

University Senate
May 6, 2013

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, May 6, 2013 in the Lexmark Public Room, 209 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Lee X. Blonder called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:02 pm.

The Chair reminded senators to:

- Sign in upon arrival;
- Give name and affiliation when speaking;
- Attend meetings;
- Respond to emails and web postings as appropriate;
- Acknowledge and respect others;
- Silence all electronic devices; and
- Communicate with their constituencies.

1. Minutes from April 8, 2013 and Announcements

The Chair said there were no changes submitted for the minutes from April 8, 2013. Therefore, the minutes from April 8, 2013 were approved as distributed by unanimous consent. There were a variety of announcements.

- Christine Riordan, Dean of the Daniels College of Business and Professor of Management at the University of Denver has been named Provost. Upon approval by the Board of Trustees, she will begin at UK in the fall. Welcome!
- John Wilson was re-elected as faculty trustee. His second term commences July 1, 2013 and ends June 30, 2016. Congratulations!
 - The Chair offered statistics on voter turnout during the faculty trustee election. Nursing came in first with 78% of eligible faculty voting. Libraries were next (70%) and then Social Work (69%). The remaining colleges were ordered as follows: AS 61%; BE 59%; PbH 56%; HS 55%; FA 54%; CI 52%; DS 50%; GS 50%; LA 50%; ED 47%; AG 47%; EN 45%; PH 43%; ME 41%; and DE 35%.
- One student was added to the December 2012 degree list by the Chair due to institutional error.
- The SC heard information from Associate Provost for International Programs Susan Carvalho about ongoing discussions between UK and two Chinese universities (Shanghai University and Jilin University). Any future, formal actions regarding program partnerships will of course involve the Senate.
- The SC approved calendar change for MA 109, MA 111, WRD 110 and UK 090 for the Freshman Summer Program for the Office of Institutional Diversity's Center for Academic Resources and Enrichment Services (CARES).

- The Chair offered farewell wishes to departing senators and SC members and thanked them for all they have done. Those whose terms were ending stood and were recognized for their University service with a round of applause.

2. Officer and Other Reports

a. Chair's Report – Lee X. Blonder

The Chair reported that the SC sent a survey to all faculty to evaluate the President. The purpose of the evaluation was to ensure faculty input into the annual review of the President that is conducted by the Board of Trustees. The survey window was open for two weeks and closed Thursday, May 2. A total of 807 faculty members completed the survey. The data is in the process of being analyzed and results will be provided in the next few weeks.

The Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) has drafted proposed changes to *Senate Rules 3.3.0* ("Procedures for Processing Courses and Changes in Courses") and *SR 3.3.3* ("Procedures to be Used") to designate how non-credit bearing courses, such as MOOCs (massively open online courses), will be processed. This has been circulated to the councils and to a group of faculty and administrators discussing a possible Coursera contract. Following final review by the SC, the *SR* revision will be sent to senators via the listserv. Please provide feedback. AS will begin pilot use of this *SR* revision this summer, with an expectation that it will be brought to the Senate for final approval in September.

b. Vice Chair's Report – Bob Grossman

Vice Chair Bob Grossman reminded senators that the Outstanding Senator Award was given to a senator who best exemplifies what senators should do – communicate with constituents, represent faculty and promote shared governance. There were three nominees, but one stood out – Senator Raphael Finkel. Finkel received a plaque and a round of applause from those present.

3. UK's May 2013 Degree List

Grossman **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve the corrected May 2013 degree list, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Anderson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. UK's Early August 2013 Degree List

Wasilkowski **moved** that the elected faculty senators approve the early August 2013 degree list, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Brion **seconded**. There was no discussion. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Raphael Finkel, Chair

i. Proposed Changes to Pre-Major Requirements for BS Accounting, BBA in Analytics, BBA in Finance, BBA in Management, BBA in Marketing and BSBE in Economics

Finkel explained the proposed changes to the pre-major requirements for the BS Accounting, BBA in Analytics, BBA in Finance, BBA in Management, BBA in Marketing and BSBE in Economics. He noted that there had been an objection to the change to B&E 105, the course that faculty from the Gatton College of Business and Economics (BE) suggested be used in place of Microsoft Office Specialization examinations as a pre-major requirement. Although Finkel's department (Computer Science) objected to the course change, perceiving it as a change to a course such that it duplicated a very similar course in

CS. It was eventually clarified that the concern about the course was based on its present structure and content, so the objection to the change was withdrawn. The SAASC and SC voted in favor of the proposal.

