

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
SENATE MEETING

\* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

MAY 1, 2017

\* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

- KATHERINE MCCORMICK, CHAIR
- ERNIE BAILEY, VICE-CHAIR
- KATE SEGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN
- SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR
- BRENDA YANKEY, COURT REPORTER

\* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

♀

CHAIR MCCORMICK: Good afternoon. We are  
ready to begin the last meeting of the year, the May

3 meeting. You may notice that it is 3 o'clock rather  
4 than 2. For many years, recently I guess, we've had  
5 to start at 2 because we've had so much business and  
6 we need to catch up and so give thanks to the  
7 Committee Chairs and Sheila. We've moved rapidly  
8 enough this year that we didn't have to start at  
9 2:00. So it's a great way to end the year and I  
10 hope we can begin it that way as well.

11 So, thank you for being here and I will move  
12 forward. So we're going to follow Roberts Rules of  
13 order. I'd like for you to be civil, be a good  
14 citizen, participate and please remember to return  
15 those clickers, they're expensive. We have on the  
16 table, in addition to our Parliamentarian and  
17 Sheila, Brenda Yankey, who is here to be our Court  
18 Reporter -- our transcriptionist I guess, we are not  
19 in court. (LAUGHTER) So, anyway, welcome Brenda.

20 MS. YANKEY: Thank you.

21 CHAIR MCCORMICK: So, we're going to get  
22 started when the slide appears and the question is  
23 read, you may vote. And so, are you here today?  
24 Yes, No, or Oh, My God it's finals. Almost done.  
25 Most of you are here. Partly because of the close

♀

3

1 proximity of our April meeting and our May meeting,  
2 Sheila worked very hard to get the minutes ready for  
3 you; however, there were a number of people who had  
4 to approve those and so they were left finally and  
5 so what you will -- so we were able to send the  
6 minutes to you prior to that time, but we did not  
7 get them to you a full six days ahead of time.

8           And so the Senate needs to move to waive Senate  
9 Rule 1.2.3 to allow the Senate to consider the  
10 agenda because the entire agenda, including the  
11 minutes and supporting documentation was not sent  
12 out six days in advance. So, I'd like to have a  
13 motion and a second. So, Joe (McGillis) makes a  
14 motion and Joan Mazur seconds it. So, the  
15 recommendation is that the Senate waves Senate rule  
16 1.2.3 to allow consideration of the agenda and us to  
17 move forward for our meeting here on May 1st 2017,  
18 and you'll see that motion here again and I'd like  
19 for you to vote. And you approve of that.

20           So there were some minor editorial changes  
21 received and unless other objections are heard now,  
22 the minutes from April the 17th will stand approved  
23 as amended by unanimous consent. All right. So  
24 some quick announcements, we should have the  
25 announcement for the new Ombud made within the week.

♀

4

1 The Provost will have that name, the  
2 recommendations from that committee. We really  
3 appreciate the work of Jonathan and his colleagues  
4 including three students and three faculty and so  
5 hopefully that will happen soon and that person can  
6 begin their work shortly.

7           The trustee election has been concluded and  
8 you'll hear more about that during the Chairs  
9 report. Roger Brown is going to share that  
10 information with you. And I'd like to thank all the  
11 departing Senators, so if you are a departing

12 Senator would you stand and let us acknowledge that  
13 you have been here faithfully for all the things we  
14 need. (APPLAUSE) Thank you.

15 So, again we'll make the update on the  
16 elections now. If you'd like to do that, Roger.

17 MR. BROWN: Okay. So, the Senate ruled on  
18 Elections Committee is charged of overseeing and  
19 certifying four types of Elections and there are two  
20 dispersed in the Fall. That's for the Senate  
21 Council and the Senate Council Chair. We've done  
22 that. Now we're in the spring and we've got two  
23 more. We've got the individual College elections to  
24 identify the new, the newly-elected Faculty  
25 Senators. Those are underway. We just concluded

♀

5

1 the fourth type of election which is for the Faculty  
2 Trustee. I think the -- well, the person who was  
3 elected is Bob Grossman. He was re-elected. I  
4 think he's not here. He's -- is he in the Board of  
5 Trustees now? Okay.

6 So that's our new Faculty Trustee and a couple  
7 more notes: There were 837 votes total for faculty  
8 trustee. That's about 40 percent of the eligible  
9 voters and here we have a slide that shows the  
10 ranking of individual colleges based on their voter  
11 participation with the College of Education being  
12 the only one to see 80 percent. Nine of that  
13 eighteen colleges have completed their elections of  
14 new Senators.

15 We are running at about half and we've got  
16 about half more to go. We will round those out as

17 they conclude here early in the summer session. And  
18 also a quick note: Next year we'll be adding the  
19 Honors College as our 19th College. We didn't do  
20 that this year because they weren't completely  
21 filled out. Anything else? We are going to -- the  
22 SREC will meet again before the summer begins to go  
23 through the election and identify any ways to  
24 improve it.

25 So, if you have any suggestions for that, any

†

6

1 problems or issues that you haven't already  
2 identified, and please send that to me or any other  
3 member of the SREC. And I'd just like to  
4 acknowledge there's a lot of email that goes on  
5 behind the scenes so the SREC subcommittee, which  
6 I'm the chair of. It consists of Joan Mazur, David  
7 Jones, Joe McGillis and Connie Wood. Thank you to  
8 them. And a special thanks to Sheila Brothers, who  
9 without her responsiveness and good ideas, we  
10 would've had a real problem with the elections. So  
11 thank you for all that.

12 MS. BROTHERS: Thanks, Roger.

13 CHAIR MCCORMICK: At this, I want you to do --  
14 to note that there were a number of challenges in  
15 that election this year. And so, you know, that  
16 group of folks did an amazing task in terms of  
17 trying to think thoughtfully how we might make sure  
18 that no faculty disenfranchised for issues that are  
19 not within their control.

20 And so they have a beautiful document now and

21 I'm sure they will -- it will be presented to you  
22 in due time. But we owe them lots of thanks for  
23 their work which they did quickly because once the  
24 faculty members realized that they were unable to  
25 vote, then of course every day that passed the

♀

7

1 voting window was narrowed. So again, thanks to  
2 Roger for all his work and the committee as well.

3 So the faculty evaluation of the President is  
4 ongoing. Hopefully you have completed that. We do  
5 have, I think, a reasonable response rate to date,  
6 but remember it closes on May the 15th and so before  
7 you leave for the summer if you are a 9-month  
8 employee, make sure that you have a moment to  
9 conclude that.

10 And so there are some steps following that,  
11 certainly the statistical analysis. That  
12 information is presented to the president. It's  
13 presented to the Senate Council and then presented  
14 to the Board of Trustees Executive Committee.  
15 Remember that that part, our part of that evaluation  
16 is part of a larger effort conducted by the Board of  
17 Trustees. The Board of Trustees has one employee  
18 and that's the President. And so they consider  
19 that, those evaluation data, fairly thoughtfully and  
20 I'll send in that information to be posted on the  
21 website once it's presented to the Board of Trustees.

22 Greg Heileman is the new Associate Provost  
23 for Student and Academic Life. He comes to us from  
24 the University of New Mexico, where he was the Vice  
25 Provost for Teaching and Learning there --

♀

8

1 and will start August 1. So, we'll welcome him when  
2 he gets there and certainly invite him to attend.

3 The Blue Ribbon Committee has had a great forum last  
4 week for this year. And they'll have another on May  
5 4th. Rick, do you have anything you want to share?

6 UNIDENTIFIED: No, just the surveys are --  
7 deadline for survey is today at 11:59 tonight so --

8 MCCORMICK: All right.

9 UNIDENTIFIED: -- if you want to do that. But  
10 if you have comments -- like you said, and if people  
11 want to come on Thursday, we'll have another one.

12 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Again, I think reasonable  
13 turn out for that -- a response for that survey,  
14 there are issues included in that that are important  
15 to Senators regarding issues what's a professional  
16 program? What is its relationship to graduate  
17 education? As well as work and interdisciplinary  
18 programs and efforts. And so, again, I would  
19 encourage you to use your own voice, but also think  
20 about making sure that your colleagues are also  
21 responsive to that call. And so that'll occur soon,  
22 May 4th. Oh, yes, Mark?

23 MR. WICKER: Mark Wicker. Yes, will any  
24 other forums be held, perhaps early next fall? I  
25 know a number of faculty -- it's very difficult for

♀

9

1 them to semester.

2 MR. MCCORMICK: Yes, I think that there's

3 going to be work over the summer. And then in the  
4 fall, once a report -- a preliminary report is  
5 drafted, then again, they'll bring that back to  
6 faculty for their comment. And so --

7 MR. WICKER: This is a particular concern  
8 because I know several members of the Blue Ribbon  
9 Commission themselves weren't able to attend because  
10 of,...

11 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Okay.

12 UNIDENTIFIED: We will be adding more forums  
13 in the fall once we get some of the initial  
14 information back. And we're -- we're getting ready  
15 to beef-up the website for the Blue Ribbon Panel and  
16 they'll be a portal there so if people want to make  
17 comments through that -- that website, that'll be  
18 another access point as well.

19 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Thanks, Mark. Well, Dr.  
20 Bailey, as part of his Vice Chair has been  
21 responsible for the election or the nomination -- or  
22 the award of the Outstanding Senator.

23 MR. BAILEY: So last-- at the last meeting we  
24 asked for nominations for an outstanding Senator and  
25 sent out a list of criteria and we got an

♀

10

1 outstanding nominee, in fact, who has a grounds well  
2 of support for this particular nominee. Again, it's  
3 someone confidential people did share the  
4 information so we have a nomination and then there  
5 were lots of affirmations too. So, I'm very pleased  
6 to announce that our award for the Outstanding  
7 Senator goes to Roger Brown. (APPLAUSE)



8 I think they are going to have a photograph  
9 taken, but while they are doing that I'll just read  
10 part of his nomination: He was nominated for the  
11 work he did several years on the Senate Council and  
12 then after a seat as a senator. He worked well  
13 promoting the interest and insurance of faculty  
14 generally and the Senates posture and so on.

15 This was the thing that was most fun, when the  
16 Provost was speaking to the Senate about policy on  
17 7.7 Graduate programs, as you will remember, Roger,  
18 untenured professor, specifically called out the  
19 provost saying the Senate already has procedures for  
20 7.7 programs. So People, he's very thoughtful.  
21 (LAUGHTER) So at least someone who is paying  
22 attention. (LAUGHTER).

23 CHAIR MCCORMICK: All right. Lee?

24 MS. BLONDER: So, my colleague Bob Grossman is  
25 at the Investment Committee Meeting right now but I

11

1 thought I would come here briefly. So, were having  
2 Trustee meetings this afternoon and tomorrow. This  
3 afternoon is Investment and Health Care Committee  
4 and tomorrow, the rest of the committees plus the  
5 main Board Meeting. You can see this is the agenda.  
6 It's posted online. You can look at each item if  
7 you want. You can click on the links and see what's  
8 coming up. What's pertinent here, there's several  
9 things, Academic and Student Affairs Committee will  
10 be approving two of our programs; The Masters in  
11 Exercise and Sports Psychology and the Undergraduate

12 Degree in Dance.

13 We also will have the Degree Lists coming to  
14 that committee tomorrow and the main Board and the  
15 other item that's coming is the Housing of the  
16 change to the GR that allows lecturers to be housed  
17 primarily in the Honors College. And that gets two  
18 readings because it entails a change for a Governing  
19 Regulation. So, no action will be taken at this  
20 Board Meeting tomorrow, but it will come back in  
21 June for an action.

22 The other thing that's of interest is that the  
23 President gives a report to the Board of Trustees  
24 Meeting, which you can read on -- if you click on  
25 the link to the main Board Meeting, but he

♀

12

1 recognizes many -- many people in the community and  
2 the University community including the faculty  
3 members that won the Teaching Awards, the faculty  
4 members that are now going to be Research Professors  
5 and other accomplishments.

6 So you can see that if you're interested.  
7 There's also all the Personnel actions; promotions,  
8 renewals, retirements, et-cetera. The only other  
9 thing I wanted to mention is this afternoon at 1:00  
10 we attended a press conference where it was  
11 announced that Kroger is going to donate, I think  
12 it's 1.8 million dollars a year, to Athletics for  
13 the next, I think it's 12 years, and the name of  
14 Commonwealth Stadium is going to be changed to  
15 Kroger Stadium. This is all detailed in an article  
16 from the Herald-Leader.

