared with me a voicemail
from a patient who was awaiting a significant
heart procedure and was hoping people would
be there. They were. Told him we never
close.

And then as I walked in the
other the facilities, our dining section. I
mean, we've got to continue feeding these
thousands of students that live on campus,
and all the patients, they were all out in
force. So I find it very, very encouraging.

So at a time when I think a lot of
research universities are experiencing
stagnant enrollment and financial challenges,
and often those are accompanied by negative
outlooks when it comes to the rating agencies
like Standard & Poor's and Moody's.

But in the most recent reports,
Standard & Poor's upgraded the University of
Kentucky's bond rating and cited our
enrollment demand, our revenue diversity
aided by UK Healthcare, strong financial
performance and low, low debt burden as
strengths.

This is putting us in a more
exclusive group of universities. But equally
important is the support of these long-time
donors and friends of the University and the
many new supporters joining their ranks.

In the fall, I hope to report to
you even greater record -- record-breaking
news to the University of Kentucky.

So as I look ahead, a few things I
want to cover with you. I'm blessed with a
talented leadership team. There are two
critical positions in my office that need to
be filled on a permanent basis as we lead
into the next strategic plan.

We must identify a candidate of

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt
exceptional quality to build on the success of Dr. Judy, J.J. Jackson. She served us well in her tenure as Vice President of Institutional Diversity.

For several years, she's fostered a more diverse and inclusive campus and she is equally committed to the students' success. She was the person I would go to when I would find the birds with the broken wings. J.J. got them through.

She's also been an invaluable part of the University and the regional community. She and Dr. John Parker landed a LSAT grant, that is a regional grant, involving several universities to attract more under-represented minorities to the inaudible). So we're eternally grateful for her.

Now, also we must find a permanent candidate for the Vice President for Research. Dr. Lisa Cassis, who served in the interim role, has been instrumental in so many things we're doing.

First of all, the funding for the Research Building, she has brought an analytical skill set for our entire research enterprise. She's finding better ways to process and move forward our intellectual property, our discoveries.

She's identifying new strategies for our research priorities as part of our strategic plan, which she's led with Rodney Andrews.

But personally, I see in Lisa the essential characteristics of a good leader, and that is to be self-sacrificing and self-forgiving. She always puts the good of those she serves first. Characteristically, Lisa's standing in the back of the room. Thank you, Lisa.

I'm nearing the end of my conversations with more than 100 campus and community (inaudible) about the future of both of those offices. It's the same process I went through when I considered how we fill the Provost position, and as I finish all those conversations, I will communicate with the campus.

Next, I want to talk about our operating budget, this coming year. We'll present this to the Board of Trustees in June.

I want to thank Eric Monday, Angie Martin and our complete budget office who are working diligently on drafting this (inaudible) operating budget to carry out all of our ambitious plans.

So we have three principles we're trying to follow as we put together this budget. First, the competitive pay for our outstanding faculty and staff with sustained pay increases that focus on merit.

The past two years, respectively, we had a two percent, five percent merit pool

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt

increase, and we are finalizing figures to further award our dedicated faculty and staff for this year. But let me say this: consideration is first being given to those in staff roles with the lowest pay.

Second, we will ensure access and affordability by implementing moderate tuition and fee increases that make certain the doors to our institution are open widest to Kentucky's sons and daughters.

I want to give you one example. We're about to break ground on \$175 million Student Center. We've got to renovate the 1930's section alumni gym, but the rest of it we'll tear down and build what will be a center for everybody, faculty, students, and community.

And if you've noticed down the road at Eastern Kentucky University this year, they're building a new rec center and student center. It's not nearly that ambitious, but they are adding an additional fee for every student, forever, of \$300. We are not doing that at the University of Kentucky because we received the largest gift in our history, and because of prudent management.

Now, the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education, they recently approved our mandatory tuition and fee increases for 2015 and it's 3 percent.

In 2006, the four year rolling average of tuition and mandatory fee increases was greater than 13 percent. Over the last four years, it's a little above 4 percent.

And we have worked to increase financial support and scholarships for our students. In this past year, by more than \$15 million.

Our commitments over the last several years have allowed us to reach these goals. 85 percent of all the students that enter the University of Kentucky do so with a grant or scholarship that they don't have to pay back. It comes from federal and state sources and our own resources.

So the third guiding principle is to strategically plan so that we will never return to that era of across-the-board cuts, and ensure that our investments and our efficiency positively can meet our academic core. To do so is a priority.

So our plan to raise compensation, manage fixed cost increases such as utilities and financial aid, and increases in benefits, which (inaudible), and performance (inaudible) distributed to the colleges based on findings (inaudible) requires 40 million in funding. \$40 million.

Now, we're able to meet these needs because of our ability to earn our way forward, and it's because of your hard work and I am forever grateful.

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt

In 2008, Kentucky legislature reduced our budget, what now totals to be \$55 million on an annual basis. It's the lowest level of state money in more than a decade.

So how are we able to fund our aspirations? First, tuition revenue growth is partly due to the rate increase, but more so to the size and mix of our class, as well as a small increase in the retention.

And we have thoughtfully and intently pursued every efficiency and every new revenue that we can generate (inaudible). And now we are asking you to consider a new strategic plan for the University.

The last two months a dedicated team of campus leaders, including the co-chair that started this endeavor, has been led by Provost Tracy, he's been working in earnest to finish our institution's next plan.

It is building upon that great work that went on in the fall, where so many faculty and staff were involved. And we take seriously the invaluable feedback of our entire community.

Last week they shared a draft of the plan and it's going to guide our way forward, and I think make us an exceptional residential research university.

So there are five main areas of focus that I want to touch on just briefly. First, undergraduate students. We have been very successful in recruiting students to the University of Kentucky.

We've got to make sure they leave here with a quality education and a degree, and this is a moral responsibility. We must do more to guarantee their success without giving in to the tendency to blame the student.

Now, I tell people, I want to be like Penn State. And why do I say this? I don't really look closely at U.S. News and world report rankings. There's one component I will always look at. They give you the reputation survey, they look at selectivity, (inaudible). But here's the dimension I always look at. (Inaudible). That's not us.

But here's the dimension I always look at. They use a model and every year they predict, based on the characteristics of the class, what the graduation rate is.

So for the last ten years, the University of Kentucky's predicted graduation rate has been about 60 percent. Some years we meet it, but often we're below it.

And I look at Penn State. Their predicted graduation rate is at 62 percent, but year after year after year, they over achieve. They graduate above 70 percent.

So I know we want to do this. I know (inaudible) we just got to get it

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt
together and make sure every student leaves here with a degree.

Our draft vision statement says the following: we want to transform the lives of students. This is hard.

This is the hardest thing we do, and I know it's not accomplished by simply telling students what they need to know or how they should act.

And on the latter, I know from personal experience as a father, the provost, the president, it has the opposite effect when you tell somebody how to act.

But we are at our best when we teach students how to think and how to evolve (inaudible), how to self-reflective, and how to take that with them to a future context that we can barely imagine.

I know that's hard, but when I talk to our graduates, I always find that they had a special faculty member that equipped them with that (inaudible).

To support this priority we will continue to recruit, pay and award and support faculty who are scholars and also scholars of teaching and learning. We want to support the development of the innovative learning techniques and classrooms.

We want to enhance and expand learning opportunities you need for a research campus, and we want to provide the necessary social support mechanisms to ensure student success.

Last week we held, in Louisville, a reception for admitted students. Even though they've been admitted and many of them have said they're coming our way, you're recruiting until the day they got here.

And I always walk around and meet the families and talk to them, and you know, sending your child off to college is a -- can be an emotional moment. But one of those parents pulled me aside and said, you know what? I feared UK for my daughter until I heard about the living learning community.

These living learning communities are so important. They provide alternatives. They provide a social life, an alternative social life.

So I'm so pleased that our facilities allow us to expand these, and I know it'll help us better educate our students.

The second priority: diversity and inclusivity. I don't have to tell you. You see the headlines of major newspapers and leading industry periodicals that are replete with unfortunate examples in our education's challenge to create a diverse and inclusive campus, and we've had our days here.

We're no different. We've had incidences of racism, hate-filled language and a lack of inclusivity. We have got to do

more to ensure this is a safe and welcoming place.

We have a responsibility to our people, especially our students, to expose them to new and sometimes challenging ideas. Never has a holistic exposure to diversity of this place and our global community been more necessary. This type of education should exist in and outside of the classroom.

I walk this campus nearly every night. I don't walk in places that people live off campus, but I see a lot. I go into our dining facilities facility, I go over to the resident halls. I just like to see who is together, and I'm encouraged by what I see, people across different races and ethnicity, who sit down and study together and talk.

So this richness is manifest across our entire community, but we've got to do more. We must guarantee, beginning with leaders like me, and through all of our UK family, that we have a skill set that includes cultural humility so that we can do all -- we can all do better in understanding and celebrating people in their differences, including differences in race, language, background, religion, sexual orientation, and culture.

And we must do this humility, recognizing we are different and not any better than our fellow co-workers, students, and patients.

If we do -- if we do, we will move closer to the ideal advance by philosopher, Edward Saed. And he described a society that is like a tapestry where each individual thread does not lose its (inaudible), doesn't lose its identity, doesn't lose its meaning for existence, its own reason for being, but together contributes to the whole tapestry. The tapestry of union and strength.

Third in our strategic plan: community engagement (inaudible), we have 170 clinical outreach practices and linkages to support 4,300 hospital beds throughout Kentucky, especially Eastern Kentucky.

I told you about that active array of grants we have, touching on the most pressing problems. So in unique and promising ways, our campus is the Commonwealth.

We are rooted in our history as a land grant institution. I think we define the meaning of engagement and we live it every day.

We were recognized recently by the Carnegie Foundation as an engaged institution, for our incredible work in and of community. And we've got to find ways to encourage and award even more of this work.

Fourth: graduate education. I know Susan Carvalho is here, and I want to

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt

thank her for the work she's done. As a research university, to help our graduate program is a signature part of what we do.

More focus needs to be placed on improving the quality of these programs and emphasizing the distinctiveness of our campus.

The goal of all graduate programs is to prepare distinguished scholars in all disciplines and future leaders in academia, public service and (inaudible).

And at the same time, we've got to recognize that there is fewer traditional pathways in the academia for some of these graduates, and we need to prepare them for other potential opportunities that they may seek.

So we've got to do all of this while maintaining the quality and integrity of our program. Thanks to Susan, we are figuring out exactly where we are in terms of the quality of our students, the stipends we have to award, what kind of success they have after they leave here. Getting a better understanding of that will guide, I think, us forward.

I have to say, I recently had supper with the graduate student congress. I love talking with these students. And we got on the subject of all the turmoil throughout the Middle East, and one of these students told me how she explained this in her class.

She first said if you change the metaphor, you can explain it. So she explained all the turmoil (inaudible) the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, and the British and French (inaudible). And once she did it that way, it became clear to her students.

I know you're training outstanding future researchers, but you're also training excellent teachers, and I thank you.

Finally, research. In the spring, I know we've got this new Research Building. It's a challenge, because we promised the state of Kentucky we were going to bring together multi-disciplinary teams to answer all these questions.

And when we did so, too, we had some optimism about an increase in federal support and we work all the time to (inaudible) see that door starting to open.

I was pleased to see (inaudible) NIH funding. You feel that when you're walking across the halls of congress.

To do this, we've got to recruit and retain the best, the best of scholars, and we're going to do so.

And we also must celebrate the full spectrum of discovery and creativity that is alive on this campus, the social sciences, arts and humanities, in a way in which that scholarship informs and supports the students

here.

I want to applaud the faculty of the Colleges of Fine Arts and Arts and Sciences. So they developed a new living learning community that will be on the ground floor of one of the resident halls being built on the corner of Limestone and Avenue of Champions.

