

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010. txt  
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

APRIL 12, 2010

3:00 P. M.

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

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

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

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

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

Welcome. I

♀

CHAIR:

Let's get going.

call the University Senate meeting to order. The usual montras here in terms of please give your name and affiliation. There will be several issues today where it's important to communicate with your constituency, and it's our responsibility to respond to the postings when Sheila sends that information around.

So the Senate Council has directed that we're going to affirm quorums before our meetings. The quorum for regular business is 45. The quorum for voting on the candidate lists for degrees is 33. So Sergeant of Arms, could you give me a count, please --

SOHNER:

Yeah, 52.

CHAIR: -- of voting members?  
SOHNER: Fifty-two.  
CHAIR: Fifty-two, so we have met quorum.  
Thank you very much.  
The minutes from February 8th and March 8th have been distributed. There were no changes received. The recommendation is that these be approved. I think we can do this as one motion unless anyone objects. Do I have a motion, please.

GROSSMAN: So moved.  
CHAIR: Second.  
GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A & S. I so move.  
CHAIR: Todd, did you second? Yes.  
BROTHERS: Name, please?  
CHEEVER: Cheever, Medicine.  
CHAIR: Discussion?  
All in favor, aye?  
AUDIENCE: Aye.  
CHAIR: Opposed nay?  
AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)  
CHAIR: Abstentions?  
AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)  
CHAIR: Thank you.  
The -- the people who put together the requirements for graduation and for computing the grade point averages and so forth need as much time as possible. The -- the tradition apparently has developed that -- that faculty will wait until the Monday following the end of final exam week, but the -- the regulation states that grades shall be in three days after the oral -- after the examinations are completed. So please if you yourself and if you would spread this around to individuals, please grades are due within 72 hours after the last examination, not on that Monday. Monday would be the latest if you had an examination on Thursday or Friday. So please, 72 hours, not the following Monday.  
Faculty trustee election began at noon today. There's the web site. There have been some difficulties. Professor Jones, fill us in if you would.

JONES: I don't know how many of you have tried to vote yet, but here's -- here's what happened: A number of people responded to e-mail, went to vote. It got to 36 voters. One of those 36 went to a different machine and tried to log in again for the second time. It didn't process that vote, but the programmers will know what I'm trying to say here. I don't know I'm talking about programming, but it -- when you vote, it moves your ID to a particular place. That person -- person had already voted. It had moved the ID to this place, but the way the program is written, there was a space there, and any future voter who tried to vote, it said,

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
oh, you've already voted. That has now  
been repaired, and as of about two minutes  
to 3:00 today the site is back up, and the  
rules committee actually still has to get  
together about our letter to that  
individual.

CHAIR: Doesn't seem so unusual to me.  
I'm from Chicago and we vote when you've  
been in the ground for 10 years, our votes  
are still good.

GROSSMAN: That's the difference, you had to  
be dead first.

CHAIR: Yes. All right. So voting for  
this first round is -- is open until  
Friday, and then the second round will  
begin at noon on Wednesday, the 21st.  
Again, encourage your people to vote. I  
know the College of Medicine started their  
voting this morning, but other colleges  
should be starting as well. And so the  
process is -- should be now well under way.

The Senate Council approved the  
change in the name of the Cardiovascular  
Research Center to the Dr. Siby & Becky  
Saha Cardiovascular Research Center. We  
approved this on its academic merits, and  
we did so on behalf of you, on behalf of  
the Senate.

We also changed GR IV, aspects of  
GR IV, again, on your behalf. These  
changes were simple updates in  
administrative titles, and we removed one  
outdated position, but the major impetus  
for this was that SACS has required changes  
in the regulations to conform with their  
policies. Dr. Jones, again, has provided  
this with respect to the substantive change  
notice. SACS wants new procedures to be  
sure that faculty are notified at least  
twice a year of substantive changes. The  
chair will be doing that at the orientation  
of new senators, and we'll make certain  
that that happens at least twice a year.  
And they also are insisting that if a  
program is closed, that it must be closed  
by the Board of Trustees. And so the  
wording was changed so that not senate but  
the Board of Trustees is ultimately  
responsible for terminating a program.

In the February Senate actions we  
approved a change in the graduate school  
calendar. And Professor Grossman noted  
that it could have been done by Senate  
Council. He, in fact, was correct, and so  
we're simply notifying you that that could  
have been done by Senate Council, but we  
shall deal with it. We have appointed  
Professor Michael Kovash as the  
representative to be online teacher and  
course evaluation group. And Armando Prats  
is the representative to the work-life  
advisory council.

Customary to say farewell to

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
departing Senators. We have done this in the April meeting, but we will have a May meeting, but since it's been customary to do this in April, these are the names of the individuals who are leaving their position now, and we certainly want to acknowledge their service and to express our profound appreciation. If your name is on this list, would you stand so we can recognize your service?

(AUDIENCE APPLAUDS)

CHAIR: I notice several individuals on that list that if I need something done, I pick up the phone and call. And so the next chair will have big trouble, but we'll deal with that as things come along.

Our first item of business is the May 2010 degree list. This is a separate attachment. Note, the last time we did this we requested of the registrar that the names be presented by department and college and notice that they have done that. So I will be sending a formal letter of appreciation to them, but again, just so you notice that and appreciate it. There have been some changes made because of the diligence of people looking at this. Any comments at this point? Professor Grossman.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S. According to the chair of the Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, there -- there's one undergraduate, Katherine C. Miller who changed her degree from a BS to a BA in geology and would be graduating this -- this May. And I sent the information. She -- the student is on the list for graduating, but she's still under the BS list. So could the record please reflect that she should be moved. And I'm not taking responsibility for this. The chair of Earth and Environmental Sciences asked me to do this. Could she -- her -- she -- her name please be moved to the Bachelor of Arts graduate degree list?

CHAIR: The record will so note, and on the strength of the e-mail from the chair which we have as documentation, that change will be made.

Further comments?

Then there's very specific language we need to use in order to approve these. If someone would so move. Professor Jones.

JONES: I so move.

CHAIR: Second please?

GROSSMAN: I'll second.

CHAIR: Discussion?

All in favor aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Abstention?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)  
CHAIR: Motion carries. Thank you.  
There is a proposed change in the engineering standard requirements for chemical engineering. Professor Anderson.  
ANDERSON: I'm Kim Anderson. I'm director of undergraduate studies in chemical engineering. The change that you are looking at, we've had a course which was CME 199 that we initiated about two years ago. And we were teaching it in the second semester of the first year. It's called Computational Tools in Chemical Engineering. We taught it for about two years and then finally realized it was difficult to teach Computational Tools in Engineering when they haven't had an engineering class. So we wanted to move that to the second semester of their second year. The proposal that we are reviewing is to change engineering standing because when it was in the first year, we included that as part of the engineering standing requirements. Because we brought that into the second year, engineering standing is now determined before they take that course, and so we need to remove it from the engineering standing.  
CHAIR: Questions for Professor Anderson?  
Thank you.  
Then we need a motion to the effect to approve this.  
NADEL: So moved. Alan Nadel, Arts and Science.  
CHAIR: And a second, please.  
WASILKOWSKI: Second.  
BROTHERS: Name, please.  
WASILKOWSKI: Professor Wasilkowski, College of Engineering.  
CHAIR: Discussion of motion.  
All in favor, aye.  
AUDIENCE: Aye.  
CHAIR: Opposed, nay.  
AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)  
CHAIR: Abstention.  
AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)  
CHAIR: Motion carries.  
We have a proposed new dual degree, PharmD and MS in physician assistant studies. Professor Smith and Boissonneault.  
SMITH: I'll lay claim to the Smith title. My name is Kelly Smith.  
CHAIR: Gil is not here?  
SMITH: Yes, I don't see Gil at the moment.  
CHAIR: That's fine.  
SMITH: From the College of Pharmacy, and before you it looks to me that the substantive content begins on page 23 of your packet. You see a proposal for a dual degree. Our college has a history of several other dual degree programs that

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
have been quite successful. This particular one, though, is unique in that it combines two clinical degrees. So this would require that our students and students in this program, which would be both administered simul -- or independently. So pharmacy is one stand-alone program. Admissions, requirements, progression through the -- the PA portion of the degree program would be administered separately by the College of Health Sciences. It would require essentially then an additional year to graduate with both degrees simultaneously. We have included similar language as to other proposals in the past about the what-ifs should a student fail to progress in one degree or the other, what may happen. We feel that we've done a thorough job of due diligence to ensure that there are adequate training sites and that sort of thing. So we put forth this proposal for your consideration.

CHAIR: Questions? Thank you. Need a motion then.

HAYES: Jane Hayes, College of Engineering. I move that we approve the proposed new dual degree consisting of PharmD and MS in physician assistant studies, effective Fall 2010.

CHAIR: And a second, please.

CASE: Second. Donald Case, Communications.

CHAIR: Discussion of proposal.  
All in favor aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Abstentions?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Motion carries.

All right. Proposed change to the minor in computer science is to drop one course and to establish a 2.5 GPA. Professor Calvert. If you'll look at your packet. Yes, please.

