UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *   * * * *

November 8, 2010

3:00 P.M.

* * * *   * * * *

SENATE COUNCIL OFFICE

AUDITORIUM OF THE W.T. YOUNG LIBRARY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

* * * *   * * * *

HOLLIE SWANSON, CHAIR

DEBRA ANDERSON, VICE-CHAIR

CATHERINE SEAGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

LISA E. HOINKE, COURT REPORTER

* * * *   * * * *   CHAIR: Good afternoon. Welcome everyone
to our November 8 meeting. Thanks for
coming. We have over 50 members here, so we
are at forum.
          Please, here's our reminder to give
your name and affiliation when you speak;
communicate with your constituencies; attend
meetings; respond to emails and web postings
as appropriate; and finally, acknowledge and
respect others and external guests; and
silence cell phones and beepers. Thank you.
          We have a few announcements, but
first we need to approve the minutes, and our

first motion is required to allow approval of the minutes, and the addition QEP to the Senate agenda.

So what happened, if you remember, on Monday, before our Senate meeting last week at Senate Council, is when we approved our agenda but in the meantime we had a request to add the QEP.

So quickly, do we have a motion to the recommendation that the Senate move to waive SR 1.2.3. so that the minutes from October can be considered and the QEP agenda item added?

Could I have a motion, please?

FINKEL: Raphael Finkel, College of Engineering.

I so move.

CHAIR: Thank you. Do we have a second?

D'ORAZIO: Second, John D'orazio.

CHAIR: All in favor?

Opposed?

Abstain?

Motion carries. Thank you.

We have the minutes from October 11 that were distributed on Thursday, November the 4th, and could we have a motion that they be approved?

FINKEL: Raphael Finkel, College of Engineering.

I so move.

CHAIR: May I have a second, please?

WASILKOWSKI: Greg Wasilkowski, College of Engineering.

Second.

CHAIR: All in favor?

Opposed?

Abstain?

Motion carries. Thank you.

We have a chat with the Provost, and this is an initiative that was indicated by Jann Burks our staff senate chair.

We're trying to have several series of these types of chats with different individuals. If you have suggestions for others that you would like to see, please let us know.

The chat with the Provost will occur November the 12th from 12:30 to 1:30 in the Student Center in Room 230. This is an open meeting. Whatever is on your mind as we chat. The next chat that we have lined up is with JJ Jackson, December the 3rd from 12:00 to 12:50, and this will be at the Wethington Building, Room 014. We're tying to move it

from different parts of the campus.

So if you all have ideas for the spring, email Sheila or I.

We finally accomplished the meeting of our Inaugural Senate Committee. Many thanks to all of you who have participated. I really enjoyed meeting you, getting to know a number of the issues. I particularly want to thank the Chair that stepped up.

Just a reminder then, what we're asking of these committees is to give reports and we'll incorporate that into a State of the University Address from the faculty's perspective, and that's going to be held during our April 12th, 2011 Senate meeting.

We've also formed a 2010 and 2011 Reinstatement Committee, and that's composed by myself, our student representative, Kyle Kirk, and Bob Grossman. We heard some of our first cases earlier this week.

Our Senate Council elections are in late fall. The nominating rounds will be start on November the 29th until December the 3rd. The voting round will then be from December the 13th through the 17th.

And let me just point something out to you. And I know this is not in the Senate rules, Davy. My personal perspective, when you think about the Senate Council, what you should be thinking is an executive body that represents the University.

And so let me ask you a question: Is there a particular college that perhaps may be over represented? And just to help you out I highlighted it was medicine.

It really helps if we get it better diversity from the campus as we try to select committee compositions and we look through the different issues. And so, you know, for example, the humanities, I think, need to be better represented.

And the other thing I -- I started to recognize as we go through a number of your conversations and as I looked around the table, I asked, how many of these people are scientist? And I would reckon that most of us are scientist. Do you want a bunch scientists making these decisions?

So please keep that in mind as we move forward with the nominations.

We also need to keep in mind that we need our final grades submitted within 72 hours of the end of the final exam; not, as I guess, I do, the Monday after the end of

finals week. And the reason this is important is because many of our staff who are busy incorporating these final grades find themselves in unheated buildings the day before Christmas. And so out of respect for these individuals let's please abide by that.

We're also in the process of asking for nominees of committees to perform summative evaluations for the Dean of the Graduate School and the Dean of Engineering. Now, those have to be individuals who are within those colleges. So if you have ideas or recommendations, please move those forward.

Second, we have a Memorial Resolution for the College of Pharmacy, Professor Thomas Scott Foster. Dan Wermeling will present this.

WERMELING: Dear Senators and faculty and colleagues. On behalf of the College of Pharmacy, faculty and students, it's my privilege to offer a motion and Memorial Resolution on behalf of Dr. Thomas Scott Foster's 40 years of service to the faculty of the University and to the teaching of our students and to our profession in pharmacy.

And so with your indulgence I would like to read the resolution into the record.

Thomas Scott Foster departed this life on October 14, 2010 following a brief illness. He is survived by his wife Marijo, a daughter Megan (David) Sullivan of the Isle of Guernsey, UK, and a son Scott (Courtney) of Ocean City, NJ, three grandchildren in Guernsey and three grandchildren in Ocean City.

Tom was a 1970 graduate of the State University of New York at Buffalo School of Pharmacy with a B.S. Pharm. degree and the University of Kentucky College of Pharmacy with the Doctor of Pharmacy degree in 1973. He also completed a pharmacy practice residency at UK in the same year. He then embarked on a highly successful career as a clinical practitioner and academician at the University of Kentucky. Joining the faculty of the UK College of Pharmacy as an Assistant Professor, he quickly rose through the professorial ranks to be Professor of Pharmacy. He continued to be active in teaching, research and service roles at UK until shortly before his passing.

He also held joint faculty appointments as Professor in the UK College

of Medicine, Department of Anesthesiology, and the UK College of Public Health, Department of Health Services Management.

He served the College of Pharmacy at UK in administrative roles as a Division Director. He also served UK as Executive Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board for over twenty years.

His teaching focused on pharmacotherapeutics, pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics and computer applications in health care delivery. An animated and engaging lecturer, he had a unique ability to motivate students to achieve more than they thought they could. He was an early leader in developing educational initiatives in clinical pharmacy in internal medicine and critical care medicine.

He led programs of multidisciplinary clinical pharmacology research involving investigational drugs and drug administration systems. Those efforts facilitated the development of numerous human pharmaceutical and biopharmaceutical products to improve the health of Americans and others around the world.

His service to professional organizations was highly noteworthy. He served as Chair of the Section of Teachers of Clinical Pharmacy of the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy. He was the founding Vice Chair of the Board of Pharmaceutical Specialities of the American Pharmacists Association, the credentialing board for Specialists in pharmacy practice. The Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education regularly enlisted him to serve as a member of accreditation site visit committees. He contributed to composing national licensure examinations for pharmacists. He enjoyed many roles with the United States Pharmacopeial Convention, the national body that establishes standards for medications distributed within the U.S. This year he received the Beal Award for Distinguished Volunteer Service to the U.S.P., the highest award of that important non-governmental standards agency.

He was a pioneer in using his pharmacy knowledge to address drug product selection issues for the benefit of the public in Kentucky, ultimately chairing Kentucky's Drug Formulary Council and Drug Management Review Board. He was appointed to

the Kentucky Board of Pharmacy, the licensure agency for pharmacists, and chaired the group. He served as a consultant to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration as well as to the Office of Human Research Protection of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

His achievements were recognized by his peers through election to fellowship in the American Pharmacists Association, American College of Clinical Pharmacy, and American College of Clinical Pharmacology.

Tom was a man of many talents, a man of many friends. His number of friends was almost matched by his number of bowties, his sartorial signature.

An avid sailor, he was happiest when with his grandchildren sailing on Seneca Lake in New York's Finger Lakes Region where his family and a summer home. Two Airedales, aptly named, Commander and Chief, were his constant companions.

And with this I move that this resolution be made a part of the minutes of the University Senate and that a copy of this resolution be provided to his family.

CHAIR: May I have a motion (unintelligible) --

STEINER: Shelly Steiner, Biology. So moved.

ARNOLD: Susanne Arnold, second.

CHAIR: Thank you.
Could we observe a moment of silence in honor of Tom?
(MOMENT OF SILENCE)

CHAIR: Thank you.
Could we have a vote on the motion please?
All in favor?
Opposed?
Abstain?
Motion carries. Thank you.
Now, officer reports. Chair report.
I'd like to bring to your attention that a discussion has been initiated at the Senate Council by the Provost, please follow the link.
The discussion is concerning what is the role and nature of centers, institutes and multi-disciplinary instructional programs?
How do these kinds of educational units and their faculties relate to

departments, schools and colleges?

What is our process? Now, we've been refining our process for the last month. Our intent is to soon broaden this discussion to involve the entire academic university community.

All college faculties and their Faculty Councils will be asked for feedback on how these issues will impact their colleges and the University.

At the final stage, all college faculties and Faculty Councils will be asked for their vote to endorse any possible changes that ensue following these discussions.

Any change in policy will be presented to the Board of Trustees for final approval.

Parliamentarian, Kate Seago.

SEAGO: I've mentioned motions before about the general rules and what I want to just mention today is that one of our agenda items is going to be an exception and as part of our Senate Rules that we have an exception is that when the Senate Council deems an item of certain importance it actually comes -- goes over two meetings.

One meeting is for a discussion only, which is what will take place today, and then at the next meeting you will actually be entertaining the motion and going through the actual steps of approving the motion and then the amendment to that motion that the body wishes.

So I just wanted to bring you all to that attention. I also want to mention because it is -- the issue is somewhat involved so you may not think of it during the discussion period. During the two -- the space between the two meetings, if you think of a possible amendment one you can submit it in writing to the Senate Council. The conditions are that it be two -- two Senators submitting the amendments and then that will be considered at the next meeting.

The approval of the new general ed curriculum is what the discussion -- it's only going to be up for discussion only during this meeting and no vote will be taken during this meeting about the motion or amendments, and it will be hopefully on the agenda during the next meeting for actual action.

And amendments maybe submitted

between the meetings, basically, require two Senators to agree and if you could please put it in writing that is most useful. Emails, I believe, will count as writing, and the amendments obviously would come out with the next agenda.

CHAIR: Our fourth item is our Committee Reports. We have the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee 2009-2010 annual report from Dr. Tom Nieman. Tom? Is Tom here? I guess not.

All right. We will move on to the update on the Presidential Search Committee. I've asked Professor Shelly Steiner and Lee Meyer to take turns to keep us updated and so first will be Shelly Steiner.

STEINER: So there's been a single meeting of the Presidential Search Committee and now try to relate to you what was done. First of all, the first part of the meeting was we signed a confidentiality agreement swearing on our next born not to say anything, but we can kind of report what's gone on in open meeting and the time frame, the kinds of the things that's going on.

First of all, this is the Board of Trustees' Members of the Search Committee, Jim Stuckert is Chairman and the rest you can read.

Britt Brockman, who's the Chairman of the Board of Trustee, is an ex officio member of the Search Committee. I wasn't aware of that; it's not listed but, you know, it's -- anyway, that's what it is. Alumni representative is Myra Tobin, the faculty members, myself, Hollie Swanson and Lee Myer for you that don't know.

The staff member is Bart Miller -- I'm sorry?

JONES: Shelly?

STEINER: Yes.

JONES: Question. Is that ex officio non-voting?

STEINER: Non-voting ex officio, yes. That's correct.

JONES: Sorry. Thank you very much.

STEINER: This is the site that we will get you to some of the information on the Presidential Search Committee.

So, meetings are both open and closed sessions. We met -- we met in open session to introduce ourselves to one another, to discuss the confidentiality report, which was very heavily emphasized.

