

SENATE MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

MAY 7, 2012

* * * *

* * * *

HOLLIE SWANSON, CHAIR
ROBERT GROSSMAN, VICE-CHAIR
J. S. BUTLER, PARLIAMENTARIAN
SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR
LISA GRANT CRUMP, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

* * * *

SWANSON: We have a motion through Senate Council, and I might show this again when he comes in, we have a recommendation that the University Senate thank Provost Kumble Subbaswamy for his University service and formally wish him well. If he returns to Kentucky, he should not go to Louisville.
Do I have a motion?
GEDDES: Jim Geddes, College of Medicine.
SWANSON: Second?
DUNCAN: Marilyn Duncan, College of Medicine.
SWANSON: Discussion? All in favor?
Opposed? Abstained? Carries unanimously.
Thank you.
Armando Prats, I can't remember if I told you or not, but would you mind giving us the report from the Work-Life Survey?
PRATS: Yes.
SWANSON: Thank you.
PRATS: I have been instructed with - to inform the Senate about, and this is a quote, given additional scores on communication with

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt
senior leadership, perceptions of trust and value, the Work-Life Committee emphasized the need to strengthen programs and processes in these areas.

If I may take a couple of minutes from you. There are three bullet points under one heading that the Work-Life Council Robin (inaudible) and all the great work that she does, put together to present to President Capilouto.

All of these bullet points that I am going to share with you are under the heading to increase trust, value, and communication.

So the first bullet point is to form a presidential task force on employee, that is to say, faculty and staff engagement, with a focus on improving internal communication and employment branding.

Like its 2005 predecessor, the 2010 survey highlighted persistent weakness in the areas of trust, value, and communication.

So the Council recommended presidential action to address these areas in a meaningful and visible way.

I think that the Council estimated that it would require an investment of approximately 350 to \$500,000.

And they had still - on the first bullet point that the University may find that an integrated goal-driven internal communication function to be constructed using existing talent and resources to a significant degree.

The overall effectiveness of this effort would be greatly enhanced by the creation of ongoing and (inaudible) marks, communication advisory boards addressing the original proposal.

The second bullet point is to build a more thorough and self-sustaining model of shared governance, which it's elaborated on as follows: to assign members from the existing University and Staff Senate, report perceptions of shared governance and consider the development of a shared governance memorandum of understanding, of quotation marks. I don't know what the quotation marks mean, but, as exemplified by the University of Arizona who formally specified roles of the Faculty and Staff Senates and Administration.

The third and final one was - is support the effectiveness of and compliance with supervisor and leadership training.

As part of this process that Work-Life undertook almost immediately after the survey, the 2010 survey, there was also a proposal for the formation of an Ombud's Committee.

So Work-Life Advisory Council supports separate faculty staff Senate

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
Ombud's Committee proposal to establish the
University Ombud's Office.

I think that is it. The second
heading of the memo to President Capilouto
was to enhance UK's family-friendly policies,
practices, and environment. And it was
basically an effort to establish emergency
backup dependent care. And how the President
has ruled on that, I do not know.

SWANSON: Any questions? Thank you.
Thank you, Armando.

We have a number of Senators who
are rotating off and their term ends in
August. Could you please rise and we could
give you our thanks? Senators who are
rotating off and whose service is ending,
thank you for your service.

An update on the faculty committee
on Renew, Reward and Retention. This is the
committee that I am Chairing.

We've got our college liaisons who
have been trying to liaise with your college,
and if you'd like more information about our
activities we have our website listed here.

We also have a comment box and it
is an anonymous comment box. We'll allow you
to comment at any time.

So we will keep that comment box up
until probably around October, or so, when
our activities are complete. So if you
remember our report is due on June 1, so
we're on track to give that report to the
President. It will be a preliminary report.

He will mull it over, over the
summer, give a response back in September, so
then we'll get more campus response during
September. And then we plan on a final
action plan in October.

So I'm send out a mass email again
just to remind everybody of that.

As Armando mentioned, the Ombud's
Committee was incorporated into the Work-Life
Study. The Ombud Committee met with the
President earlier in April and the response
from the President at our request is as
follows: because reduction in state
appropriations has created a very difficult
budget environment, the President has decided
not to move forward with the creation of the
Ombud Office at this time.

He understands and appreciates the
very real concerns that motivate the proposal
and wants to continue to talk with the Ombud
Committee and others about addressing them
within the current administrative structure.

He is completely committed to
strengthening the culture of trust and
respect at the University.

Questions?

Our committees have been very, very
active. And in particular I want to thank
the Chairs of these committees, the Senate's
Academic Programs Committee and their Chair,

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt

Andrew Hippisley, the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee, Herman Farrell, the Senate's Admission and Academic Standards Committee, Raphael Finkel, and the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, Davy Jones. Thank you very much.

We have a report from the Vice Chair, Robert Grossman.

GROSSMAN: So last year the Senate Council instituted a new award, the Outstanding Senator Award, and last year's recipient was Davy Jones.

This year we had a committee of three people, myself, Davy, and Debra Anderson from the College of Nursing.

And we solicited all of you for suggestions for who deserved the Outstanding Senator Award and we received three - well, we received quite a few nominations but three names were nominated, each was nominated more than once.

And when the committee met we decided that all three nominees would be worthy recipients of this award and so I just want to mention the runners-up before I tell you who won the award.

But one nominee was Herman Farrell who chaired the Academic Organization and Structure Committee, and Herman was cited for his work in handling a very difficult situation this year involving the College of Business, the Gatton College, and also all of his other work on the committee, handling it very fairly.

Herman also only recently was awarded tenure so he was handling this politically very difficult situation at a time that could have, hopefully would not have, but such things happen, known to happen before, could have personally affected his path.

But anyway, so we -- again he would have been a very worthy recipient.

Another nominee was Raphael Finkel who chaired, as you saw, the Academic Standards Committee this year. But one thing that all his nominators mentioned was the very detailed emails that he sent out, as you can see him typing away right there, the very detailed emails or notes that he takes at every Senate meeting that he then, after the meeting, emails out to all his constituents in the College of Engineering.

And this has helped a lot of people, a lot of the faculty in the College of Engineering who never really knew what the Senate did for them, or what the Senate did that was relevant to them, understand that things happen here that affect our lives in the trenches. And Raphael has also served on Senate Council in the past.

But the winner this year is someone else. This is someone who is no longer - is

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
not currently a Senator, although he was just reelected or - yeah. He has been a Senator in the past.

He has served on Senate Council for many years and he was also -- the main reason why we thought he deserved the award was because of his work on the Presidential Search Committee. And that is Shelly Steiner. Shelly? Shelly, can you come up here, please?

Shelly is not known for his ability to pay attention during the Senate meetings. So stand over here. So the plaque says Outstanding University Senator, Shelly Steiner, PhD, is recognized for his contributions to the University Senate by showing active and exemplary service on Senate committees, by making notable substantive contributions on important issues that impact the faculty, by consistently giving strong voice to faculty issues and the principle of shared governance, and by generating and effecting the Senate's agenda and goals.

SWANSON: Sheila, can I get one too, please?

BROTHERS: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED: She wants something pretty.

SWANSON: I want something pretty in the picture.

GROSSMAN: I temporarily yield the floor to Davy Jones who has another award to, well, not an award, a recognition to present.

JONES: I wanted to take this opportunity to express our appreciation at the Senate to another individual who for many, many years has been immeasurably contributing to the University Senate, and that is Jacquie Hager, Associate Registrar.

In innumerable ways that I could not list them all here, she has assisted the University Senate in its activities, in broad policy context, in assisting individual cases of so many students.

We learned that she is going to be retiring on June 30th of this year and I just cannot comprehend the University without Jacquie Hager. She's extraordinary.

When we heard at the Rules Committee meeting, she's been an invaluable member of the Rules Committee, providing us lots of information on context and practices to make sure that as we update our rules, we do so in a cognizant manner.

At the most recent Rules Committee meeting when we learned that she was going to be retiring, I told her and I gave her a heads up that we would acknowledge her here today.

What she didn't know was that we didn't think that just a round of applause was sufficient. So Jacquie, can you please come up here while we -- a plaque is a small, small measure of your contribution.

It says to Jacquie Hager, in sincere appreciation for your stalwart work with the University Senate, to uphold academic standards of the University, and to promote the academic success of its students, the University of Kentucky Senate (inaudible). Thank you.

SWANSON: Oh, you're not done?

GROSSMAN: No. I'm assuming Davy is yielding the floor to me. Davy, are you yielding the floor back to me?

JONES: Yes.

GROSSMAN: Okay, thank you.

Okay. And now I'd like to take this opportunity to yield the floor to our next Senate Council Chair, Lee Blonder.

BLONDER: Thank you, Bob.

As we all know, this is Hollie's last meeting as Senate Council Chair and University Senate Chair. And we are so thrilled with the way she did our Chair.

She's done all kinds of things to elevate the visibility of the Senate. She started the Outstanding Senator Award. And we want to present her with this plaque in honor of (inaudible).

The plaque says: Dedicated to Dr. Hollie Swanson in appreciation of her service as University Senate Council Chair, June 2010 to May 2012.

SWANSON: Thank you.

GROSSMAN: That concludes my report.

SWANSON: I have to admit that when Kaveh Tagavi told me that being Senate Council Chair was the highlight of his career, I thought he was nuts.

But after serving as your Chair, I believe him. It really has been -- serving as your representative has just been a thrill and I've enjoyed it.

And I want to mention that even Senate Council Chairs need mentors and Shelly Steiner was a terrific mentor when I needed him the most last year. Thank you.

Trustee John Wilson.

WILSON: I hate being the first speaker to not have any awards to give out. It's a real disability at this point.

I will be brief. I do want to give an award to the faculty who responded in such large numbers, and so quickly, to the survey that was sent out.

The survey results have been sent to each Board member on the Board of Trustees and I want to thank everybody.

It was done in great haste, and with more time we could have done a little bit better job and gotten more responses. But several Trustees have already written me in appreciation of the faculty interest.

And that's really what we wanted to do to make sure that the discussions of the budget, which will be ensuing in May and

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt

June, will not be without the context of some input from where the faculty are at this point, particularly related to the - how the evaluation process with the President will proceed.

I want to thank you for that.

I had no other remarks to make except the notion that, for me, I think the Ombud proposal is very good. For me the trust issue, which to me is certainly something that has struck me in the last few months, is actually fairly simple in terms of starts with openness and transparency, and that is saying what you mean and doing what you say.

Trust will be no problem on this campus if that's what transpires. So communication is an important part of that, but I think the behavior is pretty element.

I'll be happy to respond to questions about the survey or anything else folks want to talk about at this point.

Thank you all so much for your help and support as we go into this budget process.

SWANSON:

For those of you standing, there are chairs available. We'll leave one open for the President, but there's one here, there and back here if you'd like one. Okay.

We've got the UK 2012 degree list. I know it seems a little odd because we had commencement yesterday, but this is our process.

Several students were added to and deleted from the main list, thank you for checking.

We have a recommendation that the Elected Faculty Senators approve UK's 2012 degree list for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees as recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Can I have a motion, please?

JONES:

So moved.

ANDERSON:

Second.

SWANSON:

Discussion?

BROTHERS:

Name please.

ANDERSON:

Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.

SWANSON:

All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries, thank you.

We have the UK 2012 degree list, at this time no changes have been made. We have a recommendation that the Elected Faculty Senators approve UK's early August 2012 degree list for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board.

May I have a motion, please?

WASILKOWSKI:

So moved. Greg Wasilkowski, Engineering.

SWANSON:

Greg Wasilkowski, Engineering.

Second?

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, Arts and Sciences.

SWANSON:

Discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries, thank you.

We have SACS, SACS changed their name because their acronym was not quite long enough. So instead of SACS, they are the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. So now when you see this acronym you should say, oh, that's SACS.

So anyhow, these people require language about removal of Board members. So we're in the process of our accreditation and we're changing our GRs. You saw a number of GRs that we had changes last time.

So in this case they wanted us to specify what is our process by which we remove Board members. It is specified in KRS. And so that's all we've done is put that KRS language into our GR and that should be in your handout.

And so we have a recommendation then from the Senate Council that the Senate endorse the proposed changes to Governing Regulations II as outlined in your handout.

WASILKOWSKI:

So moved.

SWANSON:

Thank you.

BRION:

Second, Gail Brion.

SWANSON:

Okay, discussion. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

As long as we're on the subject of SACS, let me also remind you of our deadlines. The complete report, the reaffirmation report is due September 10, 2012.

The offsite review will be conducted November 6th through 9th. The QEP report is due in January. The onsite committee review will be conducted on April 9th to the 11th, 2013. And the review by the Commissions on Colleges Board, December 7 through 10, 2013. And I will continue to be your representative on the SACS Executive Leadership Team.

The next item on our agenda are our committee reports. The Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, Davy Jones.

JONES:

Okay. At the last Senate meeting we discussed and adopted some updating to one of the sections on the Senate Rules and that was basically the emergency clause in the Senate Rules on how would we handle traumatic situations of (inaudible) and consolidation and transfer of educational units or programs in the abnormal situation.

What we're doing today now is we've got two motions back to back here, several that are related to updating the Senate Rules for the normal course of events.

So the first one is 3.2. Yeah, okay. So 3.2, that's the Senate Rule for the normal process for proposing changes, proposing new programs or changes to academic

programs.

So I'll walk you very briefly here through what we've done. You don't have a red and blue version here because a lot of it's been rearranged and it would have been difficult to track the high points here.

We have a definition section at the beginning, what constitutes a program. For example, sometimes people would say well, we're changing this course, does that mean we're changing the program. No, it doesn't. Just changing a course doesn't necessarily mean you're changing the program.

So we have some guidelines here for when is something actually a program change, when you need to go through that process.

The next section is what forms to use for going through an electronic system and so there'll be a hot link inserted in the text here, go to this place and here are the forms.

The next section is the procedures that are going to be used. The procedures that the Senate expects to be used at the initiating unit level, then up to the college level, and finally up to Councils of the Senate and Senate Council and Senate. We provide there the orderly transition in section 3.2.3 on that.

There's some nuance there for whether it's a graduate program in which it talks about graduate faculty of the program versus some other academic programming which is the department or unit faculty.

So once it reaches the proper Council, we have some ways to identify how the proposal reaches the proper Council.

And then finally, the final section on the University Senate which renders the final, renders approval.

The new program, a new academic program that's a degree program, it has to go past us to the Board of Trustees. All other academic program, we render final jurisdiction over subpart 2, changes to the programs once they're existing.

Once a degree program is existing, short of (inaudible) the Senate is the final decision-maker on any changes to those academic programs.

So that's essentially what we have for the first one here. We're looking for the Senate to approve the updating to these rules which you have LCC being referred to in some open (inaudible) structures. So we need for the Senate to act to the recommendation here.

SWANSON:

We have a motion from the floor, from the committee. Discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

JONES:

Okay. We're going to do exactly the same thing right now except now it's the

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
Senate Rule 3.3.

So virtually everything I just told you about programs is now the same except it's about individual courses, approval of individual courses, new courses and changes to courses, deleting of courses.

It's the same outline. We've got some definitions on what constitutes a course change, the forms to be used, the process coming up to the educational units, to the correct Council of the Senate, and finally the final Senate action, which the Senate is final in all cases when it comes to courses.

There are some things, unique to courses, like cross-listing and so on that we have some updated rules for how cross-listing is proposed and postured.

We have minor changes in which it's an expedited approval. And we have some updated definitions here for what constitutes a minor change, so it just goes right straight up to the Senate Council Chair for approval rather than through the normal process.

And Jacquie Hager, she helped us update here on deletion of courses from the bulletin, and purging of courses that have not been taught for awhile.

So it's the exact same thing now for the courses that we just did on programs.

SWANSON: We have a motion from the committee. Discussion?

CHRIST: I do have a question about putting -

BROTHERS: Name please.

CHRIST: Oh, sorry. Alice Christ, Fine Arts.

-- putting the approval of new core courses first through the Undergraduate Council and then to the committee on the core?