17 The other thing that's happening along with it,  
18 there's going to be nutrition and wellness programs.  
19 There's going to be some community programs to  
20 upgrade some community athletics facilities. So  
21 it's more than just changing the name of  
22 Commonwealth Stadium. We haven't gotten all of the  
23 details yet but this will be voted on tomorrow.

24 CHAIR MCCORMICK: As in programs in the  
25 stores?

‡

13

1 MS. BLONDER: I think they're going to be  
2 programs possibly on campus on nutrition and  
3 wellness and there's going to be a 5K run, a Simple  
4 Truth 5K run.

5 So there are a lot of activities planned around  
6 this. And in The Herald-Leader they talked about --  
7 it's not unprecedented to have a stadium named after  
8 a company like Papa John's in Louisville and there's,  
9 I think in Western Kentucky University might have a  
10 stadium named after it nationally there. It  
11 happens, so. Yes?

12 MR. PORTER: Lee, I --

13 MS. BROTHERS: Name please?

14 MR. PORTER: Todd Porter, Pharmacy. I'm not  
15 sure. I'll check on it. And I'll check on it, but  
16 I think it's the field that's being named Kroger  
17 Field. It will still be Commonwealth Stadium but  
18 the Field and the grass is going to be Kroger Field.

19 MS. BLONDER: I don't think you're right.  
20 It's going to have a big sign that says Kroger

21 Stadium.

22 (Group conversation)

23 MS. WILSON: It's Kroger Field but I don't  
24 think it's going to be Commonwealth Stadium any  
25 more.

♀

14

1 MS. BLONDER: Yeah.

2 MS. WILSON: It's just going to be called  
3 Kroger Field versus Commonwealth Stadium.

4 MS. BLONDER: And then the -- I might have  
5 made an error.

6 MR. CAUDILL: Is there any update on the  
7 replacing that Dr. Karpf?

8 MS. BLONDER: I don't have an update on that.

9 CHAIR MCCORMICK: I don't have one either.

10 MR. CAUDILL: Somebody's gotta know what's  
11 going on. I guess maybe that's an issue.

12 MS. BLONDER: I believe that the Search  
13 Committee has a website and they hired an outside  
14 search firm and that's -- I don't know any further  
15 progress beyond that.

16 CHAIR MCCORMICK: I'll check on that.

17 MS. MAZUR: What was the question? We didn't  
18 hear.

19 MS. BLONDER: About the EVPHA search progress.  
20 Any other questions. Thank you.

21 CHAIR MCCORMICK: I would say that Sheila and  
22 Margaret did a great job in getting two of our  
23 programs to the Board of Trustee. And we appreciate  
24 the Presidents office accommodating our schedule.

25 It happened on April the 19th, whenever we met

1 last, and we reviewed the CPE schedule and it looked  
2 as if they weren't going to meet unless -- we  
3 wouldn't -- they wouldn't be able to vote on it  
4 unless it went to the May meeting. And so, again we  
5 were quite late, but we appreciated them on their  
6 willingness to accommodate, because otherwise those  
7 two programs would not have started until Fall of  
8 2018. And so we appreciate the collaboration that we  
9 experienced in that effort. All right. Morris.

10 TRUSTEE GRUBBS: Thanks Catherine. I'm Morris  
11 Grubbs from the Grad School and I'm here to convey  
12 the recommendation of two Honorary Degree candidates  
13 Dr. Brian Jackson is normally here. I'm standing in  
14 for him today.

15 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Sir, you can use the  
16 clicker there. Just click the right arrow.

17 TRUSTEE GRUBBS: First I want to thank the  
18 UJCHD Committee, particularly the faculty members  
19 who are the voting members. Dr. Jackson is the  
20 Chair. Kim Anderson, Patrick McNamara, Terry  
21 Birdwhistell, Karen Tice, Doreen Maloney and Sarah  
22 -- and Susan Barron. The Ex Offici os are Mike  
23 Richey, Provost Tracy and Chair Katherine McCormick  
24 and then the Trustee is Cammie Grant.

25 I thought I would preface the recommendation

1 with -- just by reading the overall principle of  
2 Honorary Degrees very quickly because I know you

3 don't read those very regularly so I thought I'd put  
4 them in your mind. In awarding Honorary Degrees,  
5 the University pays tribute to those whose life or  
6 work exemplify a profession, intellectual or  
7 artistic achievement.

8 It recognizes and appreciates those who have  
9 made significant contributions to society, the state  
10 and the University. It highlights the diverse ways  
11 in which such contributions can be made or sends a  
12 message that principles, values, and contributions  
13 are important. Well-chosen honorees affirm and  
14 dignify the University's own achievements and  
15 priorities.

16 The committee met earlier in April and  
17 discussed several nominations that were submitted.  
18 We sent out a call. The Graduate School sent out a  
19 call campus-wide early in the semester and the  
20 committee is recommending two nominees to be  
21 advanced on for December -- conferral at December  
22 2017 commencement.

23 The first one is L. Stanley Pigman and just to  
24 give you some highlights, he came to UK as a  
25 first-generation student in the late 1970s and he

♀

17

1 came here on a scholarship from Eastern Kentucky  
2 majoring in mining engineering. He subsequently  
3 excelled as an entrepreneur and formed three  
4 companies that have been owned and leased coal  
5 properties.

6 He's a member of the UK College of Engineering,  
7 Hall of distinction, member of the Dean's Advisory

8 Committee over in the College of Engineering, and a  
9 member of the Cosmic Award of Power Engineering in  
10 Kentucky. Since 1999, he and his family have funded  
11 numerous students through Pigman's Scholarships.

12 They support, and mentor, he and his wife  
13 support or mentor students who have demonstrated  
14 financial need with preference to those from  
15 Appalachian coal counties. The scholarships  
16 currently fund twenty-five or thirty students per  
17 year. He provides sponsorships and personal  
18 guidance to the Solar Car Team and other student  
19 organizations which he believes fosters leadership  
20 opportunities for students.

21 He created two endowed Chairs in the College of  
22 Engineering's Power and Energy Curriculum. One for  
23 tenured faculty and one for non-tenured junior  
24 faculty and he created the U of K College of  
25 Engineering Leadership Institute providing extensive

♀

18

1 Leadership development to fifteen upperclassman  
2 annually. Students who participate are called  
3 Pigman Scholars, Pigman Leadership Scholars.

4 These students go to DC with Mr. Pigman and his  
5 wife annually and they meet with the leaders there  
6 in DC who are UK alums as well as other leaders  
7 there in the area and also meet sometimes with  
8 congressmen. This slide sums up the spirit of the  
9 nomination from interim Dean Larry Holloway. Mr.  
10 Pigman's philanthropy and commitment to students is  
11 a reflection of his own Life Journey.

12 He was raised in Eastern Kentucky and under the  
13 circumstances he had important mentors who  
14 encouraged him to attend college. He clearly  
15 understands the importance of mentoring and  
16 scholarships and he emphasizes this to students. He  
17 makes it clear to the students of the philanthropy  
18 of mentoring of others, helped their success so that  
19 they will have the responsibility to give back in  
20 the future and help bring success to the next  
21 generation.

22 Stan and Karen Pigman's life extend their  
23 philanthropy too many other causes as well. They  
24 sponsor a scholarship at a mission camp in Eastern  
25 Kentucky that enables students to obtain a college

♀

19

1 degree and also provide support for any student  
2 pursuing seminary education.

3 The Pigman's built a food pantry in Appalachia  
4 and fund this operation. And they're helping to  
5 make high school and trade school education  
6 available for disadvantaged young people in  
7 Honduras. So that is the first nominee.

8 The second is Miss Jewell Deene Ellis who came  
9 to U of K in the late 40s and graduated with a B.S.  
10 in Home Economics in 1951. She pursued her Masters  
11 Degree in Education in 58. She led the development  
12 of National Standards for Family and Consumer  
13 Sciences in Education. She has, she was the  
14 cofounder, member, longtime Chair and Senior  
15 Advisor, to the Family and Consumer Science of  
16 Education and Coalition and she was instrumental in



17 the merger of the School of Human and Environmental  
18 Sciences in UK.

19 She, in 2007, was awarded the Centennial  
20 Laureate by the school of Human Environmental  
21 Sciences. She earned a Lifetime Achievement Award,  
22 Fort Harrod, Area UK Ag and HES Alumni Association,  
23 2005. She earned the Distinguished Service Award  
24 from the Kentucky Association and Future Farmers of  
25 America and a Distinguished Service Award from the

♀

20

1 American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences  
2 in 1995.

3 This sums up the nomination and Dr. Ann Vail  
4 was the lead nominator for Ms. Ellis. Few people  
5 have had both the broad and in-depth impact on a  
6 field of study as Jewell Deene Ellis. She's one of  
7 those rare individuals who leaves her chosen  
8 profession better for multiple generations into the  
9 future. Her visionary, quiet, determined leadership  
10 shaped the Family and Consumer Sciences profession  
11 in Kentucky and across the nation for more than six  
12 decades.

13 Ms. Ellis influence was greatest in public  
14 policy development and the establishment of the  
15 National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences  
16 Education. Her efforts have positively impacted  
17 every Family and Consumer Sciences Program in the  
18 middle and senior high schools, post-secondary and  
19 adult education and higher education.

20 This thought, I guess, is for moving on to the

21 voting, but before we do that let me say that both  
22 of these are -- the committee recommended that both  
23 receive the Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters and  
24 I've put here on the slide what that signifies. It  
25 recognizes extraordinary contributions to

♀

21

1 philanthropy, human development, education, and  
2 societal well-being. So, Katherine I'll turn it  
3 back over to you.

4 CHAIR MCCORMICK: This was the second slide  
5 regarding Jewell Deene Ellis.

6 MR. GRUBBS: Want me to change it back to the  
7 first?

8 CHAIR MCCORMICK: That's all right. So, the  
9 motion, the first motion from Senate Council is that  
10 the elected faculty Senators approve L. Stanley  
11 Pigman as the recipient of an Honorary Doctorate of  
12 Humane Letters for submission to the President to  
13 the Board of Trustees. This recommendation comes to  
14 you from the Senate Council from the Committee of  
15 Honorary Degrees. Okay. We've endorsed that 65 to  
16 1.

17 Our second motion is that the elected  
18 faculty Senators approve Jewell Dean Ellis as the  
19 recipient of an Honorary Doctorate of Human Letters  
20 -- of Humane Letters, Excuse me, for submission to  
21 the President to the Board of Trustees. Okay. That  
22 passes 64 to 2. Thank you, Morris.

23 So, remember that only elected faculty  
24 members may vote on the degree lists. So if you're  
25 ex officio or here on another capacity, I think you

♀

1 wont be permitted to vote. Is that true, Sheila?

2 MS. BROTHERS: They'll be permitted to vote  
3 but I'll show the results of only the elected  
4 faculty Senators.

5 CHAIR MCCORMICK: All right. Thank you. We  
6 sent you the Degree List for May so our motion from  
7 the Senate Council is that the elected faculty  
8 Senators approve U of K May 2017 lists of candidates  
9 for credentials for submission to the President to  
10 the Board of Trustees. Here's our motion. Second  
11 the same. We'll conclude that 66 to none. No  
12 extensions and no nos. That's great. All right.  
13 People followed directions. All Right. You ready  
14 to move on? All right. The elected faculty  
15 Senators, we ask that you approve U of K's early  
16 August 2017 list of candidates for credentials for  
17 submission to the President to the Board of  
18 Trustees. This is August Degree Lists. You also  
19 received that last week. Again faculty members vote  
20 on these lists. A few of you are reluctant to  
21 approve August for some reason. So we have 62 and  
22 zero. All right.

23 MR. BAILEY: So we've had a proposal for the  
24 name change for the Department of Forestry to the  
25 Department of Forestry and Natural Resources. The

♀

1 reason for the change was to better reflect the  
2 activities to the faculty to make them more

3 attractive for recruiting faculty and for recruiting  
4 students.

5 The proposal was considered by the Faculty  
6 Council, by the Chairs, by the Undergraduate  
7 Curriculum Committee, the Graduate Curriculum  
8 Committee, the Dean of College of Agriculture and  
9 Environment and all of them were strongly in support  
10 of it. There was one aspect of the name change that  
11 appeared to be controversial and this was a letter  
12 that had come from the program, an undergraduate  
13 program of Natural Resources and Environmental  
14 Sciences and they had previously indicated some  
15 concerns about whether forestry would be -- changes  
16 in the program would be encroaching in their  
17 particular area.