The concerns basically about chasing prospective candidates away.

The main business of the day was done in closed session, was to review requests for proposals from various executive search firms. The next meeting will be -- will be interviews of firms (unintelligible) and basically -- even though the search firm -- the search firm will be in charge of the search in some ways, to get a candidate, but we seek -- seek names from faculty, the deans who are visiting in this meeting, the latter part of the meeting, were each be requested to give three names of prospective candidates.

So the input -- input from faculty is very important. That input will go through the search committee that'll vet it to see what the person is, but we really -- it would be great to have names and I've -- I've gotten a few names myself which I plan to submit. So hopefully it will be fairly open.

The contract for this firm or firms will be signed on December 1. That's the time frame of trying to go through question firm or firms and -- and make a decision by December 1st.

Following the period of closed session, we went back in open session and the deans were -- all the deans were invited to come to the -- to that op -- second open session meeting in which they -- they expressed their -- what they thought would be best -- best attributes of a -- of a new president, and I might add we're having sessions, another one tomorrow 4:00 to 5:30 at the Student Union to discuss -- have open discussions regarding the impressions of what -- what people think should be a good president, the qualities of a good president. We're taking notes, we'll correlate those notes and send them out to everybody.

Yes?

DEBSKI: Who is attending? Just you and the faculty representatives of the Search Committee or --

SHEILA: Name, please?

STEINER: No, this inviting -- inviting the whole faculty.

DEBSKI: No, no, no, I -- Liz Debski, Biology.

I -- I know the faculty are invited. I'm wondering what members of the

Search Committee --

STEINER: Oh, I -- certainly I'm there --

DEBSKI: Yeah.

STEINER: -- as the chair and --

DEBSKI: But just faculty representatives?

STEINER: Yeah. We've invited -- we invited the Board of Trustees members, and they -- they indicated that they're expecting us to bring the message. So it's an open meeting. It's a friendly open kind of thing.

Yes.

CHAIR: Well, let me just clarify, too, one of the thing -- points that we were confused about is that after this (unintelligible), you know, what kind of person we would look for. That initial decision is by the Board of Trustees, and so we wanted to have these meetings so we could inform our representatives to the Board of Trustees, Joe Peek and Everett.

STEINER: And we would bring the information -- there -- at least one member of the Search Committee there took -- took notes, and it was to bring points of view from -- from the faculty.

Some of them are good. Today we a meeting kind of reiterating -- were good -- gave -- gave some -- had some very good points. I think would -- would carry weight if it were -- they're not just from me but you, faculty -- in terms of faculty.

Anyway, opinions vary from the various deans. Most -- the mo -- we had new deans -- we have a bunch of new deans that have come here, and they expressed that what -- what attracted them to UK was really a forward -- forward-looking attitude, was one after the other, so I guess it must be there, I -- I guess. But that was their impression.

And -- and that's a good carryover if we're trying to hire somebody. We will have to sell this person to the Uni -- you know, sell this person to the University, and so I think this is a -- that sounds like a pretty good start.

This is basically the proposed timeline for -- for the search. Basically, December 1st to January 1st, national advertising finalized; February, forward recommendations of semi-finalists to search firm for targeted reviews; March, off-campus interviews of semi-finalists; April, determination of finalists; also in April, interviews -- on-campus interview of

finalists; and then -- we're trying to extend an offer by May 1st.

However, there is a plan B. In case there are no qualified candidates, we would -- there -- there will basically be -- be an interim president for -- for as short a period as we -- we can, and -- and the search will begin again.

So, that -- that's about what we covered at the meeting. I don't think there's anything else.

Are there any questions that we --

Yes?

ROHR: Which pool would the interim --

SHEILA: Name, please?

ROHR: Jurgen Rohr, Pharmacy.

Which pool would the interim candidate come from? I mean, would --

STEINER: It likely would be --

ROHR: -- we have (unintelligible) --

STEINER: -- (unintelligible) if it's an interim, I have no idea. It hasn't been decided, but this is only if the search crashes, there is a, you know, a backup position that we don't have to go -- we don't have to go beyond where we want to go in terms of quality of the president. There's been no -- no discussion to the nature of that.

Yeah.

BLONDER: Lee Blonder, College of Medicine. I read in the Herald-Leader that we're competing with a number of land-grant universities for a new president. Are you at liberty to tell us a little bit about who we're competing with?

STEINER: If I can remember them. I'm -- I'm sure I'm going to (unintelligible). It's against U-Mass, U-Conn, U-Wisconsin is it or U --

CHAIR: Minnesota.

STEINER: -- U-Minnesota, those are the big ones --

CHAIR: Maine.

STEINER: University of Maine, there were seven --

CHAIR: Washington.

STEINER: Washington --

CHAIR: Washington.

STEINER: University of Washington. But these are -- we know there are -- those -- those were the biggest, but there were two other good-size universities.

(MULTIPLE PEOPLE TALKING)

STEINER: University of Tennessee has
        completed their's, and there were two others
        that were... Does anybody else know?
        Anyway, you're right. That's a good --
        that's a great question. So that's part of
        the issue, is the competition.
                Yes?
JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology.
                Shelly, has -- has the Board made
        any discussions about whether they are
        looking for only external candidates as
        opposed to internal candidates?
STEINER: Only -- no decision has been made,
        but I -- you know, the search firm is in
        charge, and I don't think they will eliminate
        -- I don't think anybody's eliminated at this
        time. It just has started, the first
        meeting.
CHAIR: Thank you.
                I'd like to welcome you to a
        sighting on Friday afternoon, Shelly Steiner
        in a suit and jacket and tie.
                Our fifth agenda item is UK's
        December 2010 degree list. There were a
        handful of students that were removed from
        the first time that we saw this and at least
        one name correction has been made. So if you
        could please take a look at that, one degree
        type has changed.
                The motion on the table, it's
        recommended that the elected faculty senators
        approve the December 2010 list of degree
        candidates for submission through the
        President to the Board of Trustees, as the
        recommended degrees to be conferred by the
        Board.
                Could I have a motion, please?
JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology.
                So moved.
CHAIR: Second?
ROHR: Jurgen Rohr, Pharmacy.
                Second.
CHAIR: All in favor?
                Opposed?
                Abstain?
                Motion carries. Thank you.
                All right. Agenda item No. 7.
                Mike?
MULLEN: Hollie, the -- the item should be
        approval of implementation of the general
        education program not approval of the general
        education curriculum.
CHAIR: Okay.
MULLEN: Curriculum is

(unintelligible/inaudible)....

CHAIR: Okay. Do I have to -- does everybody understand what Mike said? Instead of approval of the implementation of the new gen ed curriculum, it is -- this is our first reading. So let me emphasize what Kate has already told us, this is the first reading and the purpose of our first reading -- she's going to add the actual motion.

Thank you, Mike.

So the first reading, what we're -- the -- the intent is to get as many questions that are on the table out there so that we can discuss them in the interim and then we will revisit the issue in December.

This is a motion we will be considering to vote on in December. Okay? So let's get into the issue. For the background: In 2009, the final readings of the recommended course templates was approved by the University Senate with the following provisions: That the Senate must be satisfied that all necessary resources, etc. are available for a new Gen Ed with attention paid to a tenative implementation date of Fall 2011.

The Senate Council expects that the process for forming a group to vet proposed Gen Ed courses will be approved by the Senate.

In May 2010: We sought establishment of the Interim General Education Oversight Committee, and it was approved by the University Senate. This is composed of a core of ten faculty members and ex officios and the intent of this committee is that it will operate from May 17th, 2010 until May 15th, 2012.

So for today's discussion, then, we'll have the financial consideration, projected seats for General Education, course approval process, and assessment.

Associate Provost Mike Mullen will move us through that. Mike?

MULLEN: Thanks, Hollie. Good afternoon, Senators. It's good to see you all here.

When we put this together we knew this date was coming up. We were mindful of the fact that on date, that May meeting, there were two considerations: There was to be sure that we had the financial resources to do the job and to show that we could put together a process that will allow us to evaluate courses and move those courses

through the system and have them ready for a 2011 start date.

And so I want to focus on those that are a bit -- a little bit through here. I'm going to ask Bill Rayens actually to speak as well.

So let's look at the financial considerations first. What we've done here is laid out the amount of money that the Provost has allocated across the various areas of the proposed general education curriculum.

And so you can see what -- what's laid out there, arts and creativity 958,000; humanities 143, and so on for a total -- total allocated amount of 5.3 million dollars estimated over the next two years.

The -- the active budgeting is set up in such a way that we have allocated -- the Provost has allocated 2.6 million of this this academic year, and -- on this line here. And another 2.7 million for the 2011-12 academic year.

And so that -- that's the -- the total outlay; that's the amount that the Provost has been able to -- to put aside through various resources to -- to make sure that we can pull off this -- this curriculum.

And we also, concurrent with that, were looking at the seats that could be made available from various colleges, and these seats vary greatly across the ten areas. If you look at the table that was sent out in your materials, you'll see that the arts and creativity area actually says 3900 seats. We have had some movement just in the last five days -- five or six days, and another -- another 300 seats that -- that have been brought to the table, if you will, for arts and creativity, and we expect that this will be a fluid kind of a happening over the course of the next couple of years.

We don't expect that we'd have 100 percent of all the seats today but that there will be faculty looking at bringing in new courses down the road, other courses as their interest dictates that would fit in to one or more of these areas.

You can see for instance that -- that on the contrast side, natural sciences, there's 9,000 seats up there and, of course, if you think about what's being proposed there are proposals to revise a large number of the 100 level science courses which are in

place and there are a tremendous number of seats in those particular courses already.

Composition and communication one and two. Minimum here at this point, about 4400 seats. And then the global dynamics is the -- the one area also that right now is about 3960 seats, but I think it's interesting, and I've been looking at the most recent submissions of courses in global dynamics. We've received some courses in the last few weeks that are not on the list of courses that we were told would probably be coming up.

So again, let me -- let me impress upon you the fluidity of this process, but I think these numbers are going to increase over time. I'm quite confident that these numbers will increase over time.

And so I -- I tink we've got in place commitments to provide enough seats to make this -- this curriculum move forward.

The course approval process is the other -- the other side of this coin. I'm going back a little bit to last fall. If you recall, we had a call for papers, a call for proposals in the summer of -- May of 2009, and there were some 60 proposals put forth and then we had to come up with a way of actually evaluating those proposals.

And so this body approved a Senate Council proposal to develop seven vetting teams that had six to seven faculty members from across campus on them to evaluate proposals in -- in all four areas of inquiry: in the composition and communication, the quantitative reasoning and in the U.S. citizenship, global dynamics areas.

And those groups were put to work, if you will, in November and worked on through the spring until May of -- of 2010 and did yeoman's work; did a lot of work on behalf of this faculty on behalf of this curriculum.

But we knew when we went into that that that was a temporary solution and part of what we had to do in terms of moving forward with a general education curriculum was to indeed come up with a permanent vetting body, a permanent body that could -- that would be able to carry on this task and that is where the develop of the interim General Education Oversight Committee, lovingly referred to as simply GEOC for ease of rolling off the tongue, and that is a

committee that's composed of ten core faculty and what we did is we -- we recruited a faculty member representing each of the ten areas, the four inquiry areas, the two com and come, the quantitative foundation, the statistical inferential reasoning, U.S. citizenship and global dynamics.

And so the ten core faculty and also a number of ex officios; the Chair of that is -- is Dr. Bill Rayens, and he is ex officio representing the Provost's office. Hollie is also a member, a ex officio voting member. And the registrar, assessment and libraries all have non-voting ex officio members on this committee as well.

And this group has been quite active this summer, and I've asked Bill Rayens to spend a little bit of time bringing you up to date just on how the committee has worked and its actions, and how things are going.