HAYES: I guess either one of us could cover it. Greg, do you want to explain it? Okay. So basically --

CHAIR: Stand, if you would, please.

HAYES: Sure. I'm Jane Hayes from computer science. Basically, if I remember correctly what was happening here was we had CS 100 which was required as part of the minor. It's basically careers for computer scientists. So they removed that from the minor as a one credit course. And then the other thing is they added the notion of grade point average to the minor of 2.5 which puts us more in line with all of the other engineering degrees in the College of Engineering.

CHAIR: Questions. Let me assure you we

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010. txt  
have discussed this in Senate Council. All  
of these come to you with favorable  
recommendation by Senate Council. We're  
not trying to -- questions?

SNOW: Need a motion, please.  
Diane Snow. I motion the Senate  
approve the proposed change to the minor in  
computer science effective fall of 2010.

CHAIR: And a second?  
ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, second.  
CHAIR: Discussion of the motion?  
All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.  
CHAIR: Opposed, nay?  
AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Abstentions?  
AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)  
CHAIR: Thank you. Motion carries.

All right. We have a report on  
the winter intersession just passed by  
Professor Mullen.

MULLEN: Thank you, David. I guess Phil  
Kraemer gave a report on the first three  
years of the winter intersession and now  
it's my pleasure to talk a little bit about  
the last three years of the winter  
intersession. So we've had six years of  
winter intersession here at the University.  
It's been a pilot this whole time. And  
it's probably time to think about whether  
it's to be a pilot or if we're going to go  
ahead and just make it a part of what we do  
here at the University or drop it all  
together. And so I thought I'd spend a few  
minutes today just telling you a little bit  
about what has happened, share a little bit  
of data with you, and I can share certainly  
more data offline if -- if anybody would  
like to see it. I'm focusing primarily on  
The trends through all the years  
are fairly similar. I'll show you some  
measures of satisfaction, and then I'll  
recommend approval, but it's my  
understanding this is first reading; you'll  
take this up again at -- at the May  
meeting. A couple of things here in terms  
of enrollments, you can see that in the  
first three years enrollments -- total  
enrollments stayed around 100 for the first  
three winter intersessions that we ran. In  
it went up to 277, dropped to 211, and  
then back up to 237 this past fall. The  
thing I'd point out here is if you kind of  
go across all the years, on average 78  
percent of the students in these classes  
are juniors and seniors. And I'll show you  
data later that would indicate that these  
are probably junior and seniors that are  
looking for ways to enhance their progress  
towards degree, either staying on -- on  
track or accelerating their track. So it  
seems to be particularly important to the  
juniors and the seniors in our group.

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
Courses per year have remained fairly study, although the last couple -- this past year we jumped up to 18. So you can see 13, 12, 10, 14, and then 18 this past winter intersession. It's interesting, I've -- I've looked at a couple of other universities who have really mature winter intersessions. The University of Oklahoma offers about 300 classes during winter intersession. It's a -- it's a huge program. Maryland also has scores of programs -- courses as opposed to less than 20. So obviously, we're still in experimental mode in terms of how many courses we're offering here. Just a smattering of course enrollments. These are not atypical for the kinds of course of enrollments that we've seen in other years. Some of these are relatively small, Art Studio, two students, all the way up to FAM 403 with 56 students. Not uncommon to be 10 to -- 10 to 15, somewhere in that area. It's a little hard to see. The BIO 355 is a study abroad class. Senate Council asked me about that the other day, and I tracked that down, and most of those students went to Australia. The red courses, EDS 522, FAM 403, HMT 120, IEC 522 and MAT 247 were all distance learning courses. The remainder of those courses were taught in face-to-face sessions which were pretty intense, five hours a day for three-and-a-half weeks. And so there's a variety of offering modes that happen with these courses. I put this up the other day to show the Senate Council, and then of course the -- the general conclusion is that the data may not mean much. You can see the courses, and I put in parentheses the number of students that actually responded to the TCE survey online. I don't put a whole lot of merit in a class that has one student responding to the TCE. So you can see that we've got a range of anywhere from a 1.0 to a 4.0 on these. Most of them are in the 3, 3 1/2 range. The students in a -- in another part of -- of the survey that they take seem to show overall a lot of satisfaction as a group for the winter intersession, and that seems to be consistent from year to year with what Kraemer showed -- Dr. Kraemer showed me as well from his report three years ago. Some GPA comparisons, generally speaking, the GPAs are higher in the winter intersession courses. My guess is, is that this could be due to a couple times. It might be that the courses are -- are not as rigorous as -- as the ones during the semester, but I also think it's because we probably have students taking courses during -- during the winter break that are a little more intense about trying to get



LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
through these classes, so there's probably a number of things going on here. In most cases, you can see that the -- that the GPAs for the course in the winter intersession is not too far off of the -- of the GPA or the range of GPAs for courses that had multiple sessions for the previous year. So that's the GPA data. Satisfaction data, and this is aggregated over all of the students in the program, and this is actually for 2007, in each category. So why did you enroll this class? Well, basically 60 percent plus on average enrolled the class because they want to stay on track for graduation. It's an opportunity to -- to take an elective, a USP course, or in some cases a course in a major. Another 30 percent are saying that I want to accelerate my progress to -- to my degree. The others, there was a smattering of things there, I wanted to take a course with that particular professor; it was a subject of interest to me; I wanted to travel to Australia. A variety of things that come into play in -- in that particular category. And then when they're asked about how their class compared to classes during the academic year, generally you can see that about 90 -- about 80 percent of the students said that it's either about the same, better or much better than what they experienced during the academic year. Don't know what -- how -- what that's attributed to, but overall the students seem to be very satisfied with the -- with the experience that they've had over the course of -- of the last three years. And Professor Kraemer's data for the 2004, and groupings was very similar, the same kinds of results. One might think that taking a class over a few weeks during the -- the holiday break would perhaps be at a rapid pace, but clearly over 90 percent of the students that are surveyed said that the class was about right or was -- was about right -- excuse me, about 80 percent said it was about right; a few said it was too slow or much too slow. That's pretty surprising. And then another 15 to 20 percent thought it was a bit fast. But the majority of kids didn't think that having one class during a three-and-a-half week class was -- was too much to ask. And then asked if they would consider taking another class, on average, 70 to 80 percent say that either probably yes or definitely yes they would take another class. It's hard to read in what the probably not or definitely not mean. It may mean that I'm graduating, and I wouldn't be taking another one, or the experience was bad, and I'm not going to take another one. We

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
can't get out of the way the data was collected. I was curious about having the not applicable as a choice. I'm not sure what drives that, but it's probably the same ones that say, well, I'm not going to take another -- another course again anyway, so it's not applicable. Just to kind of show you who else does these kinds of things and the kinds of time spans. Our -- our -- our 2009 session went from December 21 to January 12th. Cornell, Rutgers, Arizona, Delaware, Iowa, Maryland, Mississippi, Oklahoma, are just a few other research extensive universities that are also using winter intersessions and some of these have been going a long time. As I said, the University of Oklahoma has a huge number of sessions. And it's interesting, Oklahoma does a winter intersession of four weeks; they do a May intersession of four weeks; and they do an August intersession of four weeks. So they've -- they've really taken this whole concept to heart at having small four-week periods where students take only one class, all across the academic calendar.

And then conclusions from what we've looked at here is, as you can tell, the enrollment has doubled or more, depending upon the year. We seem to be seeing an increase in the number of classes that are offered. Juniors and seniors are -- are taking the majority of the classes, and they seem to be overall positively satisfied with the -- the program. It would appear that this is a useful tool for a small number of students at this point to look for ways to be successful in moving towards graduation. And as we look for ways to help students be successful in -- in persistence and in attaining six-year graduation rates or hopefully five-year graduation rates or four-year graduation rates, we think this can be a useful tool for us in -- in doing that. And so my recommendation would be that make this a permanent part of the UK academic offering.

CHAIR:

So Senate Council originally authorized this for a short trial period. And we're at the end of that trial period. So we thought it was a sufficiently important issue that we ought to have a first reading and second reading on this. So depending on what you say today or the tenor of what comes out today, we'll bring this to the May meeting for a vote and approval. But if you would now feel free to ask Dr. Mullen questions, both with respect to his presentation and with respect to the probability of its coming before us in May. So questions? Bob.

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, A&S. Mike, I asked  
Page 10

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
you to present data addressing the issue of whether there was a retention -- a retention of knowledge problem with students who took these classes in -- in -- insofar as how it affected their success in later classes. Can you tell us -- tell the Senate what you learned?

