

University Senate
December 12, 2011

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, December 12, 2011 in the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Hollie I. Swanson called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:05 pm. She invited President Eli Capilouto to offer his presentation.

1. Update on Current and Future Initiatives – President Eli Capilouto

President Eli Capilouto began by sharing some of stories of interactions with recent graduates in a variety of cities. They all commented on their individual pride in having earned a degree from the University of Kentucky and how well their degree stacked up against that of their colleagues. He said that UK does everything from extending and saving lives to stirring souls, noting Professor Nikki Finney (AS/English) recently winning the 2011 National Book Award in Poetry. Turning to the presentation, the President explained how UK planned to moved forward and offered senators a presentation.

After his presentation, the President answered questions from senators. Peek asked President Capilouto if he was willing to comment on the recently posted Herald-Leader article. The President replied that he has said that as UK goes forward, the academic priorities remain paramount. Acknowledging the presence of a local reporter, he said he was delighted to spend time with the editorial board of the Herald-Leader, and was asked about Rupp Arena. President Capilouto explained that he thought the various options were an exciting vision, but he could not support any request for funding from the state for Rupp Arena that competes with funds for revitalizing the campus. His comments were warmly welcomed with a spontaneous round of applause by those present. He offered a few additional comments about the matter.

D. Anderson **moved** that the University Senate offer a formal resolution supporting the statement that funds from UK will not be used for modifications to Rupp Arena. Wasilkowski **seconded**. The Chair asked for discussion. Grossman opined that the resolution did not quite capture the essence of President Capilouto's comments. President Capilouto read the day's statement on Rupp Arena, that was distributed on behalf of the President, Athletics Director Mitch Barnhart, and Men's Basketball Coach John Calipari.

In what remains a challenging economy, we must be unified as a campus community about our priorities as we seek private support and finite state dollars to help fund our dreams for the University and for the Commonwealth. To that end, our Board of Trustees, our faculty and staff, and our students have spoken with a clear and unequivocal voice: Our primary focus should – and must -- be the construction and renovation of facilities and living and learning spaces so that we can revitalize the core of our campus and, in particular, further strengthen the undergraduate education we provide. Targeted investments in athletics facilities will be part of that equation as we continue to improve our competitive position across all sports. We also will further utilize this powerful brand to recruit and retain Kentucky's best students.

After brief discussion, Grossman **moved to amend the motion** so that the Senate endorse the President's statement. Anderson and Wasilkowski both **agreed**. A **vote** was taken on the **motion** to endorse President Capilouto's statement and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Grossman reminded the President that the last time the President addressed the Senate, he was not specific about how new facilities will be funded. He asked President Capilouto if he could share more specifics. The President said he could talk about educational facilities in general. He said that in the past and in the future UK will ask permission to take on debt through the state budgeting process. He referred to information in his presentation about doing a debt capacity study for UK and said that once UK can demonstrate how it can finance construction, it will be something UK can consider.

Brion commented that she was beginning to see the President's vision; she wondered how his vision of a promise to Kentucky can be kept with respect to the number of students who cannot afford an education. He responded by saying that that he clearly articulated to individuals he met in Washington, D. C. that one quarter of UK's students rely on Pell Grants. He said that he had taken a look at the amount of debt that students hold upon graduation, and was satisfied that the amount was stable and had decreased somewhat. He is working to expand support for financial aid and to see how best to control costs.

Debski asked if it was safe to say there is a priority on educational facilities and wondered if there was a way to integrate Executive Vice President for Health Affairs Michael Karpf's plan for the medical school and health care into education. President Capilouto said that there were many parallels. The Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) has forwarded its budget recommendation with capital and operating components, although there is some uncertainty regarding how much the state can afford on the operating side. He explained that the CPE utilized components such as building age, enrollment, etc. when creating the budget. Research space is a unique factor, so funded research is also a component. He offered some additional comments about building on campus.

Butler commented that he did not see graduate education as part of the President's presentation and asked the President to comment on the professional, research master's degree and doctoral degrees are seen, and future funding. The President said that many of the things that have been undertaken in terms of facilities and enrollment meet the core of UK's mission, but is not the sole core. President Capilouto said that he thought there was a need to be more explicit on how UK acknowledges graduate, professional and undergraduate activities and identifies their associated costs. He went on to say that his perspective was that he is asking the faculty how to spend their money – the faculty have largely earned it. Expenses need to be budgeted with UK's mission and priorities. UK needs to grow its way to the top, not cut its way to the top.