18 We didn't see in the file any letter that  
19 identified a response from them on this particular  
20 point. The committee basically saw no reason not to  
21 recommend the name change but asked that someone  
22 from the program come and address the Senate Council  
23 if that was taken up. So Dr. Stringer, who is the  
24 Interim Chair in Forestry came and represented a  
25 name change proposal. David McNear, who is the --

♀

24

1 I'm remembering the title -- Director of --

2 MR. MCNEAR: U.S.

3 MR. BAILEY: Director of Undergraduate Studies  
4 in the program. So he came and talked and basically  
5 there didn't appear to be a particular problem. We  
6 had asked that they generate a letter identifying  
7 that we kind of have developed a memorandum of

8 understanding about how the programs would go, but  
9 basically that seemed to resolve that particular  
10 issue.

11 So, and the Senate Council can get that point  
12 recommended that with that letter in hand that they  
13 would recommend as well that this name change will  
14 be approved.

15 MR. SANDMEYER: Bob Sandmeyer, Arts and  
16 Sciences. I would like -- I also was concerned  
17 about this overlap in the names of Forestry,  
18 changing Forestry and -- and Natural Resources and  
19 the NRES program and that includes the Environmental  
20 Studies Program.

21 So, I couldn't see from the documentation much  
22 about the memorandum of understanding how the --  
23 what that entails and how distinctiveness between  
24 the program especially in terms of liability of  
25 recruitment for NRES and Forestry and Environmental

♀

25

1 -- Forestry and Natural Resources, how that would --  
2 how that memorandum would effect that. So, if there  
3 was some way to get some indication of that.

4 MR. MCNEAR: David or Jeff, one of you want  
5 to address that?

6 MR. STRINGER: Well, is David here?

7 MR. MCNEAR: I'm here. Yeah.

8 MR. STRINGER: Okay. You want to go ahead?

9 It doesn't matter. Go ahead.

10 MR. MCNEAR: Great question. And I think it's  
11 still something -- the Memorandum of Understanding

12 is not a living document so we have yet to craft  
13 what it is that that's going to look like and yeah  
14 so I mean, Jeff and I have talked a lot about that.

15 That's the letter that you all saw with respect  
16 to basically indicating our willingness to sit down  
17 and discuss the conflicts that will arise due to the  
18 forestry name change and it will require an effort  
19 on our part and theirs to differentiate the  
20 programs. Because of that shared name. So, there  
21 is a back story to this. I don't want to get into  
22 it, but you know, if you have any more questions I'd  
23 be happy to answer them.

24 MR. STRINGER: I think there's a -- certainly  
25 on recruitment into the programs, the nice thing

♀

26

1 about it is our degree is Forestry Degree so the  
2 department name doesn't really come in, you know, if  
3 you look at the search tools, the explorative tools,  
4 the department name doesn't come in until you're  
5 well down in the narratives.

6 So, it's probably not going to be an issue  
7 there as much as it will be, the students that get  
8 into the program and making sure they understand  
9 where their home is and where it isn't. Right?  
10 Those kinds of things. So, it's going to take work  
11 from faculty in our department and the NRES Program.  
12 We have six total individuals that are involved with  
13 NRES, faculty and staff that teach and advise and  
14 that kind of thing.

15 So, it's a work in progress and we've committed  
16 to do that work to try and minimize the impact of

17 this to the students. I discussed this issue this  
18 morning with the Dean. She's fully supportive of  
19 moving forward with this MOU and getting some of the  
20 issues worked out.

21 MR. MCNEAR: That's a, if I may follow up on  
22 that, this experience for me, you know, I'm a  
23 Steering Committee Member and Director of  
24 Undergraduate Studies for NRES and I have been for  
25 ten years now and the U.S for the last couple of

‡

27

1 years and its entered this kind of program, it's  
2 multi-departmental.

3 We have faculty teaching from landscape  
4 architecture, ag-economics and several other plant  
5 and soil sciences which my home department and it  
6 really threw up a red flag in the process by which  
7 interdisciplinary programs within a college are  
8 represented or not represented in this case.

9 If you look at the timeline on this proposal it  
10 went up and went through the Chairs, the Dean and  
11 the Faculty council for votes with never having  
12 received input from Natural Resources and  
13 Environmental Sciences.

14 So they all voted on it without having received  
15 input from a program that would potentially have  
16 been impacted or will be impacted by that name  
17 change. So, to me that highlights, at least within  
18 my college and maybe this is a broader problem at  
19 the University, a lack of process for representation  
20 of interdisciplinary programs which we all, I think,

21 acknowledge that the undergraduate and certainly at  
22 the graduate level are extremely important.

23 So, you know, I think what happened here in this  
24 case is an order of operations where the discussion  
25 should've happened first and then it should have

♀

28

1 gone forward with the letters of support from  
2 Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences  
3 program.

4 So, just to put it out there in the record, I  
5 mean, it was known to the Chair that that NRES  
6 program would have an issue with that name change.  
7 If it occurred when they did change their Master of  
8 Science Program to Masters of Science and Forestry  
9 and Natural Resources Sciences. So that letter  
10 existed and that's the letter that accompanied this  
11 but it didn't get raised to the UCC Undergraduate  
12 Council Curriculum Committee. That was after the  
13 Dean voted, after the Faculty Council voted.

14 So, I'm, you know, I'm committed to work with  
15 Jeff to -- I mean, he's coming in after the fact  
16 which they had a previous Chair who perhaps had a  
17 different agenda and I think Jeff is sincere in his,  
18 you know, I think were both sincere in our desire to  
19 write this Memorandum of Understanding.

20 My concern is that interdisciplinary programming  
21 in my college, and again this could be reflected  
22 across many colleges in the campus, is that MOU  
23 holds no weight unless the Dean signs off on it.  
24 And, Jeff said he met with the Dean this morning but  
25 the interdisciplinary programs, at least and NRES



1 have never received that assurance from my Dean.

2 So, it's just a piece of paper until someone is  
3 willing to enforce that piece of paper. So, you  
4 know I have to represent and I have my opinion. I'm  
5 very, like I said, very willing to work with Jeff  
6 but like he has to represent his staff and I have to  
7 represent my Steering Committee folks in saying that  
8 it's a scary place to be because if they're hiring a  
9 new Chair, that new Chair comes in with a different  
10 agenda, you know, where does the interdisciplinary  
11 program sit and do we all have a voice?

12 MR. ?(Jeff)?: I think that the development,  
13 the movement in this direction to develop the MOU  
14 between our department, whose highly engaged with  
15 the NRES Program, can potentially act as a model on  
16 how to get documentation for the other programs that  
17 support that or are engaged in it, that can then be  
18 used for a model for other multiple or  
19 interdisciplinary programs. So that's the hope and  
20 well from our standpoint, well move in that  
21 direction.

22 MR. BAILEY: And so the problem, these  
23 interdisciplinary programs aren't attached to  
24 departments. Our procedure for collecting  
25 information involves talking to departments, talking

1 to Faculty Councils, talking to Deans and so these  
2 interdisciplinary programs, there's three I believe

3 in the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment  
4 don't have a particular representation then.

5 And so that's really the issue is how do they  
6 get involved. And so the solution, in this case,  
7 seemed to be some type of a memorandum of  
8 understanding where the program will be recognized  
9 by the Chairs as being part of the program and in  
10 that letter, if you had read that, I think it was a  
11 statement, I hope that NRES will also develop a  
12 similar memorandum to be standing with the other  
13 units that they interact with. So hopefully this  
14 will resolve the issue for these interdisciplinary  
15 undergraduate programs. Other questions?

16 MR. SANDMEYER: If I could just follow up.

17 MR. BAILEY: Yeah.

18 MR. SANDMEYER: So, I want to speak on  
19 (coughing) to the U.S. for the Environmental and  
20 Sustainability Studies Program also which is another  
21 interdisciplinary program and I still, I mean, I'm  
22 not satisfied in regards to the overlap Question and  
23 I would very much like to have seen the Memorandum  
24 of understanding written before we had come to the  
25 vote to approve the name change.

♀

31

1 So, I just want to put that out there. I have  
2 great respect for both programs. I know them both  
3 pretty well and I think the forestry program is an  
4 excellent program and I raise -- in Arts and Science  
5 I have great admiration for both of them but I am a  
6 little wary about approving this name change with I  
7 hope that things won't overlap too much.

8 MR. BAILEY: Well, the one thing I would say  
9 is that we did look at the programs and the programs  
10 are really quite different. The syllabus is  
11 different. The students that they're teaching are  
12 quite different. So, there isn't an overlap there.  
13 Yeah, in the back?

14 MR. KEARNEY: Yeah, Paul Kearney from the  
15 College of Medicine. How -- I understand the  
16 nomenclature thing. I mean, I think a forest is a  
17 natural resource, but I could be wrong. I am a  
18 doctor. (LAUGHTER) The question I have is, does it  
19 affect, when you get down to business, does it  
20 affect the way we teach the kids? Or does it affect  
21 allocation of money from one department or another?  
22 Is it just an argument about the names. This is  
23 going on in the College of Medicine.

24 That's why I bring it up because were going  
25 away from traditional departments to services and

32

1 you, and as usual, you have people that are for lack  
2 of a better term, pissing on their own bushes to  
3 mark their territory and that's a problem because  
4 imagine the problem in the College of Medicine where  
5 you're arguing about it and it does in that case  
6 affect revenues. I don't know whether this affects  
7 revenue streams in the way we teach these kids, I  
8 don't know.

9 MR. MCNEAR: So I think that a lot of the  
10 reason why they're peeing on trees is, to use your  
11 analogy in the beginning, is because of the resource

12 base funding model that was going to come down -  
13 allocation of resources based on contact hours. The  
14 fact is that when that came down if you're teaching  
15 an interdisciplinary program, you're getting credit.

16 MR. KEARNEY: That's right.

17 MR. MCNEAR: So with forestry teaching a  
18 significant amount in the interdisciplinary program,  
19 that became an issue to them and I think the ground  
20 or a land grab was happening and I think it caused  
21 some animosity among programs and certain  
22 individuals, but when that went away and that's  
23 coincided with the Chair being, previous Chair being  
24 hired by the department and that sort of sets the  
25 stage for things.

♀

33

1 But when that went away, that I think -- well  
2 it should have been less of an issue, but it started  
3 the ball, in my opinion, so I'm not speaking for the  
4 students, I think it started the ball rolling  
5 towards identity and who we are and does the  
6 department match what we do and those sort of things  
7 and you know it will -- it's not peeing on trees or  
8 whatever I guess, but it will require like when A&S  
9 changed their major, they consulted with NRES  
10 because were the other environmental program and we  
11 had a conversation and it worked out.

12 But we had a conversation first. And we still  
13 have to define ourselves on how were separate and  
14 different from that program. This will -- I'm just  
15 saying that this will create more energy that we  
16 have to put into as NRES and Forestry likewise to

17 define and say that, you know, NRES does not reside  
18 in Forestry. It's an interdisciplinary program and  
19 this, you know, it doesn't go to help.

20 It's only animosity that Forestry had against  
21 the resource pool from interdisciplinary programs.  
22 It doesn't help their complaints about us being in  
23 control by changing their name to look a lot more  
24 similar -- lot similar to NRES. It's a little  
25 counterintuitive to that idea.

‡

34

1 But the point is that I think were in a  
2 situation with the new Chair that we can develop a  
3 Memorandum of Understanding. We can begin to  
4 develop this. I prefer and I said this at the Senate  
5 Council Meeting, that I would have preferred the  
6 order of operations to be different. In an ideal  
7 world you come with the MOU, signed off on by the  
8 Dean, my program has assurance, right? And maybe  
9 even an idea that they're going to provide some  
10 effort towards helping us differentiate our program.

11 We talked about this as well, Ernie, about, you  
12 know, on a broader scale and getting the Provost buy  
13 in to help incentivize departments to buy into an  
14 interdisciplinary program. There's a larger issue  
15 here and I feel like we, you know cart before the  
16 horse a little bit in us trying now to address this  
17 with this mechanism after the fact. I'm confident  
18 that it can happen. I would prefer it happened the  
19 other way, but you know, I think either way it's  
20 gonna happen.

SENATE HEARING IN LEXINGTON 05 01 2017.txt  
21 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Discussion. Matt.

22 MR. GIANCARLO: Matt Giancarlo, Arts and  
23 Sciences. I guess I'd like to say three things.  
24 First, the motion, I think has an error. It should  
25 be a letter from the Department of Forestry National

♀

35

1 Resources, that's probably Natural Resources  
2 Program.

3 Second, I am just a Senator but I am leaning  
4 toward voting against this motion because what I've  
5 been hearing in various iterations from all  
6 interested parties is that they have not resolved  
7 some of these important issues about over-matig  
8 definitions and nomenclature which putting aside  
9 questions of resource allocation in education that  
10 can create confusion in the faculty and among the  
11 students.

