

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

NOVEMBER 9, 2009

3:00 P.M.

* * * *

* * * *

W. T. YOUNG LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY CAMPUS
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

* * * *

* * * *

DAVID RANDALL, CHAIR
HOLLIE SWANSON, VICE-CHAIR
KATE SEAGO, ACTING PARLIAMENTARIAN
SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR
LISA E. HOINKE, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

* * * *

CHAIR: I call the November meeting of the Senate to order here. It's good to see you all. This is probably familiar to you now, but no less important than it was the first time you saw it. So please, if you would, give your name, your department and communicate to your constituency. Once again, I'll remind you one of our responsibilities is to go and check the Web postings for course approvals. This is the process that we do this by. It's efficient but if nobody looks at it, it doesn't work. So please, when Sheila announces these, go to the Web page if you would and look at them.

The October minutes aren't ready yet.

With respect to the IT

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt

initiative, Senator Tom Kelly and several others of us are in the process of working with Vince Kellen, who's the IT officer here, to revise the ARs with respect to the committees that govern this issue. This actually will be appearing before Senate Council in the relatively near future. We're in the process of setting that up. But that group is meeting to try and get more faculty involvement in the IT issues both with instruction and with respect to research. So that's an ongoing initiative.

There was a continuing question with respect to the Dead Week policy. And so I'm informing you now that Senate Council has decided or determined that quizzes may be given for graduate students during the Dead Week but not for undergraduate students. This will be part of the discrimination between graduate students taking a 400G or 500-level course and undergraduate students that are taking that course. So that's the differential expectations. Another chapter in that ongoing saga.

The first item of business here is a presentation on the SACS requirement or the quality enhancement program. And so we have Deanna Sellnow and Kaveh Tagavi here to make this presentation for us. Thank you. Please come up.

SELLNOW:

Okay. Thanks for giving -- thanks for giving us a little bit of time to talk about SACS which is coming up, and I know you probably know that it's been looming in the background here for the last year or so. Well, the time is upon us to start our planning processes. And so Kaveh and I were asked to start sharing what's happening with how SACS re-accreditation process has changed this time around and how we'll be proceeding as a result of that. So that's why we're here. So we're here to introduce something that's called a QEP, and this is part of SACS that was never here before in the past. The last time UK went through re-accreditation this was not part of the process. So this is something new, and that's what we're trying to introduce today. And the reason that we're trying to introduce it today is because we need to and want to make sure that we go through this process of developing a quality enhancement plan very deliberately and very transparently so that we have broad-based involvement across the campus and across constituencies regarding what the QEP is as part of our SACS plan. We're also here today to propose a rough timeline for getting us from where we are right now, just introducing what the QEP is and getting the plan delivered to SACS January of 2013. The other thing we're

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt

doing here today is we're proposing or letting you know about a pre-planning team. There are actually four teams that will get us from beginning to end, if we go by the best practices that SACS suggests. And the first team is a pre-planning team. And this pre-planning team will actually solidify the timeline for the process, moving us forward, and then bring that back to you for your approval. And at that point, the team will be expanded and modified in some ways to get broader involvement when we actually go through the process of selecting what our topic for our QEP will be here at UK. Okay. So what is a QEP? QEP stands for Quality Enhancement Plan. And it is a core requirement now that SACS is requiring of us for reaffirmation of accreditation. And a core requirement is something we must do or we will -- we will get sanctioned. We will not get reaffirmed. What it is is a carefully designed course of action that addresses a well-defined and focused topic or issue that's related directly to enhancing student learning. Okay. So that's the -- the key piece of it is it's a well-focused, well-defined topic related to student learning. Why is QEP now part of the requirements for SACS? Well, actually because SACS was actually listening to the institutions across the region, when people were saying it felt like you had to do so much -- it was so prescriptive. People complained that the self-study report that had to be done, it was so prescriptive and so thorough, so they were listening, and they said this is less prescriptive, and it gives more control to the institutions in terms of what -- how we assess what's happening at our institution and where we want to go next with our institution and how we're going to try to get there and then how we're going to assess that.

So how? Previously for SACS what we did is we -- we prepared a comprehensive self study to demonstrate compliance. So it was really about demonstrating compliance, and we had to respond to what was referred to as 463 must statements. Those must statements were things that we had to demonstrate that we were doing that they said that we had to do. So it was very prescriptive. Now, for the compliance piece, we respond to 53 comprehensive standards. So they've reduced that. They really have reduced that must statement piece for compliance. So now for the SACS re-accreditation, we actually have two parts. Part 1 is the compliance report. Our response to those 53 comprehensive standards, and that's what -- that report is going to be due September

2012. But because they gave up all that control from 463 to 53 back to the institutions, we have this thing called the QEP. And the QEP is part 2 of what we need to report to SACS. And that Quality Enhancement Plan that we're going to engage in is due January 2013. Once we submit that plan and if they say that that plan is okay, if they agree with it that it's a good plan for this institution, then we have five years to implement the plan and assess the plan. And in 2017, so five years later, we prepare an impact report how has our plan worked? What -- what happened with our plan? An acceptable QEP. So we want to get a plan that they're going to approve, and we're actually kind of lucky in a couple of reasons, but one really important reason that we're lucky here is, right -- this QEP concept was instituted right after we did our last self study here. So they've been -- other institutions have been doing it for the last eight or nine years, and we can learn from the mistakes of other institutions; the things that worked, the things that didn't work for them. So that's kind of nice. So the -- SACS says that there are five things they look for in acceptable Quality Enhancement Program. The first is that it has to include -- it has to be a broad-based institutional process, and it has to identify a key issue that emerges from the institutional assessment. So something that we've discovered that we maybe aren't doing as well as we'd like to or we'd like to do it better based on our institutional assessment, and it has to be broad-based which is again part of the reason Kaveh and I are here today. We want to start from the get-go demonstrating that we have been making sure as many people are involved in a conversation as possible across the campus. Second of five, it has to focus on student learning, on learning outcomes that will somehow be addressing the mission of our institution. Third, we have to demonstrate that we are capable of initiating, implementing and completing it. So it can't be such a big, big, ambiguous broad thing that we can't possibly pull it off. So we have to have institutional capability. Again, broad-based involvement of all the constituencies in developing and implementing the QEP. So developing the QEP has to also -- nobody should feel like they got imposed upon. The -- the topic we pick -- granted we have to do a QEP, but the topic that we pick should be something that we can all own. Right? And the fifth is that we have to identify goals and a plan for assessing whether or not we've achieved the QEP by 2017 after implementing

it. Okay. So what is a --
HAYES: Are these slides going to be
online? I'm having a hard time writing.
SELLNOW: Yes. All of these slides will be
on. Thank you. Yeah, you don't need to
write all this down. Okay. So the next
thing that we wanted to find out so we
could share with you is what kinds of
topics of other institutions that are
similar to the University of Kentucky in
these last eight or nine years, what kind
of topics have they focused on for their
QEPs? Texas Tech looked at ethics. Their
QEP was about ethics across the campus.
LSU was enhancing student learning through
improved advising processes. Alabama,
reconceptualize -- reconceptualizing the
core curriculum, and I'm going to talk
about that a little bit more later and
why -- it seems like the obvious
no-brainer; well, we'll just do that, but
there's a catch, always a catch. Virginia,
enhancing student faculty engagement.
Other schools have done intercultural
awareness, integrated communication,
discovery-based learning. And even this
one was quite different so we included it
because it could even be something like
this: the student achievement center,
enhancing student learning in a
comprehensive service center. So it's
quite -- the topics that would be
acceptable are quite broad. But to be
acceptable, there has to be broad-based
involvement and -- and has to come from the
ground up across the institution. Since --
since the other schools have been trying to
do QEPs in terms of proposing them and
implementing them already, we've also got
some things that we've learned about what
not to do. The first one is not to present
the QEP as merely another SACS hoop to jump
through. Yes, it is something we have to
do for SACS, and we might feel like a hoop,
but we can't present it as such. We have
to -- the topic that we come up with needs
to be our topic that we feel vested in. We
can't impose a QEP from the top down. In
other words, the administration can't say,
yes, we'll do this thing. And as a matter
of fact, Texas Tech who did ethics, they
were one of the earliest institutions to
need to do a QEP, and they didn't go
through the very deliberate and transparent
process of identifying a topic, and it did
come from the top down. We'll do ethics;
that's a good idea. And they did get
sanctioned -- their -- as a result, and
their provost and their president ended up
stepping down. So, yeah, we do want to
make sure that we do this the right way.
Don't go there. The other thing that we're
not supposed to do is submit a QEP that

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt
describes initiatives that are already fully realized. So although we have this wonderful general education process that we've been undergoing, and it seems to be moving forward very deliberately and transparently a step at a time, by the time 2012 and 2013 comes along, if all keeps going as planned, that -- that will be in place, and so we -- we are ahead of the game, so to speak. We should have been up for SACS re-accreditation five years ago and proposed the general education curriculum as something to revise. So we've already really been through this process once with our gen ed, and now we'll be doing it forever and ever henceforth. Okay. And don't try to do too much. Keep it focused. When people try to do something too broad, it -- it's too hard to actually accomplish. Okay.

