

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

October 10, 2011

3:00 p.m.

* * * *

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

* * * *

HOLLIE SWANSON, CHAIR

ROBERT GROSSMAN, VICE CHAIR

J.S. BUTLER, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

ANN CHASTANG, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

SWANSON:

Good afternoon. We have quorum. Welcome to the October University of Kentucky Senate meeting. This is our please slide. Please state your name and affiliation loudly when you speak. Communicate with your constituency. Attend the meetings. Respond to e-mails and web postings. Acknowledge and respect others. And please silence your cell phones and beepers. A few minutes and announcements. Do you remember last year when every time I got up here I said that the

Page 1

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
minutes were not ready. And so
this time I'm going to say
something different. The minutes
from February 14th, March 21, April
11, May 9th, and September 12th are
ready. But we've gotten a few days
behind on the September 12th and so
what I need is a motion to waive
Senate Rule 1.2.3 to allow the
Senate to consider the minutes from
September.

GROSSMAN: So moved. Bob Grossman, A and S.

SWANSON: A second?

JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology.

SWANSON: All in favor?

ASSEMBLY: Aye.

SWANSON: Opposed?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Abstained?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Motion carries. Thank you. And
now, please, could I have a motion
to approve the minutes in block?

GROSSMAN: So moved. Bob Grossman, A and S.

SWANSON: Second?

FIEDLER: Second. Ted Fiedler, Arts and
Sciences.

SWANSON: Thank you. All in favor?

ASSEMBLY: Aye.

SWANSON: Opposed?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Abstained?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Motion carries. Thank you. All
right, a few announcements. We are
trying something new. We are
looking for improved and better
ways to record all of our
activities here in the session and
so today we have an audio
recording. So please speak up.

BROTHERS: And video.

SWANSON: Pardon?

BROTHERS: And video.

SWANSON: And video. All right, so we'll see
how that goes. This will be a test
and we want to make it searchable
and it serves our function. I'd
like to remind you of President
Capilouto's investiture. It's on
October 18th at 4 p.m. in the
Singletary Center, and there will
be a reception following that so
please plan on attending. We also
have an Annual Stakes Reception.
And this is our annual reception
with faculty, staff, students, and
Board members. So this is an
opportunity for you to meet our
Board members and express your
concerns and so on. That's October
25th, 2:30, and the announcements
and RSVP went out today. We have a

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
web transmittal that we posted today. Please review. Over the summer one of the things that we talked about at Senate Council was the need for faculty input for a lot of our distance learning issues. And so the Senate Council, we put forth a list of members that would encompass the entire University campus. And we had a list of twenty-two. We put that call out to those twenty-two members and we had nineteen accept. So I just think that's a wonderful response. Thank you. And the point of this committee then is to provide advice on best practices, policies, and so on. So I think this will be a tremendous resource for us. And Sheila wanted to tell you that I had my interview today with President Capilouto and I didn't stutter. So if you want to see that, that's the link site. All right, then another additional minutes and announcements, I'd like to tell you that we are moving forward with our document handling course approval system. We had three members of Senate Council, Marc Coyne, Katherine McCormick, and Bob Grossman. They all vetted the system. Any comments?

GROSSMAN:
SWANSON:

Looks great.

Looks great. It was also vetted by the associate deans. And then what we're moving forward now to colleges will be piloting it. We've got the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Nursing that will pilot that. And then once it moves past that, we'll open it up to the entire campus. I would like to express my appreciation and introduce our new Senate Parliamentarian, J.S. Butler. Thank you, J.S.

BUTLER:

Yeah, thanks. J.S. Butler, Graduate. I identified myself.

SWANSON:

Oh, thank you. I thought you were telling us that you graduated.

BUTLER:

I have to provide a transcript. But you know that. I'm the Parliamentarian. Thank you.