JONES: Yes. There was - the discussion about which is most effective, and this was discussed at the Rules Committee and at the Senate Council, and there's been some discussion in the meantime that I think Lee Blonder - did you want to say something?

BLONDERS: Lee Blonder, College of Medicine.

We've had subsequent discussions and what we'd like to do is have this be a discussion point during the summer at our retreat as to the relationship between these two committees and how this should best work.

JONES: Is Mike Mullen here? We - he basically said fine, please announce that this will be substantively discussed at the Senate Retreat for any modifications that need to be made and would be warranted. He was okay with that.

SWANSON: (Inaudible), do you have any comments?

UNIDENTIFIED: No. That is correct. Mike

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
is fine with this. We're fine with this.

SWANSON: Okay, thank you. Thanks for bringing that up. Any further discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries.

JONES: The final one is the UK Core Committee, a slightly different aspect, (inaudible) in relation to the Undergraduate Council which will be addressed by the Senate Council and brought back to the Senate.

It's been chronically an interim committee and the Senate Council wants a more formalizing status so that it's a standing committee of the Senate. It's that important, that substantive.

So that's this recommendation, is to make it a standing committee. It will continue with the charge and the scope that it has in the meantime. And again any relationship of the standing committee or subcommittee perhaps of the Undergraduate Council, whatever that is finally worked out in the summer will be brought to the Senate in the fall.

But we wanted to elevate it to the formal status so that it's not an interim status.

SWANSON: There's a motion from the Senate Council. Discussion?

GROSSMAN: Yeah. I just wanted to mention the reason we need to do this is because IGEOC will be expiring this month if we don't do it. Okay?

So unless everyone wants all UK core courses to no longer be approved, we should probably pass this or something like it.

FINKEL: Does it make sense for us to approve it without knowing any details as to its membership, how they're appointed, what their term of office is, what their charge is?

JONES: It dovetails in here. Everything will continue as it has been. Their membership and their processes, that would change only upon the outcome of the Senate Council's retreat, discussion at the retreat this summer, and acts by the Senate in the fall to change that.

SWANSON: Bill, would you care to address that? How you're currently - your processes for membership?

RAVENS: The process for membership?

SWANSON: Yes.

RAVENS: Currently what we do is we ask for names to be suggested when someone rotates off the committee. There are a couple of different ways these have to be screened depending on which college that name comes from. Some of the colleges, they screen within the college as well.

But whatever I end up with at the

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
end I submit to Senate Council and Senate Council approves all those names, gets back with me and tells me whether or not I can then approach those individuals for service on the committee. That's how we've done it so far.

SWANSON: And how long are those terms?

RAVENS: The terms are two years.

SWANSON: Other questions or comments?

Concerns? Okay. We have a motion from the Senate Council that the University Senate establish a standing committee of the Senate known as the UK Core Committee which will continue the same charge and procedures as the Interim General Education Oversight Committee.

All those in favor? Opposed?

Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

The next item of business is the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee. Raphael?

FINKEL: We have several items here. And the first one comes from the College of Nursing.

And it's a proposal to change a rule, the rule as it currently stands limits the number of transfer credits that certain students who are allowed to transfer into a program and the recommendation is to remove that limit.

The current limit is 67 semester hours. The students are the ones coming into the RN/BSN program. This is a program for registered nurses who are getting a Bachelor of Science in Nursing.

They'll already have state licensure as registered nurses. They might have some other degrees like a Bachelor's degree or a diploma or an ADN, Associate Degree of Nursing.

The purpose of this is to allow these students to continue here, transferring 90 credits. Now we don't have to say how many, 90, because there's another rule already that requires at least 30 hours of credit have to come from UK.

So just removing the rule saying 67, would have the effect of raising it to 90. And what those 30 hours would typically be then is upper division nursing courses including, for example, concepts of professional nursing, advanced health assessment, clinical reasoning, public health nursing, and some others.

Students might also have to take some courses, basic courses like statistics and (inaudible), whatever is required to fulfill the requirements of that degree.

The reason for this is because students often who have one of these lower level degrees, for example, an AAS, it stands for Associate of Applied Science, that's a two year degree, will often return to a KCTCS

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
school and then they'll earn a slightly higher degree, an AA or an AS, sorry for that, Associate of Arts degree or Associate of Science degree. These are both two year degrees.

And often that program at KCTCS would be better for the students because it's more adult-friendly, more evening classes than we can offer here. But then when they enter here, in order to finally get to be BSN, Bachelor of Science in Nursing, they'll have an enormous amount of background, and the purpose then is to allow them transfer it.

So the committee, the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, voted to approve this and the Senate Council has also made such a recommendation I think and so this is our proposal.

SWANSON: All right. We have a motion from the committee. Would anyone like to speak for or against this motion?

GROSSMAN: I would like to see the current form of the rule change being proposed because -

FIN KEL: Yeah, can we bring that up? It's removing one sentence.

GROSSMAN: Is it removing? So it's not clear to me whether the rule is being completely abolished or will only apply to nursing.

FIN KEL: Right. It's - well, it's been brought up, let me try to explain it.

And the truth, of course, is in the Senate Rules. But it's in a section talking specifically about this program, not just nursing, but the RN/BSN program. And it's in there that the admissions requirement, which has a 67 credit rule, is just being removed.

So unfortunately what we have there might not have enough context. So I need someone to help me. Is this in fact in a section talking specifically about this program or is it more general?

If it's more general than the College of Nursing, then that's not what we want.

GROSSMAN: Is this the specific language?

SWANSON: This is the specific language.

GROSSMAN: That will be incorporated into Senate rules?

FIN KEL: That's -- unfortunately, I don't think that's it. Hold on a second, while I'll see if I can find it here.

GROSSMAN: Sheila, do you have a copy of the specific -

FIN KEL: We really need -- we need Senate Rules 4.2.1.2.

UNIDENTIFIED: It's on page 36 of that.

FIN KEL: No. In the handout you'll find it on page 36, but again it doesn't give you an enough context to be certain what this is a section of.

But in your handout on page 35, 36,

it shows the actual suggested change to the wording.

What you saw before that we just put up was what the committee recommended to the Senate Council, that's not exactly what they ended up doing.

We need 4.2.1.2. (Inaudible).
The motion is to remove that entire sentence. (inaudible) to see what context.

Here's 4.2.1. Undergraduate colleges. 4.2.1.1. Basic Lower Level....
This is not specific to --

BROTHERS: It's admission requirements for undergraduate colleges.

UNIDENTIFIED: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED: It's 4.2.0.

FINKEL: Right there.

GROSSMAN: This applies to everyone, not just the nursing.

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.

What we had in our papers is that you kept the 67 hours in except for students in the RN/BSN, Registered Nurse, Bachelor of Science in Nursing Program for whom the limit shall be a maximum of 90 semester hours.

FINKEL: Right. And that's what we had recommended to the Senate Council --

ANDERSON: Right.

FINKEL: -- there's not to be what's on your handout on page 35.

ANDERSON: It's on page 34 of the handout. To provide a specific exclusion.

FINKEL: Yeah. So let me pose then the motion to include the wording as of page 34 and not the wording that you might see on page --

ANDERSON: 36.

FINKEL: Yeah, 36. Not the wording on 36, but rather the wording on 34. And then I think it's absolutely clear.

We leave the sentence in but we add parenthetically, Registered Nurse and Bachelor of Science in Nursing program as an exception.

I hope that clarifies it. Other questions? Davy Jones, College of Medicine.

JONES: Yeah. The way the Senate rules handle exactly what's happened is after the general policies are stated, the program and the specific exceptions are listed. So what we would do would be codify, is find where is nurse listed and that's where we would state the exception (inaudible).

FINKEL: If that's the case, what we would be doing now is voting for the concept. The actual wording would be set up by the Rules Committee?

JONES: We'd like for that kind of stuff to come to us in advance, but we can try to codify intent --

SWANSON: Davy, could you clarify what we're actually voting on, please?

JONES: Well, there's language that

declares an exception for particular nursing programs in the general rule.

SWANSON: So are we voting on the language that is stated on page 34, credit hours from courses accepted from a junior college, and so on, except for students in the RN/BSN program for whom the limit shall be a maximum of 90 semester hours?

JONES: What you just said, there will be (inaudible) courses that would be codified in the place in the Senate rule that says essentially College Of Nursing, the exception to the general policy.

SWANSON: Okay. Is everybody clear on that? All right.

So we have a motion from the committee. All those in favor? Discussion? Okay. All those in favor? Opposed? Two. Abstained? One abstain. Motion carries. Thank you.

GROSSMAN: Did not Senate Council also ask the Academic Standards Committee to look into whether the 67 credit hour rule was appropriate for all programs?

I seem to remember we voted on that also.

SWANSON: I don't recall.
FINNKE: It wasn't transmitted to the committee, I believe --

GROSSMAN: Well, it may not because it's the end of the year, but does anyone else?

SWANSON: They're on summer break --

GROSSMAN: Yeah, I know.

SWANSON: -- as of the end of today, right?

GROSSMAN: Does anyone else recall that?

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.

I think everything that we saw in the writing from the Undergraduate Council, it all said strictly for nursing, not to be for any of the other programs. That's what my understanding is.

BRI ON: Gail Brion, College of Engineering.

We talked about we should consider this for other programs, but I don't believe an official motion was made.

FINNKE: The next matter has to do with the Medical Laboratory Science.

Apparently there's a bit of a history here that back in May of last year there was a name change from Clinical Laboratory Science Professional Program to Medical Laboratory Science.

So it no longer was listed as a professional program and at that point courses at the 800 level which only really apply to professional programs were renumbered down to the 400 level, and therefore, there's a section of the Senate Rules, 5.3.2.2.1, that pertain to the old Clinical Laboratory Science Professional Program.

The suggestion, the motion then is to simply remove that section. The second

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt
part is independent of that so perhaps we ought to separate these things.

Well, I'll tell you about the other half and maybe we can do it together and you can decide. The other half has to do with admissions requirements.

The program as it was back in 2004 raised the entrance requirement, the GPA, the grade point average, up to 2.75. And now they want to unanimously in the faculty, to reduce it back to 2.50.

The idea is there are students who are of adequate quality but not enormously high quality who are being not admitted because it's 2.75. They think at 2.5 students would survive, would thrive in this program, and they want to bring the prerequisite also into line with similar programs at other flagship universities.

And the committee decided that the department in question certainly knows best, and we should, unless there's a good reason not to, to purge the belief of the members of that department in what they want to set their admission standards.

So the recommendation then is to approve these revisions to the Senate Rules as outlined in the memo of which you have a copy of, and to also have those admission requirement changes going down from 2.75 to 2.50, all effective for this coming fall.

SWANSON:

We have a motion on the floor from the committee, is there anyone who would like to speak for or against the motion?

Okay. All those in favor?
Opposed? Abstain? Motion carries. Thank you.

FINKEL:

What is a credit hour? We were asked to try and answer the question what is a credit hour.

Now there are many different patterns in which courses are taught. In my department courses are typically taught for three sessions a week, each sessions 50 minutes.

The professor stands up and talks, the students respond, they're physically there. They do whatever homework they do, they're graded on tests and homework and class participation. That's the standard lecture pattern.

And to say that it's a three credit course, for us it means three times a week, 50 minutes a time, about 16 weeks. So it adds up to 800 minutes of contact time per credit.

And so in the standard a credit hour is 800 minutes. But that's not the only way courses are taught. There are also laboratory courses where perhaps the instructor speaks to the students for only 50 minutes a week and then the students go off and do laboratory for some amount of time.

So what sort of a guideline do we have for that sort of course?

There are other kinds of courses. What you have in front of you is the entire chart listing the ones that we were aware of. And we discussed how this ought to work.

What I'm presenting to you is not meant to be a rule but kind of a guideline so that as a new course is presented to this body and it has a certain kind of contact, and it suggests a certain number of credit hours, we can look at it and say that makes sense to us. Or we can look at it and say that doesn't make sense to us based on this grid, this chart.

And so the way the chart works is it lists each of the different kinds. For example, clinical, the one my eye fell on first. What is it, it's a course activity in which students, under the supervision of a faculty member, are involved with direct treatment or observation of patients.

Now how do you assign credit for such a course? There aren't any direct contact hours in our lectures. We decided that for a particular credit hour there should be 2400 minutes during the semester or up to 3200 minutes of that clinical work. So that's how one would read that particular entry.

Now this chart requires I expect a lot of study. It's got on the order of ten, no on the order of 15 different patterns, and if you want to ask about any particular one you can, or you can study this at your leisure.

This is meant then as a starting point and a discussion more than a finished product. But as a guideline then for how we should understand as a new course is presented to us how many credits it ought to be worth.

SWANSON: So I also was in discussion with Heidi Anderson and as you know she's leading our team for SACS re-accreditation.

And we were asked to take on this chart by SACS, now renamed that other thing, so I asked her what does SACS really want and she said oh, we'll use the University of Kentucky as a model.

FINKEL: They want whatever we give them.

SWANSON: They want whatever we give them.

And the other question I had was I thought the faculty might be understandably nervous looking at a grid like this and thinking about all of those courses we've approved for years and years and years, and the question I asked is can we grandfather everything we've approved and have the new guidelines apply to new courses and she said yes.

And then the other thing I'd like to draw your attention to is when we made the motion, we made this very long motion. And

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt

please note the very last sentence:
Equivalencies on the grid will be reviewed annually by the Senate.

So we'll have to take that up and make adjustments accordingly.

All right. We have a motion on the floor from the committee. Would anybody like to speak for or against the motion?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

I'm in favor of this, but I'd just like to point out, although Raphael's committee certainly said oh, these should be guidelines, it was our understanding during Senate Council meeting from several people who deal with SACS that they wanted this to be more than just a guideline. They wanted this to be a rule.

And so what we formulated in this motion is that what's in the grid is the policy but we understand that exceptions might be made and the policy should be revised regularly.

So it's a little bit more than just a guideline. It's a fairly firm guideline that we can violate only if we have substantial academic justification for it.

PFEFFER: Sean Pfeiffer, (inaudible).

See that worries me because then I up here it's here is sold as a guideline and it supposedly a guideline then the wording when I read it says rule, and now I'm hearing those guidelines are really strong guidelines that can be changed once a year.

Is it a guideline, is it a rule? And can we look at the wording? Because this is going to impact different colleges different ways. So I'm curious. Is it a rule or a guideline and can we change the wording or enter wording in there to say --

SWANSON: I can read you the statement that Heidi sent me this morning, if that helps, okay?

Regarding the Senate Committee's work on the credit hour for the new SACSCOC standards, federal requirement 4.9 also means (inaudible) yes, adding a grandfathering clause would suffice as this new policy is approved by the UK Senate.

In addition, it is very important that the policy also reflects that the faculty and Senate will review these practices and the implementation of such policies on a regular basis.

I feel the Senate procedures for reviewing new courses and course changes are sufficient in this regard.

Remember this federal requirement 4.9 is evolving, that will make you more comfortable, so SACSCOC may develop other requirements as it continues to evolve.

PFEFFER: Then if we vote on this it goes in as a rule next year, correct?

SWANSON: That is correct. Connie?

WOOD: I'd like to propose an amendment. I'd like to add to the recommendation that existing courses are grandfathered out of this policy.

SWANSON: There's an amendment on the floor, may I have a second?

BRI ON: Second. Gail Bri on, College of Engineering.

SWANSON: Discussion on the amendment? All those in favor of the amendment? Opposed? Abstained? Amendment carries. Thank you.

KORNBLUH: Mark Kornbluh, Arts and Sciences. There's no category here for all the innovations we've got (inaudible) core. So we move lecture courses away from being solely lecture courses with more attractivity, we've made lectures and discussions different types of courses. There's no room here for inverted courses which are some of the most innovative (inaudible).

SWANSON: Dean Kornbluh, I'd like to remind you we did vet this through all of the deans several weeks ago but we tried to make that as flexible as we could on our grid.

KORNBLUH: (Inaudible) encourage innovation in UK Core in specific types of course (inaudible).