12 And third, it sounds like there needs to be an  
13 improved workflow for this that can then be  
14 reflected in the documentation that we get as  
15 Senators because the letter that we received,  
16 although its ambiguously referred to as an MOU, it's  
17 really a letter towards an MOU and that doesn't  
18 weigh very heavily as a dispositive element for  
19 rendering (coughing) us as a decision making body  
20 that everybody is on the same page.

21 MR. CROSS: Al Cross, Communication and  
22 Information. I am the Senate Council member who  
23 made the motion -- said that in an ideal world I  
24 would like to have had the MOU first, but here we  
25 are at the end of the academic year to -- Forestry

1 wants to get this done. They've got grant proposals  
2 that might be affected by the name, you know, and I  
3 was impressed by the discussion of two people of  
4 good faith at our meeting and at this meeting who  
5 made clear they are going to get this worked out and  
6 that it, that it needs to be voted on today.

7 So I perfectly am comfortable with going on  
8 ahead with it and trying to set an example on how we  
9 deal with some of these interdisciplinary program  
10 issues.

11 MR. BAILEY: Liz.

12 MS. DEBSKI: Elizabeth Debski, Neuroscience.  
13 I'm wondering as far -- I'm having reservations  
14 myself actually and I'm wondering if we could -- if  
15 there might be a friendly amendment to that motion  
16 because I don't like that it's just a submission of  
17 a joint letter. Not a, you know, so not an approved  
18 to jot -- it's slang like -- both of the parties or  
19 anything like that. It's just a submission of a  
20 letter and at the very least I think we have to have  
21 that it was endorsed or signed by both parties in  
22 that.

23 MR. BAILEY: We do have that. It is signed by  
24 both parties.

25 MS. DEBSKI: Oh, I see. That's the letter in

1 the -- I'm sorry. So that's not even the MOU. I  
2 see. So that's one of the -- why I guess the one of

3 the problems.

4 MR. SPRINGER: The letter that was submitted  
5 was signed by both of us.

6 MS. DEBSKI: But it's not an MOU.

7 MR. BAILEY: Correct. It indicates that an  
8 MOU -- were going to work towards that and --

9 MS. DEBSKI: Yeah. No, I got that. I just  
10 didn't even under -- I just missed the point that  
11 this is referring to the letter that's already there  
12 as opposed to the MOU that is to be worked out. And  
13 I guess, I don't like that even more because then  
14 it's not even saying the MOU has to be reached or  
15 signed by either one of those parties in order to go  
16 ahead with this name change.

17 MR. BAILEY: I guess, you know, the -- as Al  
18 was saying we were impressed with the positive  
19 interaction between the two. There's -- it didn't  
20 seem to be much of a question that they could not --  
21 that they wouldn't reach an agreement and the  
22 differences weren't huge.

23 There's big differences in the academic programs  
24 and really what NRES needs is an MOU, not just with  
25 forestry. This is something that transcends that.

♀

38

1 They need to have something with economics, with  
2 engineering, I don't know all the departments that  
3 you are involved with, but I mean, this is something  
4 that needs to be done throughout the programming.

5 What is positive in this is that it is moving in  
6 a new direction. Just having the letter with  
7 Forestry is not going to solve all of NRES's issues.



8 The issue has to be worked through with all of the  
9 departments. I just -- I, you know, there's a name  
10 change and then there are the issues that NRES has.

11 MR. MCNEAR: In process we have to establish  
12 the process.

13 MR. STRINGER: I think one issue is if  
14 Forestry -- if we were talking about a degree or a  
15 program, you know, and a degree name change to  
16 Forestry and Natural Resources, that's huge. You  
17 know, but we're not. Our degree, our Undergraduate  
18 Degree is Forestry. It will stay that way. This is  
19 a departmental name change that reflects what we do  
20 as a department and may cause us to function better  
21 particularly with grant procurement and those kind  
22 of things.

23 MR. MCNEAR: And, I mean, that's been brought  
24 up several times and I agree that, you know,  
25 changing the name will make the department more

♀

39

1 competitive when presented with federal grant  
2 evidence, but it doesn't mean that it has to be  
3 Natural Resources. Had we had this conversation  
4 ahead of time, it could've been something else in  
5 consultation with other departments or a bit more  
6 thorough. When I heard that I just wanted to throw  
7 out there, again there are other monikers to hang on  
8 that are equally competitive.

9 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Any other discussion? Okay.  
10 so the motion is that contingent upon the submission  
11 of a joint letter from the Department of Forestry

12 and the Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences  
13 Program outlining a way to resolve their  
14 differences, the Senate endorses the proposed name  
15 change, from the Department of Forestry to the  
16 Department of Forestry and Natural Resources and  
17 maybe some national as well.

18 MR. YOST: I'm still -- I'm opposed on this.  
19 Scott Yost, Department of Engineering. You have the  
20 letter so why is the contingent upon submission part  
21 of this?

22 CHAIR MCCORMICK: When the motion was made we  
23 didn't have the letter. The motion came from the  
24 Senate Council.

25 MR. YOST: So if they can't modify that after

‡

40

1 a motion, they present at Council since you have the  
2 updated information because -- so you have the  
3 letter so it looks like to me the name is going to  
4 be changed, you're voting on the actual name change,  
5 but the letter is in hand.

6 CHAIR MCCORMICK: The letter is in hand.

7 MR. YOST: Okay. And they will not take a  
8 friendly amendment that does mention about -- the  
9 MOU in place?

10 CHAIR MCCORMICK: This is for the motion as it  
11 stands.

12 MS. DEBSKI: Can I just -- I don't understand.

13 MS. BROTHERS: I'm sorry, name please?

14 MS. DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A&S. I don't  
15 understand why there is a motion can't be changed.  
16 We always amend these motions.

17 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Well, are you requesting to  
18 amend the motion?

19 MS. DEBSKI: I think, I really think, yeah.  
20 You know the contingent upon submission of something  
21 that's already in hand is confusing.

22 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Okay.

23 MS. DEBSKI: And so, so I would strike that as  
24 was just suggested.

25 CHAIR MCCORMICK: All right. So you want to  
‡

41

1 make a new motion? All right. So Parliamentarian,  
2 tell us what we do here.

3 MS. SEAGO: Well, the first thing is that per  
4 our rules, you know, per our rules and operating  
5 procedures, if it's -- their suggesting to strike  
6 that first bit but are the people that proposed the  
7 motion willing to accept that its a friendly  
8 amendment?

9 CHAIR MCCORMICK: No.

10 MS. SEAGO: No. In that case, then it needs  
11 to move forward as a formal proposal to change the  
12 motion with a second and then we discuss the change.

13 MS. DEBSKI: So I'll put it forth as a formal  
14 amendment to the first part all the way to the comma  
15 is stricken because again that's already in hand so  
16 theres no contingency there and that then becomes a  
17 senate endorsed proposing a name change.

18 MS. SEAGO: And you need to ask for a second?

19 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Is there a second?

20 MR. YOST: I'll second. Scott Yost.

21 MS. SEAGO: Okay. Now discuss on moves to  
22 whether or not the amendment should be accepted or  
23 not.

24 CHAIR MCCORMICK: All right. Jennifer.

25 MS. BIRD-POLLAN: Jennifer Bird-Pollan, Law. I  
♀

42

1 just think if we leave all of the contingency out  
2 that we have this letter in place which now has no  
3 relationship to the motion.

4 So, I agree that it doesn't make a lot of sense  
5 to say contingent upon the submission of a letter  
6 anymore, but I think we could say something like  
7 contingent upon compliance with the plan addressed  
8 in the letter or contingent upon an action  
9 consistent with the proposal in the letter.

10 Something like that. So were no longer waiting  
11 for the submission, I agree, but were hoping for  
12 action consistent with the letter.

13 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Joan?

14 MS. MAZUR: Joan Mazur, College of Ed to call  
15 on Dr. Bird Pollans point. Maybe we could just say  
16 given that there is data submission of a joint  
17 letter. Would that work?

18 MS. DEBSKI: Yeah, I'll take that. I just --  
19 and I would take also what I have said before the  
20 signed MOU, is an endorsed MOU, I could go either  
21 way but I -- it's confusing as it is now.

22 MS. BIRD-POLLAN: I think that's right. I  
23 don't know. I think we do want to have the document  
24 that this was requested and it was available for us  
25 at the meeting today given the deliberations with

1 said counsel about these many complicated issues.

2 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Scott, are you willing to  
3 second the revision?

4 MR. YOST: I will second the revision.

5 CHAIR MCCORMICK: All right. Good. All  
6 right. Further discussion? All right. So now,  
7 Kate, we vote on the change?

8 MS. SEAGO: The change and then vote on the  
9 motion.

10 MS. BROTHERS: Can we do the vote on the  
11 change via show of hands?

12 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Yes, absolutely. So all in  
13 favor of the change in the motion please indicate by  
14 a raised hand. All opposed. The motion passes.

15 MS. BROTHERS: I'm sorry who were the two  
16 opposed?

17 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Matt and Sean Peffer. Okay.  
18 Thank you. All right. So now the motion should  
19 read Given receipt of a joint letter from the  
20 Department of Forestry and the Natural Resources  
21 Environmental Science Program outlining a way to  
22 resolve the differences -- resolve differences.

23 The Senate endorses or we propose that the  
24 Senate endorse the proposed name change of the  
25 Department of Forestry to the Department of Forestry

1 and Natural Resources. You may vote.

2 MS. SEAGO: I don't think it's working.

3 UNIDENTIFIED: We've got problems here from  
4 the seat. (LAUGHTER)

5 MS. SEAGO: Try again. It was next to vote.

6 CHAIR MCCORMICK: All right. Let's try now.

7 MS. SEAGO: Yep.

8 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Ah, there we go.

9 MS. SEAGO: Yay.

10 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Thank you, Kate. All right.  
11 Motion passes 34 to 28. Okay. All right.  
12 Margaret.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: This is a recommendation that  
14 the University Senate approve the establishment of a  
15 new Undergraduate Certificate Sexuality Studies  
16 within the Department of Gender and Women's Studies  
17 in the College of Arts and Sciences. The rationale  
18 is there is fourteen credit hours of coursework.  
19 They expect about ten students a year

20 The only thing, SATC felt, or saw was that they  
21 felt this was an underestimate of the number of  
22 students that they think this certificate would see.  
23 So, not a bad problem to have actually. Any  
24 questions?

25 CHAIR MCCORMICK: All right. This comes from  
♀

45

1 a Committee. It needs no second and if you will  
2 vote. On the motion against Undergraduate  
3 Certificate in Sexuality Studies. The motion  
4 passes.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: All right. The next one is a  
6 recommendation that the University Senate approve  
7 the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate

8 in Baroque Trumpet in the School of Music and the  
9 College of Fine Arts. This is similar to the  
10 Graduate Certificate that you saw last month except  
11 for undergraduate students. It is an emerging and  
12 cutting edge field. It would fill a niche for us  
13 here at the University of Kentucky and they expect  
14 two students a year, which SAPC felt was appropriate  
15 given the faculty and such. Questions?

16 MR. YOST: Was your committee at all concerned  
17 that there's only one professor that is part of this  
18 program and how did you guys reconcile that?

19 MS. SCHROEDER: That has come up before. This  
20 is not the only program it has come up with before.  
21 It -- we left it at -- this is the purview of the  
22 College. We can't recommend hiring or anything like  
23 that in terms of that and we would assume that if  
24 Jason, for example, were to leave, that the School  
25 of Music would fill that position. And if not, then

♀

46

1 we would expect that upon review of the certificate  
2 that it would be suspended. Yes?

3 MS. DEBSKI: Liz Debski. I wondered if your  
4 committee is at all concerned sort of this real  
5 profusion of Undergraduate Certificates. I know  
6 that it had been an issue of discussion, I don't  
7 know, two years ago or something like that and now  
8 we just are just having tons and tons of them. So  
9 not specific to this one but I'm wondering why the  
10 current (coughing).

11 MS. SCHOR: We haven't talked about it

12 specifically in terms of the number. We do notice a  
13 lot of Graduate and Undergraduate Certificates and  
14 if you looked at the year-end report you can see the  
15 numbers. This year, last years numbers were quite  
16 similar in terms of the -- we seem to be approving a  
17 lot more certificates or getting a lot more  
18 certificates rather than Degree Programs et cetera.

