

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

\* \* \* \*

March 19, 2012

3:00 p.m.

\* \* \* \*

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
WILLIAM T. YOUNG LIBRARY AUDITORIUM  
401 Hilltop Avenue  
Lexington, Kentucky

\* \* \* \*

HOLLIE SWANSON, CHAIR

ROBERT GROSSMAN, VICE CHAIR

J. S. BUTLER, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

ANN CHASTANG, COURT REPORTER

\* \* \* \*

SWANSON: Good afternoon. Welcome to the March 19th Senate meeting. Do we have quorum? David Randall, do we have quorum?

RANDALL: Yes.

SWANSON: All right, thank you. Please give your name and affiliation when you speak. Communicate with your constituency. Attend meetings. Respond to e-mails and web postings as appropriate. Acknowledge and respect others and, ready, silence your electronic beepers. Thank you. The minutes from February

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
13th have been received. Could I have a motion for approval? Would anybody like approve?  
Move to approve.  
Is there a second?  
Second.  
Any objections, for, against?  
Thank you very much. All in favor?  
The minutes are approved. Thank you. So as far as our announcements, there was a student earning a Master's of Science in Rehabilitation Counseling that I was asked to approve effective for the 2012 degree list and so I said yes. There are three web transmittals that are currently posted, March 14th courses in programs, March 12th courses in programs, and March 9th courses in programs. Please review those. I also received an e-mail from the Provost and you remember the last time we met we had a little bit of an announcement about the President's re-organization of his office. And so now the Provost announces that they'll be - look into the Provost's office. So I don't need to read that to you, right? Okay, questions, comments? Thank you. We have a QEP update. Professors Diana Snow and Deanna Sellnow, welcome.

SELLNOW: It's been a while since you've seen us. We're still working.

SWANSON: We missed you.

SNOW: We're going to tell you. So to remind you about the Quality Enhancement Plan, first of all, what is it, just for new members here perhaps. Quality Enhancement Plan or QEP is a core requirement for SACS reaccreditation. Underscore "requirement." And the focus of this again is enhancing student learning.

SELLNOW: So before we go any further, for those of you who are new to the QEP that haven't heard us talking QEP until now, it is a core requirement so we do need to do this for SACS reaffirmation of accreditation. How many people in here out of curiosity have heard of QEP? Yea. I could go home right now.

SNOW: So we started this in fall 2009 - just to remind you a little bit about the time line. Our pre-planning team put together the big plan the spring and summer of 2010. We worked on taking all of the ideas from campus and putting them

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
into six teams that revolved out into campus. Then we invited purple, and then white papers, and then we reviewed those white papers. We put forward to the SACS leadership team and one was chosen. And the winner of that was MCXC, or multimodal communication across the curriculum. Since that time Deanna and I have been working with our team, the document development team, to put together a hundred page document that goes to SACS. And then January of 2012 is where the new information for you - the last time you heard from us was last fall. So starting in January we gave this document to the SACS team. They made some recommendations, particularly Connie Ray, bless her heart, she doesn't work here anymore, she's still helping us. In February we had outside external consultants come and we discussed with them. These are some people that Deanna knows well from North Carolina State.

SELLNOW: They were speaking of writing across the curriculum, something that's similar. It's not quite as integrated communication as our oral, written, visual, and digital. But it is. They have been doing something and have been successful with it. So we wanted to hear from their roadblocks and whatnot to try to learn best practices from them. So they came and read our document and visited with us on February 14th.

SNOW: We met with the topic development team. We had a big powwow with this entire group about how we could improve the document. And right now what we're doing is revising that document based on all this input that we received we're rehashing some things and putting some new things in there.

SELLNOW: And primarily what we're doing then is a little bit different than we're changing from what we submitted back in the beginning of January is that we're actually going to say that the QEP is targeted to upperclass graduates. When Diane and I got around to visit various units, one of the things that many people in the units talked about was we want this to be open to everybody. It's still open to everybody, but the

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
QEP focus what we have to assess for SACS to show we're doing a good job will be more narrowly defined. Even though the lab tutoring will be available to everybody the consulting and all of it will be available to everybody, but the QEP part that we have to assess and show we're doing a good job will just be in the upper division undergraduate population. And the other thing is branding. Roxanne Malford and Jane Blanton and a group of people from the document development team worked with focus groups of undergraduate and graduate students to come up with a brand, something to call this QEP besides MCXC, multimodal communication across the curriculum which is really a mouthful, but that's what the white paper was entitled. And we went with what the students thought they wanted this thing to be called. So they designed the logo. And that's what they picked.

SNOW:

We are now Presentation U. Any time we are talking about the QEP, it is officially Presentation U. You are the ultimate presentation is the slogan that goes along with it and the place where students and faculty will go for this new - to gather techniques through the presentation center. They repeatedly said - they the students - that we have a writing center; we know exactly what a writing center does and a presentation center. Everyone will know what a presentation does.

SELLNOW:

They wanted it simple is what they wanted. Just a reminder to you of what the QEP actually is going to be about, it's going to be about two different things. It's going to be about faculty development. All the best practices that we did in conducting our research and from our outside consultants said that we need to have two aspects that this isn't going to flop. And it might still flop. No, it won't flop. Faculty development is very important. There has to be faculty driven so there will be a faculty development component where faculty will be invited, not required, but invited to participate in doing some things in their classroom curriculum for communication projects the way that communication

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
plays out in the professions that  
the majors - that your majors are  
preparing your students for. So  
they'll be that. But, again,  
remember, it's invited, not  
required. So there will be an  
incentive for submitting a  
proposal, getting some sort of a  
(unintelligible) or honorarium for  
participating and assessing your  
work, okay? And then they'll be a  
student tutoring focus which will  
need help through the faculty in  
terms of there will be experts just  
like the writing center where they  
can go to get help with their  
digital projects and their oral  
projects and their teamwork  
projects.

SNOW: We'd like to give a special thanks  
to some people who have done extra  
work. The entire document  
development team has done a  
tremendous amount of work. But  
there is core of people who have  
really put together some of the  
very important information and  
details and statistics that have  
gone into this document. Karen  
Badger from Social Work, Janet  
Eldred from English and  
Engineering. Brandi Frisby from  
Communication and Information  
Sciences. Kathi Kern from History  
and CELT. Tara Rose, Assessment,  
and Jami Warren also from CIS.  
These people have done the yo man  
share of this job.

SELLNOW: Just a reminder of where we're at  
and where we have to get to by  
when. Right now we're finalizing  
the QEP and we're vetting it across  
campus and revising it and trying  
to get it ready because by fall of  
2012 we have to go through the  
approval process which will be  
coming to this body, to the  
President, to the Board of  
Trustees, to get it ready by  
January of 2013 to submit it to  
SACS. And then April 9th through  
11th they'll come to campus to  
visit to see if we really can - if  
they think that we have a viable  
plan. And they'll give us the  
rubber stamp and that's why we're  
cheering because they're going to  
say this is a great idea.

SNOW: Everybody in 2009 when we first  
came in here and everybody went oh,  
that's so far away. That's just  
next April now.

SELLNOW: It's coming upon us. What we

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
really want to do because this is a process of vetting and revising of what we're doing is to invite you to take back to your colleges and units and departments that it's time now. If people are wondering what's going on with the QEP, what it is, comments or questions, they should visit the website. They should contact Diane and/or me if they have questions, concerns, or comments so that we can be collecting that information and making sure that it is representative of the voice in the document when we submit it.

SNOW: We'll still be going around the campus in various venues to talk about the QEP as it develops, and we're willing to do this for any unit that would like to have us come. So if you'd like that, please let us know.

SELLNOW: Right. And, again, we need your help to get back to your unit, to get them back to us so that people don't say I don't know what you're talking about.

SNOW: Questions?

SWANSON: I'm just curious, what are the goods, bads, and uglies that came out of the expert's reviews?

SELLNOW: And the research that's been done in the past when these kinds of things failed. If it's just a student focus, if it's just a general communication focus, if the faculty - it's not broad-based by and from faculty, if it's required as opposed to volunteered and invited to participate, those are some of the things that we wanted to make sure based on the research and what people were saying. The consultation with faculty is really important so that there's a sense of that the faculty feel like the consultants from the QEP projects are listening to them in terms of what they want done in their classes and to help them make that happen.

SWANSON: Would we have like some kind of a website where we could look at best practices? Who on campus is doing the best in X, Y, Z?

SELLNOW: Well, that's a wonderful question. Thank you for asking it. One of the things we have in our five year implementation plan, once QEP SACS people tell us next April wonderful job, go forth and do this thing, then we have five years to do the

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt

pilot to make it sustainable on our campus. And one of the things that we will do will be monthly luncheons where faculty can come and find out from faculty who are doing it what's working, what's not working, what they did, wow, this is super cool. We will definitely be trying to infuse it across the curriculum by hearing from faculty throughout the website and face-to-face interaction.

SNOW:

And one thing that the faculty consultants thought was very, very important was the faculty was on board with it; that we really needed to have the faculty buy in an understanding of why this is important for our students and participating in the program. So we hope that will be.

SWANSON:

Other questions? All right, thank you very much. We'll next hear from the President's Chief of Staff, Bill Swinford. And as he makes his way up here, let me just remind you that Bill will be here today. The April 9th meeting we have Chair of the Board, Britt Brockman, coming and for the May meeting we have both the President and the Provost at our May meeting.

SWINFORD:

Thank you as always for your time. I know you have a lot of stuff to accomplish. I also want to warn you at the outset over the last eighteen hours I told my four children that none of us would be going to Atlanta this weekend to watch basketball and also handed back my classes' midterm. So I have been disappointing people over the last eighteen hours, just so you're warned. Let me say just a couple of things by way of introduction. I think I was here before the February Board meeting and you know from the newspapers that one of the actions that the Board took at that meeting was to move forward with a new residence hall that would be built on Haggin Field with the aim to be open for the fall of '13 academic year. And so we're moving forward with that. Six hundred one beds in a public private partnership with a company called EDR. I'll be glad to talk about that in more detail. The other thing going on, of course, is that we are in approximately the forty-seventh day of the 2012 session of the General Assembly.

Page 7

The budget is currently in the Senate. It is - it has gone from the Governor to the House and to the Senate. It continues to contain what we've been talking with you about before which is a budget reduction of 6.4 percent. That works out to about 19.4 million dollars for the University of Kentucky. That percentage is consistent across all the universities, 6.4 percent. What the House did matches the Governor's recommendation and now it is in the hands of the Senate. The other thing that the House did which the President is now spending an enormous amount of time on is that in the Governor's version of the budget there was some 200 million dollars in authorization so that the University of Kentucky could move forward with capital projects using our own funds and incurring our own debt. The House of Representatives stripped out that authorization. They did so for all of the universities. There is considerable concern in Frankfort about the debt load of public entities, all the state government including public colleges and universities. And so the President is now working very hard to get that authorization put back in. There is no state money to - that would subsidize capital projects on our campus. But what the House did was they also took away from us our ability to take on our own debt to move forward with some projects. Now to distinguish that from the residence hall project which is authorized and remains authorized because that is not university funding. So that's coming through a different set of authorizations. So the President is working to try to get that money put back. We anticipate that the Senate by as early as Thursday or Friday of this week will come out with their version of the budget. And then the way this process has worked in the past, there will be some differences between what the Senate will do and what the house has done, and then they will go into conference committee, a collection of legislators from the Senate and the House to try to hammer out the differences. So we are hopeful that if not - if the

Page 8



money is not put back - the authorization is not put back in the Senate version that hopefully when it gets to conference committee we can have some conversations that would bring that authorization back. I wish I could stand before you and tell you that we are optimistic about getting some portion of our 19.4 million dollar reduction back, but I'm afraid I can't say that. The messages we're getting from Frankfort is that money remains tight even as the economy begins to recover. And so I think that we are looking at substantial reduction in state funds going into next fiscal year. To put that in perspective, and I think I probably described this to you before, but in December of '07 the University of Kentucky had about 335 million dollars in state appropriations. We are now down 303 million dollars today for this fiscal year. Taking us back another nineteen million dollars puts us at 284. So you can think about the magnitude of that drop from 335 three years ago, four years ago, to 284 going into next year. The President has had some preliminary conversations with the deans and with the Provost and with others about how to manage a reduction of this magnitude. We are just now having those conversations. As you know, it has implications for all of the things that we do, and the President will be communicating with the campus in fairly short order after we find out what the Senate is going to do and if we get any kind of positive signal from the conference committee. But, again, I'm not holding out a lot of optimism that that will occur. The General Assembly for better or worse has been distracted by redistricting first and then gaming and now the budget. And so there just isn't a lot of other legislation we're monitoring very closely. There's always things that legislators do for and to post secondary education during these sessions. But there really isn't anything non-budget that they're spending an enormous amount of time on. Anything can happen in the closing couple weeks. We're going to watch everything very closely. Right now it's all

Page 9

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt

about budget and in particular all about trying to recover some authorizations so that even in the absence of state support for capital construction, we can make work with donors with internal sources, other sources of revenue to move forward at least on some projects over the next couple of years in addition to the residence halls. I think that's about it by way of introduction. I'd be more interested in questions that you all have about anything you're seeing or about the budget or things you've heard about.