SWANSON: Right. So what we're trying to do is we're trying to meet the requirements of the SACS, those people. Davy Jones?

JONES: There's nothing in here that prevents UK Core or any program from proposing what is an exception here on academic merit and pedagogical reason (inaudible).

SWANSON: That's right. And so, for example, let's just look at a studio, for example, we've got number of minutes per semester to could for one credit, other effort, 800 to 1600. So we've tried to give a wide range of values to accommodate those types of changes. Other comments?

FIN KEL: Let me just also briefly answer Dean Kornbluh's worries. We're not trying to prevent innovation, however, an innovated course should justify the number of credits that it wishes to offer. So, for example, offering two credits for a semester course in which the students will learn how to decide what their major is, we might have some problems with.

SWANSON: I understand there are concerns. We're going to go ahead and vote then. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you. Thank you. I'd like to invite the President down for the State of the University Address, President Capilouto.

CAPI LOUTO: Hollie, speaking of short notice, I didn't know this was a State of the

University Address.

SWANSON: We have to call it something.

CAPILOUTO: Oh, okay. Good afternoon. I appreciate all of you attending today. Angie Martin and I wanted to share with you a presentation and briefing materials we've shared with many constituents across our University, and briefings with our Board of Trustees over the past week.

And this deals with our tuition and mandatory fees, housing and dining recommendations that we must make to the Board of Trustees by tomorrow at their meeting.

This is all placed in the context of our overall budget which is presented to the Board in June. The final budget of the University is approved in September.

Before I start, though, I wanted to take a moment of personal privilege. First of all, I don't know if Dr. Subbaswamy is here, is he here? I wanted to thank him again for his leadership and service to this University.

I've been here a little over ten months and as I look over what he has achieved, what all of you have achieved together, the attention that we focused on what I think is the most positive outcome you can have for a student that enter the University of Kentucky, and that he graduates, he or she graduates with a quality degree received heightened attention, and it's progress for which I am grateful.

I also want to take a moment to introduce our new Interim Provost, Dr. Tracy, who I think many of you have heard speak before. And let me tell you that I talked to probably 60 to 70 people to get advice about naming an Interim Provost.

His name came up often for lots of reasons. One, I think he is thoughtful, he is a wonderful listener. He's analytical, he can find solutions.

And I think he's demonstrated through his leadership here of the innovation that we all are going to have to rely on in the times we live in.

Among some of the things that Dr. Tracy has accomplished, the philanthropic gifts that his college have gone over 100 percent during his tenure.

He created a centralized business operations for the management of all the colleges, financial and programmatic service through attrition, reorganization, reassignment. All those tasks were covered by 15 individuals before, it's down to 9 now.

In conjunction with UK IT he created Click Blue, an online learning platform that's exciting, and there are other universities across the country that are purchasing learning materials and services

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
through that.

And they've also developed a national board exam prep, an application for the iPhone, there are 13,000 pharmacists that are students that annually take these kinds of exams.

So that's the kind of innovation he's led and I'm pleased that he is willing to step in at a crucial time for our University.

Before I get into the nuts and bolts of our budget and the tuition increase, I want to again thank all of you for what I see here everyday that I can simply say is just remarkable.

Yesterday I had the treat of shaking the hands of I think 2500 graduates. And if you ever wonder what they say to you up there, besides the two clever ones, the person that came with a handful of confetti and tossed it in the air when I shook his hand, that was good, and then there was the person who came up and dialed a number on his cell phone and asked me to say hello to Laura.

You have encouraged creativity and it was manifest yesterday. But most of all, these students looked me in the eye, and this is what I heard most often, first of all I heard thank you, which is really touching. And they thanked me. And then several of them said, I'm proud to have a degree from the University of Kentucky.

So you made all of that happen and I'm grateful.

Today we're going to begin a discussion about budgets. So some of the priorities that we wanted to address and we've undertaken since we were all here. I want to talk about the first related to improving undergraduate education, 21st century learning, there are innovations going on across this campus that there were some fundamental things to address that we have made progress.

First of all, we all know that attracting students to our campus and their success once they arrive here is hinged tightly to the halls in which they live.

We have 600 modern beds out of 6000 in the next two years because of this bowl of public/private partnership. We will have completed our begun construction on over 3,000 new resident halls.

I just met with someone from an embassy here talking about exchange programs and all, and again people are deterred when they look at our residents halls. They want to know where their students going to live.

And I think we're going to be able to make tremendous progress in that regard.

We also have heard often that some of our best and brightest students were

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
making other choices about where to attend university. We had limited spots in our honors programs which we've increased dramatically.

And too often we said no to the top scholarship recipients who we had no awards for. I made the decision early in September to increase the scholarship budget by \$2 million. I have a commitment that I have to make to you to raise those funds as best I can and there are people who are responding.

You will see this reflected in the budget along with other scholarship expenses that have accrued over time.

But some of the early results, our Singletary Scholarships are up from 34 to 52, an increase of 18. The Patterson Scholarships are up by 46. The Presidential Scholarships by 52, the National Excellence by 48. More and more students are making Kentucky their first choice.

And that's important for a variety of reasons. It's the right thing for us to do when you look at affordability and access issues. It's the right thing to do to make sure that our prestige and reputation around the country is further enhanced.

I don't do things because of US News and World Report ranking. But if you take a look at those there are three factors that make up over nearly 30 percent of those rates.

They are your graduation rate, first year retention rate and your ACT (inaudible). And all of those are related to the preparedness of our students, the better students we get here, those are strongly correlated with our success and our graduation rate.

Having these smart kids come to UK is important and we are bringing more and more of the best and brightest. That started long before I got here, but it continues, and I think it's the right thing to do.

Next in terms of these points three and four, improvement in the leverage and line of human capital and new development and more creative approaches to leverage and financial resources.

Interim Provost Tracy, I think, has met with many people to talk about conversations we want to have about a new system of financial accountability.

I come here today in the spirit of transparency and openness. And that's what I want our budget system to further (inaudible).

I also have charged Hollie Swanson to work with the committee to look at reward and performances at the individual level, which I heard often about when I had my conversations early on campus.

I'm going to confess to you that it

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt
was difficult in this budget period to do something that I haven't relied on in my administrative experience, is some across-the-board cuts.

I think the fair thing to do is to let people know in advance what's expected in terms of the unit level and how their budgets are associated within, but I couldn't find the roots of that to the point that we could do that this time so we did some across-the-board treatment of units.

Dean Tracy will be engaged in dialogue, Interim Provost Tracy will be engaged in dialogue with the deans of all our schools over the next several months to see what impact some of our target cuts are going to mean. We'll address those as he comes upon them.

One of the things I did do is I made the decision, as you will see in Angie Martin's presentation, to distribute the cuts more heavily to those administrative units that report to me. It's a 60/40 weight and Angie will share with you the exact (inaudible).

So all of you know what's happened, what is called this new normal in higher education, the decline in state support this year for us is \$19 million.

Because of your great work I'm able to make a strong case in Frankfort. You may not think it is strong enough. I will say that compared to many other states, when you looked at how higher education is treated relative to other state agencies, we are protected somewhat.

Again I think the state agency cuts this year were upwards of 8 percent and ours is 6.4. We will continue to advocate for more and more state support.

But the realities are given the expenses, structural expenses that the state must face, it is difficult to expect that they're going to be able help soon.

As someone mentioned to me the other day, you know, the cavalry is not coming, in fact, there may not be a cavalry. And in many ways, we're the cavalry.

We have got to be able to be resourceful and earn our way out of this difficult situation.

We've had some declines in our endowment resources that Angie will mention and they're highlighted concerns about affordability and access that we try to address in this budget.

You will see that great attention was paid to how much debt our students encounter and what they're paying out of pocket for tuition and how that's changed over time.

Part of our reason for increasing our scholarships too was in this spirit.

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt

And then at the same time, while our health system is quite robust, and has grown dramatically over the last eight years, they live in a time where there is uncertainty about reimbursement.

The biggest payers are typically between Medicaid and Medicare, which are government supported plans, and how all of these changes with healthcare reform introduces some uncertainty. So there's some belt tightening going on there as well.

Many of you have heard about all these things that I have listed here. It makes me pleased to know that there is innovation going on at the college level.

I think you've probably noticed Harvard and MIT, just a couple of weeks ago, invested \$60 million in online interacting courseware, a \$60 million venture, Coursera was another.

All of these things are moving quickly and have implications.

While we did a baseline budget here there's certain things that were not included that remind me that new revenues are within our own reach.

If we were to simply grow the entering class by 250, which we did, but if we were to increase the retention of the upper class students by just 5 percent and had an additional 250 transfer students, it would increase the revenues by \$14 million.

But to do something like this it takes all of us working together.

So in setting these tuition and mandatory fee rates, we used these outcomes. We wanted to support our Kentucky promise that we remain that shining light in the state, that we recognize that we live in a global economy and in a changing higher education environment, that we begin addressing the long term financing solution through capital renewal.

Where you work and where our students learn is important. Our state has been unwilling, and I don't think it's very capable financially, in addressing these matters over the last several years and in the near future.

We introduced into this budget a plan to begin paying for the debt to rebuild our campus. We built in dollars to support \$200 million of debt, which is reasonable given our total debt here.

And as I work with more and more philanthropists who want to contribute to our University, I feel certain that we can have these funds, in combination with donors funds, to raise that amount of construction on our campus to get us into modern facilities almost two-fold.

So this is something I think we need to do. And we work our best to protect

the academic core and maintain affordability and access.

So our guiding principles are this this year, affordability, competitive salaries. We will introduce this as Angie will show you. Revitalization of our facilities, encourage efficiency to save cost, entrepreneurship, flexibility and longer term planning by working a two year budget.

I want to reiterate this. We're going to have to have many more conversations with our academic leaders over the next several months to be effective in doing this.

Protect that academic core will remain a watch word, and supporting excellence and improvement.

So with that I'm going to turn it over to Angie and she is going to go through a lot of financial information. I hope if it's at all possible, we can let her get through her material and then we'll open it up for questions for as long as we can stay.

MARTIN:

Good afternoon. I'm going to try to stay away from as many little cramped numbers as I can. But this is the budget and the tuition and fees starts with the budget.

And what we did though is put the numbers I'm going to cover in perspective. The University's 11/12 budget is \$2.675 billion, in 2001 it was \$1.196 billion.

About a quarter, 24 percent of the University's budget is funded with tuition, fees and state support. You'll see those bracketed.

What this pie I think highlights is that while these two pieces are critical to our budget, they have changed both in terms of the percentage it contributes to the budget as well as the mix itself. These are the state appropriation dollars, the tuition dollars that pay for instruction and pay for some basic infrastructure on research.

You can see how it's changed. In 2000, 2001 we had 25 percent of our budget was state support and 10 percent tuition. And in 2011/2012 it's about even at about 11 percent (inaudible).

Let's talk about the state support and what we're facing. This chart shows you what our operating budget from the state has been since 2001/2002. The blue dots represent the original budget as enacted by the general assembly.

A red dot means I literally got a phone call, normally in December, saying your fourth quarter allotment is going to be less than expected so you now have six months to absorb a whole 12 month cut.

We normally have done those with non-recurring funds during the year. This is why we have reserves, unfortunately. And then we have to build it in on a recurring

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt
basis the following July 1.

For '09/'10 and '10/'11, the state backfilled us with federal stimulus money or ARRA funds and we received 21 million in '09/'10, 17 million in '10/'11. The ARRA money is gone and you can see what is happening to our state appropriations where we'll next year be down to \$284 million.

And right now the budget bill that was enacted has set state appropriations staying constant into '13/'14.

This just looks at the shift in the total public fund revenue sources who pays, who bears the cost of education.

And in '04/'05 it was 61 percent the state, 38, 39 percent the students. By '13/'14 we are projecting that state appropriations will account for 44 percent of the cost and the students 56 percent of the cost.

Now this is public fund revenues. Revenues are as far as tuition, are the source of two factors, it's rate increases as well as enrollment changes.

So over this period of time we've had a substantial increase in enrollment of almost 10 percent, so that has factored into the tuition revenue, and you have to look at it from the state side as well.

So our enrollment has gone up, state appropriations have been going down.

This is looking at our estimated revenues for the current year, '11/'12, as well as next year which starts July 1st, as well as the following year which begins July 1st, 2013.

This is 24 percent of our budget, \$611 million base, you can see it's made up of gross tuition revenue of about 284 million.

Right now we have about 302 million of state appropriations. And other income is short term overnight investment income, service assessments that we charge to auxiliary, self-supporting units. And (inaudible) I took just small pieces of revenue that the University does collect.

I would like to point out that gross tuition revenue does not include fees, mandatory fees, course fees, program fees. All those fees are dedicated. So this is 100 percent just gross tuition revenue.

For 2012/'13 we are projecting that we go with a 6 percent tuition rate increase, both resident and non-resident. And that we increase our entering freshman class from 4,139, was our official fall 2011 count, to 4500.

We're also showing that for '13/'14, our tuition rate increase for resident students, for planning purposes at this point, we're looking at 3 percent, non-

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt
residents, 6 percent. And the entering
freshman class would go from 4500 up to 4800.

Now this increase in enrollment and
the increases in tuition rates would generate
in essence of 8 percent increase in tuition
revenue the first year, and an additional 7.7
percent increase the second year.

But you can see in '12/'13, trying
to offset that tuition with state
appropriations, and actually our other income
is going down, that's the short term
overnight investment income, remember I'm
trying to go budget to budget, so we have
budgeted actually too high. We've got a
shortfall this year of short term overnight
so we're trying to stabilize that revenue
source.

When you total all our revenues for
this un-designated general fund, it looks
like revenues will increase about \$2.8
million or half a percent for '12/'13.

Of course, the flip side is always
to look at the expenditure. Remember, I'm
talking off of that \$611 million base. So
this does not include research grants or
contracts and it does not include UK
Healthcare as well as a variety of
auxiliaries are not included as well.

With regard to personnel we're
looking at funding investments and faculty of
about \$1.1 million each year. That includes
a \$500,000 faculty fighting fund for which
the Interim Provost can use to counteroffers
for faculty that we want to keep that other
institutions are trying to take away from us.

In addition it includes the funding
for faculty promotions, the assistants of
associates, for example.

We are not proposing any faculty
and staff merit salary increase pool for
'12/'13 given the financial situation that
we've got where revenues are only increasing
a half a percent.

We are proposing in this two year
budget model to fund a 5 percent merit salary
increase for '13/'14. That would cost the
institution \$21.2 million off of that \$611
million base.

Benefits. This is strange to see a
negative number on benefits. I need to
reassure you we are not decreasing any form
of benefit to the employees.

What this represents actually, it's
a very convoluted accounting system. We
actually negotiate a rate for miscellaneous
benefits with the Department for Health and
Human Services, and that rate is taken by
adding up a lot of different smaller benefits
such as unemployment insurance, long term
disability, there's about 12 to 13 and you
divide it by the denominator which is your --
divide it by estimated payroll, total gross
payroll.

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt

We had been underestimating our total gross payroll. We're sitting at one year, negotiating with (inaudible) trying to project that. And with the growth and UK Healthcare we have missed those targets.

We're pretty good on the expense side and not so good on the payroll side. So our rates have been too high and where this is in essence the service men or our recharge unit, we're just writing those numbers and increasing and recognizing the full payroll base.

Operating. The President talks about student financial aid. We are proposing to increase the budget by 10.3 million. When I say proposing, it's probably an incorrect word.

We have already committed a \$10.3 million increase to these students. This has been awarded. The President, when he first came, was talking with different folks and looking at our different characteristics of students, agreed to increase the number as well as enhancement of our top scholarships, the Singletary Program and the Patterson Program. And he was told that would cost \$2.4 million.

What he didn't know is behind that we had already in the works had a few scholarship increases going as far as the number of students. The awarding of scholarships is truly an art, not necessarily a quantified science to a certain degree.

And what's happened is you always over-award. If we told Don, you may spend \$10, he is going to award \$12 because he knows his acceptance rate and where that will fall.

