

0001

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * * *
November 14, 2005
3:00 P.M.

* * * * *
W. T. YOUNG LIBRARY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
* * * * *

13

ERNIE YANARELLA, CHAIR

14

GIFFORD BLYTON, PARLIAMENTARIAN

15

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

16

LISA E. HOINKE, CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER

17

* * * * *

18

19

AN/DOR REPORTING & VIDEO TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

20

179 EAST MAXWELL STREET
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40508
(859) 254-0568

21

22

23

24

25

* * * * *

0002

1

THE CHAIR: Welcome to the November 14th

2

University Senate meeting.

3

I'd like to call this meeting to
order. We have a full docket, and a number
of issues which will require thorough
vetting.

4

5

6

7

I'd like to start with the Minutes
of the October 10th Senate Meeting. Are
there any changes, corrections, emendations
that seem called for?

8

9

10

11

(NO RESPONSE)

12

There being none indicated, the
Minutes stand as approved.

13

14

Secondly, I would like to remind
you of upcoming Senate elections. Davy
Jones, are you here? Davy, do you have a
word or two to say about that process?

15

16

17

18

JONES: Well, it's not a Senate election
but election for the Senate Council, by the
elected faculty Senators.

19

20

21

We just went through a nomination
round this past week. The results have been
tabulated to identify the six that are going
to be on the final ballot. Five of those

22

23

24

25 have been identified and confirmed their

0003

1 willingness, several have opted out. We've
2 got one more confirmation to make, and then
3 we'll be able to begin the process for the
4 actual and final voting.

5 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Davy.

6 I would also like to announce to
7 you the formation and official charge of the
8 Senate Provost Planning and Coordinating
9 Committee on Undergraduate Education Reform
10 and Assessment, which is already beginning to
11 take on the acronym either GER or GERA.

12 So as you hear either of those
13 acronyms I hope that you will identify that
14 with what looks to become a very active
15 Spring semester of activity and a vetting of
16 ideas, some of which we will hear today from
17 Alan Desantis in offering his synopsis, his
18 overview of the USP External Review Committee
19 report.

20 The last announcement, you will
21 note a new face, new person at the front
22 table. I'm pleased to announce that Sheila
23 Brothers has come on board with the Senate
24 Council Office as the new Administrative
25 Coordinator. I don't know if -- yes, indeed.

0004

1 Her predecessor of somewhat
2 longstanding, Rebecca Scott, is in the
3 audience. Rebecca, if you would stand. I
4 hope you will give both of these individuals
5 a round of applause.
6 (APPLAUSE)

7 As anyone who has stood in my place
8 in the past knows, the Administrative
9 Coordinator position is absolutely essential
10 to the running of Senate processes and
11 activities, and I have been -- I have been
12 blessed with Rebecca Scott in that position
13 for the year and a half that I have been --
14 virtually year and a half that I have been
15 Senate Council Chair, and I look forward to
16 and -- and am already enjoying my working
17 association with Sheila Brothers.

18 Let me now turn to the first
19 substantive agenda item, and that is the
20 College of Agriculture name change.

21 As you have learned from the
22 materials on the Web and the packet that has
23 been distributed to you, the College of
24 Agriculture has proposed to change its name
25 to the College of Agriculture, Food and The

0005

1 Environment.

2 It was reported to the Senate
3 Council by the Senate Organization and

4 Structure Committee, in the person of Ernie
5 Bailey, as Chair, with a positive
6 recommendation to the Senate Council. Last
7 Monday that proposal was duly considered by
8 the Senate Council and it comes -- this
9 proposal comes to the University Senate with
10 a positive recommendation from the Senate
11 Council.

12 I should point out and acknowledge
13 that since Monday there have been some issues
14 that have been raised in regard to
15 information provided at that Senate Council
16 meeting. This additional information was
17 placed on the Senate Council listserv, and
18 there was considerable discussion about that
19 information. Some of that information may be
20 brought to light in the course of our
21 deliberations today.

22 So we have before us a positive
23 recommendation from the Senate Council, as
24 things stand, and I'd like to call on Ernie
25 Bailey to offer perhaps a few remarks on --

0006

1 from his position as Chair of the Senate
2 Organization and Structure Committee on
3 behalf of this proposal.

4 BAILEY: The Academic Organization and
5 Structure Committee reviewed the proposal and
6 found it to be well-founded, and I could go
7 over discussion of that if appropriate.

8 It went to the Senate where it was
9 discussed, and again discussion on different
10 points, and it was approved.

11 The discrepancies that Ernie
12 mentions, I don't know what those are. Those
13 came up at the end of the week, and they were
14 a matter of discussion within the Senate
15 Council.

16 I have to say when I had learned of
17 it, indirectly, I was unhappy because it
18 hadn't come -- I was un -- I hadn't been
19 contacted, having researched this topic; the
20 Chair of the Ag Faculty Council had not been
21 contacted; the person who prepared the
22 proposal had not been contacted. So we have
23 no idea what the substance is for the
24 discrepancies or the basis for it. I don't
25 know, and I -- and I'm a bit concerned there.

0007

1 I was -- there was a personal
2 response also, and when I was contacted by
3 the Dean of Agriculture saying, what's going
4 on and what should we do, his response I
5 think was a bit more reason and -- and I was
6 impressed. He basically said that the most
7 important thing for him is the bigger issue,
8 that the college be seen to participating in

9 discussion, that's it's an open and above-
10 board issue, and he offered that if the
11 Senate Council wanted to table this issue
12 until the next meeting that he thought it
13 might be a positive activity.

14 THE CHAIR: Ernie, thank you. I think those
15 are very generous comments and I would again
16 like to publically apologize to you for not
17 having contacted you until I received your --
18 your e-mail late last week, and apparently
19 dashed your opportunity to take someone to
20 the Red River Gorge.

21 BAILEY: Playing hookie, yes.

22 THE CHAIR: Okay. We have a motion on the
23 floor of the Senate Council with a positive
24 recommendation. Is there any commentary that
25 -- or comments that people would like to

0008

1 make?

2 Please identify yourself.

3 GRABAU: Thank you. Larry Grabau, the
4 College of Agriculture or the College of
5 Agriculture, Food and The Environment.

6 And, Ernie, I want to address your
7 question, and you really -- you don't know
8 yet what happened?

9 BAILEY: I don't, and I -- and I want you to
10 realize, I have -- we can discuss this name
11 change. What I'm suggesting here is if the
12 Senate Council would like to table it, that
13 that would be a fine thing to do. If that's
14 not what you want to do, we can proceed with
15 discussing the name change. What are we
16 discussing?

17 THE CHAIR: We're, at this moment, discussing a
18 positive recommendation from the Senate
19 Council. I was -- over the weekend I was
20 duly advised of the boundaries that were
21 established by the Senate Rules. I was
22 provided with opportunities to find ways in
23 which the Senate Council could meet, if
24 possible, at the beginning of this day to
25 reconsider. I really felt that it was not

0009

1 appropriate to try to engage in those
2 activities.

3 The concern is -- is with -- that
4 was expressed, was to lay to rest the
5 discrepancies of information. It was not
6 intended to -- it was not intended to
7 prejudice the case for or against this name
8 change, and I am appreciative of Scott Smith
9 for his willingness to recommend the tabling
10 of this matter if it is the wish of the
11 Senate.

12 BAILEY: Would somebody like to make a
13 motion to table this until the -- till the

14 next meeting? That will allow the Senate
15 Council a chance to -- to have further
16 discussions on this.

17 THE CHAIR: Davy Jones.
18 JONES: I would make such a motion and,
19 again, I appreciate the Provost offering that
20 this is a good-faith way to resolve this
21 discrepancy in information.

22 DeLUCA: Second.
23 THE CHAIR: We have a second.
24 BROTHERS: I'm sorry?
25 THE CHAIR: Please identify yourself.

0010

1 DeLUCA: Pat DeLuca.
2 THE CHAIR: Were you able to get that?
3 BROTHERS: I'm sorry?
4 DeLUCA: Pat DeLuca.
5 THE CHAIR: Pat DeLuca. Sorry, Pat.
6 Okay. I will turn to the
7 Parliamentarian for a moment. We have a --
8 we have a motion on the floor, and -- from
9 the Senate Council. We now have a second
10 motion to table. The appropriate procedure
11 under these circumstances were to -- would be
12 to have a vote on the table -- tabling
13 motion?

14 BLYTON: Well, it depends on what the
15 intent is. If -- if you're -- if you want --
16 really, you're talking about postponement,
17 aren't you?

18 THE CHAIR: Yes.
19 BLYTON: All right. And then you ought to
20 postpone either to a definite time and place
21 or postpone indefinitely. It should be one
22 of those two things. That removes the
23 ambiguity when you do that. So...

24 THE CHAIR: Davy, may I have a clarification
25 on your motion?

0011

1 JONES: Postpone to the next Senate
2 meeting.
3 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Pat, are you agreeable
4 to that?
5 DeLUCA: I'll second it.
6 THE CHAIR: Okay. We have a motion to table
7 this issue until the next Senate meeting in
8 December. Is there any further discussion on
9 this issue?

10 DEMBO: There's no discussion on the table.
11 THE CHAIR: No. Pardon me. Thank you. Okay.
12 All those --
13 TAGAVI: Limited discussion. Can you ask
14 that any discussion on this, that it's going
15 to be a limited discussion?
16 THE CHAIR: Gifford, there is a question as to
17 whether there can be limited discussion on
18 the tabling motion.

19 BLYTON: No. No, it's up and down vote.
20 THE CHAIR: Thank you.
21 DEMBO: Point of order? The substance for
22 tabling has not even been brought to the
23 floor, so the Senate doesn't know why it
24 might or might not table it.
25 THE CHAIR: All those in favor of tabling the
0012
1 motion please indicate by raising your hand.
2 (SENATORS VOTE)
3 THE CHAIR: I think we're going to have to
4 require counting.
5 (VOTES ARE COUNTED)
6 THE CHAIR: All those opposed, please raise
7 your hand.
8 (SENATORS VOTES AND VOTES ARE COUNTED)
9 SOHNEY: Twenty-five.
10 THE CHAIR: The motion to table has been
11 defeated. Ernie?
12 BAILEY: May I -- if that's the case then,
13 can I go ahead and make the report from the
14 Academic Organization and Structure Committee
15 on the name change?
16 THE CHAIR: Yes, you may.
17 BAILEY: This proposal came to the Academic
18 Organization and Structure Committee. It was
19 a written proposal that was included in the
20 Senator's Web pages. Carla Craycraft came
21 and met with the committee and presented the
22 events that had gone on in connection with
23 this. The college has been considering a
24 name change for the last couple of years.
25 Part of the impetus is that the
0013
1 college was joined by the former -- by the
2 faculty in the former College of Human
3 Environmental Sciences and there had been a
4 feeling in the College of Agriculture that
5 agriculture was not fully descriptive of the
6 breadth of the activities that were going on,
7 especially with the joining of faculty and
8 programs from Human Environmental Sciences.
9 And so they began a discussion
10 about a name change, and this is something
11 that's gone on for several years, actually,
12 and there's a description of the different
13 committees that have discussed it; several
14 instances where there have been polls of
15 faculty and staff about different names, and
16 different -- different names were -- were
17 offered.
18 State college groups are very
19 important to the College of Agriculture
20 because the College of Agriculture sees a
21 large part of it's admission a service of
22 state colleges.
23 One of the -- and this is calling

24 on Carla's comments, and I'll invite Carla to
25 add to this, but Carla said that a recurrent

0014

1 theme in the discussions was that people
2 wanted to retain the name agriculture because
3 that certainly describes ongoing what's --
4 what's important to -- in the college.

5 Food, because a large part of the
6 programs have to do with food and not just
7 raising of crops, but also processing of
8 food, nutrition. Another opinion was the
9 environment, and again, this was related to
10 assuming the College of Human Environmental
11 Sciences, and there are several programs
12 within the college, that have a tracing
13 center for the environment and some of the
14 other programs that are concerned with issues
15 like that.

16 And it was -- I would say that
17 following discussions, the administration
18 offered the name Agriculture, Food and The
19 Environment as the proposed change for the
20 college. It went to the Ag Faculty Council
21 on October 3rd, and was approved at that
22 point, and then it came to the Senate
23 Council.

24 I think those are the salient
25 points. Carla, do you have other things to

0015

1 add?

2 CRAYCRAFT: No, but I would be glad to answer
3 any questions.

4 BAILEY: And I don't -- for me the process
5 was quite straightforward. I didn't hear
6 about it until later on as they were
7 preparing to come to the Senate Council, and
8 I was asked what sorts of -- you know, what
9 sorts of things ought to be included. At the
10 time, before it came to us, we encouraged the
11 college to consult with departments in other
12 colleges, Arts and Sciences and in the
13 Medical Center, that would have programs
14 related to the environment for comment to see
15 if they had any objections to that, and none
16 were found.