This next slide, don't try to write all this down, is just to show you that we really are involving -- trying to involve the campus at the start. Right now we're just talking about proposing a plan for step 1 which is selecting a topic. So all we're talking about right is proposing a plan, the process by which we'll go through selecting a topic for discussion. Okay. SACS -- and this was this thing called teams. SACS said that doing this in a team-based approach and adjusting and modifying these teams in these four different phases of doing the QEP will be a way to get broad-based constituency involvement in this process. So the first team is the QEP pre-planning team. And that's what we're going to talk about today. And that's what we do is develop the topic selection plan and propose a rough outline of a timeline for getting from point A to point B. Once that plan -- topic selection plan process is in -- is in place, then we identify a team that actually solicits input from across the campus and vets input from across the campus in terms of what topic do we want to focus on at the University of Kentucky to improve student learning? Then from there, the next team would be the QEP development team. And the QEP development team would conduct the research and actually write the plan. So once -- once the topic has been identified, we do another team. And then once the plan is submitted to SACS, then in January of 2013, once SACS says, yes, this is a great QEP, and it was broad-based, and it was deliberate, then we implement the plan until 2017 when we prepare the impact report. So those are the four teams in terms of best practices. Okay.

The next thing that I want -- we want to do is just tell you what we've done

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt

so far, actually in the last three months up to this point to getting to the point of being ready to plan, to topic selection and plan. Okay. In September there were two groups of people that went to workshops in the summer. One group went in the summer of 2008; another group went in the summer of 2009 to find out what the heck a QEP was. So -- so what we did is we got together in September and kind of conceived up a rough draft of what might constitute a pre-planning team and a timeline. We shared that with the provost who reviewed it, supported it. And then in October, Kaveh, who represents the group that went to the QEP workshops in the summer of 2008, and I, who went in the summer of 2009, we went to UCAP, to Senate Council, and to Dean's Council for input and endorsement on the way to get to here, where we are today. And here we're today proposing November University Senate approval.

So what we proposed was that the people who went to those two summer workshops ought to be involved in how to put this plan for picking a topic together. But when we looked at that group of people, we felt that we were -- it was missing -- needed more faculty involvement. So we proposed that we should add four additional faculty members that would be appointed by the University Senate Council. And so that was what we did; we brought it to Senate Council. And from there we have our pre-planning team which again is the workshop attendees. These are the additional faculty appointees from represented colleges that weren't -- to try to get a broader base of the colleges represented. And we are yet to be -- to name somebody from Student Affairs and a student representative. So this would be -- constitute the team that plans how we're going to pick the topic. Okay. I know it's crazy but it's deliberate. Yes, so that's that. Diane Snow and I agreed to co-chair, representing the academic side and the medical school side of this group.

The rough timeline, we've had the presentations; we've established the team, and then by January of 2010, we should have the plan for selecting a topic ready to go. At that point, we'll come to the Senate for approval of that topic selection plan, the process by which we're going to try to make sure this is transparent and broad-based in terms of identifying the topic we want to focus on here at UK. Then there will be a time for vetting between February and November in terms of deciding on a topic and determining which one we'll focus on. And then they'll go through the Senate-approval

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt
process at the end of 2010. Then the next team will be decided January 2011. And there will be vetting of that whole process from January to May of 2012. And then September to December 2012 will be that final QEP-approval process. The plan will be prepared, vetted with the campus so we can see what the plan is going to be, and approve it by December of 2012 so that we can submit it to SACS in January of 2013. So when you look at this breakdown of a timeline, you realize we really aren't starting any too soon because we really have to go through this very step-by-step approach to doing this. And then five years later, we get back report. Go Cats. Any questions? Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).

CONNERS: I'm Terry Conners from the College of Agriculture. What's the lifetime for this QEP? Is this something that goes away every time we get re-accredited, or is this something we maintain for the next 40 years? How could you describe that for us?

SELLNOW: Kaveh, you want this one?
TAGAVI: I -- my understanding that it's -- it's just continuous. In fact, I said why didn't they call it CQEP, Continuous Quality Enhancement Plan. I think every five years or every 10 years, then you -- you do another topic later on. But probably no campus has gone through this twice because it just started recently.

SELLNOW: And the idea is ongoing assessment and improvement of student learning should become part of our culture. There were -- as an institution we already have program outcomes that we assess and try to improve our programs that we're delivering, right? But this is the idea of having something that we're doing campus-wide that's related to our mission, student learning and our mission of our University that we engage -- embrace a culture of ongoing assessment and quality enhancement.

PRATS: Sure. I'll -- I'll bite. Armando Prats, English Department. How -- say, for example, does another university, I don't know if it was Alabama or -- how do they measure this issue of ethics, for example?

SELLNOW: Well, that's --
PRATS: I mean, do they have fewer students cheating or --

SELLNOW: That was -- that's a great question, and actually remember Texas Tech is the one that did ethics --

PRATS: Texas Tech, yeah.
SELLNOW: -- and -- and their president and provost ended up stepping down. Ethics was too broad.

PRATS: Okay. But was -- was the topic therefore chosen because they knew they had questionable people in -- in -- in addition. So -- so that's not it, right? They -- they just, what, chose it out of what concern?

SELLNOW: Well, that -- that's why they didn't -- that's why they got sanctioned is because they hadn't conceived of -- they -- they -- they didn't take the time to come up with a topic that -- that the institution supported and delivered and based on assessment at the institution, they just said, oh, we have to do a Quality Enhancement Plan; ethics would be a good one. That's my understanding. That's how it was explained to me. So that was a part of the problem. Okay.

CHAIR: Other questions? Thank you very much.

We now have two proposed changes. Yes, please.

YOST: I just have a quick question, Scott Yost, College of Engineering. Going back to the Dead Week issue.

CHAIR: Yes.
YOST: We do not have a Dead Week policy that applies to graduate students; is that correct? It's only for undergraduates?

CHAIR: It is for undergraduates only.
YOST: So when you talk about the distinction, we can do anything we want. Can we give exams on Dead Week to graduate students, not just quizzes? Can we give exams and things like this, because we have no policy for graduate students.

CHAIR: The Dead Week policy refers to undergraduate programs, but where you have mixed courses, a 400G course or a 500 course that may include both graduates and undergraduates, the requirement is that there be differential expectations for the undergraduates and for the graduates. And so for the graduates, yes, you did give an exam during Dead Week.

YOST: Just when you mentioned that, I thought they were trying to qualify the proposal for graduate students, but we don't have one, so that's what I wanted to make sure.

CHAIR: Correct. Thank you. Ben Withers, Dr. Withers is going to explain these two proposed changes to the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Fine Arts. Please.

WITHERS: Thank you. Thank you for having me today. We are here proposing changes to two of the undergraduate degrees in the Department of Art, the Bachelor of Art in Art Studio and the Bachelor of Fine Arts in Art Studio. The BA is a liberal arts-based degree, and the BFA is a pre-professional degree. The chief

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt

difference between them is the number of credit hours that are required in the 300 level or above. The BFA has more than the BA's requirements. We're here today in part because of a visitation from an external team, from the National Association of School -- of Schools of Art and Design who came to our campus in 2006 to evaluate the department for initial certification for accreditation and approval. NASAD is the -- the accredited of art programs and design programs in colleges and universities and private art schools in the United States.