So, Bill, you could come up and address that particular part of the agenda that'd be great.

RAYENS: Thank you. I'll describe a little bit about how the committee is -- or has been functioning. As Mike said, we have ten core faculty and those faculty came together this summer to decide about how they wanted to work.

The first thing we decided we needed to do was to remain very faithful to the templates for the different areas that this body had approved last academic year. And so we decided what we would is come up with sort of a course approval process whereby we had basically approval forms that were reflective of the language in the templates.

And so we worked on those, and we sent those out to the template committee, the original template committee to see if they were happy that we captured the language. When they weren't happy that we captured the language, we revised the language and we sent them out again and they ended up happy that we had captured the language in the original templates.

And so then we constructed these forms and we made them available both to faculty and to the academic deans around campus.

Now, the details of the approval process, we had to come up with some sort of

plan that -- that we thought would be
efficient, that would be fair, that would be_
transparent and then we took that to Senate
Council and Senate Council gave us the one-
year approval for using that process. That
process, you know, both fits the forms that
we're using temporarily, and how we're using
the forms to -- to vet the course. So we
have approval for -- for one year for doing
that.

      Basically how it works, we
constructed a website, Gen Ed website trying
to make this very, very easy for the academic
deans, and there's basically one big button
you push on there, and when you push on that
button it tells exactly what you need to do
in order to get a proposal to the committee.

      And once that proposal goes to the
committee, it's set up automatically to alert
the right people so the proposal gets put in
the right area, then the area experts are
alerted automatically that that proposal is
there and they act basically -- I showed that
-- the ten area experts, they basically act
as associate editors and then they identify
referees -- two referees. The proposal
(unintelligible) is sent out to referees.

      The form that we constructed late
in the summer for a particular area is then
filled out by the referee. It is returned to
the associate editor and then ultimately,
when all is in agreement the -- the results
of that vetting process through a particular
course is brought to the entire committee and
the entire committee votes.

      So we have been busy, you'll see
here, three -- three columns. The 2009 has
vetting approval. We were, of course, not
evolved in. That was what Mike was talking
about the original process, and you see what
GEOC or IGEOC has been doing over in the two
right most columns.

      You can see the proposals that have
been submitted by area, and these are the ten
areas identified in the -- in the General
Education Program; and those are reviewed,
and by reviewed I mean all the way through
the process and on to Undergraduate Council.

      There are many more that are in
various states of -- of review. I wanted to
add that one footnote, you see the asterick
37 of these were submitted on or after
October 1st. The committee really is -- the
committee members, this is not reflection on

me at all, but the ten area experts are really doing a good job. Are any of the ten area experts here?

They're really doing a good job; they're working very hard. Just keep in mind they are just like you, they have full-time lives, full-time jobs with teaching and research and -- and who knows what else but yet they're doing a -- really they're being very attentive to these courses after they come, as are the referees, and they're probably referees in this audience as well who are really taking on this task with -- with good spirt.

And so even though some of these arrived after October 1st, you see we already have 35 that have gone on to Undergraduate Council. So I feel like this process is working. It's working as efficiently as it can work, I think, and have -- and have very busy humans involved in the process.

So Mike now is going to talk a little bit about assessment.

MULLEN: I guess one other point I would add on that approval process is that one member of the IGEOC Committee is also a member of other Undergraduate Council, and that member brings those approved proposals directly to the Undergraduate Council where we then look at those and -- and pass those as quickly as possible. We're trying to keep the process flat so there's not a lot of down time between approval phases. And, indeed, that particular member who is a member of Undergraduate -- is Ruth Beattie here? She's the one we can't do without. She's not here. That's the -- that's the one who's doing double-duty. So, Ruth, if you see her, thank her on my behalf.

The work's very hard to make sure that the curriculum forms, the major change forms, the minor change forms, whatever other materials are there, that the syllabus are being filled by guidelines; so all that's taking place there and that makes it really easy for Undergraduate Council then to look at these courses and -- and make a decision on them.

So it -- it seems to be a very well-oiled machine that -- that Bill has put in place, and -- and seems to be working very well.

The last piece that we threw on here was assessment because this is an issue

that we -- that we really do have to deal
with, and I should point out that GEOC is
also a faculty committee that is tasked with
oversight of the Gen Ed process, will be
playing a role again in -- in assessment and
-- and we have a really good relationship
between the committee and the assessment
office, and so we will -- there's -- there's
a constant mechanism now in place for faculty
input and oversight into the assessment
process.

I wanted to just simply go through
what the proposed process for assessment is
-- is at this point. There's actually a
fully fleshed out draft plan or proposed plan
for assessment at the Gen Ed website for your
-- for you perusal.

If you remember, design principle
seven said we will have a curriculum that is
based on student learning outcomes and those
must be assessed so that we can use the
assessment of student learning outcomes as a
mechanisim by which we continuously improve
the program and make sure that we're not
straying from the initial intent or original
intent of having courses that will match
those student learning outcomes.

So we've done that. You all have
developed four student learning outcomes,
very broad-based student learning outcomes;
we have those in place. Then we have to map
courses to those students learning outcomes.
That happens by -- very naturally in this
particular case, because if you submit a
course for inquiry in humanities it
automatically falls under learning outcome
one which is the learning outcome that's --
that is in place for the inquiry courses.

If you were doing this in your own
curriculum for an entire program, remember
you have to go back and map student learning
outcomes across multiple courses where you
might find that particular (unintelligible).
But in the case of this, it's -- it's pretty
straightforward.

Then we have to in every course
that is -- that is being taught as a Gen Ed
course, we have to have something to assess.
And recall that grades are not assessment in
terms of being used at a -- at a university
level for an entire program. And so what's
being called for is using assessment
terminology as the extraction of authentic
artifact.

Let me rephrase -- as a professor myself let me rephrase that and say this is a graded assignment. It just happens to also address one or more of the -- of the student learning outcomes.

So hopefully there will be at least one, if not more than one, activities, products, papers, other kinds of evidence of -- of proficiency in a course that is graded. And why is it graded? It's graded so students take it seriously and it can then be used in the assessment process outside the course boundaries itself. And those are pulled into a pool, so there will be a pool for the -- for the inquiry area and you'd have -- you would have artifacts from across multiple courses in that pool.

The -- obviously, we're not going to look at all 4,000 or however many artifacts in any given year in a particular area so a stratified random sample is then pulled from those -- from those pools, and a group of evaluators, as -- as yet unnamed, but typically we would be thinking lecturers, faculty members and so forth that would come together to look at groups of about ten of those artifacts using the appropriate rubric. Rubric development will be something that I think the faculty are going to be involved with long term as we revise and assess our own assessment process.

Many of the rubrics that we're starting with are actually from the American Association of Colleges & Universities. They've developed a whole range of rubrics called the VALUE rubrics which are used at a very general level to assess inquiry, critical thinking and those kinds of things, and so it's not looking for, does someone have the right answer in a -- in a sociology paper but how did that person think about sociology in that paper would be the -- the way that that would be used. And so we'll be using those pools of artifacts for evaluation against rubrics.

And then finally the analysis of that data will take place in the Office of Assessment, and essentially that will tell us where do we think we are on a scale of one to four or one to five in a particular area and that data will come back to multiple (unintelligible) the provost office, my office, GEOC will get that data and that will allow us to then bring faculty together to

have discussions about are we -- is that my time limit? Have discussions about are we on track with what we're doing? Are the -- are the -- are the courses meeting the learning outcomes or more importantly are the learning outcomes appropriate? Are we asking the right questions and so forth?

So it's a global view down on what we're doing, not a microscopic view on one course. Indeed, in any one cycle, my course might not even get sampled into the next level that's looked at. So that's -- that's kind of how this will -- will go. Again, the data will then be used to allow us to look at the overall program, make decisions as to are we on the right track? Are we going in the right direction? Do we need to tweak things? And -- and it gives us a mechanism to not stray from what we, as a faculty, said was important to us for this General Education curriculum.

And that was the extent of what I had planned to show as to what we had talked about, and at this point we can have questions, discussion. Dr. Prats?

PRATS: I'm Armando Prats, English Department.

I -- I know that this is a done deal, but can you -- can you define for me -- this is a two-part question. Can you define a seat for me? I mean, what -- what does that mean, seat?

MULLEN: Well, the first part of that is -- is estimates from the college. We have a list of courses that are coming in with estimates of number of seats per course and that's how I generated that --

PRATS: Okay.

MULLEN: We simply know that much because the college has provided (unintelligible)....

PRATS: All right. So -- so is it --

MULLEN: That's what it is.

PRATS: I mean, if we focus on arithmetic, I'm -- I'm way over my head here, but is it -- is it correct to say that inquiry in the humanities goes for $12 -- $20 a pop; inquiry in arts and creativity gets $245 a seat? How -- how is that -- how is that determined. I mean, I'm assuming that these figures mean something.

MULLEN: Sure. Well, there's a couple issues here. In some cases we're talking about building an infrastructure where there was none before. (Unintelligible) arts and

creativity, so that's an issue for us, is do
-- do we the bodies in place. So that's --
that's part of that issue.

        The rest of those -- those kinds of
decisions are essentially being made within
the colleges in terms of where the money is
going.

PRATS: So -- but I thought you -- but I
thought you said that the Provost has
allocated this money. How -- how is that
possible?

MULLEN: The money is allocated based on
proposals that we have received during the
year.

PRATS: Okay.

MULLEN: Mark, did you want to

KORNBLUH: Mark Kornbluh from Arts & Sciences.

        Maybe I can answer this a little bit.

        What Arts & Sciences did is I met
with the Chairs in each department about what
seats they could provide for General
Education in each of these areas, and we
committed that at the college we would supply
seventy seats in seven of areas, that we
would be 60 percent of their composition and
communication; the dean of communication
committed that they would do 40 percent and
fine arts would provide enough seats.

        And then we met with each
department, we -- and we talked about
reallocating teaching resources for the
faculty time in each department was
committed across the curriculum so that --
and many arts & science faculty -- we're
hiring people now and there is an
understanding the faculty will teach general
education, they'll teach lower division,
upper division, graduate students.

        And what it took, we worked -- I
worked with each department about what it
would take to alter the mix of courses to
engage both lecturers and tenure-stream
faculty in lower division general education
courses, and we worked out an amount of funds
given within the parameters of what the
Provost had available.

        So from my perspective, assigning
these to each of the different areas doesn't
gain very much. Arts & Sciences will receive
(unintelligible) three and a half million
dollars to provide about 90 percent of the
instruction; it's not as much as we would
have liked, but it is enough to improve --
significantly improve the integrity of how

we're doing lower division, general education
teaching. We will -- all -- all general
education classes will have some -- a much
greater level of engagement with students
through small classes or sections, in some
way the faculty or graduate students are
directly engaged with students. We are
eliminating all the courses where there was
just large classes and no engagement, and --
and testing.

So it varied. Arts & Sciences
shifted money around internally as well, so
these dollar figures given, and all that
money listed on there for humanities or for
social sciences came to arts and sciences and
we shifted it around internally and commit
that we can provide those seats
(unintelligible)....

GREISSMAN: So in answer to the question how
many administrators does it take to answer a
good question for Armando Prats; the answer
is three.

Because I worked on the first
budget, the initial budget, will kind of
underscore what Mike said. I started by
assuming that everything we now do for areas
of USP that are related to, programmatically,
to the Gen Ed, those monies would be
reallocated for and Gen Ed and we'll stop
doing USP Gen Ed.

But we've done tons -- you know,
tons of humanities, arts & creativities is
brand new except for, you know, a roughly 500
seat that is done by fine arts for its own
performing arts students. We are starting
from scratch.

So if you wanted to do that
calculation you did, you'd have to add in all
the money currently in arts & sciences being
reallocated. So, in fact, it's a much more
equitable figure. You were looking at an end
for arts & creativities that involved, for
the sake of argument, 99.5 percent new
investment and for humanities I much smaller
new investment because it's a part of the
existing monies.