17 So I would say that that was an
18 additional part of the process. So, again, I
19 don't know what the discrepancies are, and
20 I'm ready to hear them.

21 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Other comments?
22 Larry Grabau?

23 GRABAU: And so you shall, Ernie. I voted
24 to table because I didn't want to say this
25 because I thought it might prejudice the

0016

1 conversation, so I must; I must.

2 During the Senate Council meeting,

3 which, Ernie, was actually October the 31st,
4 not this past week, but -- but, sometime ago.
5 I mean, that becomes important because people
6 had a chance to actually read what transpired
7 at the Senate Council Meeting. It's
8 recorded, of course, on our -- in our
9 Minutes.

10 I want to start by saying the first
11 time that I suggested to the Dean of the
12 College of Agriculture that we change the
13 name was in early 1995, so I am very eager to
14 see a change made.

15 The question that came up in the
16 Senate Council was about process, and as
17 those of you who have watched the Godfather
18 where Michael Corelone says, It's not
19 personal, and then proceeded to order his
20 brother's death, this is really not personal.
21 Okay? It's about process.

22 The -- the scenario -- I asked the
23 question on the Senate Council floor, and you
24 can read this if you wish, which was about
25 how much of the faculty were consulted in

0017

1 this process and the response -- Carla's
2 response was that, to enumerate the -- the
3 things that have gone on, and to indicate
4 that the Ag Faculty Council Chair and the Ag
5 Faculty Council had been quite involved in
6 this process, and you can go and check it out
7 if you wish.

8 So I took that simple step. I just
9 contacted Deb Witham, and here's what she
10 wrote; she wrote: Here's my take on the
11 process that Ernie and Carla discussed. At
12 no time during 2004 to '5 while I was Chair
13 of the Ag Faculty Council did the discussion
14 of our college name change come up. You can
15 check our minutes on our Web site. Nor did I
16 chair the committee to change the name of the
17 college despite what Carla has indicated in
18 her proposal. The Dean took the
19 Vision/Mission Committee from Strategic
20 Planning Process, which he personally chaired
21 -- and that's common -- that's public
22 knowledge. Then reconstituted as a name the
23 college committee. When that group got stuck
24 he abandoned it and worked directly with a
25 few folks. I was not part of that or I was

0018

1 not included in that inner-circle.

2 So I don't -- I don't sense from
3 Dr. Witham, from Deb, that she has any
4 significant qualms about the product, the
5 name change, but she did take some exception
6 with the description of her involvement in
7 the process and that's what I did not want to

8 report in public.
9 THE CHAIR: Are there other comments? Ernie.
10 BAILEY: Does somebody else want to go
11 first?
12 THE CHAIR: I didn't see another hand.
13 BAILEY: Okay. I got bits and pieces
14 of discrepancies and it hasn't been clear.
15 On that one -- on the routing
16 sheet, the consultation sheet, Deborah Witham
17 isn't identified as the chair of that
18 committee. She's chair of a subcommittee,
19 and I think that's accurate. It may not be.
20 Carla?
21 THE CHAIR: Carla, please?
22 CRAYCRAFT: Okay. I would certainly like to
23 address this, and I apologize for any issues
24 that might have come on the communications'
25 side.

0019

1 Deborah Witham at the time of the
2 Strategic Planning Committee was on the
3 subcommittee, and that's the way she's
4 identified, and not even as chair of the
5 subcommittee on this.
6 Deborah Witham was our Ag Faculty
7 Council Chair at the time so she becomes, in
8 my view, the lead faculty contact, which is
9 the way I have listed it here, as the contact
10 person who's faculty involved for any
11 questions that might have come up about
12 discussion on the Mission/Vision Value
13 Subcommittee.
14 So perhaps it's my miscommunication
15 of how it has been written that's the
16 problem, so I apologize for that.
17 That group was asked to talk about
18 the name change as part of a long-range
19 strategic plan, make recommendations. That
20 was the group we worked with to develop the
21 surveys and there was a quite a few
22 discussions.
23 I was not aware, Larry, that she
24 was not part of the smaller group or whatever
25 she called there. So this was based on my

0020

1 knowledge of how the process worked. I was
2 not in either of those committees, i.e., I
3 was not on the Long-Range Strategic Planning
4 Committee and I certainly was not on the
5 subcommittee.
6 So I apologize if there was a
7 discrepancy. The only -- Deborah is never
8 listed as chair of this, and including chair
9 of the subcommittee.
10 Are there any other questions that
11 might help?
12 BAILEY: In the Senate Council Minutes, I

13 mean, I looked at that because this had come
14 up as an issue and I noticed that Carla had
15 responded to the question about the extent to
16 which the faculty were aware and the extent
17 to which the Ag Faculty Council was -- was
18 involved, and she didn't identify, according
19 to the Minutes, and I don't re -- my
20 recollection isn't so good, but according to
21 the Minutes she identified Deborah as having
22 served on the committee that was discussing
23 the name change; Deborah was the Chair of the
24 Ag Faculty Council, and in the Minutes she
25 states that she assumed that that meant that

0021

1 they were familiar with what was going on.
2 And, I don't think that it was any more than
3 that.

4 I have a sense -- I mean, again, if
5 -- if the committee looked at it, and that
6 was one of the most serious questions that we
7 pursued was to what extent was there a
8 discussion or was this something that the
9 Dean simply made up -- popped up one day and
10 -- in the course, and the faculty.

11 This was a matter of discussion for
12 a considerable time, and I think any of us
13 could have said it would have been better if
14 this had been happening or if there had been
15 an e-mail that had gone out or -- there's any
16 number of things could happen.

17 There's been some criticisms about
18 the polls that were conducted, because they
19 were polls of the entire staff and faculty at
20 the College of Agriculture, which is 2,400
21 people, I think there's 400 faculty. And
22 part of that emanates from the fact that the
23 Dean wanted to come up with something that
24 the staff and faculty and the state colleges
25 would all embrace. He didn't really

0022

1 concentrate on the faculty until the end when
2 he brought it to the Ag Faculty Council.

3 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ernie. Yes,

4 Craig Infanger?

5 INFANGER: Craig Infanger with Agriculture.

6 Based on this discussion, I move to
7 reconsider a motion to table.

8 CIBULL: Second.

9 THE CHAIR: Mr. Parliamentarian? Some of
10 these are firsts for me.

11 BLYTON: What is he asking for?

12 THE CHAIR: He wants to reconsider tabling the
13 motion.

14 BAILEY: Postpone it.

15 THE CHAIR: Postpone it.

16 BLYTON: The Rule on that is you can do this
17 after intervening business. Well, there

18 hasn't been any intervening business, so that
19 would be out of order because there hasn't
20 been intervening business.

21 UNIDENTIFIED: The Chair has to rule it out of
22 order.

23 THE CHAIR: I so rule it out of order. How
24 could I go against Gifford Blyton?

25 CIBULL: Point of clarification, is it --

0023

1 this is just a point of clarification. Is a
2 discussion of the item intervening business,
3 or does it have to be something entirely
4 different? If you discuss the motion, is
5 that not intervening business?

6 BLYTON: Well, that's kind of ambiguous. It
7 seems to me what you ought to do at this
8 point is to vote up or down, and then if --
9 then it can be brought up at a later time if
10 it fails this time. I mean, it doesn't mean
11 that the action is lost, it just means that
12 it's lost for now if the body votes against
13 it. So I think what you ought to do is vote.

14 THE CHAIR: Yes, Mary?

15 MARCHANT: I think I'd like to add some
16 information at this point in time. My name
17 is Mary Marchant, and I am the current Chair
18 of the Ag Faculty Council so we voted
19 unanimously to accept the name change on
20 October 3rd, and one thing our Ag Faculty
21 Council was impressed with is that there were
22 three surveys of faculty and staff on
23 December 15th, 2003, January 2004 and January
24 2005. So that is one of the main reasons
25 that we voted to support this. Thank you.

0024

1 THE CHAIR: Thank you.

2 INFANGER: Craig Infanger of the College of
3 Agriculture. I move that the motion be
4 tabled until the January meeting. That's a
5 different motion.

6 THE CHAIR: Is there a second?

7 (NO RESPONSE)

8 THE CHAIR: I hear no second. Davy Jones.

9 JONES: To follow-up on what she said and
10 also what Ernie said, which neither one was
11 actually clear and maybe I've got it wrong so
12 you can clarify it to me, these polls that
13 were taken so as to determine what the
14 college faculty wanted, there was never a
15 survey of the faculty on what they want. In
16 every case it was a combined mixed survey in
17 which the results for the staff and the
18 faculty were pooled and staff out number the
19 faculty five to one, or something like that.
20 There has not been a survey in which we know
21 do the faculty of the college want this.

22 THE CHAIR: Ernie Bailey.

23 BAILEY: There's different ways that you can
24 approach it, different ways to construct the
25 proposal.

0025

1 JONES: I'm not talking about --
2 BAILEY: The only thing I could say is, you
3 know, of all the groups that were there
4 there's only one group that got to actually
5 vote yes or no, and that is the faculty. The
6 Ag Faculty Council is the only one that
7 voted. The others were consulted, and I'm
8 impressed with that as a -- as Senator.

9 JONES: Did the Ag Faculty Council poll the
10 faculty?

11 BAILEY: No, and they're not required to.
12 They represent the faculty.

13 JONES: Are they prohibited to do that?

14 BAILEY: No. It's their choice.

15 THE CHAIR: Are there any other issues or
16 questions? I'm about to call the -- John
17 Thelin.

18 THELIN: My recollections, as we look
19 through the -- the account of the various
20 surveys is that, yes, you had surveys but I
21 -- as I recall, there was a lot of ambiguity
22 as to what the message was from each of those
23 and the way choices of names were presented
24 and not presented.

25 Now, I don't have verbatim, but --

0026

1 but I'll call on other Senate Council
2 members, was there some ambiguity that the
3 results of those surveys were not necessarily
4 compelling?

5 JONES: To clarify what you're saying,
6 John, the discussion, I remember, in the
7 Senate Council was that in these early polls
8 that were mixing faculty and staff together
9 choices of different names were presented but
10 the way it was described to us when it got to
11 the Ag Council only one name was presented to
12 them for an up or down vote.

13 THE CHAIR: Please let -- please raise your
14 hands so I can identify you.

15 Ernie Bailey?

16 BAILEY: Ernie Bailey. And, again, wearing
17 the hat as Chair of the Academic Organization
18 and Structure Committee that deals with name
19 changes for lots of groups, my understanding
20 is that -- is that we're looking to see that
21 the faculty in a college -- and the faculty
22 in it, that are being effected had the chance
23 to -- to approve or reject whatever name
24 comes up.

25 What we're discussing now is the

0027

1 process by which they chose which name to go

2 through, and -- and I don't know what we can
3 do. If we go through and say that we're
4 going to reject it because of the surveys, to
5 some extent we as a Senate are thumbing our
6 nose at the Ag Faculty Council making their
7 decision.

8 I don't see how we can function
9 unless we recognize all of the college
10 faculty councils. That's the issue that
11 you're getting into if you follow this line
12 of thought.

13 THE CHAIR: Carla?

14 CRAYCRAFT: I'm Carla Craycraft, College of
15 Ag, writer of the proposal.

16 The thing I would like to say on
17 this as far as the different pieces of the
18 proposed name, there certainly are groups
19 within the College of Agriculture amongst our
20 faculty that would prefer to leave the name
21 as is, College of Agriculture, and they were
22 fairly vocal and they certainly wrote in
23 comments in the surveys and -- and we have
24 those.

25 But I think the bottom line that we

0028

1 heard is, but if you're going to change it,
2 be sure to keep Agriculture in the name.

3 There is another group of faculty
4 that are fairly adamant that it needs to
5 change because it's not inclusive enough.
6 What we do in the college is much broader
7 than what most people think of as
8 agriculture, and there are very few Colleges
9 of Agriculture left at land-grant
10 institutions across the United States.

11 In appendix A of the proposal it
12 lists all of our benchmark institutions that
13 are land-grants and what their proposed names
14 are. The process that we also went through
15 to eliminate agriculture and life sciences
16 because we have a medical school here and we
17 have other programs and other colleges that
18 certainly work under life sciences and felt
19 that that was not appropriate for us here.

20 So we took that off the table as a
21 discussion, although some of our faculty
22 would have liked to have and life sciences as
23 part of it.