What's happening is that the acceptance rate is increasing. More and more students are coming to the University. So this \$10.3 million reflects this scholarship enhancement, it reflects the tuition rate increase. Some of our scholarships are tagged directly to our rate increase as well as it includes an increase in the (inaudible).

This 10.3 is a very large number. Currently, our scholarship budget for undergraduates is about 29 million. And then for our -- if you fold in graduates, we're at about 56 to 57 million. So we're proposing to increase that by 10 million, a reflection of what has already been committed. And then following that through in '13/'14, an additional 9.3 million.

You got to remember scholarship, if you grant it, you've got to live with the renewal. And that's going to take five to six years before a scholarship program is really fully implemented.

Strategic investments of 5.1 million, these are comprised of a tuition

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
incentive funding program that we have with the colleges. For every increase in the student credit hour production, the colleges will receive a flat dollar amount of \$120. This program has been in the works now for a couple years, actually two years.

But this will be the first time we're actually in the phase of awarding out the money, and that will hit July 1st, 2012. This also includes summer school funding. As many of you know, we teach an online course.

If you teach an online course, the colleges get to retain 60 percent of that tuition revenue. If it's an on-campus course they retain 40 percent of the revenue.

Utilities and capital renewal, these are standard practices that we try to fund. And the debt service pool I'm going to talk to you about in just a second. So on the 2012/'13, we are looking at expenses totaling almost 22 million and an additional \$47 million in '13/'14, this is incremental.

Looking at that capital investment, as the President mentioned, our goal is actually to create a \$15.4 million debt service reserve pool in order to issue \$200 million worth of agency bonds for capital projects on the campus. The \$15.4 million reflects a 20 year amortization period at 4 percent.

We would get there by allocating 5 million in '12/'13, an additional 7 million in '13/'14. Many of you may remember, when we implemented IRIS or SAP several years ago, it was actually six years ago to be exact, we financed the IRIS SAP project over seven years, was the lease/purchase payment structure. So these our last payment on IRIS.

The main system will hit in '12/'13 which means we are redirecting \$3.4 million toward this debt service pool on capital renewal.

We continue to make enhancements to SAP and IRIS, we're just using more non-recurring dollars and nothing to the magnitude of what we of course had to invest up front.

So we've got revenues of 2.8 and we've got fixed costs and strategic investments, of 22. That means for 2013 we've got a gap of \$19 million. And for '13/'14 we've got a gap of \$23 million.

Now that \$611 million base, we can't cut every single dollar in that base because utilities are in that base, debt service is in that base, scholarships are in that base, so it becomes counter-productive.

We have taken out those three things which reduces our base down to 510 million and so 19 million divided by 510 million means an across-the-board reallocation of 3.8 percent.

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt

It is a reallocation because we would expect that 24 percent of our budgets go up with 2.8 million. It's just that we want to do other things that total 22 million. So we're going to be shifting the dollars around in the institution.

We are not going to do just a straight 3.8 percent. As the President mentioned, he wanted to do a heavier weight to the administrative units than the academic units so we looked at how much money do we need. We looked at the bases and came up with the academic units are being asked to reallocate 3.3 percent effective July 1st, and the administrative units are being asked to reallocate 5 percent as of July 1st.

We are planning for these additional reallocations for the '13/'14 year. We are hoping that the financial picture improves and that these reductions actually are reduced further. If we have enrollment is up, if retention is up, if transfer students are up, if expenses are down.

With regard to expenses and that scholarship dollar, I should have mentioned this earlier, this summer we are putting together a team to analyze our scholarship expenditures to make sure we are spending every dollar as efficiently and effectively as we can. Is there a way to avoid that \$9 million increase in the second year.

Now this is a pie chart. (Inaudible). Undergraduates, full-time, in-state students. There's a big difference between sticker price and net price. And what this tries to get at is to picture that, that scenario.

So if you look at fall 2011, we had 91 percent of our undergraduate, in-state students, full-time, that received some sort of grant or scholarship. I'm not including loans. Grant or scholarships, dollars that they do not have to work for, dollars that they do not have to pay back.

So we had 9 percent, or about 1300 students, in-state, that did not receive any grant or scholarships. Of those 91 percent students, of those 13,000 students, they paid an average tuition and fee for the fall semester of \$4,558.

They received a total A package, on average, of \$3,468. And you can see what it is composed of.

The UK scholarships is that big number I just talked about, part of the 29 million. UK gifts and endowment, that's restricted funds, gifts and endowments that are supporting that, federal is primarily PELL Grants. It also includes the SEOG, the supplemental educational opportunity grant.

State grants include the KEYS, the merit-based program for the state, as

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt
well as the CAP program, which is a need-based program in the state. Private are things like the Rotary Club where we have a third party come forward and say we are giving money for a specific student typically.

So after looking at this, our out-of-pocket costs for these full-time, in-state students in fall 2011 was \$1,000 -- \$1,090. Now this is just tuition and mandatory fees. This does not include housing or dining or books.

So we thought, what did that look like in 2006 and how has that changed over time. And you'll see that the gap in 2006 was \$854. So it actually in the span of five years has not grown substantially, especially in light of the tuition rate increases and how they've increased.

The amount of aid has also increased and especially it's interesting I think to look at the makeup of that aid and you can see where UK scholarships has grown from funding 18 percent of the total aid to now it funds 33 percent. And again this gets into the issue of are we using those dollars in the most efficient and effective manner.

Of course the President immediately then asked well, what about loans. You didn't include loans so what does that mean. Now loans are a little bit difficult to measure because students come here when they transfer in, they may have debt and we don't know about it.

So what we did, and we wanted the full picture of debt, not just how much does a student borrow in one year, but when they graduate, what do they leave here with at UK.

So we took the fall 2006 entering freshman, full-time, resident cohort, again just Kentucky students. There were 3,415. That represented 81.5 percent of the entire cohort.

By December of 2011, 1,759 graduated from the University of Kentucky, a graduation rate of 51 percent. 53 percent of these graduates has no loans, have no debt. 47 percent of the graduates had loans with an average debt of \$23,500.

So we tried to put that in perspective of earnings because that's the (inaudible) these students are going to be expected to pay it back.

And what you have here is from the College Board and they got the information from the US Census Bureau, but bachelor's degree, a worker that is working full-time, year-round, this is national information, ages 25 and older, someone with a bachelor's degree is on-average earning \$55,700 gross, \$42,700 after taxes.

A high school graduate is earning \$33,800 gross, and 26,700 after taxes, so a

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt
16,000 difference.

So if our students are graduating with 23,500, that's just the 43 percent of those in-state students, it would take them about -- or less than two years, in essence, to pay off their loans if they really took everything that they would have made between these two points to pay toward that. This is more just to size this level and to get a sense of how burdensome is this debt on our students.

We also of course in setting tuition and fees want to look at how do our fees and tuition compare to other institutions.

These are the top 20 public research universities in accordance with US News and World Report, and you can see where we fall. This is for fiscal year 2011/'12, so it's fall and spring, '11 and '12, and we are at 9,128 and the average is 11,496. This is for in-state students.

This is for non-resident, out-of-state students and we are at the bottom of the pack at \$18,740. (Inaudible) for us as well as for these other institutions.

It's always good to compare ourselves in the state. I do have to say that the Council on Post-Secondary Education has statutory authority to set tuition and mandatory fees for all nine public institutions in Kentucky.

UK and U of L are in one sector, one level. The six regional comprehensives are in another group, and KCTCS is in a third group.

What the Council did recently, about two weeks ago now, is they said that the research universities could increase the in-state undergraduate rate 6 percent, the comprehensives, 5 percent, KCTCS, 4 percent.

CPE sets two rules when it comes to -- actually three, three rules when it comes to tuition and mandatory fees. One is this one: this is the maximum amount you can go without asking for an exception. So UK, U of L, 6 percent.

The second rule has to do with non-resident students. We must charge, we must assess at least two times the in-state rate for our undergraduate out-of-state students.

This gets to a tax payer subsidy issue because they're saying that the tax payers of Kentucky will subsidize the in-state students more than the out-of-state students.

Now this is gross. And this does not mean that net again of course because we do award scholarships to our out-of-state students.

The third rule is that all other rates, that means all the graduate rates, professional rates, are up to the discretion

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
of the institutions to the Board of Trustees as long as they are market competitive. They don't really give us much guidelines, that's pretty much it.

They haven't really come after that. Course fees, program fees, they've also left that up to the institutions to a certain degree.

They are watching course and program fees intently to make sure that it doesn't tip to where the majority of the students are paying those fees, and if they do, then they're going to pull them back under and say it's part of tuition and mandatory fees.

So our list price, sticker price, for next year for tuition, mandatory fees, housing and dining are as follows. We are proposing the 6 percent increase in tuition and mandatory fees. We're proposing a 4 percent increase in our dining. That's primarily reflective of the increase in food costs.

Housing, the traditional halls, we're proposing no increase. For the four, what we call new dorms, the dorms that came online in 2005, we are proposing a 6 percent increase in those dorms. Those dorms are structurally unbalanced as far as the budget goes.

They're not generating as much revenue (inaudible) so given the demand for those facilities especially we're trying to pull those back in line.

So we're looking at a total cost per semester of an incoming freshman of \$8,259 which would be a 4 percent increase from what they paid this past fall.

Next, we are taking this recommendation to the Board of Trustees tomorrow and I get to remind them they are not approving the budget tomorrow. What they are doing is approving the tuition and mandatory fee rates.

We take the budget to them on June 19th. Then on June 21st, CPE will actually approve the tuition and mandatory fees. We don't expect any issues because we are in compliance with all their parameters. And of course August 22nd, the school year begins.

CAPI LOUTO: A couple other things I wanted to mention about our scholarship report. (Inaudible). We will post all of this on the web for anybody to access. We've gone from a point where 80 percent of our students had some form of grant or scholarship now to 91 percent.

So the piece that I was really concerned about given the national data on students accumulating debt was, you know, what is this distribution of debt.

And you see, you know, up in those higher categories, 80,000, 70, 60,000,

they're just a few dozen students. And that may be a wise loan for them depending on the job they're going to get in the degree and all. But it didn't strike me as we were, you know, not advising our students well in terms of the debt that they take home.

This national debate you see of the, you know, it's higher than credit card debt today, a lot of that brings in the not so decent for-profit segment that is maximizing loans for students for degrees in which they're not going to have earning power.

I wanted to make sure we hadn't slipped into that. In no way have. I think we offer a tremendous value for the investment that somebody makes in what we provide at the University of Kentucky.

I also wanted to mention that embedded in our scholarship awards, which I think has been very crucial to this University, just a few years ago our investment in the Parker Awards, have been instrumental in our attracting minority students, it's gone from 3.9 to 9.5 million. That's embedded in that scholarship increase as well and I wanted to point that out.

So with that I want to thank Angie and then certainly we would like to respond to your questions. Yes?

GEDDES: In an early slide -
BROTHERS: Name please.

GEDDES: Jim Geddes, College of Medicine.
In an early slide you showed the hospital budget was 10 years ago, 24 percent, now 38 percent of the budget. How much of that goes back to the University or is that strictly for hospital?

MARTIN: Well, I've got to look at the exact transfers. The whole clinical enterprise including the Kentucky Clinic, is now I think, is 150 million comes back through primarily the College of Medicine.

CAPILOUTO: It's gone from, on that slide, the absolute number is probably \$290 million to \$940 million. When people tell you that the portion paid by the state nowadays is decreased, you look at that bar graph, the only segment that has not increased in absolute dollars is the state, that's true.

But part of the reason the state dollar is more depressed is that piece has grown so much. Yes?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.
So you said several times protect the academic core. Can you elaborate on what you see as the academic core and what you mean by protect it?

CAPILOUTO: Well, I think first of all demonstrated in the heavier lifts that I'm asking administrative units to take.

That is a significant portion of our budget compared to those in the academic

units. That I think is the heaviest lift.

I think the opportunities that when we move forward for those units who produce and need more resources to realize those rather than doing across-the-board kinds of things that we typically do is another way to protect the academic core.

We're not there yet. We have to have much more honest conversation. But until we get there and have something enduring in place, I'm relying on our Interim Provost and conversations with our deans to understand more fully exactly what those are.

BRI ON: Gail Bri on, College of Engineering.
So faculty are not going to get raises for another two years, maybe four years?

CAPILOUTO: No.

BRI ON: Two years?

CAPILOUTO: No. I think what we are talking about is one year, 5 percent pool.

BRI ON: And the only way we receive a new raise is we have this fighting fund which would be recruited in case we get another job offer somewhere else. Is that - did I understand that? Did I understand that there's a fund --

MARTIN: 500,000.

CAPILOUTO: \$500,000. That has been in place for how many years?

MARTIN: Five.

CAPILOUTO: Five years.

BRI ON: We just lost an excellent faculty member and money wasn't at the root. In fact, we offered more than the university that they're going to. One of the reasons they left was that they didn't see anything getting better overall in the long haul. And I just thought I'd remind that fact as feedback into this continuing....

We know we're below our benchmarks and we're falling further and further behind. And it's getting to the point where we've fallen far enough behind that even the fighting fund isn't going to keep the best of us.

CAPILOUTO: Well, let me say that I want it to get better. And for it to get better we have to make some hard choices. It's difficult.

I don't think we can move forward with the physical plan we have. To be directly honest with you.

I think we have a outstanding faculty that can attract better students who will continue and graduate from the University of Kentucky so that we move beyond the graduation rate of a little less than 60 percent.

But we need a combination of those things. And we're trying to make steps to begin in that direction. I don't think we can adequately recruit students and do the work we have to do in these facilities.

I do not think the state is going

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt

to do anything anytime soon. I'm going to be honest. And I don't want to just sit here and say we can't do anything.

So it's a tough call we're having to make. I hope, I hope, you know, everyone working together we can move these revenues. We have a much more talented student population now. I think we have some great things in place to better retain our students.

We need to sharpen how we award this financial aid. We need to look very carefully at that.

And I'm still encouraged by the people who do want to come here. They strike me as very talented too. I hate to hear any story about somebody getting away.

BRI ON: I just - I would just hope that faculty are included in this academic core (inaudible).

CAPI LOU TO: That's a given.

MOUNTFORD: Roxanne Mountford, Arts and Sciences.

I wanted to ask you about assessing the University library system of (inaudible) percent cut.

Many of us consider the library as an instructional partner, as a part of the academic core. So I wanted to ask you about that decision.

CAPI LOU TO: 11 percent?

MARTIN: That's two years combined.

CAPI LOU TO: Oh, two years combined. And they are in - well, this is the first year cut.

We'll have discussions about the implications of that for the second year. It's going to be six months of planning here. We'll understand exactly what that means.

I think one of the real challenges libraries across the country face is almost a monopolistic type behavior by publishers. I don't know exactly what to do about it.

The price increases for the journals we use and all, go at a pace outside of anything we do here, anything that's normal. I mean there's several universities that have said hell no, I'm not going to pay them anymore. And that cuts back on some of our resources. But it is a market-driven type of activity where the market is failing entirely.

And so you see these other open source kinds of things starting to bubble up. Will it have an impact on these prices, I'm not sure. But we treated them as an academic unit, as an administrative unit, excuse me, as an administrative unit. We will look carefully and work with them.

We do want to protect that as a valuable resource as best we can. Thank you for bringing it up. Yes?

I NAUDI BLE: (Inaudible), Department of Mathematics.

Again some clarification upon what constitutes the academic core and (inaudible) I've heard a lot about educating undergraduates, et cetera. Does the graduate (inaudible) under the academic core?

CAPILOUTO: Yes, very much so.

But you will see how much the vitality of this undergraduate education means to much of that. I mean we have a \$59 million total scholarship support that we have -- we have the overwhelming majority of our students are undergraduates.

In reality the resources they generate help sustain many of the graduate programs too. You know that those are more expensive to operate. And for the number of students that we have in those, we have to spend more on stipends which is reflected in our overall budget as well. So we keep our eye on that.

The other thing is, you know, I hope to work effectively with people to look at other sources of support. I leave for China on Monday. Rodney Andrews, from the Center for Applied Energy Research, will be going with me.