So they're bringing together the arts. It will have an arts studio, writing lab, performance practice room, and a large multi-purpose space for performing. That is how you support your student experience and I want to thank you.

All of this, too, must be linked to an effective graduate education program.

So the committee that has worked on this is holding three Town Hall meetings over the next several weeks. I hope you will participate, they'll be livestream, and also provide your written comments electronically.

So this will define our work and we want to have you as the authors of this big dream. It's the only way we can make our vision a reality.

Again, I thank you for your steadfast support of this University, and especially our students. I get dazzled every day at this place, and I stand in awe in what we do. Thank you very much. I'm happy to take questions.

HIPPI SLEY: Questions for the President?

CAPILOUTO: Yes?

BLONDER: President Capilouto, I think I heard you say that you were accepting 12 percent more incoming freshman this year. Did I hear that correctly?

PRESIDENT: The applications were up. But I think the class size is going to be about the same as last year.

BLONDER: I was going to ask if you were going to accept more students (inaudible).

PRESIDENT: It looks like we -- 5,250 is the goal, which is where we were last year. You know, this year for the first time, we required a deposit for confirmation because we used to have a difficult time predicting and estimating what kind of support we needed and all.

Now, this was new, but as of this weekend, we're about at 5,250 with paid confirmation. So this is more complete data than we've had in the past.

Yes?

PRATS: This is just somebody from the English department, but when you recruit students and formulate a budget for the University, is there any way to factor in, and lessen somehow, the debt that students accumulate when they get out, hopefully with a degree. It's just crushing debt.

And I wonder what the University can do at its highest level to produce a --

at least some sense of concern, not to mention mitigation, of a debt that is so burdensome?

CAPILOUTO: Excellent question. 50 percent of all the students who graduate from the University of Kentucky graduate with no debt. Of those who graduate, the average debt is \$23,000.

If you look at wages in Kentucky and you compare the wages of those with a college degree compared to those with a high school degree, you can make up that deficit in about two and a half years.

Still, what you say is so important, because what we know is our students and their families need to be more financially literate.

It's complicated when you try to figure out these loans and what they're going for mean for you for life, and more and more, we see evidence that people don't really understand it.

So one of the appeals I've made to a donor is to further support what people do in terms of educating families and students in the area of financial literacy. And congratulations.

STEINER: More of a statement than a question; you came a couple of years ago and you spoke -- you showed us your plans, and they looked wonderful.

I'm going to upgrade that to spectacular as we see things going up. I look across from the biology building and I see a science building.

CAPILOUTO: I walk by there every night. Even if it's dark I watch (inaudible).

STEINER: I really congratulate you today.

CAPILOUTO: I want you to do remember to do one thing, Shelly, every time you say congratulations to me, I want you to thank UK Athletics because they give me 66 million reasons why we could do that.

STEINER: But you got it. You got it. That's the important thing. You made them give it. Thank you very much is my comment.

HIPPI SLEY: Thank you very much.

CAPILOUTO: Thank you.

HIPPI SLEY: Okay. Our final piece of business, we have a proposal on a new Governing Regulation: faculty disciplinary action. It's a second reading. It's for action, which means for a vote.

This comes recommended from Senate Council. The motion is that Senate Council recommends that the University Senate endorse the proposed new GR Faculty Disciplinary Action.

Before I put it on the floor, I would like a few words. This is the result not of some dream or some vision, some document fell in somebody's lap and that's what we're discussing.

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt

This document is the result of a lot of hard work, the origins are in 2013. A lot of the big, heavy lifting happened from September 2014 until very recently.

So a lot of work has gone into this and there was a special committee that was formed to look at this, and Senate Council looked at that and recommends what you have now.

I requested this Body to look at it very carefully, deliberate all over it, but do more than just think of gaps and weaknesses, but actually come up with solutions to fix what they didn't like.

So what I asked for was concrete solutions, concrete amendments that they would propose. Nine people at this University, two of them not senators, but acting through senators, looked at it and decided I don't like this, this is what I prefer.

So a lot of thoughtful and careful work has gone into this and thought and care has been implemented in the actual proposal (inaudible) things.

So what I would like to do now is I want to start by entertaining these -- these amendments. I'm going to entertain them section by section.

The proposers, I think, are all here, and we will begin by voting on the amendments.

This is a motion that comes from committee, it doesn't need a second. And immediately there is proposed amendments, which is this, and it needs a second. Who seconds Senator Ferrier's amendments?

BRI ON: Gail Brion, College of Engineering.

HI PPI SLEY: All right. This is the amendment. It's an insertion. If you look at your huge, massive pile of documents, you'll see one of them called Ferrier, and you will see his amendments based on line 16 to 25.

UNI DENTI FIED: It's last.

HI PPI SLEY: The last one, No. 9. So I'd like at this point for anyone who would like to speak for this motion, including the Senator, Wally.

FERRI ER: Okay. Thank you. Wally Ferrier, B and E.

I want to echo Andrew's comments about the truly herculean task that Dave Watt's committee and Senate Council following that, a huge amount of work went into that. We're very appreciative of that.

You know, from the neck down, the policy looks great to me. I'm in full agreement with many of the amendments to follow.

The articulation of the various levels and layers of process are just spot on in my opinion.

However, I think the head needs a

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt

little bit of clarity insofar as providing a boundary, however permeable, between the faculty member's public life and one's private life.

So this amendment addresses two interrelated questions. The first is to what extent does misconduct in one's private life carry over into misconduct in the University's life, in the University's domain.

And related to question two is, to what extent does a faculty member's words and (inaudible) or actions in his or her private life, which could be construed as misconduct in a public domain, trigger the disciplinary policy.

So let me give you a few hypotheticals, for example. In the public domain, you have a faculty member at the University domain, it's quite sensible to show that increasing levels of severity of misconduct probably correlate with increasing levels of severity and disciplinary action.

However, in the private life, private domain, I think we need a zone of indifference that, through varying levels of severity and misconduct in your private life, carry over into the disciplinary policy.

This establishes that boundary as criminal or civil action that precludes a faculty member from effectively carrying out his or her duties as a faculty member.

So if there's -- there's an increase in array of misconduct in private life, tax evasion, public intoxication, wreckless driving, and increasing in severity, assault, sexual assault, rape, involuntary manslaughter, at what point does the policy care or is indifferent to the increasing levels of civil or criminal misconduct in one's private domain?

The other question invariably is an example of that would be if a faculty member were to stand with the Westboro Baptist Church, hypothetically, that came to Lexington to protest a LGBT float in Lexington's July 4th parade.

So there's no evidence that the faculty member is acting on behalf of the University, but may be holding a sign or placard with some words or slogans that would in the University purview be considered hate (inaudible) and therefore subject to misconduct.

I'm just asking and urge that we carefully consider that zone of indifference and that's what this amendment is designed to do.

HI PPI SLEY: Anyone who would like to speak against the amendment?

O' CONNOR: How does that work?

HI PPI SLEY: Name?

LISA O'CONNOR: Lisa O' Connor, College of
Communication.
My -- this was my constituents'
major concern with this GR. And so I think
this helps a lot, and I don't think we would
vote yes without it. So I think it's a very
important addition.

HIPPISLEY: Abigail?
FIREY: Yes. Abigail Firey, Arts and
Sciences.
I would like to make a motion to
refer this proposed GR to a committee of five
faculty, elected by the Senate.
I think the committee should
include one faculty member trained in law,
who shall be charged with giving special
attention to the protections of the accused,
and to the clarity of the scope, jurisdiction
and processes described in the document.
A revised version of this document
should be presented to the Senate at the
November 2015 meeting, having been circulated
no fewer than ten days prior.

HIPPISLEY: Thank you, Senator Firey.
There's a motion on the floor to commit or
refer the entire GR, (inaudible) discuss to a
new committee, which to follow, we need a
second.

CHRISTIANSEN: Second.
HIPPISLEY: This motion can take precedence
over the motion (inaudible).
WOOD: Point of order --
BROTHERS: I'm sorry. Who was the second?
CHRISTIANSEN: Second. Aaron Christian, Arts
and Sciences.
WOOD: Point of order. Is this an
amendment and is in order given that there is
an amendment on the floor?
FIREY: It's a motion to refer the
committee.
HIPPISLEY: Kate, can I ask you to address
that?
SEAGO: Yeah. It -- it's a motion that can
come forward before, during. The speaker
just has to be recognized, as Andrew did, and
at that point, this particular motion takes
precedence.
The logic behind it is that if the
body chooses to go forward with this
amendment, the logic is there's no sense in
considering the other amendments because
you've committed it to committee.

UNIDENTIFIED: It's not an amendment.
UNIDENTIFIED: It's a motion.
SEAGO: It's a motion. So there's no
reason in considering the amendments with
this motion being brought forward.

WOOD: Thank you.
HIPPISLEY: So we have a motion on the floor
that takes precedence to return to committee,
which would be composed if Abigail suggests a
change and Abigail suggests. It has a
second, so we have this on the floor and we

can discuss it.

UNIDENTIFIED: The whole proposal?

HIPPISLEY: The whole proposal. Roger, then Abigail.

BROWN: Andrew, could you just clarify?

The idea is that after we go through all of these amendments, there would be one -- at least one more time to vote on the whole thing; is that right? Or are we voting -- in other words, it doesn't make sense for us to approve, say, an introduction to the GR if we don't end up approving the rest of the GR.

HIPPISLEY: The plan is or was, whatever you want to say, the plan was to allow the nine senators to have a chance to amend and make themselves happy. And at the very end of all these amendments, we would have a GR proposal to vote on. Yes, no, return to committee, whatever you'd like. So that was the idea.

UNIDENTIFIED: We're going to vote up or down each amendment?

HIPPISLEY: Each amendment, up or down, and we end up with a GR as amended and that would be on the floor for discussion. Abigail and then Lee?

FIREY: Yes. The reason that I'm making this motion is that while I think that this document gives us a really excellent framework to start a very, very important discussion, I think that a document of this type has to be crafted very, very carefully, with appropriate language so that in the future, the language of the document can stand on its own, without people having to explain the intent or to give elaborate (inaudible) of it.

What I like about this document is first of all, I think it's wonderful that the President came to Senate Council and really embodies the spirit of shared governance in asking us to craft this document.

And I also think, as Andrew said, so many people have already worked so hard on this. The Ad Hoc Committee did enormous work on this; Senate Council did enormous work on this. And I would really like express my thanks and admiration to the senators who put in the amendments that they have.

One reason I think that those amendments are so valuable and so important, is that they pointed us to a number of significant problems in the document, and problems that at least were evident in the original document.

And then I think we've still not fully addressed consistently throughout the document, even if we were to have all the amendments, are the following: You'll remember that the original document permits secret accusations.

So the document ignores that the accused has the right, which is very key to sixth amendment, to confront those

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt
testifying against him or her.

There are also, in this document, secret investigations that are conducted when the faculty member to be accused is unaware that the prosecution is developing a fully developed case.

Second: The scope of the offenses and also the range of people subject to this process needs clarification. Any offense, and I think that this is what our learned colleague who just spoke really raised eloquently, any perceived offense, criminal or otherwise, both inside or outside the workplace, could be prosecuted under this policy.

The document also expands the definition of faculty, and the document itself notes that the definition of faculty does not match that of all other University documents.

Third: The procedures in the original documents are drawn from the legacy of medieval inquisitions. They collapse into a single process and office, the basis of investigation, verdict, and sanctions. I was pleased to see an amendment address this.

Although the Faculty Inquiry Panel has been described to us at the previous meeting as being like a grand jury, it is explicitly forbidden to exercise the normal powers of a grand jury to obtain documents and hear the testimony of witnesses that it summoned.

And in the original document, the Faculty Inquiry Panel consists of one faculty member outnumbered by two other non-faculty members.