24 The recurrent words we kept hearing
25 were food, keep agriculture, environment. We

0029

1 put those together in the final name, so I'm
2 just kind of giving you the overall of how we
3 arrived there.

4 We had multiple forms of input that
5 all faculty had an opportunity to voice
6 opinions, either directly to the Dean,

7 through the surveys, or through various
8 committees including that Subcommittee for
9 Strategic Planning for the College Mission/
10 Vision, Value Subcommittee.

11 So, and the final vote, again, once
12 the Ag Faculty Council, and as Ernie has
13 pointed out, that is the only group that was
14 asked to give an up or down vote for what the
15 college name was.

16 So I hope that's some
17 clarification.

18 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Carla. Yes. Please
19 identify yourself.

20 BURKHARDT: Patricia Burkhardt, College of
21 Nursing. It seems to me as a Senate what
22 falls under out purview is: Did they follow
23 the process, and what I see on pages 5 and 6
24 is that they followed the process that we as
25 a Senate Subcommittee generated.

0030

1 So they have Faculty Council input,
2 and we have to believe that Faculty Council
3 represents faculty. So it seems to me that
4 we're wordsmithing and getting into sort of
5 the internal workings of colleges and
6 divisions, and so for me, the point of
7 clarification is: Did they follow the
8 process? It appears to me that they did, so
9 I'd like to call a question.

10 INFANGER: Second.

11 THE CHAIR: Second.

12 BROTHERS: Who's the second?

13 THE CHAIR: Please identify yourself.

14 INFANGER: Craig Infanger, Agriculture.

15 THE CHAIR: Craig Infanger. The question has
16 been called.

17 UNIDENTIFIED: It requires a two-thirds vote.

18 THE CHAIR: It requires two-thirds vote. All
19 in favor of calling the question, please
20 raise your hand.

21 (SENATORS VOTE)

22 THE CHAIR: All those opposed?

23 (SENATORS VOTE)

24 THE CHAIR: All those in favor of the motion to
25 change the name of the College of Agriculture

0031

1 to the College of Agriculture, Food and The
2 Environment, please indicate by raising your
3 hand.

4 (SENATORS VOTE)

5 THE CHAIR: All those opposed, please raise
6 your hand.

7 (SENATORS VOTE)

8 THE CHAIR: The motion passes.

9 Ernie, let thank you for your work,
10 and Carla. I would like to thank the Senate
11 for its work as well in trying to work

12 through this knotty issue.

13 I would like to defer Item 3 until
14 after the overview of the USP External Review
15 Committee report. Alan Desantis has a
16 seminar which he has postponed to 4:30, and
17 I'm sure he -- he needs to get back there in
18 time.

19 By way of background, I want to
20 indicate -- please stand and welcome Alan
21 Desantis to provide us with a synopsis of the
22 USP External Review Committee report.

23 Before I do that, though, let me offer some
24 background to this committee and its report.

25 First of all, since it's

0032

1 formulation and inception in, I believe,
2 1986-1987, the University Studies Program, a
3 creature -- creation of the University Senate
4 has not undergone any systematic review and
5 assessment, but instead has grown in some
6 ways and been adjusted through incremental
7 changes as well.

8 The USP External Review Committee
9 report is part of a continuing effort to
10 review and to improve the University's
11 general education core of it's undergraduate
12 program.

13 It began with the formation of the
14 USP Self-Study Committee, ably chaired by
15 Lori Gonzalez, which culminated in the
16 issuance of a lengthy and searching report,
17 which you had available electronically.

18 USP External Review Committee was
19 then constituted to review and assess the
20 state of the -- of University studies and
21 perhaps offer some suggestions or a general
22 framework for envisioning new possibilities
23 for general education reform.

24 Subsequently, the Provost and the
25 Senate Council put together a joint Senate

0033

1 Council Provost General Education Reform and
2 Assessment Committee to plan and to
3 coordinate forums, events and other
4 activities intended to catalyze discussion
5 within colleges and among faculty over the
6 next six months or so.

7 As the process is presently
8 envisaged, recommendations for improving
9 general education and enhancing opportunities
10 for student -- assessing student development
11 in the program itself, will then be collated
12 and reported on in an addendum, perhaps, of
13 the USP External Review Committee to
14 representative faculty bodies for review and
15 consideration.

16 Ultimately, any new proposals and

17 any guiding framework and structure for
18 revised general education program will be
19 taken up for discussion, debate, and
20 institutionalization here.

21 Since final resolution of any USP
22 recommendations and proposed program
23 revisions will take place in this august
24 body, it is well and welcome that Alan has
25 come to the University Senate to deliver the

0034

1 committee report synopsis and in a symbolic
2 way to launch this wide-ranging faculty and
3 college review.

4 Alan, if I could give you the
5 podium.

6 DESANTIS: Well, thank you for having me in
7 today. Unlike Ernie, I actually have to
8 keep moving or I stop talking and fall down.
9 So I'm going to move around and discuss the
10 External Review a bit.

11 I'd be remiss if I didn't give
12 credit to my fellow members. Unfortunately,
13 most had to leave or were unable to attend,
14 but Tony from Theater, and Jeff Osborne from
15 Biology, Jane Peters from Art, Bill Rayens
16 from Statistic, and Jane Wells from
17 Accounting. So, as you can see, we have a
18 pretty diverse group of personalities and a
19 pretty well represented group of thinkers
20 from the Natural Sciences, the Humanities,
21 and the Social Sciences.

22 The committee's charge. In early
23 February the committee met with Mike and
24 Phil, Connie and Ernie to discuss what we
25 wanted to do, what our charge should be and

0035

1 what should this report look like.

2 At the end of the first couple of
3 meetings we had decided that what the
4 committee should do is generate a series of
5 guidelines that would serve as an
6 intellectual springboard for what I'm going
7 to call the Exploration Committee. That's
8 the group that's going to take this and run
9 with -- I think Ernie a really kind of cute
10 acronym, but GERA?

11 THE CHAIR: GERA.

12 DESANTIS: Ah. That's the one. We saw this
13 as an ideal opportunity then to articulate
14 what we believe should be the University's
15 mission for all undergraduate students.

16 We started reviewing what had taken
17 place since the initiation of USP, and what
18 we found out is what, of course, many of us
19 know: That it was a series of classes that
20 were added and then subtracted and then taken
21 away and added, and what we realized was that

22 we were lacking some cohesiveness and, in
23 fact, what was happening was that professors
24 and students were just growing increasingly
25 hostile and confused about the makeup and the

0036

1 structure of USP.

2 As a result, then, we decided to
3 take a step back and realized that what we
4 had been doing is putting the cart before the
5 horse and that we needed to begin to define
6 what our core learning outcomes were. We
7 needed a foundation if we were going to think
8 about what an undergraduate program should
9 do; what a USP program seeks to accomplish.

10 So without any further ado, the
11 document really focuses on the five learning
12 outcomes that we think no matter what program
13 we implement or embrace, there are five
14 learning outcomes that hopefully will be used
15 as a guiding force or a road map in bringing
16 around significant change in undergraduate
17 reform.

18 Number one. We hope that any
19 reform, no matter what shape it takes, will
20 enable students to understand their place and
21 purpose in their world. Hopefully a reform
22 program will produce both curiosity, kind of
23 the process of wonderment, and knowledge, the
24 product, about the world outside their
25 Commonwealth.

0037

1 And, of course, this becomes
2 especially important when we look at the
3 makeup and the experiences of our students.
4 Being a land-grant institution, we get many
5 students from small towns, Eastern and
6 Western, that haven't experienced a great
7 deal of the world and, as a result, we have
8 profound responsibility to make sure that
9 when our students leave us, they're equipped
10 to answer and ask, in fact, the really hard
11 questions: What it means to be a human and a
12 participant in a world like ours? Like, who
13 are they and what are their responsibilities
14 to the world and how can they be both
15 ethically grounded and sensitive to multi-
16 culture differences? Not easy tasks.

17 Specifically, therefore, we hope
18 that any program that is embraced by the body
19 will empower students to form their own world
20 view.

21 Number two. We hope that a program
22 will also encourage and empower students to
23 understand their own cultural practices.

24 As I remember coming in from high
25 school starting my first years of college, I

0038

1 did what my grandparents did and what my
2 parents did and my life in the beginning was
3 relatively unexamined.

4 A USP reform should make sure that
5 all students are pushed to examine why they
6 do what they do and why they think in their
7 own particular ways.

8 And, finally, we hope that a USP
9 course can empower students to learn about
10 the complexity of their world. What's going
11 on? What are different cultures, religions,
12 foods, geopolitical systems?

13 Now, for each one of our core
14 ideas, what I want to talk about is suggested
15 areas for investigation. We had about six
16 months to do this, which isn't a long time.
17 As a result, we generated a lot ideas without
18 fully investigating and exploring their
19 options. As a result, I'm going to hand this
20 off to the Exploration Committee to do that.

21 But here are some of the ideas that
22 looked fruitful and interesting, and
23 hopefully the next group will begin to
24 explore.

25 In investigating our benchmark

0039
1 institutions, what we liked from the best was
2 that they were able to integrate a global
3 perspective into their entire program. I
4 mean, as of right now we have a cross-culture
5 requirement, but that's kind of a vulcanized
6 class out there. It's relatively marginized,
7 and what we hope is that any reform folds it
8 in and it become a -- a fluid and intricate
9 part of all our university studies and
10 courses.

11 And, number two, and, in fact, the
12 committee was pretty enthusiastic about this
13 was that the University really needs to start
14 to encourage and facilitating the study
15 abroad program, that this, from what we can
16 tell, really changes the lives of students
17 and, in fact, that changed my life.

18 This summer I took my six-year-old
19 son and my 9-year-old daughter to Italy, and
20 it was a wonderful process in which they
21 learned a great deal about -- about the
22 country in which my grandfather was from.
23 But, at the same time, I saw these kind of
24 great moments of epiphany where they were
25 learning a lot about what it meant to be an

0040
1 American.

2 And so, as a result, we hope that
3 the University Studies Program strongly
4 encourages and facilitates in any way
5 possible, students leaving the borders of the

6 Commonwealth and begin to explore different
7 cultures and customs, religions and people.
8 Number two, a second core of
9 learning outcome that really resonated with
10 the group was that ideally a core program
11 should enable our students to engage in the
12 process of inquiry and reflection. And, of
13 course, this resonates with the Boyer Report.

14 We love the idea that somehow UK
15 has a unique opportunity to form a symbiotic
16 relationship between the research we do and
17 the classes that we teach.

18 I had a neighbor, a good-hearted
19 neighbor that asked why would a student go to
20 UK when they could go to someplace smaller,
21 like Eastern or Western or Center or
22 Transylvania? And my answer was that we do
23 something very unique that they can't; and,
24 that is, we do research and in its best we
25 can incorporate and enfold that research into

0041 meaningful learning experiences.

1 So, hopefully, any change that gets
2 brought about will encourage faculty to bring
3 their research into their classrooms where
4 students can be inspired by our quest for new
5 knowledge and can be informed by our research
6 process.

7 Specifically, therefore, we hope
8 that any new program, no matter what form it
9 takes, enables students to create their own
10 moments of epiphany. And this is one of the
11 things that got me hooked on academics, and
12 probably something that touched all of us.

13 And, as well, a program that can
14 foster a life-long spirit of curiosity, and
15 this is something that we do that others
16 can't and I think Boyer very nicely
17 articulated what a research one grant
18 institution can offer.

19 Suggested areas of investigation.
20 We were looking at both our benchmark
21 institutions and our own institutions and one
22 of the really nice things that come out of
23 this was: We're doing a really great job.
24 Unfortunately, we're not doing a great for

0042 all students. We're doing a great job for a
1 select few, but the Arts and Science's
2 freshman discovery course is a wonderful idea
3 capturing Boyer's idea of folding our
4 research in with our pedagogy.

5 We also really like the idea of
6 what we're doing on campus with the living
7 and learning centers. Well, once again, we
8 hope that this can be expanded to include
9 more than just the select few.
10

11 One idea that we liked was an upper
12 division discovery seminar, primarily taken
13 in your senior year, in which any student,
14 regardless of major, could focus in an area,
15 whether it be social sciences, the natural
16 sciences or the humanities, and explore some
17 inquiry-based learning.

18 One of the things we were hoping, I
19 guess ideally, was that these seminars would
20 focus on civic engagement; that the projects
21 would focus on improving the human condition
22 or what President Todd had labeled the
23 Commonwealth's uglies, I think.