19 We've noticed that theres not a lot of Minors  
20 being proposed any more and we feel like  
21 Undergraduate Programs are recommending  
22 Undergraduate Certificates to fulfill some of those  
23 elective requirements et cetera, expanding the field  
24 rather than just minoring. Though we haven't made  
25 any kind of ruling or judgment, you know, on

♀

47

1 anything like that.

2 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Do you receive any type of  
3 retention or career --

4 MS. SCHOR: Retention, career, and trying to  
5 get expertise in multiple fields and then also  
6 certificates seem to be a test bed for trying out  
7 new ideas and curricula and so we think that's a lot  
8 of it. And then with Undergraduate Certificates,  
9 specifically, they're supposed to be  
10 interdisciplinary. There's not a lot of room for  
11 interdisciplinary with the requirement of only 3  
12 credit hours required outside of it.

13 But we do see some trans-work in the  
14 inter-disciplinaries. Yeah.

15 MR. YOST Scott Yost, Department of  
16 Engineering: Maybe I'm wrong but is the Provost



17 Office pushing for more Undergraduate Certificates?

18 It seems to me I thought I heard that in the last  
19 couple months. Are you hearing anything like that?

20 MS. SCHROEDER: I haven't heard anything like  
21 that and he's been in several of our meetings.

22 MS. WILSON: I have not and there's nothing  
23 that --

24 MS. BROTHERS: Sorry, your name please.

25 MS. WILSON: Lisa Wilson, Provost Office.

‡

48

1 He's not been, that I'm aware of, anything  
2 particularly.

3 MR. YOST: Well, good because there's a call  
4 that calls engineering about proposing a certificate  
5 program --

6 MS. WILSON: It's not from us.

7 MR. YOST: Okay.

8 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Any other questions?

9 MS. DEBSKI: I mean, I'm sorry one more  
10 general question. Is there any assessment? I mean,  
11 I know that there's an assessment of Majors. Is  
12 there any assessment of -- and Minors -- any  
13 assessment of Certificates?

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, they get reviewed,  
15 according to the Office of Institutional  
16 Effectiveness, they get reviewed when programs get  
17 reviewed by the college. So they're -- when those  
18 come up -- when the college comes up for a program  
19 review, those programs would get reviewed at the  
20 same time and they're reviewed with the same

21 criteria as all the other programs are reviewed.

22 Good question.

23 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Other questions? All  
24 right. The motion comes from the Committee and  
25 needs no second. The motion is that the Senate

♀

49

1 approve the establishment of a new undergraduate  
2 certificate in Baroque Trumpet in the School of  
3 Music in the College of Fine Arts. We have 54 in  
4 favor and 2 opposed and 1 abstain.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. So, SAPC was asked to  
6 make a recommendation about USPs that have not  
7 received Senate approval and I want to clarify that  
8 its not that they were voted down by Senate, they  
9 just never reached Senate for approval and these  
10 USPs were operating in the colleges as if they had  
11 received Senate approval.

12 So, we are asked to make recommendation on how  
13 to handle said programs. During that time we also  
14 found out about two USP programs who thought they  
15 had received Graduate School approval and University  
16 Senate approval but no one could find record of  
17 those either. So, we went ahead and made a  
18 recommendation for that as well.

19 SAP -- SAPC talked about it, the best way to go  
20 about it and then I met with Ryan Jackson as well to  
21 make sure he was okay with it and that Graduate  
22 Council would be okay with it as well. So, we had  
23 three recommendations that came out of this.

24 The first one was that to contact all the USP's  
25 not approved by the Senate which are on page 2 and 3

1 of the documentation that was provided. We were --  
2 asked them just to submit just the USP form. That  
3 would be it.

4 Since they were approved by the Graduate School  
5 it was assumed that they had received department and  
6 college level approval so there's not any kind of  
7 burden of proof for college level review, minutes,  
8 et cetera, just the USP paperwork and the  
9 requirement for that again goes with what's required  
10 in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness for  
11 stats reporting, et cetera.

12 After August 31st, that was the date that we  
13 chose because we wanted them to be able to be read  
14 by the first Senate meeting this fall. They would  
15 be forwarded together to SAPC. SAPC would take on  
16 the burden of reviewing all of them together and  
17 having them, hopefully, approved by Senate Council  
18 and Senate no later than the end of September.

19 For the USPs that colleges think they have but  
20 there is no records for it at the Graduate School  
21 level, those colleges would submit the USP paperwork  
22 along with proof that it had been voted on by the  
23 college since we didn't have that kind of proof at  
24 the Graduate Council, they would receive expedited  
25 review at Graduate Council and then move on the

1 traditional process of SAPC incentive from there.  
2 And just to keep in line, we had suggested an August

3 31st deadline as well. So, that was our  
4 recommendati on. Questions? Yes, sir.

5 MR. WHITAKER: Well, I guess --

6 MS. BROTHERS: Name please.

7 MR. WHITAKER: Oh, sorry. Mark Whi taker, A&S.  
8 So, who in the department would be responsible for  
9 supplying the paperwork? Would it be the, you know,  
10 you asked -- would it be the Chair? On the other  
11 hand -- and are the programs suspended until the  
12 senate approves them?

13 MS. SCHROEDER: No. So, I'll answer, try to  
14 answer both. Okay, the first one in regards to  
15 who's required to do the paperwork, that would be up  
16 to your, you and your department. Whoever wanted to  
17 do that. We do realize that, you know, faculty go  
18 off contract on May 15th and don't go back on  
19 contract until August 15th so there are some  
20 concerns about whether or not there will be enough  
21 time to fill out the three page USP form and provide  
22 a curriculum contract or not so that will just  
23 depend on how you guys want to handle that in your  
24 college and in your department.

25 And to answer your second question, no, they're re  
♀

52

1 not suspended. That was never a discussi on at all.  
2 That wasn't a discussi on with Senate Council Office,  
3 at Senate Council, nor with Ryan Jackson and then  
4 at the time then Di rector of Insti tutional  
5 Effecti veness, Mi a Alexander-Snow, did not feel like  
6 they should be suspended or anything like that. We  
7 just need to clean it up, make sure that its on

8 record, that were following our own curricular  
9 processes and that we have paperwork to back that  
10 up.

11 MR. WHITAKER: Thank you.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Uh-huh. Any other questions?

13 CHAIR MCCORMICK: All right. A motion from  
14 the Committee needs no second that the Senate  
15 approve their three recommendations on University  
16 Scholar Programs not approved by the Senate. Again  
17 this is a paperwork, hopefully, endeavor, and this  
18 is a motion.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. This last one is just a  
20 brief report from our committee. We are a very  
21 active committee on campus and there always seems to  
22 be lots of questions about, you know, what we  
23 approve, et cetera, and we reviewed twenty-seven  
24 proposals this year. Two of them, you have not seen  
25 yet. You'll see in the fall, but we had four

♀

53

1 Undergraduate Certificates, One BA Program, one MS  
2 Program, seven Graduate Certificates, two PHD  
3 Programs, three University Scholars Programs, two  
4 Graduate Certificate suspensions, three Masters  
5 suspensions, two BS suspensions and two PAD  
6 deletions.

7 So, pretty active and busy committee this year.  
8 Over the last three years, we usually see an average  
9 of twenty to twenty-one proposals so we did see an  
10 uptake this year. So we gave three interpretations.  
11 A couple of those you're still waiting on, you'll

12 see this fall. Things that were looking at, as  
13 described earlier, interdisciplinary programs,  
14 processes and then definitions for professional  
15 programs and processes. So, thank you guys always  
16 for your thoughtful questions and feedback and I'd  
17 really like to recognize my committee members if you  
18 all would stand up.

19 CHAIR MCCORMICK: You have a number here.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, I think I do.

21 (APPLAUSE)

22 MR. GIANCARLO: Big thanks from our  
23 department. (APPLAUSE)

24 CHAIR MCCORMICK: One thing I would remind you  
25 of before we move further in the agenda and before I

‡

54

1 I lose any more of you is the work that we did  
2 regarding Honorary Degree, that is confidential and  
3 so please don't share those names with your  
4 community members, anybody at Kroger or wherever in  
5 the local bar.

6 So, again please remember that that's  
7 confidential until the President  
8 has a chance to have this approved at the Board of  
9 Trustees and that he has the chance to contact the  
10 recipients. So, thank you for keeping that  
11 confidential.

12 So, we have a final report today. It's from  
13 Nicholas Kehrwald our Interim Dean of Students who's  
14 going to talk with you a little bit about some work  
15 that he's doing. This is two endorsements for  
16 changes or actually creations of two new ARs.

17 Remember that the Senate endorses only. This is an  
18 Administrative Regulation and so were really --  
19 we've been very collaborative.

20 We really appreciate the opportunity to work  
21 with these, these folks in making this what we think  
22 is a better proposal for students, faculty, staff,  
23 everybody that's concerned. And so, Nicks here. He  
24 has Marcy Deaton from Legal to answer any questions  
25 that he cant, and so I appreciate your attention and

‡

55

1 well get started.

2 MR. KEHRWALD: So, I don't get to give just a  
3 short snippet. As Katherine said, these are two new  
4 Administrative Regulations and it really stems from  
5 a revision of our Code of Student Conduct which is a  
6 two year process. It got revised last year, June of  
7 2016.

8 And so, but as you can see I wanted to give a  
9 brief history of just our Community of Concern. A  
10 group of people met since 2011. First full-time  
11 staff member hired in 2013. As you can see we've  
12 now processed a significant number of behavior  
13 alerts and so that staff has grown from one to two  
14 in 2013.

15 Now we will have four full-time staff. So, one  
16 of the Administrative Regs was just to sort of  
17 codify the existence of the Community of Concern and  
18 the sort of interdisciplinary team that meets on a  
19 regular basis to review the behavior alerts that  
20 come in, particularly those behavior alerts that are

21 of significant concern.

22 And so again, I just want to give you a brief  
23 idea of those numbers. I think when I put this up  
24 ten days ago our behavior alert number was at nine  
25 hundred and sixty eight for this academic year. I

♀

56

1 would estimate well reach eleven hundred. So it  
2 will essentially be one hundred percent increase in  
3 three years time from 2013-14 to this year.

4 And the other thing -- one of the  
5 Administrative Regs is to codify our Community of  
6 Concern. The other one is spending a lot of time  
7 focused on our involuntary medical withdrawal. So  
8 while we have a number of behavior alerts, the other  
9 key stat there is that we don't do a lot of  
10 involuntary medical withdrawals. It is the last  
11 resort in terms of trying to help students deal with  
12 these issues.

13 With that being said it was really necessary to  
14 create a new policy because the prior policy had  
15 been pulled out of the Code of Student Conduct. And  
16 so this was the previous paragraph that was in the  
17 Student Code.

18 Again, when the Code got revised, it was better  
19 to have it pulled out for a variety of reasons which  
20 is in the next slide. The biggest of which was that  
21 there was just no process and so in terms of the  
22 Department of Justice review, particularly from a  
23 legal perspective and disability law, the Department  
24 of Justice reevaluated what it meant to be and have  
25 a direct threat.



1 Department of Ed and the Office of Civil Rights  
2 has to sort of assess what that means and really  
3 come up with a sort of template through their  
4 resolution agreements from the University on how to  
5 address these kinds of significant mental health  
6 concerns.

7 And so we really have taken the guidance of  
8 some of their previous decisions with other  
9 institutions and then as well as my legal colleagues  
10 so the National Association for College and  
11 University Attorneys produced a very nice white  
12 paper for institutions.

13 A couple of really important things on this  
14 slide and its part of the reason of having a  
15 separate policy for this issue is one; Universities  
16 need to be conducting individualized risk  
17 assessments on each one of these cases. So while  
18 you might have a policy, it's really hard to sort of  
19 have a broad sweeping policy that you're going to  
20 apply generally and so conducting individualized  
21 assessments are really important. Again, focusing  
22 on observing rule of behavior is important  
23 particularly when you're talking about dealing with  
24 mental health. That's also going to be  
25 simultaneously protected under a disability law.

1 And again, trying to create a policy for  
2 students that's going to be applicable for all

3 students. So that was really the goal of creating  
4 this new policy as opposed to just having a separate  
5 paragraph in our previous Code of Conduct. Thank  
6 you. And so, again we've tried to incorporate all  
7 of those principles within our new Administrative  
8 Regulations, which I think it's AR40.12, is the  
9 involuntary medical withdrawal.