SWANSON:

I read that some states like Michigan, for example, are perhaps getting penalized by the Feds because of their lack of state support. What was that number that they were working on?

SWINFORD:

I'm not familiar with the Michigan case in particular. But as you probably also know, the President of the United States has raised some significant concerns on a couple of fronts both in terms of the support the states are giving to post secondary institutions but also about tuition and about the necessity of maintaining affordability. And he in his public comments it seems to task both the states and the institutions to task to insure that higher education remains affordable. What we are seeing a little bit of at the state level is a continuing conversation about performance funding. That in order to continue to earn the amount of state support we do get there are conversations about tying that to graduation rates, retention rates, and the like. I feel like in an era of retrenchment those conversations have lost a little bit of steam, but it is still a conversation a lot of legislators have about accountability, and we're continuing to watch them.

FRIAR:

Alan Friar, Earth and Environmental Science. Is the proposed reallocation of coal severance funds to help the students go to college in eastern Kentucky counties have any direct or indirect impact?

SWINFORD:

Thank you. As you all know, I think we talked about a little bit the last time I was here the original proposal that was made by

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt

the Speaker of the House, Greg Stumbo, was to bring the University of Pikeville, U Pike, into the public system and to subsidize that move with coal severance dollars. The current proposal on the table as an effort to increase college going and graduation rates, particularly eastern Kentucky, is to use coal severance dollars to provide scholarships to students to attend public and independent institutions particularly in that region. As of right now, it continues to be the case that those funds would come exclusively from coal severance dollars. The University of Kentucky receives 1 million dollars annually from coal severance for a scholarship program we have called the Robinson Scholar's program which provides tuition assistance to first generation students from a twenty plus county region of eastern Kentucky. That's the only coal severance dollars the University of Kentucky directly receives. So the current proposal as it relates to scholarships from coal severance dollars would not affect the University in any way. What had concerned several institutions including ours about a move of U Pike into the public system was that the original proposition would come from coal severance but coal severance revenue tend to fluctuate pretty dramatically. The concern was once you make the commitments, they'd have to dip into the general fund to support whatever initiative they propose. So that's the conversation we'll keep having as long as it comes from coal severance, it does not have direct implications to the University. But if coal severance tax revenue were to decline a considerable amount and start looking at the general fund, then it becomes a much more immediate concern.

FRIAR:

As a follow-up, are those students eligible to attend UK?

SWINFORD:

The proposal as currently crafted would be to allow those scholarship dollars to be used for students to attend public and independent institutions in eastern Kentucky counties with the proviso if there were undergraduate programs that were not available at those institutions, then they could take

that money with them to other institutions. But that's a pretty limited vein and it's only for undergraduate.

TRUSZCZYNSKI : Can you tell us a little bit about how the University is going to handle that cut?

SWINFORD: Well, again, we've had preliminary discussions and I mean very preliminary. The President has met with the deans and has been talking regularly with the Provost. He's got some analysis that's being run. As you all know, how we approach this has implications for everything we do and has implications for tuition, for example. I mean he made some decisions about that. I will tell you that this President is very skeptical about across the board reductions as a way of absorbing reductions in state appropriations. I think he wants to take a look at a reasonable and deliberate approach to making reductions perhaps disproportionately on the administrative side to the degree you can preserve academic programs we are able to do so, but please don't take that to mean there will be no reductions on the academic side of the house. The numbers I see don't make that tenable. But I think the President will be looking for a way to protect the academic functions as much as he possibly can. So it wouldn't surprise me at the end of the day that we have a disproportionate share being born by the administration. We're just not there yet. Yes, ma'am?

DEBSKI : Liz Debski, A&S. So do you anticipate hiring and staff freezes?

SWINFORD: I wish I could give you an answer to that question today. I don't know. Some universities across the state, including the University of Louisville, have announced a hard freeze. There are various ways of going about that. The President's general philosophy, guiding philosophy is to allow units to make the decisions. I think part of this exercise we're going through over the longer term to take another look at our financial model I think will result in greater flexibility for units. So a top down freeze is kind of counter to that philosophy. I think the question for all of us is

whether or not in this environment the institution as a whole has the kind of discipline we need in order to make strategic hires without just making hires because there's a position available and we've always had that position in place and we've always needed somebody to fill those particular functions. I think that's the question the President will ask of the deans and the department chairs and the rest of us is as we move forward with the budget reduction, what kind of discipline is there in the system among the decision-makers, among the hiring officials so that a freeze from top down is not the appropriate way to go. I think we're still trying to figure that out. Again, part of the President's challenge is that while he has charged this group to put together a new financial model, we've also got to deal with the very short term realities of what we're facing going into '12-'13. And we won't be able to implement a brand new financial model for '12-'13. We're looking at '13-'14 for whatever that creature is would be implemented. So we've kind of got to run on parallel tracks a little bit, but I think he wants to continue having conversation with the campus about how you continue to decentralize decision-making even if we're having to deal with this 19.4 million dollar reality. Anybody else? Well, thank you all very much.

SWANSON:

Thank you, Bill. We have our Vice Chair, Professor Robert Grossman.

GROSSMAN:

Hello. The one thing I wanted to talk about was the Outstanding Senator award. I sent out an e-mail asking for nominations for the Outstanding Senator award. This year we decided that the award should go to either a first Senator or a Senator who has recently completed his or her term. So far the response back from you has not been great. So I encourage you to please think about who you think has been doing a particularly good job as a Senator. Please send me an e-mail with some description of why you think this person deserves the award. Just to remind you, last year's recipient was Davy Jones. So he's not eligible this year. He is on a selection

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
committee, in fact. Also, no  
current member of Senate Council is  
eligible either. But previous  
members of Senate Council who are  
no longer on Senate Council are  
eligible. Okay, thank you.

SWANSON: Thank you, Bob. We have our newest  
member of our cadre, John Wilson,  
our Faculty Trustee. John?

WILSON: First I want to thank the - this is  
John Wilson with Behavioral  
Science. I want to thank the  
Senate Rules and Elections  
Committee for a smooth election  
process, and I want to thank all  
the Senate for everything they did  
to get out a large voter support  
for all four of the candidates.  
Over a thousand faculty voted in  
that election and that did not -  
the Board did not miss notice of  
that fact that it was an extremely  
good turnout and a message that  
faculty at this institution do care  
about what's happening. So we  
thank you all. It was only a month  
since I was elected. It's been a  
long month. Sort of like white  
water rafting without the raft is  
the best impression of it. So I'm  
learning as fast as I can, not  
necessarily as fast as I need to.  
But from my viewpoint one of the  
most important things I can do is  
be here at the Senate. Be here at  
the Senate Council to facilitate  
that learning process. And I think  
that communication process will  
help me enormously. And since the  
faculty trustees are ex-officio on  
the Senate Council, I think there  
is a reason for that and we should  
be there. Dr. Voro sends her  
regrets today. Teaching  
obligations prevents her from  
coming. But she's in perfect  
agreement with that policy. So we  
will try to make communication even  
better between the Council Senate  
and the faculty trustees going  
forward. Hollie asked me today to  
come to you to give you a brief  
background about one of the issues  
that we'll be talking about today.  
And that is an issue concerning  
amendments to the governing  
regulations. One of the first  
things I learned was governing  
regulations which I'm sure you guys  
know are the umbrella policy of the  
institution that essentially guide  
the development of other  
regulations and the whole process.

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt

The Board of Trustees can change these governing regulations but there's only one process by which that can take place. There is a first reading before the Board and then a period of a month to provide for input from the University community in specified ways and then a final vote. The governing regulations are considered to be so important that they really require a reflective period and they shouldn't be changed lightly. So in February a variety - at the February Board meeting a variety of changes to the governing regulations were given a first reading. Dr. Voro noticed a couple of issues in terms of the core values that were being changed that we wanted to think about. So I want to give you some background on this topic. Governing regulation one contains among other things a statement of the vision, the mission, and the core values of the institution. Core values generally don't change very much. They're called core values. So what we did was we created - and this is in your handout as well. The first three columns are the core values as they were in April of 2003, October 2006, and what they actually currently are right now as we're speaking. The next page shows links to these versions if people want to read the original documents. As you can see, there's a remarkable similarity of the core values as you move across those three columns. Since 2003 really only one core value was added and that's that sensitivity to work life concerns. That engendered a lot of debate at the time in the Board of Trustees and in the University community about that as being added to core values. You can see that there are definitely wording changes that take place. But that's pretty much core values are core values. Changed to a slight degree. There's a blank column. And then the fifth column - actually the fourth column that is text is what the core values that were presented to the Board of Trustees for a first reading in February 2012. These are exactly the core values that are listed in the strategic plan which was approved in 2009. I think I have

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
it up there. June 2009. And what we noticed was that there's some changes in wording. But that two core values had disappeared from the listing. That is personal and institutional responsibility and accountability and a sense of community. We wondered and asked the question since no core value had been deleted in so long what was happening with these two core values. And this is where the second - a second problem emerged is this had supposedly taken place in 2009 and a three year lag between the fact that it actually became visible between those core values were no longer there. So because we really couldn't find any I want to say rationale for why they were deleted and even more so the fact that something as substantial as a core value needs to really have some wide understanding among folks that it's being deleted before it actually gets deleted from the core values. We went to the Senate Council and asked the Senate Council to consider submitting a fix to this problem and from our point of view one of the things we were interested in is maintaining those core values, not deleting them without a really wide and open and transparent process. Communication errors definitely led to this. And earlier the 2003 system was actually probably more appropriately changing the GRs before you approve the strategic plan is definitely preferable to changing the GRs after you approve the strategic plan. In essence a series of miscommunications led to a deletion of two core values and that's what we brought before the Senate Council to discuss. Yes, sir.

PRATS: Armando Prats, English Department. So there are no narratives that you can share as to how these two core values came to disappear?

WILSON: Well, this is where the three year time lag poses some serious problems. It only became visible in February of 2012. And the deletion from the strategic plan occurred three years earlier. Now there is some evidence that this could well be as simple as a clerical error because the Board was certainly told in 2009 that the



FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
core values had really not changed. So there's a lot of confusion about what was really intended at that time. But there's clearly no wide acceptance or understanding that the core values were actually being deleted. I can't enlighten three years later what else might be going on. I have no narrative that describes that in any order. And I did look through the minutes of a lot of meetings, but it wasn't there. Other questions?