24 UNIDENTIFIED: Kentucky uglies.

25 DESANTIS: Kentucky's uglies. Yeah,

0043

1 Kentucky's uglies. I thought he was talking
2 about me. I feel a lot better about that.

3 Number two. We like the idea of
4 extending this to the senior year because
5 right now there's a gap that exists between a
6 students' first two years, where they
7 disproportionately focus on USP, and their
8 latter two or three or four years, in which
9 they focus on majors, and so we thought this
10 would be a nice bookend to have some
11 fundamental liberal arts education in the
12 first two years and then wrap up the whole
13 process in their senior year so there seems
14 to be some cohesiveness, some thought to the
15 entire educational process here on campus.

16 Number three. We hope that any new
17 initiatives or reforms that take place
18 encourage multi-disciplinary thinking.

19 Most American universities,
20 unfortunately, both force professors and
21 students into myopic departments. Knowledge
22 becomes, unfortunately, awkwardly categorized
23 and divided. I teach COM 101 to about 1,200
24 students each year, and I'm constantly amazed
25 when I talk to my friends like Jonathan

0044

1 Golding, how much we do overlaps. How much
2 common and shared knowledge we discuss in our
3 classes without ever building bridges with
4 each other in knowledge.

5 A bold and creative reform then, I
6 think, has to try to liberate our ideas from
7 departmentalization. And what I find so
8 interesting about this, is when I read my
9 colleagues' research, we do this; right?
10 When we write, we're always borrowing each
11 other ideas, and when I look at research
12 teams and grant teams, they're made up of
13 really smart teams of interdisciplinary
14 thinkers. For some reason we don't do that
15 in our classrooms, however.

16 So I think proposing the same type
17 of approach to the overall program, we need
18 to ask ourselves some questions like: What
19 do we want our students to learn? And maybe
20 stop asking: What classes do we want them to
21 take?

22 Specifically, then, I hope that
23 any new program can encourage students to
24 synthesize and integrate ideas from multiple
25 perspectives and apply theory and methods for

0045

1 multiple disciplines.

2 Every once in a while I have a
3 student, it's a rare thing, that will make a
4 connection in class. They'll be like, Dr.
5 Desantis, is this like that stuff we talked
6 over in psychology or physics or biology?
7 And they get it. But, unfortunately, it's
8 far too rare and the tragedy is we're failing
9 because those connections should happen every
10 day because knowledge, of course, is that
11 fluid. It does overlap, it does influence
12 and it is informed by each other.

13 Suggestions for future
14 investigation. I like this one. I was
15 really proud of our University once I began
16 investigating our best practices because in
17 this case we are the best practice.

18 The Modern Studies program, for
19 example, eloquently took this idea, and it
20 was a pilot study that lasted for a few years
21 and now, unfortunately, it's dormant.

22 The Social Science Honors program
23 is another really nice example. Jonathan
24 Golding and Ernie and a few other of my
25 colleagues of Social Science got together and

0046

1 decided not so much what classes should be
2 taught, but what are the ideas that unite us
3 all? How best can we end up of teaching
4 these overarching or undergirding ideas that
5 unite the Social Sciences, and our new Space,
6 Place and Culture Honors program is another
7 very nice idea.

8 As a result, then, I hope that the
9 program that begins to explore and
10 investigate some core reform, tries to see
11 how we can take these programs that have been
12 out there for a select few and begin to
13 incorporate the learning experience for the
14 general undergraduate population at large.

15 Number four. We hope that any new
16 reform can empower students to meet the
17 demands and challenges of the 21st Century.
18 Well, what does that mean? In many regards
19 our University curriculum looks a lot like it
20 did 100 years ago, and this isn't to say that

21 the study of classical traditional knowledge
22 is obsolete but, in fact, it's to say that
23 because of changes in politics and economics
24 and technology and culture we now have
25 additional demands as a University.

0047

1 I think what we must do is give
2 serious consideration to what new types of
3 knowledge and what new types of skills our
4 students need to be prepared, to be
5 competitive and responsible citizens once
6 they leave.

7 Specifically, we have to prepare
8 our students to enact to do discoveries, and
9 not just skills but also knowledge. We have
10 to make sure that our students are able to
11 engage in ethical discussions as new
12 technologies emerge; that we have to make
13 sure that discoveries and knowledge doesn't
14 surpass our ethical discussion. And,
15 hopefully, this will be eloquently woven into
16 many of our classes as well.

17 And, finally, we have to make sure
18 that when our students leave they're able to
19 be participatory citizens in a multi-lingual
20 and multi-cultural global village.

21 So what are some of the ideas that
22 hopefully will be investigated? The thing
23 was I found, and, once again, it reaffirmed
24 my faith in how great of a faculty we are,
25 that many of our departments are already

0048

1 doing this, at the 3 and 400 level. There
2 are classes that are tackling issues of
3 global economies, new technologies, evolving
4 geopolitical issues.

5 What we need to do, however, is
6 make some systematic changes in our 1 and 200
7 level classes at the USP level. We have to
8 make sure that our syllabi, our subject
9 matter and our courses remain responsive to
10 cultural global events and changes.

11 Another area that we really liked
12 that we saw a handful of smaller schools
13 doing was classes dealing with media and
14 visual literacy courses. It became apparent
15 to us that older ways of making sense out of
16 a world are quickly becoming obsolete. That
17 arguments are now coming in montages of
18 sounds and images. I was trained as a
19 rhetorician and I spent years studying
20 Aristotle and Quintilian and Cicero about how
21 to make sense out of formal logic and
22 discussion and public discourse, and
23 somewhere around the '90s I realized that I
24 really needed a new platform, a new logic to
25 make sense out of images and medias.

0049

1 For example, anybody that watched
2 the last election realized, it wasn't two
3 Cicerone orations that won or hour lost the
4 election, it was 15-second, 30-second images,
5 cartoons, that ultimately swayed it. So if
6 we're sending out students with the ability
7 -- without the ability to make sense out of
8 images, then we're doing them a great
9 injustice and maybe democracy a great
10 injustice.

11 Finally, we hope that a new program
12 would help students discover and examine the
13 ambiguity of human knowledge. Maybe the
14 University's most important mission is to get
15 our students to question everything; that
16 when they enter our front doors the, perhaps,
17 major dictum should be that no ideas, no
18 matter how well entrenched or sacred, are
19 above and beyond evaluation and critique.

20 Of course, this charge is even made
21 more important when we begin to think about
22 what the students will face once they leave
23 our universities. Science and theology,
24 Oprah, Fox News, MTV are now making regularly
25 claims of -- with absolute certainty about

0050

1 truth and falseness of every issue
2 imaginable.

3 What we need to make sure of, that
4 is, that our students are prepared and
5 equipped with the knowledge and skills to
6 evaluate the merits of these truth claims
7 that seem to pop up once a week or so.

8 Specifically, hopefully, our
9 students will be exposed -- will be able to
10 -- excuse me, expose their assumptions to
11 investigation. When a student walks in the
12 front door most of what they do and their
13 practice have gone unexamined. By the time
14 they leave we want to make sure that our
15 students have questioned most of what have
16 remained unquestioned, and at that point,
17 that intelligent point, in which they can
18 decide what issues and what practice and what
19 customs they want to reaffirm, reform or
20 reject.

21 We also hope that in our classrooms
22 we foster an atmosphere in which any idea we
23 discuss is also open for debate and
24 discussion, so both inside and outside our
25 classroom.

0051

1 And, of course, we want our
2 students to understand different ways of
3 knowing, different epistemologies, and come
4 to the realization that how we come to know,

5 at times, can produce different and
6 incongruent truth claims and the tension that
7 exists between knowledge claims and ways of
8 knowing or epistemologies.

9 Suggested areas of investigation.
10 Once again, our best teachers in our upper-
11 level classes, as well as our lower-level
12 classes, have already kind of elegantly
13 incorporated critical thinking skills into
14 their classes, which is wonderful.

15 Our hope, however, is that this
16 skill will serve as a guiding principle and a
17 significant criteria in reshaping USP; that,
18 of course, all core courses have to be free
19 for open debate and exchange.

20 There's of course a challenge with
21 this. As many of you know, we have more and
22 more freshmen starting each year and as a
23 result our lecture halls are growing larger
24 and larger. Unfortunately, the Sage on the
25 Stage model doesn't often foster that kind of

0052

1 socratic exchange of. Far too often it
2 fosters passive reception of information, and
3 so what we hope is that in investigating our
4 problems we begin thinking of creative ways
5 in which technology or the use of TA's or
6 maybe even pedagogical skills can help us
7 facilitate critical thought within classrooms
8 that hold 3, 4, 5, 6, 700 students in a
9 sitting.

10 Older ways of fixing USP seem to no
11 longer be adequate. In fact, it's causing
12 consternation and anger on both the students
13 and the professors behalf.

14 USP reform, we believe, needs to
15 take place, but it needs to be rebuilt from
16 the ground up. There needs to be some
17 foundational changes that take place, and
18 that I believe can come from learning
19 outcomes. Let's start with the primary
20 question of what we want our students to
21 learn, and then proceed from there.

22 We suggest that whatever shape or
23 form the new curriculum takes, and that's up
24 to you folks to decide, that at least the
25 External Review Committee has begun a

0053

1 conversation on what's important to us, what
2 our goals and what our responsibilities are
3 as a University to the Commonwealth.

4 Hopefully, by the time our students
5 leave they will understand their place in the
6 world. Hopefully, however USP is reformed,
7 it will empower students to engage in inquiry
8 and reflection. It will empower them to
9 think from multi-disciplinary perspectives.

10 It will give students the skills and the
11 knowledge needed to meet the demands of the
12 21st Century, and it will empower them to
13 challenge and question knowledge whether it's
14 coming from us or coming from the outside
15 world.

16 Finally, to help facilitate the
17 next stage of core reform, the Committee has
18 a couple of suggestions. Number one, the
19 Exploration Committee, we believe, has to be
20 -- no matter how its constituted, has to be
21 made up and has to be able to engender campus
22 respect and trust because all change creates
23 a level of anxiety and mistrust.

24 Talking to Ernie and Phil, I know
25 this is already in the plan but we hope that

0054

1 there is campus-wide conversations that
2 actively seek out all faculty members
3 because, as you know, we faculty members are
4 an unusual lot and we want to be included in
5 decisions and we want to participate and we
6 want to at least strive for consensus and I
7 know that's a plan that Ernie and Phil are
8 working on. There has to be strong top-down
9 leadership that can push all of us out of our
10 inertia and into participatory change. That
11 is, the people at the top really have to get
12 behind this if significant change is going to
13 take place, and at times I'm a bit more
14 skeptical than others, but hopefully they'll
15 prove me wrong.

16 Of course, I figured you'd like
17 this one. There has to be a strong reward
18 system for faculty who commit time and energy
19 towards undergraduate reform. It can't just
20 be part of the additive model where we keep
21 giving and giving and, unfortunately, aren't
22 rewarded for the time we spend in the
23 undergraduate classroom.

24 There has to be a commitment to do
25 no harm to graduate programs that now depend

0055

1 on TA funding that comes from USP classes,
2 and I'm sure that's a great fear of many of
3 ours.

4 And, finally, there has to be
5 realistic and honest levels of funding. The
6 doing more with less is a pedagogical
7 anathema. One thing we found from looking at
8 our best practices, and our benchmark best
9 practices, is you can't do more with less.
10 To do really great things, to be bold and
11 creative, to make a life in stu -- to make a
12 difference, excuse me, in students' lives you
13 do have to invest both time, energy and
14 money.

15 So, with that said, thank you.

16 THE CHAIR: I'd like to give Phil Kraemer an
17 opportunity to offer a few words of
18 perspectives on the work of the USP External
19 Review Committee.

20 KRAEMER: I'll be very brief. I would first
21 like to thank Alan and colleagues for the
22 work they -- they did on this plan. I think
23 they gave us a lot to chew on, and chew on we
24 must.

25 About five years ago I recall

0056

1 reading in the Chronicle an article that
2 described curriculum reform at two
3 institutions. I believe it was Duke and
4 Rice, and according to the article, was
5 contrasting the success and failure of those
6 enterprises. I believe it succeeded at Duke,
7 failed at Rice and the reason was process.

8 I think the process by which we as
9 a faculty engage this is the ultimately most
10 critical beginning question.

11 I went to North Carolina three
12 weeks ago and listened to Colleagues at
13 Chapel Hill describe their new curriculum,
14 but more importantly the process by which
15 they arrived at that new curriculum. And,
16 again, the emphasis there was on process.

17 The important principles were: Get
18 as many faculty involved in it as possible,
19 it's got to be embraced by the institution,
20 it reflects the institutions values and we
21 need to find ways to let everyone have a
22 voice. You also have to go as quickly as you
23 can. We know that we would like to move
24 quickly and develop the best curriculum we
25 could, but we need to adjust our speed so

0057

1 that we don't attempt to simply push
2 something through for the sake of saying we
3 have some kind change or reform.