That is a country that is a large coal consumer that is looking for ways to better consume coal, looking for environmentally sound ways to do so and all, and we've got to find those kinds of opportunities as well.

SWANSON: I'd like to remind everybody that this is a Senate meeting and I've asked that our Senators get their questions addressed first, please.

CAPILOUTO: You'll have to help me there.

SWANSON: Senators?

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.

I want to go back for a minute to the tuition and fees and all of those kinds of things and scholarships for students.

I know a lot of the private universities look at need-based scholarships over merit-based scholarships and I'm wondering how we deal with that.

CAPILOUTO: Well, I think some of our -- we do have a lot of focus on merit-based scholarships, but as I talked to one of our most outstanding graduates this past week, I had lunches with some exiting students.

He said, you know, I didn't quite qualify for a scholarship -- I mean a loan, but the way my family is I would not have come here without your scholarship, you know, financial need was important with my family given other things that are going on.

I think that many of our merit students are financially needy too. And then I think our significant investment in the Parker Awards are attention to a need-based segment of the population.

The other thing that's happened,

whether it's good or bad, in this country, we have gone from, you know, in terms of the cost that we bear, I think in our University 10 years ago, 15 percent of our population, and I'll have to go look this up, this is one of the first data points that I got when I got here, but about 15, 16 percent of our population was PELL Grant recipients.

They can receive up to \$5500. It's probably the best national measure of need because all university students can qualify.

We've gone from 15 percent to - 26.

MARTIN:

CAPILOUTO: - to 26 percent. So you know, in many ways as taxpayers, we're all bearing those costs. But that probably fill the gap the most in need-based education, in need-based scholarships.

ANDERSON: I wonder if there's a way to honor or reward students who are meritorious, who have the financial means so that they would want to come to University of Kentucky, but their family would still be glad to pay.

I mean I don't know if we're doing anything with that or not, but there are some universities that are, who are.

CAPILOUTO: Well, I'd love to hear those suggestions. You know, it's kind of hard to give a scholarship and ask for part of it back.

ANDERSON: That's why I'm wondering, you know, is how can you reward them, how can you recognize them as being meritorious.

CAPILOUTO: Sure.

ANDERSON: But then encourage their family. And I know these are private colleges, but Wooster is doing some of that and Depaul in Indiana and places.

CAPILOUTO: Yeah. That's such a whole different, you know, when you're starting with a \$40,000 sticker price, and they heavily discount. I'd be interested in learning more if there's something we can do.

ANDERSON: It's a mind set.

YOST: Scott Yost, College of Engineering. It may be a little too early, but I hear I guess coming up with a funding mechanism of how you're going to decide funding in the future based on maybe student tuition hour. I guess could you clarify?

CAPILOUTO: I don't know the answer. I don't know what it's going to look like. But I want it to be open and enduring and predictive.

We're having to compress two months of planning in here and now give it to the units and have them work in a compressed amount of time and do this year after year after year.

You know, it's difficult to be strategic and long term in what is a long term enterprise.

So what we're trying to do, and

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt

Interim Provost Tracy is leading this effort, he hasn't spoken to this group and I hope he'll come back and speak.

TRACY: Can I just say that Thursday at is it 11:30?

SWANSON: I believe it's 11:30 in the Student --

BROTHERS: Center.

TRACY: There'll be another presentation on the budget model. I did one today at 11:30 to 1:30, several of you were there. I recognize faces. There will be another one Thursday at 11:30 about the budget model, budget cuts. (Inaudible).

THYNE: (Inaudible), Arts and Sciences.

I was just reading about that according to the University of Louisville (inaudible), their budget, the one piece (inaudible) they're going to give bonuses this year. They would pay for a large part with a transfer of the athletic budget. I was curious if we thought about any way we could (inaudible) maybe we could use some advantage here, one term or long term (inaudible).

CAPILOUTO: Well, I have not seen (inaudible). Since people always bring up athletics, I will talk about athletics.

I've talked to Athletic Director Barnhart about better ways to support the academic enterprise.

I want to tell you that I called 50 top notch students who we're trying to convince to come to the University of Kentucky. These are our highest scholastic achievement students.

And I would call them at night and we had conversations about the University of Kentucky and they certainly knew about all our academic programs and they'd want to be here.

And I'd ask them other questions about what they like about the University of Kentucky. The community spirit of this athletic is the faculty. So they, you know, it is important to their success.

The other thing I'll note is we should send this out to everybody. Angie sent it to me Sunday. Bloomberg News did a breakdown of probably the seven or eight major conferences in the United States and it listed the amount of student fees paid by every college by the students in every conference.

And we are at the very bottom out of 35 schools. We have a total of I think it's \$700,000 in fees charged to student. The University of Louisville is near 4 million.

So, you know, it's pushing forward. I will look at opportunities. In scholarship for our students the total is

MARTIN: 2.2.

CAPILOUTO: From athletics?
MARTIN: No, no, that they give us.
CAPILOUTO: Right.
MARTIN: 14, 15.
CAPILOUTO: 14, \$15 million in scholarships.
And they do some good things. Their graduation rate for African American students is double what it is (inaudible).
The contribution to IRIS, and I noticed this in the budget, what was the total, Angie, 2. - 3. --
MARTIN: Ours was 3.4.
CAPILOUTO: 3.4 million. So they were convinced to contribute \$700,000. And they're budgeted \$80 million out of 2.7. (Inaudible).
And there are other things we'll look at. I understand exactly what you're saying. I think they understand.
SWANSON: All right. He can.
KOVASH: (Inaudible).
CAPILOUTO: That's one of the things I want the Provost to be addressing in these meetings. If you look at some top-ranked universities, some that come to mind, Florida, Ohio State, I think Minnesota may be one, don't hold me to that, their student faculty ratios are higher than ours. Okay. The big question we have here is where are they deployed.
You know, when you have growth in certain areas, can we respond to that. Are there opportunities for growth that we're not taking advantage of in programs. I think we have to do a better job. We can stay a little longer.
SWANSON: Let's take one more question.
CAPILOUTO: Let me say I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today. We are working to be more transparent.
Interim Provost Tracy told me tomorrow he will be sharing with the schools, which is somewhat different, not only their allocations and resources, but the allocations to the other schools and all.
We're trying to be open about this. We're trying to get to a better place. And we'll only do this through direct conversation. So if you have other ideas that you want to share with us please let Dr. Tracy know. Please let me know. Angie is very receptive to questioning she receives. So I thank all of you for being here.
SWANSON: Professor Andrew Hippisley would like to tell us about his work in the Senate's Academic Program Committee.
HIPPI SLEY: There are a few to get through so I'll try to be as quick as possible.
The first one: this is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new graduate certificate, Risk Sciences in the Division of Risk Sciences within the College of Communication and Information.

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt

They recognize a projected increase in specialists in emergency and crisis management. Unfortunately at the moment there's no appropriate training being carried out by disaster management insurance programs. What is needed though is a focus on communication and knowledge management and that's what the certificate applies.

The main aim is to train students in the understanding of risk and crisis communication and management.

The target audience, non-graduate degree seeking students and students with a graduate degree or working towards one, the last ones may be students pursuing a MA or PhD. And they will be (inaudible).

So there are four courses making up 12 credits. Three are at the 700 level and these are on risk communication, crisis communication and training and consulting. All of those 700 ones are housed in Communication and Information and already exist.

A fourth 600 level course on knowledge management will be offered by (inaudible).

Courses will be entirely done and conducted online. The first three (inaudible) will have weekend seminars.

The certificate is entirely funded. Much of it coming from TIF funds. The projected income is every ten students will give \$62,280.

My committee was pleased with this, we would like to recommend it. We had one issue on research methods, if it's a science, risk sciences, where are the research methods, and these are actually interspersed with all the courses on the certificate, which we were satisfied with.

SWANSON: We have a motion from the committee. Would anyone like to speak in favor or disfavor of the motion?

FINKEL: Raphael Finkel, College of Engineering.

You said that all the courses will be offered online. Will there be any direct communication between faculty and students in a synchronist fashion?

HIPPISLEY: The synchronicity will be the weekend seminars. So the students will come in on the weekends. I wonder if the director of this program is here?

BELL: Shari Veil, Risk Sciences, College of Communication and Information.

The courses, the three courses that are new are hybrid courses so there is seat time in the weekend seminar as well as online. (Inaudible) depending on projects that we're working on at the time.

For example, you can't do an online interaction for a simulated press conference to handle a crisis. So there will be

interaction most definitely in those courses.
And like I said, all the courses have been offered (inaudible) already in seat time so we're using the faculty (inaudible).

SWANSON: Other comments, questions or concerns? All right.
We'll go ahead and vote. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

HIPPI SLEY: Thank you. This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new minor, Visual Studies, in the Department of Art within the College of Fine Arts.

In fact, this is a change that will parallel a change that must be made in the BA from an Art History to an Art History and Visual Studies BA.

These changes are connected to the growing importance of visual media. Visual studies, by the way, examines production and consumption of images, objects, and events in diverse cultures within a global context.

21 credits, 7 courses selected from five different categories. Some of these categories are Introduction 101, which is and introduction to visual studies, everyone does that.

A course from a Global Art category, for example, African Art. A course from an Art form category, for example, three dimension form, an Art History and Visual Studies course, which must be at least the 300 level, and then finally a category which is three courses from different areas which can be Digital Video Symbols in Culture and even Russian Culture.

All these courses already exist. There's no new resource overhead. That's it.

SWANSON: We have a motion on the floor. Would anyone like to speak in favor or disfavor of the motion?

All right. We'll go for a vote. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

HIPPI SLEY: Third one. This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new graduate certificate, Stream and Watershed Science in the Department of Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering.

To fully understand how to manage stream and watershed systems you need to see the connection to engineering, policy management, biological systems and social systems. So an interdisciplinary approach is what's needed and that's what the certificate will provide.

The connection of four courses will give multiple perspectives on the same set of issues and in this regard will constitute a program unique in the Commonwealth and actually rare nationally.

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt

All courses are all three credits. There's an introductory course and one from three primary focus areas and that gives it the interdisciplinary flavor. (Inaudible), and water quality and policy management. Two courses must be from outside the student's major.

The program (inaudible) the affiliated faculty are drawn from a wide range of programs that include Agriculture and Economics, Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering, the Center for Applied Energy Research, Chemistry, Civil Engineering, Earth and Environmental Sciences, Economics, Forestry, Geography, Plant and Soil Sciences.

My committee's opinion was this was what this what a certificate should be, well-motivated, meaningful and interdisciplinary.

SWANSON:

We have a motion on the floor. Would anybody like to speak in favor or against the motion?

All right. We'll go for a vote. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

HIPPI SLEY:

This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new minor, Neuroscience in the Department of Biology within the College of Arts and Sciences.

Neuroscience is the study of the nervous system from a range of perspectives, from memory approaches to animal behavior, and plays an important societal role by shedding light on the reason research is needed for cures.

All this has led to a staggering membership of the professional body. The Society for Neuroscience has over 40,000 members and there are numerous degree programs nationwide. Crucially every top 20 university has a graduate degree program in this area.

Given this and the expertise of the UK faculty, the proposers think it's about time we had a Neuroscience of our own, program of our own, and in fact this minor is being proposed as the initial step towards a major degree. But even as a minor it can give our students an important preparation for Neuroscience graduate programs.

There are 18 credits making up the minor, all courses already exist except for one, BIO 302, Introduction to Neurobiology, which is being proposed and approved.

The 18 credits map out the six courses, distribution as follows: a prerequisite to the minor BIO 152 or the equivalent, the new introduction to Neuroscience. Or you can do the PSY 312 Brain and Behavior course so that the psychology students can have entry into the program.

There are four electives including

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
courses like ANA 605, Principles of
Neurobiology, the CAG 580 Topics in Chemistry
series, as long as it has an emphasis on
Neuroscience, and a PSY Drugs and Behavior or
BIO 650 Animal Physiology Laboratory.

SWANSON: We have a motion on the floor.
Would anyone like to speak for or against the
motion?

All right. We'll go for a vote.
All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained?
Motion carries. Thank you.

HIPPISLEY: All right. This fifth one is a
recommendation that the University Senate
approve the establishment of a new
undergraduate certificate, Global Scholars,
in the Gatton College of Business and
Economics.

Actually the reason for this
proposal is to formalize the program of
study that already exists, in fact, has
existed since 2006.

The aim of this certificate is to
professionalize students, to train them in
business such as expected (inaudible)
communication skills in a global perspective.

The target audience are high
achieving incoming students, specifically the
Gatton freshman, and these are GPA 3.5
students with an ACT of at least 28 or an SAT
of 1240.

And also these students should be
in parallel in pursuing an international
business minor.

The focus is on business acumen and
leadership skills. There's going to be some
co-curricular requirements, for example,
Professionals in Workshop Series, Community
Service, and meetings with successful alums.

There are 18 credits distributed
across freshman to junior year. So some of
these are Freshman UK 101 with a dedicated
section to Academic Orientation, that's a
dedicated section for this particular
certificate, B&E 120 Leadership in the Global
Marketplace, B&E 122 Challenges of
Leadership.

At the sophomore level, B&E 240
Intercultural Business Communication and B&E
327 Larger World Issues in Business.

The junior year students study
abroad, ISP 599 and a business or economics
class taken abroad, 3 credits.

The senior year students will have
to do MGT Marketing 499 Strategic Management.

SWANSON: We have a motion on the floor.
Would anyone like to speak for or against the
motion?

We'll go for a vote. All those in
favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries.
Thank you.

HIPPISLEY: This is a recommendation that the
University Senate approve the establishment
of a new - I think that should be graduate

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt
certificate Rehabilitation Counseling in the
Department of Special Education and
Rehabilitation Counseling within the College
of Education.

A rehabilitation counselor helps
people with physical, emotional, and
cognitive needs to have maximal independence,
employability, and general (inaudible) which
involves assessing clients needs, designing
and implementing rehab programs which include
counseling, appropriate training and job
placement.

So why is the program being
proposed? There's an increasing need for
such a service to be performed by qualified
vocational rehab counselors, but many of
those in these positions currently do not
meet the state approved certification
guidelines.

So the certificate will provide the
extra training required to certify
rehabilitation counselors, primarily for
those already in rehab counseling positions.

The target audience are primarily
graduate degree holders who already working
rehab in some capacity who requires special
certification.

And this is a direct response to
the Commission of Rehabilitation Counseling
who have recently added flexibility into the
rules for certification by allowing holders
of various degrees to sit for the exam.

The degrees could be Behavioral
Health, Behavioral Science, Disability
Science, Human Relations, Human Services,
Marriage and Family Therapy, and Occupational
Therapy, et cetera.

The target is about 10 to 15
students per year. The program is designed
in accordance with commission requirements,
that means the 18 credits cover six courses
which address these various competency
(inaudible) techniques of counseling,
foundations of rehab counseling, assessment,
occupational information, medical and
cultural aspects of disability and community
resources.

This program is entirely based on
courses that already exist and are being
used, part of them are being used for the
existing Masters degree. 100 percent online.

There are no resource issue
because all the courses exist as do the
instructors.

SWANSON: There's a motion on the floor.
Would anyone like to speak for or against the
motion?

FINKEL: I have two questions. First --
SWANSON: Raphael Finkel.

FINKEL: Yeah, Raphael Finkel, Engineering.
100 percent online. The same
question I asked before. What sort of
contact is there synchronistly with

instructors for the courses for these 18 credits?

HIPPISLEY: I'd like to suggest Professor Crystal --

CRYSTAL: Ralph Crystal.
We have established these courses at times when faculty would be available to communicate with students with office hours online. So --

FINKEL: So the answer is purely office hours.

CRYSTAL: Office hours as well as availability to have chat rooms and discussions with students.

FINKEL: In that case I'd like to speak against this. I believe that it's a bad precedent for the Senate to except any program, certificate or otherwise, where all the contact hours are non-synchronous and that the only way to talk to an instructor is through office hours or through chat rooms.

I think it's a bad precedent. I think we're moving towards the University of Phoenix model where we try to raise money by having the cheapest possible kinds of courses.