PRATS: Can I follow up?

WILSON: Sure.

PRATS: While somebody else is thinking of another question. So civic responsibility became civic engagement. And civic engagement is somehow different from a sense of community. I mean I would like - I mean since we're talking about the whole thing, perhaps somebody can enlighten me as how civic engagement and sense of community are different and require a separate expression and separate row.

WILSON: Well, I guess our concern was not as the faculty trustees not so much the exact parsing of every element. That was a long process during the strategic plan. I guess our biggest concern was that at the time that these things were approved by the Board of Trustees there was no understanding on the Board that these were being deleted. And so our concern is that something as significant as something, a deletion of a core value that hadn't been there for nine years is something that we felt was needed open and transparent that wasn't present in 2009. And that's - but we would not quibble with what the strategic plan process did with the actual wording. But we still don't have any narrative for any of those things this far removed from that process.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S. I went through the same thing, Armando, when I was looking at it, and then it occurred to me sense of community is probably meant more internally at UK; whereas the civic engagement and social responsibilities were externally focused. I don't know if that's what they meant when they wrote it, but that's how I'm thinking about it.

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt

TRUSZCZYNSKI : Mi rek Truszczynski , Engi neeri ng.  
So if I understand you correctly,  
there is no trace of why it  
happened, right? We don't know why  
and how it happened?

WILSON: None that I can find.

TRUSZCZYNSKI : Is anybody looki ng?

WILSON: We looked and we inquired of  
people, the faculty trustees at  
that time when that was accrued. I  
inquired of seven or eight folks  
who were on that planni ng process  
and although the typical response  
was you know, I don't remember what  
I had for dinner last week much  
less what happened in 2009, none of  
them - the most vocal response was  
I don't know why anybody would  
eliminate that.

TRUSZCZYNSKI : So isn't we simply say clerical  
error happened and have them  
reinstated and once they are  
reinstated we really look at the  
process through which they are  
changed and perhaps if it's  
necessary analyze the semantic  
content and whether they're  
appropriate or not?

WILSON: Right. I would agree complet ely  
that, you know, simply one  
shoul dn't change core values for  
the clerical error. That's simple  
as I can make it.

SNOW: Diane Snow, Medical Center.  
Whereas I doubt anyone is going to  
stop being personally or  
insti tuti onally responsi ble or  
accountable or throw away their  
sense of communi ty because there's  
not a box filled in in here, I'm  
worried about somethi ng happeni ng  
like this that we're not payi ng  
attention to for three years.  
Because of this there is a new  
system that is stated in any way  
that we are now going to look at  
these ones every year or -

WILSON: I don't think this error will  
happen again. I think this is a  
peculiarit y of the process that  
somehow swit ched changi ng the  
governi ng regulati ons and the  
approval of the strategi c plan. I  
mean the 2012 Board, you know, as  
facul ty trustees we would not vote  
to remove accountabi lity from the  
list of core values or sense of  
communi ty wi thout some real  
understandi ng that that was really  
the deci sion of a facul ty process a  
substanti al so -

SNOW: I want to make sure we're payi ng  
attenti on.

WILSON:  
DEBSKI : Yes?  
Liz Debski, A&S. Aside from the embarrassment, are there any (unintelligible) consequences that the deletion of these values could be in three years?

WILSON: I'm probably not the person who can best describe that, but I guess the SACS accreditation does require that the listing of core values in our strategic plan should match what's in our governing regulations. So it would entail putting those values into the strategic plan. But actually, you know, from the point of view of the institution, they haven't been removed yet. That's the beauty of the process is they have not been removed yet. The process works. You have to have a first reading and a period of comment and then a vote. And that had never taken place. So in essence that's the safeguard. The mistake was the timing. And there's lots of reason that can make that understandable. It's just something obviously one would pay attention to in the future. I don't know if that answers your question.

DEBSKI :  
SPEAKER: That's fine.  
May I also (unintelligible.) Does that change the mission statement? I know two changes, one is I guess (unintelligible.) But what rationale for putting less focus on research?

WILSON: Well, as I said about the values, we're not questioning that whole strategic planning process which led up to an appropriate discussion of that. Those things were explicit in 2009 when the Board looked at the strategic plan. We're not considering opening that up for further discussion at this point because there's no - we would be second guessing a long process of the strategic planning process and we're not intending to do that. We're simply saying parts of that process were not as open and understandable to the University community so -

SPEAKER: Are you saying the other changes were also proposed in 2009 and just haven't been looked at since then?

WILSON: The others were proposed in 2009 were never formally made but were visible to the Board of Trustees. I think the difference we're talking about is these changes in

core values were not visible. The other changes were visible in the documents provided to the Board.

SPEAKER: So it remains. What's the motivation for putting less focus on research?

WILSON: And I would not be the one to answer that question. That would be a part of that whole strategic planning process.

SPEAKER: (Unintelligible) A&S. Suppose I have an opinion about this. What do I do and what's the window which is going to close?

WILSON: The process for comment during that month you could send comments to the President. As I understand it, the vehicles changing the amended regulations is to go through the University Senate, the Staff Senate, the student government or the President. So we went through the Senate Council and this body to propose amendments to that. Those other venues are open and certainly the President himself can propose amendments.

SPEAKER: And the window closes when?

WILSON: The window closes - it's one month after the meeting. So February 21st was the first meeting. The next meeting is March 27th.

CHRIST: Allison Christ, Fine Arts. Does that mean you're going to motion to -

WILSON: Trustees do not make motions.

CHRIST: I mean from here.

WILSON: Hollie will present what the Senate Council decided on this issue.

SWANSON: Are we ready to move into motioning or do we have more questions?

WILSON: Thank you.

SWANSON: Thank you. So let me reiterate. One of the issues that has come up as we went through this process is that what we're - we've got strategic plan and then we have the GRs, and SACS says that the two have to align and the problem we have right now is they do not align, all right, and so that is our fix. So that's what we have to be fixing. And so as John alluded to, we've been in considerable discussion and John and I came to the Senate Council last week. We proposed a fix and then Chair Brockman asked the Board of Trustees members and the Academic Affairs Chair, Keith Gannon to work through this issue with us. So the first meeting of that was Tuesday and the President has handled that

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
one. And so we've been in considerable discussion trying to work through this. And so here are the changes that we are proposing. And let me slip to the next slide then. With respect to the proposed changes to governing regulation 1.C.3, recommendations that the University Senate ask President Capilouto to forward to the Board of Trustees a request - rather indirect - a request to amend governing regulations 1.C.3 "values" to keep the core values of personal and institutional responsibility and accountability and a sense of community and modify the 2009-2014 strategic plan accordingly. Does that make sense to everybody?

SPEAKER: I still have the same question, what about the other changes? I mean -

SWANSON: We're not rewriting the strategic plan at this point.

SPEAKER: No, but the mission sentence will also change.

SWANSON: You will have an opportunity to rewrite the strategic plan starting next year. The point of this exercise is not to rewrite the strategic plan.

SPEAKER: But this is rewriting the governing regulations.

SWANSON: Yes, we are changing the governing regulations such that the two documents are aligned.

SPEAKER: Yeah, but I mean this only talks only about .1.

SWANSON: That's right, we're just focusing on this one issue.

SPEAKER: I see one. I see two.

SWANSON: We're just focusing on this one issue for today. If you'd like to take up another issue, you're welcome to do that, but this is the one we're focusing on today.

SPEAKER: That keeps unchanged - I mean the other two will -

SWANSON: We will retain the vision statement, yes. We are not voting on the - any change in the vision statement today.

SPEAKER: Thanks.

SWANSON: Because of the process. It's just a process issue.

SPEAKER: I was just wondering if we are voting on this or not. Thank you.

SWANSON: Right. That's all we're voting on are these two clauses. We want to put them back into the strategic plan and then the GRs would have them. That's all we're voting on

PRATS: today. Any other questions? Armando Prats. I was thinking of what Bob was saying a little bit earlier. And could we not insert the sense of institutional community in that column to distinguish it from civic engagement, or does everybody know what sense of community means in that context?

SWANSON: I think that the concern is that we thought we could just use the simple fix to just keep what we have rather than to go into a word-smithing and rewriting. I think we're concerned - I understand that - and actually somebody made a really good point and said a sense of community might mean you have a good sense of community but you don't include me. I thought that was a really good point. So we could go through that exercise, but I'm concerned of opening up that can of worms at this time a week before the Board votes. Other questions?

BRI ON: Gail Bri on, Engi neeri ng. So just to clari fy, right now our governing regulations have both personal and institutional responsibility and accountability and a sense of community? So our governing regulations are right?

SWANSON: That's right.

BRI ON: All we're really asking to do is have the strategic plan fixed to reflect what's in the governing regulations?

SWANSON: That is correct. That is correct. Anything else? Okay, and it's been a complicated week. All those in favor of the motion? Opposed? Abstained? All right, thank you. Motion carries. And as I said, we will be rewriting the strategic plan. I think people estimated, Marcy, they're going to start next January.

SPEAKER: I think so.

SWANSON: So hop on board. This is your opportunity. And that's why we really didn't want to get into any more details at this time because we can start all over again. All right, so then the other thing that came up to our attention is the proposed changes and governing regulations IV. And so this issue went through a considerable discussion. We engaged Davy Jones and the Rules Committee and Irina and John again joined us. And what

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
we're looking at if you have in  
your handout - do we have that?

BROTHERS:  
SWANSON:

The two?  
Right. Do we have those two so we  
can see those side by side? It  
just wasn't clear the way it was  
worded. And so what is actually  
done doesn't change but our wording  
has changed to be SACS compliant.  
So let me just bring this to your  
attention so you can see this. So  
currently we have this wording  
right here. The Senate function is  
to approve all new academic  
programs and make final academic  
decisions on recommendations to  
changes of these programs. And  
point three, make final decisions  
for the University on curriculum  
courses, certificates, and diplomas  
offered to the University and the  
termination of these academic  
programs. All right, so what SACS  
says, and I've got Davy here and he  
can correct me if I was wrong, SACS  
says that we did not have the Board  
action in there. Is that what SACS  
said or is it more complicated than  
that?

JONES:

SACS has a new policy that  
basically says the Senate's  
decision to terminate a degree  
program cannot be final now. It  
has to go to the Board of Trustees.  
It's upon the recommendation of the  
Senate that it goes. But for SACS  
compliance we have to re-word this  
now to show that the new degree  
program upon the Senate's  
recommendation and the closure of  
the degree program on the Senate's  
recommendation upon the Senate's  
recommendation reached the Board  
for final action. Other academic  
decisions are made at the level of  
the Senate.