In response to a question from Blonder, the President explained that the return on the \$1 million invested in utilization of Huron Consulting was, for UK, a precise analysis of UK's financial picture, with respect to UK's debt capacity. Huron will comb through UK's records as expert staff with a fresh perspective that can help us move rapidly to address other issues. Creating and integrating a transparent budgeting system by which UK can allocate finances in a \$2.7 billion enterprise is a serious undertaking that needs a team of experts. President Capilouto said that everyone needs to know what we want to achieve, and then find out if we have financial systems that support those goals. The consultants will also be relied upon to serve as analysts who can quickly and methodically answer questions and offer expertise on best practices to move quickly.

T. Conners asked about marketing UK; he opined that he saw more billboards for Spencerian and Sullivan colleges than he sees for UK academics. President Capilouto again thanked those present for giving him great material with which to start discussion with various individuals. He said that students are becoming more and more sophisticated consumers; not all marketing angles can be summed up through what is seen on billboards. He said he is always open to better ways to let people know what a great value and opportunity this University holds.

Coyne commented that the President experienced a land grant celebration recently in the College of Agriculture, and suggested that type of interaction should be available to everyone. He asked how President Capilouto meshed a desire for having the best and brightest students at UK, with making that experience accessible for all Kentuckians, particularly high-school aged students that may start their educational college career with limited academic skills. The President said that UK's admissions process has been holistic and is not determined by an ACT score or GPA. There are many programs, like UK's First Scholars organization, that assist different types of Kentuckians. He said the land grant mission is manifested in almost everything we do around here. He commented that an emphasis on community is rooted in the community and culture here. The world is very different now from when land grant universities were conceived, there were no two-year institutions. President Capilouto said that UK does want to attract the best and brightest students and are more committed to making sure everyone who comes to UK leaves here as the best and brightest, which is the strongest contribution we can make to the state.

Grossman said that everyone had been reading about administrative bloat and referred to the portion of the President's presentation that mentioned a review of the President's organization. He asked President Capilouto for more information. The President replied that it starts with his office and the people who report directly to the president, as well as those who report to both the president and the provost. He said he expected that leadership throughout the University will undertake similar, serious reviews. Grossman asked if the President had a timeline. President Capilouto replied that he did not have a specific timeline, but rather has a framework in which to look at things.

The Chair thanked President Capilouto for attending and he thanked her and senators for the opportunity to speak.

Some of the recipients of the UK Alumni Association's Great Teacher Award were in the audience – the Chair recognized them all by name and asked those present to come forward for a picture with the President.

1. Minutes from November 14, 2011 and Announcements

The Chair noted that some editorial changes to the minutes had been received. She solicited a **motion** to approve the minutes from November 14, 2011 as amended. Grossman **moved** that motion and Brion **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

There were a number of announcements.

- The Chair offered congratulations to the UK Alumni Association's 2012 Great Teacher Award winners:
 - Kristin Ashford, Assistant Professor (Nursing)
 - Arne Bathke, Professor & DGS and Director of the Applied Statistics Laboratory (AS/Statistics)

- Eric Christianson, Associate Professor (AS/History)
 - James Haubenreich, Associate Professor (DE/Oral Health Practice)
 - Ajay Mehra, Associate Professor (BE/Management)
 - Ana Rueda, Professor and Chair (AS/Hispanic Studies)
- A new web transmittal was posted December 7 – please review it!
 - There is a “new” (from the February 2011 Senate meeting) policy on religious observances. Faculty shall give students the opportunity to make up work, and shall indicate in syllabi how much advance notice is required for such an accommodation. Please visit <http://www.uky.edu/Diversity/holidays.html> for additional information.
 - Board of Trustees Chair Britt Brockman, MD, will attend the April Senate meeting – any suggestions for topics or questions can be sent to the Chair or Mrs. Brothers.
 - General note – any information communicated via email from the Office of the Senate Council can be shared with faculty colleagues. The Senate does not have a good method of disseminating information to faculty, and relies on senators and other faculty to share information.
 - There will be a University Senate “Welcome Back Reception” on Thursday, January 19, from 5 – 7 pm at the Boone Center. Please contact Dora Collins to RSVP.

2. Officer and Other Reports

a. Chair

The Chair noted that the Senate Council (SC) was currently working through the process for electing the next SC chair. She asked Wood to offer additional information. Wood reminded senators that they had previously received an email soliciting input into the election process – information will be solicited through December 14. The SC will meet on December 21 and elect the next SC chair. The nominating committee is soliciting any input from senators – anything from nominations for a particular individual to general feelings as to the direction of the SC and Senate, and how that can be affected by the SC chair. She assured senators that that comments will remain confidential – they will be summarized and shared with the SC as a whole.

- The UK Alumni Association has requested a faculty senator to serve on their Board of Directors. The Chair will serve this academic year and the SC will identify a senator to serve for the 2012 – 2013 academic year.
- The Chair attended the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) meeting on November 19. She said there was a focus on financial; there were numerous presentations on university budgets, as well as a presentation on financial exigencies. A variety of senators who attended also offered their comments on the meeting – everyone said it was a good meeting.
- The Chair announced that undergraduate and professional/graduate commencements will be held on Friday, December 16.