Fourth: At both the Faculty Inquiry Panel and the Faculty Hearing Panel it is not clear who can cross-examine witnesses, or even whether cross-examination and conferring with a lawyer are permitted. These are actions guaranteed to employees at public state universities.

Fifth: The prosecutorial appeal of a Faculty Hearing Panel's determination of innocence is especially (inaudible) because the, I quote, "errors of law or interpretation of law which can trigger it, are almost inevitable."

The panel, the Hearing Panel, comprises faculty who, more than likely, are untutored in law. There is no (inaudible) to guide them with regard to standards or points of law, or norms in interpretation.

On the one hand, this document asserts that none of the procedures are imagined as real law, but only as administrative hearings, but it also asserts the premise that any failures of law are grounds for further prosecution since the document does not relate penalties to offenses in any useful way.

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt

Further, any penalty determined by the Faculty Hearing Panel is advisory, and the Provost, without any consultation of general counsel, can arbitrarily assign any penalty.

The only appeal against that penalty is to the President. In my view, in its present form, this document is insufficiently developed to bring to a vote.

It does offer a useful framework for a potentially sound, fair, efficient disciplinary process. It makes important moves with incorporated faculty to judge their peers in that process.

But were it to be passed in its present form, or even its amended form, it would be unworthy of the Senate, of our President, and of the University of Kentucky.

HI PPI SLEY: The motion on the floor is to return to a new committee. We're not speaking for and against the GR, that time can come, but the motion is, does it get returned to a new committee or do we take an action. That's exactly what the motion is and I think Lee was first, and then Matt, and then Gail, and then Wally.

BLONDER: I would like to speak against this motion to return to a new committee because I feel that the committee that we had was extremely diligent, extremely hard working, and expert in the area.

They have done all that they can, along with Senate Council, to put together this GR regulation proposal.

We've also had senators putting a lot of work into this over the last few weeks, to read it and to suggest these amendments, and I am personally against returning to a new committee and having it come back in November.

HI PPI SLEY: Matt?

GI ANCARLO: Matt Giancarlo, Arts and Sciences.

This is either for the Chair, or Lee Blonder or anybody else. Do we know what the calendar is for when the President hopes to have this revised policy on his desk and if returning it to committee would perhaps not meet those expectations, or what the potential forecast for that would be?

HI PPI SLEY: I'll answer this. So during the discussion period two or three weeks ago, it was made very clear that the President came to Senate with a request to formulate this GR policy so that it's Senate or faculty authored.

He made this request in 2013. He made it again when I became Senate Council Chair in November 2014. He wanted it to be delivered (inaudible) by January, 2014, the Ad Hoc Committee said that was absolutely impossible and David Watt suggested May 2015, so that he can give something to the Board of Trustees; it is the

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt
Board of Trustees who want this policy.

I don't know if anybody wants to add anything to my answer. Gail?

BRI ON: I would -- I would like to speak in favor of the motion, and the reason being is that I would like to see this GR again after all the amendments have been put in. Many of the amendments address what the motion suggests. However, this is too large for us to digest in just two meetings.

I appreciate the Committee's work, the Senate's work. I just don't think that something done fast is necessarily done well. I feel rushed.

HI PPI SLEY: If the motion passes, you will not see any amendments in the GR because we will not vote on the amendments, we will just go home.

All right? So the amendments have not been proposed and passed yet. Of all those amendments, that was (inaudible).

If this short circuits all of that, it will return in November as and start again because we will have a new body (inaudible). So it would start all over again.

All right? I checked my Robert's Rules on this. Wally?

FERRI ER: Wally Ferrier, B and E.

I likewise think that maybe some of the issues raised by Gail could be addressed through additional amendments.

And I think it's important to look at the political realities in light of the previous question that, you know, the President could very well have a ready, you know, executive action to present to the Trustees if nothing comes from us today. So what is the political reality?

HI PPI SLEY: The political reality, again echoing what Dave Watt said a few weeks ago, the President, by default, would have issued an AR, and faculty have no consultation, no endorsement of an AR.

Instead, he did something else. He asked the faculty to help him out. The Ad Hoc Committee insisted upon some sort of rule which the faculty could either approve or endorse. We got a GR, which means we endorse.

So absent this GR, he is absolutely capable of issuing an AR by June, which will have nothing to do with us at all.

Now, he may use some of what we've done up til now, but he does not need to consult us or have our approval or endorsement.

GROSSMAN: Bob, and then Joan.
Bob Grossman, Board of Trustees.

So everyone realizes about how the GRs work, the Board of Trustees is completely autonomous. They can issue any GRs they want.

Now usually, they issue GRs upon

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt

the suggestion of one or another body; the President, being one.

We can endorse a GR, it will go to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees is not required to consider that GR or vote on it.

The President can say I like this GR, I'd like you to vote on it. The President can also say that the faculty have lost their heads and this is terrible and we really shouldn't vote on it.

In the latter case, my guess is the Board of Trustees would say, why don't you guys work this out and come up something more suitable or we'll decline to vote on it.

In the former case, they probably would go ahead and approve it.

The point is that even if there are parts, parts of this GR that -- this endorsed GR coming out of the Senate, that the Board of Trustees doesn't like, they are not bound by any recommendation or endorsement of the Senate. That's one point I wanted to make.

Another point I wanted to make is that this GR is a considerable improvement, both over the system we have now, which is no system at all, and every Dean does whatever he or she wants to do.

And also, over the original suggestions that were given to us by administration, just to give you one example, this document says the burden of proof, or sorry, the standard of proof is clear and convincing evidence, which is about an 80 percent level of certainty.

The original document said preponderance of the evidence, which is a 51 percent certainty.

Now if you want to, you know, lose a month's salary or whatever based on 51 percent of 49 percent certainty, then go ahead and knock this down. I have no idea what the President's going to propose in an AR or a GR.

But if we pass this, it's a clear endorsement of the clear and convincing evidence standard of proof. And there's numerous other examples of that.

The statement about the sanctions must be commensurate with the penalties is incredibly not in the original document. So now we have a statement in there that at least gives the - that gives the Provost some guidance on sanctions and gives grounds for an appeal.

If I took a University of Kentucky ballpoint pen home and used it to do a crossword puzzle, thereby wasting University resources, so therefore, you are suspended for a year. Under this rule that is absolutely going to be a grounds for appeal.

And remember, it's not just the Provost or the -- and the President, there's

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt
also grounds for appeal in the Senate
Academic Privileges and Tenure Committee in
certain kinds of cases.

HIPPI SLEY: Joan?

TAGAVI: Can I call the question? The
reason I'm doing is because if this passes,
that's fine, if it doesn't pass, we have lost
all of this time to do any of those
amendments. So I'd like to call the
question.

HIPPI SLEY: The question can be called.
There's no discussion or debate on that. We
need a two-thirds majority. And I think we
might have some voting.

UNIDENTIFIED: We'll have to do a show of hands.

HIPPI SLEY: I want to get this right.

TAGAVI: Make it clear.

UNIDENTIFIED: Make it clear.

HIPPI SLEY: The motion is to return or refer --

TAGAVI: No, the motion is to stop the --

SEAGO: Call the question, yes.

HIPPI SLEY: So we can vote on it. Sorry. The
motion is to call the question.

GROSSMAN: The poll is closed.

BROTHERS: Just do it by hand.

GROSSMAN: Oh, there it is.

HIPPI SLEY: Oh, yes.

TAGAVI: Andrew, make it clear that if you
say yes then we will stop the discussion and
we will vote.

HIPPI SLEY: Yes.

GROSSMAN: On the -

TAGAVI: The motion to return --

HIPPI SLEY: Abigail's motion, yes. All right.

I'll give you a countdown. Five, four,
three, two, one. Calling the question. I
would say that motion passes, 43 to 18 to 2.

All right. Now we have the motion
on the floor to return to committee and show
your hands. I would like to ask you to vote
now. All in favor of returning it to
committee. Show of hands.

UNIDENTIFIED: No.

HIPPI SLEY: All right. All right.

BROTHERS: I assume you all know that one is
yes, two is no, three is abstained.

HIPPI SLEY: One is yes, two is no, three is
abstained. One is yes, two is no, three is
abstained. It needs a majority.

I'll give you a count down. Five,
four, three, two, one. It never gets as
exciting as this. So the motion is defeated
and we will now return to the motion that was
previously coming forward from Wally Ferrier,
the Wally Ferrier motion.

Once a motion to return to
committee has been defeated it cannot be made
again in the meeting.

BROWN: Point of order. Roger Brown, A
and S.

I thought we just agreed that the
process that we would go through all the
amendments and we would put it all up for a

vote and I hear you saying at that point our only option is going to be to defeat it or to agree to it. And at that point we're not going to be able - at least see all the changes.

UNIDENTIFIED: No.
BROTHERS: The motion from Senator Firey was to send the GR to a new committee and that motion failed.
SEAGO: Right. And then during the remaining discussion during this motion they cannot be returned to committee.
UNIDENTIFIED: As it was. As amended it should be able to be returned to committee and (inaudible).
HIPPI SLEY: I did say that, didn't I?
UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, you did.
SEAGO: Yes.
HIPPI SLEY: Let me deliver my promise. If we get to the point where we have a GR, then that motion can be raised again. We will --
WOOD: Point of information.
HIPPI SLEY: Yes.
WOOD: We will consider each of these amendments, then do we get to consider the original proposal as revised?
HIPPI SLEY: Yes. We have more work to do. So we will --
BROTHERS: Do you want to go back to Wally's slide?
SEAGO: Yes.
BROTHERS: Because that's where we left off.
HIPPI SLEY: We've got quite a few of these today. I think Wally gave an extremely eloquent statement on this. Is there anyone who wants to speak against it? Lee?
BLONDER: I have a question. Well, first of all, I think the first part of the amendment is already stated in the line starting with line 16 (inaudible).
But my question is what is Kentucky Administrative Regulation? It's on line 22, on Wally's --
CROSS: Al Cross, Communication and Information.
Kentucky Administrative Regulations are regulations that have a force of law, they're issued by state government agencies pursuant to law. They must be authorized by law to be issued and they're approved by legislative committees before they can take effect.
HIPPI SLEY: Margaret?
SCHROEDER: Margaret Schroeder, College of Education.
I'm sorry, I'm a little confused. Where did this come from up here, if we were given this in a handout?
HIPPI SLEY: This is the proposer himself, made an adjustment. Wally, can you explain?
UNIDENTIFIED: You amend your own amendment.
HIPPI SLEY: You amend your own amendment.
FERRIER: Yes. Wally Ferrier, B and E.

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt

My original amendment sent to you all at Senate Council was read. Bob Grossman sent me I think just one-on-one, a private note that yes, there was some redundancy among federal law and state within the paragraph. So we revised - I revised my own amendment.

This is what we should be voting on. It simply strips the redundancies from the paragraph.

HIPPI SLEY: It's not a substantive change.

FERRIER: It's not a substantive change. The key ingredients here are when acting within or on behalf of the University. And indifferent to a faculty member's misconduct in private domain to the point of, and you can read the rest. Thank you.

HIPPI SLEY: I'm going to encourage us to really stick to the substance here or we're going to get too hung up on the process.

MAZUR: So this is -- Point of order. I really don't think this is okay. I don't think we can have things that we haven't had presented to us in this formal process.

And I appreciate the effort for clarity and corrections, but we have before us what we need to vote on and I really think we should stick to that. Joan Mazur, College of Education.

HIPPI SLEY: Kaveh?

TAGAVI: I have been in the Senate for maybe 20 years. I've never called the question. And I'd like to call the question again. The reason for that is, first of all, you said we cannot have amendment on the floor, which is incorrect, and our parliamentarian was wrong when she said you could ask that.

But beyond that, when you ask for written amendments, they're time-stamped in the order that you should offer those amendments.