SWANSON:

So the wording is upon the  
recommendation of the University  
Senate. The Board of Trustees  
shall make the final University  
decision on the establishment or  
closure of degree granting academic  
programs. Other decisions on the  
academic status and content of  
academic programs shall be made by  
the University Senate pursuant to  
procedures contained in the Senate  
rules. And then we added this  
asterisk except when they start  
changing the rules so that we  
didn't have to go through this  
whole process every time SACS  
changes their rules. All right, so

we have questions on that? I'll probably defer to Davy. Go ahead.  
SPEAKER: (Unintelligible) Arts and Sciences. So am I understanding correctly SACS imposes on us that we give up the right that we used to have?  
SWANSON: Isn't that nice?  
SPEAKER: That is - I don't think so. So why should we go along with that?  
SWANSON: Because we need to be accredited and the reason we need to be accredited is so we can receive federal funds.  
ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. Yet the understanding though is upon recommendation of the University Senate so the Board of Trustees cannot do it without the recommendation of the University Senate?  
SWANSON: They cannot reach down and say, you know, I just don't like that program, it's nonsense. So it has to come from us. So it preserves the process. Thank you. Other questions?  
FARRELL: Herman Farrell, Fine Arts. Is there any distinction between the term "termination" and "closure"?  
JONES: Closure is the more recent wording of SACS for the process so that's what we've also changed the wording from "termination" to "closure."  
FARRELL: So it means the same thing essentially, closure (unintelligible.)  
JONES: Yeah, it's exactly the same thing. There's no changing governance nuance to that.  
FRIAR: Alan Friar, A&S. So does this mean the Board of Trustees is obligated to accept the recommendation of the University Senate or does the Board have autonomy?  
SWANSON: No, they can vote yearly. That's a good question.  
CONNERS: Terry Conners, College of Agriculture. What if a degree program were to be suspended rather than closed; is that covered or require a separate action?  
JONES: That's the second sentence. Other decisions, okay, so that's neither approval nor a closure. The Senate makes the final decision on that.  
GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S. Just to address (unintelligible) - the kind of the point behind (unintelligible) comment, we are a member of SACS because we live in Kentucky and the Federal Department of Education has said that SACS will be our accrediting body. We have a



FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt

representative to SACS who serves on the Board of SACS but there are also many other institutional representatives on SACS, and they do have power over us. They, by federal law, they can tell us that we need to change policy. One of the biggest exercises of that authority was about ten years ago when LCC was separated from the University of Kentucky. There have been many other examples. If you ever taught a 500 level course, you know about another policy imposed by SACS on us. There's not a whole lot we can do about it. In the past I've advocated that we stick our middle finger in their general direction. But this is not - I do not advocate that we do anything on this particular issue.

SWANSON:

We're trying to get everything more SACS compliance so we're going through a lot of these kinds of issues. Other questions? Okay, so this is our fix. Recommendation from the Senate Rules and Election Committee that the Senate endorse the proposed new wording that I just read to you for governing regulations IV.C.2 and IV.C.3. So I just showed that to you. Do we know what we're voting on? All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you very much. All right, I'd like to just give you a brief update on the Faculty Committee on Review, Rewards, and Retention. We're having our second meeting tomorrow. And then we'll be hosting two forums. I'll send out an e-mail. It's supposed to come out probably tomorrow. On Thursday, March 22nd from 2 to 4:30 at the Medical Center MN263 and Friday, March 23rd, 9 to 11 the Center Theater at the student center. We're still in the process of setting up an online forum and we're also selecting people to be individually or group interviewed. Any questions about that? Comments? Okay. All right, we also have another activity that's been ongoing. You heard about it last in November. This has been undertaken by Marc Coyne and Greg Wasilkowski of our Senate Council. And they would like to tell you of our leading efforts in redesigning the President's evaluation. Marc?

COYNE:

So let me remind you again of the

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
background of this. The idea was to create some sort of a survey instrument that would allow the Faculty Senate and faculty of the University of Kentucky to better inform the Board of Trustees about our opinions of the performance of the President. And so we were charged to put together the initial evaluation form, and we've had input from you as well as from Senate Council and from other faculty trustees. And, Sheila, this is posted to the Faculty Senate?

BROTHERS: No, it is not posted on the agenda.

COYNE: Is it on the website?

BROTHERS: No, but I can put it on the website.

COYNE: So the questions I'm going to show you are where we currently stand now in terms of where we're going with our approach to this evaluation survey form. And basically we have ten questions and a number - several other questions associated with them. The ten questions that we have basically look at vision and planning by the President. They look at the execution of that vision and shared governance with faculty as well as with the University representation to other constituents. The first ten questions really are on the five point grade scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. And the idea is that it will provide a rating system as well as an opportunity to provide specific comments and specific examples where the President has either succeeded in a particular area or failed in any particular area. And then that's followed by three narrative questions that are intended to provide constructive criticism and advice to the President about where the President should go in terms of the future. So once this is posted, these will be the questions that we have currently devised. And what we're looking for is input back from you and from the rest of the faculty as to whether these are appropriate questions to meet the goal of looking at vision, looking at shared governance and administration, and looking at constituencies and interaction with constituencies. I'll let you take a brief look at these. But, again,

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
this is a five point scale. Do you agree that the President has done these things? Do you disagree or do you have no opinion? If you have no opinion, it either indicates that it's a bad question or the President is doing a fairly reasonable job there and there's no reason to change that. The second set of the five questions for that group, again, working our way towards does the President effectively interact with external constituencies? And these are the narrative questions where we're looking for constructive advice for the President in the future and future directions, the significant achievements, least effective performance areas, and what they should focus on or what the President should focus on in the near future. Now to a certain extent, these questions are somewhat vague, but remember that they're intended for someone who has just come into office. It is also intended to be supplementary and advisory to the Board of Trustees in terms of what the faculty think about presidential performance and so the types of questions that are asked can very well change in future evaluations as the President has matured in office and we have a better opportunity to evaluate what that performance has been. So remember that the first survey and evaluation really reflects what do we think about the initial performance of the new President of the University.

SWANSON:

FERRIER:

COYNE:

Comments?  
Walt Ferrier. To what extent are these questions linked with the President's job description either explicit or implied?  
That's a good question. I don't know that I have specifically looked at any of that in terms of the job description. I think it is a more reflection of what we think the job description of the President ought to be and the Board of Trustees will then try to mesh what their evaluation of the President's job description is in terms of what the faculty thinks that job description should be. So we did not use the Board of Trustees - in fact, I'm not sure that I ever knew what the Board of

Trustees' job description ever was given the nature of the job search that we had. So I think this is more reflection of what the faculty are going to think that job should entail rather than what the Board thinks the job should entail.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S. Just two questions. First of all, are these questions yet available for wide discussion?

COYNE: They are yet available for wide discussion, interpretation, and change.

GROSSMAN: Are you going to send them to the Senators or are they posted up on the website?

COYNE: Again, I'm going to rely on Sheila to get that available and circulating for everyone to take a look at.

GROSSMAN: Okay, and then the second question is when is going to be the Board of Trustees' first evaluation of the President and so when will the faculty be able to speak up on this and if that implicates the Board of Trustees this time?

COYNE: I will defer to Hollie for that question.

SWANSON: I'm going to speak with Brit sometime during the next week. It comes up for discussion at the meeting - Board of Trustees' meeting next Tuesday. But as I understand it, are you evaluating the President? I don't think the first year.

GREISSMAN: Richard Greissman. Formative review after the second year.

SWANSON: Right, so it's a formative review this year. So there is still some time in May. And the other question is that - and I welcome your input. The other question is how do we incorporate our view into what the Board sees because the Board has different questions. You know, they'll ask questions like fund-raising. They're going to ask questions well, how did you get out there and represent UK, those kinds of questions. So, you know, they'll be looking at a slightly different picture. Ours is a little bit more focused. How would you think - I'm going to have that conversation with him during the next week. How would you think that should go?

GROSSMAN: Is that a rhetorical question? Do you want answers right now?

SWANSON: I'd like an answer because I have

ANDERSON: to give one.  
Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.  
I think that the Senator made a really good point about looking at the job description. And, yes, it may be we have different views. But there's probably a point in the job description related to these questions, and I think we should really be able to articulate that when we speak with the Board.

PRATS: Armando Prats. Hollie, I seem to remember that there was a survey of a previous president that came out and the Board of Trustees could not see the results before their first meeting. This is something that we've received as school was just starting in maybe the fall of 2010. And so my question I think is when would you be distributing the final form of this survey and does it matter because it seems to me that the Board was pretty much able to ignore it two years ago if I remember correctly.

SWANSON: You remember correctly and that is a point that I brought up with Brit, and he acknowledged that that was a poor practice. And so - and I don't know - yeah, I would imagine so don't quote me on this. I would imagine that they would be wanting to look at a July one. And so for us polling the faculty on July - or June is not a good idea. So what I had envisioned was that perhaps we would be running this survey sometime in April before you get into that end of semester. Does that make sense to everybody? So that would - the only problem that would give us two months short but what's he going to do in two months.

BRI ON: Gail Bri on, College of Engineering. This is kind of a follow along. So what's a bad score and what happens if he gets a bad score?

SWANSON: He doesn't get his bonus.

BRI ON: But I mean right now this isn't tied to anything. It's not tied to an automatic vote of no confidence.

COYNE: The initial survey, Gail, from the perspective of the faculty is a form of evaluation as well to send an indication of how well we believe the President is performing. Later iterations, I don't know that you can give them more teeth, but they can certainly carry more venom associated with them.

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt

SWANSON: But you'll notice, too, in the conversations in some of the newspaper articles that we had on Sunday that President Capilouto asked the Board for a constructive evaluation. And that's what we're trying to develop here is a constructive process.

HIPPISLEY: Andrew Hippisley, Arts and Sciences. I think on the grade scale three is anomalous because it's the only one that is a critique of the questionnaire at present because you said three can mean that's a bad question. If the President gets lots and lots of threes, he's not an ordinary president. It's just a pretty less than ordinary questionnaire. So what I would think would be better is if someone didn't like the question, they just don't answer it because you're going to sum all those in the end, aren't you, to get some kind of average? You're going to weight all those through Senate (unintelligible) something like that. I think three is not a very good -

SWANSON: Lee, you have an answer for that?

BLONDER: Yeah, Lee Blonder, College of Medicine. In our Senate Council discussions I believe we agreed to change it so that three would be neutral and then we'd have a separate answer no basis for judgment. That way we don't (unintelligible) scale with, you know, I don't really know how (unintelligible.)

SWANSON: And I think that's an excellent fix because we've heard when we've done the previous president's evaluations we've heard a lot from people how do I know, yeah. Other comments? All right, we have the Senate Admission and Academic Standards Committee, Professor Raphael Finkel, Chair.

FINKEL: Good afternoon. You have in your copious handout a lot of detail about this particular proposal. Let me try to summarize it for you. The idea is to allow high school students to take university courses and to get university credit. The advantage is this is going to be great for qualified high school students. It will promote partnership with Kentucky secondary schools, something which the University wants to do, and it will actually compete with programs

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
already in place at BCTC, for example, and Morehead. It's also a professional development opportunity for the high school faculty. Now the way it's supposed to work is like this. The high school instructor will actually be teaching the course, not a university professor. It will be a high school instructor teaching the course. And the high school would get in touch with the University saying I would very much like to teach your course biology 379. I'm making up a number. And then the associated University department, in this case it would be Biology, would say does that make any sense to us, who are you anyhow and would have to vet the pairing that is whether we would be willing to pair our course with that instructor teaching it. It would have to be, in fact, the proposal would have to be vetted by the Department. I'm picking on Biology because I'm looking right at Liz Debski. The college dean - in this case it would be Arts and Sciences and the Undergraduate Council. At some point then the Chair of the Department would reply saying forget it or would say yeah, that sounds okay, let's consider it, and at that point would notify the Provost also. And then if everyone was happy with it, then those high school students could apply for a special kind of admissions to the University. They wouldn't have to pay application fees but they would have to pay tuition. So we would get some money. This is a strange deal because usually high school students don't pay university tuition. But if they want the dual credit, that is credit for high school and for the University, we would expect them to pay tuition. They would have aid counselors who could try to scare up some money for them and then the registrar would enroll the students. And then the course would happen. At least the first time it would happen. Students would get midterm grades because they're undergraduates and they must get midterm grades. They would get final grades. And then the course would have to be evaluated using the standard fashion by which we evaluate courses and instructors

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
using our usual surveys. If this particular course is a prerequisite to some other course, let imagine the students - well, if the high school student never comes to the University of Kentucky, okay, they paid some tuition and got some university credits, but that's the end of it. If they come to the University of Kentucky, then they can say I already have these credits. I, therefore, should - I've got a step ahead in my undergraduate program and now I want to take the subsequent course for which this is prerequisite. Okay, it will count as a prerequisite but the department can add at that point extra hurdles saying yeah, you took it, but you got a C; we're not going to accept a high school C as if it were a university C. So you need a department to set its own hurdles for what a prerequisite really should be for one of these courses taught only in the high school, not only but taught in the high school. So that's the general idea. If you have any specific questions, I'm sure I can't answer them, but I guess it's time to at least invite them.