MULLEN: Right. Bob asked me -- Professor Grossman asked me to look and see what we could find out with -- some of these courses are actually prerequisites to courses in the major. And so I went back, and -- and we searched through those, and out of the three years that I looked at, and there were two students in Sociology 101 that actually went on to take Sociology classes and had As and Bs in -- in their upper division Sociology. And there were two Merchandising 247 students that went on and had a B and C. And so we couldn't find a whole lot of data that these students were -- were then moving on into other courses. So the conclusion of that, I think, we came to was that the students seemed to be taking courses that fulfill electives and/or general education. And another thing the Senate asked -- Council asked me about was financial issues. And the numbers represented here and the courses represented, and I'm sorry I didn't bring that data on the slide, would result in about a -- if you just did it on a per-course basis, is almost \$14,000 of tuition money coming in per course. Now, of course, that's spread across the -- the different courses. If you've only got two students, my guess is that's not paying for the teaching cost of that course. If you've got 56, you're generating a heck of a lot of income in that particular department. So departments then have to be making decisions on if we're doing it for two students, then we must have (unintelligible) and -- and the Art Studio course, it's a critical course for a small number of students so that they can graduate on time, and we're making a conscious decision to make that offer. I know that the Family Studies course was offered because it was -- it was an elective, and a lot of family studies students were taking that course as an elective to -- to their course degree probably. I more than answered your question.

CHAIR: Please.  
ARRINGTON: Michael Arrington, Communications. We saw data about responses to the courses from the students' perspectives, about whether you think the course -- has being more difficult, at an appropriate pace. Do we have any data from

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010. txt  
the instructors?

MULLEN: I do not.

ARRINGTON: Okay.

MULLEN: Would you like some?

ARRINGTON: I can't help wondering whether -- I mean, I'd love to hear some thoughts from the instructors about the ways in which they had to modify courses in order to fit within that four-week -- that shortened framework.

MULLEN: I'll see if I can poll a substantive grouping of the past couple of years and get some information for you.

ARRINGTON: Thank you. And I'm saying that as someone who's taught a winter intersession course before and had to modify a course to make it fit.

MULLEN: And your experience?

ARRINGTON: Because it was a 400-level course, I didn't have to worry about whether they were -- I had a handful of students who were trying to graduate and not have -- without having to take spring courses at the time. And so I had no way of knowing whether -- whether what I cut and what I included impacted their retention post-graduation. And so I'm not -- I'm not sure about how effective I was and would love to hear something about that from other --

MULLEN: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR: Professor Yanarella.

YANARELLA: Ernie Yanarella, Political Science. Mike, I was a big supporter of this when it was initially vetted in the Senate Council. As you know, I -- I had a different vision of what this might evolve into. I thought it would be a great forum for experimental courses, also for study abroad. Instead, it seems to have found its niche. On the other hand, I -- I still believe that it could serve multiple roles, even those that I had hoped that would be invested in -- in it. Do you have any thoughts about the likelihood of -- of your office or any other office trying to create a recruitment strategy, both for -- for more courses and/or diversified courses and also for -- for increased numbers of students. I -- I hadn't seen all -- all of the data that you have presented today with regard to some of the universities where they have, you know, scores and scores of -- of courses in this particular session.

MULLEN: That's a good question. And -- and you and I have talked about this before. In fact when I was in Ag, my first reaction to this particular program would be, this would be a fantastic way to do study abroad, and I actually tried to get a group of students to go to Thailand, but they all wanted to stay home for the

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
holidays. So I -- that didn't work in that particular instance for me. I do think that we need to be somewhat more intentional with how we bring courses into the program. It concerns me that in some cases we might have a course taught because a lecturer or -- or -- or a faculty member wants to teach it, but is it the strategic course to be taught for a particular degree program? So I think that there certainly would be ways for my office to facilitate discussions campus-wide. As we pointed out in Senate Council, at some point, though, that becomes a college-level decision in terms of what courses are strategic from the perspective of getting students moving through the system. But I do think if we're going to approve this, I'm not sure we -- I -- we -- I don't think it's -- we shouldn't be happy with it bumping along at 14, 15, 16, 17 classes. If there's really an opportunity here to serve students in a way that both satisfies and enhances learning and provides an opportunity for students to -- to stay on track or accelerate their learning. So I -- my -- my office would certainly be willing to take that -- those discussions up with the associate deans council and to work with the deans groups to -- to have those discussions.

CHAIR: Further questions?

CONNERS: Dr. Terry Connors, Forestry, College of Ag. Mike, I've got just a -- more common, I guess, we've got 15 classes, 250 students. From my perspective, I'm not sure that this program warrants continuation based on those small numbers. But it's obviously serving a purpose. If we decide it's serving a good purpose, how would you propose growing this program to something more substantial, more significant?

MULLEN: Well, most of these programs are run in just the same way as the summer session is. So I mean, there is an opportunity for faculty to, you know, to put it in to dollars and cents, there's an opportunity to earn a little extra money, and so I'm not sure how many faculty even think about winter intersession, whether it's something that they consciously think about. But seems to me we have to have a broader discussion about the kinds of things we could do. And Ernie is absolutely right, there's some opportunities here for some experimental courses. What about one-hour courses or two-hour courses? Does it have to be a three-credit hour course over a four hour -- over a four-week period? Can we envision some really useful kinds of things that would help fill in our majors or fill

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
in our electives that we can do in perhaps a slightly more leisurely pace. I think we just have to have a marketing campaign. We need to talk to groups of faculty campus-wide about this and -- and find out if there is indeed support for expanding the program. I have no doubt that -- that these kinds of opportunities can indeed leverage students into the programs if they're looking for ways to get done more -- more quickly. I -- I think that the data at least would infer that -- that students think this is a good program for -- for maintaining progress towards degree. So I -- I don't know how to answer your question directly other than to bring groups of folks from other colleges in to have a discussion about it.

CONNER: I guess I'm thinking that if this is a program that's driven by student need, that there should be more students participating.

MULLEN: Right. Well, it could be that we're not strategically placing the correct courses that the students need too. So we probably need to think strategically within the -- within our programs, is this the course we need, or are there other courses that would serve more -- more students? I think it's a discussion we need to have within the colleges in terms of what are the priorities that we know our students to have. And we can tease that data out of the student databases. Where are the holes? Where are the bottlenecks? What are the courses that keeping kids from making good progress -- progress? And perhaps those are the courses then that need to show up in those sessions. And that's true for summer sessions as well.

CONNERS: Thank you.

PRATS: Armando Prats, English Department. Yeah, Mike, I -- I taught it the first year, and then it -- it's exhausting. And so I wasn't likely to do it again. But it is my understanding that the pay rate or scale changed, at least at the college level. You may want to see if -- if -- if that affects how many courses you end up teaching.

MULLEN: I don't have data on -- on pay rates for -- of different faculty. I know at some universities there's a percentage scale that's just simply applied to the faculty member's base. Two-and-a-half percent per credit hour or whatever the case may be. And I -- I don't know what the -- I think colleges here probably do different things in different colleges in some ways.

GROSSMAN: I have a question about the process. Before this came up, you had a recommendation that we accept a report.

Now, you're talking about a first reading of a proposal. And I'm not sure exactly what we're supposed to be doing here. If it's first reading of a proposal, I would like to know what the proposal is. Is it a proposal to make the winter intersession permanent? And if so, that should be put forward for -- that we're going to vote on this the next -- the next session.

CHAIR: Yes. I -- I believe Senate Council will come forward with a proposal or at least coming forward with a proposal to make the -- the session permanent.

GROSSMAN: Okay. But -- and so that's just for discussion, but for today we should also accept the report that Mike has been giving?

CHAIR: Yes. We -- we need to accept that. Would you make a motion to that affect then?

GROSSMAN: I move that we accept Dr. Mullen's report.

CHAIR: Do we have a second?

STEINER: Second.

CHAIR: Shelly.

STEINER: Shelly Steiner, Art.

CHAIR: Any questions, any further questions of Dr. Mullen or with respect to this motion? Jane.

JENSEN: Jane Jensen, Education. I'd like to -- to -- to second the idea of finding out more about the pay raise and -- because I know that there's been a fair amount of conversation around summer school and the way that summer school faculty salaries are figured out, and so I think that should be very clear if we discuss a proposal.

MULLEN: Two things to bring back to you.

CHAIR: All right. Can we vote on that motion? All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay.

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Abstain motion -- your report is accepted. Any further questions for Dr. Mullen with respect to -- yes.

KWON: I have one more. Donna Kwon, Fine Arts. I was just wondering also if it could be articulated what exactly the advantages are for the university. I guess we have the advantages for the students, but just the university as a whole to make this permanent? Is it mostly financial or --

MULLEN: Well, there could be a couple things. Clearly, if -- if -- if a handful of students take a three-hour course, and that gets them out of here one semester sooner, and it happens to be towards the end of that six-year window, it actually gives us a bump on our graduation rate which is -- which can be significant. Certainly, it's financial. The total

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010. txt  
amount of money that -- that came in is --  
is well beyond the teaching costs on  
average university-wide. So there is some  
income to consider for the university as  
well. Those would be the two that...

CHAIR:

Thank you.

So a great deal of time and  
effort has been spent on revising the  
Student Code of Conduct. In a large part,  
I think to respond to the SACS initiatives.  
And Richard, I gather you're going to bring  
us up to date on this.