Does that help?

PRATS: Yes.

FINKEL: Raphael Finkel, College of
Engineering.

I have been asked by one of my
constituents to ask a related question, which
is: When one talks of a seat, is one talking
about a seat in a classroom or is one

possibly talking about a student in the class
through distance learning? If we are perhaps
adding -- padding the numbers by saying, oh,
well, I have 500 students but they'll all be
doing it by distance learning, then perhaps
we're not doing our students a favor.

MULLEN: I will respond to this, and I'll
have Mark respond too.

The numbers that I've put up here
do not reflect distance learning courses to
any extent. These are all based on fall and
spring in-house, in-seat courses. That does
not mean that there won't be seats available
during the summer at other times, but the
numbers that I've presented are in -- are
students that are here on campus taking --
taking those courses on face-to-face method.

Mark, do you want to --

MR. KORNBLUH: Yeah. Arts & Sciences is planning
to offer some additional online interactive
courses in some of these areas during the
summer, and those numbers are not in here
yet. We have been doing modeling to see how
many requirements are left by existing USP
students. How many transfer students need to
take certain number -- transfer students
don't come in having completed two years of
all their general education requirements.
So, in some of these areas we under -- we
underestimated the number of seats we needed,
sot we will offer some online seats during
the summer but at this point we have
committed to doing it. We haven't permitted
or committed to doing any onlines during the
year that's not in these numbers.

MULLEN: And I should point that this also
does not include, at least to the extent that
I know, in what's been given to me, this does
not include -- include seats that might be
taught in four-week or an eight-week
face-to-face. These are fall and spring.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, Biology.
That's what I wanted to make clear
because it says to be available for Fall 2011
but, in fact, these numbers represent --

MULLEN: Right.

DEBSKI: -- the fall and the spring --

MULLEN: Yeah. That's on a per academic
year --

DEBSKI: -- academic --

MULLEN: That's right. Per academic year.
Fall/spring semester. Right.

Connie?

WOOD: With regard to the Senate approval

process --

MULLEN: Yes.

WOOD: You've given a clear discussion as
to the current interim committee. However,
my question is: Are you proposing that the
GEOC be a permanent body that handles the
course approval process? If so, will it --
will the members always be appointed by the
Chair of the Senate Council; will it be a
standing committee of the Senate; will there
always a representative to represent the
Undergraduate Council, et cetera, and so
forth.

          I -- I -- I don't see in here a
process other than the interim process, and I
think it's very important that that process
be included in this proposal.

MULLEN: Part of GEOC's charge is actually
to -- to work on what is the appropriate
permanent process, and so we put that -- and
that's part of what we originally desired was
to oversee those particular process.

          And so your point is well taken.
Clearly we've got something that's going to
be in place for two years; what happens on
May 15th, 2012.

          The only answer I have to that is
that, you know, we (unintelligible) GEOC will
get -- will itself be making recommendations
to Senate and Senate Council on what the
long-term makeup of that body and how it's
going to work with it. And -- but I think
part of what we're doing now is: Is this the
appropriate structure long term? We think it
is, and it seems to be a structure that works
at other universities. I've seen it in two
or three that I looked at, but a small
committee of faculty that reports to the
undergraduate curriculum committee,
(unintelligible)....

          But you're right, we don't have the
long term. I can't tell you what we're doing
May 15th, 2012.

WOOD: Well, perhaps we should delay
implementation then.

MULLEN: I would hope that that wouldn't be
a sticking point.

WOOD: That was tongue-in-cheek.

MULLEN: I would like -- I guess my hope is
that we have really fine faculty on the
General Education Oversight Committee that
will help all of us, the administrators and
faculty alike, determining what the absolute
best process is after we've spent a year

vetting the -- the large majority of the
courses -- the biggest chunk of work in -- in
terms of getting this done is right now; and
in terms of the continuance of the work, and
then it'll be more of a steady stay over time
approving occasionally courses. But, more
importantly, also developing what do we think
the out -- the guidelines are and shall be
and should be for making sure the courses are
stating true to general ed, so there's that
oversight component there that will be
involved in the next year also.

WOOD: And is that coming back to the
      Senate?

MULLEN: Anything that GEOC does, by virtue
      of the charge given to them by the Senate,
      has to come back to Senate Council for
      approval by Senate Council.
               Mary.

ARTHUR: Sometimes that process can be --

SHEILA: Name, please?

ARTHUR: Mary Arthur.
               Sometimes that process can be a
      little bit slow going, and I'm wondering if
      there is a need for additional resources to
      help facilitate some of that process
      (inaudible)....

MULLEN: Are you referring to approval of
      general education or curriculum in general?

ARTHUR: It'd be in general, but I just
      think it will kind of be a bolus of things
      coming through at once here.

MULLEN: We -- we discussed that, and right
      now we think we're on top of the process.
      (Unintelligible) is on the committee. We've
      got a good group of reviewers and colleagues
      that are working with them in each area, and
      certainly the bottleneck is not at GEOC right
      now and it's not in the Undergraduate Council
      at this particular point in time.
               Actually, I think, Clayton you were
      next.

THYNE: Clayton Thyne, Fine Arts.
               I have a question following -- when
      we get to the last four points there. When
      we get the sample pool for evaluation, that's
      stripped all of identification --

MULLEN: Right.

THYNE: -- right? And then we have the
      data to help make (unintelligible), in
      general, but I'm just thinking about being
      the guy that's going to end up submitting the
      (unintelligible) --

MULLEN: Yeah.

THYNE: I'd like to know what you people
        thought of my course. I mean, is there any
        way that you can -- I mean, that seems like
        if we're going to have this resources going
        into evaluating a course. It would be nice
        to get that feedback --
MULLEN: Yeah. There's -- there's nothing
        --
THYNE: -- (unintelligible) that students
        say --
MULLEN: Right.
THYNE: You said we could get off --_
MULLEN: There's -- there's nothing to
        preclude you, as a faculty member, coming
        back and asking for that kind of an
        assessment. That is not the goal at this
        particular time. In fact, we want it to be
        definitely an anonomyzed process so that
        we're not worrying about, is this from
        Clayton's class or from Mullen's class, but
        is this one student that came from here, this
        one's from here, we don't even know. Do
        they seem to measure up to what we expect on
        the SLOs.
                And so from an administrative
        perspective, I have no inclination to look at
        it at the level of granularity that allows me
        to say what Clayton's doing. That doesn't
        mean that a group faculty couldn't determine
        how to use the data in other ways.
THYNE: But it will all (unintelligible) --
        to the Senators here; is that a fair
        statement?
MULLEN: Heidi, is that a fair statement?
ANDERSON: It's a fair statement
            (unintelligible), yes.
THYNE: Once it's stripped, am I going to
        be able to get the --
MULLEN: Well, let's talk, for example,
        think about it this way: What if -- what if
        your department says, well, we're teaching
        four general education courses. As a
        department we want to know how we're doing.
        You could ask the Office of Assessment to
        return to you everything that was collected
        about your courses and you could do a
        departmental assessment on it.
                Again, another fair statement?
ANDERSON: Yes. That's another fair
            statement. Some of the other universities,
            they've actually put in a second system to do
            exactly what you're suggesting, and that is
            to be able to give feedback directly to the
            faculty members to be able to help them with

their course.

MULLEN:		Right.

ANDERSON:			And so I think that's something GEOC could possibly recommend in their long-term implementation strategy as part of the -- as part of what (unintelligible), as part of what (unintelligible).

Oh, I'm sorry. Heidi Anderson.

MULLEN:		My reticence in answering this is because we get the other question also when we talk about assessment, and, that is, oh, you're going to collect this stuff and you're going to use it to single me out, and that's not the point of assessment at this level; it's not to evaluate a course level or the instructor, but to evaluate at the student learning outcome level with random stratified sample --

FINKEL:		But I just very much hope that we think about that second route otherwise, I think we're missing an opportunity --

MULLEN:		Why don't you --

ANDERSON:			Yeah --

MULLEN:		 -- we can remember that --

ANDERSON:			I've got it.

MULLEN:		Everybody's got it. Okay.

FINKEL:		Raphael Finkel, College of Engineering.

A question about assessment. Who does these various steps? It's unclear from the documents. Have the courses been mapped to the SLO and, if so, who did it and if not who will do it? Who decides what are the authentic artifacts? Has that been done? I so, who did it, if not, who will do it, and so on?

MULLEN:		Well, you all decided the SLOs. The folks that submit a proposal essentially map their own course to an SLO. So if I submit a course and I want it to account for inquiry in the natural sciences, by default this maps to student learning outcome one, which is inquiry (unintelligible) ----- inquiry general education outcome.

The authentic artifacts, you decide what that is. The instructor of the course decides what that is.

FINKEL:		On a per offering basis or on a syllabus basis.

MULLEN:		On a -- on a per -- that's a good question. I was thinking on a per offering basis, but I suspect that if you had multiple (unintelligible) for the ease of what you're doing, you'd want it to be same artifact from

that one -- that one course. And so what will be done is we'll be asking -- council of assessment will be asking the instructor what artifact are you going to provide and, you know, the current system, and they're being worked on, is how do we get these into the blackboard environment where they could be stripped on the backside.

We understand not everybody uses blackboard, so we have to -- you know, we have to have a way of electronically gathering that -- I'm not sure how we'll do everything there, but we'll electronically gather that information and it will be coded by the instructor, and assessment office will be told, this is the assignment I want you to use and then that will be pooled in, the students demographics, name, course (unintelligible) -- work itself.

Another sample of the pool, if you want me to work (unintelligible) on that --

MR. FINKEL: Sure. Yeah.

MULLEN: -- that's just a stratified random sample, so if we collect -- let's just say we collect 4500 artifacts from one course area -- Heidi, I don't have a don't have good feel for what the total number is, but it will be a small percentage of that, I mean, 200 -- 200 papers or whatever the case may be across that 4,000. And those are then, under the current plan, are to be broken into groups of ten so the individual evaluators that will be normed against the rubrics would not have to spend, you know, their next month and a half on 200 -- 200 samples --

FINKEL: So that the sampling is done automatically then --

MULLEN: Yeah.

FINKEL: -- by a computer program. Who designs the rubrics?

MULLEN: The rubrics we have now to get us started, are -- are chosen from the American Association of Colleges & Universities. I believe one of the rubrics has been -- for communications has been modified in-house already. Is that a true statement? Yes. Because our composition and communication is pretty radically different than almost anything out there, so the -- the communications and writing rubrics that were put out there by AACU did not really address those well.

But there are standard rubrics that are used by literally hundreds of colleges

and universities nationwide to look at
critical thinking, processes of inquiry,
ethical considerations, perspectives on -- on
U.S. and the global citizenship.

And so that's the starting point if
you use those rubrics in a very general way.
And -- and what we already know and what has
already happened is that the faculty will
have the opportunity to evaluate, is this
rubric working? If not, we have the
opportunity to continuously modify and build
rubrics that work for us.

But in the -- in the short term,
that's where we started, was in using the
AACU evaluators, and those are shown on the
bottom of that (unintelligible) plan that's
on the Gen Ed website.

Mike.

KOVASH: Mike Kovash, Arts & Sciences.
So within the budget framework that
you've showed us, what will be the largest
class size that you imagine?

MULLEN: That's a real good question. At
the risk of saying something wrong --

KOVASH: Roughly.

MULLEN: Yeah, well, we're still going to
have some courses that are fairly large. The
-- the goal though is to make sure that if a
course is, you know, 100 or more, that we
clearly have breakout sessions, that there
are opportunities for students to be in 20,
25 -- groups of 20 to 25 so that they can do
the hands on and they can experience material
on -- on a more intimate setting.