Their site visit team noticed a few problems with the department that we've worked on to correct. One of them is the dismal state of the Reynolds Building so I'll pass a hat and ask for some help for our capital change fund there. But they also pointed out that we lacked some coherency and consistency in our pre-major requirements for these two degrees. These pre-major requirements were dispirited. They were not required at any point in time within the student's studies. So for example, we would have some seniors who would still be completing the pre-major requirements. The faculty took those recommendations seriously. We put together a faculty committee that looked at the NASAD recommendations, and they in turn recommended that we create a foundations committee, a faculty and staff committee, that looked particularly at this issue of our pre-major courses. They have established what you have in front of you. Essentially, it calls for the creation of a coherent and consistent freshman year, four classes in art studio, two classes in art history, in addition to a one-credit orientation to -- to the department, to the university, that's aimed at 18-year-old, 19-year-old incoming freshmen and a freshman exhibition at the end. There's also a requirement, a distribution requirement. The students are now asked to take courses from the three major areas in art studio, roughly 2-D, 3-D, and new media. So painting and drawing, print-making in 2-D, 3-D, and sculpture ceramics. New media would be photography, and digital based as well as, also performance art -- artists. We believe that this is important to do, one for recruitment. We think that we can recruit better students because now we are an accredited department. We're the second accredited art department in the State of Kentucky. Murray is the other one. And we think that this will have some major impacts on retention of students because they will be receiving better advising and better course of study during

that first year. I point out that as constituted, this proposal requires no new resources in terms of the number of courses or sections that we are asking our students to take or our faculty to teach. Though we did make a successful case to the Provost that a new faculty position, a tenure-track position, with the title director of foundation would help us with the clinical data, coherency and consistency of courses, especially when it comes to overseeing the PTIs and the TAs who teach in the program. And we have since the department approved this proposal, received that faculty position. As a matter of fact, we'll be coming back to you soon to change some of the particular courses in that foundation sequence based upon her recommendation. We would have liked to have waited for that, but we -- we approved this as a department, it has been through the process, before we knew we had that faculty position, and we only hired her -- she started this fall. So that's why -- where this particular statement. Are there any questions?

CHAIR: Then we need a motion, please, something to the effect of what's on the screen.

HAYES: Jane Hayes, College of Engineering. I move that the Senate approve the proposed changes to the BA Art Studio effective Spring 2010.

CHAIR: Second?

ESTUS: Second. Steve Estus, Physiology.

CHAIR: Discussion? All in favor aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Motion carries. We'll -- do you have anything additional that you want to speak to this one?

WITHERS: Ditto.

CHAIR: Any questions on this one? Need a motion, please. Somebody be brave.

HAYES: Jane Hayes, College of Engineering. I move the Senate approve the proposed changes to the Bachelor of Fine Arts, Art Studio, effective spring 2010.

CHAIR: And a second, please.

ESTUS: And I'll be the ditto.

CHAIR: Further discussion? All in favor aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Motion carries. Thank you. Mary Chandler-Bolin. Thank you. I'm sorry I didn't have a chance to greet you before. Counseling and Testing Center. Again, you'll recall one of the things we're trying to do is to bring you up to date on what we consider to be important initiatives and -- and (unintelligible)

around here so --

CHANDLER-BOLIN: Thank you so much.

CHAIR: -- please --

CHANDLER-BOLIN: Thank you. First, I appreciate the opportunity to be here this afternoon with you, and I believe out on the table prior to the beginning of the meeting there should have been some of our resource information. If you did not receive such, please let me know, and we'll get extra copies out to you. Much of that information is available via the Counseling and Testing Center Website. We are a free service for students. As I often say to students and parents, this is the only time in your life where you will have quality mental health services for which you will not have to tap your insurance or have some other direct fee pay. So it's a very good deal. We're staffed by licensed psychologists and doctoral students in counseling psychology and clinical psychology. These are advanced doctoral students who are towards the end of their course of study very often and getting ready to head out on internship. What I wanted to do, and I'm going to fly through about an hours worth of information in probably 10 minutes or slightly more because I know you have quite a full agenda, and it doesn't just include me. And would really invite you to contact me after the meeting or if I'm not available, feel free anytime to call the Counseling and Testing Center and ask for the on duty, the OD psychologist. We have a system where from 8:00 to 5:00 during the workday there is someone available to handle a call from faculty, staff, students, parents, anybody who has a question or has a concern. So for example, I think for you all as faculty if you have students about whom you're concerned for whatever reason, their behavior in the classroom is disruptive or their performance has dropped or they used to appear in class relatively well groomed, and I say that per student sort of norm. They may arrive in their pajamas but at least they were clean, that sort of thing. But and -- and they've gone from that to being very disheveled, smelling of alcohol more than sometimes might be expected, and I say that -- it sounds a bit flip, but our students do use alcohol, and so you may have someone who walks in the next morning looking or smelling a little hung over. I'm thinking about the kids that this becomes an issue in their performance and their ability to do what needs to be done in the classroom in terms of not only doing homework and -- and exams but also interfacing, doing the interactive process for learning. So if

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt

you have concerns about students, feel free to contact us in terms of how to generate a referral, about ways that you might interact effectively with the student.

There also is separate from the Counseling and Testing Center, what we call the Care Team, formerly the Students of Concern. And that actually operates out of the Dean of Students' Office. If you are concerned about a student and would like that to go in to sort of an official University record where other people might also be reporting their concerns, the Care Team is the place to -- to put that into -- into the record. Many schools have had Care Teams. I think a lot of schools since the tragedies of Virginia Tech and NIU have formed Care Teams, some call them Students of Concern Team. But the idea is that often a student will come to the attention of more than one person around the University. It could be a residence staff member. It could be a faculty member. It could be somebody at the gym who sees them behaving in a way that seems unhealthy or unsafe. Those calls can go to the Dean of Students' Office. And I wanted to draw that distinction because if you call and talk to one of our staff psychologists, they can consult with you, but it's very likely they will say to you, please register your concern also with the Care Team because it's separate. That's really a function of the Dean of Students' Office. What we would do would be confidential conversation with you and consulting.

Very quickly, I want to just hit a few highlights of what we offer: Individual counseling and therapy, also couples, and couples do not have to be married couples. They can people who date, people who are roommates, people who have some sort of relationship about which they need to work or resolve conflicts. We also offer group therapy which is really the therapy of choice for many students who have issues around anxiety, depression, and self esteem, interaction patterns, families or origin kinds of concerns. Often we will recommend them to group therapy versus individual therapy. It's a really rich opportunity and one which, frankly, is not going to be very available for them outside of the University. If you can find group therapy in the -- in the community, it's out there. It's hard to find, and often insurance doesn't pay for it. So very often, I'll say to students, take advantage of group therapy while you're here. There are plenty of opportunities to get good individual therapy beyond the University once you're out. We also work with students who bring issues to us around

alcohol and other drugs which is a considerable problem. Sometimes they come to us because they have run into legal difficulties and/or parental difficulties. And so that certainly is one thing that we are quite familiar with. There are some students who have long-standing problems that probably really do need to go to a rehab or detox kind of facility, and we can help facilitate that as well. We provide support for academic success, and I'm looking here at my colleague Karin Lewis who is in charge of the study. It's -- and it's so nice that you're here because I was going to mention you all anyway. The issues around student success that has to do with strategies and skills and tutoring and how to get the hands on, Karin's folks are the experts there. For students that have more, I would say, ingrained, this is kind of how they operate issues, low self esteem, chronic procrastination. Students whose performance is adequate or more than adequate but they keep sabotaging themselves, so if it's more pervasive, long-standing, chronic kind of challenge around academic success, send them to the Counseling Center. If they need the specific kinds of things that the study need -- the study would offer to them, we'll send them to the study. Vice versa, if they land at the study first, and they need something that's more broad-based, there are folks over there will send them to the Counseling Center, so it's real nice interaction around that as well. In a similar way, we work with students around decision-making skills, not limited to career and major. But as you know as faculty, there are some students that go through a vast number of majors in their four to five to six to seven year tenure at UK. Often that is not about their academic ability. It's their sense of who they are. This period of sort of 18 to 25, there are several really key tasks that students have, one of which is figuring out who am I in relationship to myself and others and how does that play out in my workplace and my relationships, in my -- in the entirety of my life? So we can work with students around that, particularly students who may have chosen one particular career path and find that they are not successful for a variety of reasons or perhaps they chose a particular path because of strong encouragement from parents or former high school teachers or someone said, you should really be X, and a student really is struggling with X even though perhaps they're capable of doing that work, and we can help them look at some other options that might be a better fit for them. So

that figures in again in a larger piece of student development.