I am being quiet about having this section by section, but I'm asking my colleagues, please, we all know the issue, let's just vote so that other amendments will get a chance.

HIPPI SLEY: So the question is being called again.

TAGAVI: I didn't quite call it, but I will.

HIPPI SLEY: Are you going to give it a chance, are you going to call it?

TAGAVI: No, not yet.

UNIDENTIFIED: Fair warning.

HIPPI SLEY: Let's get moving. I mean, please say what you have to say, but we have to move, too.

Any further discussion for or against the amendment? Hearing none, let us vote on this amendment, accepting this amendment. It has a second. Amend the amendment.

UNIDENTIFIED: You have them backward. Keep

going, keep going. Stop. No, keep going.
HIPPI SLEY: This is --
UNIDENTIFIED: There's no amendment to Ferrier's.
HIPPI SLEY: This is the amendment. We're going
to get there. I'll give you a five second
count down. Five, four, three, two, one.
The amendment now lives in the document.
The new document, that we will come
up with, will have Ferrier's amendment in it.
Now we're going to go to another
part of the documents, section II, scope.
And this was language suggested by, moved by
Senator Tagavi. Do we have a second?
BRION: Second.
HIPPI SLEY: Gail Brion, second. He provided a
rationale so I won't ask him to give it to us
again. You had a chance to look at that.
So is there anyone who would like
to speak for or against it, now is the time.
Hearing no further discussion, let's vote on
accepting or rejecting this.
JASPER: Sam Jasper, Dentistry.
I just wanted to ask a point of
clarification on the last amendment, did that
include the changes on page 2 of that, too,
that Wally read? It was under Ferrier's
amendment, also.
BROTHERS: That will be addressed separately.
HIPPI SLEY: No. It's section by section.
JASPER: Okay, thank you.
HIPPI SLEY: No further discussion on this? All
right, let's vote. Five, four, three, two,
one. Okay. The motion passes.
Now we move to floor procedures, A,
allegations, moved by Senator Lee. And it's
an insertion (inaudible), the rationale was
provided. We will hear anyone who wants to
speak for or against the motion.
WOOD: I want to know what's the deal with
my clicker's not working.
BROTHERS: What do you mean, your clicker is
not working?
WOOD: It just goes red when I try to push
it.
BROTHERS: Laura, do you mind giving her a
substitute clicker and then just note the
number?
ANSCHER: Yes.
HIPPI SLEY: As we're waiting on Connie, anyone
want to speak for or against? Bob and then
Senator Cross.
GROSSMAN: I would like to speak against this
motion.
BROTHERS: I'm sorry. Who was the second to
this amendment?
HIPPI SLEY: The second is Gail Brion.
BROTHERS: Okay.
GROSSMAN: I would like to speak against this
amendment. First of all, the allegation
involving a criminal activity, for example,
murder doesn't have a statute of limitations.
UNIDENTIFIED: Right.
GROSSMAN: So this could allow a prosecution

to go back 40 years if it involves a criminal activity. But presumably, the less serious allegations don't involve criminal activity, well, then there's a twelve month.

So you go where less serious ones have a shorter statute of limitation which doesn't make a whole lot of sense.

The other thing is that twelve months is extremely arbitrary. I think we can leave it to the judgement of the Faculty Panel as to whether a particular allegation is -- should be prosecuted.

HIPPI SLEY: Senator Cross?

CROSS: Al Cross, Communication and Information.

Bob is correct. There is no statute of limitations on a felony in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. So it raises the question how applied.

You can probably solve the problem by saying, on the second line, must occur within any statute of limitations, thus, if there was any statute of limitations for any crime, and it does apply to this, and I would make that amendment. I move that it thus be amended.

HIPPI SLEY: We have a motion to (inaudible)?

BROTHERS: Your name, please?

HIPPI SLEY: Senator Cross has the motion.

CROSS: Moves.

KENNEDY: Second, Kennedy, Emeriti.

HIPPI SLEY: So there'll be an insertion with (inaudible).

BROTHERS: Al, can you give me that sentence again?

CROSS: Second line, instead of the statute, any statute.

BROTHERS: Any statute.

GROSSMAN: And do you delete the second sentence also?

CROSS: I'm just sticking with this.

PORTER: Well, you're amending an amendment and so you have to vote on it. Could you have taken it as a friendly amendment?

TAGAVI: Yes, you should do that.

HIPPI SLEY: Is Senator Lee here? Could you take that as a friendly amendment?

VAILLANCOURT: Yeah. I think Senator Lee is not here, but I will -- I'm also from the College of Ag, Lisa Vaillancourt.

(Inaudible).

HIPPI SLEY: I don't think (inaudible). So we have a motion to put any in there, and we have a second and we can discuss that motion or not.

All right, we will move -- we will vote on the amendment to an amendment.

BROTHERS: All right. Let me make a new slide for that.

So this isn't the actual amendment, this is the amendment to amendment we're going to vote on right now.

Just to put any (inaudible). Five,

four, three, two, one. Okay, we have any in the amendment.

We'll get back to the original -- so we have an amended amendment from Senator Lee, which is on the floor, we need to go forward?

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

HIPPI SLEY: Okay. Anyone want to speak for or against this amendment? Senator Vaillancourt?

VAILLANCOURT: Yes. Lisa Vaillancourt, College of Ag.

And I just wanted to explain the rationale for this amendment, from our college, is that we felt like it was important to have some kind of an end point for allegations since the allegations basically can come from anyone in any form.

If we just imagine that, you know, 10, 20 years later, somebody could accuse you of having done something and you have to actually deal with it, which could be difficult because you have to (inaudible).

So we felt like it needed some end point and one year was kind of arbitrary, but that's just kind of what we felt like was reasonable.

HIPPI SLEY: Kaveh, Dave, and then Gail.

TAGAVI: In all fairness, this is -- it's difficult for me to disagree with this amendment, but if somebody lies regarding their PhD, they do not have a PhD. They say they have a PhD. 30 years later, doesn't matter. This is not a crime.

If 30 years later we could establish that they do not have a PhD, they should be fired.

Unfortunately, the way this is written might now allow it. I don't mind putting a limit on that especially after knowing the problem.

In fact, one of my amendments, 30 days would be fair, a month. That really doesn't matter that much.

HIPPI SLEY: Gail and then Dave.

BRI ON: I'm -- I'm curious as to -- and I go back to Dr. Ferrier. We found this amendment relates to the amendment that we just approved because in that amendment criminal activity did not impede a faculty member from doing his job is not considered under here, and I hear criminal activity like murder now being considered.

I'm not sure (inaudible) relate to each other. So I'm asking for clarification.

HIPPI SLEY: Can someone provide clarification for Gail?

BROTHERS: Senator Lee isn't here.

BRI ON: No, I'm asking Dr. Ferrier how he thinks this relates to this one.

FERRIER: Dr. Ferrier needs time to process.

I don't know, honestly.

BRI ON: Either do I.

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt

HI PPI SLEY: Dave and then Connie.

WATT: I'll pass.

HI PPI SLEY: Connie?

WOOD: I was hoping you would speak.
I have to speak against it. There are many times when research or academic misconduct can occur, but it does not come to light within a specified period of time. And the way this is written, it would then not be punishable, and I think that that's inappropriate for an academic institution.

HI PPI SLEY: Yes?

HEALY: Many statutes of limitations --

HI PPI SLEY: Name?

HEALY: Michael Healy, the Ombud.
Many statutes of limitation have a discovery rule. So I mean, the -- it'd be hard to write this in at the moment, but that would be what would happen is you have to say within 12 months of the -- of the misconduct being discovered. I mean, that's how we do it in law.

HI PPI SLEY: Dr. Porter?

PORTER: Todd Porter, Pharmacy.
Is there a difference between 12 months and 365 days here that's relevant? What's going on with the leap year in this? Can we drop the 365 days?

HI PPI SLEY: We can think about that. Any further discussion so we can move to the next one?

GI ANCARLO: Matt?
Matthew Giancarlo, Arts and Sciences.
Following on the suggestion that we just heard, I would propose or move that we amend the proposal to say, must occur -- must occur within 12 months of discovery of the alleged behavior. This is in line 81.

BROTHERS: I'm sorry. Say that again, Matt.

GI ANCARLO: It's towards the end. I would amend the modification to read within 12 months of the discovery of the alleged behavior.

HI PPI SLEY: Does anyone want to move to insert that phrase?

UNIDENTIFIED: I'll second it.

HI PPI SLEY: It's been seconded. This is the motion right now for discussion or vote. Anyone want to further discuss this motion to amend the amendment?
Okay, we will vote on this. Five, four, three, two, one. The amended -- the (inaudible) amendment has now passed.
So okay, as just amended, that was Matt Giancarlo. Hearing no further discussion, we will vote.

BROTHERS: The next one.

HI PPI SLEY: You might have gone too far.

UNIDENTIFIED: Do you need a new slide?

BROTHERS: This is voting for the Lee motion as just amended.

HI PPI SLEY: This is the amendment. One is yes,

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt

two is no. Is everyone clear? Okay. I'll give you a count down. Five, four, three, two, one. Okay, the Lee carries. This is Procedures, A. Allegations, by Senator Ferrier, lines 85 to 89. Does anyone want to speak for or against?

UNIDENTIFIED: What line numbers?

HIPPISLEY: If you look at the document, it should be lines 85 to 89. Anyone like to speak for or against?

BRION: I would like to speak for --

HIPPISLEY: Well, we need a second. Yes, we need a second.

BRION: And I will second.

HIPPISLEY: Name?

BRION: Gail Brion. And I speak for this. I believe it's very important that academic freedom is protected and not be an actionable item, (inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: Anyone else like to speak? Hearing no further discussion, all right, we will move to vote. There are no amendments to it. Five, four, three, two, one. The amendment has been accepted, it's part of the document. Okay, we move to an amendment proposed by Senator Xenos. Line 18 for insertion. Is there a second?

TAGAVI: Second.

HIPPISLEY: Anyone want to speak for against? Kaveh?

TAGAVI: Over the weekend -- Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering -- I spent an hour, couple of hours on other codes at universities such as Berkeley, University of New Mexico, Wisconsin, and none of them allowed complaint from anybody other than faculty, staff, and students, and administrators. This doesn't quite do that, but I would like to speak in favor of that.

HIPPISLEY: Lee?

BLONDER: Lee Blonder, Medicine. I think I understood from talking with Marcy Deaton at a Senate Council meeting that UK Healthcare and the entire University has a hotline where they accept anonymous allegations and they have to investigate them. So I don't know that we can do this, so I'd like to speak against it.

HIPPISLEY: Bob and then Kaveh.

GROSSMAN: I was going to say what Lee said. We currently accept anonymous allegations. They are investigated. There's procedures for dismissing them without concerning the faculty member at all if they are from crazy people, which does happen.

HIPPISLEY: So it's a structural issue.

GROSSMAN: Federal law --

TAGAVI: There is an easy fix for that. We can say if as required by law. So the sexual harassment has to be done anonymously, we

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt

could put that provision in there. So the concern that we (inaudible) that, it could be easily done by a small amendment by saying if otherwise not required by law.

HIPPI SLEY: I think when Marcy was there she was just hoping it's to be any kind of complaint. And that's putting it in the GR. Armando?

PRATS: Armando Prats.
What if a student alleged something on a faculty member in an evaluation, which would be anonymous?

Would there be an obligation on the part of the University to investigate that with these? And is that not a sort of an amendment to these (inaudible).

It's a valid thing, like somebody is accused of being racist by somebody who does not want to come forward, but has been hearing, you know, this and that in the classroom all semester long, but we do nothing about it because it's anonymous.

HIPPI SLEY: Dave?

WATT: I speak in favor of what Armando just said because you can have a situation where a student will come to you and say they witnessed the following incident happen between a faculty member and another student, but they are not prepared to give you their name.