- The Chair invited College of Arts and Sciences Associate Dean Anna Bosch to offer an update on the document handling system. Guest Bosch did so, explaining that
- Guest and Associate Dean Anna Bosch (College of Arts and Sciences, AS) gave senators an update on the document handling system. She explained that the course approval process is being piloted in AS, since it is a large college and more likely to find pressure points in the system. Bosch explained some of the implementation practices that AS is trying. She said she was optimistic about the system.

d. Trustee Peek

Peek began by saying he saw his job as getting issues on to people's radar, and he believed he had been successful in a number of areas. He successfully worked to change the regulation regarding appearing before the Board of Trustees (Board) and just recently found in his office the rejection letter he received when he attempted to appear before the Board, prior to his election as trustee. He noted that the recent Board action regarding the Reynolds Building was positive, that the profile of the Honors Program was being raised and that a proposal for an employment ombud office was in the President's office for review. President Capilouto is working on new dorms through a private/public partnership. Although some of UK's endowments are underwater, UK will make every effort to minimize disruptions.

Peek went on to explain that he thinks the University is on a better path. On that note, he said he was resigning as faculty trustee, effective December 31, 2011; he said he had accepted a position with the Federal Reserve Bank at Boston. He quipped that he had saved the University, and will now try to save the economy. Peek offered his appreciation for the support he received, and for the help other people offered him. Peek was honored with a round of applause by senators.

Wasilkowski **moved** that the University Senate thank Joe Peek for his exemplary work. The motion was **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

D. Jones asked Peek if he had any suggestions for senators who may be interested in serving out the remainder of Peek's term. Peek offered a few comments and said that a faculty member interested in serving should understand the difference between campaigning and serving. The faculty trustee needs to get along with other trustees; Peek said he enjoyed a good relationship with the other members of the Board.

The Chair noted that there was a small remembrance for Peek and asked senators to sign it on their way out.

4. Academic Calendars

Grossman **moved** to approve the calendars (2012 - 2013 Calendar; 2014 - 2015 Calendar, Tentative; 2012-2013 Dentistry; 2014 - 2015 Dentistry, Tentative; Fall 2012 Law; Spring 2013 Law; Summer I (four-week) 2013 Law; Summer 2013 Law; Fall 2014 Law, Tentative; Spring 2015 Law, Tentative; Summer I (four-week) 2015 Law, Tentative; Summer 2015 Law, Tentative; 2012 - 2013 Medicine; 2014 - 2015 Medicine, Tentative; 2012 - 2013 Pharmacy; 2014 - 2015 Pharmacy, Tentative; 2012 - 2013 Winter Intersession; 2014 - 2015 Winter Intersession, Tentative) as published in the handout. Wasilkowski **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Establishment of Senate Committee to serve as Faculty of Record for the Honors Program

The Chair explained that prior to 2005, there was a clear body of faculty responsible for the Honors Program (Honors) curriculum, etc. Faculty who taught in the Honors Program had split appointment between Honors and their home departments. In 2005, however, policy changed and faculty teaching in Honors no longer had a split appointment; their only appointment was in their home department.

Since there is no longer a clear body of faculty to serve as the Honors Program faculty, the Senate needs to identify a group to serve that purpose. The Chair commented that the **motion** came from the SC: that the Senate create an Honors Program Committee, appointed by the Senate Council in consultation with the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, to act as the faculty of record for all Honors curriculum. This Committee will be composed of 10 faculty broadly representative of the undergraduate colleges; the Committee will report to the Director of Honors, to whom it shall transmit its recommendations for consideration by the Undergraduate Council.

Brion **offered an amendment to the motion** to change¹ the language change to “...act as the faculty of record for oversight and direction ~~for~~ of all Honors curriculum.” Coyne **seconded**. After brief discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion to amend**, and the motion **passed** with a vast majority in favor.

There was discussion among senators. A **vote** was taken and the **motion** (“The Senate will create an Honors Program Committee, appointed by the Senate Council in consultation with the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, to act as the faculty of record for oversight and direction of all Honors curriculum. This Committee will be composed of 10 faculty broadly representative of the undergraduate colleges; the Committee will report to the Director of Honors, to whom it shall transmit its recommendations for consideration by the Undergraduate Council.”) **passed** with a vast majority in favor.

6. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee - Andrew Hippisley, Chair

i. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in International Education

Hippisley explained the proposal and presented the **motion** from the Senate's Academic Programs Committee that the Senate approve the proposed new Graduate Certificate in International Education, effective spring 2012. There was very brief discussion.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (SAPPC) - Walter Ferrier, Chair

i. Update on Current Activities

Ferrier explained that the SAAPC had been revitalized over the summer and was making plans for the spring semester. He explained that that the SAAPC wanted to serve as a listening post for faculty ideas and initiatives. Ferrier said that the present time was an excellent time to affect cultural and institutional shifts toward a new normal to dream up and carry through new activities as UK moves forward. The SAAPC can serve as a meeting point for an exchange of new ideas. The SAAPC has created a listerv to facilitate the exchange of ideas.