4 So we need to deliberate on this.
5 We need to have cautious conversations that
6 need to be quite pervasive. And, I think the
7 beginning point is well structured by Alan's
8 committee, laying out the foundational goals.
9 I think that should be the beginning point,
10 and hopefully the planning committee that
11 Ernie eluded to will provide a mechanism to
12 induce the conversations about those
13 principles. And we want to make this an
14 activity really that brings out the
15 intellectual scholarly side of the faculty.
16 This really is important whether or not
17 you're teaching undergraduates.

18 This was another lesson at North
19 Carolina. The faculty that had a say in that

20 curriculum, that offered something about it,
21 some opinion, were not just the faculty
22 teaching the undergraduates. They had
23 faculty from a number of colleges, many of
24 whom had never taught undergraduates. But in
25 the end, they ended up with something, that

0058

1 by the time it got to the approval process,
2 at the Senate, they were so confident with
3 its success that they went into it without
4 the usual kind of concerns that we have with
5 most of our proposals.

6 I'd hope that we'd have the kind of
7 conversation and engagement we need on this
8 topic that we could too get to that stage, in
9 not too far in the future, but get there
10 knowing that what we've got is something
11 that's worth having. Ernie.

12 THE CHAIR: Phil, thank you very much. I think
13 it is a consensus among a good many people in
14 the administration and in the faculty
15 leadership that this year and part of next
16 year will provide, I think, in some respects
17 the last best chance for -- for some while,
18 for us to undertake a very significant reform
19 of the general education core.

20 I would remind you of a very noted
21 statement that I carry with me from Albert
22 Camus, who said: By your action or inaction
23 you too shall enter the fray. Over the next
24 six months you will have opportunities to
25 weigh in or not on a future direction for the

0059

1 general education core. By your action or
2 inaction, you will help to shape the extent
3 to which assessment works hand-in-hand with
4 general education reform.

5 I hope that you will rise to that
6 occasion because I think that if we -- we
7 miss this opportunity with a significant
8 turnover in the -- at the higher
9 administration, with a whole series of
10 activities taking place like the USP Self-
11 Study Report, the External Review Committee,
12 the College of Arts and Sciences Self-Study
13 and Review, if we do not take this
14 opportunity we will have lost a golden
15 opportunity to significantly better and to
16 improve our overall undergraduate program.

17 I'd like to turn back now to the
18 third agenda item. Yes, ma'am.

19 MARTIN: Catherine Martin, College of
20 Medicine. I'd like to make two comments
21 about the curriculum.

22 One is that President Todd
23 commented on how we lose a lot of students,
24 there's a lot of attrition, and there was

25 nothing addressed as far as a way to
0060
1 establish connectiveness for students to feel
2 more part of UK.
3 The other issue is I think that
4 having this age group provides a unique
5 opportunity to educate about their
6 vulnerabilities, such as alcohol use, and I'd
7 like to see that considered as part of
8 moving forward.

9 THE CHAIR: Catherine, thank you so much.
10 If I could, in the interest of
11 time and agenda, turn back to agenda item 3,
12 the Department of Geology name change.

13 Within the last year the Senate
14 Council considered the Geology Department
15 request to change its name to the Department
16 of Earth and Environmental Science. Thank
17 you.

18 The Senate Council, which was in a
19 creative state of mind, came up with an
20 alternate name which we feel like better
21 incorporated what we understood to be
22 geology. We offered that to the Department.
23 Frank Ettensohn had his department consider
24 it, they roundly rejected it.

25 We also had some trepidation with
0061
1 regard to approving even the name change
2 which they offered because of our concern
3 about the use of the term environment and
4 whether it was -- whether that term was fair
5 game or whether it should be more or less
6 monopolized by one or two departments or
7 programs.

8 In light of the fact that the
9 College of Agriculture put forth its
10 recommendation, it became apparent to us that
11 the term environment was, indeed, fair game
12 and so this original proposal was
13 resuscitated and was considered at the
14 October 24th Senate Council meeting.

15 The name change proposal was for
16 the Department of Earth and Environmental
17 Sciences. It has been sent to the Senate
18 with a positive recommendation from the
19 Senate Council.

20 Frank Ettensohn, are you here?

21 BAILEY: He was here --

22 THE CHAIR: He was here?

23 BAILEY: -- and he left and he was going to
24 come back.

25 THE CHAIR: Okay.

0062
1 BAILEY: I could review comments from the
2 AOS Committee Meeting from a year ago on
3 this.

4 THE CHAIR: If you would, Ernie.
5 BAILEY: Frank had commented -- reported --
6 one of the first paragraphs of our report.
7 He reported the Department of Geological
8 Sciences has eleven faculty, one full-time
9 lecturer who request a name change that
10 reflects an evolution in the way that geology
11 is regarded. And here's a quote from him:
12 The disciplines have evolved from a profit
13 oriented exploitative approach to one that
14 emphasizes understanding the earth as a
15 system and a remediation of current and past
16 environmental ills. And in our meeting he
17 commented that geology was associated with a
18 rape and plunder of the land type of an idea
19 and that this wasn't really consistent with
20 tracking students and faculty.
21 A lot of the students are finding
22 work in -- for environmental agencies. The
23 faculty hires that they're coming in, have
24 concerns about environmental impact of, I
25 guess, related to this discipline.

0063

1 The committee met. They had
2 consulted with people in agriculture, biology
3 and chemistry. After listening to the
4 discussion the committee approved it.
5 Basically, it was moved that, yes, this is an
6 appropriate name change. It is appropriate
7 to move this way, but we were concerned that
8 they had not consulted with the people in the
9 College of Medicine and different areas.
10 They went and did so, came back -- actually,
11 there was an original name change suggested,
12 Frank took it to the faculty, the faculty
13 rejected that one. It came to the Senate
14 Council, he was offered another choice, he
15 went back to the faculty and that's why it's
16 taken a year to get to this point. That's
17 the long and short of it.

18 The main point is it has to do with
19 a change in the function of the department
20 from what historically it was.

21 THE CHAIR: That is correct. And what we see
22 here is that the Academic Organization and
23 Structure Committee and the Senate Council
24 now is more or less in alignment in agreeing
25 on this to -- to recommend this to the

0064

1 Senate.
2 Do we have any discussion on this
3 item?
4 (NO RESPONSE)

5 THE CHAIR: Seeing none, I will -- since this
6 has been reported to the Senate with a
7 positive recommendation, let us vote on the
8 motion.

9 All those in favor of the motion to
10 approve the name change of the Department of
11 Geology to the Department of Earth and
12 Environmental Sciences please raise your
13 hand.

14 (SENATORS VOTE)

15 THE CHAIR: All those opposed?

16 (SENATORS VOTE)

17 THE CHAIR: It looks like it's unanimous. Any
18 abstentions?

19 (NO RESPONSE)

20 THE CHAIR: The motion passes. I would like now
21 to turn to our fourth agenda item, an
22 overview -- pardon me, to our fifth agenda
23 item, Academic Offenses Committee
24 recommendations.

25 The Academic Offenses Policy Review

0065

1 Committee report is in some respects a
2 culmination of a year-long-plus effort by its
3 committee members.

4 Senate review and Senate Council
5 discussion has taken place, and there has
6 been an attempted resolution of principle
7 differences within this proposal through, I
8 would -- I would say very passionate and
9 heart felt efforts to articulate those
10 differences and to find ultimately common
11 ground.

12 We are bringing this to the Senate
13 for discussion purposes only today in order
14 to solicit Senate opinions and Senate members
15 opinions and views on the proposal and, more
16 specifically, on a number of key issues that
17 have been animating the Senate Council
18 debate.

19 In light of your comments and
20 perspectives that are opened up today, we
21 will consider further the Academic Offenses
22 Policy Committee report and its
23 recommendations in an effort, then, to bring
24 a recommendation to this body at a future
25 meeting.

0066

1 I would like to turn to Bob
2 Grossman, who will provide us with an
3 overview.

4 GROSSMAN: Thank you, Ernie.

5 You'll find my PowerPoint
6 presentation is much less colorful and
7 animated than Alan's was, but hopefully will
8 still have substance in it.

9 First of all, before I start, I
10 want to thank the members of this committee
11 who have had many, many more meetings than
12 anyone really should have on this subject,
13 and also been in discussions via e-mail on

14 many of these issues.

15 When we first started looking at
16 Academic Offenses Polices at this University,
17 one of the first things we did was do a
18 comparison with our benchmarks and we looked
19 at our 20-benchmark universities, and of them
20 all, only two of them do not leave discretion
21 for the penalty for a first offense to the
22 instructor. Those two are Virginia and
23 Maryland. At Virginia you get expelled for
24 anything. You bounce a check, you get
25 expelled; you look at your professor

0067

1 sideways, you get expelled.

2 Maryland has a modified student run
3 honor code with minimum penalty is an XE for
4 any offense, but all the other universities
5 in our benchmarks and many other universities
6 across the country leave the discretion for
7 the penalty for the first offense to the
8 instructor.

9 So -- and, in fact, many of us have
10 identified many problems with the current
11 system that we have, which is that the
12 minimum penalty for an offense is an E in the
13 course, and that is that many faculty have
14 just opted out of that system and decide not
15 to punish offenses with an E partly, and I
16 think the major reason why, is that many of
17 the offenses that occur in classes they do
18 not feel are so serious as to require an E
19 for the offense.

20 There's also a desire to avoid
21 becoming entangled in the University
22 bureaucracy of handling academic offenses,
23 and so a lot of instructors handle things
24 under the table and they offer deals to
25 students. If you -- I know you cheated so

0068

1 I'm going to give you a zero on this
2 assignment or I'm going to give you a zero on
3 this exam or whatever. That in itself -- and
4 if you accept this penalty, we'll just keep
5 it quiet between you and me. And that in
6 itself leads to a whole host of problems.

7 One is, if the student is innocent
8 or they feel they're innocent, they feel
9 pressure to either accept this lesser penalty
10 or go to the Appeals Board and challenge the
11 finding offense. But if they do that and the
12 Appeals Board finds against them, the minimum
13 penalty is an E. And so they have to -- they
14 can challenge the finding, but if they lose
15 they're risking a much, much harsher penalty
16 than if they just accept the deal. So that's
17 one problem with it.

18 The other problem is if the student

19 is a cheater or has plagiarized and they
20 accept the deal, no one ever knows about it
21 and so they can go to another class and do it
22 again, and again, it gets handled quietly, go
23 to another class, do it again and again, it
24 gets handled quietly and -- and the student
25 can go through their career cheating

0069

1 everywhere, always being handled quietly,
2 often not being caught, and nothing ever gets
3 punished.

4 So these were some of the problems
5 we perceived with the current system that we
6 wanted to do deal with.

7 Another -- there were some other
8 peripheral issues, but those were the main
9 ones.

10 So this is a proposal that we've
11 come up with and I'm comparing what the
12 current rule is at UK with what the proposed
13 rule says.

14 The current rule, again, is the
15 minimum penalty of an E for a first offense,
16 and that E is not subject to the repeat
17 option, and then there's a minimum penalty of
18 suspension for a second offense; that's
19 assuming the offense is actually reported
20 which, as I said, is often not the case.

21 Under the proposed rule, we do not
22 provide a minimum penalty for a first
23 offense. I'll come back to this a little bit
24 later, but it's completely up to the
25 instructor's discretion what is the penalty

0070

1 for a first offense, up to the level of an E
2 in the course, which is subject to the repeat
3 option. Okay.

4 The minimum penalty for the second
5 offense would be an E in the course, again,
6 subject to the repeat option, and the minimum
7 penalty of suspension for a third -- would be
8 for a third offense.

9 Some of this is slightly modi --
10 has been modified by the Senate Council since
11 the last version of this proposal appeared.

12 We're going to institute a new
13 penalty of XE for first or second offense, an
14 XE is not subject to the repeat option and it
15 appears on the transcript as an XE and a
16 failure of the class due to an academic
17 offense.

18 For first or second offenses an
19 instructor -- if the offense is very severe,
20 an instructor can say I think this offense
21 deserves an XE or worse, but that penalty can
22 only be imposed if the Chair and the Dean
23 both agree to it.

24 So that's -- that's one set of
25 changes.

0071

1 Transcript notation. Currently for
2 suspension, dismissal, and expulsion for an
3 academic offense, it's indicated on the
4 transcript that the student -- that this
5 happened for an academic offense, but after
6 three years it gets removed from the
7 transcript for -- not for expulsion but for
8 suspension or dismissal.