And sometimes these are serious enough that, quite frankly, you really should look at them. And so I would oppose this particular motion.

I understand the concern, but I think you still would want to investigate those sorts of things, those sorts of issues.

HIPPI SLEY: Bob then John.

GROSSMAN: Just quickly to answer Armando's question. The GR -- the proposal says any person may make a complaint against the faculty member by making allegations to the chair of a faculty member's department, the dean of the faculty member's college or an appropriate university official.

So in my reading, student evaluations wouldn't count because you're not making them specifically to one of these three (inaudible).

JOHN WILSON: John Wilson, Medicine.

The anonymity is to protect faculty who may witness offenses by a dean or vice president and would be at great risk if they were to come forward. I would speak against the amendment.

HIPPI SLEY: Anyone else want to speak for or against?

UNIDENTIFIED: Call the question.

HIPPI SLEY: We maybe don't need to call the question, maybe the discussion is over already.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, it's over.

HIPPI SLEY: All right. Dave, the discussion is

over.

WATT: Fine.

HIPPI SLEY: We don't need that.

UNIDENTIFIED: Is it an amendment?

UNIDENTIFIED: What are we voting on?

HIPPI SLEY: We're voting on that anonymous clause. The Senator Xenox amendment.

All right, I'll give you a count down. Five, four, three, two, one. Okay. So that amendment was rejected, it will not live in the GR proposal (inaudible).

We now move to staying with IV Procedures, A. Allegations. This is another amendment by Senator Lee to insert this language at her line 89. Anyone want to speak for or against?

BROTHERS: The second?

HIPPI SLEY: Oh, we need a second.

MAZUR: Second.

HIPPI SLEY: Second from Joan. Bob?

GROSSMAN: I'd like to propose an amendment because I think believe the term clearly related issues of academic freedom is a little too broad.

There -- just as an example, if I'm looking -- if I decide I want to do research in human sexuality and I use my UK computer to look up pornography, that's clearly related to academic freedom, but isn't within the bounds of academic freedom.

So I would like to change -- if you could put up the wording there again. Allegations that are clearly within the bounds of academic freedom, rather than related to the bounds of academic freedom.

HIPPI SLEY: Any discussion? Who seconds this amendment to the amendment?

STEINER: I second.

HIPPI SLEY: Shelly seconds. Anyone want to speak for or against?

TAGAVI: Is it a friendly amendment?

HIPPI SLEY: Lee is not here.

TAGAVI: Well, if he is not here then he cannot move it. Somebody here has to move it for him.

GROSSMAN: It's already been moved.

HIPPI SLEY: He moved it by writing (inaudible). Anyone want to speak for or against this amendment to this amendment? No? All right, let's vote on it.

UNIDENTIFIED: We'll vote on this and then we'll go to the next one.

HIPPI SLEY: This is a motion to amend the amendment, not the amendment itself. All right. Five, four, three, two, one. Bob's amendment to the amendment, that's what we're doing. All right. Bob's amendment carries and now we're on the original motion as amended. Anyone want to speak for or against? Todd?

PORTER: The amendment, regardless of how it's worded, is not necessary. The dean

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt

always has the discretion to dismiss an allegation in discussion with the faculty member or even without. So there's no need for this wording.

HIPPI SLEY: Anyone else want to speak for or against? Senator Vaillancourt?

VAILLANCOURT: Yeah, Lisa Vaillancourt, College of Ag.

This was actually my amendment, Lee wrote it in for me. I didn't realize that the dean had that discretion, when we were reading that, it seemed like he had to refer it to Council and I guess I was worried about the crazies calling in and complaining and (inaudible).

HIPPI SLEY: So you're speaking against it?

VAILLANCOURT: Well, just clarifying, I guess, why it came up.

HIPPI SLEY: Yes?

DIETZ: Hank Dietz, Engineering.

Line 96, the dean must inform the general counsel, sounds pretty unambiguous to me.

VAILLANCOURT: Sorry. That's how I read it, too.

HIPPI SLEY: Ernie?

BAILEY: I had that same point.

HIPPI SLEY: Any other discussion? Dave.

WATT: General Counsel was actually very interested in talking with deans about this because although some of you may believe that all deans act uniformly across the University, that is not the case.

And General Counsel would like to make sure that Dean No. 1 is not dismissing some allegation that, in fact, should come forward, or Dean No. 2 is pushing forward some allegation that quite frankly should not be handled.

So I would urge you to defeat this amendment.

HIPPI SLEY: Any further discussion? All right, let's vote on this as amended. We don't need that. Here we are. I'll give you a countdown. Five, four, three, two, one. Narrowly, the amendment is defeated. It will not live in the proposed GR at the end of the day.

We now move on to an amendment moved by Senator Grossman, it needs a second.

MAZUR: Second.

HIPPI SLEY: Second by Joan. It's an insertion at 86 of his document. He provided a rough draft. Connie?

WOOD: I'd like to speak in favor of this.

The committee was originally told that this policy would be for all faculty, regardless of whether or not they held an administrative appointment.

And so this provision was in our report that just allows the process to continue if the accused is above the level of a chair. And so it is very greatly needed if this policy is to apply to all faculty.

UNIDENTIFIED: Has this been seconded?
HIPPI SLEY: It's been seconded by Joan.
All right. Hearing no further discussion, we will vote. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries. We now move to Procedures, A., Allegations, moved by Senator Tagavi. And he's added in a clause and provided a rationale.
TAGAVI: Do I briefly go through this?
HIPPI SLEY: You provided the rationale, unless someone asks anything, I don't think you need to.
BROTHERS: Is there a second?
HIPPI SLEY: Is there a second?
MAZUR: Second.
HIPPI SLEY: Second by Joan again.
MAZUR: Keep moving here.
HIPPI SLEY: Let's keep going, yes.
Anyone want to speak for or against?
TAGAVI: I'd like to speak for it. The rationale for this is after a case is adjudicated, ten years later or three years later, some new evidence comes, fine, fair is fair. But if the General Counsel or the dean does not move on it, they shouldn't be able to sit on that forever.
Now, if somebody wants to say 30, make it 31, or two months, I'm okay with that. But that's the rationale.
HIPPI SLEY: Thank you for that. Senator Dietz?
DIETZ: Hank Dietz, Engineering.
I would suggest if you're going to change it to 30 days, we already have the one year (inaudible) for other discovery. Perhaps that would apply here as well, if you would consider that as a friendly amendment.
TAGAVI: Did you amend it?
DIETZ: I'm suggesting it as a friendly amendment.
TAGAVI: I accept.
HIPPI SLEY: So this is no longer 30 days, but --
DIETZ: One year.
HIPPI SLEY: Twelve months.
TAGAVI: Twelve months.
DIETZ: Twelve months.
SEAGO: I believe that was the earlier phrase used in the amendments.
HIPPI SLEY: So this is a friendly amendment so we're not going vote on that.
UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah. One year, 12 months, whatever the wording is.
HIPPI SLEY: Any further discussion on the Tagavi's rationalized amendment? All right. Hearing none, we will vote on it. I'll give you a count down of five seconds. Five, four, three, two, one. And the motion passes. Okay. So this is a motion also by Senator Tagavi. (Inaudible). He provided a rationale already. Anyone for or against it?
BROTHERS: Second for it, please.
HIPPI SLEY: Second.

WATT: I think when this was included --
CHRIST: Second.
HIPPI SLEY: Second by Alice.
WATT: I think this was -- Dave Watt,
Medicine -- but when this was included,
Tagavi, we actually didn't expect them to
make a recommendation. It says non-binding,
I believe, and I think the feeling of the
committee that looked at this is: we value
Terry Allen's opinion.
So if Terry Allen has done an
investigation, we'd like to know kind of what
Terry Allen thinks about this as it might
compare with other investigations that he's
done of harassment.

TAGAVI: I'm surprised that Professor
Watt is now bringing this up because last
time he said it was left by mistake. And, in
fact, I'm surprised that it was not fixed.
The problem is if a UK entity
call in office of (inaudible) or the police
department (inaudible). They put in the
report that this is guilty, it kind of puts a
really bad case or anger to the next one
which says University (inaudible) Faculty
Inquiry Panel.
I think Dr. Watt agrees with
me, that this should be limited to just
facts. That this is a fact-finding
endeavor on that on that very first
(inaudible).

HIPPI SLEY: Any further discussion? Hearing
none, vote. Five, four, three, two, one.
Okay, motion passes.
We'll now move to a section C, part
C of the Procedures and this is moved by
Senator Lee. Anyone want to speak for or
against this particular amendment?

WATT: (inaudible) I'll speak against.
HIPPI SLEY: Oh, we'll need a second. Second?
BLONDER: I'll second.
HIPPI SLEY: Lee.
WATT: So I'll speak against this
amendment. I understand the sentiment that
is expressed here. Perhaps I mentioned last
time that the University is under federal law
to complete investigations of sexual
harassment from the time of discovery to the
end to 90 days.
And it was the President's
instructions that we try to devise a policy
that could be accomplished within 90 days.
Yes, I can understand that if a
faculty member is in a library in Italy,
they're going to have to come back and
there's going to have to be some adjustment,
but I would rather sensible souls kind of
work together to see how to get things done
in a timely fashion than to put this
particular type of language into the
document.

HIPPI SLEY: Ernie?
BAILEY: Ernie Bailey, Ag, Food, and

Environment.

There's a lot of discussion amongst the senators in our college about this, and the intent and the interest really was to give the faculty member who is accused an opportunity to consult with a lawyer or to defend himself.

HIPPI SLEY: Kaveh?

TAGAVI: Also again, if that's -- here's to what Senator Watt mentioned, if that's the real concern, the only concern is to say unless otherwise required by federal laws or other regulation. It doesn't have to (inaudible) all together, you could amend it to make it to where you want it.

BAILEY: I accept that as a friendly -- no, I can't because that's Chad's (inaudible).

HIPPI SLEY: Are you moving to amend what you just?

BAILEY: No.

HIPPI SLEY: Any further discussion? Bob.

GROSSMAN: Am I allowed to suggest a substitute amendment?

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

GROSSMAN: Normally, I would, but I don't know if I'm allowed to today.

BAILEY: No.

HIPPI SLEY: Any further discussion?

GROSSMAN: Then okay, I would like to propose an amendment to this amendment and not write in a substitute amendment because that isn't allowed.

Hearing what Dr. Watts said and also hearing the sentiment here, I would like to propose an amendment which would strike the last sentence and instead -- so right after the part that's being left in, by the faculty member, comma, or longer if circumstances so indicate.

This way it's -- if someone is in Italy and the situation can be dealt with, you know, it needs three weeks instead of two weeks, whatever, there's some discretion on the part of the dean, rather than boxing them in on 14 days.

HIPPI SLEY: The amendment is sort of two things, a deletion and an insertion. But this needs a second (inaudible).

PORTER: Second.

HIPPI SLEY: Okay. Any discussion on deleting and inserting (inaudible)? Okay, let's vote on what Senator Grossman proposed. It wasn't that one was it?

BROTHERS: This is it.

HIPPI SLEY: Okay. Five, four, three, two, one. Okay, so that amendment passes.

UNIDENTIFIED: That was the Grossman amendment that would be amended.

HIPPI SLEY: Now we're going to entertain more of those four. Any further discussion? All right. This is just amended by Grossman and that's what we're voting on, Lee amendment. Five, four, three, two, one.

Carries.

Okay. This is moved by Senator Bailey on behalf of a non-senator. So it's basically replacing seven with fourteen. This one stays, it's there because we just passed it, I've put it in brackets so you know whether we passed it or not. We passed also the (inaudible) in the last one. So ignore the blue.

PORTER: Second.

HIPPI SLEY: Any discussion?