GREISSMAN:

Good afternoon. The university  
defines two types of conduct, academic  
misconduct and nonacademic misconduct. The  
academic misconduct is cheating and  
plagiarism, and it's exclusively under the  
purview of the faculty through the  
University Senate. It's why a section of  
the University Senate rules is on academic  
offenses. Nonacademic conduct is of great  
concern to the entire community, especially  
the faculty. And so even though this is  
technically outside the purview of the  
faculty. For at least two reasons, I think  
it's really important to vet this with the  
faculty as we have. First and foremost,  
there is no group that is more concerned  
and intimately involved in the success of  
the students than the faculty. And  
secondly, the faculty play a primary role  
in the judicial process, in that faculty  
serve as disciplinary hearing officers and  
faculty serve on the university appeals  
board. In fact, the majority of members at  
the university appeals board are faculty.  
So it's really important that whenever we  
do something like this, we vet this with  
the faculty. The last time the code was  
changed was 2005. We wanted to get out of  
the habit of thinking perhaps like GenEd,  
this is something you do once every 25  
years, make this more of a living document.  
But there were much more immediate  
compelling reasons. The -- in the last few  
years, there have been a number of federal  
pieces of legislation that have affected  
universities. The Cleary Act named after a  
family who lost a student. At a  
university, a student was murdered, and the  
persistence of the parents produced federal  
legislation that defined universities had  
to be much more transparent about how it  
handled nonstudent behavior, how it  
reported criminal acts, and how it took  
measures to learn from its instances,  
especially the most egregious where  
students are hurt or worse.

Title Nine changes affected us,  
the Office of Civil Rights, at the federal  
level also. Finally, there were state  
pieces of legislation that we had to take  
into account. So it seemed compelling it



LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
was time. I was not involved in -- in the good work that the committee did until it reached an impasse. There's some really, really tough issues. And the provost asked me to intervene. I thought I was merely a mild-mannered reporter from a trade -- metropolitan newspaper, and instead I had to come intervene. There were tough issues. I'd like to compliment the committee for the work it did. It was an extraordinarily difficult assignment. The committee had to take into account the student portfolio review that the provost asked be conducted when the sitting vice president for student affairs -- affairs, Pat Terrell left. We had a new Administrative Regulation, Administrative Regulation 6:2 on stalking and violence against students that we had to incorporate with the Student Code. And finally, there was an interim report coming out of the student portfolio that looked at -- bless you -- looked at how the university handles these most difficult cases, cases of student-on-student violence.

So the committee met; we produced a document. Fortunately, we were guided by a really remarkable model code that two academic faculty put together, I think a lawyer and a student affairs person. Both faculty produced a model student code. It was extremely helpful. The thrust of the change is really important in that student codes were historically modeled after criminal codes, both process and content looked -- language of a code, it looked more like a criminal code than it did, something a university would put together. We were determined to shift the focus and language into a code that was more educational. The reality is there are extra-university processes that students can take up if they want to pursue something in civil or criminal court. We felt our role was to provide an educational process even in cases that were difficult like student-on-student violence. Lots of universities are experimenting with restorative justice. We're not quite there yet, but that may be our next move. But really to have student code be part of the co-curricular content of the university. We hope that the code vetted would be -- for the past few months, reflects that.

We sent the code to the Student Government Association and to the faculty through the University Senate. We got back some commentary. I'd like to believe it was because the committee was so thorough and not because the code is about 34 pages. We did get back some really important commentary. I'd like to, in particular, thank Shelly Steiner for forwarding to me

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
some commentary by his colleague, John Rawls. John had some real concerns about how we use the term threat. And the code revision that I sent you reflects a much more careful delineation of how we're using threat in behavioral terms, in terms of what people do. It's real important that we examine that kind of thing and Professor Rawls was instrumental in getting us to look at that.

I think we're now ready to have the code go to the Student Government Association for its endorsement. That happens Wednesday night. I'm here now to ask the faculty for its endorsement in that this is something the university can promulgate on its own, but as I say, it would be to my mind irresponsible if not reprehensible to have a code revised without faculty endorsement. I'd -- I'd certainly love to answer questions you might have now. I can go over some particulars, but it's been pretty carefully vetted. After questions, I'd like to ask the Senate to endorse the policy. We then send it to the board. It's only after the board approves it that it's final. We hope to have it into effect by July 1. So any -- any questions.

NADEL: Point of information. Would any amendments made by this body in any way affect the student version or deliberation?

GREISSMAN: Well, let's see, if there are amendments from the floor?

NADEL: Yeah.

GREISSMAN: We certainly -- we would absolutely bring those to the Student Government Association. We deliberately put this first and SGA second, Dr. Nadel, to make sure that the students were apprised of faculty input, yeah. Thank you for asking. That's a pledge. Please.

SNOW: Diane Snow, College of Medicine. You said students gave some input. I'm just curious if there's any evidence that students gathered together and got into any kind of thoughtful discussion about this? Whether this represents bodies having discussed it, or were they just individuals here and there that made comments?

GREISSMAN: I can only comment on the Student Government Association. So on the one hand, it is the representative body of the students. Beyond that, I -- I don't know. I'd like to believe that students did that. I don't -- I don't even have anecdotal information in which to offer.

SNOW: Would be nice to see them taking a proactive status on this.

GREISSMAN: Sure, sure. Well.... Others, please?

CHAIR: May we then have a motion to the effect of endorsing this proposal?

NOKES: So moved. Sue Nokes, College  
of Agriculture.

CHAIR: A second?

SNOW: Diane Snow, College of Medicine.

CHAIR: Discussion of the motion.  
All in favor aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Abstention?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: For a minute there, I was a  
little worried. Thank you.  
You'll recall that the quality  
enhancement program is a requirement for  
our upcoming accreditation visit, and we're  
in the midst of a process to develop that.  
So Professors Snow and Sellnow are here.

SNOW: I'm Diane Snow and I'm here with  
Deanna Sellnow, and we've come to give you  
an update on the QEP. As you may remember  
we were here in February to talk about the  
kickoff of this process and let you know  
some of the early steps that had taken  
place in the fall of 2009. So we just  
wanted to keep you apprised of what's going  
on. So for some of you who may not have  
heard already, hopefully that's very few of  
you, what is a QEP? It's a quality  
enhancement plan. It is a core requirement  
for SACS reactivation of accreditation.  
And SACS is the Southern Association of  
Colleges and Schools. And as defined by  
them, is a carefully designed course of  
action that addresses a well-defined and  
focused topic or issue related to enhancing  
student learning. So this particular  
effort is focused completely on student  
learning.

Why is QEP now a core  
requirement? To make SACS reaffirmation of  
accreditation process easier and less  
prescriptive. Really these are the two  
pieces that the change encompasses. And it  
gives us more control and flexibility over  
designing a program that is efficient for  
the University of Kentucky.

Why is it important to UK? Well,  
if you look at the negative first, if SACS  
does not approve our QEP topic, then we  
could lose accreditation. And whereas,  
this might seem like something coming from  
an ivory tower, it's actually important to  
every one of our departments because if the  
university isn't accredited, neither  
are -- are individual programs. But let's  
look on the bright side, we have the  
opportunity and flexibility to develop a  
unique student learning related topic,  
goal, and plan that will benefit our  
institution.

An acceptable QEP according to  
SACS, is a broad-based institutional

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
process. It's focused on student learning and learning outcomes. It's based on key issues emerging from assessment and also emerging from the mission or strategic plan of the institution, and we're taking all of these factors into account as we move forward. Ultimately, we have to walk the walk, and we must demonstrate institutional capability to implement, complete, and assess this program. So we have to be very careful and focused as we go about designing it.

The big picture is a best practices approach. As I said earlier, we started with a pre-planning team in the fall of 2009, and at that point, we developed a topic selection plan and a timeline. We are now in the topic selection team phase of the program, and this is identifying a topic based on broad input from a university community. I'll talk a little bit more about this in just a moment. Once we finish this, the QEP development team will take over, and it's their dubious task to put together the 100-page document that will describe how we will go about achieving a quality enhancement plan. And this is due in January of 2013, which may seem far away but don't blink, it will be here. And then a AEP implementation team will take over and implement the program. And that is due to be finished by December of 2017. So the QEP topic selection team continued goals are to ensure deliberate and transparent process, and to this end we are talking about this process to everyone we see. We're stopping people on the sidewalk and telling them about it. And we're inviting you to share your big ideas. You're just as much a part of this university as the student's we're initially trying to reach. We want everyone's ideas. So we're encouraging you to go to the website and share your ideas as well.

Here's what we don't want to do. We don't want to present this merely as another hoop to jump through. Nothing worst to kill the joy about this than to talk about it that way. Really, it's a great opportunity, and we'd like to present it that way. We don't want to impose a QEP topic from the top down. There have been other institutions who have attempted to do this and failed miserably. We don't want to be one of those. This is supposed to be something that is built from the bottom up and has everyone on board. Submit a QEP topic that describes initiatives already fully realized, and of course we've had a lot of people talk us -- to us about the curricular reform, and we're already involved in that. Can we use this as part

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
of our QEP topic? Unfortunately, no. However, we can devise something that dovetails with that. So if you have a good idea on a topic that would dovetail with the educational reform, then please submit that. And as I said earlier, we want this to be peaceful. So we don't want to try to do too much.