9 The proposed rule as it stands now,
10 and this is still a matter of discussion,
11 which I'm going to come back to later, but as
12 the rule is written right now the -- first of
13 all, remember, we added this XE that appears
14 as such on the transcript and we say that it
15 can be converted to a regular E upon appeal
16 after one year. So if one year goes by the
17 student can come back to the Appeals Board
18 and say I'm sorry. It was a terrible thing I
19 did, and I really shouldn't have done it and
20 the Appeals Board can show mercy and convert
21 it back to an E.

22 As it is written now it's converted
23 automatically after three years; just like
24 suspension and dismissal are removed from the
25 transcript after three years.

0072

1 I shouldn't have written expulsion
2 up there. I think it's just suspension and
3 dismissal are removed after three years.

4 Appeals. This is one of the
5 subjects that has generated the most
6 discussion and the most heated discussion of
7 all the subjects, and the way appeals are
8 handled now, as they're written in the
9 policy, is as follows: First of all, right
10 now the rules are all offenses and penalties
11 may be appealed to the University Appeals
12 Board.

13 That's a little bit -- that's as
14 the rules are written but, of course, if an
15 offense is never reported it can't be
16 appealed and if it's reported the minimum
17 offense is an E.

18 So it's not quite true that all
19 offenses and penalties may be appealed to the
20 University Appeals Board. Only those that
21 are actually dealt with in the official
22 system can be appealed.

23 And the University Appeals Board
24 may not reduce penalties below the minimum
25 specified in the rules. So the University --

0073

1 if someone -- the University Appeals Board
2 finds that someone cheated or plagiarized

3 they cannot reduce the penalty lower than an
4 E. If it's a second offense, they cannot
5 reduce it lower than suspension.

6 So under the proposed rule, same
7 thing. All offenses and penalties may be
8 appealed to the University Appeals Board.
9 The hope, though, is that now that
10 instructors are permitted to impose penalties
11 less than an E for a first offense, those are
12 now also subject to oversight by the
13 University Appeals Board, so a student can no
14 longer be told, well, I'm going to give you a
15 zero on this assignment and if you protest
16 your innocence you're going to get an E in
17 the course. They will be able to go to the
18 University Appeals Board and say, I didn't
19 cheat. Again, the University Appeals Board
20 may not reduce penalties below the minimum,
21 specified in the rules.

22 Now, the next two -- the next three
23 items are different. The recommended -- what
24 we say is that for a first offense, if an
25 instructor says this student deserves, say, a

0074

1 reduction of their grade by one letter -- or
2 one letter level, that the University Appeals
3 Board can only reduce that penalty, if they
4 find that they student is guilty, they can
5 only reduce that penalty if it is grossly
6 disproportionate to the offense.

7 You may have seen a letter, an
8 e-mail from Kaveh in your e-mail boxes and it
9 was -- a copy out there was put -- this is a
10 sub -- this is something that he is
11 disputing, and I don't want to get into the
12 disagreement right now but this is
13 specifically something that he was referring
14 to there.

15 But, again, if the Appeals Board
16 finds that a penalty less than an E was
17 grossly disproportionate to the offense, they
18 can reduce it to something that is
19 proportionate.

20 If the Chair and the -- if the
21 instructor and the Chair and the Dean all
22 agree that this was a really terrible offense
23 that deserves at least an XE, then the
24 University Appeals Board can say, no, this
25 doesn't deserve an XE, it wasn't that

0075

1 terrible. They can reduce it to an E. They
2 can reduce it further, but it needs to be
3 extraordinary circumstances and this is going
4 to be left up -- the definition of this is
5 left up to the Appeals Board, as is the
6 definition of grossly disproportionate. In
7 their judgment, if there are extraordinary

8 circumstances for it, then they can reduce
9 the penalty to less than an E. And we can
10 talk about what might constitute
11 extraordinary circumstances, but, again,
12 that's up to the Appeals Board.

13 Finally, something that we've added
14 is if the UAB reduces a penalty or finds a
15 student not guilty, it must provide written
16 justification to the instructor. This
17 recommendation is coming out of the
18 experience of some faculty who found that
19 there were actions of the Appeals Board that
20 -- when the Appeals Board ruled against them
21 and they never knew why and they couldn't get
22 any information back from the Appeals Board
23 about why. We feel that the Appeals Board
24 will be -- that the action of the Appeals
25 Board will be much better founded and the

0076

1 instructors would be much better served if
2 when -- if an instructor has gone over the
3 line, if that is used as an opportunity to
4 educate the instructor about what are the
5 expectations about rules of evidence and
6 things like that.

7 Jurisdiction. This is also an area
8 that has generated a lot of discussion, not
9 as much as heat, but a lot of discussion.

10 Currently, what this -- these rules
11 have to do with our honor codes. There are
12 certain colleges that have established honor
13 codes. There are some colleges in which
14 those honor codes apply to every one in the
15 college, there are other colleges where it
16 only applies to certain professional programs
17 of the college and not graduate programs, and
18 there's an issue that comes up when colleges
19 -- when students in one college take a course
20 in another college and the two colleges don't
21 follow the same rules and how do you handle
22 cheating offenses in those cases.

23 So the committee came up with one
24 recommendation and the Senate Council decided
25 to go the other way, and -- which was fine.

0077

1 But this is as it currently is after the
2 Senate Council modified it.

3 Basically, what the Senate Council
4 said was that the rules of the student's home
5 college are what count. So if a student
6 from, say, Law take a course in, say, Arts
7 and Sciences, and the student is found by the
8 instructor to be cheating, then the Law honor
9 code takes precedence.

10 Conversely, if a student from Arts
11 and Sciences takes a course in Law and is
12 found to be cheating by the instructor, then

13 it's Arts and Sciences Rules that take
14 precedence.

15 And the reason for that is simply
16 when a student joins a college and signs up
17 for an honor code, they're doing so
18 explicitly and so the students -- the
19 students who sign up that they will obey such
20 an honor code should be the only one subject
21 to it.

22 There's also some changes in the
23 graduate school jurisdiction. Currently the
24 Dean of Graduate School has jurisdiction over
25 graduates in 600 and 700 level courses only;

0078

1 not 500 level or 400-G level or undergraduate
2 level, and in academic work outside of
3 courses, which are things like thesis, any
4 dissertations, things like that.

5 And, as it is right now, and this
6 may still change, the Dean of the Graduate
7 School -- we said the Dean of Graduate School
8 just has jurisdiction over graduate students
9 regardless of what courses they're taking.

10 And, again, this is consistent with
11 the idea that it's the home college of the
12 student that determines the rules that that
13 student has to follow.

14 Okay. Issues that have arisen, and
15 there have been a huge number of issues that
16 the committee has had to work through; that
17 the University committee has -- community has
18 brought to us, concerns that they had about
19 initial versions of the proposal that we took
20 into account, reworked the proposal, brought
21 it back and -- anyway, here are some of those
22 issues.

23 The first one, of course, is should
24 a penalty less than E be permitted for an
25 academic offense. And, if so, how much

0079

1 discretion should instructors have in
2 choosing a penalty.

3 You can see where the committee
4 came down on this that -- that, yes, a
5 penalty less than an E should be permitted as
6 the vast majority of other universities do
7 and instructors should be allowed discretion
8 to impose a penalty that they think is
9 appropriate in their classrooms.

10 We have a lot of autonomy and
11 authority in the classroom and we did not --
12 the committee did not feel that academic
13 offenses should be any different, although we
14 did agree that there needed to be some
15 accountability for the instructor's decisions
16 and that's what -- and we do -- are allowing
17 some Appeals Board oversight of the

18 instructor's decisions to make sure that the
19 decisions are not way out of line in terms of
20 what the penalties are.

21 What should be the minimum penalty
22 for second and third offenses? The committee
23 originally proposed a minimum penalty of XE
24 for second and subsequent offenses. The
25 Senate Council modified that to a minimum

0080

1 penalty of E for second offenses, and then
2 suspension for third offenses. So there's a
3 lot of ways that this can be -- that this pie
4 can be cut, but that's another question that
5 was wrestled with.

6 What level offense should be marked
7 on the transcript, for how long? You saw
8 what we currently do. There are several
9 members of the committee and I think members
10 on the Senate Council who think that if an
11 offense is serious enough to appear on a
12 transcript it should stay on the transcript;
13 not just be removed automatically after three
14 years, although one could set in an appeals
15 process for other offenses on the transcript.
16 Others think that it should never be marked
17 on the transcript. There's a lot of
18 different ways of handling that.

19 There's also the question of level
20 offense recorded on the student's internal
21 record and for how long. The -- one of the,
22 what I think is the only virtue of our
23 current system where -- where most offenses
24 are dealt with under the table or many
25 offenses dealt with under the table, are that

0081

1 if that student is just a one-time offender
2 you punish them and it's over and that's it.
3 There's no record of it anywhere. They learn
4 their lesson. They go on in life and it
5 doesn't come back to haunt them.

6 And there was considerable
7 sentiment in the committee and on the Senate
8 Council that a single offense should not
9 haunt a student forever, and so there's been
10 a lot of discussion, but on the -- but the
11 flip side, how do you know when a student
12 commits an offense whether that's the only
13 offense they're ever going to commit. Right.

14 So, you know, there's this desire
15 to say, okay, well, I hope this will be the
16 only offense and we'll just keep it quiet
17 but, on the other hand, if they go around and
18 cheat in other classes you want to hammer
19 them.

20 So there's been a lot of discussion
21 about what is the appropriate level offense
22 that should be recorded as an offense on the

23 student's internal record; how long that --
24 that should be kept on the student's internal
25 record, and whether it should be recorded

0082

1 that the student committed an offense,
2 whether it's a warning, if it's a first
3 offense, and it's not severe one, et cetera,
4 et cetera.

5 I think we've come more or less to
6 an agreement on a good way to handle this
7 although it hasn't been approved by Senate
8 Council yet. But it seems that every one
9 agrees that if a student commits a first
10 offense and the penalty is less than an E
11 that the record of that offense should be
12 destroyed upon graduation of the student,
13 okay, so that there's no longer a record that
14 they cheated.

15 It doesn't mean that the student
16 doesn't have to in the future say, yes, I
17 cheated once if they're asked: Did you ever
18 cheat or were you ever caught cheating,
19 because the event happened. But it does at
20 least permit the written record of the
21 offense to go away. And there is still some
22 discussion about how to record that first
23 offense; whether it should be recorded that
24 an offense was committed or whether it should
25 be a warning or what.

0083

1 This cross-jurisdictional issue has
2 taken far more time than it really deserves,
3 but as you can read up there, and I talked
4 about it before, who is in charge when a
5 student from one college cheats in another
6 college or who is in charge when a graduate
7 student takes a course in a -- in one of the
8 traditional colleges, and is it the Dean of
9 the Graduate School in charge or the Dean of
10 the traditional college in charge; whatever.

11 And from our committee's point of
12 view the most important thing was delineate
13 the lines of authority more than anything
14 else. Just say who should be charge so the
15 student who was convicted of cheating
16 couldn't come back later and say, oh, you
17 violated my -- the due process because you
18 said that person was in charge and, in fact,
19 that one should be in charge.

20 Appeals. Appeals of penalties.
21 The original version of the proposal that was
22 -- that was posted back in February said that
23 minor -- minor penalties, those less than an
24 E in a course or E or less in the course
25 could not be appealed. They had to be

0084

1 approved by the Chair. This was

2 controversial, and there were some committee
3 members who also argued that this wasn't
4 appropriate.

5 We then said, okay, well, maybe we
6 should have departmental level Boards to
7 review them, this was criticized as
8 cumbersome, and also inadequate. And so in
9 the end, the committee did decide, okay,
10 we'll let all appeals go to the University
11 Appeals Board but, again, there's the
12 restriction that if the penalty is less than
13 the E, the Appeals Board can only interfere
14 on the penalty if they find it's grossly
15 disproportionate to the offense.

16 Finally, there's a question about
17 how firm should deadlines be. I don't know
18 about you, but I had never read the rules
19 before I got involved in this and there are
20 all sorts of rules about deadlines; when you
21 have to make decisions about cheating and
22 things like that, and these rules exist both
23 to protect students and to allow instructors
24 to move along in the process if the student
25 is hiding under a table because they know

0085

1 that an academic offense accusation will be
2 coming.

3 So we continued to put deadlines
4 into -- we basically just carried the
5 deadlines over from the old rules into the
6 new rules, but because a lot of people don't
7 know what the rules are there's some issue
8 about whether the deadlines should be hard
9 deadlines or not.