BAILEY: And the logic for this, again, was to give the faculty member time in order to get legal counsel. I just thought that seven days was too short.

HIPPI SLEY: Gail?

BRION: I -- have we discussed Bailey line 110 before coming to line 115 and 116?

HIPPI SLEY: It was a comment.

BROTHERS: It was a clerical edit.

HIPPI SLEY: It was a clerical, yeah, Gail.

BRION: I thought it was listed as an amendment, line 110, Bailey on behalf of (inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED: It was a comment.

HIPPI SLEY: It was a comment rather than any amendment. So that shading just means comment.

BRION: Okay. Which is listed under the list of amendments.

HIPPI SLEY: Yes, shouldn't be. Any further discussion?

KELLUM: Why shall instead of may? The shall says (inaudible).

BROTHERS: Can you say your name, please?

KELLUM: Becky Kellum, A and S.

BAILEY: Yes, that's precisely what Roberta was intending here. That it had (inaudible), not discretion. They must have that (inaudible).

HIPPI SLEY: Hearing no further discussion we will vote on this amendment. Count down. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries. And we move to motion by Senator Lee to insert something. Do we have a second?

BRION: Second, Gail Brion.

HIPPI SLEY: Gail Brion. It parallels with the earlier thing. Anyone want to speak for or against?

PORTER: Does this not address the same thing we just addressed two amendments back?

HIPPI SLEY: Yes.

PORTER: Well, do we put them both in? Do we want both of them in? I mean, if this passes what will we have?

LAUERSDORF: Well, this is the one that Bob's amendment actually struck and rewrote, or removed and rewrote.

HIPPI SLEY: At that place.

LAUERSDORF: At that place. So doesn't that call into question the language here if we're looking for this to be parallel --

BROTHERS: I'm sorry, what's your name,

please?
LAUERSDORF: Mark Lauersdorf, A and S.
UNIDENTIFIED: Well, you can propose an amendment to this, add something similar.
GROSSMAN: Okay. Line 145. So I would like to propose an amendment to this amendment, which is to strike the entire proposal and instead, on line 130 of the Chad Lee amendment's document, insert after 21 days of the dean's notification to the faculty member, comma, or longer if the dean agrees. If the dean agrees and circumstances so warrant. How about that?
UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible) the circumstances?
GROSSMAN: Well, the dean needs to be the one who makes the decision here about whether -- if the dean believes that circumstances so warrant, how about that? If the dean believes that circumstances so warrant.
UNIDENTIFIED: But that's not the wording (inaudible) --
GROSSMAN: No. But the paragraph isn't the same wording either.
BRION: You're basically taking away the (inaudible).
GROSSMAN: Yeah.
HIPPI SLEY: This proposal is to amend an amendment which could be substantial. Does he have a second? If he doesn't have a second it's not going to go anywhere.
UNIDENTIFIED: Second.
HIPPI SLEY: Any further discussion on Bob's? Let's vote on Bob's amendment to the amendment or just go forward with what's here.
GROSSMAN: But just to be clear, so insert the part with or longer.
HIPPI SLEY: This is it?
BROTHERS: This is the slide to vote on Bob's amendment.
HIPPI SLEY: Yeah, okay. All right. I'll give you five seconds. Five, four, three, two, one. It is defeated and we go back to the original motion. Can I go backwards just to see it, Sheila?
BROTHERS: Yes, you can go back. A little more.
HIPPI SLEY: All right. Any further discussion? Hearing none, let's vote on whether to accept this or reject it.
BROTHERS: One more.
HIPPI SLEY: Five, four, three, two, one. Okay, it's in.
All right. We go to Senator Tagavi to add this extra clause. Anyone want to speak for or against? Tagavi?
TAGAVI: Imagine if -- Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering.
Imagine a faculty member is doing research in computational free dynamics on the computer and the sanction is given to them that you cannot use computers or supercomputer. That's fine as the sanction,

but then you shouldn't expect them to perform and do research.

HI PPI SLEY: You explained it in your rationale.

TAGAVI: Okay.

HI PPI SLEY: Bob?

GROSSMAN: I would like to speak against this amendment. I think it's -- in the example that Kaveh gives, is the misconduct is serious enough to warrant keeping the person off the supercomputer that they need to do their research, then that should be -- that's already taken care of with the first part of the sentence.

The sentence that's already there (inaudible) seriousness of misconduct.

So if the person is using the supercomputer to try to hack into the NSA, well, then that's -- they shouldn't have done that in the first place. They should've realized the consequences.

HI PPI SLEY: Senator Dietz?

DIETZ: Hank Dietz, Engineering.

Perhaps what we want to do is rather than saying that you can't prevent them from doing this, say that it doesn't prevent someone from doing whatever it is they're doing. In other words, the -- any responsibilities that this sanction would prevent them from performing are (inaudible) or something like that.

HI PPI SLEY: Kaveh?

TAGAVI: I agree with Senator Dietz.

(Inaudible) in fact, that's the implication. In fact, I agree with Bob. If a sanction is justified, then the DOE should change, or the assignment should change, so that they're not required to do what they are required. So Hank, if you can help and correct it, I'll be more than happy to accept.

DIETZ: Okay, so -- if any of these sanctions prevent the faculty member from performing assigned, their normally assigned duties, appropriate adjustment shall be made to their assignment.

TAGAVI: I accept that as a (inaudible).

BROTHERS: So it would be the sanction prevent the faculty member from performing their normally assigned duties?

DIETZ: Their normally assigned duties. Their duties shall be (inaudible) changed (inaudible).

HI PPI SLEY: That's Tagavi's proposed amendment and it has a second. Any further discussion? Todd Porter?

PORTER: Todd Porter.

So I am opposed to this because there are some sanctions that should prevent you from doing your job assignment.

For instance, if you're sexually harassing staff or students, the goal would be to remove you from that situation and it -- that might be exactly what you want,

unfortunately.

Well, I understand you don't want to prevent somebody from doing their job because they took a pen home, but at the same time, there are some activities that (inaudible) sanction you want.

TAGAVI: Can I respond to that?

HIPPISLEY: Sure.

TAGAVI: It doesn't say you cannot impose a sanction. It just says your duty should be adjusted. (inaudible).

DIETZ: Right. That was the (inaudible) --

TAGAVI: I don't (inaudible) against

(inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: Anyone else against or for?

Hearing no further discussion, this is what we're voting on. Five second warning. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries.

This is our motion by -- amendment proposed by Senator Grossman on line (inaudible) of his document. It needs a second.

MCCORMICK: Second.

HIPPISLEY: Second by Katherine McCormick.

Anyone want to speak for or against?

WATT: Although I am generally in favor of what Bob proposes, my concern is that this is a difficult area that requires professionals to do assessment of when people should be mandated to have counseling, when they should perhaps have more serious treatment.

I don't think inserting this particular phrase in this document is going to solve the broader problem that I pointed out to the Senate last time: we don't have a good mechanism for dealing with faculty who have behavioral or mental health issues, and this, unfortunately, I don't think is going to solve the problem.

CHRIST: I agree. I think it makes it look like treatment is a sanction and that's a

mistake.

HIPPISLEY: John?

WILSON: John Wilson, Medicine.

Suppose a professional decides that Wilson needs extensive medication. Am I required to take it? I am speaking against this.

CHRIST: What professional? We don't have one in here. That's the problem.

HIPPISLEY: Anyone else want to speak for or against? Jeremy?

CRAMPTON: Jeremy Crampton, A and S.

This also goes to the comment that was made about the distinction between public and private life.

GROSSMAN: If I could just say, first of all, I don't expect this to solve the entire problem, but certainly, this could be the best thing that ever happened to a faculty member, to say, hey, you need help. You

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt
should get help.

I purposely inserted the professional needs to determine whether treatment is indicated because you don't want the dean saying you need help.

This -- you need to be assessed to see whether you need help. So I understand the privacy questions and all that, but again, this is one option among many options for sanctions.

So this fairly -- it will be -- again, it's indicated by circumstances. So again, this could be the best thing that ever happened, otherwise it's just punishment, punishment, punishment.

This is actually trying to get somebody some help.

HIPPISLEY: Connie?

WOOD: We're all aware of the problem. I do not think that this addresses the problem, a very significant and serious problem, and our committee decided that rather than to, perhaps, misaddress the issue is not to address the issue.

EL-MALLAKH: May I speak?

HIPPISLEY: Yes.

EL-MALLAKH: As a mental health professional --

BROTHERS: Name, please?

EL-MALLAKH: Oh, I'm Peggy El-Mallakh, College of Nursing.

I just want to point out some of the legal issues involved in involuntary treatment. You can only force treatment under the criteria of danger to self, danger to others or inability to care for yourself, and anything outside of that, you cannot force treatment on people.

HIPPISLEY: Any further discussion?

KENNEDY: There are two things addressed here. One is assessment, the other is requirement for treatment. Can we get rid of the requirement of treatment part but leave the assessment part?

HIPPISLEY: Can I ask you if you have an answer for that?

EL-MALLAKH: Yes. You cannot require treatment under state law. That is Kentucky law that there are only three criteria on which you can force treatment involuntarily.

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible) assessment.

EL-MALLAKH: You can require assessment, but regardless, if the assessment shows anything less than danger to self, danger to others, or inability to care for yourself, you cannot force treatment and you must -- an emergency physician would release a person that did not meet those criteria after an assessment.

HIPPISLEY: Maybe Bob will accept this a friendly amendment?

GROSSMAN: Yeah. So drop -- if his amendment is to drop starting with "and" there between the commas, then I accept his amendment.

HIPPISLEY: This is how to do business. Okay.

Hearing no further discussion about this amendment - yes, there is.

PFEFFER: Yeah, there is one. I'm not sure I want the dean to be --

BROTHERS: Name, please?

PFEFFER: It's Sean Pfeffer, Business. I'm not sure I want the dean to be able to look at me and go, you need to go get mental health treatment. No, no, not get treatment, go get assessed, which is what you said they can do. So I understand the dropping of the second part.

But you guys in here want the administration of the University to be able to look at you straight out and require you to go get assessed for alcohol (inaudible). I'm not positive that this helps. Think of that when voting on this.

HIPPISLEY: Let's vote.

O'CONNOR: Lisa O'Connor, College of Communication and Information.

Wouldn't it be satisfactory to say the treatment may be an option, I mean, wouldn't this be a voluntary thing to say, I've got a problem, I need help, I need assessment and that would (inaudible).

CHRIST: It's in the sanctions list.

HIPPISLEY: It falls in the category of sanctions. (Inaudible).

GROSSMAN: Someone always has the option to go.

DIETZ: Hank Dietz, engineering.

It sounds to me like because this is listed as a sanction, there's already an assumption that there has been some finding was (inaudible). So I think this is reasonable to have under the circumstance. We're not talking about this happening (inaudible) started.

HIPPISLEY: Any dying last points to make?

TAGAVI: To my dear colleagues, we're going to lose time. We have bigger fish to fry. (Inaudible). The issues are known, so please be brief. (Inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: Back in the back, any further discussion? No? I'll give you a five second countdown. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion is defeated. We will move on. Anyone like to second this motion?

BRIAN: I second it.

HIPPISLEY: Second from Gail. Is there any discussion? Kaveh gave us a great rationale before. Yes. Kaveh?

TAGAVI: I'd like to speak in favor of this motion. I just -- I just cannot fathom any situation where a 50 percent reduction in salary for five years is justified when the faculty member should not be fired.

HIPPISLEY: Thank you. Any other comments?

TAGAVI: And in fact, I'd like to invite, I know this is my amendment, I'm kind of stuck with it, I don't know if I can amend my own amendment, but I invite others since I

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt
didn't see any other codes that the salary
reduction is justified. I would like
somebody to amend this and actually drop the
whole line.

BLONDER: So amended. I'll make that
amendment.