We see an enormous range of what students bring to us. From fairly predictable home sickness and transitional adjustment issues of first-year students all the way up to the other end, I'd say the other end of the -- the bookend, if you will, of students who are significantly acutely suicidal and need to go to the hospital. And we see sort of everything in between there. The issues that students bring to us most frequently by percentage are -- and this is student's words, stress, which is a rather global term. They identify stress. Academics, finances, relationships, anxiety, depression. Those are probably the top six or seven off the top of my head. I'd give you the full list of 10, but I'd have to look at a sheet of paper to give them in order. We are part of a national research consortium. What we see from students at UK is very similar to these -- to -- to consortium schools across the US that represent smaller schools and schools much larger than we are, including the Ohio State University and some types of that are -- that are big schools. So we have a nice range of the consortium. But we look pretty similar. A lot of students -- and actually let me back up one notch. I should have said this by the way of introduction. I'm a licensed psychologist, and I am the director of the Counseling Center, and my invitation, as I understand to come speak to you today, led from the NPR story, the NPR features that looked at college student mental health. And there have been several over the last year, but most recently, I think it was on October 19th, there was one that looked at college student mental health concerns and what -- what students are bringing to us. More and more students arrive at the University having been on psychotropic medications. That could be an anti-depressant, an anti-anxiety medication, ADHD meds would probably be the three most common. They also very often have been in therapy. They may have already had hospitalizations. They are more likely than a generation ago, at least by the statistics we have, to have made a suicide attempt. So we're having students that come in who are very bright, very intellectually able to do the work, and interpersonally may have some struggles, psychologically may have some very significant struggles. And my encouragement is if you're concerned at all about a student, contact us. Let us consult with you about whether we're a good fit for the student. We're not an

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt
extremely long-term service. So if you have a student, for example, who you know because perhaps the student confesses to you, they've been in therapy for an extended period of time, already had multiple hospitalizations, that's the kind of student we're more likely to try to find a therapist in the community for who could be available for longer-term therapy than we would provide. But we could certainly consult with you about what those resources might be.

We also do a lot of outreach and programming. So if there's a mental health or a student development or really any other kind of topic in that realm that you'd like for us to bring into your class, we can come and talk to students about healthy relationship, communication skills, stress management, general sort of student mental health wellness kinds of concerns.

We also have a program called QPR, Question, Persuade, Refer. This is a systematic effort to reduce suicide. It's a national program. It's not just for colleges, but the University of Kentucky is a recipient of a federal SAMHSA grant, a college suicide prevention grant. You may have heard of the Garrett Lee Smith grant. This is one of those. And we have finished year one. We're in year two now. And I'm going to give a shout out to one of my colleagues, Dr. Todd Cheever. Stand up, Todd. He didn't know I was going to do this, because I didn't know he was going to be here. He's a psychiatrist, and he's not affiliated with the Counseling and Testing Center, but he is the chair of the State Task Force on suicide prevention, of the steering committee for that group, but I served on that group for a number of years as well. And Todd is one of the QPR trainers that does provides training here at UK. I wanted to mention it to you because often, even uninvited, our students may spill beans in our laps. And those beans might be about being suicidal. And, oh, Richard Greissman, stand up too. This is another QPR instructor. Sorry. I just looked up and saw he's here. So one thing that some of you may get contacted by us because we're looking to bring a couple of faculty in to the fold that we have here of QPR instructors. It means a day of training to be certified, and then the individual trainings, it would with faculty, with students, with staff, with whatever the group might be. It usually lasts an hour to 90 minutes. It's a brief gatekeeper training to help people identify those who might be at risk for suicide and to know how to proactively intervene to get them to the right kind of professional

help. It's not intended to create people being sort of junior counselors or any sort of mental health functioning professional, but only to give you the information whether you need it to intervene with a student, a colleague, a family member, a neighbor, someone with who you worship or are in civic activities. QPR is a really, really fine program, and I can brag on it because I'm a national trainer for the program. But please consider having us come to your faculty, your department meeting, to classes. We do a lot of UK 101. I've done some trainings in individual faculty meetings in departments. This would be a really, really rich way for you to be able to look out for your students, and again, not for you to have to manage the crisis, but to recognize that there's a crisis brewing and be able to hand that student to somebody who could do a more thorough evaluation and provide some -- some hands-on assessment and the kind of help that they might need. So that was very, very fast. Wow, that was right at 10 minutes. I usually don't do quite so well. What I will tell you in closing is that the services of the Counseling and Testing Center are confidential by law and by ethics. We're separate. We're not under -- under the student's academic record. If a student is at risk to die or somebody else is at risk to die, we will break confidentiality in order to get people safe. And that's really the sort of boundaries around it, other than legal requirements such as subpoena. There are times that records could be called out, but typically unless a student gives us written permission to share information, if you call and say, I referred Johnny over, did you see Johnny yesterday for his appointment? Our standard response is that we cannot confirm nor deny a student's status as a client of the Counseling Center. However, students have the option to give us permission to confirm with you that they attended. And some students will give just that much permission, yes, tell Dr. Jones when he calls I did come to my appointment. And we don't discuss what the content of the discussion would have been. But the staff at the Counseling Center, I will brag on them; they're wonderful. They're very, very dedicated psychologists who could be making probably twice as much money in private practice, and choose to work with college students because this is the population that we feel drawn to serve. And you, as faculty, are really, really key in the effort to not only promote individual student welfare, but also to help keep the campus safe because you're

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt

the ones that are going to sometimes notice from student's behavior or perhaps comments that they write in essays or other documents that you might read or logs, journals, that sort of thing, you're the one to whom a student might directly or indirectly share information that they really are in a pretty high level of distress and need some -- need some referral, need some help. So that's the quick, quick version. Please feel free to call us again for consultation, for more specific information. The information that would have been out front, is our general Counseling Center brochure which is buff and folded. A blue one about managing stress, and I had asked to come speak to you today rather than the December meeting because as the semester continues, I will assume you will have more students who might feel stressed. So in this next month to six weeks, you might refer some people to us that you couldn't refer to us if I spoke to you on December 13th or not so many of them. And -- oh, a simple one-page flier that we designed is How to Help Distressed Students. It's a very quick and dirty sort of reminder of things that -- that might be helpful to you. And again, I -- I very much appreciate the opportunity to -- to speak with you and thank you for all that you do not only to educate our students but to help them be well and help them stay alive.

CHAIR: Questions?

CHANDLER-BOLIN: Yes.

SNOW: Diane Snow, Med Center. I applaud your effort, first. This is wonderful to have this service available to our students. Thank you.

CHANDLER-BOLIN: Thank you.

SNOW: Do you have some measures of success? Are there measures you can test saying you're doing a good job with these students?

CHANDLER-BOLIN: We do. There's an instrument called the OQ45. It's a 45-item repeat measure which is given at intake at the initial appointment and then on follow up. And we usually get between a half and a full standard deviation of drop over the course of, say, five to seven sessions in terms of the symptom distress that a student reports. And their score drops, meaning they're less distressed. And those measures had to do with their sort of internal functioning, their interpersonal functioning with others, their interactions, and sort of general life satisfaction, were the kinds of things that that instrument looked at. We have recently switched away from that instrument to a new one called CCAPS. And I think

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt
we'll find probably similar kinds of repeated -- it's a repeated measure also in terms of the outcomes, and I think we'll see something similar with that. But it's new. We've just instituted that this fall, so I don't have any semester-long or year-long numbers on that yet. But, I suspect it will be similar. Yeah, yes, sir.