He encouraged senators to utilize the listerv as a tool for ongoing conversation and discussion, and a way to exchange ideas. Ferrier also mentioned that the SAAPC wants to recognize the faculty member who proposes the best “great idea, but...” with an award, simply to celebrate bold, fresh ideas.

¹ Strikethrough formatting denotes deleted text and underlining denotes added text.

c. Interim General Education Oversight Committee (IGEOC) - Bill Rayens, Chair

i. Report to the Senate

Guest Bill Rayens introduced himself, explaining that he was chair of the Interim General Education Oversight Committee (IGEOC) and saying that he was present to report to the Senate on what IGEOC has been doing for the past 20 months.

Rayens gave senators a presentation outlining the hard work performed by IGEOC, including:

- Developing a plan for vetting courses;
- Creating forms for submissions of courses to be offered as UK Core courses;
- Requesting and receiving approval from the Senate Council (SC) for said plan and forms;
- Emphasizing intricate review of courses for inclusion in UK Core; and
- Ensuring the review is not unnecessarily thoughtful.

Approximately 200 courses have been approved for UK Core, with about 150 of them having been vetted by IGEOC; the remainder were vetted by the body that served prior to IGEOC. Because IGEOC was told early on that its roles would be defined as IGEOC functioned and worked, they developed a role in assessment and were asked to serve as a group to facilitate development and revisions of rubrics used to score artifacts used across campus. One cycle of that has been completed for Composition and Communication, as well as for Citizenship courses. The faculty who participated in scoring have suggestion for how rubrics could be revised, and those suggestions are moving back through IGEOC. Rayens explained that IGEOC's charge was essentially to help think through things as they come up, and things come up all the time. He noted that IGEOC did not set policy, but the SC had reminded IGEOC that the committee should offer suggestions regarding how the committee, and future processed, should function.

Rayens closed by saying he was proud of the members of IGEOC, who were singularly loyal to the Senate-approved outcomes. Although IGEOC is faculty-friendly, it is all very stubborn when issues of fairness and integrity are concerned. Neither bias nor lobbying is permitted. There is a strong faculty presence making decisions about UK Core and IGEOC is not afraid to tackle the issues.

The Chair thanked Rayens for his and IGEOC's hard work.

Addition to agenda: 6.d Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee - Herman Farrell, Chair (Proposed New Institute for Sustainable Manufacturing)

The Chair explained that the Senate needed to formally waive *Senate Rules 1.2.3* to allow the Senate to consider the proposed new Institute for Sustainable Manufacturing, because it was not included in the agenda posted six days prior to the meeting.

Blonder **moved** that the Senate waive *Senate Rules 1.2.3* to allow consideration of the proposed new Institute for Sustainable Manufacturing. Effgen **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. d Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee - Herman Farrell, Chair (Proposed New Multidisciplinary Research Institute for Sustainable Manufacturing)

Farrell explained the proposal. When he was finished, he added that the proposal had been approved by College of Engineering faculty, but quorum was not met at the meeting. A subsequent electronic vote

resulted in approval, with 67 in favor. Farrell added that the Senate would take two separate votes on the proposal for a new Institute for Sustainable Manufacturing.

The **motion** from the SAAPC is that the Senate approve the proposed new multidisciplinary research Institute for Sustainable Manufacturing, effective upon Board of Trustees approval, based upon its academic merits. After very brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Farrell introduced the second **motion**: that the Senate endorse the proposed new multidisciplinary research Institute for Sustainable Manufacturing, effective upon Board of Trustees approval, based upon its non-academic merits. After brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:13 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Robert Grossman,
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Adams; Anderson; Anstead; Ballard; Birdwhistell; Brennen; Brown-Wright; Capilouto; de Beer; DeSantis; D’Orazio; Eckman; Ederington; Ettensohn; Feist-Price; Fielden; Getchell; Hackbart; Hardin-Pierce*; Jackson; Kirk; Lester; Lowry*; Martin; Mazur; Meyer; Mountford; Noonan; O’Hair, MJ; Richey; Rieske-Kinney; Scutchfield; Sekulic*; Shannon, Smith; Speaks; Steiner; Stewart; Sutphen*; Subbaswamy; Tick; Tracy, J; Turner; Voro; Wells; Williams; Wimberly; Wiseman; Witt; Wyatt*; Yost.

Invited guests present: Anna Bosch, Bob Gregory and Bill Rayens.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, February 7, 2012.

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.