HIPPI SLEY: So it's a friendly amendment.

GROSSMAN: To do what?

BROTHERS: To remove the whole thing?

TAGAVI: The reason I don't accept is that
if this amendment stays, I want this
amendment to be voted on, otherwise this is a
friendly amendment. That's the only reason.
Otherwise, that is a friendly amendment. I
would like to not accept it.

HIPPI SLEY: Let's go ahead and vote on this
amendment. Connie, do you want to speak for
or against?

WOOD: I guess against. Because I'd like
to speak for what Lee wants to do. Every
year I've been here, and I will not give you
the exact number, the salary raises have been
merit based, and what they are doing here is
trying to roll back raises that were merit
evaluation.
And I think that reduction in
salary for a specified period of time should
only be allowable if it is found that the
merit evaluation on which the raise was based
is found to be based on fraudulent
information, but so -- I mean, I don't know
how they can just say we're going to dock you
when it was merit based.

HIPPI SLEY: Tagavi?

TAGAVI: I changed my mind. I accept that
as friendly amendment. Lee's amendment I
accept as a friendly amendment.

GROSSMAN: There's no wording to it.

HIPPI SLEY: Lee?

BLONDER: To strike the entire sentence about
reduction of salary as a sanction.

HIPPI SLEY: That's now Tagavi's amendment. He
accepted it as a friendly amendment. This is
on the floor unless there's any further
discussion about this. All right. Striking
out a sanction, we can now vote on it. Five,
four, three, two, one. All right, that
sanction's now removed.
All right. I don't know if
this needs much discussion.

CROSS: Point of order. The sanction is
not removed knocked down the amendment. I
mean, if the original document (inaudible) --

HIPPI SLEY: Oh, yes. We haven't voted on the
document. Thank you, Senator Cross.

WOOD: That was not the intent.

UNIDENTIFIED: It was a friendly amendment.

WOOD: His amendment became to be
to strike the whole line, and that's what we
voted on.

HIPPI SLEY: We are now discussing this
amendment. No further discussion on this
one, we will vote. Yes, no. It needs a

second.

MAZUR: Second.

HI PPI SLEY: Second from Joan. Bob?

GROSSMAN: I know we're pressed for time, but can we just ask for discussion? I would just like to remind all my colleagues that right at the top it says that sanctions shall be commensurate with the offense. And so there is already a protection in here, it's presumably suspension without pay, reducing someone's salary, these types of things. People are already protected by the commensurate line. So we already got rid of the reducing of the salary, which you know, I don't feel too strongly about, but here, if suspension without pay is warranted by the offense, I think it should be an option.

HI PPI SLEY: You're speaking against it?

GROSSMAN: I'm speaking against, yes.

HI PPI SLEY: Lee?

BLONDER: I think that the line of commensurate with the misconduct is very much a judgement call and subjective, and I think I am very much in favor of striking or without here.

HI PPI SLEY: Tagavi?

TAGAVI: Actually, if you don't strike this out, you are basically allowing salary reduction because there is no -- it doesn't say for one month. If it said for a maximum of one month or three months, it would be different. If you allow this, this is basically salary reduction.

HI PPI SLEY: Further discussion? All in favor of striking out or without? Five, four, three, two, one. All right, that amendment has been accepted.

All right. Tagavi did provide an eloquent rationale for this. If anyone would like to speak for or against?

BRI ON: I second, Gail Brion.

HI PPI SLEY: Hearing no further discussion, we'll move to vote on this. Five, four, three, two, one. Okay, motion carries.

Now in a new section, (inaudible), the amendment doesn't have a second.

MCCORMICK: Second.

HI PPI SLEY: Katherine. For or against, anyone want to speak? All right, we will vote on this. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries.

Okay. It needs a second.

UNI DENTIFIED: Second.

HI PPI SLEY: Discussion?

WATT: I'd like to speak against it, Dave Watt, Medicine.

The reason for this is you can imagine a faculty member, who would like to delay this process, could submit one email and then a second email, and then, oh, I forgot to get you the third email.

You know, I think by filtering things through the General Counsel as the

only person that basically could consider or recommend that the Inquiring Panel consider new information, we will get past what I think are the inevitable delays that you're going to see otherwise.

HIPPI SLEY: Abigail and then Jeremy?

FIREY: Yes, I'd like to speak in favor of this amendment. Whether we like it or not, in many cases the General Counsel is acting on the prosecutorial side in many of these procedures, and I think it's really essential that the faculty be able to offer new information in their own defense.

HIPPI SLEY: Jeremy?

CRAMPTON: Jeremy Crampton, A and S. I think if there is going to be new evidence, I think it should be provided on one side, the other side should be provided (inaudible) evidence, too. And also, I just (inaudible), but I speak in favor.

HIPPI SLEY: Okay, thank you. Connie? Bob?

GROSSMAN: Logistically, this could be impossible because the Faculty Inquiry Panel is formed, does an inquiry and then is dissolved.

And so the faculty member comes back six months later and says, oh, hey, I have this new bit of information that you didn't think about, and you know, people are away, people have left the University. So this is going to be extremely difficult to (inaudible).

HIPPI SLEY: Tagavi?

TAGAVI: I wasn't going to talk because I want to move faster, but if what Dr. Grossman and Dr. Watt says is correct, why are we allowing the General Counsel (inaudible)? We can drop it for both, that's okay. But if the General Counsel can do it, so should the faculty member be able to.

HIPPI SLEY: You're speaking for the motion.

TAGAVI: Yes.

DIETZ: Hank Dietz, Engineering.

Why not drop everything from and that on? In other words, just leave it as open that the Faculty Inquiry Panel may consider new findings of fact. Don't specify where they're coming from.

UNIDENTIFIED: Friendly amendment.

TAGAVI: Accepted.

HIPPI SLEY: Okay, so the amendment now that Tagavi proposes -- we don't -- we don't need a second slide. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED: No (inaudible).

HIPPI SLEY: Yeah, there you go. This is now the amendment on the floor that's been accepted as a friendly amendment. Any further discussion?

MCGILLIS: Yeah, Joe McGillis, College of Medicine.

I'm a little uncomfortable with taking out or faculty member because I would

be concerned that the faculty member would not (inaudible) allowed to present new evidence. So I would argue against leaving or faculty member in.

HIPPI SLEY: Do you accept this as a friendly amendment? All right. This is Tagavi's amendment that we're going to vote on.

GROSSMAN: Just a question, please?

HIPPI SLEY: Yes.

GROSSMAN: This line here that's still up there is in the original document, right? This is not the amendment. The amendment is to delete the part about as discovered by General Counsel or whatever.

HIPPI SLEY: Right, you're right. The amendment is to delete as discovered by the General Counsel. Motion to delete. Okay, we'll vote. Five, four, three, two, one. That deletion has now been accepted as an amendment.

Okay, so now we have another one. Do we have a second? Gail?

BRI ON: No, something else.

HIPPI SLEY: Well, we need a second before we discuss.

BRI ON: I'll second that as well, but I'm just wondering at what point we no longer have a quorum.

HIPPI SLEY: We no longer have a quorum is less than 45.

BRI ON: Thank you.

KENNEDY: Kennedy. Only if someone suggests the absence of a quorum, so maybe nobody should.

HIPPI SLEY: We have a second. Any discussion on this? Okay. We'll vote on this. Five, four, three, two, one. Okay, motion carries. Tagavi again, it needs a second.

MAZUR: Second.

HIPPI SLEY: Second from Joan. Does it need a discussion? No discussion. Anybody want to speak in favor of what we're voting on?

UNIDENTIFIED: We taking the red in or taking the red out?

HIPPI SLEY: Five, four, three, two, one. All right, the motion carries. All right. I need a second for this.

BONDADA: Second.

HIPPI SLEY: Any discussion on this?

WOOD: I don't know what it means. More probative than prejudicial?

TAGAVI: It means more positive than negative, is what it means.

WOOD: The evidence of probative value means it helps the investigation. So --

TAGAVI: Our Ombud is a lawyer, could you please explain that?

HEALY: Well, pass.

HIPPI SLEY: Any other discussion on this? No? Oh, Bob.

GROSSMAN: I don't see how you can decide what the value is unless you admit the evidence first. So I move that we strike more and

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt
then -- actually delete the whole phrase, of
more probative than prejudicial value.

UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

GROSSMAN: Starting with of (inaudible) admit
any evidence. Yeah, just leave it like that.
Yes, and in any evidence.

HIPPI SLEY: I'm taking it this isn't going to
be accepted as a friendly amendment?

TAGAVI: I'm accepting it just to save time.
Let's just move on.

PORTER: Doesn't the red get taken out as
well?

GROSSMAN: No.

HIPPI SLEY: This is the amendment we are going
to vote on right now. Tagavi accepted it.
Is there any discussion further? Abigail?

ABIGAIL: Yes, I'd like to speak against this
amendment. It says, any evidence. It
doesn't say anything about the quality of the
evidence.

HIPPI SLEY: Anyone else want to speak for or
against? Okay, hearing none, we will vote on
this. Five, four, three, two, one.

UNIDENTIFIED: Can you put probative back in
there?

HIPPI SLEY: Okay. Motion is defeated.
All right, then, Senator Debski,
your moment has come.

DEBSKI: Actually, I would like to sort of
move my space. So I would like to just
consider the amendment by Tagavi made
on behalf of a non-senator because if that
passes, I would like to withdraw my
amendment.

HIPPI SLEY: Sheila, can I go past without
having a vote on this?

BROTHERS: If not, I'll just make another
slide.

HIPPI SLEY: Okay. This is Senator Tagavi
on behalf of another senator, I think.
(Inaudible).

DIETZ: Did you need a second?

HIPPI SLEY: Yeah.

DIETZ: I'll second it.

HIPPI SLEY: Okay. So all those in favor of
this motion?

UNIDENTIFIED: We need discussion.

HIPPI SLEY: Oh, sorry. Yes, Mark?

LAUERSDORF: Can we for good conscious and
voting on what we're looking at, have someone
repeat to us what G1B is?

DEBSKI: So again -- Liz Debski, A and S.
The purpose of all of this is to
remove the part that says the dean can appeal
an innocent verdict. So the language
that's --

UNIDENTIFIED: I don't know what G1B is.

HIPPI SLEY: If you look at --

GROSSMAN: I'll read G1B, if I may?

HIPPI SLEY: Yes.

GROSSMAN: In accordance -- so this is
proposed language. This isn't yet in the
document. It says, "In accordance with

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt
Section 4A above, allegations brought forward and adjudicated to finding of innocence, a dean can cost the case be reopened for new adjudication when there is substantive new evidence as determined by the General Counsel."

So G1b has some grammatical errors and it makes it hard to read, but what it does say, I think, is that new evidence will allow a case to be reopened, that's it.

UNIDENTIFIED: But this is not yet (inaudible) part of the document?

GROSSMAN: Correct. We haven't reached that part yet. This is referring forward to G, which is in the -- which we haven't reached yet.

UNIDENTIFIED: We should reach it. We should go to that now.

UNIDENTIFIED: We should go to it now.

HIPPISLEY: We can go to G1B, if you'd like.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes. (inaudible) adding a (inaudible) a G1B.

HIPPISLEY: All right. So if you see it, tell me to stop.

BROTHERS: Keep going. Keep going. There.

HIPPISLEY: There we are. This is a --

BRIAN: Second.

HIPPISLEY: Second from Gail. Does anyone need a point of clarity about this? Are we comfortable with this? Mark?

LAUERSDORF: Mark Lauersdorf, A and S. Am I correct in understanding that 1a and 1b are coming forward in tandem here, that they're both being proposed as a rewriting of the general No. 1, which appears to have been stricken in its entirety?

UNIDENTIFIED: Right.

HIPPISLEY: Yes.