10 And different universities have
11 ways of -- have different ways of doing this,
12 but I guess our committee is of the opinion,
13 and at least a few Senate Council members are
14 of the opinion, that if you're going to have
15 -- a deadline is only meaningful if it's a
16 deadline, and so there you go.

17 That's it. If you have any
18 questions, I'll be happy to answer.

19 THE CHAIR: Gentleman in the back.

20 JOHNSON: Dean Johnson, College of
21 Communication and Information Studies.

22 Just as a couple of clarifications.
23 One, Provosts and Deans do teach from time to
24 time, and it's not clear what happens in the
25 line of authority, and you may want to

0086

1 specify that someplace in the rules.

2 The other thing is, is the current
3 rule actually allows for suspension with a
4 particularly grievous first offense, and that
5 has happened. And the second thing is that
6 you don't necessarily have to recommend to

7 the Provost a suspension on the second
8 offense. That can also be an E in the
9 course, and that also has happened.
10 So I just wanted to clarify those
11 things.

12 GROSSMAN: In terms of the sus -- yeah, you're
13 right. Certainly you're right that
14 suspension can be imposed for first offenses,
15 and that's the same here. I talked about
16 minimum penalties here, but you could -- you
17 could expel someone on a first offense if --
18 if it was appropriate under the new rules and
19 under the old rules.

20 As to the second one, I didn't
21 under -- according to the rules, it says that
22 if an offense is the student's second, then
23 the minimum penalty is suspension.

24 JOHNSON: No, that's not the way these rules
25 read --

0087

1 UNIDENTIFIED: You can give an E --
2 JOHNSON: -- because I have --
3 UNIDENTIFIED: -- on a second offense.
4 JOHNSON: -- that occasionally --

5 GROSSMAN: I don't know if it actually does
6 say -- I didn't -- wasn't aware of it, but
7 there is a line in there that says if the
8 offense is the student's second the minimum
9 penalty is suspension. A lot of people
10 aren't -- can -- well, is there an internet
11 connection here? Can we bring up the current
12 rules? Jeff has --

13 CIBULL: Could we move -- I mean, we could
14 take -- note that as a point of --

15 GROSSMAN: We can note that as a -- as a
16 point, but --

17 CIBULL: -- and check it out, but continue
18 to discuss it.

19 GROSSMAN: Yeah.

20 THE CHAIR: Other questions? Phil?

21 KRAEMER: Bob, just in terms of the appeals
22 process, I'm wondering about what I perceive
23 as an inconsistency between the E and the XE.
24 The reasons for the E was disproportionate to
25 the offense. For the XE it was extenuating

0088

1 circumstances. Couldn't there be a situation
2 where there are extenuating circumstances for
3 an E?

4 GROSSMAN: Let's see. For the -- for the XE
5 what we said was that the Appeals Board could
6 reduce the penalty down to an E without --
7 just because it thought so; just because it
8 wanted. But it can only reduce it below that
9 under extraordinary circumstances. Okay. So
10 that's a case where the instructor and the
11 chair and the Dean all agree that a

12 particularly harsh penalty is warranted, and
13 we said, well, in that case, if all those
14 agree then, fine, reduce it to an E but don't
15 reduce it further.

16 Again, we were trying to carve a
17 certain -- carve out the instructor's
18 classroom as a place where the instructor has
19 authority and autonomy, and so -- you know,
20 in terms of giving the Appeals Board powers
21 to tell the instructor what penalties to
22 impose, we wanted them to be able to do it
23 only under the grossly disproportionate
24 clause for penalties less than E or the
25 extraordinary circumstances clause for

0089

1 penalties greater than the E, in which, the
2 instructor and the chair and the Dean all
3 agree.

4 THE CHAIR: Connie?

5 WOOD: Connie Wood, Statistics.

6 A point of information. Currently
7 when a grade of E is imposed that E cannot be
8 removed by a repeat option. Could you speak
9 to the new rules? The way it seems is if the
10 proposed change is saying that even if an XE
11 is imposed, after three years it
12 automatically goes to an E, which then can be
13 removed by a repeat option; is that correct?

14 GROSSMAN: I -- yes. That is correct. That
15 is the way the rules are currently written.

16 WOOD: That -- well, I have some concerns
17 with that, Bob, because there -- and have
18 handled, unfortunately, as chair, some very
19 egregious academic offenses where it is
20 entirely appropriate that that E remain and
21 not be removed.

22 GROSSMAN: Sure.

23 TAGAVI: Can I explain something? E is not
24 removed. It's removed from the GPA
25 calculation.

0090

1 WOOD: Oh, I understand that.

2 TAGAVI: Okay.

3 WOOD: I mean, the same way any E is
4 removed by a repeat option, but it seems like
5 that there are certain situations where one
6 would want to specify that, in fact, that E
7 never be removed from the GPA.

8 GROSSMAN: Sure. Sure. Right. Yes. And,
9 again, just to amplify on Kaveh's
10 clarification, the E that is removed from the
11 -- by the repeat option, is not removed from
12 the transcript. It still says on the
13 transcript that you failed the class. All it
14 says is that -- all it means is that if you
15 failed that class for cheating, then that
16 grade of E is calculated into your GPA even

17 if you repeated the class. You cannot -- you
18 cannot use the repeat option to exclude that
19 E from your GPA.

20 There were several reasons why we
21 wanted to remove that E that can't be removed
22 from the GPA with -- with the repeat option,
23 the major one being that if a student fails a
24 class and then retakes it and gets a better
25 grade and for some reason they don't use the

0091

1 repeat option to remove it from their GPA,
2 anyone looking at the transcription might
3 suspect them of cheating and it seemed to
4 cast a cloud of suspicion over innocent
5 students because there is no way to tell
6 whether an E was imposed for cheating. And
7 that's why we proposed the XE.

8 Now, I agree with you that if an XE
9 is so -- is warranted, that it should not be
10 removed from the transcript unless certain
11 conditions are met, which can be specified by
12 the complainants, the instructor, or the Dean
13 at the time of the offense.

14 And so when this goes back to
15 Senate Council I think we're going to be
16 proposing that -- that the automatic removal
17 from the transcript just be wiped out and
18 that removal from the transcript only occur
19 upon appeal to the Appeals Board, upon
20 showing -- you know, the paying restitution
21 business that we have in felony convictions
22 in the State of Kentucky. And, of course,
23 three references from your best friends,
24 stuff like that, and a letter to the
25 Governor.

0092

1 THE CHAIR: Janet. After Kaveh.

2 TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering.

3 I have a narrow concern, and my
4 concern I put into an e-mail today and there
5 is copies outside. I don't know if everybody
6 has a copy or not. I provided that so I
7 don't have to go through the whole concerns,
8 so I can just summarize it.

9 A year ago what this proposal --
10 this proposal included a language similar to
11 this. Penalties less than E are not
12 reviewable by University Appeals Board. That
13 language is no longer there, and this year it
14 says now -- it says slightly different
15 language. It says penalties less than E --
16 something like this, this is not a direct
17 quote. Penalties less than E are not
18 reviewable by University Appeals Board unless
19 they are then found to be grossly
20 disproportionate, which means if they are
21 merely disproportionate, not grossly

22 disproportionate, then the opinion of the
23 instructor, which could be a full professor,
24 could be a TA, the opinion of the prof -- of
25 the TA -- or the instructor, I should say,

0093

1 even if the Department Chair and the
2 University Appeals Board agree together, that
3 this should be less than, let's say, three
4 levels of reduction in the letter grade,
5 which is if he gets an A that means a D.

6 So if the Chair and the University
7 Appeals Board unanimously they want to give a
8 D, the instructor says, no, it should be an
9 E, which could delay your graduation, for
10 example, the instructor's opinion prevails.

11 I think this is an unfair situation
12 we like to put our University and our
13 students in, and give them an E because the
14 TA or the instructor wants an E.

15 By the way, presently if the
16 instructor decides with the Chair, the
17 Chair's opinion prevail over the level of
18 penalty.

19 THE CHAIR: Janet?

20 ELDRED: Janet Eldred, English.

21 I have a couple of things. The
22 first thing is -- is Kaveh's question raises
23 for me the issue of teaching assistants and
24 PTIs in the classroom and the level of
25 authority that they be granted as

0094

1 instructors.

2 I'm real comfortable with the idea
3 of instructors who are faculty and have a
4 long-term commitment and operate under
5 certain rules, but I worry about it when
6 we're using a lot of part-time instructors
7 and a lot of teaching assistants.

8 The other thing I worry about is,
9 this is a very, very, very complex document
10 that we -- you know, it's going to be
11 impossible to reach consensus so that
12 everyone is happy about every little part of
13 it. Are we going to vote on a whole or are
14 we going to piecemeal this to death when it
15 comes to us for a vote?

16 It's just -- I mean --

17 GROSSMAN: I imagine it will be like other
18 documents where amendments can be offered
19 from the floor and then it is up to you
20 whether you want to piecemeal it to death or
21 not, or whether you want to vote down
22 amendments and -- and vote the whole thing up
23 or down. That's my guess.

24 THE CHAIR: Yeah. Janet, this -- this past may
25 not be -- but the Senate Council, afte

0095

1 numerous efforts to -- to deal with the
2 proposal in the last meeting or two had
3 recourse to looking at specific issues so
4 that we could try to find if there was
5 agreeable common ground on individual issues.

6 What we experienced was that, you
7 know, at some point we threw up our hands and
8 said, well, we really need to go back to the
9 Senate and to -- to get a sounding from --
10 from the Senate which will ultimately make a
11 decision on this.

12 We're hoping that with the good
13 advice and the perspectives that are being
14 opened up here that the -- that this will
15 help to leaven the Senate Council discussion
16 and -- and resolution of a proposal and a
17 recommendation.

18 GROSSMAN: And, Janet, your -- your comment
19 about the TAs and PTIs is -- is well taken,
20 and certainly we can look at modifying their
21 authority in some way by saying they need to
22 -- their decision needs to be approved by a
23 regular faculty member or the Chair or
24 whoever is supervising them.

25 The TAs would be supervised by a
0096 faculty member; right?

1 UNIDENTIFIED: No. No.

2 GROSSMAN: No. Not necessarily? Okay. Then
3 -- then in those cases, yeah, I think -- I
4 think it's probably appropriate that -- to
5 have the Chair make the final call in those
6 cases.
7

8 ELDRED: The other thing I wanted to say is
9 that reasonable and principled people
10 disagree on these kinds of issues, and so I
11 can imagine cases, you know, where we're not
12 going to -- it's not going to be clear, and I
13 just want to know your sense from the
14 committee: Do they feel like this is an
15 integral whole where when you're picking out
16 pieces -- that's what happened with USP. You
17 bring together a whole, and by the time it's
18 done being picked at and picked at, and you
19 end up with missed -- you know, it's just --
20 it's just not good. And is this that kind of
21 proposal or is it one where details can --
22 can change and you still have something that
23 has some integrity?

24 GROSSMAN: I think it depends on the details
25 that you're talking about. For example,

0097
1 these jurisdictional issues, I think you
2 could decide one way or the other and, I
3 mean, I could live either way just fine.

4 There are some other issues that I
5 think strike more at the heart of it. For

6 example, Kaveh's desire to give the Appeals
7 Board say over all penalties I think would
8 gut the whole reform.
9 ELDRED: And so when you come before us you
10 will have a statement from your committee
11 indicating which of these things are integral
12 and vital and which are maybe easier to --
13 GROSSMAN: Well --
14 ELDRED: I mean, that would be useful to me
15 personally. I don't know if it's useful to
16 anyone else.
17 GROSSMAN: I certainly can ask the people what
18 they say. What I just said before is my own
19 opinion, of course, not the opinion of the
20 committee. But that's my opinion.
21 THE CHAIR: Jeannine?
22 BLACKWELL: Jeannine Blackwell.
23 Did you all consult the Appeals
24 Board about how they see this assembly line
25 speed-up, let's say?

0098

1 GROSSMAN: Our committee has solicited opinion
2 from the University community since last
3 February, I think, and we have had some
4 responses but very few. People who have
5 responded have not generally identified
6 themselves as members of the University
7 Appeals Board, so I don't know.
8 I specifically did solicit input
9 from the Chair of the current University
10 Appeals Board, and certainly past Ombuds have
11 spoken up and their -- the Ombuds' opinions
12 are divided. Some support the reform; some
13 are against it. In fact, I think, out of the
14 seven, there are four who have made favorable
15 noises and there are three who have made
16 unfavorable noises.
17 But none of them have seen, or
18 until only recently, have seen this current
19 version of the proposal so I wouldn't like to
20 speak -- you know, say that they endorse what
21 we have proposed here, but certainly four
22 have said, yes, we should have penalties less
23 than E and three have said the current system
24 works fine.
25 THE CHAIR: Yes.