WERMELING: Wermeling, Pharmacy.

CHANDLER-BOLIN: Yes.

WERMELING: Are you integrated with the Student Health Service?

CHANDLER-BOLIN: We are a separate stand-alone unit but work very closely with the University Health. The -- the closest interaction is with Behavioral Health, formerly called Student Mental Health. They have two psychiatrists, a psychiatric nurse practitioner, and usually three residents. And what tends to happen is they provide most of the evaluations and follow up for medication, largely anti-depressants, but also other meds. We provide talk therapy typically. We meet jointly with that staff, the Counseling Center and the Behavioral Health staff once a month, and in between we do consulting as we need it about shared cases. And at this point it works really nicely because I think some students already know University Health because they go there to get various routine things done, allergy shots, whatever. And for some students that's very comfortable. Other students I think are very comfortable initially starting at the Counseling Center, especially, I think, some students that are from areas where in their upbringing -- where there was more stigma -- stigma about mental health help seeking. I talk a lot with students about consulting. I talk to you all about therapy because as a psychologist, that's what I do, is therapy. But often with students, I talk about concentration and problem solving. So we probably are a little softer sell in some regards at the Counseling Center, but in a similar way with the study, wherever a student starts, if they need to get to the other place, we'll get them to the other place. The staff at UHS is really fabulous, refer also to the general medical staff there, the docs. They also have a nutritionist who works with students who have a disorder eating, and then also the GYN clinic has -- has certainly worked well for us.

CHAIR: Anything else?

CHANDLER-BOLIN: Thank you very much. I appreciate it. Have a wonderful end of the semester.

CHAIR: We now have a proposed change to the College of Law Admissions'

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt
requirements. I put them here, but they're also in your Agenda. Is Drusilla Bakert here? Please, come up.

BAKERT: Good afternoon. The College of Law has for a long time stated that letters of recommendation were preferred but not required for a candidate's consideration. We want to change our rule to require at least two letters of recommendation for several reasons. First and foremost, we place a great deal of weight on letters, particularly from faculty. So we feel that saying that letters are not required sends a message to candidates that they're not as important to us as they actually are. We do from time to time have a candidate come before the committee whose file is technically ready for consideration, whose file in all respects looks good, but there are no letters of recommendation. And so the committee is always faced with the question in those circumstances of, can we hold this candidate for -- for further consideration until we receive a letter when we haven't actually required the letters, but simply stated they are preferred. Secondly, changing our rule will place us more in line with the current practice at other law schools. In the last few years, most of the schools with whom we compete have changed their rules to require at least two letters of recommendation, including both of the other Kentucky law schools, the law schools at University of Cincinnati, Tennessee, Georgia, North Carolina and Indiana, Illinois, et cetera. The only school in our region I located that still only prefers letters is University of Florida, and we don't like to be in the same group with them. Finally, it will save my staff which is fairly small some administrative time because right now we do tell candidates they can have their file held for consideration pending receipt of particular letters. And when those files become ready for consideration without the letters, we have to manually hold them back from the admissions committee. So if we require the two letters, we don't even have the file become ready for consideration until its two -- at least two letters are received. Are there any questions?

CHAIR: All right. Then I need a motion, please.

SNOW: Diane Snow. I recommend that we propose the changes to the College of Law admission's requirement effective spring 2010.

CHAIR: A second?

GROSSMAN: Second, Bob Grossman, A&S.

CHAIR: Discussion? All in favor aye?

AUDI ENCE: Aye.

CHAIR:

Opposed nay?

AUDIENCE:

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR:

Motion carries.

Work-Life Presentation on

Flexible Work Arrangement. Robynn.

PEASE:

How many of you have staff, just regular staff or -- that -- that you supervise, that you supervise? Just a few of you. I'm here to remind you all about the flexible work arrangements guidelines that the President endorsed back in April of 2008. I think I had contacted the office to request this presentation back in August after a high level administrator at one of the colleges called me and said, what did you do? What did you say to my employee? She wants a very flexible work arrangement. I'm not sure if that's the right thing to do. So I'm here to let you know that we've -- we've had these guidelines in place for over a year now. And the Work-Life Office does consult with both employees and supervisors about the kinds of flexibility -- flexible work arrangements that you might be able to provide in your unit. These are guidelines, not policies, that really entail how to arrange a productive work schedule. We look at how, when, and where the work gets done. And what, I think, has -- has been working well is asking you as supervisors to consider ahead of time before your employee asks what options might be available. For example, some units might only be able to collect, you know, the start time and end time of the day. Some units are offering telecommuting once a week. Some are able through cross training and adequate staff are able to offer compressed work weeks. All kinds of arrangements are being offered. Today I -- I received a call about a job share that the folks want to do in a particular unit. So again, the other reason why I want to let you know, I -- again, sometimes I go, and I work with supervisors and maybe have a highly productive employee. They don't want to lose this individual so they're -- they're wanting to maybe flex that person's time, give them the ability to work primarily at home. But maybe the unit itself -- for example, I had a supervisor he didn't want to lose an employee; she wanted to quit the work. So he said, well, maybe you could work at home? But the nature of her work was actually being there in the office addressing foot traffic and unexpected problems that arose. So that was not a feasible option for him to consider. So we deny as well as promote the options. We did send out a survey to 1,398 supervisors across the campus, and we -- some of you might have received those.

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt

It was a rather long survey, but we did receive a 47-percent response rate. And among those surveyed, 54 percent of supervisors are allowing some type of flexibility with their direct reports. The reasons they're allowing it include response to help their staff manage work and family life, to maintain morale and job satisfaction, and also simply because of folks are -- are requesting that. And indeed, our supervisors have seen a 31-percent increase in -- in requests for flexibility. We don't have all the data analyzed, but preliminary reports do suggest that those supervisors, 54 and younger, are more likely to allow for flexibility, and the women on campus are more likely to offer it up than men. Again, 64 percent of our respondents said staff initiate. And I want to let you know when employees call us in the Work-Life Office, we say, you know, we talk about the nature of their work, what kinds of options must be -- might be available. We take into consideration a staffing pattern. And then we do suggest that they write you as a supervisor a proposal. And again, how, when, and where the work gets done, how communication will -- will take place, and we also ask for a probationary period so that you have the option of declining. And again, as indicated in our survey, myself included, we do deny flexible work arrangement options if they're not feasible for our units. We have a lot of folks, 44 percent reporting informal arrangements as opposed to that formal agreement, but again, I'd like to encourage you to consider a formal proposal. It could be in the form of a memo or a more comprehensive letter because, again, it clears up any expectations or communications about the flex -- the nature of the flexible work arrangement. So that's my report. Again, I want to let you know I'm out there. I'm -- I'm helping the staff be creative. We get a lot of calls, for example, in the summer, how do I accommodate the kids being off -- off from school? I can't afford after school -- or I can't afford summer programs anymore. Can I flex my time? And remember, in addition to just a flexible work arrangement, we now have reduced summer hours where people can reduce their -- their weekly time or even take a leave of absence for a specific period in time in the summer as well as in the winter, and that's -- all you have to do is have your supervisor approve -- supervisor's approval to implement that flex option as well. So having said all of that, are there any questions about what we're proposing?