But I don't really -- I'd have to
go back and look. That's a good thing to
ask, though.

KOVASH: So if there are breakout sessions,
that's where some of the funding goes?

MULLEN: Well, right, and that -- if you
talk about courses that were very light and
were taught about one person, or whatever the
case may be, clearly we're going to take a
course that has 400 students in it, and our
goal is to somehow get that course to now
provide an engaging interactive environment.

We can't continue to just have one
person teaching 400 students. Now we're
looking, okay, is there a lecturer that's
doing the -- the main lecture on a smaller
basis? Do we have TA's and/or lectures that
are running breakout sessions, and so that's
where the expense (unintelligible) will go
up as we take these models where we have

large courses and start to break these down
into small units.

KOVASH: One more question. You show 4800
seats projected, for example, statistical
inference and reasoning. But I -- am I
right, Bill, that these got one course now
that's been approved and so we're talking
about implementing it in Fall '11?

So, you've got a lot more seats to
-- to deal with. Can you do that by Fall
'11?

MULLEN: Do you want to refer this one to
your dean?

RAYENS: Sure. Bill Rayens.
Statistics to answer that question
(unintelligible) --

But the first -- there was another
course approved in pathology. Pathology will
be picking up about 700 of those seats. What
I had to do on a local level back in
statistics was -- statistics was to try to
recover those other seats. And -- and I did
that by a variety of means including
increasing by one the number of sessions that
TAs would cover, overall recitations that the
TAs would cover. But we're also simplifying
the recitations so that it involves more
procedural learning and less discovery; and
move the discovery more into the classroom.
And we just had too -- too much detail on
this.

So we really thought through we're
going -- we're going to need to give the TAs
an additional recitation to cover.
(Unintelligible) with this application and
how can we move more of the discovery into it
(unintelligible) -- lecturer how to handle
it, and I'll be honest with you, it was
really tight. So wearing my DUS hat, you
know, I -- I really barely got the lid on the
-- on the container there, but we should be
able to offer those seats.

MULLEN: And we believe there's other folks
out there that -- we know that there's at
least one other program that's looking at how
they might do that as well and I think
there's opportunities for programs
(unintelligible) --------- (unintelligible)
course of our -- in our particular area, so
it's a starting point, it's not a --
hopefully, it's not a finishing point.
Leigh?

MAYNARD: Leigh Maynard, College of
Agriculture.

My impression is that the area with the least coherent plan is transfer equivalencies and given that we have state legislation and given that we have (unintelligible) asking us to be as accessible as possible and given the unique nature of some of these courses (unintelligible) especially composition and communications. What are your thoughts on that --

MULLEN: Well, Leigh brings up a really good point because this is a -- this is an issue that is being worked on not only here at UK but at council on post-secondary education. HB 160 essentially said that -- excuse me, yeah, HB 160 (unintelligible) -- essentially says that we will have a transfer system that works, and I can tell you from my own personal experience because my very -- very first day on this job I ended up at (unintelligible) representing the University on a transfer committee. I had lots of experience, obviously, and a state senator wagged his finger at me and told me that the University of Kentucky is the worst offender and that you're -- you know, we're not accepting credit for these particular courses and I'm speechless.

But anyway, I do want to assure you those discussions are ongoing and we have to be able to articulate transfer between all state institutions on a -- on a very simple basis.

Now, having said that, it's not a simple thing. Kentucky State has a 45-hour general education curriculum. I can't remember what the others are, but they vary from 30 to 45 hours. Most of them have slightly different categories. And so what has happened at the state level, we had faculty from this University join faculty from all the other universities, public universities and (unintelligible) summer, go through all of our student learning outcomes at every university for everything we do and came up with a set of five units of learning outcomes across a -- what they were saying a 33-hour base.

And so we've got learning outcomes now that year college, each university is going to have to map so we'll now with -- at the -- at the state level, will know what those learning outcomes are, and they're pretty derivative of what we see. It's

incredible how Murray State's learning
outcomes weren't terribly different from ours
and weren't terribly different Morehead's and
so on.

And so we'll have to -- we'll have
to then take our courses that meet our
general education, map those into a state
level system that says for students that take
composition and communication one and two,
and this is one of the more difficult ones,
I'm not saying -- you can -- you can correct
me if I get this wrong because you're on that
committee.

Would essentially map into the
writing and communications student learning
outcomes. Likewise, a student at Murray
State takes English one and comm one, those
are going to map into the same thing. So
we're going -- we're going to have look at
how those fit and -- and when we get the
whole agreement done, everybody in the State
is going to have to say, yes, we'll accept
that; we'll accept those courses from Murray
to satisfy this part of our Gen Ed at UK and
vice-versa.

I think we've got the easier time
of it this time because we have a 30-hour
curriculum. It's going to be harder to
transfer into Kentucky State, you know,
because it's got that 45-hour curriculum.

So that's kind of the framework
that's going on. It's an imperfect system,
but it is (unintelligible) the discussions
that you have because you start looking at
this in -- in terms of student learning
outcomes rather than seat time, and it
generated a heck of a lot of really spirited
thoughtful discussion this summer on what
does it mean to obtain student learning
outcomes rather than just (unintelligible).

And so that's where we're at on the
state level. Now, when it comes to out-of-
state transfers, we are clearly going to
still have the same issue we have now.
Someone comes in from Montana, they bring a
whole slew of stuff with them that we don't
already have articulated in the book, we're
going to have to articulate those courses.
What does that count for here at the
University of Kentucky. So we'll have --
have to continue that process for out-of-
state....

And I'd like to thank Mike Shanks,
who is sitting right here, because he's the

guy that's going to make this happen and --
but this process will be going on throughout
this coming academic year and you'll be
reporting actually to -- you know, in the
spring about where we're at on this statewide
transfer agreement.

       The other -- the one thing we did
(unintelligible) if someone finishes all the
Gen Ed at one institution, they will be
credited for finishing Gen Ed at any
institution in the State. That -- that part
doesn't change. This is what we do now.

PEEK: Just one -- Joe Peek.

       Just one general question on
transfer of credit because we've had a
problem without Gen Ed even being here --

MULLEN: Sure.

PEEK: It's my understanding, which I hope
is wrong, but it's my understanding that if a
course from some other university has ever
been granted equivalency for a course at UK
it's somehow in this data base and that it
automatically is mapped. So if we've ever
given credit for a course -- a specific
course and some other student shows up with
that specific course, it will automatically
be mapped in and given credit. Is that a
true statement?

SHANKS: That's a true statement.

PEEK: I think that's a dangerous thing if
no one ever goes back and sort of checks --

SHANKS: We're starting the process of that
very issue --

PEEK: Good. Okay.

SHANKS: -- investigating how we end
courses that we no longer offer here at the
University.

PEEK: Yeah, but even ones that are
offered because we found some pretty weird
stuff that had been okayed many, many years
ago when we started looking at it.

MULLEN: Well, I guess from my perspective
as a faculty member --

PEEK: Yeah.

MULLEN: -- if I see a student comes in
with something that -- was given credit for
one of our -- something in my curriculum that
I've changed repeatedly -- if it's one
student --

PEEK: Yeah.

MULLEN: -- and the student is _ --

PEEK: Yeah.

MULLEN: -- and the subject isn't prepared
(unintelligible), but if you have 12 students

all coming in the same place and none of them
have the prerequisite knowledge of that
course, then it's time to have a discussion
with the registrar's office about we need to
take this off the equivalency list.

PEEK: Yeah.

MULLEN: But I would say that's a -- that's
a -- something that the faculty should
monitor --

PEEK: Yeah.

MULLEN: -- monitor themselves, if their
having students float through the system.
Does that seem like a good answer?

PEEK: Yes.

WOOD: Connie Wood.
But technically is there a process
to eliminate the equivalency?

SHANKS: Yes and no. It's all manual right
now. I'm working to change that to where it
is --

WOOD: There is no process?

SHANKS: Yes, it is a process. Trust me, we
work every day to end courses. You can ask
the English Department.

PEEKS: For example, our unit could ask for
what are the equivalencies that are in --
sort out the data, and then we could look
over them and adjust them as we feel
necessary?

UNIDENTIFIED: That's what --

MULLEN: Because your department actually
gave the permission to begin with to use that
course.

PEEKS: Someone did.

MULLEN: Someone did.

PEEKS: Many, many years ago probably,
yeah.

MULLEN: That's what faculty
(unintelligible) --

PEEKS: Yeah. Thank you.

MULLEN: Liz?

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, Biology.
Well, a little while ago we got an
e-mail from Todd, Swamy and -- and Karpf
asking -- asking the faculty to help identify
efficiencies and -- and faculty and staff
efficiencies and cost savings and -- and
since -- you know, so -- so I understand
Swamy put aside the five-and-what million
dollars. Can you give us an idea where that
money is coming from and what's going to be
cut because we clearly are not --

MULLEN: I wish that I could give the
specific accounting of that, but I -- I can't

tell you exactly where those pools are coming from. I do know that there are -- that he has been working this past year to -- to find those -- those (unintelligible) efficiencies.

Let me rephrase it just slightly in a different way, though, and (unintelligible). Undergraduate tuition funds is the biggest chunk of our income now. It think it's inherent upon us to -- to really look at how we provide the best education possible, and I think that's what Swamy's thinking, so he's looking at this as an investment in our undergraduate, an investment in our ability to do the best we can by our students as they come in.

That doesn't answer your question directly --

DEBSKI: No.

MULLEN: -- but I -- but I think that we, you know --

DEBSKI: And I have to say that there's history here, you know, so Todd was out -- not going to get into this --

MULLEN: Yeah.

DEBSKI: -- but Todd was out saying, you know, we're raising tuition to improve education and improve the salaries, and -- and at least in arts and sciences, which is where I am, you know, that money didn't go there. And so -- yeah. So --

MULLEN: This -- this is a really good discussion to carryover into the -- into the next meeting when the Provost will actually be here, and so we can -- or we can work on that answer for you between now and then because I can't -- I can't answer -- I can't tell you (unintelligible). I don't know.

CHAIR: Or you ask him on Friday at our Provost chat.

MULLEN: Questions?

CHAIR: That's it.

MULLEN: I'd like to thank all of you on behalf of our students for four years of a lot of work thinking about how we do our undergraduate course at this University. I look forward to the possibility of implementing it.

So if those are all your questions, I'm going to vacate and my e-mail, mike -- mike.mullen@uky.edu certainly can send your comments to me or send them directly to Hollie. Okay?

CHAIR: Yeah. Thank you very much.

MULLEN: Okay.

CHAIR: One of the topics that is starting to circulate is whether we need a -- I know we need it before January, but whether the Senate needs to have a committee on assessment and so I think that is something that we need to revisit this year.

        All right. Agenda Item No. 6, Proposed changes to administrative regulations 1:2 Policy relative to requests for appearances before the Board of Trustees.

        We have with us today Marcy Deaton, Associate General Counsel and Joe Peek, Faculty Trustee.

DEATON: Hi. I'm Marcy Deaton from the Legal Office. I Chair the Regulation Review Committee for the University.

        We don't write policy or like create it, but we do go through the Regs to make sure they're consistent with other Regs, state law, accreditation, policies and requirements and that thing.

        This regulation actually came to our committee from former Board members, Yanarella and Pease and I believe also a student government rep. Of course they went off the Board so the new Board members, Joe Peek and Sheila Brothers picked up the mission and we've been working with them to develop this new procedure so that people can get to the Board more efficiently.

        Really, it's your policy if you'd like to go through it with them, so, I'd be happy for you to do that; if you want me to, I'm happy to.

PEEK: Either way.

DEATON: You did so well (unintelligible)...

PEEK: The first thing is to pay attention to what she said. She ran the committee that did this. Sheila had a very major input. If you've got problems with it, those are the two people to blame, so go to them if you have problems because I --

DEATON: And Richard.