10 Another major component to this is having  
11 conditions of return. And so again making sure  
12 students are ready to come back to the institution,  
13 that they've addressed any Community of Concerns and  
14 that we feel comfortable having them back, but I had  
15 previously touched on this, right? We rarely use  
16 this.

17 The whole idea is to promote other, like less  
18 restrictive alternatives including working with  
19 students Restriction Intervention Plans, obviously  
20 promoting voluntary withdrawal avenues that are  
21 currently driving Senate rules. Questions? Marcy,  
22 you have anything to add?

23 MR. FIEDLER: Ted Fiedler, Arts and Sciences.  
24 In the past year and a half, two years, I have seen  
25 students who are not threatening anyone but who are

♀

59

1 clearly failing at all of their courses or getting  
2 nothing but in-completes. Now frankly I think the  
3 university is -- ought to be responsible in dealing  
4 with these situations because were just taking their  
5 tuition and they're in trouble and were not doing  
6 anything.

7 What are you all doing about situations like

8 that which may not be as serious as these but to the  
9 individuals in question, you know its a kind of  
10 behavioral pattern that needs checking. Okay? And  
11 intervention as far as I'm concerned.

12 MR. KEHRWALD: So, yeah, not --

13 MR. FIEDLER: It's a different situation, but  
14 its not unrelated.

15 MR. KEHRWALD: Not to the Administrative Regs.  
16 Some of the things we've really tried to do is, our  
17 Community of Concern has really tried to work with  
18 institutional Research and our analytics team to get  
19 a lot of data on our students to look at if we can  
20 have any sort of targeted or predictive analytics  
21 for how we do outreach, but also how we work with  
22 students.

23 The typical thing with students who have  
24 behavior alerts here is that there really are no  
25 great predictive analytics. So we cant do speci fic  
♀

60

1 outreach or training for speci fic departments,  
2 colleges, faculty, et cetera. Obviously, mental  
3 health does not discriminate in terms of students  
4 academic abilities or any other sort of demographic  
5 right that you might think of.

6 I will say that from our perspective the one  
7 population that's certainly the most at risk is our  
8 first year students. So about fifty percent of all  
9 of our behavior alerts have been coming from our  
10 first year students every year and that's been  
11 consistent with the last three years.

12           You may have seen one of the major initiatives  
13 out of the Provost Office is how we look at our  
14 behavior alerts and also pull in our information on  
15 our academic alerts because we find a lot of  
16 students who might actually present with both of  
17 those issues.

18           So trying to implement a case management sort  
19 of approach to how we systematically address  
20 students who have, or are presenting in multiple  
21 ways, both of academic alerts and behavior alerts  
22 who are struggling basically across all levels of  
23 the institution. So that is something that we will  
24 definitely be looking at for Fall of 17. Now that  
25 we've really intersected some of 16 data.

‡

61

1           MS. DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A&S. I have two  
2 main questions. I'm wondering what you think is  
3 driving this incredible increase in the number of  
4 students with behavioral effects on whether you get  
5 -- I don't know if you addressed that all before  
6 they are actually in class.

7           Then I'm wondering, as a professor, when you  
8 have a student who clearly has either and the  
9 Community of Concern has been contacted and  
10 everything like that and they're not following any  
11 of the recommendations, what can you do? I mean,  
12 they still come to the classroom. What exactly are  
13 we supposed to do?

14           MR. KEHRWALD: I'll attempt to answer both of  
15 those questions to the best of my ability. I think  
16 the first question is really complicated. I mean, I

17 think if you look at the enrollment here at the  
18 University of Kentucky, obviously over the last  
19 seven years our Freshmen class has grown right  
20 around from, right I think four thousand to  
21 consistently right about five thousand plus.

22 And so part of, I think part of the increase in  
23 numbers that we see is just due from just the sheer  
24 size perspective, but I think there's been plenty of  
25 articles written about the current group of students

‡

62

1 from a mental health perspective, in terms of their  
2 needs and what someone described as of a lack of  
3 persistence, a lack of coping, those types of  
4 things, I wish I had a wand and had the answer to  
5 how to address all of that.

6 But, again I know one of the major focuses  
7 under the Provost in this description of Academic  
8 Excellence is to look at our student wellness and  
9 look at how we address these things. And so,  
10 partly, it will be looking at how we think about how  
11 we do outreaches perhaps proactively to your  
12 question, address some of this.

13 In terms of, you know, I think dealing with  
14 student issues, there are some boundaries in terms  
15 of what we can do to effectively assist faculty  
16 members. I think one of the things that both from  
17 the Dean of Students Office perspective, both our  
18 Office of Student Conduct and our Community of  
19 Concern tried to reiterate the fact that you all  
20 have a great deal of control over your classroom.

21 So, you know, dealing with students who are  
22 disruptive and having them temporarily, you know,  
23 removed from that class and those kinds of things  
24 too, I think reiterate that point with you all.

25 And again, some students have these issues  
♀

63

1 that are persistent and are a little bit more  
2 difficult so again I don't want to say the devils in  
3 the details. But it kind of depends on what the  
4 student presents with because sometimes it can be  
5 really hard.

6 MS. DEBSKI: Well, how many of those nine  
7 hundred and sixty cases do you think are really,  
8 really, I mean not simply lack of coping but really,  
9 really mental illness?

10 MR. KEHRWALD: Oh, that's a really hard  
11 number. I would say at least a third of those are  
12 probably some sort of long term mental health, that  
13 they could probably receive resources and sort of  
14 ongoing counseling or some sort of services. At  
15 least a third. Yes.

16 MS. HAPKE: I'm Holly Hapke, I'm from the  
17 College of Business. I have had more than a couple  
18 different issues with students that I've put through  
19 this Community of Concern and it's the draft of the  
20 AR -- this is just a suggestion. There's no  
21 faculty on this committee and so when we were talking  
22 about classroom management and behavior, even though  
23 someone out of the counseling center may be a  
24 faculty member or someone at the University of  
25 Health Services may serve as a faculty or the DRC,

♀

64

1 it appears that the committee is made up of all  
2 staff.

3 CHAIR MCCORMICK: The Academic Ombud is a  
4 faculty member.

5 MS. HAPKE: Correct. But is it an  
6 administrative role that wouldn't be in the  
7 classroom? I'm just to the point of --

8 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Well, typically our Ombuds  
9 come from the classroom.

10 MS. HAPKE: So that would be the only faculty  
11 on the behavioral committee?

12 MS. DEATON: I think it --

13 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Name please. I'm sorry.  
14 Name please.

15 MS. DEATON: Oh, Marcy Deaton, Legal office.  
16 I think it says like these are the least the minimum  
17 members of the Community of Concern. We tried to  
18 leave it as general as we could so that it was open  
19 to add other people, you know if someone determined  
20 from Student Affairs it was necessary.

21 MR. KEHRWALD: Marcy, yeah, we tried to keep  
22 it as broad as possible so the only definitive  
23 outlined person is the Academic Ombud that would be  
24 listed. Yeah so I was just trying to pull it up.

25 CHAIR MCCORMICK: So your recommendation

♀

65

1 would be that you'd like to see more faculty?

2 MS. HAPKE: Yes, especially when its -- when

3 were dealing with classroom issues and of course  
4 this -- is in AR and theres nothing that talks about  
5 classroom issues.

6 MR. MCGILLIS: Yeah, Joe McGillis, Medicine.  
7 I'm just going to endorse what she said because can  
8 we revise this to say that we include some number,  
9 three or four faculty members across campus, so we  
10 know at least theres going to be a minimum number of  
11 classroom teachers that -- like she suggested.

12 Can we make a motion to make a suggestion? So,  
13 I make a motion that we add four positions to this,  
14 perhaps, that are teaching faculty, or faculty  
15 members.

16 CHAIR MCCORMICK: All right.

17 MS. SEAGO: He's put an amendment on the  
18 floor. You need a second.

19 MR. FIEDLER: Ted Fiedler, Arts and Sciences  
20 and I second it.

21 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Been discussed.

22 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Excuse me. I want to  
23 make sure I have the motion right. We move to  
24 recommend adding four positions of teaching faculty  
25 to Community of Concern?

♀

66

1 MR. KEHRWALD: Yes.

2 MR. PORTER: Is this an amendment? Todd  
3 Porter. Open to the next motion or - what is this?

4 CHAIR MCCORMICK: I'm sorry. So the motion is  
5 that we endorse the proposed changes to AR4.11. So,  
6 what we have is an amendment to that motion that we  
7 add faculty members to the Community of Concern



8 membership. So it would be AR4.11.3.A.2.

9 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Yes, Margaret.

10 MS. MOHR-SCHROEDER: Margaret Mohr-Schroeder,  
11 College of Education. My question is actually for  
12 you Joe. What's your rationale of four?

13 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Does that include the  
14 Ombuds?

15 MR. MCGILLIS: It seemed like a reasonable  
16 number. (LAUGHTER) The Ombud typically spends his  
17 time as Ombud and it's not a big thing. I'm just  
18 trying to decide -- let me ask this question.  
19 What's the actual size of this committee, typically?

20 MR. KEHRWALD: Yeah, I would say probably  
21 roughly right now, I would say ten or -- it would  
22 depend on the presenting cases. We're going to pull  
23 in different people on campus depending on what the  
24 presenting issue is, but I would say probably ten or  
25 twelve consistently.

♀

67

1 MR. MCGILLIS: So, if we had four faculty  
2 members appointed then they wouldn't necessarily all  
3 be there at the same time for every weekly meeting  
4 or?

5 MR. KEHRWALD: They could be but for instance  
6 our Community of Concern deals with both student and  
7 staff issues so we don't typically have an HR  
8 representative there every week because we don't  
9 necessarily have staff issues within our Community  
10 of Concern.

11 And then, like I said, sometimes we will have

12 a representative from our Office of Institutional  
13 Equity and Equal Opportunity but I think depending  
14 on their availability and the types of students that  
15 are presenting, that representative might not always  
16 be there either. So, that's why I say it just kind  
17 of depends.

18 MR. MCGILLIS: So that's why, I'm guessing.  
19 Four seemed like a reasonable guess to start with  
20 but if it's a committee that they're pulling in  
21 specific numbers for each instance that they have a  
22 pool for, we could at least try to make it like one  
23 or two.

24 CHAIR MCCORMICK: And again, so Joe are you  
25 suggesting this would be the faculty perhaps

‡

68

1 nominated by the Senate Council or perhaps the  
2 Senate and then those nominees would be sent to the  
3 Provost and faculty.

4 PROVOST TRACY: Are you referring to a pool  
5 of faculty available or four faculty permanently  
6 appointed to the committee? There's a difference  
7 between those two.

8 MR. MCGILLIS: So, as you just stated it  
9 sounds like this Community of Concern is a pool of  
10 individuals that would be pulled in for various  
11 cases, is that correct?

12 MR. TRACY: I think that what's there is the  
13 actual people who meet every week.

14 MR. KEHRWALD: So there are, there are -- the  
15 offices and that's why we don't have names, but the  
16 offices that are always there every week are the

17 University Counseling Center, Health Services,  
18 Disability Resource Center, Student Conduct, Legal  
19 Counsel, U of K PD and our Academic Ombud. Those  
20 seven consistently will be there at every meeting.

21 And again, like I said, depending on the types  
22 of student issues were dealing with, we might, like  
23 I said, have other representatives there. So, I  
24 think for the Provost question, it's a question to  
25 have them there for every meeting regardless of the

‡

69

1 types of cases or to have a pool.

2 CHAIR MCCORMICK: You know, one way we might  
3 resolve this is this would go forward to Marcy's  
4 committee which is the Regulatory --

5 MS. DEATON: They've already had it.

6 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Oh, they've already -- well  
7 could we then, could we look at this in total and  
8 then on your direct -- discreet -- or direction, I  
9 could work with Nick to improve and increase the  
10 faculty involvement so that it's -- Margaret?

11 MS. MOHR-SCHROEDER: So, he's saying that  
12 those are a minimum. So let's say they can try out  
13 the case that was, you know, similar to what was  
14 presented, a violent student in front of class,  
15 would you normally bring in additional faculty  
16 members? Is that your normal practice or would you  
17 just rely on the Academic Ombud person to act,  
18 represent and act as the faculty member?

19 MR. KEHRWALD: Presently thus far we've been  
20 relying on our Academic Ombud, who like I said was,

21 present at every meeting.

22 MS. MOHR-SCHROEDER: Okay. And so then you --  
23 my worry is that if we add in the faculty  
24 representation which I agree with, I heard you say  
25 that there's staff issues that you deal with also. I

♀

70

1 don't see a representative for staff on there so are  
2 we opening a can of worms then? You know if we ask  
3 for that?