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt

CHAIR: Questions? Thank you so much.
PEASE: Did you want me to talk about my position as staff representative?
CHAIR: I was going to mention it, but better for you to mention it.
PEASE: Well, I was asked, as you see, I -- I am the staff representative to the Board of Trustees. And I don't really know what you'd like to know. I have two -- two Board of Trustee meetings under my belt now, and the first one was -- I -- I didn't oppose the President's bonus so I got some -- my -- my constituents weren't all happy about that. And then the second meeting, well, you know the outcome of that. It was also quite interesting with the -- first of all, the vesting option, I opposed that motion raising some concerns about the fairness of -- of how -- how the vesting option would really play out among staff -- staff or -- faculty and staff. I also know it's a small percentage, but we have about 2,000 employees who do use their existing retirement fund for hardship money. So as the work-life director, I hear the stories about people who are having a hard time because they're not getting the salary increases. I work alongside people who, given not only their salaries, but their life circumstances, are really choosing between medicine, health care, self care, and food on the table for their children. So that's the kind of attitude. That's the kind of -- those are the stories that I bring to the -- to, I guess, the full board and committee meetings. I want to keep -- keep that in mind as we talk about some of the larger issues that go before the board. Also, you know that I -- I opposed the motion, the proposed Wildcat Coal Lodge. Our folks --

UNIDENTIFIED: Good for you.
PEASE: Well, you know, again, while not all employees -- I mean, it's hard to -- to speak on behalf of every single person, but while not everyone opposed it, many of our staff did express concern for the naming, and their reasons were like the committee that you might suspect, the -- the concern for product placement, just the -- that broad label coal, what does it mean? For me, in addition to what they said, the -- the trouble with such a broad name, you could see it positively or you could interpret it negatively. And I think in this particular day and time as we saw with our students play out, coal, it has an increasing negative name, not because we don't appreciate the energy it provides, but because there is a real political-social movement to be more conscientious of our environment, and for whatever reason, coal has become sort of the scapegoat of --

for -- for -- for the symbol, and it becomes the symbol for a need to change. So those were some of the reasons I opposed the motion, and it was a very emotional time because the students did want to speak. And many of the board members moved out, but that's -- I'm -- I'm filling -- or I'm filling out or serving out Russ Williams term. It was his -- the last year of his third time in office. So this is a real change for our staff. He was very well loved and respected by both the staff and many of the board members. And so I thought maybe as the work-life director, given the nature of my day-in and day-out with all of the different types of concerns that come through my office, I might be a nice person to transition during this -- this time of change for the staff. So I do keep the employees, faculty included, their working conditions in mind as I sit there at the full board meeting. So that's my position. Are there any questions or comments about that? May not always win, but I can say that -- that I guess my greatest disappointment, because I do feel somewhat disappointed, that I think there -- just from my -- my two times there, there is a great emphasis, and you may already know that, on the -- the emphasis on the financial bottom line. And so, you know, I was hoping that there would be more formal opportunities for greater dialogue about the consequences of certain decisions that go beyond just, you know, meeting the budget, whatever that budget is. So who knows, maybe after this last board meeting, more opportunities will arise because, as you know, you saw the consequences of not paying attention to issues, in addition to just, you know, making money or building new buildings. We have to pay attention to the political and social environment and the aftermath of those -- those decisions. So thank you very much. I -- I received a lot of positive support. I haven't yet to receive one negative comment about my decision on the Wildcat Coal Lodge. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. Office of Academic Enhancement, Karin Lewis, Director, please.

LEWIS: Good afternoon. I'm Karin Lewis, Director of Academic Enhancement. Can you hear me without the microphone or do you want me to stand here? Is that better? I appreciate you having me come speak to you. It's nice to see some of my fellow Discovery Seminar faculty out there. It's nice to have some familiar faces to look out at and -- and people that I've been involved with with the UK Women's Forum. So it's really nice to be invited here.

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt

Thank you. And also some of the faculty I work with on occasion.

I'm here to just share some information with you about academic enhancement. Academic enhancement is an academic unit that was established -- this is our sixth year, so a little over six years ago the task force, on first year initiatives, recommended the establishment of academic enhancement. And I was hired to direct and build and grow it. And boy, has it grown. In five years, we've -- we've grown quite a bit. We are situated under the associate provost of Undergraduate Education. Mike Mullen is my boss. And we offer a number of services that we're hoping that many of you are familiar with. From our peer-to-peer tutoring program which is a peer mentoring, peer tutoring program. It's proactive, preventative. We have individual academic consultation. We have seminars that are formerly -- about five years ago, you might recognize the term, The Master Student Workshop. That has evolved and become the Study Smarter Seminar that is now offered on week nights and not on weekends, thus we get a whole lot more students coming. And we do classroom presentations. And for those of you that may have to go to a conference, rather than cancel your class, you can request that we come and present to your class. And it can be on one of 25 different subjects from critical reading skills, to time management, note-taking techniques, exam preparation, any number of things that you think your students might need while you're gone. That's the Absent Professor Program. We also do a lot with UK 101 and the academic lesson plans and the UK 101 curriculum. We offer GRE and GMAT prep classes, encouraging students to prepare for those exams and go on to graduate school. And we do consulting with departments and individual faculty, and we work very collaboratively with a number of departments and faculty from the Math department to the College of Education, to -- we have some formal arrangements and some informal arrangements, like the College of -- or the Department of Educational Policy Studies' Evaluation. We have a very nice working relationship with them. We last year had over 22,000 student contacts. We are a centralized provision of services. So one-stop shopping essentially. Easy to find. Situated on south campus right in the lap of 65 percent of the freshmen. That was intentional. They have no excuse. They go downstairs to eat their dinner because that's where the dining hall is, and we're on the third floor. So you have no excuse. You go eat,

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt
come upstairs, get some tutoring. We get our direct support from the associate provost and the provost. And we are a bridge between Academic Affairs because we're situated in Academic Affairs, but we work collaboratively with Student Affairs as well. So we try to bridge that sometimes seeming abyss. Our mission is to serve all students on campus. There are a number of programs that are serving particular populations of students. And I have a particular purpose, and -- and they have different funding sources and different reasons for being. And we are the one place on campus that serves all students, any major, any college. Undergraduate students are a particular concern. First year students and their retention is a particular concern. But we also have graduate students and an occasional faculty member will come in for a consultation as well, like for time management, things like that. We are in a location that the students refer to as The Study. And so you may know us by that name because that's how they refer to us. The academic unit is Academic Enhancement. The place where they come for our services is called The Study. We're on south campus, as I said. This is a snapshot of our -- just one of our programs, the Peer Tutoring Program, our largest program. We started in and at and until last year we went from serving 271 students to over 14,000 students for tutoring alone. We promote it as proactive. Come early; come often. We will help you avoid falling into that deep hole or getting behind in classes. We -- we serve honor students to very, very struggling students, you know, in -- in a broad range. We have B-plus students that really want the A. And they'll come in regularly. And then we have students that are floundering that will come in just to stay afloat and try and figure out where their feet are in this academic environment. So we get the whole range. I employ over 75 undergraduate students, and I typically have about five graduate student assistants. Everybody who works for me is a student. And I have -- myself and my assistant director are the only two professional staff. We have no clerical staff. Everybody who works for me is a student. So if you call or you look at our Website or you walk through the door, you will encounter -- you will be encountered -- you will encounter an undergraduate student who will greet you. Some of our scholarly work, we provide opportunities for undergraduate research. And we have had undergraduate students present at national conferences.

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt

We have graduate students that have written and presented at various conferences as well. And my assistant director and I, also engage in scholarly work, so -- and it's a really nice opportunity for both the graduate students and the undergraduate students to be able to do that. And we are funded, as I said, by the associate provost of Undergraduate Studies and with the generous support from the provost of some nonrecurring funds. We have a shoestring budget, but we have some very generous people on campus that have -- have contributed to our programming, including the College of Arts and Sciences. They have been great over the last three years. Student Government gives us what they can. Some years it's as much as almost \$30,000. This year it's 13,000. The KEA grant, we get \$2.00 per hour for every student that qualifies that works for us. So for every -- every hour they work, and we pay them, we get \$2.00 back. So that fluctuates from year to year. That's where we are situated. And this is my staff, all their happy faces. Everyone is a student. You heard Mary talk about the Q -- the -- yeah, QPR training, suicide prevention. Every one of my employees is trained every year because, as she mentioned, you all might be front-line people that face students in distress. Often they will go to their peers first, and we want these young people to be prepared should someone, as she said, spill the beans in their lap. So that's one of the ways we work together with the Counseling and Testing Center. We also work with a number of other organizations and departments on campus. We work with the Career Center as well. But that's my staff. My senior staff in the upper square is a mix of graduate students and undergraduate students that have expressed interest, applied, and were trained in leadership positions. And they help us remain open at night because most students seek our services at night when they're trying to do their homework and things. And being here till 10:00 at night is a little bit much for me every night and Sunday nights. So they help us keep our fingers on the pulse of what's going on even when I'm not in the center. That is who I work with. And there's my contact information. Does anybody have any questions? Yes.