So where are we right now? This is the spring of 2010, and we're in the brainstorming phase. We're introducing this QEP to everyone on campus. There are a group of us on the committee of about 30. We've divided it into two pieces, and about half of us are going around to all the different departments on campus, all the units, and as I said, people on the sidewalk and telling them about the QEP process. We're asking for big ideas to be submitted at the QEP website. So please go to [www.uky.edu/QEP](http://www.uky.edu/QEP). We are collecting and reviewing existing formal and informal assessment data. The other half of our 30-member team will be looking at all of this data from the different units and from the university to try to see what we already have devised as important areas for focusing our topic.

So this summer, members of our team will be categorizing the ideas based on emergent themes. We will develop criteria for evaluating pre-proposals and white papers. And I'll tell you about those in just a moment. And we're also going to be working on developing rubrics for the pre-planning proposals and for the white papers.

So the pre-planning -- planning proposal, we imagine, is a one-page executive summary that includes a rationale explaining out the big idea relates directly to student learning. Remember again, this has to be our focus. And why this big idea is valuable to students, faculty, staff, and all stakeholders involved with University of Kentucky. That will play its way in to white papers which are fully developed eight- to ten-page proposals, and they will provide a rationale and implementation plan solidly supported with research. And here's the good part, we're going to get paid for these, so hopefully they'll be a great incentive to contribute them. Developers will be compensated with \$1,000. And just for the ideas alone -- alone, we're discussing the idea of having some incentive for that too, so that the major ideas that emerge from this, we're hoping, can result in free parking for faculty and staff, and free books for students. So we're keenly working on that at the moment.

In the fall semester of this

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
year, we're going to report back the emergent themes to campus. So all summer long we'll be working on this. When people come back to campus in the fall, we're going to say, here were the major areas that we determined from your comments that people would like to work on. And then we'll begin to invite the pre-proposals. So starting in the fall, October 1st is the deadline for the pre-proposals, and then we will evaluate those and select eight to ten for white papers, and then December 1st, those white papers will be due. So this is going to be a fairly rapid process happening over the year 2010. And in January, February, March of next year, we'll evaluate the white papers. We'll choose three potential QEP topics, and then those are going to go to the SACS leadership team, and we will choose a final topic from -- based on assessment of this and its feasibility. So please go to this website and submit your big ideas. And I'll be happy to take any questions or comments you may have about the process. Thank you. Shelly.

STEINER: Do you have any -- just any notion of the kinds of things that have been done by other institutions? I don't want to copy what they're doing, but I have no idea what --

SELLNOW: If you go to the QEP website, you'll see a link that says presentations, and you'll see previous presentations where we've listed a whole bunch of ideas from other institutions. We also have a FAQ page that has a whole bunch of ideas from other institutions.

STEINER: Thank you.  
SNOW: And I have FAQ pages with me if anybody would like any information to take with them, please see me about that. You have a question?

KWON: Donna Kwon, Fine Arts. I was just wondering if any -- I know we're invited to submit our big ideas, can we see the other -- the other ideas that are emerging? I just feel like when you're brainstorming, it's -- there's kind of a discussion that happens with dialogue, and I was just wondering if there was room for that in this process?

SNOW: We've been discussing this as a committee about how to do that and at the last discussion, we decided to put the week's ideas that have come to us, so you could see what's current, and those would be filed away under a separate subheadings as they start to emerge into different categories. So then you could go to any individual category as well and find out how many people have had ideas on that topic and if there is varieties of

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
suggestions that have been made under that  
topic.

SELLNOW: And on the home page you can see  
how many topics have been submitted so far  
so it's keeping a running tab of that.

SNOW: The day we opened we had a bunch,  
and I believe we had someone very  
important, who's here in our presence, who  
had a very good one.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S. If I make a  
-- may make a suggestion along these lines,  
if you'd set up a Wiki or some -- or some  
online community where people could share  
ideas, that would help facilitate that kind  
of --

SELLNOW: We have Allison from the PR  
Department doing something with a facebook  
page so we'll check into that and  
(unintelligible) still.

SNOW: Any other questions? Thank you  
very much. In the back.

MOUNTFORD: Roxanne Mountford, A&S. Can you  
give some idea about what rubrics you'll  
use to assess this?

SELLNOW: We're going to develop rubrics  
based on the criteria that SACS will be  
looking at in terms of financially feasible  
and the various things that they have said  
(unintelligible). So that will be a part  
of what we do this summer.

MOUNTFORD: So -- so campus-wide  
participation, cost of programs, do you --  
any -- anything like that, that you can  
share with us?

SELLNOW: So far we haven't studied --

SNOW: That committee has not met yet.

MOUNTFORD: Okay.

SELLNOW: Right now we're just collecting  
big ideas and collecting formal -- informal  
assessment to analyze.

SNOW: A member of our committee would  
like to address that question.

JENSEN: One of the criteria is broad-  
based and so it -- it has to show that it  
has that -- that it has been part of the  
process.

SELLNOW: Which is why we'll be back again  
in September with this group.

CHAIR: Thank you both very much.

We now want to present to you  
three proposed additions to ARs. Marcy  
Deaton is chair the committee that has done  
all this work. So Marcy if you would -- if  
you would fill us in on what we, and have a  
PowerPoint over here you can --

DEATON: You want me to be over --

CHAIR: Yeah.

DEATON: Hi. The first regulation that's  
come out of my committee for you today is  
out-of-state employment or assignment of  
faculty and staff. This one did not  
receive any substantive changes. This  
regulation establishes the policies and

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
procedures for staff and faculty who are assigned to out-of-state programs. It defines the benefits and the salary adjustment that would accompany those out-of-state assignments. It's strictly from an HR, salary and benefit perspective. Our changes at this point were just to update the formatting. It had out-of-date references to other ARs and titles of people and whatnot and to eliminate a lot of unnecessary wordiness. So we just seek your endorsement of this and hope that you've had a chance to take a peek at it.

CHAIR: This does deal with faculty salaries and so forth, so we did think it was appropriate to bring it to you for endorsement. Do I have a motion to this --  
GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S. I move that we endorse the proposed change.

CHAIR: Second?  
NADEL: Alan Nadel, A&S.  
CHAIR: Discussion? All in favor aye?  
AUDIENCE: Aye.  
CHAIR: Opposed nay?  
AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)  
CHAIR: Abstention?  
AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

Motion carries.  
DEATON: Thank you. The second one is AR 4:7. It's the Student Financial Aid Appeals and Advisory Committee. It's been renamed. It did previously just be the Student Financial Aid Advisory Committee. This establishes an appeals process for students regarding their financial aid; and for student athletes regarding their student aid or grant or athletic scholarship. Apparently the NCAA requires an independent committee to allow the students to appeal to when their scholarships are issued, and we also had the committee for regular student financial aid. So it makes sense. This is what this committee has done for many years, but the reg itself didn't describe that very well. This revision was actually requested by athletics and the division of enrollment management so that it would be more in compliance with NCAA. So again, it's not a substantive change but it's a clarification, and we seek your endorsement.

CHAIR: Questions about this issue?  
Motion, please?  
ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.

CHAIR: Second?  
MEYER: Lee Meyer, College of Agriculture.

CHAIR: Thank you. Discussion?  
THELIN: John Thelin, Ed Policy. I think it's an important reminder that it is the University of Kentucky, not the athletic



LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
association and not the athletic  
department, that belong to the NCAA.

CHAIR: Further discussion?  
All in favor aye?

AUDI ENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed nay?

AUDI ENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Abstention?

AUDI ENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Motion carries.  
This last one has gone through a  
lot of revision and a lot of care. This  
is, I think, important to us.

DEATON: Yeah, it has. This is probably  
the one that's most dear to your hearts.  
This is the information technology advisory  
committee. This one has undergone a  
committee restructuring. The -- the prior  
committees were three. There was research,  
instructional, and the IRIS or  
administrative system committee. They all  
three reported through the provost and the  
CIO and VPs. The new committee structure  
is a new, I'll call it, an umbrella  
committee that consists of a majority of  
faculty that will report directly to Swamy  
and the CIO. Now, there will be two  
subordinate committees. One is the  
combination of the research and  
instructional committee that's now an  
academic committee. And then there will  
still be the administrative system  
committee. Both of those will report, as I  
said, through the umbrella committee, to  
the provost and the CIO. I think the aim  
here was to make the umbrella committee  
have more faculty involvement, and I think  
we have accomplished that.

CHAIR: And both faculty committee and  
the academic committee are --

DEATON: And in the academic, yes.

CHAIR: -- they are chaired by faculty?

DEATON: Yes, I left that out. I'm sorry.

CHAIR: Questions?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S. Who appoints  
these committee members?

DEATON: The president.

PROVOST: With recommendation from the  
Senate.

DEATON: With recommendation from the  
Senate for the faculty members.

KIGHTLINGER: Mark Kightlinger, College of Law.  
This is probably just a stupid question,  
but I notice that on the academic computing  
committee it refers to a graduate student  
member, does that include professional  
students, or are law students not allowed  
on this committee, which might not be a bad  
idea?