BLACKWELL: Jeannine Blackwell, Graduate School. I'm sure the answer is going to be yes, but each of these high school instructors has to have the credentials, the SACS approved credentials for teaching at that level?

FINKEL: It's a good question. The answer has got to be yes although I don't know if the document that we have in front of us says so, does it? It does, okay. Then the answer is yes. It makes sense. We don't want someone who has no Bachelor's degree in Biology teaching Biology 379 in high school, right.

MULLEN: Essentially the requirements are this is no different than if we hire a part-time instructor to teach Chemistry 105 at the University or hired an engineer to teach a 100 level Engineering class at an off-site campus. We still have to meet SACS requirements. That person has to have a minimum of eighteen credit hours in the discipline at the Master's level or beyond. We're essentially talking about a TPI program that can be taught in high school but students



FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
could come here. We could offer credit courses at this campus and the student could come here. That course would also give credit for their progression through the high school as well. So this is very much tied to meeting the same academic standards that we expect of faculty teaching on our own campus.

FRIAR: Alan Friar, Arts and Sciences. I'm actually on this committee but I'm new to it so I feel like I'm late in the discussion. I think in print it's a great idea and I forwarded it to faculty in our department. In practice I wonder in part because I've gone through this experience as a parent of a freshman what the likely clientele is going to be because of the proliferation of AP credits and the fact the students can take AP courses for a lot less than they can take a course paying UK tuition.

FINKEL: Good question. How many students are we talking about, how many courses are we talking about? Do we have any answers to that?

MULLEN: It's going to be relatively low. We've had only upwards of close to four hundred students in the last decade or so. We already have high school students taking courses. It's (unintelligible) as opposed to dual credit. And by the way, I'm Mike Mullen. I forgot to give my name. So we wouldn't expect this to be high demand. Although it's interesting that Eastern and other regionals as well as other benchmarks, Michigan State, Purdue, and others are doing these things. They're certainly scaring up students who are interested in taking college level courses while they're still in high school. I think we would be well served how we fashion programs with select school in our nine - in the immediate service area to look at advanced students. Not at students who might not even be admitted here. But how do we help a student who's in the eleventh grade and running out of options at their own high school to think about I can maybe pick up ten, twelve, fourteen credit hours and walk in here being a semester - I don't know - and two semester and three semesters. That would be my thinking.

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt

FRIAR:

Part of the reason (unintelligible) our faculty is there is not an AP program in Biology. On the other hand, there is not a state mandate to teach earth science at the high school level either so -

MULLEN:

It's interesting. CPE, when we started this two years ago, this has been a two year discussion. It was started by faculty members in the Classics has one of his own graduates working at his school. They want to teach one of their class course there as a dual credit. We didn't have a mechanism in place as other universities did. CPE has drafted a policy that governs the entire work statewide. And, again, it has the same provisions that we already were talking about, SACS accreditation. The faculty earning complete control. Assessment of what's happening in the classroom. The ability and control to stop the relationship if you as a faculty says we took a chance here and they can't make their way out of the second course when they get here. So it's really up to the faculty to decide is this a quality course, is this not a quality course. We're just here to help you set up the MOA, I guess.

FINKEL:

Yes?

DUNCAN:

Marilyn Duncan, College of Medicine. If the course is being taught by a teacher in a high school, how is the high school being compensated? Does the student pay a fee to the high school or does the University pay a fee to the high school? Of course, having a faculty that is outside of the University?

MULLEN:

Those would be negotiated with the departments. It could very well be the high school teachers - if it were a high school teacher (unintelligible) would teach it as part of their load (unintelligible) an alternative to something else they've done. We - if you had somebody in mind who you wanted to have involved in the dual credit program, you could hire somebody and pay them the 2800 or 2400 or whatever you pay a PPI. It would be the same thing. So it's really going to be a departmental (unintelligible) and it will be the Department negotiating with the high school departments is how that

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
works on those kinds of things.  
We've also seen many places that  
have done a variety of grant funded  
kinds of activities where grant  
funding it brought in. For  
instance, you might imagine a grant  
that would provide millions of  
dollars to get kids from  
Appalachian Eastern Kentucky  
involved in these kind of programs  
early, and the grant money would be  
used to pay those expenses as well  
as tuition back to the University.  
So there is a myriad of ways of  
seeing these things come to  
fruition depending on how you  
negotiate them.

FINKEL:  
CONNERS:

Yes?  
Terry Conners, College of  
Agriculture. I believe I heard you  
say that a high school C may not  
satisfy the requirement for  
prerequisite. That's a little  
troubling because now we're saying  
to the student we're basically  
undercutting your whole reason for  
trying to take a class at the  
college level while you're a high  
school student. Wouldn't it be  
better to have some sort of  
standardized evaluation process  
that the professor normally in  
charge of the class in that  
department impose a final exam the  
student would have to pass so that  
that question never comes up?

FINKEL:

Right. It makes sense. However,  
again, this is a matter for the  
negotiation. Part of the vetting  
process at the local department,  
the Biology Department here would  
be to decide what should be the  
evaluation of students who take the  
course. Should we, for example,  
ask them to take the same final as  
the students here take? There's a  
timing question because our finals  
will typically be weeks before the  
high school final. But we could do  
that and the local department here  
could certainly decide we will  
accept a C as a prerequisite just  
as we would for a locally taught  
course. But we want to leave the  
position open. How do the document  
that describes this particular pair  
and the student would know ahead of  
time what it would take to get  
University prerequisite credit and  
it might say black and white if you  
get a C, that will not count as a  
prerequisite. You'll get the  
credit but it won't be

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
prerequisite. You have to get at least a B if you want to take the next course or it might say a C is enough. The document for this specific course for this particular high school should say explicitly what that rule should be.

CONNERS:

SPEAKER:

Thank you. I agree.  
Is this always a one time approval or if the teacher gets approval once and says well, next year I want to teach this course, again, would she or he have to go again through this approval process?

FINKEL:

As I understand the document, it would be approved once until something should change. That is if it's a different instructor at the high school or if the course changes here and course changes do happen or the evaluation of the course just didn't look very good. The students didn't do well. Or they said this is a terrible instructor or for some reason the local department says this didn't work. Then the local department should be able to just cancel the agreement.

OSBORNE:

Jeff Osborne, Arts and Sciences.  
What's the motivation underlying this move?

FINKEL:

I had mentioned several motivations. One is because the Joneses are doing it and we have to keep up with them.

OSBORNE:

FINKEL:

Bad reason, one.  
Bad reason, right. If there is a qualified high school student who cannot take an interesting course because it's just not offered at the high school, this is an opportunity for the high school actually to offer such a course. It's an incentive for the high school to offer courses that might not otherwise teach or for a part-time instructor here to teach it in the high school and to get some students. It promotes a partnership. So it's a kind of University outreach to the local community, and that's in my mind a good thing. It's a professional development opportunity for the high school teachers as well. So those are the motivations at least the ones that were explicit in the document. And the down side it doesn't hurt us at all. I see only advantages as long as we get the logistics right. It doesn't hurt the students. It doesn't hurt the

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
high schools. It doesn't hurt the department here. And it doesn't hurt the University in any way. So even if the reason for it is weak, the reasons against it, I don't see yet.

BLACKWELL: I think this is a marvelous idea because students that have used up all of their opportunities in foreign languages, in mathematics, and in a whole range of other fields and have an empty or very close to empty senior year curriculum, this gives an excellent opportunity for them to have a higher level experiences and to connect them to the University of Kentucky.

SWANSON: All right, we're going to get ready for a vote. The recommendation from the committee is that the Senate approve the proposal to allow dual credit and the changes to Senate rules 3.2.0 and Senate rules 4.2.1.3.4.

FINKEL: Which you have in front of you. It's additional wording to those two Senate regulations - Senate rules, yeah.

SWANSON: Would anybody else like to speak in favor or disapproval of the proposal? All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you. Our next committee report is from the Senate's Academic Programs, Professor Andrew Hippisley, Chair. Andrew?

HIPPISLEY: Okay, so we have a recommendation that the University Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees the establishment of a new undergraduate certificate in Global Studies within the Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. This is a certificate that comprises twelve hours of internationally oriented courses plus a study abroad to amplify the group of (unintelligible) of any student's major and thereby helping in the training to live and work in the global community. So it answers the demand of U.S. society for a better understanding of what it means to be a global citizen with a global perspective. Course certificate is a study abroad course which is sandwiched between domestic courses that function to prepare for and then reflect on and reinforce the trip abroad experience. And this has been

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
carefully designed according to best practice. As well as these twelve hours of internationally oriented courses, this is where we thought it was very interesting as a committee, students also pursue a credit bearing education abroad course and what is termed a co-curricular component which is an internationally focused lecture or film or something event sponsored by UK or some other institution which whose criteria has been carefully checked to count as one of these components, and this assessment is SA based. The assessment of the certificate program will be carried out on a regular basis and we'll look at both problematic success as well as student success. So they have to propose metrics that will include retention, quality of essays, GPA scores, and comparisons with those from students who didn't take the certificate. While our committee thought this was a wonderful proposal, we unanimously recommended we're convinced that its design and evaluation plan and administration will insure its success, and it's one of the strongest proposals we've seen.

SWANSON: Questions? All right, so we have a recommendation on the floor that the Senate approve the proposed new undergraduate certificate in Global Studies effective for fall 2012. Would anybody at this time like to speak for or against this proposal?  
Okay, all -

PRATS: Can I ask a question?

SWANSON: Yes, you may.

PRATS: Is there any funding for these things?

CARVALHO: Susan Carvalho, Associate Provost for the international program.

PRATS: Oh, Susan.

CARVALHO: Students voted to implement an education abroad fee some years ago. That's now \$6 per student per semester and all of that goes into scholarship back to students. That is available only to students who go on credit bearing education abroad experience. And this also has to be credit bearing education.

SWANSON: Any other questions?

SPEAKER: (Unintelligible.)

CARVALHO: Do you mean funding for the administration for the students to go abroad?

SPEAKER: Yes.

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt

SWANSON:

Other questions?

CONNERS:

Terry Conners, Agriculture. Under section four, resources, is that included in what we're going to be voting on?

SWANSON:

That's an administrative issue. We're approving the program - the academics of it. Other questions? Okay, let's go ahead and vote. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

HIPPISLEY:

So this is a recommendation the University Senate approve submission to the Board of Trustees the establishment of a new undergraduate minor in Information Studies within the School of Library Information Sciences in the College of Communication and Information Studies. The University of Kentucky stands out by not having a major information studies. The proposed minor is a first step on the way to offering a major in the same field. Why does UK need information studies? Well, it's a training response to the explosion of digital information, the technology to produce information is out of step with the capability of interpreting it or exploiting it and to put it bluntly, that's where the jobs are. So in a sense there are two kinds of information based careers is what we learned. One is designing and implementing the technologies that can be (unintelligible) data. The second making use of the results of these information technologies. Training in the first is known as infomatics and UK is well equipped with infomatics already primarily served by computer science. What's lacking at UK is specific training for the second kind, the job in things like web publishing, information organization and analysis and information sharing across various domains within different kinds of companies and institutions. So our committee assigned a high priority to propose an office degree in information studies. We thought the design implementation of the program was very convincing at various levels. Eighteen credits are made up of veteran courses that are already in existence or are emerging. The implementation of the degree program is to

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
strategically phase to start with a minor and then they're going to end with a major in the future. All courses are offered online to extend reach of the training opportunity. The resourcing is completely convincing to us. There's a clear table of dollar inputs and outputs and support from the Provost through tip funds is forthcoming.