The recommendation (positive) from the SC was that the **move** to approve the proposed pre-major requirements for the BS Accounting, BBA in Analytics, BBA in Finance, BBA in Management, BBA in Marketing and BSBE in Economics. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and two abstaining.

ii. Proposed Changes to the College of Education's Policy on Admission, Retention and Completion of Educator Preparation Programs

Finkel explained the proposed changes to the College of Education's Policy on Admission, Retention and Completion of Educator Preparation Programs, saying they were fairly complicated and encompassed a large change. The proposal was driven by changes to external certification requirements set by KY's Education Professional Standards Board. Finkel listed the seven wide ranging areas being affected: a student must be admitted, retained and complete the state educator program in order to receive teacher certification; progress should be continuously monitored, assessed and reviewed; synchronize GPA rules for admission at the undergraduate and graduate level, and for retention and completion; identification of standards that candidates must complete (college-, state- and subject-specific); requirement for completion of planned clinical (student teaching) experiences; completion of state-mandated character and fitness review and background checks; and a mechanism for appealing negative results during any of the reviews. Finkel summarized by saying that the details are complicated but the wording is consistent and clear and should satisfy the requirements of the accrediting agency.

The recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** that the proposed rules be used to replace *Senate Rules Section 4.2.2.3* in the current *SR* on admission to College of Education Educator Preparation programs, subject to codification by the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.

iii. PhD Nursing Admission Requirements

Finkel explained the proposal, saying that the rationale for the change was to unify admission requirements for BSN- and MSN-entry-students so that both groups have the same criteria for entry. It will reduce the minimum GPA requirement for BSN-entry students from 3.5 to 3.3, which is currently the minimum for students entering from the MSN. In addition, the GRE requirement is removed from both the BSN and MSN entry requirements, since the GRE has not been predictive of success. Students can take the GRE at a later date if needed for fellowships. The proposal fleshes out an existing requirement and codifies that applicants must supply a goal statement. The requirement that students have clinical experience if entering from the BSN area will be dropped because they already must be a registered nurse, which is a pre-requisite for clinical work. Finally, a requirement will be added for MSN students that at least one of the three references should be from a faculty member with a PhD. The changes seemed perfectly reasonable to the SAASC and the SC.

The recommendation (positive) from the SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the PhD Nursing Admission Requirements proposal as written. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. Jasper asked for the rationale behind dropping clinical experience and Guest Terry Lennie

(Nursing, PhD Nursing director) explained that clinical experiences are built into the BSN and MSN curriculum now, as opposed to being a pre-requisite.

There being no additional questions, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) - Herman Farrell, Chair

i. Proposed New Center for Research on Environmental Disease

Farrell explained the creation of a new multidisciplinary research center at UK. He said the SAOSC's review included a look at the infrastructure and the academic programming. The proposed new Center for Research on Environmental Disease will report directly to the Dean of the College of Medicine. Any new faculty who are assigned to the Center will be hired by the department in which they will be housed, not the Center. The director will work with an executive council (two core and two affiliate faculty members) and external advisory board. The College of Medicine faculty council enthusiastically supported the Center's creation. Hippisley, chair of the SAPC, was asked to review the academic program aspect; Hippisley responded with a few questions about educational goals and how to evaluate them but nothing that should stop the proposal. There were two motions for senators.

The first recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the proposed new Center for Research on Environmental Disease based on its academic merits. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The second recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **endorse** the proposed resources and placement of the proposed new Center for Research on Environmental Disease in the College of Medicine for approval by the Board of Trustees. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed Name Change for the School of Interior Design

Farrell explained the impetus behind the name change for the School of Interior Design, noting that the proposal involved a rather simple name change [as opposed to a structural change]. There will be a short form of the school's name, as well as a tagline after a colon with additional descriptions of the unit. He added that there is no unified consensus on names for similar units across the country.