DEATON: I'm not sure I know the answer.  
We had -- I'm not sure we considered that.  
We set it up so that the graduate student  
would be submitted from the graduate

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010. txt  
student group. I forgot their name.

KIGHTLINGER: And I don't know anything about that group either. (Unintelligible) so it's all professional schools --

DEATON: I -- I don't know, but before it's final -- that's one reason we wanted to start bringing more regulations here so that we could get more input from more people, and that's -- that's a good point, and -- and we'll take that back and ponder that.

NADEL: Along those lines, if we issue a JD, aren't they by definition graduate students?

DEATON: I think so. They may be members already of this graduate student council. I think that's what it's called. But they may already be included. I don't know the answer, but I'll find out.

CHAIR: Further questions?  
Need a recommendation or motion, please.

GROSSMAN: I move that we -- the Senate endorses the proposed changes, pending clarification of the questions that we just had.

CHAIR: Thank you.

MOUNTFORD: Mountford, A&S. Second.

CHAIR: Thank you. Discussion of the motion.

AUDIENCE: All in favor, aye?

CHAIR: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Abstention?

AUDIENCE: (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Motion carries. Thank you, Marcy.

We have proposed change now to the ARs with respect to the lecture title series. I think probably this evoked more response to our e-mails for input and queries than -- than anything we've seen come down the pike for awhile. So Richard, would you bring us up to date where we are and...

GREISSMAN: Mostly introduce our provost. If I may take just a second, going back to what Marcy did, thank you, Marcy. What we're trying to do with ARs and GRs is identify those that are here and important to the faculty in terms of how you live your lives as faculty and vet those thoroughly, witness the conversation about lecturer AR. Others we want to fast track in this regard. We will send it to the Senate, ask the Senate to send it to you as an agenda item. We'll give you a chance to say, oh, this seems pretty routine, fine; or either by Senate or by Senate Council or by Senate intervention say, you know, you got this wrong; this is more important than you think it is. We'll

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
pull it off the fast track and vet it in this more thorough way as we've done with the lecturer. This is an -- this is an attempt then to not spend a lot of time on ARs that seem less -- that seem more tangential to the day-to-day work you do. But the promise is that, to vet it in such a way that if we get it wrong, and we probably will, you have a chance to pull it off the fast track and ask for a more thorough discussion. In any case, it will come to the University Senate. And at that point in the -- in the worst case scenario, you can say, you know what, it's too controversial; let's table it and have a more thorough discussion. Just wanted to point out what we're trying to do here. Any questions on that? Thank you.

Okay. The lecturer AR was last changed in August of -- in -- in 2005. It began as an Arts and Science initiative years ago to try to bring greater professional posture to the lecturer series -- lecturer series faculty. There was some unfinished business as the provost pointed out in his memo to the Senate. And what we're trying to do today is address that. The salient changes, in addition to what we always do, which is try to clarify language. Eventually, if we do this five or six times, we may actually get it readable. But the attempt is to clarify language, but obviously the -- the most substantive things have to do with the terms of employment. We introduced the concept of a rolling contract. We introduced the concept of a professional development opportunity. And those are probably the two most substantial changes. In the context of a rolling contract, we address a preliminary period. I deliberately don't call it a probationary period, so as not to confuse language that is exclusive to the tenurable faculty; it is a period of time. I hope you see how careful done -- not only how carefully we vetted this, but how closely we tracked your concerns, and the concerns were numerous. So for instance, initially the -- the period before the rolling contract, the initial appointment period was two years. Senators felt it should be longer, four to six years. We compromised by saying four years. So it's a four-year period before anyone is eligible for a rolling contract. The rolling contract for a senior lecturer was initially proposed as four years. We reduced it to three years, again, because folks were concerned that four years seemed too long. The lecturer rank, the initial rank is a two-year rolling contract. We talked about both lecturer and senior lecturers having a two

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
year or a bi annual review of their faculty performance. Again, it was felt that lecturers, prior to promotion to senior lecturer, if that occurs, should have a more regular review if nothing else to build a more substantive body of evidence that warrants promotion. So we changed the language to say a lecturer is an annual faculty performance review, and a senior lecturer bi annually. Those are probably the most substantive changes. The quasi-sabbatical feature is to recognize that lecturers, like all faculty, need a period of time in which to replenish, to make sure they remain current by having a time in which they can do things other their ordinary activities. It's a six-year eligibility like sabbatical. It's a two -- one-time course reduction per each six years. So it's -- it's a one-year, two-year -- one-year, two-course reduction. There were some questions there. We tightened that language to make it clear.

Let me stop and -- and entertain questions. The hard questions go to Swamy. The easy ones, I'll take. Swamy, do you want to say -- do I need to say anything --

PROVOST:

No.

GREISSMAN:

Okay.

GROSSMAN:

Can you just define rolling

contract?

GREISSMAN:

Sure. A rolling contract is a contract that each year renews for the full duration. So a two-year rolling contract is one that comes up each year, and as it's renewed, it's renewed for two more years. So if a person after a period of time has unsatisfactory progress, in the worst-case scenario, we give that person two years, not the current one year. For a senior lecturer, it's a three-year rolling contract. The idea is that it renews every year for a three-year term. Again, unsatisfactory performance would then warrant a three-year window. The argument here is that it would seem, much like we do for all -- all other faculty, the first thing we do when someone has unsatisfactory performance is to address the problem, and ameliorate it, rather than simply public stockade or, you know, cut at the knees. So the -- the period of time seemed elongated, except if one thinks about the period of time it takes for one to recover, recover from something personal, a death of a child. It could affect one's performance. And so this is really an attempt to say that we will carefully track faculty performance in the lecturer series through the merit evaluation. If there's an unsatisfactory performance, the faculty person is immediately taken off the rolling contract, given a new contract that's for

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
the full duration -- Bob's question -- and then told that there are three possibilities, terminal -- termination of employment at the end of that time, a renewal of the nonrolling contract because there's progress but not sufficient progress, or a return to rolling contracts because the person has corrected the poor performance and is on track again. So anything else?

CHAIR: Further questions?

MEYER: Lee Meyer, College of Agriculture. Richard, will you talk a little bit about the part about the provost making final decision without reference to an area committee and any discussion about that?

GREISSMAN: Sure. Swamy, would you want to address that? Okay. Okay. I'll -- I'll start. The easy answer is we rolled over from the last time. It's been that way for lots of years. Only Davy knows how many years. But the idea here is that it's -- the -- the range of activity is quite different, and promotion process as a consequence is quite different. And so what we didn't want to do was tie up area committees with reviews that really were meant to take a -- a different profile. And so I think the logic is that unlike certainly tenurable title series where one wants an area committee, there is a range to the dossier that includes outside letters, in this case, not, that makes the dossier richer and more complex. We probably need to (unintelligible). So this is unchanged from 2005. I'll stop and -- and Davy if you want to make any other comment on that.

JONES: Well, yeah, again, back in 2005 when the senior lecturer title rank was created, the area committee chairs were canvassed as to whether this is something that -- that needed to go through them. At that time, they said -- they said, no, this -- this doesn't need to go to the area committees. We -- we again reconvassed them this time, and I think we got five responses back so far and four said, still, it doesn't need to; one thought maybe -- (unintelligible) was iffy.

MEYER: I'm chair of the extension area committee, and I don't necessarily think we need to go through the area committee, but it doesn't -- it only -- the decision is only made with the involvement of the faculty in the unit, and then no -- as I interpret it, no other faculty involvement.

GREISSMAN: Oh, good, good. I'm glad you -- I need to clarify that.

MEYER: Okay.

GREISSMAN: It goes through the entire process at the college level. So it

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
doesn't go from the unit. Forgive me, the -- because I think it fair -- it's not always fair. Because the dean has to make a recommendation, it goes from the unit to the college. The deans can ask the college advisory committee to weigh in. So it -- it has the thorough vetting at the college level. We're only circumventing, if you will, the area committee that the provost level.

MEYER: Okay.

GREISSMAN: So good, I'm really glad you asked that.

MEYER: Okay. And I don't know if other people weren't clear on that --

GREISSMAN: Sure. Let me go back to the language and see if I can add greater clarity.

MEYER: Okay.

GREISSMAN: Yeah, because we -- we certainly don't want to have any interpretation done at the college level. It needs to be thoroughly vetted. Thank you for that.

CHAIR: Ernie.

YANARELLA: Ernie Yanarella, Arts and Science. Richard, I -- I raised this in the Senate Council, and you suggested that I -- I do so in the University Senate, and that relates to these two issues. One has to do with the grandfathering in of existing lecturers. There was some very eloquent concern expressed by faculty about -- about the lecturers in their departments who are, you know, giving loyal and dedicated service, and there was a good deal of anxiety about the -- some of the qualifications that are written into the -- the -- the new changes in the AR and so forth. So I'm -- I'm asking if we have assurances from the provost office with regard to -- to that. Secondly, there was some discussion about the percentage of lecturers to faculty in individual academic units, and again, there was concern expressed about the generality of that language. It should be -- also be assured on that. And then thirdly, I think you borrowed my favorite tie, and I'd like to have it back.