PEEK: And Richard. Thank you.

        So one nice thing that -- that should be in your packet is the flowchart that Sheila did, and I think that's easier than going through the details and if you have questions about the details you can ask those.

        But in terms of this flowchart, you know, there are some things that are different than -- in what's going on, and -- and actually some questions have come up

about what's different. And one of the
problems with the old rule, which you really
couldn't get there unless the Board of
Trustees wanted you to get there, all right,
because the agenda would come out Monday
morning for a Tuesday meeting and the Tuesday
meeting was at 1:00 p.m., you had to have
your application to speak 24 hours in
advance, which means you only had, you know,
three hours to find out what the agenda was
and then to submit your petition to speak
before the Board of Trustees; then the Board
of Trustees had to work very quickly to
approve or not approve, and so there wasn't a
lot of time for you to find out what was
going to be on the agenda or them to figure
out why they weren't going to let you speak.
        So now how is it different? Well,
it's different because we're changing the
time at which the agenda is put out and, in
fact, it already changed. The new chair --
you know, Sheila and I talked to him about
this, and the new chair, Britt Brockman, at
the Board of Trustees, has already had it
changed to Friday at 1:00 p.m. I believe. So
he's already moved it from Monday morning to
Friday.
        This change is going to move it to
Thursday at 1:00 p.m. So what happens now is
the agenda is going to come out three
business days before the meeting. So the
agenda is going to come out on Thursday at
1:00 p.m. or no later than Thursday at 1:00
p.m., and then it's three days until the
meeting.
        Well, what's important for a
petitioner is that you have not three hours,
you now have 24 hours. So two things have
changed. One is when the agenda comes out,
three days in advance, business days; when do
you have to have your petition in? Two days
in advance. So now you get 24 hours to find
out what's on the agenda instead of three or
four hours and, second, there's enough time,
you know, two business days, in fact,
including the weekend, for the Chair of the
Board of Trustees to make a determination
whether or not to send your petition forward
to either the committee or directly to the
Board, so there's actually time to give it
some thought and sort things out.
        So two days before -- two business
days, so this would be Friday at 1:00 p.m.
you have to have your petition in to the

president's office. The president's office
doesn't make a decision. It used to be the
president's office would decide whether or
not to forward it to the Board of Trustees.
The president now is not in the loop. It
goes directly to the Board of Trustees Chair.

So the petition comes in, they
forward all of them to the Board of Trustee
Chair and he may or may not consult with the
president, and then he makes the decision.
And so you can think of it sort of like a
process of (unintelligible) academic papers.
Where the editor can just look at your paper
-- well, you know, it never would have
happened to me of course, but some of you
they might look at your paper and say, ah,
forget it. I'm not even going to bother
sending it to the referee. All right? And
so it's thrown out.

And the -- and the other, well,
I'll send it to the referee, but sending it
the referee doesn't mean it's going to be
favorably disposed of.

Same thing here. The Board Chair
gets the petition, the Board Chair can say,
yes, you may speak to the Board, I think that
will be relatively rare, or can say, no,
you're done or a third option the Board Chair
can say, okay, this might have some merit so
I'm going to send it to a committee.

The fact that you get to the
committee doesn't mean you're going to be
able to speak to the Board -- the full Board
of Trustees in the same way the fact that
your -- you know, your articles or your paper
submissions to a journal being sent to a
referee doesn't mean it's going to be
accepted. It means it's in the process
still.

So then the next step is the Board
Chair refers to the committee and the
petitioner is informed that their petition
has been sent to a committee and which
committee is a relevant committee and when it
meets so that person can then show up at the
committee.

Then the committee chair and the
committee will decide a couple of things.
They can say, no, we don't want to hear from
you or they can decide, yes, we do want to
hear from you. But if they decide they do
want to hear from you, that doesn't mean,
well, you get to go all the way to the full
Board. All right?

They listen to you and then they make a decision about should we now allow you to go all the way to the full Board on Tuesday or can we carry that information or can we dispose of that information.

So there's still multi-step process but now there's some chance that you will be heard at a minimum by a committee and at a maximum by the full Board. And so I think, you know, this -- this works at least in theory a lot better than the old system.

So there are some details in the actual AR that I've glossed over, but a couple of things is that, yeah, you -- it's nice that you know what the agenda happens to be but we've put wording in there that says, we might consider your petition if you want to talk about something, you know, that's on the agenda but also if it might be an item for a future agenda or a future meeting.

So if it's relevant to us -- the Board of Trustees doing their job, then we might hear from you even if it's not on the current agenda. So one result, you know, because one option is the committee takes other action it deems appropriate, one thing they might do is say, well, this is a topic that's worthy of being considered by the Board of Trustees but we need to collect some more information so what we're going to do is put it on the agenda for the next Board of Trustees meeting.

So this other -- the committee takes other action it deems appropriate is just catch-all (unintelligible) everything else. (Unintelligible)....

So do you have questions about the particular details of the -- of the new rule?

Yes?

JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology.

If the committee denies, are you going to find out why?

PEEK: Yes because written in there is, one, if you -- if you make it to the committee, right, you're going to be there. You're going to hear their discussion of whether or not to let you speak so you'll have any idea, but written in here is the -- are two things. One is, there's a -- we keep a permanent list of the disposition of every petition. Second, you have -- I believe -- I believe the final, we've revised it a bunch of times, but I believe the final rule is that you have -- is it seven days?

DEATON: Seven, yeah, business days.

PEEK: So you have seven business days
        after the Board of Trustees meeting to
        request a written response, and THE written
        response may be we didn't think it was
        worthwhile, right, but you can request a
        written, you know, rationale for why you were
        not allowed to speak to the Board of Trustees
        or even why you weren't allowed to even get
        to the first step of speaking to the
        committee.
               So you do have that right to -- you
        know, to request in writing and to see in
        writing.
               Yes?

JONES: Occasionally it happens and I think
        it happened either at the most recent Board
        meeting or the one before it that an agenda
        item was added at the last moment of the --

PEEK: Yeah.

JONES: -- a closed meeting was added --

PEEK: Yes.

JONES: How -- how does that figure into
        what the --

PEEK: That's something I don't think
        we've thought about in terms of -- Marcy,
        might have an answer to that.

DEATON: No.

PEEK: In that case if it's a closed
        meeting, and I didn't know about it either --

UNIDENTIFIED: (UNINTELLIGIBLE)....   _

PEEK: Yeah, and it was a closed meeting
        so you couldn't -- you know, not only could
        you not speak, you couldn't even listen.
        Right?

DEATON: (Inaudible)....

PEEK: Yeah. But -- but what -- but his
        point is what if some other agenda item pops
        up and so it comes at the last minute? We
        didn't take that into account.

DEATON: I don't know how you could give
        people notice of that.

PEEK: Yeah. Because -- she's saying it'd
        be difficult to give people notice. The
        problem we had here was the logistics of how
        do you have time to get a process in place
        that can work.
               And so -- and, also, it's, you
        know, is this the perfect thing? No. We'd
        like to have better access, but the problem
        is the Board of -- it has to be approved by
        the Board of Trustees and for them to approve
        it they have to believe that this isn't going
        to disrupt their meeting; that they can still

have an orderly meeting that doesn't last for days.

And so you've got a valid point. I don't know, because if it's a new agenda item, action might very well be taken on that agenda item without the possibility of input.

JONES: You might have just some clause at the end about, you know, last moment actions will be decided at the discretion of the chair. I mean, just some mechanism for --

PEEK: Yeah.

BROTHERS: Would open -- open record, open meeting clause come into play here?

DEATON: If it were -- if it were a case of a closed meeting like last time, I don't think we can write anything --

PEEK: Right.

DEATON: -- there that would help.

PEEK: But if it's just a --

DEATON: Just say they put on for some reason at the very last minute, what do we name the coal lodge, again --

PEEK: Right.

DEATON: -- we might want to have something at the end --

PEEK: Yeah.

DEATON: -- that we can -- I don't know what that might be, Board -- or chair discretion, I would guess, would be the only way to go (inaudible) --

PEEK: But then -- so I go online to the Board of Trustees' website, you know, three days before the agenda comes out, does that mean I have to keep checking back all the time? I guess it would mean I'd have to keep checking back.

UNIDENTIFIED: (INAUDIBLE).

DEATON: We didn't think of that before --

PEEK: Yeah, we didn't think that --

DEATON: Yeah, we didn't think --

PEEK: We thought deeply but not that deeply, and so -- so we're kind of in a deep one now. So, I don't know -- that's something I think we have to think about. If it happens one time in five years, I'm not worried about it. But if you for some reason didn't fully trust -- trust the process, then how do I -- you know, if I'm, you know, the member, you know, I'm from the Board of Trustees and I'm here to help. Right?

So remember what could happen. The Board of Trustees might say, hey, this is a touchy topic, maybe we shouldn't consider it? Oh, yeah, lets do. Right? And so something

could slip on. You didn't trust the process, you would be concerned about something slipping onto your agenda at the last minute. And so there's a way to over -- you know, to -- my thinking is this is more open now than it used to be but there's a way for that openness to be circumvented.

So maybe the safe thing to do is to put some clause in there -- I'm not sure how it would work, though, because it's like if there's an agenda item that gets added, then the petitioner should have a chance, some minimum length of time, to petition. What do you -- what's doable legally?

DEATON: Well, anything is legal as a Board Chair to say this is a new item, first five people that sign in, you know, I'm going to go outside the regulation -- the Board's regulation.

PEEK: Okay.

DEATON: I'll -- I'll hear five people, because the chair can pretty much do what he wants to do anyway. But, you know, writing something to that effect in there, that the chair may deviate from this process if something is added at the last minute, can't hurt to add.

PEEK: Okay.

DEATON: But I don't think you can tell the chair what to do in that situation, but at least have it there as an option.

PEEK: Okay. So my understanding is at the end of this there's going to be a vote to go along with this or not; right? So one saying -- one way to handle this if you -- if you think it's a serious concern, and it may be, would be if you agreed, right, is to say we approve with this sort of amendment or condition, I don't know how this works, when you make a suggestion.

Because remember, in the end, like everything else, you know, this is like -- you know, we'll take -- you know, we'll take your views into consideration, but you only sort of have -- you know, you don't have the authority to say no. You either have the ability to say, oh, we agree or we disagree, and then the Board of Trustees can care or not care. All right?

But that would be a way to voice this concern which might be a legitimate concern. I guess in my personal feeling, you know, I have a duty to express my own and not necessarily go to the administration, would

be that -- maybe this is something that ought to be added in in some way. That's my own personal view.

DEATON: I think it --

PEEK: Yeah.

WERMELING: Couldn't it just be policy that you have a standing reservation for one petition for the faculty? I mean, this barrier is -- to me, it's just -- you know, I was wasn't familiar with all this, but it seems fairly ridiculous and insular that the faculty can't speak to the governing body in a shared governance institution.

I mean, the logic of this just fails me, and so I think you should have a standing reservation for a petition and you just get one in, you know, take -- take your best shot and whatever your best issue is, but you get a standing reservation for one.

PEEK: But -- but the logic is -- this law went into effect in 1970. We're talking the anti-war demonstrations. And I think it was to insulate the Board; that was the whole point, was set it so people couldn't get to them, you know.

So -- and then the other side of it is, yeah, they should hear from the University community, they should hear opinions from the University, you know, community, but they also have to do business, so they can't hear from every single one of you every time, so they're going to have to have it limited in some way, and there is a limit in here in terms of the -- the -- you know, the typical number of petitioners who can be heard at a given meeting. So there is a limit unless, again, as Marcy points out, the Chair can do whatever he wants.