The recommendation (positive) from the SC was that the Senate **move** to endorse the name change of the School of Interior Design to the School of Interiors: Planning / Strategy / Design. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. Porter spoke strongly against the proposed name change, saying that it should be patently obvious that such a school involves planning and strategy. Rey-Barreau, the contact person for the proposal, explained that sometimes it is confusing for the public to understand the context of what interior design encompasses. Due to preconceived notions among the public about what interior design means, it is harder to attract students. In addition, since the word "design" is part of the college name (College of Design), it was redundant to include it in the school name. In response to an additional comment from Porter, Rey-Barreau said that the student body was comprised of 95% females; some research indicates that male students are more attracted to a program with "strategy" and "planning" in the name.

Finkel asked if a comma would work better. Rey-Barreau explained that the proposed name of the school was purposely designed to illustrate the natural tendency of the field to sometimes perceive things a little bit outside the norm.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with three opposed and one abstaining.

iii. Proposed Name Change and Change of the Organizational Structure of the Graduate Center for Biomedical Engineering

Farrell began by noting that while reviewing UK's *Governing Regulations*, the SAOSC learned that a graduate center (as least by definition) is equivalent to a department. As part of their review, the SAOSC wanted to make sure that there was no substantive change. After reviewing the policies and procedures and discussing current practices with the director, the SAOSC determined that there was no substantive change in educational policy or administration. Farrell went on to explain the rationale for the change, which was included in the proposal.

The recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to endorse the proposed change of the organization and name change of the Graduate Center for Biomedical Engineering to the Department of Biomedical Engineering. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one opposed.

Because Farrell is going on sabbatical, his term as senator (and committee chair) is ending. The Chair suggested senators acknowledge Farrell's outstanding service as a committee chair and he was given a warm round of applause.

c. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) - Davy Jones, Chair

i. Reference in Senate Rules to Nonexistent Form for "I" Grade Reference in Senate Rules to Nonexistent Form for "I" Grade

Jones explained that the Registrar's office brought the issue to the attention of the SREC – although there was in the past, there is currently no form for a faculty member to use when giving a student an "I" grade. If a faculty member retires, the subsequent individual responsible for working with the student about changing the I grade needs to know the terms under which the original instructor offered the I grade. The SC sent the matter to the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, which offered suggested language for codification by the SREC. The SREC then added a small portion and the SC offered a few additional edits. Ms. Brothers displayed the proposed revised language on the screens in the front of the room. Jones said that the I grade form will be filed with the department chair so the next person responsible for the I grade knows what is required.

There were a handful of questions from senators. In response to a question from Grossman, Jones explained that the reference to an I grade form was anticipatory; upon Senate approval, a form will be created and posted on the Senate website. A couple of questions were asked regarding whether use of the form is a requirement or not, and how faculty will be informed of the change.

The recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 5.1.3.2*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. Grossman **moved** to amend the motion to add "and section" between "course" and "number" [to read "the course and section number" in the second list item]. Brion **seconded**. A **vote** on the amendment to the motion was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

There were a number of questions from senators about the need to legislatively identify the department chair as the individual to whom the I grade form is submitted. Jones reiterated that the chair will be the

responsible person if the course is not taught the subsequent semester and also if the faculty member separates from the University or otherwise cannot teach the course, such as retirement or death.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion to approve the proposed changes to *Senate Rules 5.1.3.2* (with the addition of “and section” between “course” and “number”) **passed** with none opposed.

d. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) - Andrew Hippisley, Chair

i. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Peace Studies

Hippisley explained the proposed new Undergraduate Certificate in Peace Studies. He noted that the proposal included language about a faculty record and rules of voting, moving in and out of the faculty of record, etc.

The recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the proposed new Undergraduate Certificate in Peace Studies, within the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.

ii. Proposed New University Scholars Program - BS Accountancy and MS Accountancy

Hippisley explained the proposed new University Studies Program of a BS Accountancy and an MS Accountancy. The recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the establishment of a new University Studies Program of a BS and MS in Accountancy, in the Von Allmen School of Accountancy, in the Gatton College of Business and Economics.

Christ noted that the motion had a typographical error – the word “Studies” should be “Scholars.” She **moved** to amend the motion to change the word “Studies” to “Scholars.” D. Anderson **seconded**. A **vote** was taken on the amendment to the motion and it **passed** with none opposed.

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

iii. Proposed New BA/BS in Information Communication Technology

Hippisley explained the proposed new BA/BS in Information Communication Technology, as well as the faculty of record. The recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new BA/BS program in Information Communication Technology in the School of Library and Information Sciences within the College of Communication and Information. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

Guest Ken Calvert (EN/Computer Science, chair) stated that he saw the full proposal just two weeks prior, when an EN senator brought it to his attention. He said that the course ICT 301 from the School of Library and Information Sciences (SLIS) was very similar to a course taught by Computer Science (CS) for years. The courses described by SLIS as required courses for the proposed new program were sent to CS during the fall semester, but that looked very different from what was in the current version of the proposal. Calvert said that he was not necessarily speaking against the proposed new program, but rather that he wanted to know where the boundary lies between what CS does and what the proposed new program involves. For example, the proposals lists possible jobs for graduates, but those jobs are primarily occupations that involve skills that students in the Information and Communication Technology (ICT) program will not learn, but would learn if they were in a CS program. In summation, Calvert explained that CS was concerned about two issues: 1. the proposed new course ICT 301, which is

an introduction to databases courses, looks a lot like CS 101; and 2. the job analysis presented in the new program proposal that identifies a variety of occupations that the Department of Labor describes as requiring degrees in computer science.

The Chair asked if someone from the college was present and could speak to the concerns of CS. College of Communication and Information Dean Dan O'Hair said that the program had been vetted for over the past year and that SLIS did contact CS. SLIS has no intention of teaching programming to students. While the issue of boundaries was a fair question, there was only one course where there might be an overlap, in something that could be considered a common course. SLIS has been working on an ICT degree since 2009 and it has been vetted with industry, an advisory board, colleges, and created in conjunction with a self-study committee. The jobs listed within the proposal are identified by the Department of Labor as illustrative of occupations for ICT graduates. In response to a question from Edwards, Ms. Brothers confirmed that ICT 301 had been approved by lack of objection on a web transmittal as of April 30.

There were a number of questions from and concerns by senators regarding the objections raised by CS, although it was acknowledged that the specific course in question was already approved. Grossman **moved** to return the proposal to the Senate's Academic Programs Committee until such time as the School of Library and Information Sciences and the Department of Computer Science have discussions and resolve some of the issues. Wasilkowski **seconded**.

Porter, a member of the SAPC, stated that the committee had already discussed the specific issue and doubted there would be a difference in outcome; the SAPC is satisfied that the proposed new BA/BS in ICT is sufficiently different from the CS degree to be a separate degree program. There was additional discussion about CS's concerns and the appropriate action for the Senate to take.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 32 in favor and 25 opposed. Porter expressed a concern that the votes were not counted correctly. A **second vote** was taken, with 31 in favor. Porter asked for clarification as to what the SAPC was supposed to do. Grossman suggested that the two colleges/departments have an opportunity to discuss the proposed new program and hopefully come to a compromise.

e. Senate's UK Core Education Committee (UK CEC) - Ruth Beattie, Chair

i. UK Core Senate Rules Language (Changes to Senate Rules 1.4.3.0 & 5.4.3.2)

Beattie explained the proposed changes to *Senate Rules*, saying that the implementation of UK Core necessitated a change to the language. The changes to *SR 1.4.3.0* involve the composition and function of UK Core Education Committee; the changes to *SR 5.4.3.2* deal with the actual UK Core graduation requirements for students. She drew senators' attention to one change to the language: references to the "Dean of Undergraduate Studies" should be changed to the "Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education."