GREISSMAN: I -- I don't pick the right days to wear it, although I see Ernie a lot. The first question is one Swamy needs to answer but not I.

PROVOST: And certainly I -- I think that whenever we make any changes, there's always the question of, you know, to what extent are the current incumbents affected and how you handle that. In this particular instance, I mean, as you know, the requirement that gets in the way and -- and certainly raises questions, has to do with the general requirement or expectation of a terminal degree where applicable with

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
exceptions to be granted. And certainly the expectation was that going forward those exceptions would come in those professional fields where a terminal degree is not necessary or -- or appropriate, nor actually feasible, for instance, so I think that was the communication. So in a field like political science or something like that, where indeed just given the supply and demand and the way our benchmark institutions are operating, that indeed over time, it is feasible to expect that terminal degree holders who would have a professional track into teaching introductory courses would be created as a good cadre of people who then would be engaged in pedagogical, you know, changes and so forth. I think that to simply say everyone is grandfathered would -- would -- could possibly just simply create, you know, a two-class system just doing the numbers, and so it has to be implemented, you know, thoughtfully; that is, I think on a case-by-case and in -- in some instances perhaps within a college where there are significant number or in a department where there are significant number; some fair system that is approved by the, you know, or recommended by the faculty and adopted by the college, would be the way to go rather than my imposing a one -- one rule fits all. I will be guided by the circumstances that are local because some of these decisions are best made in a decentralized context than a centralized context. But I think the ultimate goal is to, in both fields, where it's appropriate to expect a terminal degree to go towards a cadre of those who possess terminal. And that need not be a part of the AR, I believe. You know, I think that that's something that'll have to work through the particular units that are affected.

GREISSMAN: I'm sorry, may I ask -- answer Ernie's second questions?

PROVOST: I'm sorry. Excuse me.

GREISSMAN: Thanks. So the second question which I remember this is -- this is really good. We tightened the language in the ARs to define educational unit. The first issue was what's the educational unit? You know, the college, university, universe. So the educational unit is the unit in which the appointment occurs, and that's department, school without departments, graduate center, although it's not as likely, try finding a college without either departments or schools. So that's the unit that has to decide on a percentage. In 2005 when David Durant and I presented the revisions that the University Senate endorsed, we had in there language about a percentage, and the

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
University Senate said, no. We think  
faculties and departments have enough at  
stake that they will know what's right.  
And -- and we actually were asked on -- by  
the Senate to -- to leave the reference to  
a specific percentage -- again, in part,  
kind of a Swamy comment, again, the -- the  
number varied too much given  
circumstances, and so we left it like that.  
We were guided by -- he says with a twinkle  
in his eye, the wisdom of the University  
Senate to not put a percentage in. So it's  
up to the units to decide on a percentage,  
discuss it, vote, put it in their unit  
rules, and then that's the percentage until  
the unit decides to change it. We don't  
think, again, one size fits all, but it is  
at the unit level, department, et cetera,  
that that percentage is -- is adopted, if  
any.

YANARELLA: That comports with what I  
would -- I'd like to be the understanding.  
GREISSMAN: Good, great, great, so be it.  
Thanks. I'm sorry. Go ahead.  
WASILKOWSKI: Yes. I -- I received a number of  
comments from my colleagues from the  
College of Engineering, and there was one  
theme that was quite common, being the two  
years -- two year period after the first --  
first review. In case, for instance,  
someone is very bad teacher  
(unintelligible) review and then is granted  
an extra two years of employment which  
would very mistaken for progress, so, does  
it have to be two years; couldn't it be one  
year only?  
GREISSMAN: I think we changed it to one  
year. We did change it to one year.  
WASILKOWSKI: He said two years, okay.  
GREISSMAN: No, no, no. Well, it's two years  
after the -- the lecturer is promoted to  
senior lecturer, but as long as the -- in  
the initial appointment --  
WASILKOWSKI: I'm sorry, I --  
GREISSMAN: Sure. Sorry. So, yes, yes, in  
fact it was your college comment that had  
us change that.  
MOUNTFORD: Mountford, A&S. Richard, the --  
the -- at the beginning of the year under  
appointment where we talked -- talk about  
the maximum percentage, would these ARs  
have the effect that each unit would need  
to establish what the percentage would be?  
GREISSMAN: I will give an answer and then  
pause, and the pause is code for Davy to  
say something. My sense is that it's only  
if the unit wants to impose a percentage  
that it needs to be codified, but Davy,  
please.  
JONES: I guess it -- it was my  
interpretation that if -- if the units  
choosing to hire lecturers, they need to  
make some -- some affirmative statement or



LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010. txt  
else you wind up that, well, the chair  
never manages to lead the faculty do that,  
and we don't want to make it misunderstood  
that we want it to be a blank check.

GREISSMAN: Sure.

MOUNTFORD: That -- that would be my thought  
on it.

JONES: Sure.

MOUNTFORD: That units should include  
lecturers being pushed to make some  
statements on it.

JONES: And along with that, I guess,  
Heidi is sitting here too, we've had in the  
language for five years that the units are  
supposed to develop the criteria by which  
the lecturers are evaluated. Five years  
down the line, there are still departments  
that are hiring lecturers every year, and  
they haven't established those criteria for  
how they're evaluating lecturers. So I  
think you're helping the units with the  
tenure criteria and statements; if you  
could put a finger on the lecturers too.

ANDERSON: That is correct. And with  
this -- whatever happens with this  
particular AR then the next thing we will  
be doing is looking at those units to see  
if their lecturer criteria is up to date,  
and if it is not, then we'll be contacting  
those particular units just like we do with  
-- with the college rules, with the  
department rules, asking them to update.  
So we'll have a rubric pulled together,  
just similar to what we do with the college  
rules and the department rules and make  
sure -- send that out and ask them to -- to  
get on board with it.

MOUNTFORD: That's great. Thank you.

CHAIR: Further questions? May I have a  
motion, please?

WASILKOWSKI: Greg Wasilkowski, College of  
Engineering. Move to endorse.

CHAIR: Thank you. Second?

GROSSMAN: Second.

CHAIR: Discussion of the motion.

MEYER: I believe there were some  
proposals for some clarification of  
language. I assume those would be involved  
in this proposal?

GREISSMAN: Absolutely. The GR/AR work group  
that Marcy and I chair, meets Wednesday and  
I'll bring it up then and make sure that  
the group, that includes faculty  
representatives, Kaveh Tagavi and David  
Randall, help guide us on that. So we'll  
-- we'll get those two groups.

CHAIR: That's the group that, in fact,  
Marcy chairs so we'll look at it and make  
sure that...

Further discussion of the motion?

All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed, nay?

AUDI ENCE:

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAI R:

Abstention?

AUDI ENCE:

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAI R:

Motion carries. Thank you.

Item 12 is an update on the transfer action plan legislation from Frankfort. Provost Swamy.

PROVOST:

Thank you, David. This has a rather treacherous history. Here I'm defending the General Assembly of the State of Kentucky. I never thought I would be put in that position.

Let me just remind for those who really, rightly so, have been busy with important and useful things and not paying attention to what goes on in Frankfort. There's -- there's been a myth, and there is myth. I mean, now I think finally we're sort of getting it. Now that we passed the legislation, people are paying attention to the fact that it even happened. That somehow that the thing that's keeping large numbers of KCTCS students from transferring to four-year institutions and getting college degrees is the fact that we don't have a well aligned articulation for courses within the two-year system and the four-year system. And -- and you'll see that there will be data collected. Data is being collected and -- and will be, in fact, presented to all concerned next year or so which will impact upon (unintelligible). This is not (unintelligible) but totally. But that's extremely widely held. Some of these things are just anecdotal. You know, my cousin's son had taken English 101 and 102, and when he went to UK, they said none of that counts, he has to take English 104. That's the one -- that's the first thing they say, and you have silence because it's true; those don't transfer, you know. And immediately you're on the defensive, especially UK is on the defensive. So there's -- there's not much you can do about that. It's a widely held belief. And then you -- it was intensified over the last two years when the Governor appointed the task force on higher education, and the whole big agenda, how do you, you know, make it more affordable; how do you increase college; how do you improve quality, and all of those kinds of things. Everybody honed in on just one thing: If only we had transfer articulation and all these four-year institutions would do their thing. Nothing else; that's all that resonated. And then the mandate to the incoming CP President Bob King was everywhere he went introducing himself, you know, there's one thing you need to do, you need to fix the transfer articulation problem. And basically, in fact, poor