0099

1 GROSSMAN: And here's one of your former
2 Ombuds.
3 SCHACH: Former Ombud and former Appeals
4 Board member, but most importantly --
5 BROTHERS: Your name?
6 SCHACH: Sorry?
7 BROTHERS: Your name?
8 SCHACH: Horst Schach from Landscape
9 Architecture.
10 Most importantly, an alumni of

11 Berkeley '64 through '66 so I know a little
12 something about student rights. Most of you
13 are too young to even remember.

14 But the point is that that's --
15 that's the aspect about this whole thing that
16 concerns me the most. I've been sort of
17 following it as it goes along. But I think
18 if anything is important, it's the duty of
19 this body to maintain a level playing field
20 for students. That's what student rights,
21 for the most part, are all about. And the
22 minute you move sanctioning and all these
23 decision-making processes to the lower
24 levels, I think you lose control of that.

25 Now, granted, the rule that we have

0100

1 now, minimum penalty E, as being, you used
2 the word, under the table, but quite frankly
3 if you adopt this policy you're going to take
4 those under-the-table negotiations and you're
5 going to legitimize them and that moves this
6 whole process down to the department unit
7 level, which is a little bit frightening when
8 you think about it from the perspective of
9 the student. The kids in Arts and Sciences
10 are getting by with this; those over here are
11 not.

12 During my two years as Academic
13 Ombud there were some colleges we never had a
14 single violation. Now, you know there's
15 something not quite right; right?

16 That's not going to change. I
17 agree there are problems with the present
18 rules as they are written, but I'll tell you,
19 again, I also spent, well, many years on the
20 Appeals Board, the problem is the manner in
21 which we deal with accusing the student,
22 finding guilt or non-guilt and a lot of these
23 negotiations under the table, quite frankly,
24 are really wonderful negotiations on the part
25 of the faculty member simply because they

0101

1 know that in a court of law, which the
2 Appeals Board hearings are, you can't make it
3 stand up, and so some of these things kind of
4 do work.

5 And I think all in all the biggest
6 volume of increase in appeals that's going to
7 happen as a result of this will be on the
8 issue of minimum sanction. In other words, a
9 student right now comes in the Ombud Office,
10 I've been accused of plagiarism or cheating.
11 Are you guilty? Yes, I was, but I don't want
12 that... No debate. The E is it. Thank you
13 very much.

14 Now, we're going to have the debate
15 in the Ombud's Office and then working their

16 way to the Appeals Board -- well, he's -- you
17 know, I really -- I want a redo. And, by the
18 way, I consider the redo totally
19 unacceptable. I think that anything that
20 this rule -- if you do adopt this rule, any
21 assignment that's ever done with a violation
22 of integrity should not be acceptable,
23 period. It should be a zero at the very base
24 for that piece of paper, that term paper,
25 that speech or whatever.

0102

1 But I simply urge you to think very
2 hard about creating a level playing field for
3 all students from their perspective, and I'm
4 -- I'm really kind of concerned about that
5 and thank you for your time.

6 THE CHAIR: I do want to recognize Enid.

7 WALDHART: This is Enid Waldhart from
8 Communications.

9 Building on what Janet had said, I
10 think it is very important for us to act and
11 that there are times when action, even if it
12 is to be amended later, the only way we can
13 find out some of the consequences of this is
14 to try it, and that -- we've been talking
15 about it and talking about it, and I think
16 the system now has enough problems that if we
17 were to put something in place in total the
18 way it's written, knowing that these things
19 can be amended and whatever, but if we never
20 get to the place where we actually try it, I
21 -- I think we sort of just talk and talk and
22 talk and talk and then pretty soon, if we get
23 enough new people coming in to replace us old
24 ones, that then maybe the talk goes away.

25 But I think we really need to

0103

1 consider voting for the whole package, up or
2 down vote, and say let's do it and let's do
3 it as a whole; do our talking in between time
4 and get it together. But I would really,
5 really urge that whatever comes forward to
6 the Senate be dealt with as a total and that
7 if you don't like it you vote against it.

8 But I think we just need to be
9 doing something.

10 GROSSMAN: Ernie, can I?

11 Just to address a couple of things
12 that Horst said: First of all, the redo the
13 assignment penalty is one that is under
14 discussion. There is a member of our
15 committee, Randall Roorda, who -- is he here?
16 Randall, are you here? No, you're not
17 Randall, you're Kaveh. Is Randall Roorda
18 here?

19 (NO RESPONSE)

20 No. Randall Roorda spoke very

21 passionately in our committee meetings and,
22 again, sent a very passionate e-mail to the
23 Senate Council about how redo the assignment
24 should be an allowed penalty.

25 In our committee meetings we took
0104

1 what Randall said and we made it an allowed
2 penalty. The Senate Council may decide to
3 rule it out. I don't know. But that is
4 under discussion, and I just -- I can't speak
5 to the matter like Randall can as director of
6 the freshman writing program, but he has
7 strong reasons for saying that even for redo
8 assign -- even for first offense, that redo
9 the assignment can be an appropriate penalty.

10 Remember also this will be
11 recorded, the idea is that the first penalty
12 will be recorded and that in itself might be
13 enough of a punishment to make sure that the
14 student's course is corrected.

15 But I'm not taking a strong
16 position on that and, again, it's still being
17 discussed.

18 Again, the question is, is the
19 current -- is the proposed rule better than
20 the current rule, and the current -- I mean,
21 you talked about student rights and, in my
22 opinion, the current system where you can
23 blackmail a student into giving up their due
24 process rights by threatening them with an E
25 in the course unless they accept your finding

0105
1 and your penalty is a complete violation of
2 student rights and, frankly, I don't think
3 would hold up in court.

4 So what we have right now is
5 instructors taking it on themselves to
6 violate the written rules of the University,
7 and the main point of our proposal is to
8 create a system that will allow instructors
9 to obey the rules and do the right thing by
10 imposing an appropriate penalty for an
11 offense.

12 Yes, you're right, there will be
13 variation from classroom to classroom,
14 depending on the instructor. That's the
15 situation we have now, only now we have no
16 oversight at all because these things are
17 handled under the table.

18 ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.
19 I just have a question. What
20 you're saying, then, is that all the under-
21 the-table negotiations are now out in the
22 open?

23 GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know what you mean by
24 negotiations.

25 ANDERSON: With the -- with the new rules.

0106

1 No, with the new rules -- the under the
2 table, when you are the -- when you have a
3 student that you say, you're going to get a
4 zero on this paper but nothing will be
5 recorded. Are you saying that that won't
6 happen any more? It won't happen now? Is
7 that that will be a penalty and it will go
8 into the record --

9 GROSSMAN: Yes.

10 ANDERSON: -- so that I as a faculty member
11 two semesters down the road have the same
12 student, and the student has plagiarized, I
13 can now look at their record and say, I
14 wonder if this has happened before, and it'll
15 be in there?

16 GROSSMAN: That's the idea.

17 ANDERSON: Okay.

18 GROSSMAN: The idea also is that the
19 negotiations -- the hope is -- and, you know,
20 like Enid said, we don't know exactly what's
21 going to happen, but this system that we are
22 proposing is not unique. Okay. It exist at
23 lots of other places.

24 What we are hoping is that there
25 will be no longer any motivation for

0107

1 negotiations on either side; that is, the
2 student is no longer told that if you don't
3 accept this finding of guilt you're going to
4 get an E in the course, or you'll risk
5 getting an E in the course.

6 And the instructor no longer feels
7 like -- won't feel like if he tries to impose
8 the penalty of, you know, 20 percent off on
9 the assignment that the student will go to
10 the Appeals Board and it will be lowered to
11 10 percent so that he has to sit there and
12 negotiate.

13 So the idea is there won't be
14 negotiations. Now, will it play out that
15 way? There's no guarantee that it will play
16 out that way. Instructors may still decide
17 to handle it under the table if they want
18 but, again, they're -- you're removing the
19 motivation for the student to accept that if
20 the student feels that they're innocent.

21 THE CHAIR: We will soon lose our forum. I'm
22 going to give Kaveh the last word on this,
23 and then I would like to engage the Senate
24 Council's census whether we -- we can and
25 should take up the last issue on the agenda.

0108

1 Kaveh.

2 TAGAVI: I seriously doubt that the under-
3 the-table negotiations, which I like to call
4 informed (INAUDIGLE), I believe, would go

5 away. I mean, it is not true that there is
6 no more incentive. In fact, here's the
7 incentive: I'm the professor, you are the
8 student. I caught you cheating. I'm going
9 to reduce your grade by one letter grade, and
10 it's not going to go on your record. But if
11 you want to appeal this, if you don't agree
12 to this, fine. We go through the Appeals
13 Board and it will be there recorded. So
14 there is the negotiation going on.

15 However, there is one point that I
16 forgot to mention previously; and, that is,
17 in my opinion the cornerstone of our academic
18 offense presently is the fact that students
19 are always afforded an appellate review by a
20 emotionally distant, impartial and unbiased
21 panel. Namely, the University Appeals Board.

22 Under the new proposal, the
23 professor who is most passionately involved,
24 probably furious because of the offense. In
25 fact, I have told my colleagues when somebody

0109
1 cheats in my class, I feel violated. I'm
2 that upset.

3 So here we have a situation where
4 the instructor says X and the University
5 Appeals Board, which is distant, somewhat
6 professional, sees many more cases, is
7 impartial, unbiased says, Y and we are saying
8 let's do X.

9 I'm not asking for a lot of
10 difference. I have no problem, per se, in
11 this concern that minimum penalty of E or
12 less than E should not be there. All I'm
13 saying is that let's not encroach on the
14 University Appeals Board authority to review
15 appeals.

16 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Kaveh.

17 I want to thank the entire Senate
18 and I'd also like to thank Bob Grossman for a
19 very lively interchange. I think it has met
20 the hope and expectation of the Senate
21 Council. As someone said, we could discuss
22 and debate these issues into infinitum and
23 there has -- we have risked fine tuning this
24 proposal within an inch of its life and not
25 bringing it out, and our hope is that perhaps

0110
1 by the next Senate meeting we will have the
2 opportunity -- you'll have the opportunity to
3 review and vote on the proposal.

4 We have one last proposal, and I'm
5 going to quickly outline what I have to say
6 about this. And if the Senate is indisposed
7 to making a decision on the basis of that,
8 I'm sure someone will make that point.

9 The College of Engineering has put

10 forth a proposal, which you have in your
11 packets, to amend the freshman admission
12 requirements. These are new minimum entry
13 requirements which are outlined at the end of
14 the last couple of pages of the packet.

15 This has been sent forth with a
16 positive recommendation from the Senate
17 Council, and it has also benefitted from a
18 conversation with the Provost in the Senate
19 Council relating to a much large issue; and,
20 that is, the continued proliferation of
21 higher admission policies different from the
22 University's, and we have in the context of
23 making our recommendation on this particular
24 proposal done two things.

25 Number one, we have made a --

0111

1 established a policy where we will require
2 Provost's assessment of college and financial
3 impact analysis that will occur in tandem
4 with the Senate Council review process of
5 all forthcoming proposals that have to do
6 with changing admission requirements.

7 And, secondly, in this particular
8 proposal the Provost weighed in on his
9 assessment of the financial impact and the
10 impact to other colleges in terms of shifting
11 enrollment away from one college with the
12 higher admissions requirements to other
13 colleges with the present University
14 requirements, and he believes that there is
15 no significant impact of this proposal on
16 either other colleges or on University
17 financial situation.

18 We have a proposal on the floor,
19 then, from the Senate Council with a positive
20 recommendation. How does the Senate wish to
21 respond to this?

22 All those in favor please indicate
23 by raising your hand?

24 (SENATORS VOTE)

25 THE CHAIR: All those opposed like sign?

0112

1 (SENATORS VOTE)

2 THE CHAIR: Any abstentions?

3 (SENATORS VOTE)

4 THE CHAIR: One abstention. Okay.

5 There being no further business,
6 this meeting is adjourned.

7 * * * * * * * * * *

8 THEREUPON, the Senate Council Meeting was
9 adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

10 * * * * * * * * * *

11
12
13
14

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

0113

1 STATE OF KENTUCKY)
2 COUNTY OF CAMPBELL)

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

I, LISA E. HOINKE, 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 Senate Council meeting was called to order; that said meeting 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 meeting of the Senate Council.

13
14
15
16

My commission expires: January 23, 2007.
IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 11th day of December, 2005.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

LISA E. HOINKE,
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE
K E N T U C K Y