I'm not saying that these particular courses are poor, or badly thought out, but I think we ought not approve something which is purely 100 percent online with no direct contact with an instructor except through chat rooms and office hours.

CONNORS: I understand the --

BROTHERS: Name please.

CONNORS: I'm sorry, Lisa Connors, Communication and Information.

We do have programs already that offer some non-synchronous (inaudible).

DUNCAN: Marilyn Duncan, College of Medicine.

I'm a member of the Senate Academic Program Committee and this is an issue that's come up quite a bit in our discussion with other courses, is how much online instruction is part of course and how much is appropriate. And this is an issue we want to come back to in the committee to discuss and possibly bring to the Senate.

We thought, our committee thought in this particular case, this particular program, this was probably one of the best examples you can think of, of a program that we deemed appropriate to have it be completely online.

The students are currently working in many positions throughout the state, but they're required to get this advanced training in order to keep their job. And there's a tremendous need for these people to be in these jobs. There are many openings throughout the state needing new kinds of workers.

What was also pointed out to us by

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
some of the people who teach in the program was that because the students are online, they can communicate and share ideas and share experiences with people through a number of different (inaudible).

So their chat rooms allow them to learn more than they might learn if they'd be in a classroom on campus with say 30 students or something because in a class they're sharing ideas and exchanging thoughts with students in a variety of situations. (Inaudible).

So they're actually getting perhaps a broader experience than they might have in a classroom. I think you bring up an important point, we'd like to discuss the issue and (inaudible).

SWANSON:

J. S. ?

BUTLER:

J. S. Butler, Parliamentarian.

The agenda as well as the statement there includes post-graduate. If we're to change this to graduate I request the Chair to do something about changing the wording you - so I'm confused as to what we're voting on because the word post-graduate appeared everywhere.

HIPPI SLEY:

Sure. So this is a better view of the committee's proposal which went to Senate Council, and the Senate Council who instructed the committee to reword it as -- you remember this - as a graduate certificate.

GROSSMAN:

I remember the discussion, but I don't remember the outcome.

HIPPI SLEY:

It was agreed. Professor Crystal agrees that that was okay.

SWANSON:

Could we have an amendment from the floor then? Could you just amend? Could you just make an amendment to that motion, please? Somebody? Or do you just want to look at me.

DUNCAN:

(Inaudible).

SWANSON:

Pardon?

DUNCAN:

Jeannine Blackwell and some other people told us this was in line with what's considered post-graduate.

HIPPI SLEY:

I'm trying to remember, we have to change the words.

SWANSON:

Davy, can you help us out?

JONES:

Yeah. CPE, there's no category called post-graduate certificate. There are undergraduate certificates, there are graduate certificates. Behind the graduate certificate is called a post-baccalaureate certificate.

Now the internal professional agency, accreditation body, they have a nomenclature they call I think a post-graduate certificate. But the purpose of us - we're the final approval body, we're approving a graduate certificate, not something that's officially called a post-graduate certificate.

HI PPI SLEY: I'm remembering now the exact wording. It was a post-bac graduate certificate.

SWANSON: Post-bac graduate certificate?
Would somebody -

UNI DENTI FIED: Post-baccal aureate graduate certificate.

SWANSON: Would somebody like to make a motion?

UNI DENTI FIED: Yeah. I'd like to move that we change this to (inaudible).

SWANSON: Would somebody like to second that?
No?

WASI LKOWSKI : Wasilkowski , Engineering.
SWANSON: Discussion on the amendment?

WOOD: According to the University Senate rules, and I believe I'm paraphrasing what Davy just said, we only have graduate certificate.
And it was the reason why we do have the clause in there that says that this will be reported to CPE as a post-baccal aureate certificate is to meet the reporting requirements of CPE, but according to the Senate rules, we only have undergraduate and graduate certificate.

GROSSMAN: Yeah. And some of this is starting to come back to me as well.

SWANSON: Is that the meeting I was gone?

GROSSMAN: I was trying to remember. We're moving awfully fast. The post-graduate I believe was what you guys originally proposed all in the post-graduate. And so what we are going to pass here, assuming it passes, is it will be a graduate certificate, but the name of it, to make it clear, all the people who were (inaudible), I seem to remember that the name of it would be called post-graduate certificate.

CRYSTAL: We have to comply with CPE reporting requirement, it's a post-bac certificate.

GROSSMAN: Which is why there's that parenthetical statement.

SWANSON: Connie?

WOOD: With all due respect, I'll beg to differ. At Senate Council, we agreed to call this a graduate certificate with Dean Blackwell's blessing, and (inaudible) on to the Senate rules and then reported to CPE as a post-baccal aureate certificate.

SWANSON: So we have a motion on the floor to amend the motion. Would you like to withdraw that motion? All right. That motion is withdrawn. Could I have a new motion to make the proper amendment, please?

GROSSMAN: All right. I move that we delete, that we change the word post-graduate in the proposal there to graduate.

SWANSON: Is there a second to the amendment?
Connie Wood.
All right. All those - discussion on the amendment? All those in favor of the

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt
amendment? Opposed? Abstained? Motion
carries.

We are back to the original
amendment.

FINKEL: Raphael Finkel, Engineering.
As I understand the rules for
a graduate certificate, the students who are
allowed to come into it, we have to specify.
Typically, it's specified as either currently
enrolled graduate students or enrolled post-
baccalaureate students.

You didn't mention who would be
eligible to join this certificate. Is that
clear?

HIPPISLEY: A subset of graduate degree
holders. And this subset are those who got
degrees in a list which I started including
behavioral health, behavioral science, and so
on.

FINKEL: That doesn't correspond to my
understanding that usually we require that
they be enrolled either as graduate students
or enrolled as post-bac students.

Do we need to say something about
that?

SWANSON: Do you have a response to that,
Ralph?

CRYSTAL: These are the students who will be
post-baccalaureate. The students will have
master's degrees in related fields in
rehabilitation health. So they would come in
as post-bac students. (Inaudible) of under-
graduate students but the certification for
(inaudible) that they also have master's
degree in a related area. For all purposes,
I believe, they will be post-baccalaureate
students.

SWANSON: Other questions, issues, comments?
YOST: Scott Yost, College of Engineering.
(Inaudible), I'm just curious. This is kind
of an in-between thing. I'm speaking in
random thoughts here in context of this is
not a degree program. A certificate is not a
degree program, it's just a certificate.

But the comment was made that we
have other programs that are purely 100
percent online. And then I guess I have a
question to give us a couple of examples of
degree programs that are purely 100 percent
online to distinguish from courses.

And I know we have courses that are
purely 100 percent online that are
asynchronous, but I do agree that this is -
there are complete programs that are totally
asynchronous, I'm curious what they are.
This one may be okay (inaudible). But I am
concerned about the total program being
asynchronous.

COLLINS: Belva Collins, I'm Chair of the
Department of Special Education and Rehab
Counseling.
(Inaudible). Well, but we already
have a graduate certificate (inaudible).

YOST: A certificate?
COLLINS: A certificate. (Inaudible).
YOST: Purely asynchronous, online?
CRYSTAL: We've had this for eight years now,
eight and a half years.
GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Arts and Sciences.
I think you're maybe
misunderstanding some of the terminology.
Program, the word program includes
in it both degree programs and certificates.
So I imagine that the vast majority of the
programs that are totally online would be
certificate programs, not degree programs.
Although, apparently there's at least one
degree program.
COLLINS: There are two. I know that we have
at least one other certificate program.
SWANSON: Other questions, issues? We'll go
ahead and vote then. All those in favor?
Opposed? One, two, three? Abstained? One.
Motion carries. Thank you.
HIPPI SLEY: I'm going to yield the floor to my
Vice-Chair because I've got a conflict of
interest in this one.
DUNCAN: This is a recommendation that the
University Senate approve a new Master's of
Arts program in Linguistic Theory and
Typology which is going to be offered, or
would like to be offered, by the Department
of English in the College of Arts and
Sciences.
This new program will focus on
theoretical linguistics, which is the
knowledge of language and the human
characteristic and ability and also on the
linguistic typology, which is understanding
the similarities and differences among
languages.
So this program will take advantage
of an internationally recognized faculty
already here at UK. We had (inaudible) in
the field of morphology, including formal and
computational methods for the analysis of
linguistic data.
And also there would be another
focus to the program on sociolinguistics
which is a subdiscipline that models language
variation and change based on sociocultural
variables such as age, class, gender, region
and ethnicity, and thus investigates the
relationship of language structure and forms
of cultural expression.
And UK has grown in reputation in
this area as well with a focus on dialect in
Southeastern United States, especially
Kentucky.
Now there's three main reasons why
they want to offer this program. One is that
most linguistic programs offer a graduate as
well as undergraduate degree, so in fact UK
is unique in offering only the undergraduate
program.

And if they can Masters degree,

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
they will be in line with the standards of
their field and with our benchmark
institutions.

Also this will be a new opportunity
for the citizens of Kentucky because at
present there is no graduate program in
linguistics here in the state. Also the
students would then be prepared to
participate in the global job market with
career opportunities in a number of areas
including the high tech industry, legal
consultation, and government positions with
agencies including the CIA, as well as
communications in healthcare.

So this program will be housed in
the Department of English, with most of their
faculty doing about 90 percent of the
teaching and they will also supply all of the
TA lines of which there are seven.

The program will have two tracks,
one in morphology and one in
sociolinguistics.

Both programs would have a
prerequisite of six hours in foreign language
as well as a basic course in linguistics,
either linguistics 211 at UK or an equivalent
course from another institution.

The degree will require 30 hours
of course work. There will be 9 foundational
courses in phonetics, phonology, morphology,
and these are already online and currently
being taught.

There will also be 6 credits from
research methods and research seminars in
linguistic theory and typology, and 15
credits at least at the 600 and 700 level,
and these courses would advance the
foundations in this field.

And many of these courses are
already offered. Some of them will be
offered as a special (inaudible) with
variable topics and teachers on different
semesters.

We thought this program was very
well organized and put together, the learning
outcomes were well-described and seemed
appropriate. It seems likely that the
students would have attained a set of
transferrable skills that would be valuable
in a variety of careers, as already
mentioned, when they finish this program.

This program has a director, a
steering committee including all the faculty
participating in the program, and the
steering committee would have a nice plan in
place also for evaluating and developing the
program including outreach student support
and TA support was administration.

The initial program director will
be the DGS, but the committee may later chose
another one.

In general, our committee was
enthusiastic about this application. We

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
thought it was organized and thorough and very clearly presented. The rationale is strong. And the resources were already in place.

It had no online courses and so it's unanimous.

SWANSON: We have a motion on the floor. Would anyone like to speak for or against the motion?

All right. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

The next item of business is Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee, Professor Herman Farrell, Chair.

FARRELL: Thank you, Hollie. First as a point of personal privilege, I would like to thank the committee for their hard work this entire year. And I'd like to thank Hollie Swanson for her support of the committee's work throughout the year and especially this last semester.

I've had the opportunity to observe many really great leaders throughout my life, governors and mayors, and Hollie is one of the great ones. I appreciate all of the support.

Going on first to the name change for the Department of Nutrition and Food Science.

Basically this is a simple name change from the Department of Nutrition and Food Science to the Department of Dietetics and Human Nutrition.

This proposal was supported by the entire faculty with unanimous approval in October of 2011. Faculty council as well. Subsequently, also in October, the Chairs of the College of Agriculture, the School of Human Environmental Sciences faculty, voted 32 to 1 in favor of it. And the COA graduate curriculum faculty also unanimously approved it.

The Associate Deans and the Chair, Interim Chair of the Department, Dr. Sandra Bastinalso fully support the name change.

We reviewed it carefully, went back and asked Jim Geddes, who facilitated the proposal through our committee, we asked him to check with other educational units that might have similar names.

He wrote back to us that he checked with Lisa Cassis, the Chair of the Graduate Center for Nutritional Sciences, and he's (inaudible) instructor for Clinical Nutrition, regarding the proposed name change and neither indicated any objection, and then we therefore voted for the proposal unanimously.

SWANSON: Okay. We have a motion on the floor. Would anyone like to speak for or against the motion?

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt

All those in favor? Opposed?
Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

FARRELL: The next issue is from the Department of Art. This was a name change, and what we noted was also a structural change, going from the Department of Art to the School of Art and Visual Studies.

I'll note for the record that my colleague fellow, Chair Hippisley, stepped back because of conflict of interest and I hadn't prepared anybody within my committee to come forward.

I am a member of the College of Fine Arts and this is not my department, but when the time came to vote on this issue, I recused myself from the vote. I would share that information with you.

The Department of Art voted unanimously on January 13, 2012 to change its name (inaudible) to the School of Art and Visual Studies. As soon as we got the proposal several of us piped up and wondered whether we should be treating this as a simple name change or whether it was a structural change.

Michael Kilgore, who facilitated the conversation, got a hold of Davy Jones to ask him questions about what is the difference in terms of structure between both of those educational units, the school and college, and he revealed back there is really no change, no difference other than the faculty called the leader a director or chair.

And this is an issue that we are going to take up next year to address better.

JONES: A school can house departments, but a department can't house other departments.

FARRELL: Right. And this would be moving from being a department to a school. I'll note also that within the College of Fine Arts presently there's a School of Music as well as Department (inaudible) of Art (inaudible).

In Dr. Ben Withers proposal to us he outlined a couple of factors with regard to the academic merits, notably that looking at UK's benchmark institutions, they found that the overwhelming majority of their peers do not use department and that six identified their units as schools.

And essentially there was a little bit of concern about the voting within the college itself. The College of Fine Arts does not meet together as a congress.

It has an advisory committee represented by faculty members, two from each, each of the educational units within the college and they voted unanimously to support this proposal so there's no problems there.

And again this issue of perhaps in having a college congress and voting on

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
matters is something that will be (inaudible)
next year.

SWANSON: We have a motion on the floor.
Would anyone like to speak for or against the
motion?

CHARNI GO: Richard Charnigo, Public Health.
Just a minor point, the display
reads School Art rather than School of Art.
Since this is a name change we probably want
to get that right. Do we need a formal
amendment to that?

SWANSON: Yes, we do.

CHARNI GO: Okay. I move that we change School
Art to School of Art and Visual Studies.

SWANSON: Thank you. Second?

ANDERSON: Second.

SWANSON: All those in - discussion? All
those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Thank
you.

Would we like comments on the
amendment of the original motion? All
right. All those in favor? Opposed?
Abstained? Thank you. Motion carries.

FARRELL: Next up is again a name change from
the Department of Special Education and
Rehabilitation Counseling to the Department
of Early Childhood, Special Education and
Rehabilitation Counseling.

I'll read from the proposal, the
answers to our guideline questions from the
-- from Belva Collins, the Chair of the unit.

The name change came as a request
from the interdisciplinary early childhood
program. In the fall of 2011 the EDSRC Chair
charged a committee made up of program
faculty Chairs to propose potential name
changes that better reflect the department
and its programs with the direction to make
the new name as inclusive for all programs as
possible.

The committee then went forward and
faculty voted on the issue on the Department
of Early Childhood Special Education and
Rehabilitation Counseling because this name
clearly identifies each of the programs in
the EDSRC, and it lists them in the order in
which they address disabilities and life span
(inaudible).

After the faculty vote the Chair
presented the name to the dean and the
colleges and faculty Chairs. There was no
objection from the Council of Chairs, the
name request went forward with the deans
approval and again this went forward to our
committee. I think we had one person abstain
because of conflict of interest (inaudible),
unanimous support.

SWANSON: Would anyone like to speak for or
against the motion?

JONES: Is the name Department of Early
Childhood Education or is it Early Childhood?

FARRELL: It should be Early Childhood,
Special Education, and Rehabilitation

Counseling according to the proposal that was submitted to us.

SWANSON: Do we have anybody from the (inaudible) here?

COLLINS: (Inaudible).

SWANSON: Could you read the correct word, please? It should be - is it correct? It is correct. All right, thank you. Any other comments, questions?

All right. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

FARRELL: Our last motion make take a few moments to go through. We'll have reports from myself as well as from Hollie Swanson on the issue.