SWANSON: Questions? Okay, do we have a motion on the floor that the Senate approve the proposed new minor in Information Studies effective fall of 2012? Would anybody like to speak for or against the motion? Okay, all those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

HI PPI SLEY: This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees the establishment of a new BS education degree program in STEM Education with a content of math and physics in the Department of (unintelligible) Education in the College of Education. Actually this proposal partially answers the charge of the newly found department (unintelligible) which we all voted on back in February to create degree programs and house teach STEM subjects. This first proposal is the first in a series of STEM education plus some kind of content so it's math and physics but it could be biology, for example. It's divided up into thirty-one hours of UKCore courses and twenty-seven hours of STEM education courses vetted out into the content. So if the content was math, you would have a course in matrix, algebra, and the applications, for example. If the content was physics, then you'd have to have a course on optics, relativity, and physics. To get to the full one hundred twenty hours students complete additional content support courses, for example, introduction to computer programming and other things like this. Once these courses are completed, students are eligible to apply for certification and this is nontrivial because if you're eligible to apply for certification, there is a 99.9 percent chance you'll get it. So the result of the program is



FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
certification eligibility and a BS  
in STEM Education in some content  
like math and physics. While we  
thought this program's  
justification was actually entailed  
by the Board of Trustees' decision  
to create the STEM education  
department in the first place in  
response to Kentucky educational  
needs, so what we are also  
recommending is it's merit based on  
design features which we believe  
will allow the new department to  
carry out one of its core missions.  
Are there questions?

SWANSON:

JONES:

SWANSON:

JONES:

Just a point.  
Davy Jones.  
The recommendation was as he read  
it also contains the information as  
to the departmental placement and a  
college placement of the degree.  
That's not actually written up  
there but I've heard him say it; is  
that correct?

HIPPISLEY:

SWANSON:

I said it. It's written, yeah.  
Any other questions? Comments?  
All right, so the motion on the  
floor is that the Senate approve  
the proposed new Bachelor of  
Science in Education in STEM  
education, mathematics, and physics  
content areas effective fall 2012.  
Would anyone want to speak in favor  
or disapproval of the motion? All  
those in favor? Thank you.  
Opposed? Abstained? Motion  
carries. Thank you.

HIPPISLEY:

So this is a recommendation that  
the University Senate approve the  
submission to the Board of Trustees  
the establishment of a new PhD  
program Gender and Women's Studies  
in the Department of Gender and  
Women's Studies in the College of  
Arts and Sciences. This is very  
brief. There will be thirty-six  
hours of course work, eighteen of  
which are required. Two feminist  
courses, two methods courses, one  
of which is directly related to the  
female but outside of GWS. So it  
could be statistics and two pro  
seminars. The goal of the program  
is five main goals, critical  
understanding of the history of  
feminist thought, theory, and  
social action, expertise in  
feminist methods, understanding of  
gender as it intersects with other  
social categories, and feminism and  
gender lives in transnational  
contacts. And the fifth one is  
just a generic doing original

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
research goal. The motivation for this, well, the demand has been identified as being considerable. Nearly half of the benchmark institutions already have a PhD in GWS. So it's a means of expanding an already very successful graduate certificate in Gender and Women's Studies and that's graduated a hundred twenty-two people since 1993. Now, additionally there appears to be a good market for graduation of such program. For example, academics, consultation of various kinds. So the SAPC recommends this degree.

SWANSON:

Questions?

JONES:

Same comment as before. The motion he read included the departmental and college placement which has been abbreviated out of this but that's part of the motion.

SWANSON:

Other questions? All right, so the motion on the floor is that the Senate approve the proposed new PhD in Gender and Women's Studies effective fall 2012. Is there anyone who would like to speak in favor or disapproval of the motion? All right.

CHRIST:

It's not - I guess I just have a question. The handout mentioned that there were reservations about this program that would be elaborated on.

HIPPISLEY:

Yes, I can elaborate on the reservations. The general practice of our committee is to invite the proposal. The committee asks questions and then send any reservations which are then - result in a revision. And what you're voting on is the revision after the recommendations were accepted. We - one of our main reservations was the title of the degree program. It's called Gender and Women's Studies. And to the uninitiated it looked like it was all feminism. That's uninitiated. In fact, we learned that feminism entails gender. If Patty Cooper is here, that's right, isn't it? Feminism entails gender?

COOPER:

Let's put it the other way around. Gender studies will include feminism.

HIPPISLEY:

Right.

SWANSON:

We have two genders.

COOPER:

I see what you're talking about. Feminism is not about women necessarily.

HIPPISLEY:

Right.

COOPER: It is about relationships and understandings and construction. So feminism, yes, does come up as part of gender studies but gender studies can also -

SPEAKER: You can say it, men.

COOPER: Men and women are both included in the word "gender." Gender has to do with how cultures understand biological, social, cultural meanings of male, female, or whatever third categories may exist biologically.

HIPPISLEY: And exactly what Patty says is now in the revised proposal. It's helpful to have you -

SWANSON: Are there other questions? All right, let's go ahead and vote. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

HIPPISLEY: This is actually entailed by the PhD. So part of the PhD granted MA once you got twenty-four credits and you passed your qualification examinations. At that point students may wish to end their course of studies in which case they'll be granted an MA. This is also the point where the committee, the GWS will decide whether the student is able to carry on with the PhD. And one of the outcomes can be yes. One of the outcomes can be go away. And the other can be yes, you can have the MA but don't go further to do the PHD. The AMA has twenty-four credits including those eighteen required that I just mentioned. Half of which must be 600 and 700 level. Plan A is a thesis in addition. Plan B is six more credits instead of a thesis but also exams, oral exams, and written exams. I think I've covered it.

SWANSON: Questions? All right, we have a motion on the floor that the Senate approve the proposed new Master of Arts in Gender and Women's Studies effective fall of 2012. Would anyone like to speak in favor or against the motion?

FRIAR: Alan Friar, A&S. I did have a question. Plan A versus Plan B, is the thesis option the preferred option for the people continuing with the PhD?

HIPPISLEY: No.

COOPER: No, because for people continuing to the PhD, it's all on its own. So, no.

SWANSON: Other questions, comments?

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt

FINKEL: Raphael Finkel, Engineering. The way I understand it, it's really intended to be a PhD program, not a Master's program.

COOPER: That's correct.

FINKEL: The only way a person should get a Master's degree should be by having passed the qualifier and on the basis of the qualifier asking for an en passant Master's. The qualifier requires thirty-six credits of pre-qualifying residency. Therefore, the question of twenty-four versus thirty credits seems to be irrelevant and the question of option A versus option B seems to me to be irrelevant. Am I wrong?

SWANSON: Jeannie?

BLACKWELL: Jeannie Blackwell, Dean of the Graduate School. There are in virtually every one of your PhD programs where you have this kind of doctoral structure, there are instances where there's a student who for many different reasons because of moving, relocations, because of family issues have to end their degree programs earlier than they had planned to at the beginning of their careers. And for those students having this option available is really, really helpful. It's probably not going to be the major plan. It's certainly not going to be the intent at the beginning of the admission into the doctoral program, but those of you all who have doctoral programs and have gotten stuck in this windmill know that it is - it's very helpful to have this option available for the faculty to use if needed.

SWANSON: All right, let's go ahead and vote.

FINKEL: It doesn't answer my question. Should we just leave it unanswered?

BRION: Gail Brion, Engineering. As I understand, there will be three different ways to get this Master's of Arts. You can either get it on the way to your PhD en passant that's after thirty-six hours and the exam or you could stop at twenty-four hours and write a thesis and get the Master's or you could take thirty hours and get the Master's. Is this correct?

COOPER: That's my understanding, yes.

BRION: So en passant is only one way in getting this Master's?

COOPER: It's only one way. It's only for people who are definitely staying

and going on.

FINKEL: In that case usually when there's a regular Master's program, it has particular requirements. You must take this course and this course or within the field there's certain requirements. But what if a student has taken twenty-four credits all concentrating on one aspect of the subject and says I really don't want to continue. Will those twenty-four credits which are very narrow be good enough then with a project or a thesis?

COOPER: They have to take the eighteen hours that are required. They must take those. So -

FINKEL: That's a breadth requirement of some sort then?

COOPER: Yes, yes.

SWANSON: Are you satisfied?

FINKEL: Yeah, as long as the document says that, I don't have any problem, yes.

FRIAR: Alan Friar, A&S. Does that mean then that we're approving not just en passant MA but any MA?

SWANSON: Should we remove that en passant?

FRIAR: Based on what I've heard, that's what I would recommend.

COOPER: Is Brian Jackson here? No, he's not. That was his recommendation about exactly how he worded it to make sure that we are covering all of the bases. This is not a stand alone MA to which people can apply.

SWANSON: I see.

COOPER: However, if the circumstances arises, as Dean Blackwell explained, that someone cannot continue, then there is an option for someone so that they've not lost completely the time that they (unintelligible.)

SWANSON: All right, does that - all right, we're going to go ahead and vote then. All -

GROSSMAN: I'd like to propose an amendment and remove the word "en passant" because I do think that it's misleading from what the proposal is describing.

COOPER: I would be hesitant to do that given that this was the direction from Brian Jackson. But if it doesn't create a huge problem -

WATKINS: John Watkins, Public Health. I think by removing the en passant and assuming I said that correctly, then you're almost implying you're doing more than implying when you're advertising this as being a

freestanding Master's which is not the purpose. So I do disagree that the en passant needs to stay in. I think it needs to stay in.

COOPER:  
GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, Arts and Sciences again. Again, I don't agree because you can just refuse to admit people into that degree program and people say I want to apply to your Master's of Arts program, sorry, we don't admit people into the Master's of Arts program. It's as simple as that. We have that in Chemistry. We don't admit people to the Master's program.

BLACKWELL:

The Graduate School can make the arrangements so that there is no initial admission into a Master's level for this degree. So you can leave it there or you can take it out and the Graduate School will know what to do with it.

COOPER:  
SWANSON:

Thank you.  
All right, there's a motion on the floor for amendment. I believe we need a second.

FRIAR:  
SWANSON:

Second.  
So now we need to make a - we need to vote on the amendment. The amendment is to remove en passant. All right, all those in favor of removing en passant? Opposed? Abstained? All right, motion denied. We'll go back to the original motion that the Senate approve the proposed new en passant Master's of Science in Gender and Women's Studies effective fall 2012. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you. We have the state of undergraduate education with Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, Mike Mullen.

MULLEN:  
SWANSON:

How would you like to handle this? We'd like to hear you talk because otherwise we won't (unintelligible.)

MULLEN:

I have to make this short because one of the points we want to make today is about an upcoming - so I'll say it now, an upcoming event that's going to be coming to the University of Kentucky in April of 2014. There's a - it's called the National Conference on Undergraduate Research. Some of you may be aware of that. It was here about early 2001. And it's changed a little bit since then. We are expecting anywhere from

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
three thousand to four thousand students from all disciplines from all over the country to descend upon Lexington at that particular time. And it gives us a unique opportunity. One of those unique opportunities is we should as an academic and research community want these 3500 students on the campus for those couple of days. It so happens there's classes going on during that time and where do you have a conference if all of the classroom building is filled with students and faculty and the student center is filled with what we do on a daily basis. So we wanted to at least throw out here today the idea that we do as Weber State is doing this year and as Salisbury State and as others have done and to reevaluate what two days in April could look like at this University in terms of a celebration of research and scholarship for students from the Arts and Humanities all the way through physics and zoology. And do that in a way that has faculty involved with these students from all over the United States in terms of moderators and guides and maybe holding forth for special sessions and having our students from this campus, number one, involved and we've been sending twenty to thirty students a year to this conference for the last several years. This would be an opportunity for a lot more of our students to present here but also for those students to show off their stuff with those 3500 in terms of them being guides and them being involved in moderating some sessions and what was going on. So it's a really great opportunity. I'm not asking for a motion today on this. I'm planting the seed. We have two years and two weeks. We've already said yes. We're going to a meeting in one week to present what we're doing, and so I'd like for this body to think about that. I'd like for us in the next few short months to think about what the proposal would look like and Diane and I will work on that with select members of this group as well as other folks around campus so that we can envision what it looks like to have a celebration of undergraduate scholarly activities

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
at the University of Kentucky in  
2014. That's the piece we wanted  
to make sure I said before I get to  
any of this other stuff. Does that  
work, Diane?