WERMELING: What -- I mean, what you're telling me, though, is that you have -- access is denied for virtually all Board meetings; is that correct? There are not petitions heard at every Board meeting?

PEEK: Well, this is the new rule but there have not been very many. There have been in the past. I think the Robinson Forest situation, there were people who spoke on that a number of years ago.

WERMELING: I think petitioners have to get focused so that you have one representative, but I still -- I still, you know, having one reserved petition available as a slot.

PEEK: Right.

WERMELING: It doesn't have to be consumed --

PEEK: All right, yes, but suppose we have
        that one reserved petition, how do we
        determine -- who determines and how is that
        determined who that one -- that one speaker
        is going to be?
WERMELING: I think that's beyond the scope of
        this meeting, but --
PEEK: Yeah.
WERMELING: -- I have thoughts on that.
PEEK: Okay. Okay. Yes.
MOUNTFORD: Roxanne Mountford, Arts & Sciences.
            Could you explain to me, Joe, why
        the Board doesn't hold community hearings on
        a regular basis on issues of importance?
        That is the case at other universities. It
        certainly is odd that we don't have
        (unintelligible).... I would think that for
        anything of public importance to the
        University that there would be open hearings.
PEEK: You're probably asking the wrong
        person to defend that practice.
MOUNTFORD: Do you know?
PEEK: Well, I wouldn't be the best person
        --
MOUNTFORD: There are no opening -- there is no
        process --
PEEK: No, other than the Board meetings
        because, as someone mentioned, we have open
        meeting (unintelligible) so if we're going to
        have a meeting we have to announce it ahead
        of time, and we have to announce the agenda
        ahead of time. I don't know what the
        exceptions are in terms of last items.
DEATON: I think you can have open forums,
        but our Board just historically has never
        done that.
MOUNTFORD: But, you know, I would think that
        that would be a very, very good thing for the
        Board to do.
PEEK: Uh-huh, (affirmative).
MOUNTFORD: Even if we were to pass this,
        this is a fairly restrictive, I mean,
        inconsequential change from my point of view,
        and more consequential change would be for
        the Board to begin holding hearings so that
        the public and University can comment in an
        open way about, you know, different issues
        that they're going to address.
CHAIR: One thing we could consider that I
        could move forward is that -- remember what
        we were saying in that April meeting? We're
        trying to give that perspective from the
        State -- from -- from the University. And so
        what I could initiate then is an invitation

to the Board to attend that meeting and we could turn that into a forum. Do you think that would be useful?

MOUNTFORD: Yes.

CHAIR: Okay. Because we've had -- we've had some -- Britt and I have had a few conversations about that kind -- those kinds of ideas, but I didn't -- I didn't quite have in mind, you know, how to get it to move forward.

PEEK: And my impression is that the new -- you know Britt Brockman, the new chair, is willing or interested, whatever the correct word is, in meeting with the Senate Council or the Senate. He seems to be open to that --

CHAIR: Right.

PEEK: -- which I think is a big change --

CHAIR: Right.

PEEK: -- from the past.

CHAIR: As long as we don't throw anything --

PEEK: Yeah. But the problem is that would be something they might do annually, and what you're suggesting is, no, this needs to be done on a regular basis. I -- I think if a proposal was made to have a regular set of open forums and you -- you know, and allowed the Trust -- the Board of Trustees to vote on it, my guess is the vote would be no.

JONES: It would be my impression that it'd be more likely that they would set up a committee --

PEEK: Yeah.

JONES: -- a standing committee for the _ (unintelligible) concern committee for --

PEEK: Yeah.

BROTHERS: That would be the University Relations Committee, I'm on that.

     (MANY TALKING AT ONCE)

PEEK: So, yeah. I mean, I think open forums are a good idea because what we need is more transparency in following back, you know, more accountability and I don't see a lot of accountability and I don't see a tremendous amount of transparency.

     So I think it's a good idea, which probably tells you right there it's not going to happen. But, again, you can ask; right? Until that -- I think it's separate from this AR. That's a separate, I think, suggestion that might be good to make.

     Yeah.

FERRIER: Walter Ferrier, Business and
Economics.
Joe, can you provide just a quick
context for us to Dan Wermeling's question
about having perhaps a standing reservation
for one proposal, and your response was,
well, how do we determine who among many?
How many typically? Is it three --
PEEK: Well --
(MANY TALKING AT ONCE)
FERRIER: How many petitions though -- how
many petitions are --
PEEK: We don't know. This is a new
process. Typically probably no petitions or
very few petitions occur.
FERRIER: So this, in fact, may stimulate the
demand for more petitions.
PEEK: I think so because why would you
bother submitting a petition if you have a
pretty good idea it's going nowhere.
FERRIER: All right. That's --
PEEK: And so part of this, I think, is to
give the idea that maybe, and there's no
promises here, but maybe it can get
somewhere.
SARGE: Kevin Sarge, Biochemistry.
Why can't we have a system where
the faculty decides which petitions get
heard? Couldn't they provide it online and
then an online vote could be taken to
determine which one's to go to the Board.
Why should the Board of Trustees get to
decide which ones they hear or not?
PEEK: Well, one would be logistics. You
know, logistics is -- it's difficulty as it
is to get a proportion to committees and so
forth.
SARGE: We could decide which one petition
would be heard.
PEEK: Yeah. Well, the way this is set up
now, it's more than one petition but you mean
to add the -- in terms of the length of the
petition or do you mean --
SARGE: No. The petitions would be posted
online --
PEEK: Yeah.
SARGE: -- whenever --
PEEK: Okay.
SARGE: -- and then an online vote could
be taken and the majority vote determines
which one gets heard. Or which two, yeah.
But in -- but in the other case suggested by
this gentleman, it's not clear who would
decide. Why can't we as a whole decide which

petitions get heard?

PEEK: Well, given -- given the tight --
the tight time frame, so the agenda comes out
and say, hey, you all let's talk and so
somehow someone -- you have to get these
petitions in and someone has to go through
them, someone has to figure out, oh, we've
got to get them online and then we're going
to have to an instantaneous vote because
there's no time, because then, you know, then
off we go, so the petitions come in Friday
afternoon and, you know, the meeting is
Tuesday and the committee meetings are where
most of them are going to end up.

WERMELING: Yeah, but really our chair of the
Senate Council -- the Senate Council hears
these things, they represent all of us. They
represent their faculty. That's their
appointment; it's their job; it's their duty.
And so it seems in the end, the council would
hear these things from the chair and the
council would vote on these things and decide
which ones are the priority for the faculty.
But it seems like that's the natural body on
a governance, and then Hollie would end up
having to execute it. Wermeling.

WASILKOSWKI: Greg Wasilkoswki, Engineering.
My first question is why there is
only three day period between posting the
agenda and the meeting?

PEEK: Because three -- because we tried
to write something that could get approved,
and currently it's more like three or four
hours. And so it's a matter of pushing it
back. One thing is the more that you push it
back, the more there's going to be last-
minute additions.

WASILKOSWKI: Maybe you didn't hear my question.

PEEK: Okay.

WASILKOSWKI: It is really necessary for the
Board of Trustees to have such a short period
of time to prepare agenda because if this is
not really necessary then it means that
they're not playing honest game with us and
don't want changes.

PEEK: I'm not sure --

WASILKOSWKI: What is the rationale that there's
only three days to --

PEEK: Well, because only three days is
almost three days more than what you have
now; right? And if you go back five days --
I think the problem is the further you go --
five days, seven days the agenda isn't set.
And so the -- you know, the earlier you have

the agenda posted, the more changes there are
going to be and the more problems you're
going to have with last minute additions to
the agenda.

WASILKOSWKI: There's a number of problems
with time for voting or choosing one of the

PEEK: Right.

WASILKOSWKI: -- petitions will be
(unintelligible) result. I don't think so.

PEEK: Well, except that we won't know
what the full agenda would be, is my guess.

WASILKOSWKI: Well, we'll never know, but what
would be added in will be added in from the
(unintelligible) --

PEEK: Right, but -- but the hope is that
if you get it three days in advance it'll be
very -- it will be somewhat rare to have it
-- the agenda edited.

CHAIR: All right. Thank you very much for
all of the folks involved in this effort. We
now have a motion that we need to vote on, so
could I first hear a motion that -- to this
amendment, if -- if so desired?

JONES: Okay. I move to endorse the
proposed change with the caveat that some
clause is put at the -- the end to give the
Chair of the Board the discretion to
entertain last moment petitions arising from
last moment additions to the agenda.

BROTHERS: To give the Board Chair the --

JONES: Discretion to consider and decide
last moment petitions due to last moment
changes in the agenda.

CHAIR: And that's acceptable?
(Unintelligible). Is there a second?

MOUNTFORD: Second.

CHAIR: Any discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
Abstain.
Motion carries.
Thank you very much. I think that
was a very informative discussion.
Joe, we would like to hear our
report from the Trustee, please.

PEEK: I got nothing. So, it might be
better if you ask me specific questions. I
think before I arrived from my class,
Shelly's already given a report on the -- on
the search thing, I think. That's the main
thing that's going on right now, is the
presidential search and I think it's great
that we're having these forums. The problem,
of course, is nobody -- I don't know what

Shelly said, you know, but nobody knows for
sure what's going to happen with the
information other than what you can know is
that Everett and I will take it forward to
the Board, so it will get to the Board. What
they do with it, you know, there's no
guarantee how seriously it will be taken. We
don't know.
            Yes?

JONES: (Unintelligible) soliciting
      questions --
PEEK: Yeah.
JONES: I find --
PEEK: (Unintelligible) talk about
      something that you want to know, rather
      than in class where I talk about what I want
      to talk about.
JONES: Okay. It's interesting that the --
      the new Chair of the Board is bringing maybe
      a little different demeanor.
PEEK: Uh-huh.
JONES: Have you seen any indication yet
      perhaps the -- the Board would treat the
      (unintelligible) about how this might impact
      the -- the process of evaluating the
      president this year and -- and what --
PEEK: How we evaluate the president
      wasn't extensively on the agenda. The agenda
      was solely selecting a president, but at some
      point a comment was made by I believe
      President Todd saying, and maybe some others,
      saying, well, this thing about evaluating a
      president every year, that's too much.
      That's too often. But that wasn't the topic
      of -- that -- that retreat was solely about
      how do we think about selecting a president.
            Yeah?
ARTHUR: Mary Arthur.
            I'm wondering if there's some way
      just to get the -- all the ideas that have
      been generated by so many minds thinking
      about it, ones who care about our University,
      to the actual candidates. Maybe it would
      help them think about what kind of
      environment we have here.
      (unintelligible/inaudible)....
PEEK: Yeah, when we -- yeah, when we get
      to the final candidate there will be forum,
      right, where you can ask questions and
      that'll -- but that'll be once the field has
      been narrowed to, I think, three to five?
      Hollie would be the expert, to come in, and
      Shelly, they're on the committee, but that's
      once it gets down to the three to five. Then

you will have a chance to ask some questions.
Yeah?

SNOW: Diane Snow, Medicine.
(Unintelligible) question, I asked
that all of their comments be complied --

PEEK: Yes.

SNOW: -- from all of them and
distributed to the entire campus so people
can see what kind of (unintelligible).

PEEK: Yes, I thought you were going to --
or you --

CHAIR: Well, I hedged. I don't know if
people like my hedge. My concern is that if
we post it on the web we might scare off
potential presidential candidates and the
counter argument is that, is they ought to
know what they're getting into.

PEEK: Yeah, I don't -- I don't -- I don't
know which is the best.

CHAIR: We could ask the search firm.

PEEK: Yeah. Okay. Now, that makes sense
because they'll probably will be meeting with
the search firm, yeah.
(MANY TALKING AT ONCE)

STEINER: As a member of the search
committee, I will be in a position to ask the
questions I hear.

CHAIR: Right.