LAUERSDORF: So doesn't voting on G1B presuppose --

HIPPISLEY: We're voting on this.

UNIDENTIFIED: This is the whole thing.

LAUERSDORF: Okay.

HIPPISLEY: This is a watering down of the dean's appeal basically, but it still preserves it. This is why Liz Debski says I want to know what happens here first. Yes?

BONDADA: Regarding what the General Counsel what can further (inaudible) includes the dean.

HIPPISLEY: All right, let's vote unless anyone has anything further to say. Time is getting on. I'm closing the polls in five seconds. Five, four, three, two, one. All right, motion carries.

Liz, does this have enough (inaudible) for your merits, which is all about striking off deans?

DEBSKI: Yeah, but now you can go back to the original amendment by Tagavi on behalf of a non-senator that had G1B in it, okay?

UNIDENTIFIED: You're going to go forward from this?

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt

DEBSKI: I'm not withdrawing it yet until I see whether or not (inaudible).

HIPPI SLEY: Okay, sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED: Keep going.

BROTHERS: Keep going.

HIPPI SLEY: Back. Here we are. All right. Need a second.

PORTER: Second.

UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

HIPPI SLEY: Any further discussion? Hearing none --

UNIDENTIFIED: Let it roll.

HIPPI SLEY: Let it roll. All right. So that now carries. So all the Liz Debski amendments are now being withdrawn. Is that safe to say?

DEBSKI: Yes.

HIPPI SLEY: All right. So I'm trying to find out where we start next. Do we need to go back?

BROTHERS: No, we've done that.

HIPPI SLEY: So can I go forward?

BROTHERS: Uh-huh (affirmative). That's new.

HIPPI SLEY: All right. It needs a second.

DEBSKI: Second.

HIPPI SLEY: Liz Debski seconds. Any further discussion? Hearing none -- I'm closing the polls. Motion carries. This is a Senator Debski one, we're not doing it because she withdrew it. We did this. No, we didn't. All right, we haven't done this. It's a sort of composition question, technical details, not that substantial.

BROTHERS: Second?

HIPPI SLEY: It needs a second.

FERRIER: Second.

HIPPI SLEY: Senator Wally second. Any discussion further? Hearing none, let's vote on it.

WATT: So I would speak against the putting in Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement. We seem to change Provosts the same way we change shirts, and I didn't say that with the Provost sitting here. But a new Provost comes in and changes the name (inaudible) immediately (inaudible). My point is if you put a specific name on the GR and then there's a new Provost who wants to change the name, you've got to go back and change all your regulations.

HIPPI SLEY: Thank you.

STEINER: An Associate Provost, would that?

WATT: Without a name.

TAGAVI: I accept that as a friendly amendment.

HIPPI SLEY: So that's the amendment as it is, it was accepted, friendly. Anyone else want to discuss it?

TAGAVI: Can I speak for this, quickly?

UNIDENTIFIED: No, let's go.

HIPPI SLEY: Let's go. We're ruling you out of order.

TAGAVI: I'm going to say this is friendly to the Provost because the Provost should not be (inaudible).

HIPPI SLEY: It was in your rationale. It was in your rationale. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries. All right. That's gone, she withdrew it. It needs a second.

DEBSKI: I second it.

HIPPI SLEY: Liz Debski seconds it.

GROSSMAN: Is this part of the package of amendments proposed by the --

HIPPI SLEY: This is Senator Tagavi on behalf of. Any further discussion? Connie?

WOOD: I don't understand. This is just about protection for the faculty member to get written notification. Why would we not include that protection for a faculty member?

HIPPI SLEY: So you're speaking against it?

WOOD: Yes.

HIPPI SLEY: Anybody want to speak for it? All right. Let's roll, as they say. Okay. Counting down. Five, four, three, two, one. It's defeated. All right. Second, anyone?

GROSSMAN: Second.

HIPPI SLEY: Does it need any discussion? Hearing none, we'll vote on striking that language. Okay. Five, four, three, two, one. Accepted. Second, anyone?

ILAHIANE: Second.

HIPPI SLEY: Hsain seconds. Discussion?

WOOD: This is codification, this is not substantive. I suggest we skip it, it can be cleaned up as a clerical.

HIPPI SLEY: Anyone object to it being seen as editorial?

UNIDENTIFIED: I accept that.

HIPPI SLEY: Senator Cross?

CROSS: It's not just codification, you're striking out dean and replacing (inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED: True.

CHRIST: But we defeated the revisions and agreed.

WOOD: We already limited the dean's appeal, so this is just codification.

CROSS: Okay.

HIPPI SLEY: Senator Tagavi, do you accept those (inaudible)?

TAGAVI: Yes.

HIPPI SLEY: All right. So it will not be voted on. Yes? Abigail?

FIREY: I'm not sure it is just an editorial. When you say "the accused" it means that only the accused can submit a written brief, it doesn't say whether they can do so with the assistance of legal counsel or whether counsel can write the brief.

HIPPI SLEY: Should we just vote on it to be safe?

UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah.

MCCORMICK: So were you suggesting changing that and going back to the former

(inaudible)?

FIREY: No. Because that also precludes consultation with legal counsel.

HIPPISLEY: We're in the middle of a vote.

UNIDENTIFIED: Apparently this not the time for discussion.

UNIDENTIFIED: Apparently not.

HIPPISLEY: Five, four, three, two, one. Okay, motion carries. All right. We need a second for this. Do we have a second?

ILAHIANE: Second.

HIPPISLEY: Hsain seconds. Discussion? We vote. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries.

Okay. This -- there were three or four or ten clerical edits. Senate Council said that they were clerical, the body just needs to accept the clerical edits as an amendment -- as a --

WOOD: So moved.

HIPPISLEY: Thank you. All right. Second?

UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

HIPPISLEY: Everybody. All right. We're going to vote anyway.

UNIDENTIFIED: What are we voting on?

HIPPISLEY: We're voting on the clerical edits, but it doesn't really matter. Everybody said it was okay. Okay.

We have on the floor a proposed GR that comes from Senate Council as a recommendation that the University Senate endorse the proposed new GR on Faculty Disciplinary Action -- this is the understatement -- as amended.

CROSS: Move it as amended.

UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

UNIDENTIFIED: It doesn't need a second.

HIPPISLEY: It doesn't need a second; it came from committee. Is there any discussion? Senator Lauersdorf?

LAUERSDORF: Mark Lauersdorf, A and S.

I would just like to go on record and say that expedience of process does not necessarily make good process, and I, in good conscious, cannot necessarily vote for something where I'm not sure of the internal integrity of the document, given the number and extent of changes that have been made in this process.

UNIDENTIFIED: Here, here.

HIPPISLEY: Bob and then Senator Dietz.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Board of Trustees, A and S.

Just to hopefully lay one of your concerns at rest, again, the Board of Trustees is not obliged to accept word for word anything that this body puts forth.

So if the concern is about an inconsistency here where it stills says dean when the dean had previously had the power of appeal revoked earlier, that can be handled before it is actually proposed to the Board

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt
of Trustees.

If your concern is about the rushing through process to approve the amendments, there's nothing I can say about that.

HIPPI SLEY: Gail and then -- oh, sorry, Senator Dietz.

DIETZ: Yeah. So I basically am right along with what you were saying there. I think that what we're trying to do is provide some guidance so the Board of Trustees does not end up doing this without our input at all, and I think that this is qualitatively expressing the right set of concerns.

So even though I don't like the fact that we've done this faster than I could possibly imagine, I think that it is still expressing our concerns in a more reasonable way than if we don't have a document forwarded.

HIPPI SLEY: Gail and then Wally and then Senator (inaudible).

BRION: I would like to suggest an amendment to this. As amended after review -- after review of amendments by Senate Council.

UNIDENTIFIED: No, no, no.

BRION: I want somebody to have the time -- I don't know how to say this, but I want somebody to have the time to look at the documents after all the amendments have been put in, and I'm saying I trust Senate Council to look at it to make sure that we don't have things that are still at odds.

HIPPI SLEY: Senate Council is meeting one more time on Monday.

BRION: This is what I would like to happen.

GROSSMAN: Can I -- can I ask that you trust your Faculty Trustees, John Wilson and I --

TAGAVI: Yes.

GROSSMAN: -- to clean up any inconsistencies without losing the meaning of any of the amendments. We both sat here and listened to the discussion.

TAGAVI: Yes.

GROSSMAN: And to pass it as well by the SREC as well to clean up any inconsistencies.

HIPPI SLEY: I think -- is that it in terms of comments or discussion? Wally?

FERRIER: Just one quick one. When the Board of Trustees promulgates some GR, either verbatim what we've produced here, or some other animal they're created on their own, don't we, as a body, have a chance to tweak it in the fall?

UNIDENTIFIED: No.

UNIDENTIFIED: No.

FERRIER: So no GRs can ever be revised and modified?

UNIDENTIFIED: It's got readings.

WILSON: It has two readings, and after the first reading, it requires comment, you know,

UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt
we know we can't veto it, but it does need
comment from the Staff Senate, the University
Senate (inaudible) and the rest of the
Senate. So we do (inaudible).

HIPPI SLEY: Okay. Are we ready to vote?
UNIDENTIFIED: Let's vote (inaudible).
BRION: I proposed that as an amendment,
would you like me to withdraw it if I have no
seconds?
HIPPI SLEY: Well, you didn't have a second.
BRION: You didn't ask for a second.
HIPPI SLEY: Do we have a second to Gail's
amendment to send it back to Senate Council?
JASPER: Sam Jasper, Dentistry.
I'll second.
HIPPI SLEY: Any further discussion? Gail, do
you want to vote on that amendment? Do you
want to withdraw your amendment?
BRION: Yes.
UNIDENTIFIED: You can't. It's been seconded.
HIPPI SLEY: It has been seconded. All right,
we vote on her amendment to send it back to
Senate Council. Are you withdrawing it?
BRION: I'm not withdrawing it. Just vote
on it.
HIPPI SLEY: So the vote is to send -- tell us
what the vote is.
BRION: To send it back to Senate Council.
As amended, as long as Senate Council reviews
the amendments for consistency.
HIPPI SLEY: So the motion on the floor would be
if we accepted -- if we vote for Gail's
amendment, would be as amended as long as
Senate Council reviews the amendments for
consistency. Right?
UNIDENTIFIED: Are we voting on the motion?
UNIDENTIFIED: We're voting on the amendment.
HIPPI SLEY: This is the motion and now that's
the extra language. This is what we're
voting on.
UNIDENTIFIED: We're voting on the amendment.
UNIDENTIFIED: Let's do something as a friendly
amendment.
HIPPI SLEY: The whole Senate Council would have
to accept it as a friendly amendment. Let's
vote on this. All right, we are nearly there
with this.
UNIDENTIFIED: Will we have the possibility to
have the vote without the extra (inaudible)?
GROSSMAN: Yes.
HIPPI SLEY: All right. Let's go. Defeated.
All right, so (inaudible). We need a second
(inaudible). Well, you know what the
language is to endorse the GR, all right, as
amended.
UNIDENTIFIED: As amended.
HIPPI SLEY: As amended. Yes is one and two no.
All right. We have (inaudible).
Five, four, three, two, one. We
need a motion to adjourn.
BLONDER: Wait, I have a question. Lee
Blonder, College of Medicine. What happens
next?

HI PPI SLEY: UK Senate Meeting 50415.txt
It goes to the President.

STATE 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 at the time and place stated in said caption the witness named in the caption hereto personally appeared before me, and after being by me duly sworn, was examined by counsel for the parties; that said testimony was taken down in stenotype by me and later reduced to computer transcription under my direction, and the foregoing is a true record of the testimony given by said witness.

No party to said action nor counsel for said parties requested in writing that said deposition be signed by the testifying witness.

My commission expires: April 6, 2019.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this 19th day of June, 2015.

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