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
Richard, you know, he -- he -- he provides a lot of defense for me. There was a hearing -- hearing to which I said I'm not going to go, and Richard was kind enough to go, and I think Mike Mullen -- yeah, Mike was also brave enough to go, and this just basically because, you know, they had a well-prepared, logical reasoned argument for why this was just really, you know, barking the wrong tree, but they didn't even get to open their mouth. Then on top of that -- on top of that, in -- in the spring, I believe, last -- last year, Louisiana, of all states, passed, among other states, legislation -- I hope nobody's from Louisiana. I mean, the Governor is an idiot. They -- they passed a piece of legislation that established a post-secondary education council and had articulation in it. And believe me, if that -- that legislation which was basically brought over here and people just crossed Louisiana and put Commonwealth of Kentucky, I would have resigned. If that had passed, I would have resigned. That's how bad it was, how inclusive it was. And fortunately, we really have a couple of very enlightened legislatures and leaders in the General Assembly, believe it or not, and they really provided us incredible access. They said, look, this is going to pass unanimously in both chambers and be signed by the Governor, and so don't oppose it but try to get it to where you can live with it. It -- it was just an incredible amount of access we had. And I, you know, Representative Carl Rollins who introduced me in the House. I really can't say enough good things about him. There were multiple times when he really worked with the provost and academic institutions to try to accommodate what we said, you know, would -- would really make it possible for us to live with. And so ultimately that's really what ended up happening. It did pass. In fact, it was unanimous in both chambers, and I think there will be a major signing ceremony. This one is important enough that whether we sign a budget or not, there will be a signing ceremony. So the intention certainly is a -- is a noble intention to improve the transfer rates in the Commonwealth and increase a number of baccalaureate degrees awarded. It aligns transfer policies for general education and pre-major curricula across public institutions, both KCTCS at one end and the public institutions and relies on faculty to create clear pathways for KCTCS students to transfer to Kentucky public four-year institutions, so those pathways and alignment is not going to be somehow administratively done, but it's going to

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
actually done by faculty which -- so all of that is good. So there's really nothing here that's objectionable frankly, you know, by the time it was all done. And you know, there's some, again, mix about what it hopefully (unintelligible) because there were so many versions of it, and that, you know, people who saw it at different levels probably had some misperceptions.

So let me tell you what it does not legislate. It does not legislate a common numbering system across all Kentucky higher education. It doesn't do that. So Northern can have its numbering, and we have our numbering. It does not require a common general education or lower division. It does not say that. We can have our courses; they can have their courses. It does not in any way dictate undergraduate admission standards which is faculty (unintelligible). It does not do that; you can rest assured. Okay.

What it does legislate is a common -- common numbering system across KCTCS. In fact, when the KCTCS system was formed by splitting out the community colleges from the University of Kentucky back in you know, back then there was a common system within the community college system. But once it got split off, it was free for all because they combined that with technical colleges and so Air Conditioning 101 might have been Engineering something else somewhere else, for instance. There was really not that -- that coordination. Frankly, that caused a great deal of problems in terms of transfer articulation in -- on the ground because what -- what was good for -- what -- what meant something in Jefferson Community College was not the same as what it was, say in Somerset. So that alignment of the single common numbering system really was the crux of the issue in my opinion. I'm biased. So it would have been adequate just to address it but, you know, somehow you have to blame the four-year institutions involved so blame me too. So that's going to happen. And that's already started happening. There's a really good chief academic officer of KCTCS right now who is working on it. So I'm very pleased with that. The faculty of public institutions will have to work together to develop a set of general education learning outcomes. This is a term that, you know, we're all now used to. And in fact, I'll have a couple of things to say about that. And so it's really now alignment of learning outcomes rather than of particular course -- and course numbers and -- and curricular alignment; it's really learning outcomes. Disciplinary

faculty are the ones that develop the cross-institutional sets of learning outcomes for pre-major requirements as well to clarify the award and transfer of credit. That said, let me just remind you where this learning outcome stuff comes from. I mean, you -- you've now heard this so many times for the last four years. This should be easy for you. In response to SACS expectations, really all of our institutions, all public institutions, have been working on learning outcomes and assessment and that whole cycle. So this isn't anything new. That's why this -- this is very easy now. If we had not started down this path, this would have been far more difficult for us. Again, the four-year institutions have (unintelligible) general education programs, and some of them are in the -- you know, no one is, I think, as advanced as we are in our thinking. They're all following the same AC and Duke model from which we derive. And so those -- those learning outcomes are surprisingly aligned already among eastern, western, northern, and southern. And now more deliberately so. So I think those assignments -- those alignments are simple. So KCTCS can make a single alignment with the four-year institutions and among all the community college systems, so I think that articulation ought to work much better done that way. Then so as I said, this is proof certainly as a part of SACS or pre-major curricula and everything that our -- was spoken in terms of learning outcomes. So I think we're in a good position, and this process, of course, you know, the devil is in the detail and how quickly we can work it out and so forth, but those efforts are underway, and I think by and large there's a good understanding, I think even on the part of the General Assembly except for a couple of notable exceptions that we are earnest about getting this done right, and this is not really the pantacea to the whole transfer problem.

CHAIR: Swamy will be back our last meeting of the semester to talk about the state of the university. So he'll, I assume, stand questions, more general questions there. But are there questions for him on this issue? Yeah, Bob.

GROSSMAN: Yeah, Bob Grossman, A&S. One of our most consistent transfer problem has to do with transferring labs, especially labs that differ in the number of hours. Oh, I took one hour of this lab and one hour of that lab, does it count for two hours of this lab at UK? Is any of this going to help with those problems?

PROVOST: To be candid, there was no

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
explicit discussion of labs, per se, in --  
in -- while -- while all of this was going  
on. When the faculty committees assemble,  
I think that's going to have to be one of  
the tasks. And you know, it's entirely  
permissible and, in fact, even an  
expectation under House Bill 160 which is  
currently also -- that you have -- you  
could have some kind of a state-wide test  
that -- equivalency test that someone might  
-- someone might have to take. So it may  
be worth talking about, is there a  
competency test or something that one might  
take as well in order to standardize it.  
But I think that's -- that's a discussion  
that needs to take place then.

STEINER: I just want to say I think  
you did a superb job in heading -- heading  
up this issue. I was following it from the  
very beginning. There was a great amount  
of fear, and you guys really got into it  
and really did a wonderful job.

PROVOST: I mean, frank -- frankly, the  
credit goes to everyone around --

STEINER: But you did it quickly and  
decisively. I heard about that.

CHAIR: Are you in a position you could  
tell us anything about the budget or would  
you care to --

PROVOST: I have general expectation. By  
the way, this is not just in this state.  
Every state that has, I mean, you know,  
the -- a midterm election, basically no one  
expects any problems to be seriously  
tackled until the November elections are  
over. So we will -- will have some kind  
of -- I mean, the law requires us to have a  
budget. You know, it is no longer possible  
for the General Assembly to not have a  
budget. The court ruled that in 2004. And  
so there will, in fact, be a budget, but  
there's very little disagreement about the  
2009 -- I mean, budget between the  
House and the Senate. And so there will be  
a budget, I'm pretty sure. Say famous last  
words. But you know, whether there will  
have to be a special session after the  
April deadline it's not clear. But somehow  
or another we will open the new fiscal year  
with a budget. It is the '11 and that  
really no one has any idea because any  
number you would come up is fiction, pure  
fiction. And there are huge problems.  
Every state has it. Stimulus funding is  
what's holding up the higher education and  
as well as all education budgets. And huge  
shortfalls anywhere you look at it, in any  
state, in fact, California, 35 percent;  
Illinois -- in fact this year there was  
about a 400 million dollar shortfall. The  
state is in arrears to the tune of about  
half -- more than half of what they owe --  
owe the university. So I mean, you know,

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010.txt  
we're actually sitting very well on that.  
I hope if you're not aware of it, I urge  
you to call up your friends in other states  
and, you know, just so a little bit of -- I  
always get this wrong -- schadenfreude or  
freudenschade. Actually, both have  
meaning, so....

CHAIR:

Yes, thank you. The last issue  
today is -- is my simply reminding you of  
the procedures for bringing new business.  
The Senate rules mandate that the business  
that comes before the full Senate is sent  
by Senate Council. And that's basically  
what this is telling you here. I'll give  
you another moment to read it. But the  
next page will tell you that 10 Senators  
made petition to bring new business before  
this body. So I think you may have noticed  
that we're doing some things a little  
differently and we're going to attempt to  
continue to make these meetings more  
productive and more valuable for you and  
for the faculty. And we will be having  
probably a second retreat this summer to  
focus specifically on the issue of -- of  
how we can do things better. We'll  
continue to receive any suggestions you  
have. Send them to me or send them to the  
Senate office, and that will be fodder for  
our discussion probably in May. We'll  
probably have an initial summer retreat in  
May, but irrespective here's the procedure.  
We will have a very busy May meeting. The  
May meeting will be the first Monday of May  
on the 3rd, not on the second Monday, and  
it will be a very, very full meeting. It  
will be a very important meeting.

Other than that, I believe we  
stand adjourned now. Thank you very much.

\* \* \* \* \*

THEREUPON, the University of Kentucky  
Senate Council meeting for April 12, 2010 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 27th day of  
June, 2010.

LISA E. HOINKE  
NOTARY PUBLIC

LH, UKSENATECOUNCILMEETING, APRIL2010. txt  
STATE-AT-LARGE  
K E N T U C K Y