4 MR. KEHRWALD: So, like I said, for staff  
5 issues that would be where we would specifically  
6 pull in our HR. And so, and our legal counsel, like  
7 I say is present at every meeting. So I guess I'm  
8 trying to think -- to answer your question I guess  
9 I'm trying to understand who else would you want to  
10 rec -- who else would you want to give -- represents  
11 for staff and faculty?

12 MS. MOHR-SCHROEDER: I'm just asking that if  
13 were asking that for students, for a faculty member  
14 to be present, and that's not already in language on  
15 A.2 that a staff person have an HR representative  
16 then like -- I'm trying to think far bigger picture  
17 representation-wide. Is staff counsel going to look  
18 at this?

19 MR. KEHRWALD: We haven't -- no, we haven't  
20 met with this.

21 MS. DEATON: The legal office is very  
22 comfortable the way it's been working for many  
23 years.

24 CHAIR MCCORMICK: So can you maybe go back to  
25 the charge of the committee so that we don't drift

♀

71

1 too far from what the interest is? All the way  
2 back.

3 MR. YOST: While she's looking this up, can I  
4 just ask another question while she's looking this  
5 up?

6 SECRETARY BROTHERS: What the charge?

7 MR. KEHRWALD: 4.11.

8 MR. YOST: When you say it is a staff issue,  
9 you bring in somebody from Human Resources, but I  
10 don't, I don't see that on the list as far as a  
11 representation from the Human Resources so there  
12 seems to be an extra Ad-hoc situation where you  
13 bring in people that may be needed for the situation  
14 at hand. But it's not spelled out in this  
15 composition proposal. And I'm just curious as to  
16 how you call in people when they're not in this  
17 composition.

18 MR. KEHRWALD: And the reason I use staff is  
19 one because we don't get a lot. A lot of our  
20 behavior alerts do come through for staff even  
21 though it's been designed for the entire university  
22 community. And, like I said, so -- we, while we  
23 have HR, like I said, that's the easiest example to  
24 think about of pulling in and I don't know that we  
25 have -- to your question, I don't know that we have

♀

72

1 a lot of other sort of major Ad-hoc issues that  
2 arise because the, the, the offices that are

3 included within the Reg are really the core offices  
4 that will deal, from the student perspective, with  
5 our behavior alerts.

6 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Marcy?

7 MS. DEATON: Marcy Deaton, Legal. I am not on  
8 this. I was when it was initially formed several  
9 years ago and it was student and then a separate  
10 committee was formed out of HR and I'm not sure  
11 faculty -- which was four in four weeks. But there  
12 would've been two meetings and then they started  
13 meeting together and now my understanding is that  
14 that doesn't work so well.

15 And they're not really meeting together anymore  
16 and if the Community of Concern for Students, which  
17 is what this is 99.9 percent attendance should be,  
18 gets the referrals that involves the staff member or  
19 faculty member, they generally refer it out, back  
20 out to HR or back out to Faculty Advancement. They  
21 do not handle it and impose anything on an employee  
22 out of this committee. Am I correct, Nick?

23 MR. KEHRWALD: Yeah.

24 MS. DEATON: That's the way I understand it.

25 CHAIR MCCORMICK: If you look at this --

♀

73

1 MS. DEATON: -- and it actually says that.

2 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Is primarily regarding  
3 students. Margaret?

4 MS. MOHR-SCHROEDER: Yeah, I want to second  
5 what they just said. If you scroll down to the  
6 bottom of page 1, it actually says now in this AR  
7 that if a referral regarding the University employee

8 is received, the DOC will forward the referral to  
9 the appropriate University unit. So, I think there  
10 answers the question even more that this actually  
11 would not, at all, entail staff or faculty.

12 MS. DEATON: Can I say one more thing?

13 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Sure.

14 MS. DEATON: Again, from my experience with  
15 this committee from years ago and now working with  
16 Nick, its -- the reason we left it as general as it  
17 is on the committee is, it does not say, you know,  
18 eight members. It doesn't say exactly who's on it  
19 like a lot of committees that you may be used to.  
20 You've got to have so many on your Academic Area  
21 Committee from this department and that department.

22 We don't want it to be that way because these  
23 student situations can be very different from  
24 student case to student case. They may need to  
25 pull in a particular student's advisor or someone

♀

74

1 who's one of their professors because of that  
2 particular student's particular behavior. So its  
3 really, it doesn't do the committee a benefit to  
4 have it very strictly set about who is on it and how  
5 many people and from what area.

6 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Margaret?

7 MS. MOHR-SCHROEDER: I would like to speak in  
8 favor of Joe's motion of the pool of four people that  
9 they could draw one or how many ever they felt was  
10 appropriate.

11 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Liz, did you have your hand

12 up?

13 MS. DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A&S. Yeah, I'd like  
14 to speak in favor of there being at least some  
15 faculty representation on the committee. I mean,  
16 again, having dealt with these situations in the  
17 classroom, I think there's a very different  
18 perspective from what I read here from sort of my  
19 perspective than the professor trying to deal with  
20 this situation and I just think it would be nice to  
21 have a little bit more of that in this, but I would  
22 like to go back to the actual wording of Joes thing  
23 because what he said was the teaching faculty.

24 I don't know if it got transcribed that way but  
25 teaching faculty, I don't think really describes

♀

75

1 because then you have STS. Is it just STS people?  
2 Is it just, you know, so I would just like to  
3 suggest that somebody be a little clearer as to  
4 who's, you know, who's eligible to serve on the  
5 committee with regard to sort of it could be sort of  
6 somebody who's spending, I don't know, at least 25  
7 percent of their time in the classroom or something  
8 like that as an ELB or something like that as  
9 opposed to just making it a teaching faculty.

10 CHAIR MCCORMICK: So one of the motivations  
11 for this work -- Oh yes, Connie?

12 MS. WOOD: Is the intent here to restrict it  
13 to regular and special title series?

14 MS. DEBSKI: Regular, so I would -- so I  
15 thought of that but then the thing is I wouldn't  
16 want to exclude lecturers.



17 MS. WOOD: Oh, I just thought lecturers are  
18 for -- no they're not.

19 MS. MOHR-SCHROEDER: No, they're not. No  
20 they're not.

21 MS. WOOD: No, they're not. Well, you could  
22 throw in lecturers,

23 (Group conversation)

24 CHAIR MCCORMICK: So, Joe? Do you want to say  
25 it again, the amendment and well get a second?

‡

76

1 MR. MCGILLIS: I guess I should've written it  
2 down.

3 SECRETARY BROTHERS: The motion was to  
4 recommend adding four positions of teaching faculty  
5 to the Community of Concern, but there's no language  
6 about a pool. So recommend adding four positions.

7 MR. FIDELIS: A pool of four.

8 CHAIR MCCORMICK: A pool of four.

9 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Okay.

10 MR. FIDELIS: And the title series they just  
11 said was 25 percent -- did you commit to that?

12 MS. MOHR-SCHROEDER: You don't need the 25  
13 percent teaching faculty, you can just have regular  
14 or special titles series; faculty and lecturers.

15 MR. FIDELIS: And lecturers.

16 MS. MOHR-SCHROEDER: That will do it.

17 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Okay. All right. Jennifer?

18 MS. BIRD-POLLAN: Well, there are other  
19 people, I mean, there are special title series in  
20 faculty in our campus that have significant teaching

21 responsibilities so I'm not sure why were dividing  
22 them.

23 MS. DEBSKI: Yeah. Okay. So Roger was just  
24 saying to maybe just the teaching DOE, a current  
25 teaching DOE.

♀

77

1 CHAIR MCCORMICK: And you don't care how much  
2 of their DOE?

3 MS. DEBSKI: No, I don't think.

4 CHAIR MCCORMICK: All right. Scott?

5 MR. YOST: I'm just curious. When you have  
6 these six or seven different categories, University  
7 Counseling Center, could there be more than one  
8 person from the University Counseling Center? I  
9 know, is this already a pool set up on these bullets  
10 or is that, are you talking one person from the  
11 Counseling Service and one person from -- but they  
12 can then pull whoever?

13 MR. KEHRWALD: So typically we try to keep  
14 the attendance regular, but again if someone can't  
15 attend the meeting, they might have a back-up so you  
16 might have sort of a primary person. You might  
17 simultaneously train a back-up.

18 Some offices, like depending on who you need,  
19 might just send both representatives just because  
20 that's a heavy week and they're involved in  
21 different types of situations. So there's no one  
22 way to answer that question, but typically you had  
23 talked about probably at least one primary designee  
24 and then at least a secondary or alternate designee  
25 if that person is not going to be available.

1 MR. YOST: I'm just trying to get  
2 clarification because if these could be one person  
3 or more than one if we put in there four faculty,  
4 then it's kind of doing a different way in here than  
5 what you have.

6 MR. KEHRWALD: Well, and part of the reason I  
7 think Marcy made this earlier point, part of the  
8 reason we didn't want to put it in specific numbers  
9 or positions is because again that, that can change  
10 or vary like I said, based on their availability and  
11 or people leave.

12 MS. HAPKE: It's a three-year appointment. It  
13 says on number A4 --

14 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Sorry, name please?

15 MS. HAPKE: Excuse me. Holly Hapke. On number  
16 A.4 it says a three year staggering appointment. So  
17 you're defining their role.

18 MR. KEHRWALD: Yeah, in this new AR that's  
19 right, they would have a three year appointment.  
20 So, I mean, I'd have to go back and think about -- I  
21 don't know that -- when -- upon drafting whether  
22 there was any thought given to the number for each  
23 respective office. I think to answer your  
24 questions.

25 CHAIR MCCORMICK: All right. So, . . .

1 MS. VISONA: This might be an amendment too.

2 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Name please?

3 MS. VISONA: Moni ca Vi sona, Col lege of Fi ne  
4 Arts. What about just putting another dot. You  
5 have somebody, if -- many of the representatives in  
6 following areas and then just put dot that you have  
7 teachi ng facul ty?

8 CHAIR MCCORMICK: I like it.

9 MS. VISONA: Or facul ty wi th DOE.

10 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Yeah, and then the number  
11 coul d be.

12 MS. WOOD: Point of order: at this point  
13 were endorsi ng an AR that is already bei ng presented  
14 to us. In our recommendati on, what we can do is  
15 recommend -- we endorse subject to the inclusi on of  
16 blah, okay?

17 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Yes.

18 MS. PORTER: I thi nk that's the more  
19 appropri ate way to do thi s.

20 MS. SEAGO: Circli ng back, woul d the dot in  
21 teachi ng facul ty answer the point about the pool for  
22 the fi rst amendme nt?

23 MR. MCGILLIS: Well, my concern now, was that  
24 somebody that just raised was the staggeri ng three  
25 year appointme nts and to me that's not quite

♀

80

1 consist ent wi th what you're sayi ng about peopl e  
2 bei ng drawn from these vari ous offi ces.

3 The fact that there's a staggered three year  
4 appointme nt woul d suggest to me that there is one  
5 person from each of these servi ces appointe d for a  
6 three year peri od. So again, I don't have a probl em  
7 wi th that but it's not consist ent wi th what you are

8 saying.

9 MR. KEHRWALD: I think we would still do that  
10 but like I said, we would probably -- the danger is,  
11 like I said, when people are out. You're probably  
12 also simultaneously training.

13 MR. MCGILLIS: Well, say for example the  
14 University Police Department, you know, would you  
15 have one member who's appointed for a three year  
16 term and then have somebody that would come in and  
17 substitute or,...

18 MR. KEHRWALD: We would have someone who's  
19 there on a regular basis like we do right now. But,  
20 occasionally, like two weeks ago we had that person  
21 sent a representative from that respective area

22 MR. MCGILLIS: Okay. What was that suggestion  
23 again?

24 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Well, because, I'm sorry  
25 I forgot your name.

‡

81

1 MS. VISONA: Monica Visona, College of Fine  
2 Arts.

3 MS. SEAGO: Yeah, sorry. She was asking  
4 about making the suggestion that we just add the dot  
5 in that teaching faculty be included in more or less  
6 the details be worked out later and now -- so I was  
7 asking the question to you, if that's acceptable for  
8 your amendment or do you want to proceed with  
9 crafting the language for more, your more specific  
10 one of a pool of four faculty?

11 MR. MCGILLIS: I think I would be more

12 comfortable with a specific pool, or specific  
13 faculty who were appointed to essentially rotate or  
14 be available.