SNOW: Diane Snow, Med Center. Sort of philosophical thing here. When I was an undergraduate student, we had a peer-to-peer program as well. It was called Asking Your Friend What you Missed or What you Didn't Understand.

LEWIS: Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).

SNOW: And it seems to me by watching my students just, you know, an unprofessional survey here, that they're getting less and less capable of taking care of themselves in many different ways. So since you're a research base group, do you see causes for this? Are you addressing the causes so that maybe lots of programs like this won't be as necessary, or do we not go that far?

LEWIS: Yeah, if I did my job phenomenally, hopefully, I would work my way out of a job. I do see -- I do see incoming students, and I'm -- I'm a parent of a college student so I see it from -- coming even from a home where -- where parents are educators, so they have, you know, the best possible insights. I would say many, many students come -- our number one request is for consultations on time management. And typically that's because they're arriving here, and they've never had to manage their time. Somebody else has done that for them. And they get here, and -- and they don't know what to do. Some of the academic preparedness, some of it's -- I -- I would say most of the students that I speak to have never been taught directly study skills. And I consider them tools in their toolbox for learning. They have a few. They don't even know what they are. And I say, well, now you're here, you need power tools. And they don't know where to get them so I -- this is where you get power tools. And we directly teach, typing for note-taking for different types of subject areas, how to use those notes. My background is in educational psychology, cognition and learning. So we do a lot of helping students learn how to learn and think critically and read critically across different genres of reading. But, yeah, there is -- there's a pattern of preparedness or lack thereof when they come in. And I -- it just seems to be where we are right now.

SNOW: Are there ways for us to reach a little bit farther back and start putting some of these programs together at the high school level?

LEWIS: Well, actually, that's an interesting thing that you -- that you bring up. I was just part of a summit with the Fayette County School System and the Sheldon Center, Dr. Phil Kraemer set it up, and we've been talking to them about how we can bridge this understanding, what are they getting? It was interesting. I had a conversation over lunch with a math instructor at the high school. And she would give them quizzes every single day to make sure they did their homework and had

enough points so that if they got behind, they could catch back up. And I said, what do you do when they're a senior? Well, most of them -- many of them are not taking math their senior year, what do you do to help kind of wean them off of that to prepare them for when they get here when they don't get that? They get two midterms and a final, and they've never dealt with that before. How can we talk to each other more about, you know, maybe they do need a lot of support. Developmentally, they probably do, but how do you wean them off that and start preparing them? And then when they get here, how do we give them a little more structure and wean them off that through their freshmen year? We've opened that conversation, and I -- I think it's an important one. Hopefully, the commissioner at the state level will -- will consider that conversation a valuable one to have between higher education and the public school system. Yes.

GROSSMAN: You have student peer tutors who teach specific subjects; they'll tutor in specific subjects; is that right?

LEWIS: They tutor, yes.

GROSSMAN: They tutor in specific subjects?

LEWIS: Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).

GROSSMAN: I'm just wondering what kind of quality control you have on it because sometimes it's very hard to know -- students will tell you someone said something, and you never know whether they actually said it or that was just what was understood.

LEWIS: Right.

GROSSMAN: But I often get students in my office telling me, well, my tutor said such and such and what they -- what they're telling me the tutor said is completely wrong. And I never know --

LEWIS: Are you speaking of tutors in The Study?

GROSSMAN: Yep.

LEWIS: And what is your name?

GROSSMAN: John Doe. Bob Grossman; I teach organic chemistry.

LEWIS: Okay, okay. No, that's important feedback for me to have because we only have certain tutors that are qualified to teach or to tutor organic chemistry.

GROSSMAN: Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).

LEWIS: And -- and sometimes people come in when they're not on staff, and I need to make sure that that's not happening; that they're not getting misinformation. We have a very, very stringent hiring process. They have to go through the online employment system, just like anybody else. They have to fill out an application. They have to provide a letter of recommendation from a faculty member, a letter of

endorsement. They have to have an interview. They go through a lot. And we get about 450 applicants a year. It is a highly sought after position, and so we get the highest quality of students that come through our door. We also train them, and they have to have taken the course successfully here at UK, in particular. They can't just have tested out of it, come in here, you know, never taken a math class, never taken a science course here, but tested out and got credit for it and work for me, because there's added value to having taken that course here and knowing the faculty and knowing the workload and how it works here at UK. So those are some of the quality control. And we also provide ongoing special development for them. So they are required to do additional training. We are certified -- internationally certified by the College Reading and Learning Association, so we have to meet their standard. And five of the top 20 also have CRLA certification. And 11 of our benchmarks also do. So we are doing our part to lift our own. And that's not required of me. I did that intentionally because we want the standard to be high. So if you ever get feedback like that, I -- I encourage you to call me directly, and I will make sure that we straighten it out. We work very closely with a number of faculty to make sure that doesn't happen. And sometimes a faculty member is -- has something particular in mind. And like for -- I'll give math for example. They are teaching a concept, and they have not taught formula yet. And they did that intentionally. So we talk. And they say, don't -- tell the tutors not to share the formula. We know there's a formula for it. We're going to teach them that next week, but this week we're working on concept. We're like, fine. Get the word out to the peer tutor so that they do not share that formula. And they encourage the students to look at the concept and say, there's a reason; there's a method to this madness. So it helps for me when faculty talks to me about what's going on in their classes or if there's a change in the curriculum or there's something particularly coming up that may be problematic. We -- every once in a while we have a problem set for chemistry or something in math or in -- in physics, and they'll give me the head ups, and they'll say, here's -- here's what we're looking for, and I pass that out to the peer tutors. And they're very, very high achieving young people. And they'll all crowd around a table and they'll work through a problem together so they can

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt
anticipate questions that will come from other students.

And just another thing that we train them on is how to redirect conversation when freshmen come in complaining about their instructors. And we do that because our peer tutors gave us feedback. They said -- they fill out a form every week giving us feedback on what's being asked. And typically at the beginning of the freshmen year, there's -- there's a rash of that. And we train them how to redirect that conversation because it's not productive, and -- and they appreciate that as well. Any feedback? I'm -- I'm open to feedback. We want top quality tutors, and we want the right information going out because we're supporting you. Any other questions?

CHAIR: Further questions?

LEWIS: Thank you very much for having me.

CHAIR: Thank you.

LEWIS: I appreciate it.

CHAIR: One of the responsibilities we have is to approve the degree list. So you have a separate handout with the names of individuals to receive degrees. The list has actually changed because of faculty input. So, what you do is important. And I need a motion worded essentially like this. Dr. Jones.

JONES: Toxicology. Motion worded like that.

CHAIR: Thank you, Dr. Jones. Second, please?

JENSEN: Jane Jensen, College of Education. Second.

CHAIR: Thank you. Discussion? Yes.

SELLNOW: Just a quick question. Tim Sellnow, Communications and Information Studies. Just curious if -- if there's an error that -- that comes to light after this fact, what is the opportunity for amendment or changes? Is this it?

CHAIR: The -- the student will only be awarded the degree if everything is completed. So this is authorizing but nothing happens until all requirements are satisfied. So this is an essential hurdle but not the last one. So if a student doesn't finish up, then the degree will not be awarded. Please.

ARRINGTON: Michael Arrington, Communications, as well. I think the case that we have in mind, though, is of a student who has defended her dissertation successfully but is not on the list.

CHAIR: Then it is absolutely our responsibility to see that that name gets on this list. We have actually gone so far as to have a meeting of the Board of Trustees by phone or whatever when there

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt

was a student who had to have a degree and so there are ways of dealing with that, but it should be on this list or we need to -- we don't add names from the floor, but if there's a problem like that, get to us. Sheila, is there anything else I should say with regard to that question?

BROTHERS:

No.

CHAIR:

No.