SNOW:

MULLEN:

That works.  
That works, okay. Now I'll try to  
go relatively quickly because I'm  
all that stands between you and the  
parking lot that is Nicholasville  
Road. What I wanted to do today  
and I won't spend as much time on  
this as I had originally done.  
Hollie and I originally talked and  
I think it actually says in the  
program state of academic affairs.  
And we decided that that's really  
Swammy's talk; that's what he comes  
for. We're not going to do broad  
brush strokes that Swammy would do.  
The part that Hollie and I talked  
about that is that many folks don't  
know what the Division for  
Undergraduate Education is or what  
we do. And so I wanted to talk  
about that for a minute. I'll talk  
about retention for just a minute.  
I wanted to update on Council  
activities as well as IGEOC  
activities and then mention the  
Honor's program. And I'm not going  
to spend much time. There was a  
talk by Bill Swinford at the  
beginning that talked about  
structure. This is one heck of a  
structure. And this is the way we  
look right now. We're in the  
middle of going through a review  
with external folks from other  
universities to take a look at what  
we do. I always look at us as  
having student academic support.  
The study or academic enhancement  
is in there. First generation  
initiative, Robinson Scholars where  
that one million dollars in state  
scholarship money throws in.  
Undergraduate Studies, 2500  
undergraduates who have not  
declared a major at any given time.  
We've got student academic  
enrichment piece, (unintelligible)  
Center, Honors, external  
scholarships, undergraduate  
research, Diane's operation, and  
then program administration's gen  
ed implementation Undergraduate  
Council. General Ed Oversight  
Committee program assessment and  
planning primarily internal but  
also for general education. And  
then I have a program development  
person. And we also are



FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
responsible to the unit for all of the university wide curriculum, UK 101s, 201s, 300s, 110s, the apps of the developmental course work for math, English, and reading for students who might come with - who might need some help. I can't really see all that without my glasses. Common reading experiences, DSP, and then the experience in learning activities. So all of that falls under the umbrella of either the Associate Provost or the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. Affiliated programs dotted line from self. I confer with Kathy Kern a lot as actually housed in the Office for Academic Administration. The advising network is a group of folks campus-wide both professional and undergraduate or faculty that talk about and think about how to improve advising and then advising counseling in the athletic center also has a dotted line back to me but actually is housed in athletics. So that's a very broad brush overview, and I'd be happy to talk to you at our leisure at another time about more about what we do because I could talk for a couple hours and you don't want me to do that. In 2006 we admitted one of the largest and one of the most academically unprepared cohorts to the University of Kentucky in quite some time. And that following year if you look at the way this chart works out, the following year that cohort came back at a rate of seventy-six percent. So we lost nearly twenty-four percent of our students after that 2006 cohort. And that's when Swammy declared the war on attrition. We started doing a number of things campus wide to enhance our retention rates. One of which was to improve the quality of the cohort and that's been happening steadily over the last few years. Our retention at this point is now between eighty-one and a half and eighty-two percent. And so we've kind of plateaued. We've got more work to do to move that forward. We'd like to see that be closer to our benchmarks, closer to eighty-eight, ninety percent is where we'd like to get with the first year retention. The second line is one that's of concern to

us. And this is one where, faculty, we need your help. We saw our first of third year retention for that 2006 cohort. We lost another eight percent. But if you look at what's happened for the last decade, we lose eight to ten percent a year every year between the second and third years. That's not acceptable. Our benchmarks are losing four and five percent after the second year. We shouldn't be losing twice what our benchmarks lose. And that speaks to what are we doing in terms of engaging within our own degree programs because really by the second year they should be interacting with you, not with my academic support staff or with student affairs. They should be interacting with you. So what have we done? We've beefed up advising. I think that's worked really well in several units. UK 101 is our academic orientation course. We've expanded that from some forty sections not too long ago to over a hundred and that has had a proven impact on student retention, particularly for students who are a little less prepared than others. Academic enhancement is the you may know it as the study. Not too many years ago, 2003, we had about 485 tutoring sessions there in the entire academic year, the year after it was formed. This year we're on course for about 21 to 22,000 tutoring sessions at the study. And so we've been ramping that up. One of the problems we have there is we don't have a satellite on the north side of campus. So the folks that live on the north campus or who are commuters or live in apartments on the north side, it's a twenty-five minute walk from here to the Commons. And so we don't serve well from a logistical perspective. Student academic alerts. I would love for you if you took nothing else from this to go back and talk to all of your faculty. We put out a call every semester, please look at what your students are doing. This is particularly important for the first and second year students. If they're not showing up for class in the first week, they've missed twice in the first four times, get your TA or yourself to submit an

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
academic alert on that student.  
And, of course, that means if you're in a large class you've got to be doing something to collect attendance data. National data shows that if we do an alert which results in an intervention, we can have substantial impacts on the success of the student because basically it tells the student hey, we're watching you. You know, they come here and they've got this freedom thing going on, nobody is going to tell me what to do. But what happens, when you submit an alert, the student gets one that says your professor just said, you know, you've been skipping classes and your first homework was horrible. The advisor gets that. And then there's a loop that goes back to the advisor talking to the student. Eventually it will be a loop that comes back to the faculty member as well. And the thing that we're going to start doing is residence hall directors also get involved. At Mississippi State they dramatically changed their success because the residence hall director would just talk to the kid in the residence halls and say hey, we understand you're not going to class or things aren't going well; do you need help with resources; let us know where we can send you, that type of thing. And so if you would do that, that would be great. Midterm grades are fabulous in terms of fine tuning of the schedule, but they don't do much in terms of saving a kid. By the time a kid has that E or D at midterm, it's probably too late to help them because they've already missed lots and lots of classes. We've put a financial ombud in. We find that a lot of kids leave school because they have a hundred fifty dollars worth of fines and they can't - so I've got a hold so I don't go back. We found a way to bring a lot of these kids in and work out payment plans for as little as what it takes to pay off those fines to restructuring their tuition payments in a way that allows them to carry forward. That's been really useful. And then I said improving the quality of the cohort. When I came here, the seventy-fifth percentile ACT was about twenty-one. That's up to

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
about a twenty-three now. I'd like to see that go to a twenty-four. We'd be much more like our benchmarks from that perspective. So I think we'll see a difference there. And I really think having the widespread availability of on-campus housing is going to make a huge difference for us. And it's not on here, but right now we can only get ninety-two percent of our freshman into housing. And students who live off campus their first year are retained at about ten percent, ten to twelve percent lower rate. Well, yeah, think about it. They're not interacting with anybody at that point. We also have a problem we can't keep many sophomores and juniors in the residence halls. We just don't have the capacity. So what we're talking about doing should make a huge difference in terms of the academic communities in our residence halls. So I'd like for you all to think about what you can do. I've asked the deans and the associate deans these same questions. How do you interact with your students on the first day or two of class? Encourage engagement with you and your instructors with your students but talk about expectations. Sometimes faculty talk to me when I say this stuff, oh, you want me to lower my standards. No, I don't. I want you to increase your standards. I want you to make sure that they're clear. And I want you to enforce them and help students make their way to those standards. We have a large chunk of our students who leave here with a 3.0 or better who say they're not being challenged. Twenty-five percent of them basically say classes are too big, teaching isn't good enough, quality is low. My peers are not as serious about their education as I am. That's an indication of what's going on in our classroom. So if we're not pushing them and expecting a lot of them and giving them the tools to be successful, that's our fault as faculty. So talk about your expectations. Attendance is one of the biggest things you can do. Whether you take it or not, if you don't officially take it but you can have somebody at least put those alerts

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
in, make a big difference. And I'm hoping we'll get to a point where we might even be able in large classes to do card swipes or clickers at some point that would flow right into the system and you wouldn't even have to touch it. We're getting close on that. And then just examine your curriculum. I talk about curriculum in my own college and there are some places where we don't have an introductory course in the major until the 300 level. And it's hard to bring a kid in as a freshman if we're not engaging them in that first year in a meaningful way in the degree program. So think about your curriculum. What are the touch points. Think about how you might interact with those incoming students in the fall. Think about how you would interact with sophomores, your returning students, during K week this week. Don't let them go to the K week parties. Have a college party where they come in or a departmental party and you bring your second year students to talk with you as faculty and talk about expectations and opportunities in your degree programs. Get them involved in your major. So that's - I can usually talk an hour on retention. We don't have the time for that. Undergraduate Council activities, this has been a relatively modest year after last year's onslaught of general education courses. I can just give you the breakouts there. You can see the number of courses that have been submitted. This year the approvals don't match the submitted or in review because the beginning of the fall we were working on things from last year. So there is a carry-over effect here. But you can see the magnitude of what we're dealing with this year in Undergraduate Council. We have had some interesting discussions about new programs this year. We need to have better cross campus communications I think about degree programs. And before we get to the Undergraduate Council level, we've worked really hard this year to make sure that we're bringing all parties in to have discussions about those programs before they move forward. I just throw up the

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
members of the committee for you really quickly if you're interested. That's who represents you on the Undergraduate Council now. We are wanting to have a vote on the Humanities person, I think, coming up this coming month. There is a notice that went out on that. And then IGEOC. Last year we did a hundred fifty some proposals for UKCore. We caught our breath this year. Thirty-five total so far come through the shoot and so it's time for IGEOC to be really thinking more about policy. I will ask the one area that we'd like to see more activity from more than just Fine Arts is Arts and Creativity. There has been discussion actually about is the word "Arts" appropriately in that category because the whole point of it was creativity. It's wonderful that we've got more students than ever doing things in Fine Arts. I think it's fabulous. But Fine Arts can't do it alone. And so think about yourselves. I know I could teach a course in soil sciences with maybe a year's prep that would be different than anything I've ever done that I could introduce a creativity component to. So there's opportunities. Engineering has risen to the call. A couple courses in Ag and a few other places. So think about how you might do a creativity course that fits into UKCore. The other one where we have a low number of classes from a diversity perspective is actually Social Sciences. A lot of Social Sciences classes seem to be going down to U.S. Citizenship and Global Dynamics. So think a little bit about the way you might fit into those. And that's your IGEOC. Okay, we had several new members come on this year. Honors. I'll try to do this quickly. This is the new Honors website. There's been talk about Honors for nearly two years. Members, there are a few folks in this audience who have had their hands on the Honors program in more than one way over the last two years. But there has been a change. There's basically when UKCore came along, there was an original proposal that came out that essentially turned Honors into a twenty-one credit hour general