Wasilkowski **moved** to amend the text as described by Beattie and Christianson **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the proposed changes to *SR 1.4.3.0* and *5.4.3.2*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Because President Capilouto had not yet arrived, the Chair suggested moving to the next agenda item. There were no objections.

7. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules* Regarding Graduation Composition and Communication Requirements

Interim Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Ben Withers explained that when he entered the position, there were a few items needing his attention: 1. the UK Core *SR* changes that the Senate just approved; 2. changes to and codification of language describing the Honors Program (completed earlier in the academic year); 3. foreign language proficiency (which will be submitted to the Senate in fall 2013); and 4. revisions to and codification of what used to be the Graduation Writing Requirement (GWR). Its new name will be “Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement” (GCCR).

Withers offered some historical information on the GWR. A few years ago the Writing Initiative lost funding and was dissolved. After that, the University was focused on revisions to UK’s general education program, UK Core. The previous Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education appointed an ad hoc committee to figure out how to connect UK Core and a graduation requirement for composition and communication, as well as identifying a means to support it. Deanna Sellnow chaired the ad hoc committee, which represented a broad cross-section of campus. The language was presented to the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, which brought a proposal to the SC in 2011 and 2012. The SC requested certain changes about a year ago, in February/March, but the then-Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education left UK before the project moved to completion. In front of senators, now, is the revised proposal, shepherded by Roxanne Mountford in the Division of Writing, Rhetoric and Design, in the Department of English. The revisions were sent back to the original ad hoc committee for their blessing, and then back to the SC in January 2013. The SC asked that the language be put into the *Senate Rules* format currently presented to senators. The new rule essentially creates a broadly representative committee that reports to the Undergraduate Council, which will be responsible for vetting the new GCCR requirements.

The GCCR is modeled on the GWR, but with more flexibility. Every unit is asked to identify courses or individual assignments within that department, or partner with another department, to require 4,500 words of writing, with no restrictions on what is written, as well as a 10-minute oral or visual assignment, and as an assignment that demonstrates information literacy in the discipline. At the SC’s suggestion, the writing and communication and composition requirements must be completed in English. Those units providing the courses are responsible for assessing said courses. It is difficult to identify what the courses will look like in advance, hence the need to send assessment reports to the advisory committee, which will ensure a commonality across campus. There will be three modalities involved, which will parallel neatly with Presentation U, UK’s QEP program. It also provides funds for faculty development. Withers said he offered one caveat to SC, to which they agreed – the proposed new GCCR will not be final until everyone involved is satisfied that it can be implemented. The language will be incorporated into the *Senate Rules* in fall 2014 (for students entering in fall 2014) and courses will be offered for the first time in fall 2015 when the fall 2014 class will be sophomores and ready to begin meeting the proposed new GCCR requirements.

The Chair explained that the recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate adopt the changes to *Senate Rules 1.3.3.5.1*, as outlined in the proposal. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. After one question, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair said there was a second, associated motion. The recommendation (positive) from SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the proposed changes to *SR 5.4.3.1* and charge the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education with reporting to the Senate on the success of the program at the end of the 2013-14 academic year with an implementation date of fall 2014. In response to Grossman, Withers clarified that freshman entering in fall .2014 will complete the GCCR while sophomores, which will give a year for implementation and informing students. Nagel asked about accommodations for a very smart student who might want to take hard courses in their freshman year. Withers said that the proposed language states that completion of the GCCR should take place during and after the sophomore year. The intent is to keep students writing throughout their college career. Courses taken during the freshman year can partially meet the requirements, since the 4,500 words do not have to be written in one course. In addition, some departments currently have their GWR courses at the 400- and 500-level. Withers said that when he read past sets of minutes regarding the UK Core implementation, flexibility was an important thread woven throughout. In response to another question from Nagel, Withers said that a student cannot complete a degree in two years, but could do so in three, and still meet the requirements of the GCCR, although exceptions can be made in exceptional circumstances.