SUAREZ:

Juana Suarez, Hispanic Studies. I guess I want suggestions of what -- what would be our specific job and how we can handle the specific requests, because this year, at least, I felt an enormous responsibility because I underwrote for the undergraduate studies for my department, but I didn't really know where to go -- or other than send the list to the (unintelligible) and the graduate studies. But there was no conversation going on addressed to the people in the College of Arts & Sciences saying that somebody else should keep a master list. So what is the most effective way to work around this to make sure that we are doing the right job and we have (unintelligible) --

CHAIR:

Get the problem to the Senate Council Office. Tell us what the problem is, and we'll -- we'll work through that.

SUAREZ:

No, but to verify the list?

CHAIR:

I'm sorry?

SUAREZ:

To verify the list which it seems to be the basic step here. You are giving us a list to confirm. So at least in our departments, what should we do? Talk to the advisor?

CHAIR:

That's the reason the list is out there so it can be verified, and I guess --

BROTHERS:

I think Davy may be able to help her.

CHAIR:

Davy.

JONES:

In theory, every member of the department has -- has a legitimate interest in -- in whether that list is correct or not. I mean, you -- you could send it to all the faculty. If you didn't want to burden the faculty, as a minimum, your department chair, your DUGS, your DGS, you know, those people as a minimum should be contacted to cross check are there any inadvertent omissions that need to be corrected here. As a minimum, those people.

SUAREZ:

Thanks.

CHAIR:

Further discussion issues? Yes.

KOVASH:

Mike Kovash, Arts and Sciences. In colleges like Arts and Sciences where there are so many departments and where when you're faced with a list of hundreds of names and -- and trying to sort through them to see that that doesn't in your department appear on that list, I understand the registrar sends the list the

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt

way it appears. But if it could be broken down by department as it's distributed to the Senate, then I think it would be much more effective to find out whether the list for your department is -- is -- is correct.

CHAIR: We'll look into that.

SUAREZ: I agree with him.

CHAIR: We'll look into that and see if the registrar can partition that for us. Yes.

WOOD: I think -- I think an early version comes in a spreadsheet form that has degree codes. So it might be possible to sort by degree codes, but not just the BA but the -- that last four-letter code. And then to send that to the DUS.

CHAIR: Any other comments. Okay.

A motion has been made and did we have a second on that? Seconded. All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: So ordered. All right. Just to update you on where we stand with respect to the general education initiative. So a mass e-mail will go out sometime this week to all faculty. You obviously will also receive that. That will have the names of the members of the vetting committee. We'll also have the address where you could go to check on the -- the dates for the meetings. Recall that the meetings are open. And so if you have a specific interest, you may go to that meeting and observe what -- what is happening there. This is the -- white with the red arrow there, where you can go to get the updated vetting team composition and keep abreast of what's happening. Dr. Mullen, you want to give us some quick information on where we stand here?

MULLEN: Certainly. Thanks. Just wanted to -- to re-emphasize what Dave has already talked about. At the last Senate meeting, you all voted on the composition of vetting teams. And then two weeks after that, Senate Council was working to get those -- those teams in place. And as you can see, you've got access now to see where -- who those -- who are on those seven vetting teams, four for the inquiries courses, one each for composition and communications, quantitative reasoning and the citizenship areas. And so those -- those teams have been constituted. We -- David and I both have charged those committees with their activities in terms of what they are to do, looking at those pilot courses that were developed over this past summer and evaluating those against the curricular templates, the course templates that were approved by Senate. Two of those

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt

committees have met already, Team 1 and Team 7 met this morning. So we had the Humanities group meet this morning and the -- and the Citizenship group met this morning. So they got their charges and got off to the races quickly. So we do have the vetting teams in place, working to evaluate those 60-some proposals. We actually have a couple proposals that came in for -- for courses, existing courses, that wanted -- that they just wanted to teach them under the gen ed guidelines this -- this coming spring. Sociology is offering a couple of sections of Soc 101, for instance, but they weren't part of the original pilot. So those two are being evaluated as we move forward. There are 24 courses on the books for this coming spring that are being vetted by these teams to ensure that they do meet the course templates as voted on by -- by this body. David. Any questions on how this works? Yes, sir.

LEE: Carl Lee, Mathematics. What is the procedure for a course that already exists if someone wants a vetting team to consider it?

MULLEN: Well, they would have to, of course, submit the narrative and a syllabus that is revised to meet the course templates. And so in the case of Soc 101 and -- and actually in Physics 211, they went through a similar process, worked as a group, developed a syllabus to address the course -- the learning outcomes that were part of the course templates for social sciences and natural sciences. And so they'll be evaluated in that way. They -- we -- we still need to, as part of the feedback from these vetting teams, determine what the long-term process is going to be for courses as they pulled together to meet the -- the needs across all areas. And so we, you know, right now in this pilot phase, the vetting teams are doing the work. Ultimately, we'll have to go through a course revision and new course proposal process to make sure that these meet all expectations.

LEE: So at this point, they could contact the vetting team directly with --

MULLEN: They would typically contact me, and I would provide that information to the vetting team, or they would get in touch with -- with Senate Council. Yes.

HAYES: Jane Hayes, College of Engineering. So will the vetting teams be looking at all of the courses that previously met the gen ed requirements and ensuring that those departments have an opportunity to submit a revised syllabus? Because I can imagine a vetting team that perhaps doesn't have a member from a

particular college or a department --
MULLEN: Right.
HAYES: -- that maybe a course might be overlooked that previously was available as an option to the students.
MULLEN: Right. Well, as it stands now, a current USP course is not by default a new gen ed course. So those courses will have to go through the process. Whatever that ultimate process for -- for major course change and/or new course submittal turns out to be, they will have to go through that process. So at this point, there is not an active -- these vetting teams are not actively looking out to see what the USP courses are now and how we can change those. Those discussions are taking place internally in the colleges, particularly in Arts and Sciences right now, departments are engaging on what it's going to take for them to mount these courses and to -- to -- to meet the need. I would -- and I'm also working with the associate deans for Academic Programs in each of the colleges, and they're having that discussion as we speak about what it is that -- that we need to be doing? How are we going to leverage the courses that we need? And starting to have those discussions within their own colleges about what -- what -- what do our offerings look like? And -- and then those will come down through whatever process you all decide on for approving those courses for the new gen ed curriculum. Did that --
HAYES: So it's a push process?
MULLEN: It is a dispersive process.
HAYES: If you want your course to be considered, you --
MULLEN: Exactly.
HAYES: -- need to push it to the vetting team?
MULLEN: Right.
HAYES: They're not pulling it?
MULLEN: If your chair or you are -- are not having that discussion, we don't know. So we need to be made aware of the -- of -- of the fact that you are interested in having a course being considered for part of the new gen ed, yes. Other questions? We will be bringing the results of the vetting committee work that is going on for the next four weeks or so to you at the December meeting so that you will have a chance to evaluate what they have been evaluating. They will be reporting to you on their findings relative to the pilot courses as proposed. And will be also discussing, from their perspective, how the processes work. So you'll have an opportunity to hear more about this at that next meeting. Thank you.
CHAIR: Thank you.
MULLINS: Appreciate it.

Xcript 11-9-09 Senate.txt

CHAIR: So keep an eye open for this e-mail that will be coming to you. Recall that the composition of those committees was an entire -- it was entirely a vote of the Senate and Senate Council. That's where we are now. The process is moving forward very deliberately, very carefully, and we hope very transparently.

Any other questions? All right. Yes, Jane.

JENSEN: The -- the meetings that are happening for the vetting teams, those are open, right?

CHAIR: Those meetings are open, absolutely.

JENSEN: So if one of our faculty has a question about the teams or their makeup, they're open and welcome to go to the meetings themselves if they want to?

CHAIR: Yes.

GREISSMAN: And times are posted on your Website.

CHAIR: I'm sorry?

GREISSMAN: And times are posted on your Website.

CHAIR: Yes, the times are posted on that Website where that arrow was. So you may go to the meeting at that time at the place indicated.

That's it for the business today. We'll see you in December. December is going to be an important meeting. Have a good month.

* * * * *

THEREUPON, the University of Kentucky Senate Council meeting for November 9, 2009 was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

* * * * *

STATE OF KENTUCKY)

COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

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 26, 2011.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 30th day of December, 2009.

LISA E. HOINKE
NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE-AT-LARGE
KENTUCKY