STEINER: And I can't tell you, you know,
be enlightened. I'm trying to go to these
fora and find out what -- what's on people's
minds and they -- they will -- so the
petitions will be presented. I can't give
you a response because of the confidentiality
agreement. But the petitions will be
presented and you have to trust -- trust that
I hear you, you know. Your questions will be
raised, issues will be presented. I
guarantee you that things that come to these
fora's, you know, I have your questions and
think that generally what's important_will
be heard in -- in the process.

PEEK: And I think along those same lines,
you know, you're talking about, well, what if
we have opinions about things. How are we
going to be heard. We have to file a
petition.
Well, actually, you have two
faculty trustee and so you can tell faculty
trustee. And if there's an issue that you
guys about, right, then perhaps what you want
to do is you want to go after your faculty
trustees and say, you know what, you really
should invite one of us to your committee, to

speak to your committee.

So there -- you don't go through a
petition. You know, you could just say, hey,
why -- why don't you see if you could get us
invited to talk about this topic because we
think it's a really important topic and
that's not necessarily even in the agenda
item. All right?

That's a -- that's a lot like here,
is it doesn't go through the deadlines and
all the stuff. You know, here's an issue
that a lot of the faculty are concerned
about, we think it ought to be discussed.
All right?

And so if that's the case and that,
again, could happen just for -- the Senate
speaks for -- or the Senate, you know, maybe
speaking for the faculty. Why wouldn't they
get together and say, hey, you know what, Joe
and Everett, you guys need to bring this
issue up. Either you bring it up or invite
one or more of us to come and to discuss this
topic because we think it would be very
appropriate for your committee -- for your
committee.

If I'm on the committee, I don't
know how it works yet. If I'm on the
committee perhaps I have some say in terms of
how it works, but even if I'm not on that
committee at least I'm in the room with some
people who are on the committee and I could
say, you know, this is something that may
need to be talked about.

So you have a cou -- you know, it's
not just this petition. You know, there are
other ways of doing it, you know, to -- to
try to get there.

CHAIR: All right. Thank you very much.

I think in the interest of time we
need to move on.

Tom Nieman is in the room now, and
he is willing to give us his report on the
committee of retroactive withdrawal.

Tom, please.

NIEMAN: After two Joe Peek presentations
this is going to be tough; hard act to follow
there.

I chair the Retroactive Withdrawal
Appeals Committee, and apparently I'm suppose
to make a yearly report of this and what in
the hell it is we do.

And so first I'll tell you what we
do. Retroactive withdrawals cover students
withdrawing from the University or from a

semester initiated after the last day of
class for the semester in which they are
petitioning.

So they petition our Board -- our
committee to withdraw from the entire
semester of courses for a number of reasons.
One, it has to be a serious injury or
illness, they were in a car accident or
something of that nature; serious personal or
family problems; serious financial
difficulties; or permanent disability
verified by the Disability Resource Center.

And then all this has to be
diagnosed after the semester for which the
withdraw is requested, so they can't just
come to us with -- you know, for any
particular reason. They have to come within
that boundary, so to speak.

And so I being the chair of the
committee since March of 2010, I've been on
the committee for -- this is my fourth year
now, and I just wanted to kind of express a
couple of things.

Our cases that we've heard has been
incrementally getting more and more. It's
been increasing. October of last year we had
14; in total we -- we've had, from October to
May, we had 93; and in May we had 23.

And so the cases of people finding
various reasons to come before the Board have
been starting to get broader and broader and
one of our concerns is that the cases that
are coming to us probably shouldn't be
reaching us, or at least some of them
shouldn't, and that we should really be
looking at other options for students to
withdraw.

One of the issues is withdrawing
from the courses in general. If you wanted
to drop one or two courses you shouldn't be
coming to us. Ours is typically for an
entire semester.

So if you have like say two Es and
two As and you are in a car accident and you
came to us and said, well, I'm going to
withdraw for this -- the two Es in the
semester and keep the As, we won't do that.
So either you get the whole semester or you
get nothing. And so that's part of it, and
we have that kind of thing.

There is -- students have been
coming to us and asking for withdraw and they
said, well, I tried to withdraw over on --
using MY.UK and, again, the -- they're not --

either not getting good advice or they don't
understand that MY.UK allows you to withdraw
-- drop courses, let me get this right. It
allows you to drop courses; it does not allow
you to withdraw from the -- from the
semester. The semester is something that's
different, so it -- when they use MY.UK they
can drop -- say if they have five courses,
they could drop four but they can't drop the
last one which would be tantamount to a
withdraw and so they have to get into other
things, and they don't appear to understand
that. And so, again, we -- especially when
it gets to the calendar -- and you might want
to consider changing the calendar a little
bit or at least changing the comments. The
calendar says that after the 11th week you
can drop -- you can drop all your courses,
but it doesn't tell you what you should do to
withdraw from the semester and so there's a
difference between dropping and withdrawing.

      And that -- that's really all I've
got here, and I would be willing to
entertain questions from anyone that has any.

JONES: I'm -- I'm a little concerned about
your workload here. At some point that's
going to become unmanageable, if not already
there.

NIEMAN: That's what we're worried about.
It's starting to increase, and increase
exponentially. And --

JONES: Could -- could you make some
suggestions to the Senate Council as to
alternative remedies that they might consider
for that?

NIEMAN: Well, we're finding things like --
for example, students are coming to us and
wanting to get Ws removed from their GPAs
because it -- it affects them getting into,
say, med school. And so we're saying, look
we're not here to fix your GPA, we're not
here to fix Ws and these kinds of things.

JONES: It's a misunderstanding of the
function of the committee.

NIEMAN: Exactly, and -- and so I -- now,
I've been talking to the advisors and I
talked to the Faculty Senate -- the Senate
Council the other day, and so we're trying to
get this word out that, look, there's --
there's problems here. You're going to
inundate us pretty soon, and it -- the cases
are difficult enough the way they are.

      That's -- that's one thing. You
don't want to be on this committee too long

if you get on it. It tears you down after a while.

Yes.

KOVASH: Mike Kovash, Arts and Sciences.
If access to your committee was through referral from the academic ombud office, then that could be a gatekeeper because ombud would say, yes, this does fall in the purview of the committee; no, it does not.

NIEMAN: Yeah. That's -- that's an interesting point. Last year we had a couple that were referred from the ombud and we looked at it and we said, what the hell are we doing with this? So that's (unintelligible). It is a possibility. We've talked about that, yes.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, Biology.
Well, what about a website then where you can list your criteria that students would have access to for appealing to your committee?

NIEMAN: They have all -- when they appeal they have to go through their advisor and through the dean's office in their college, and they get all that information. And the break down appears to be with the advisors and with the associate deans at times. And then, see, the issue is that if this happens after the last day of the semester, then it's questionable whether we probably should be getting it then and the dean maybe shouldn't be handling it.

But my -- well, Mike can speak to that. In the Ag College, the dean and -- has been very good at handling a lot of stuff, and the Ag College is easy. When one comes from the Ag College we know we deserve it, and that we, you know, we're not being handed one we shouldn't get.

Other colleges it's not so good.

CHAIR: All right. Thank you very much, Tom.

NIEMAN: I had an hour and half to present it, but.... Thank you very much.

CHAIR: All right. Our ninth agenda item is the SACS Accreditation Quality Enhancement Program. We have Professor Deanna Sellnow and Diane Snow.

(UNINTELLIGIBLE)

SNOW: (Unintelligible) we want you to go back to your constituencies and tell them everything about the QEP. So, keep the conversation going.

SELLNOW: So in September we rolled out
          themes and we obtained through the big ideas
          and we've got some of those, things like
          developing engaged citizenship, expanding
          global awareness and involvement, fostering a
          vibrant and supportive campus culture,
          enhancing scholarship: critical thinking,
          effective communication and academic
          integrity, advancing 21st century teaching
          and leaning and navigating successful
          transition.

SNOW: (Unintelligible) called for
          proposals on each topic. People were able to
          submit their proposal, we invited them and
          tried to make this process very, very easy;
          all they had to provide for us was a name, a
          title of the proposal, the theme that they
          were addressing, one of those six, and 500
          word description.
                  While I was (unintelligible) the
          hard work (unintelligible). Deanna and the _
          committee had a very simple job of bringing
          all of these proposals. The way we let
          people know about these was, many fold, one
          of them was to use 10,000 postcards that we
          distributed across campus and we were on
          various listservs; Deanna and I did the UK
          Homepage with Dr. Todd, just show of hands,
          how many people actually heard that? Okay,
          little bit. We were wondering how successful
          that is. Went to the Kernel, even leaving
          some web site and apparently reached a lot of
          people under this process, and we're very
          proud to report to you that of those six
          different topics, these are percentages that
          we possibly got within each topic.
          (unintelligible) an important topic across
          campus.

SELLNOW: (Unintelligible) direct more than
          one theme and that's what happens when
          (unintelligible).

SNOW: We have 63 proposals in all, so I
          think that was a pretty good turnout. And
          even better, the responses were across all
          of our constituencies, so undergraduate
          students, 24, or 38 percent. We were very
          proud of that because this was not the case
          for the big ideas that we received on the web
          site. We were a little bit worried that we
          were going to see things -- a lot of things
          from faculty and staff but not very much from
          students.
                  But when push came to show and it
          was time to really put those ideas out into

a proposal, the students showed up as well as getting everyone (unintelligible). We're really happy about that.

So in October those were read and arranged by the committee. We identified ten proposals that were to be developed into white papers and there's an honorarium for each of these white papers, and the team-base approach, the entire committee became a part of this and then for each of the people who have a white paper, we assigned two (unintelligible) liaisons to help them adhere to the various SACS criteria.

These are, on the left, the ten different lead authors across campus that will be writing the white papers; who are actually right now are very busy writing white papers. Down the middle column you see the topic that each of them are writing on and status of the group that's involved.

Now these were the ten that was picked because they were the SACS proposals that were written. However, there were a number of proposals that were submitted to us that were along the same ideas as these that were chosen, so we put the lead authors in connection with those other people and gave them the option to also bring those people into their team. The goal of this is to have the very best possible white paper written.

We also put some of people from the committee alongside them to help them understand the numbers (unintelligible) the SACS criteria but also budget items and we have some experts working with them on those. So they have a whole team of people to help them write these white papers.

The white papers will be due December 1st, and then the committee will reconvene and look at these ten papers. We will select three to be forwarded to the SACS_(unintelligible) team, and the (unintelligible) team will then select one of those by February of 2011.

So we are in the homestretch of this process and we seem to have done what SACS has required of us, which is to have a broad-based approach where we reached across campus and have as many people as possible participate in this progress.

Questions?

UNIDENTIFIED: What does QEP want --

SELLNOW: (Unintelligible) you know, QEP for SACS --

(LOST
CHAIR: Thank you very much.
         All right. Could I please have
    motion to adjourn?
WASILKOWSKI: Greg Wasilkowski, College of
    Engineering. Move to adjourn.
        * * * * * * * * * *
    THEREUPON, the University of Kentucky Senate
Council meeting for November 8, 2010 was adjourned.
        * * * * * * * * * *
    STATE OF KENTUCKY   )
COUNTY OF CAMPBELL   )

    I, LISA E. HOINKE, the undersigned Notary
Public in and for the State of Kentucky at large,
certify that the facts stated in the caption hereto are
true; that at the time and place stated in said caption
the UK Senate Council Meeting was taken down in
stenotype by me and later reduced to computer
transcription under my direction, and the foregoing is
a true record of the proceedings which took place
during said meeting.
    My commission expires: January 27, 2015.
    IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
hand and seal of office on this the 12th day of
February, 2011.

        _____
        LISA E. HOINKE,
        NOTARY PUBLIC,
        NOTARY ID 435798
        STATE-AT-LARGE
        K E N T U C K Y