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
education program which didn't  
garner a lot of - there was not a  
lot of support for that. The other  
problem we've had with the track  
system that was in place since 2003  
is that most of the tracks died by  
virtue of the fact that they were  
personality driven. The one person  
who got it going walked away from  
it and it didn't persist. And so  
the changes that we've put in place  
by virtue of - if you remember in  
December you all voted on a faculty  
Honors, Honors faculty of record.  
They were the last group that  
worked with us. It is a program  
that requires a minimum of fifteen  
hours in Honors courses, two in the  
freshman year, at least one in the  
next two years as well as a  
capstone and experiences. Now  
those are actually courses, too.  
So it's not part of that fifteen  
hours. But undergraduate research,  
education abroad, community  
service, other activities that also  
might qualify by virtue of what the  
Honors faculty decide makes sense.  
So that's kind of the framework for  
it. It has extreme flexibility.  
We can now talk about having HON  
seminars as we've always had and  
those will continue in a variety of  
areas. But some of you in this  
room may already be contemplating  
how would I teach a section of one  
of my existing courses as an Honors  
course and have it count not only  
in the Honors program. Student  
says this is great. It gives us an  
opportunity to do a minor, an  
Honors minor in an area that I  
might not have thought about  
otherwise. I'd like to think this  
kind of a structure based on what  
we receive in benchmark will give  
you the opportunity if you desire a  
group of five or six faculty said  
I'd really still like to do world  
food issues or some other kind of a  
program, you could build those  
courses and have that as something  
that is out there for your students  
to participate in. We want faculty  
from all disciplines, all colleges.  
Medicine has been asking when can  
we get involved for quite some  
time. Mike Reed in Medicine asks  
me all the time. Well, Mike, the  
answer is now. And so we want to  
make sure you're involved. And so  
contact Mike Marcus in Honors if  
you're interested. I wish I could

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
tell you the name of the new director. We did advertise. We're about three days from probably being able to say that. We're still wrapping up some things. You'll get that as soon as we can honestly say it. Just a couple things, we'd like to have a more co-curricular with more faculty than we have available to us now and we'd like to expand Honors living learning communities not in the new dorm or residence hall focused on Honors but I'd like to see enclaves scattered across other residence halls as we envision how this goes in the future. There's lots of opportunities for faculty to be invested and involved in this program. Any questions on that before I move away from it? Everybody is ready to hit the parking lot it looks. Last thing, Hollie asked me to ask you for help if anybody is interested, our graduation application dates are very, very, very early. They're based on an old system of handwritten with no computer. Our benchmarks - many of our benchmarks you can apply, put in an application for graduation as little as a month to two weeks before graduation. And those dates are kind of set by you all. And so we would like to put together an ad hoc committee that includes at least two Senators to think about what we can do to make this a little bit more flexible for our students. The student who wakes up in January and says if I take one more course, I'm done in May. Sorry, you missed the deadline. That was a month and a half ago. If anybody would like to volunteer, I'd like to have you help. Let Sheila know or contact me. So that's it. And I took all of Diane's time. I said I wouldn't do but I did. Diane, do you want to say anything real quick? Okay, I'm going to take off my QEP cap now and put on another administrative cap that I wear which is Director of Undergraduate Research and talk to you about something that contributes greatly to the retention of our students. If you look at any of the literature, the track over the last decade, being involved in undergraduate research is a real

SNOW:



FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt

plus for keeping students on campus and getting them really involved in what's going on, and I can go from here. So our mission statement is pretty obvious but I wanted you to see what our core is. We provide leadership in programs that promote and support undergraduate research and that includes scholarly activity. And the point that I'm trying to make since I took over this job in 2010 is that I want this to be for all students on our campus in every discipline. Research is perceived as being something that's only for scientists and I still hear that from our students. So the part of your job is to go back and talk to your students and say anybody who is interested in research can do it. If you have a driving question that you're passionate about and you're willing to go to primary resources to find the answer to that, that's research. So all of our students should be engaged in that, especially given our research faculty here. We want to enable students to study and work under the supervision of research faculty. We're a Carnegie one or now the new designation is very high research. But we're a Carnegie one designated research one institution. So all of our faculty are involved in research. And, of course, the overall goal of all of this is to promote academic excellence. I wanted you to know who we are. There are four of us in this office and Bessie Guerrant is the person who is in charge of faculty support. She's the Associate Director. I'm going to skip down to Evie Russell who is our Student Advisor and Programs Coordinator. I think many of you know Evie and myself. And then I put in red a new edition to our office who is Danica Kubly. She's a very young, vivacious person. She has a fantastic rapport with our students and (unintelligible) walking into the office and working with her. She's getting more and more people to attend meetings and helping them learn how to make posters, and she's just been a fantastic influence in the office. So I welcome you to stop in to our new office in (unintelligible) 211 and come and meet her. The Office

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
of Undergraduate Research provides support for undergraduates through all of these things listed. You can see that list yourself. I'll highlight a few of the things. We have programs that come up every year. A very important one is the showcase of undergraduate scholars. We'd like you to encourage students to get involved in this. They have to apply, send an abstract to us, but we're trying to include not only all of our undergraduate students but a cohort of high school students so they can interact with college level people and see what it's like. They can see what it's like to present a poster and so forth. So we're trying to bridge that gap. And we've had a great group of students this year at Posters at the Capital in Frankfort we presented to our legislatures. So it's fairly fantastic. (Unintelligible) a little bit more about that. Dr. Mullen introduced that. We provided research travel funding and summer research grants and we're trying to provide money for our students where it's possible. That may be dwindling a little bit but we're going to do our very best to continue whatever we can do. And I'm working to find outside sources of funding for that. Publication opportunities, we just moved Kaleidoscope online. So this year has been really fantastic for that giving our students the opportunity to publish, and we have a fantastic student organization for the promotion of undergraduate research and that's growing by leaps and bounds as well. The benefits to our students are many. These are just a few, but one of the ones that we really want to drive home is this gives students the opportunity to work one on one with a mentor. And that's the very best kind of education. When they can sit and talk with a faculty member and learn what they do and why they do it, that's fantastic. (Unintelligible) opportunities to present and publish and gain skills. It promotes higher GPA at graduation. The bottom one is really important to me. Good letters of recommendation are fantastic, but what we're teaching our students is just putting your

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
foot into a facility that does research doesn't give you a good letter of recommendation. You have to show up. You have to do the work. You have to be involved. That's how you get a good letter of recommendation. So they're really understanding that this isn't something you just do for the sake of it. You do it because you're passionate about it. So what's new in the office? Faculty involvement has increased from four hundred in 2010-11 to five twenty-five. These are people who are officially on our website. They've come to us and pressed the button and said please register me as a faculty member who wants to mentor undergraduate students, but I'm sure we have plenty more out there. We're trying to find you. If you aren't registered with our office as a faculty mentor, please come and tell us. It's easy to do. Just go to the website and click. Student involvement has increased dramatically as well. We're excited about that. But, again, this number is really, really low. These are just the ones who have taken the time to go to the website and say that they're involved in undergraduate research. So we know there are tons more out there. And I've been talking about this 395 mechanism to try to find students. Now thanks to SACS - I can actually say thanks to SACS for something - they have implemented a system where now we have to know where each of these students are for the 395, and that's the independent research. So now I can go through that list and match it up to ours, and I think our data base is going to grow exponentially now that we can find these students. But, again, the way things happen on campus is word of mouth. So if you know students who are doing research anywhere, please tell them to come us. I instituted a new advisory board called the Undergraduate Research Oversight Committee. I'm really excited about the you rock. And the student advisory board (unintelligible) we've made them an actually official role in the Office of Undergraduate Research to get really involved and help us find students and educate students.

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
Kaleidoscope is now online. We have six hundred seventy-seven downloads of our Kaleidoscope issue. The newest one is at the end of February 2012. We're also very excited about that. And it's linked now in the library through You Knowledge. Summer research grants have been about the same as far as how many we're able to award. But look at how many applicants this year. It's almost doubled. So I think there is an awareness of things happening. We're starting to see the grants. And if we keep up what we're doing, we should reach a lot more students. That's in progress right now. And then Dr. Mullen referred to the National Conference on Undergraduate Research. This is such a big deal. We're so excited about getting this on our campus, and it's going to be a huge amount of work between now and April 2014, but it's going to be worth it. Dr. Mullen and I are going to Weber State in Utah next week and we will learn a lot more on the National Conference on Undergraduate Research there about what it's going to take to make this happen on our campus. But we're working diligently to put committees and things together at the moment. And a focus that we have made in the past is to send as many students as possible. When I took this job, I kind of took issue with that. I don't want to send as many as possible, I want to send the best possible. So we've made the criteria a little bit higher for getting there. So we might not be sending as many students, but the ones we're sending are really good students and we're sending good science. So the theme that we came up with for our NCUR 2014 is Future Readiness and Global Competency and we're going to try to bring in speakers who further that. Dr. Todd promised me when he left here that any way he could help me with undergraduate research, he'd be happy to so. So he is definitely coming back to talk to us about entrepreneurship and research. We're trying to get Pearse Lyons to be a speaker for us in our (unintelligible) sessions. I'm in a conversation right now with Ashley Judd, and I'm hoping that

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt

she says yes to us. And she has to have some other people on campus to be a spokesperson for us. And the one person we have signed on for sure already is Kris Kimel who is the CEO and founder of Kentucky Space and also the Idea Festival which I think all of our students should be made mandatory to go to, but that's another issue. So what I'd like for you to do, please, is to spread the word especially about the National Conference of Undergraduate Research and start to get some excitement built about this. Dr. Mullen and I put together some committees already. Some of you might be on those committees. This is going to take a village for sure to get this done. There are an awful lot of different committees involved. This is a two and a half day event. I didn't have the dates up there but it's April 3rd through the 5th of 2014. So it will be a one day administrative day and registration. The meeting is Thursday, Friday, and half of Saturday. And as Dr. Mullen said, we would really, really like to get all of our students involved. And the word that we're using for this is to redirect class focus. We'd like to still be having the class, but it's a different kind of class that day, active learning. We all talk about how important that is. We want our students to be really involved in having a presence in this meeting not only so our students can learn from all the people here who are coming to the meeting, but so they can see about the University of Kentucky and all the good things we have to offer. So in just the sense of doing research on our campus and in promoting it through major programs like the National Conference on Undergraduate Research, please, faculty members, be really involved in this. And I'd be happy when we have more time to spend a lot of time talking to you about it. I bet you're all hungry. One other piece that goes along with this is the graduate (unintelligible.) So we'll set up some kind of an activity where your departments will have a chance to actually interact with these students from other places and they

MULLEN:

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
can do some active recruiting of  
students (unintelligible) as well.  
So that's a big part of this whole  
thing.

SWANSON: Questions?

SNOW: (Unintelligible.)

SWANSON: Questions?

GROSSMAN: Actually very quick. There needs  
to be money during the regular  
academic year to help fund students  
doing research. It's very  
expensive and the - at least in my  
opinion chemistry it is, and people  
sometime liken it to just pouring  
reagents down the drain. Sometimes  
you get good students. You get a  
paper out of them. More often than  
not you don't get a paper out of  
it. And it costs money.

SNOW: It's a labor of love in many cases  
and it's really helping the  
students grow. So, yes, it is  
expensive and we know that. I'm  
trying to do a lot about that.

MULLEN: It's a (unintelligible) process in  
undergraduate education and we're  
trying to identify more funding for  
(unintelligible) whether it's in-  
house which isn't going to happen  
this year or donor money, donor  
funding (unintelligible.)

SWANSON: Other questions? Thank you very  
much. And thank you for your  
patience. And with no other  
questions, do I have a motion to  
adjourn? All right, meeting is  
adjourned. We'll see you in April.  
Thank you.

(Thereupon, the University of  
Kentucky Senate Council Meeting for  
March 19, 2012 was adjourned.)

STATE OF KENTUCKY     )  
COUNTY OF FAYETTE    )

I, ANN E. CHASTANG, 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

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 3-19-12.txt  
caption, the UK Senate Council Meeting, was taken down  
in stenotype by me and later reduced to computer  
transcription by me, and the foregoing is a true record  
of the proceedings which took place during said  
meeting.

My commission expires: May 12, 2015.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my  
hand and seal of office on this the 18th day of May,  
2012.

---

ANN E. CHASTANG,  
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE  
K E N T U C K Y  
ID #442199