Essentially, December 5th the proposal for restructuring of the School of Management in the Gatton College of Business and Economics was presented to the University Senate and January 30th I met with Interim Senior Associate, Dean Troske and Interim Dean Merl Hackbart, as well as Lee Blonder and Hollie Swanson and Davy Jones, to go over the proposal.

Essentially what the proposal involves, the parts to it that are not very complicated is simply the movement from the School of Management which is within the Gatton College of Business and Economics. And it's one school within it, there's another school (inaudible), and there's a Department of Economics.

This is really focused only on the School of Management and going from what was four units identified as Decision Sciences, Finance, Marketing, and Management to three units, Finance and Quantitative Methods, Management, and a third being Marketing and Supply Chain.

February 6th, those two deans met with the committee and we had some follow-up questions, we received those follow-up questions on February 21st, and because of the responses we then called for Hollie Swanson and Lee Blonder to meet with us.

We had some concerns about the responses, and essentially what the problems were was that one that the proposal had referred to the initial vote on the restructuring within the School of Management as being (inaudible) by the college, by the faculty of the SOM.

Once we could give an action to vote, what we found was that 42 School of Management faculty voted -- 42 School of Management faculty members were eligible to vote, 27 actually voted on the issue.

Of the 27, 13 voted for this reorganization into three departments, 7 voted in favor of reorganizing into four departments, 5 voted for staying the same and one voted abstaining. And one voted for what

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt
was called (inaudible) for reorganization of
the School of Management.

And note that what was involved in
all this also was the potential evolution of
the School of Management and move into other
units, (inaudible).

The question really on the table
was whether you go to from three units to
four units, three departments and four units.
And we noted rather quickly that 13 people
had voted for the three departments while 7
had voted for four departments and 5 had
voted for the same, which would have
maintained the four units. So it was 13/12
vote, was still a plurality and not a
majority of the 27 faculty members who had
actually voted.

We also had views of
dissenters had to centers in our initial
request. Something that we put in our
guidelines, we are interested in not only
knowing the votes, we are interested in
knowing the dissent and actually (inaudible),
what's the issues involved.

We were told that the person who
was giving us the report said to speculate on
the rationale of those voting against it
would be (inaudible). It was subsequently
found that there was documentation from the
people who had voted against the proposal
that that came a little bit later.

We were also told in this response
that there was a PAPPAS report, a report from
an outside consultant that had supported this
move towards a three department structure.
And when we just simply looked at the PAPPAS
report, we found that that was not the case.

The PAPPAS report called for a
reorganization of Gattton College, and not
necessarily the School of Management, into
six departments, including the one unit that
was going to end up being divided up which
was Decision Science.

In the PAPPAS report they included
them in the six units that they would
consider to be worthy of continuing on in a
restructuring. So we had issues with that.

We also asked for the stated
rationale of 13 faculty members who had voted
against the suspension of the Analytics
major, that had sort of been packaged
together with this entire proposal.

That Analytics major suspension
proposal went around us and went to the
Senate Council and Senate Council voted to
support it. In response to our question, can
you tell us a little bit about why that
faculty voted against, 13 members voted
against that change, suspension, we were told
that it's not an adequate discussion so we
didn't send it on to the Senate Council.

So as a result of all of this, Lee
Blonder and Hollie Swanson made a few

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
suggestions to us. One is that we consult with the Faculty Council of Gatton College as well as the University Senate, Senators from Gatton, and bring them in to sort of talk with them about what's going on since we were having some issues with regard to forthrightness coming from the Gatton College Leadership.

Hollie also suggested that we go back again and do the follow-up questions and that's what we did. We did both things at the same time.

Subsequently when we met with the faculty colleagues about a week later, a couple of documents popped up. The key one was this vote count which included those dissenting voices and why they were actually opposed to the change. And notably they were saying they hoped to spare this Decision Sciences unit that was going to be eliminated.

Then also the issue of the transfers. Once the decision is made with regard to the changing of going from a four unit school down to three unit departments with one unit being broken up, the question was well how is that going to happen, how the transfer was going to take place.

And so we unpacked a lot of that and we discovered that at least two faculty members were not happy about where they were headed. They were consulted briefly, but they ended up being sent into unit that was unrelated to their field.

And there were other faculty members as well that were sent into other departments but they had sort of made peace with that process.

So then essentially what happened after that was we got responses back to our follow-up questions, we discovered that we needed to hold an open hearing on this because this involved a significant reduction, transfer of units and/or the closing of a unit.

So we went ahead and held an open hearing downstairs on March 30th, and immediately at the beginning of the meeting, the Senior Interim Associate Dean Troske came forward in his opening statements that there would be no impact on students and no change in graduate programs.

We took those issues to task. Rather quickly there was actually a memo or two memos that I had identified indicating that there was a clear relationship between what was going on in terms of changing the education unit structure and the academic programs, a change in the graduate degree program, the PhD concentration from Decision Sciences.

In that discussion we also learned that this Analytic major is under review, but

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt

what came also was that the Analytic major itself was revamped in the last two years, matter of fact, the Senate Council last year voted to approve a change in the structure of the academic program.

The faculty of the DSIS reviewing, addressing some of the concerns about size, of number of majors, and number of students taking the courses and trying to revamp the curriculum and did so. And then they were subsequently told that one major itself would be suspended and there were other issues with regard to even the faculty itself who would supervise that major being dispersed.

And so all that came to the floor in this discussion, about five faculty members from this unit came to the meeting. Over the course of the months there were a couple of emails that I received where I was asked to sort of take information confidentially and I had some colloquy with Hollie about how to do that.

My gut instinct was to get, just to hear it, but not rely upon it. I think we need to be open and transparent about everything that we do here. This is somewhat affecting personnel decisions, but this is also affecting the academic core of our University and we should be able to talk about everything.

Eventually what happened was all those faculty came out and they came forward and put themselves on the line. Many of them were leery about coming forward, they were concerned about some form of retaliation, and they thought that this thing, this train had already left the station, at this point to complain about it, express concerns about it would upset the apple cart. I'm bouncing around metaphors, but that was essentially what was relayed to us.

One of the things that I asked in the hearing is what is the impact on the faculty and that's when they talked about their transfers affecting them, and those two in particular came forward to talk about that impact.

They talked about the problems going forward with this with promotion and tenure because you have graduate students who maybe you're (inaudible) with them, have to go over to another department or vice versa in order to move forward (inaudible) faculty.

I asked the question would any of you feel that this has affected your professional status (inaudible) and the first response was no, I've got family here, we're not going anywhere. But then subsequently one faculty emailed me after the meeting, when we had opened it up for responses after the meeting if there's any follow-up, and he said yes, if I didn't have this family concern I would probably be going elsewhere

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt
as a result of this impact, this change in structure.

So essentially those were the items that were brought forth to us. We received emails in support of the proposal from the Gatton College faculty as well as emails in opposition to it.

We also received some documents with regard to the academic impact and this issue of a benchmark institution and I'll get to that in a moment.

So then we met on April 2nd, basically three days after the open hearing to deliberate. And we were hoping to present the entire decision by our group to the Senate Council that day, we were being urged to do so by the Gatton College of Leadership, and we were doing our best to at least get through our process.

But after deliberations on that Monday morning, April 2nd, we reviewed all the factors that are sent forth in the Senate Council rules, under the Senate rules. Now we just changed the Senate Rule recently, but we were operating under the old rules. But even under the new rules, the factors could be quite similar because there are lots of things in consideration, other factors would incorporate issues (inaudible).

So that's what we did. We sat down and we went through the list of the factors one by one and we ticked them off. And we voted in the end on the two avenues. One was voting on the academic merits and voting on the non-academic merits.

And when we came to the vote on the academic merits we noted that the only evidence that has been presented to us from the Gatton College Leadership was this issue of comparison of benchmarks.

And we took a look at that list and it was comprehensive, but problematic because it didn't really address the core issue which was the elimination of the Decision Sciences unit. What we were seeing was that across the board it had benchmark institutions, Decision Science units were still extant, some in educational units within a school and some in departments of their own, but they were still extant.

We had - we incurred some evidence that this was considered to be a failure in the field. We were (inaudible), we weren't given any actual evidence of that.

I actually asked the question pointedly during the open hearing has there been elimination of a - of this similar educational unit in the last couple of years and actually it was the dissenting professor, (inaudible) who raised his hand and said yes, there was one Decision Sciences unit that was eliminated, terminated, I don't know exactly what it was, a couple years ago. But he said

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt
it had a lot to do with the tech bubble and (inaudible). We were given no other evidence of any other of elimination of an educational unit.

So we factored that in. We also took a look at the evidence that was presented to us by the (inaudible) as we call them, about the doctoral programs, and through Decision Sciences and Information Studies and how it was a top 18 recognized unit, so within the top 20 goals of our University.

They (inaudible) 29 doctoral graduates had gone on to prestigious careers. We also were given evidence of that the DSIS group itself had received numerous citations and observations of merit and were listed in the top 20 rank. And those are still I think on the website.

So factoring all that in, we voted five to one to not endorse based on the academic merits.

We then went on to the non-academic merits and we had all those issues about governance and the way the votes were presented earlier in April to the School of Management.

We did note that the School of Management's vote was subsequently ratified by the entire Gatton College leadership in November, the Gatton College, and that included the School of Management faculty.

There was a large number of people who voted (inaudible) acknowledged that this was subsequently ratified. But then there's still this concern that maybe this was a (inaudible) things had sort of moved on, that we weren't sure that there was really a fair vote.

And then we also raised the simple issue, which we have never got an answer on, of a satisfactory answer on, was the issue of cost, very simply.

Going from four educational units, uncompensated unit directors within the School of Management, to now three department Chairs, we assume that. We were told that it was revenue neutral, which I find it hard to understand how that could be possible.

So the vote there on voting to not endorse the non-academic merits was six to nothing. And then we went to the Senate Council.

SWANSON:

On April 2nd, the Chair of the SAOSC committee, Herman Farrell, presented the findings of this committee to the Senate Council. After considerable deliberations the Senate Council voted to table the motion from the SAOSC Committee to allow for the Gatton College to address the concerns raised by the committee.

The Senate Council is particularly concerned with the governance process

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt
specifically, let the Gatton College revisit the voting process to be ensure that it is fair and allow for fully informed vote by all faculty members.

Gatton Dean David Blackwell had upheld a special meeting of the faculty in the School of Management on April 19, which I attended. Here he presented the background of the proposed changes and reported on the concerns raised by the SAOSC committee.

These concerns as well as the criteria used by the committee that includes an evaluation of the academic merits of the proposed changes were discussed.

Dean Blackwell outlined the voting process that would then be undertaken and encouraged all to participate. 30 of the 43 School Of Management faculty members were in attendance.

The minutes of this meeting were taken by the Gatton Faculty College Faculty Council Chair, Bob Ramsey, who also supervised and coordinated the voting process. An electronic ballot was circulated to the faculty that clearly described the proposed organizational changes. 40 of the 43 School of Management faculty voted. 27 voted in favor of the three departments. 8 in favor of the four departments. And 5 in favor of retaining the current structure.

The faculty members of the Gatton College were then asked to either endorse or not endorse the recommendation of the School of Management to organize into three academic departments.

Of the 85 faculty members, 72 participated. 63 voted to endorse while 9 voted to not endorse the proposal. The transfer of the majors in the Gatton College was then considered by the Undergraduate Council.

The Undergraduate Council voted in favor of transferring the bachelors in business administration degrees from the School of Management to the three new departments in the Gatton College.

The recommendations of the SAOSC and the Undergraduate Council as well as the response from the Gatton College was then considered by the Senate Council on April 30th.

Would you want to talk about the response from the committee?

FARRELL:

Right. So then the response from the committee when we heard about this re-vote was twofold.

The first part was that on April 12th, Dean Blackwell had sent out a letter noting that the concerns of the SAOSC would be that (inaudible) subsequent vote.

My problem with that letter was that it only revealed part of our concerns, the governance issues, but it didn't really

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
talk about the academic impact, merit
academic core issues.

And I didn't get even wind of that
letter going out on April 12th until April
18th, the night before the vote was going to
take place.

I immediately sent out an email to
Hollie saying hold on a second, maybe they
should consider the academic merits as well
and they should take into consideration all
the factors that we took into consideration,
here's all my documentation, reams of them, I
forwarded them and Hollie did forward them
on.

The problem with the vote itself,
it took place. Essentially what happened,
what appears to have happened, and I wasn't
there, I admit I wasn't there. But what
appeared to have happened is that the issues
of academic merit was inflated into the issue
of governance and it was just supposed to be
one vote.

In fact, on the record there's a
statement, I think it was Dean Troske saying,
well, when you're voting, you're going to be
voting on academic consideration.

And then that also that same night
that I had been informed about some of the
problems with it, an email had gone out from
Steve Skinner, the Interim Director of the
School of Management where he stated, quote,
unquote, as Dean Blackwell indicated in his
April 12th memorandum, the specific purpose is
to explain the need for the re-vote, clarify
the reorganization options, and have
discussion of those options, in bold, this is
the single agenda item for the meeting. Back
to regular script, please note the discussion
will be limited to how we arrive at re-vote
new vote or clarification of a pre-proposed
departmental structures. The merits of the
proposals are not items for discussion.

And so I raised these issues when I
went before the Senate Council basically
suggesting that they had given what I refer
to as lip service to the academic
considerations.

I raised the point that I had just
gone through tenure review and also served on
the search committee where we went through
the metrics and I'm sure they went through
the metrics for my tenure review.

When I was on the search committee
we went through and ticked off everything,
all the factors that we would be taking into
consideration when we're considering the
academic merits of a particular person who's
going out for program director, and it seems
like that process has been sort of set aside
within all of this process.

I'm sure the dean may want to
respond to that, but that's essentially our
take on it and so we have stood by our votes

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
against endorsing this proposal.

(Inaudible) in light of the fact that they had gone back and had this session and had this new vote, what's your take on it, and I said I have no problems now with the non-academic merits of it.

I have no problems with the non-academic merits of it, (inaudible) I still stand opposed to it (inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED: Speak up.

FARRELL: I'm sorry. I apologize.

SWANSON: The Senate Council considered all of these deliberations and moved to endorse the proposed restructuring of the School of Management and the four areas in Analytics, Finance, Management and Marketing, to three departments, Department of Finance and Quantitative Methods, Department of Management, and Department of Marketing and Supply Chain effective upon approval of the Board of Trustees. The motion passed.

There was some confusion about the degrees. The Gatton College web page lists information about a PhD in Decision Sciences and Information Systems, no longer accepting candidates for '12/'13.

However, Gatton administrators explained that there are only two doctoral degrees in Gatton, the PhD in Business Administration and the PhD in Economics. The website refers to concentrations in various areas, not actual PhDs.

The Senate Council also voted to endorse the following transfers in ownership, the BBA in Pre-finance and Finance to the Department of Finance and Quantitative Methods, the BBA in Pre-analytics and Analytics to the Department of Finance and Quantitative Methods, the BBA in Pre-management and Management to the Department of Management, and the BBA in Pre-marketing and Marketing to the Department of Marketing and Supply Chain effective upon approval by the Board of Trustees.

The Senate Council thanked Herman and the members of the committee for their hard work on the restructuring proposal. The Senate Council members agreed that the SAOSC review of the restructuring proposal was extremely thorough.

So we now have a motion on the floor. Would anyone like to speak in favor or against the motion?

BROTHERS: Can you state the motion for the transcript?

SWANSON: May I restate the motion? The recommendation from the Senate Council that the Senate endorse the proposed restructuring of the School of Management and the four areas of Analytics, Finance, Management and Marketing to three departments, Department of Finance and Quantitative Methods, Department

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
of Management, and Department of Marketing
and Supply Chain effective upon approval by
the Board of Trustees. And then this is the
transfer of ownership. So that's that one
first.

ANDERSON: I just have a question for
clarification.

SWANSON: Yes.

ANDERSON: What about the academic merit? Do
we vote on that as well?

SWANSON: It is my understanding - Davy
Jones, would you like to clarify that?