Jones asked for clarification about what the Senate was being asked to approve, particularly what “success of the program” entailed. Withers said that the Senate was being asked to approve the GCCR with the caveat that the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education return to the Senate to report on whether costs or anything else will prohibit implementation. Without the firm prescription from the Senate, it will be difficult to encourage units to gather information necessary to evaluate the GCCR. If there is a lot of desire for more English or WRD courses, that information will be presented to the Senate in spring 2014. Part of the feasibility success report is if problems can be solved.

Brion asked about the possibility that the incoming Provost will not have resources to support the GCCR. Withers said that faculty are in charge of the curriculum, so if the faculty feel the GCCR is important, then the Senate must make a statement about implementation and push it forward. Swanson **moved** to amend the motion to read, “reporting to the Senate on the ~~success of the program~~ implementation of the plan....”¹ Jones **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion that the Senate approve the proposed changes to *SR 5.4.3.1* and charge the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education with reporting to the Senate on the implementation of the plan at the end of the 2013-14 academic year with an implementation date of fall 2014. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

8. President Eli Capilouto, University Senate Chair - End-of-Year Remarks

The SC Chair introduced President Eli Capilouto, University Senate Chair. President Capilouto said he wanted to drop by prior to the end of the semester to express his gratitude for everyone’s hard work. The President offered senators updates on his recent activities, including the items listed below.

- Evening with handful of PhD candidates, who each took 10 – 15 minutes to describe their research.
- Attended a biochemistry lecture with over 30 students from around the state and the world, where the faculty member translated the world of biochemistry into the fascinating research on Alzheimer’s disease conducted by the students in the class.

¹ Strike-through denotes deleted text and underlining denotes added text.

- A weekend presentation of research from students in the Colleges of Design, Education, Business and Engineering doing group work on sustainability aspects of UK's master campus plan, with oral, video and visual presentations on solutions.
- Watched UK's spring drama production of "Spring Awakening," which stimulated discussion on how issues from decades ago are still issues and how adults have things to learn from our children.

President Capilouto then talked about the accomplishments of the past year.

- Tuition increases were limited to a three per cent increase.
- Faculty and staff will receive merit raises as of July 1.
- Improvements to the campus infrastructure and strong recruitment of students.
 - For example, the proposed new Academic Science Building, renovations to the Gatton College of Business and Economics Building and renovations to the Nutter Training Facility and Commonwealth Stadium, all in addition to new residence halls

The President then showed senators a video of what the proposed new residence halls will look like. In response to a question from Prats about the new Academic Science Building, the President replied that once the infrastructure and utilities aspects are taken care of, it will be time to begin designing the building. There were no additional questions from senators.

The Chair thanked the President for attending. She also thanked Interim Provost Tim Tracy for his service during the year.

Noting that the next meeting will be on September 9, the Chair said she would entertain a motion for adjournment. Wasilkowski **moved** to adjourn and Christianson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 pm.

Invited guests present: Ken Calvert and Terry Lennie.

Absences: Adams, I, Allison, Anderson, H, Anderson, K, Anstead, Appiah, Atwood, Badger, Bailey, Ballard, Bathon, Bayliff, Bensadoun, Berry, Bilas, Blackwell, D, Bland, Branham, Brennen, Bruzina, Capilouto, Charnigo*, Coyne, Crampton, Dawson, de Beer, Deep, DeSantis, Durham, Eckman, Feist-Price, Fox, Graf, Hardin-Pierce, Hazard*, Hong-McAtee, Huffmyer, Jackson, J, Jackson, V, Johnson, Kaplan, Kellum, Kirschling, Kornbluh, Kovash, Larson*, Latham, Leahy, Martin, A, McCormick, McGill, McMahan, McNamara, Mehra, Michelman, Mock, Murthy, Noonan, O'Connor*, Osborn, Plamp, Pulliam, Rabel, Richey, Schroeder, Sexton, Smith, Speaks, Stanley, Steiner, Stombaugh, Tick, Tracy, J, Tracy, T, Truszczynski, Turner, Underwood, Voro, Walker, Walz, Wiseman, Witt, Wright, M, Wyatt, Yelowitz.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, May 28, 2013.

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.