15 MS. SEAGO: Wait a minute. So that would be,  
16 so then, and Connie's point was well taken is that  
17 were endorsing this and then recommending --

18 MR. MCGILLIS: Recommending.

19 SECRETARY BROTHERS: That --

20 MR. MCGILLIS: Yeah, essentially what I meant  
21 in the first place was to do.

22 CHAIR MCCORMICK: All right. So were going  
23 to vote on endorsing this policy with a  
24 recommendation that he can entertain, I guess,  
25 determine how this might work in the future.

♀

82

1 MR. MCGILLIS: With additional faculty  
2 representation.

3 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Right. With additional.  
4 Jennifer?

5 MS. BIRD-POLLAN: Jennifer Bird-Pollan,  
6 College of Health. If we vote no, now on this, you  
7 could still vote on endorsing the AR the way it  
8 stands? The way it was proposed to us because all  
9 were voting on right now is Joe's amendment?

10 MS. SEAGO: Yes.

11 CHAIR MCCORMICK: I thought we were endorsing  
12 the policy.

13 MS. SEAGO: Well, we have to vote on the  
14 acceptance of the amendment before we can vote on  
15 the policy because the amendment filed -- the  
16 amendment occurs first and then the policy.

17 CHAIR MCCORMICK: All right.

18 MS. SEAGO: So we were -- I guess we were just  
19 clarifying where Joes amendment was headed.

20 CHAIR MCCORMICK: All right. So the amendment  
21 is, read it for us, Sheila.

22 SECRETARY BROTHERS: The amendment is the  
23 recommendation to add a pool of four positions of  
24 faculty from the regular title series, special title  
25 series or lecture title series, to the Community of

‡

83

1 Concern.

2 CHAIR MCCORMICK: All right. All in favor? Oh  
3 sorry. It was not title series.

4 MR. YOST: Did we not do away with the title  
5 series and make it DOE?

6 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Well, I need to hear that  
7 from the proposer. So. Okay, so what is the  
8 language now then? A pool of four positions of  
9 faculty?

10 MR. MCGILLIS: A representative of DOE of  
11 teaching.

12 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Okay. So just to make  
13 sure. A recommendation to add a pool of four  
14 positions of faculty with the DOE that includes  
15 teaching to the Community of Concern.

16 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Joe, who was your second?

17 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Ted Fiedler.

18 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Ted, is that agreeable to  
19 you?

20 MR. FIEDLER: Yes.

21 CHAIR MCCORMICK: All right. Okay. Now.  
22 Sheila would you read that again?  
23 SECRETARY BROTHERS: A motion to -- an  
24 amendment to the motion to include a recommendation  
25 to add a pool of four positions of faculty with the

♀

84

1 DOE that includes teaching to the Community of  
2 Concern.

3 CHAIR MCCORMICK: All in favor?

4 MR. FIDELIS: Show of hands on that?

5 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Show of hands please. All  
6 right. All opposed?

7 SECRETARY BROTHERS: I'm sorry, opposed  
8 are,...

9 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Three.

10 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Jennifer. I'm sorry  
11 your name please?

12 MR. DONAHUE: Kevin Donahue.

13 SECRETARY BROTHERS: I'm sorry?

14 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Okay. Motion passes. All  
15 right. Now, we're going to vote on the endorsement  
16 of AR4.11 which is the establishment of the  
17 Community of Concern is (coughing) the proposed  
18 changes to Administrative Regulation 4.11 and you  
19 had that --

20 SECRETARY BROTHERS: With the amendment.

21 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Right. With the amendment,  
22 thank you.

23 SECRETARY BROTHERS: As amended.

24 CHAIR MCCORMICK: As amended. All right.

25 Thank you Catherine. All right. So that passes.



1 So, the second part is the Administrative Regulation  
2 that deals with Involuntary Medical Withdrawal  
3 Policy. One of the things that Nick shared with you  
4 is that we don't have a policy so currently we are  
5 doing this kind of as, as the need arises and so  
6 there are very few of these. Probably -- do we have  
7 any this year?

8 MR. KEHRWALD: No.

9 CHAIR MCCORMICK: We've had four across the  
10 time.

11 MR. KEHRWALD: Six years.

12 CHAIR MCCORMICK: In six years. So these are  
13 very -- don't happen very often but we need a  
14 policy. So, any other -- any questions regarding  
15 this? Yes, Connie.

16 MS. WOOD: My question has to do with Roman  
17 Numeral 6. B. 1.

18 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Okay.

19 MS. WOOD: This is the section on appeal for  
20 when a student that has been required to take an  
21 involuntary medical withdrawal. The AR seems to  
22 state that the appeals board in this case there's a  
23 set of retroactive, a withdrawal appeals committee  
24 which usually deals with issues that are ex-factors.

25 This is -- I assume that this is something that

1 can arise during a semester and therefore what is  
2 the relationship -- I just want to clarify that the

3 student also has a right to appeal to the University  
4 Appeals Board.

5 MS. DEATON: Correct. This is not in this.  
6 Yes, the University Appeals Board is going to hear  
7 student discipline cases and a student who alleges a  
8 violation to Rights. So the only time a student in  
9 this situation could appeal to the UAB would be if  
10 they were alleging somehow their Rights were  
11 violated. It wouldn't typically go there because  
12 this is not considered disciplinary action.

13 MS. WOOD: Right. But they still would have  
14 access to the UAB.

15 MS. DEATON: If they alleged that that their  
16 student Rights had been violated.

17 MS. WOOD: Okay.

18 MR. KEHRWARD: Yes.

19 MS. DEATON: Which are defined by the  
20 Governing Reg for what student Rights that would  
21 included. You know not my Right to wear a U of L  
22 shirt. It's the Rights in the Regs.

23 MS. WOOD: There's the issue of the assignment  
24 of grades.

25 MS. DEATON: Well, any of the -- that's why we

♀

87

1 left it as general as we did at the time. Davie  
2 wrote the first part as may be otherwise provided by  
3 GR11 and then I added on regarding violation of  
4 student rights, but the main thing -- but anything  
5 related, they would be having a separate appeal.  
6 This appeal is only about Involuntary --

7 MS. WOOD: Oh, okay.

8 MS. DEATON: -- Medical.

9 MS. WOOD: All right. I'm sorry. I mean, I  
10 missed that.

11 MS. DEATON: They can appeal separately if  
12 they think their Rights are violated or anything  
13 about the grades. This is just the limited issue of  
14 I don't think I'm a student who this should be  
15 imposed upon me or I've applied to come back in and  
16 I have not been allowed back in. So that's what  
17 this is about.

18 MS. WOOD: Okay.

19 CHAIR MCCORMICK: And the RWA is willing to do  
20 this and because we feel that it cant go back to  
21 this for people since they've already made the  
22 decision that would be inappropriate and so that  
23 committee was reasonably familiar with this type of  
24 stuff. Any other questions? Elizabeth?

25 MS. DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A&S. I'm just  
♀

88

1 wondering is it defined anywhere? And so you've  
2 talked about a professor having control of the  
3 classroom. Under what kind of circumstances could a  
4 professor ask to have a student removed from the  
5 classroom? Is it only with a direct threat?

6 MR. KEHRWALD: You know there's a -- we have  
7 a definition within our Student Code but I know both  
8 of our Community of Concern has worked with SELF, as  
9 well as the Academic Ombud to sort of create a  
10 guide.

11 The parameters are actually much broader than

12 that and I'll be honest, I can't think of them all  
13 off the top of our head, but you know, faculty can  
14 set parameters on the conditions of their classroom  
15 on a whole list of things, right? Whether it's the  
16 use of tech -- some form of technology or you know  
17 even something to the effect of you know here's an  
18 example eating food in class.

19 You know, if those kinds of things are outlined  
20 in the syllabus and the instructor is quite clear on  
21 that that's not allowed and is you know not  
22 permitted it could be considered disruptive to the  
23 other students. The faculty member is well within  
24 their rights to have the student removed for those  
25 kinds of things as well.

♀

89

1 MS. DEBSKI: Well, then I guess I'm wondering  
2 that doesn't really take care of a mental illness  
3 kind of issue, but you can't really anticipate as  
4 using their cell phone and write on the syllabus so  
5 can you remove the student for issues that you  
6 haven't put on the syllabus that are not so explicit  
7 as a direct threat?

8 MR. KEHRWALD: Yeah, without going too far in  
9 the weeds I think you know, again, I'm not trying to  
10 be evasive, but I think it's really going to depend  
11 on what that is and how -- it depends on what the  
12 student is presenting with. That's a hard question  
13 to sort of answer in general.

14 MS. DEBSKI: So you would come to your  
15 committee to get that answered? Where will the  
16 professor go?

17 MR. KEHRWALD: Yeah. I mean, it's --it would  
18 get -- you could certainly submit it as a behavior  
19 alert. One of the things we would commonly do right  
20 now is review it and we would also review it with  
21 the Academic Ombud to sort of say what are the  
22 options here in terms --

23 MS. DEBSKI: Yeah, but again, the student  
24 isn't, you know, complying with any of what's said.  
25 When should we expect it then again there was a very

‡

90

1 good kind of, I think, outline of what steps the  
2 student would have to take, you know in order to not  
3 undergo this medical withdrawal. I'm wondering how  
4 that transfers down to the classroom, to the  
5 individual classrooms.

6 MR. KEHRWALD: So occasionally we give  
7 directives to students and if students don't follow  
8 them then that's -- some of those cases -- those are  
9 examples of issues that we'll then forward to our  
10 Office of Student Conduct to address. It's, doing a  
11 system of works. A student repeatedly shows an  
12 inability to comply with certain things then we'll  
13 forward to our Office of Student Conduct.

14 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Mark?

15 MR. LAURSDORF: Question I want to point out.

16 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Name please.

17 MR. LAURSDORF: Mark LAURSDORF, A&S. Question  
18 on the point of order given the low count on the  
19 most recent votes and the continuing trickle of  
20 exodus, where do we stand on quorum?

21 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Well, I would suggest you  
22 take a vote and see if you have forty-six -- I  
23 think. Don't quote me on that.

24 MR. LAURSDORF: Yeah, I'd say based on the low  
25 count on the last vote.

♀

91

1 SECRETARY BROTHERS: A quorum stands until  
2 someone questions it. So the vote on the last one  
3 counts but this one will be checked. (LAUGHTER)

4 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Any other discussion?

5 MS. SEAGO: Well, we need to assess whether  
6 there are forty-six voting people present.

7 CHAIR MCCORMICK: All right. So I guess we'll  
8 do that by --

9 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Forty-- I'm sorry,  
10 forty-five is a quorum. So I think you can take a  
11 vote and if you don't have a quorum then you'll  
12 know.

13 CHAIR MCCORMICK: All right. This is the  
14 proposed changes to Administration Regulation 4.12.

15 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Are you ready?

16 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Yeah.

17 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Catherine do you want to  
18 vote?

19 MS. SEAGO: Oh yes, I can vote. (LAUGHTER)

20 SECRETARY BROTHERS: Motion fails for lack of  
21 a quorum.

22 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Motion fails.

23 MS. SEAGO: Because he called for the  
24 question, he called for quorum and that is not  
25 present in the room any more.

♀

1 CHAIR MCCORMICK: This is an opportunity to  
2 raise any issues that were not part of the agenda.

3 UNIDENTIFIED: Can we adjourn?

4 CHAIR MCCORMICK: Well, this is the  
5 opportunity to vote for adjournment. The motion to  
6 adjourn. All in favor. Thanks

7 (WHEREUPON, the University Of Kentucky Senate  
8 Hearing concludes at 5:00 p.m.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

♀

1 CERTIFICATE

2 STATE OF KENTUCKY )

3 COUNTY OF OLDHAM )

4

5 I, BRENDA YANKEY, the undersigned Court Reporter and  
6 Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky At  
7 Large, certify that the facts stated in the caption  
8 hereto are true, that at the time and place stated  
9 in said caption, that said proceedings were taken  
10 down in stenotype by me and later reduced to type  
11 writing, and the foregoing is a true record of the  
12 proceedings given by said parties hereto and that I  
13 have no interest in the outcome of the captioned  
14 matter.

15 My commission expires: January 31, 2020.

16 IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I hereunto set my hand and  
17 seal of office on this day May 26, 2017.  
18 Crestwood, Oldham County, Kentucky.

19

20

21

22 BRENDA YANKEY, NOTARY PUBLIC  
23 STATE AT LARGE, KENTUCKY  
24 NOTARY ID #546481

24

25

♀