JONES: All right. Each of these two are
considered by Board of Trustees as ultimately
a managerial structural issue.

Now consideration of academic
impact or infrastructural soundness, can go
into that, but both of these that are going
in are matters that the Senate only endorses
or declines to endorse, not something we
control by approval like academic content or
degree.

SWANSON: So what Davy is saying, if I can
paraphrase, is that the academic merit is
rolled into this motion. Is that correct?

JONES: Academic merit can be one of the
lenses you consider when you consider this
managerial issue.

FARRELL: I would just point out that when we
voted on this issue, we got language to vote
the two different ways, academic and non-
academic, from Davy Jones.

And subsequently now we sort
of revisited it and said that this should all
be brought together as one. I assume that
members of the committee that I represent
would still be opposed to the issues of this
proposal.

SWANSON: Liz Debski?

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.

Herman reported numbers associated
with the vote. Can you give the vote numbers
from the Senate Council?

SWANSON: Yes. From the Senate Council, 3 in
favor, 2 against, and 2 abstained. Other
comments?

KELLUM: (Inaudible) Kellum, A and S.

(Inaudible).

SWANSON: Dean Blackwell, can you address
that? She's questioning the non-academic
merits of the proposal.

BLACKWELL: There really are, in some sense,
there are only academic merits to the
proposal which is what motivated the movement
among the School of Management faculty to ask
for departmentalization as opposed to having
all of these disparate areas lumped into just
one broad school.

This is something that had been
discussed with the previous dean even before
this PAPPAS report came out.

And the sense was the faculty
didn't have, you know, identity with their

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
disciplines because of there would be a --
the governance just - the governance
structure had a difficult time in allocating
resources among these different areas that
are, you know, essentially largely unrelated.
And then there was a lack of
national identity because of the brand name.
This whole idea of the School of Management
capturing many different areas is really one
that had gone by the wayside in most
universities.

So it was really a movement of the
faculty that precipitated this on its
academic merits.

INAUDI BLE:

(Inaudible).

(Inaudible) if we don't approve
this is it going to go back to four units?

SWANSON:

(Inaudible).

BLACKWELL:

So one there aren't four academic
units, there's one academic unit being
eliminated, that's the School of Management.
Within the School of Management there are
different areas of faculty interests. And no
real formal administrative structure around
those areas. Rather informal.

And so that's the -- the
implication that a unit called DSIS is being
eliminated is not accurate. The only unit
being eliminated is the School of Management.

So if the proposal is not endorsed,
we will just retain the structure that we
have now which is the School of Management
and a collection of faculty from many
different areas, you know, that we'll attempt
to coordinate with the governing structure
that tries to help those in their specific
areas as much as possible.

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, A and S.
Dean Blackwell, you just surprised
me and I'd just like to get clarification.

So the Senate could endorse or not
endorse the proposal, but our vote merely
informs the Board of Trustee's vote.

BLACKWELL:

Right.

GROSSMAN:

So we can't stop it -

BLACKWELL:

No, no, no, no.

GROSSMAN:

- with whatever vote we get here.

BLACKWELL:

Assuming it goes to the Board of
Trustees, if the Board of Trustees doesn't
support it, then we will stay in the
structure that we're in now.

GROSSMAN:

Okay. So -

BLACKWELL:

Not the Senate.

GROSSMAN:

Thank you. That's the
clarification I wanted.

BLACKWELL:

The Senate is endorsing or not
endorsing.

GROSSMAN:

Right. So you will go ahead and
bring this to the Board of Trustees --

BLACKWELL:

That's not my decision.

SWANSON:

- the President --

BLACKWELL:

-- President -

GROSSMAN:

The President decides -

BLACKWELL: The President will weigh all of this information and decide whether to put it before the Trustees.

ANDERSON: I have one question about the financial impact. If we're adding three department Chairs, how would that not increase the financial? How would it not have a financial impact? If I became department Chair, I want a raise.

BLACKWELL: I'm going to preface my answer by stating that a lot of the meetings and discussions that went on related to this happened before I arrived.
But, in fact, there will be some increase in administrative overhead as a result of the reorganization.
But I view that, and I think faculty view that, as a reasonable tradeoff for the improvement in the lives of, you know, those faculty as far as identification with their discipline and the other merits.

SWANSON: Gail Bri on, College of Engineering.

BRI ON: Gail Bri on, College of Engineering.
I have two points. Number 1, would you like to amend the proposal going forward to include what you just said, that there will be additional administrative costs?

BLACKWELL: I mean the --

BRI ON: As part of the process, it goes to the Board of Trustees

BLACKWELL: I'm willing to be perfectly transparent about the it will increase administrative costs.

BRI ON: So you're willing to add that amendment to the Board of Trustees, to the proposal that goes to them?

BLACKWELL: I'm not exactly sure what form this will go to them but in - but I'm perfectly willing to be transparent about that.

BRI ON: And secondly, from the very beginning it seems like there should have been two proposals, one on the academic impact that this body would have voted on and one on the organizational impact.
They are getting inextricably entwined. And I just offer to you that it would have been more - it would have been easier for me to understand what is going on had your college put forward two proposals that went through. One on the restructuring and one on the academic impact that would have made clear that there is an area that is being cut out.

BLACKWELL: No area is being cut out.

BRI ON: Having suspended additions into the doctoral area that covers Analytics. Because it's on your web site.

BLACKWELL: Correct. And that's the same - so let me elaborate.
These are actions that have happened with other areas in the School of Management in the past. There have been suspensions of admissions to doctoral, areas

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
of doctoral study in other areas in the
School of Management in the past because of
the timing of a cohort.

We run a very small doctoral
program and so there'll just be occasion
where we may only have one assistantship to
offer for that area in a particular a year
because we've got a bottleneck of students
that were trying to get out.

Because of resource issues, we
might suspend admissions to a bigger area
within the School of Management's doctoral
program, you know, for a year or even two
years until we get those students out the
door. And then admit students again.

BRI ON: So you will be opening up
admissions into this area again?

BLACKWELL: There's no plan to permanently end
admissions to that area of doctoral study,
no.

GREISSMAN: I promised myself --

BROTHERS: Name please.

GREISSMAN: I'm sorry. Richard Greissman,
Provost Liaison.

This is a Senate matter and I
really had promised myself (inaudible) so
forgive me as I chastise myself for having to
get up, but two things have been said and I
think that it's fair to weigh in, especially
in the second matter because the dean is
taking the heat for something I did.

Let me go to the first issue
first. Could I ask someone to please restate
the vote the School of Management had?

SWANSON: The last one?

GREISSMAN: The last vote, yes.

SWANSON: The entire college or --

GREISSMAN: The school.

SWANSON: All right. An electronic ballot
was circulated to the faculty that clearly
described the proposed organizational change.
40 of the 43 School of Management faculty
voted, 27 voted in favor of three
departments, 8 in favor of four departments,
and 5 in favor of retaining the current
structure.

GREISSMAN: Folks, what's not in play here is
to keep things as they are.

Three years ago the School of
Management faculty petitioned the dean. I
noted that the Provost then came to me and
said the School of Management faculty simply
have given up working as a whole.

They would like to know if it's
permissible that they deal with academic
educational and administrative matters along
divisional lines. GR VII permits it. The
language is large and diverse departments
may, excuse me, faculty in large and diverse
departments may vote to deal with education
or administrative matters along divisional
lines. We said yes, it's permissible, they
voted.

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt

And for the last two years the School of Management has ceased to function as a school because the faculty voted to work along divisional lines.

So I respectfully suggest that what's not in play here is to keep the status quo. The faculty have made that clear first three years ago and now with a vote. Five people out of 43 said leave it as it is. So what's at play is whether it should be four or three departments.

And in terms of that, it would be more expensive to make four Chair's in four departments than three.

So I think - I think your question is a good one, but I respectfully suggest the administrative cost is not whether we talk about three or four departments versus keeping the school.

That's not the issue. The faculty has said so.

On the second matter, the dean should not be held accountable for not doing two votes. He had no choice. Davy said it well. Let me restate what Davy and I discussed at great length just to make sure we did this right.

You can't take a vote on the academic matter when it's not involving educational matters. This is an administrative matter. That said, no one has ever said the faculty cannot take into account the academic impact when they vote on an administrative matter.

Please let's not just focus on either the School of Management or the Gatton School faculty by claiming that the Gatton School faculty didn't take into account the academic impact when they voted.

Do we really want to say that a faculty in a college didn't take that into account before they voted?

If you do frankly I think you're insulting your faculty of the college.

Forgive me for being so blunt. If I've insulted, I don't mean to.

But let's look at the vote and ask ourselves did the faculty really say to themselves I'm not going to vote on the academic impact. If that's the case (i n a u d i b l e).

FERRIER:

Wally Ferrier, College of Business.

I'm a member of the Gatton College of Business Council which is a faculty initiated, faculty nominated and faculty elected body. Primarily provide counseling and perspective about academic and non-academic matters that cross our radar screen. Or any faculty member in the college overall.

I want to thank Richard for being blunt. I want to echo his sentence that I assure that you that my colleagues and I were charged with the monitoring of the process of

UKSenateMeeting----may2012.txt
the voting this last time.

An overwhelming majority of the School of Management faculty voted in favor of the three department option. An overwhelming number of college faculty also voted for the three department option.

So we found, our Council found that we were not in violation in any college or Senate Rules of electing. We are satisfied that the faculty have spoken and the vote reflects as well the faculty. And we subscribe to the idea, or the ideal rather, that shared governance ensures autonomy, self-determination, and initiation of new things and should be hopefully kind of devoid of conforming.

SWANSON: Do you have something?

FINKEL: I've got a couple of things. First back to the issue of insult. We mean no insult to anybody.

We take into consideration the votes of a - we take into consideration the votes of every educational unit that comes before us. We look at the dissent and we look at the votes in favor, and we only prick up our ears when we see some dissent, we want to know what it is.

If this issue about insult has come to the floor, I must say that it feels to me like our intelligence has been insulted throughout this process.

We were given facts that were problematic and contrary to the evidence that was presented to us. And I have to point out to Dean Blackwell that what he's now stating on the record about there being no impact on an education unit or an extant educational unit is just (inaudible) false.

There are faculty members that are within what was a cohesive unit known as DSIS, it's on the website, that are now going to be separated into different units. And that's contrary to the facts that had been presented to us.

We would not have wasted our time taking into consideration any of this if there wasn't this concern. With regard to the governing regulations and issues of academic merit, everybody please take a look at what the rules say with regard to my committee, the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee.

We are allowed to take into consideration both academic and non-academic merit. It's implicit in the rules. It's stated that in the rules and it's stated in our guidelines that we would take into consideration all of those factors.

And the problem here is we have gone back and forth with statements that are rhetorical but not truthful. And I find that's what (inaudible). And so, yeah, I am being an advocate for this position because I

think there's a lot on the line here.

We're being told that there's this issue of governance and that should be overriding. Well, governance is important but we also have to take into consideration other issues like tenure dilution and merit. And merit isn't up to a popular vote.

You can have a minority that is correct on the issues but overwhelmed by a majority and that's what we're seeing here.

I'm sorry to lay this out this way but it seems to me that this vote has a huge impact going forward when we're talking about perhaps targeted cuts. We're talking about who knows what's going to happen in two or three or four years with regard to changes in educational unit structure if we allow for majority will to be the defining principle. With regard to changes in educational units, we are inviting a disciplinary war within our ranks. And I think that's problematic.

I think if you are within a college and you are in a minority or even in a plurality, you need to look to your left and your right for votes that could come against you. And that's essentially what we are doing that's taking place here. (Inaudible).

This issue of conflating issues of governance with the academic merit, and we still stand on this issue at Senate Council, they weren't fully discussed.

In the governance issues you definitely went forward and had the vote and we were glad that you did that.

And if I had been asked and been invited into the process when you were going back on April 12th, if you had contacted me and said what would you add into the conversation coming up on the 18th and 19th, I would have said why don't you have a full discussion or conversation or meeting with regard to the academic merits and then I would have backed off.

But instead only one side was presented and not the other. And again it gets into the issue of trust, for me.

FERRIER: Walter Ferrier, B and E, once again.

As a Gatton Faculty Council member, I assure you that to a person that both the academic and non-academic merits of this proposal were simultaneously considered.

On the supposition that the DSIS area was in coherent areas of studies, it's never been. It was cobbled together probably 20 years ago.

So in terms of academics, teaching and research, and most importantly culture, they were as fragmented as it gets. They're in a better place now.

WOOD: I call the question.

SWANSON: All right. We have a motion on the floor. All those in favor?

UNI DENTI FIED: Is this the motion to call the question or is this the question?
SWANSON: You have to vote on the question? You have to vote on the motion right?
WOOD: To call the question.
SWANSON: So we vote on the call the question?
BUTLER: If there's a motion to call the question that is an intent to close the debate. If there is unanimous consent to stop talking as with anything else you may skip the vote. If anyone objects to stopping debate then you must have a second and a vote on calling the question, requires two thirds vote.
SWANSON: All right. Do I have a second to call the question? Is there a second?
TANNOCK: Second.
SWANSON: All right. All those in favor to call the question? Opposed? All right. Abstained?
BUTLER: As long as that was two thirds the question has been called and you now move to an immediate vote.
SWANSON: We now move to an immediate vote. All those in favor of the motion? Opposed? Abstained?
UNI DENTI FIED: I had 16.
SWANSON: Okay. All those opposed?
UNI DENTI FIED: 22.
SWANSON: Abstained?
UNI DENTI FIED: I had 8.
SWANSON: All right. So it did not pass. We'll go for the second motion.
GROSSMAN: I have a -
SWANSON: Go ahead.
GROSSMAN: I have a question. We just declined to endorse.
SWANSON: Right.
GROSSMAN: Does that mean - do we need a second? Davy, do we need a second vote to not - to actively not endorse or we just that's it, decline?
JONES: The report to the Board now from the Senate is not to endorse.
SWANSON: Okay. We'll go for the second recommendation from the Senate Council that the Senate endorse the following transfers in ownership the DBA in Pre-finance and Finance to the Department of Finance and Quantitative Methods, the BBA in Pre-Analytics and Analytics to the Department of Finance and Quantitative Methods, the BBA in Pre-Management and Management to the Department of Management, and the BBA in Pre-Marketing and Marketing to the Department of Marketing and Supply Chain. Pardon me?
BUTLER: You may simply vote on this or if it's irrelevant you can -
SWANSON: It seems irrelevant to me.
BUTLER: You can simply ask for unanimous consent to drop it.
SWANSON: All right. Unanimous consent to

drop it?
 GROSSMAN: I'm not sure that it's irrelevant because the Board of Trustees could still.... But I guess they could do it anyway even without our vote.
 SWANSON: Davy, what do you think? Go ahead and vote?
 JONES: The Board is going to take two actions. It's going to create or not the units, (inaudible). If they were to take a second action on whether to agree to move the degree (inaudible) and on what the Senate thought about the home of these degrees.
 SWANSON: Go ahead and vote? All right. All those in favor?
 UNIDENTIFIED: 14.
 SWANSON: 14, okay. Opposed?
 UNIDENTIFIED: 19.
 SWANSON: Abstained?
 UNIDENTIFIED: 7.
 SWANSON: Okay. All right. It is not endorsed. Thank you. Our last item of business, Lee Blonder, to pass the gavel.
 BLONDER: Thank you. We need a motion to adjourn.
 GROSSMAN: It's unanimous consent.
 BLONDER: Thank you.
 SWANSON: One last item. This is my own personal gift to Herman Farrell, the Ironman Award.

C E R T I F I C A T E O F S E R V I C E

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF HARRISON)

I, LISA GRANT CRUMP, 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 I was not present at said proceedings; that said proceedings were transcribed from the digital file(s) in this matter by me or under my direction; and that the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings to the best of our ability to hear and transcribe same from the digital file(s).

My commission expires: April 6, 2015.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 12th day of May, 2014.

UKSenateMeeting---may2012.txt

LISA GRANT CRUMP

NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE

K E N T U C K Y

NOTARY ID 440572SCOC