SWANSON:

We also have a new Senate Council member. And remember the last time I asked you to approve our selecting a new member and I said that we would try to find a college that wasn't represented. And it's not that I lied to you. It's that I was outvoted. And so we welcome our new Senate Council member,

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
David Pienkowski. He's in the College of Engineering. We are in search of more committee members. This time it's for the Health Sciences Dean search committee so that request is going out very soon. And then we have Robert's Rules books available for our new chairs. So if you are a new chair, at the end of the meeting, please come and get your book. And we would also like to tell you that we have a few hard copies in color that are available for the External Review Committee that I chaired. For my chair's report, I'd like to give you a little bit of information about the review committee. As you know, we put forth our report. We asked for comments and feedback. I want to thank you. The survey generated four hundred responses, so over twenty-four hour period. That was just wonderful. Thank you. And I'd like to also tell you that this is an ongoing process. It is not a done deal. We are collecting feedback and suggestions all the time. So please, if you want to e-mail me, please do that. And I'm collating them and talking to them with the President as we go along. And we also have forums that are in the process of planning. So you'll be hearing more about that. And Joe will be giving us a little bit more information about how it was received and discussed at the Board. Any questions, comments? (No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Just to tell you, one of the comments that I've heard that has been the most consistent is a concern from the faculty about our research and graduate students. And so I'd like to delve into that issue a little bit more and ask you a little more information, what's the problem. Is it the numbers? Is it the financing? Is it the quality? Is it all of the above? And so let's more in trying to understand that issue. I attended the COSFL meeting on your behalf. COSFL is a group of all the Senate chairs from the universities, public universities within Kentucky. And so we met two weeks ago. And what they announced is that they are planning an AAUP meeting, and that will be here in this auditorium on November 19th

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
from one to five. There are two objectives of that meeting. One is to discuss the formation of a statewide chapter so that if you want to join AAUP, you don't have to have -- traditionally we had to have a chapter within the campus. So now we can be a member of the statewide chapter. So they'll be working on that. And then they're also working on getting some national representatives to do some presentations. And what they're working on is to try to get somebody to come talk to us about how to understand the university budget. So I'll keep you updated on that. We have a report from Vice Chair Professor Grossman.

GROSSMAN:

Hi. This will be very brief. I just want to tell you a little bit about this experiment that we're doing here with recording the Senate meeting. It turns out that the largest expense of the Senate Office is the one and a half staff people that we have. But the second largest expense is the transcriptionist for the Senate meetings. The cost is about six hundred to nine hundred dollars per Senate meeting. She's very skilled labor as you can see. So given the workload that we have in the Senate Council office and the limited number of staff, we thought we would look into ways of shifting some of the money that we currently spend on transcription into staff. And so our experiment over here is seeing if we can record the Senate meeting both video and audio and then be able to play it back afterwards and be able to understand what happened just as well as if we had a transcript. We're not going to stop using the transcriptionist until we're absolutely sure that the taping works well. And we're still in the process of exploring whether the transcript -- the video and audio transcript that we generate is searchable. If it's searchable, then like the text is then we have to decide is the search capability worth the -- which is worth more, the search capability or the extra staff time. If on the other hand we can figure out how to search the video and the audio, then I think it's pretty much a no-brainer what we're going to do. But anyway I'll

Page 5

keep you posted, and obviously we won't do anything without letting you know.

SWANSON:

Our next officer report is Professor J.S. Butler, our Parliamentarian.

BUTLER:

Hi. Being a member of the Senate is great fun for me. I enjoy doing this sort of thing. I do not wish to bore you with very much. There are a couple of things that would simplify matters. First of all, the Chair may request unanimous consent on anything that appears to be absolutely uncontroversial, not just minutes, but anything else. The way it works is the Chair says I seek unanimous consent for approval of the minutes. If nothing happens, it's done. If someone says no, no. Then it's necessary to have a motion, a second, and a vote. This can be done on anything though that appears uncontroversial. Of course, the Chair can be mistaken about something uncontroversial. It is easily fixed. Anyone can fix it by saying no. Second, there is often quite a bit of confusion about the term "receiving" or "adopting" a report. You receive a report. The Senate receives a report the same way you receive a report. It's delivered to you. It shows up in your e-mail. It shows up in your mailbox. You received it. That's it. You received it. That doesn't mean you like it. You get things in your e-mail. You get things in your mailbox and say I don't agree with this but you received it. So that's that. "Adopting" means the Senate takes a document that a committee wrote and changes it from a committee report to a Senate document. That's approval. It is not necessary. And if a committee writes a report, it is the committee's report. It is received. It's received when you see it. If it wasn't received, the conversation goes like this. You have the report on classes. And you say huh, what are you talking about; I didn't receive it; can I have it? And so if you didn't receive it, that means you don't know what they're talking about. Now, you received it. Do you like it? If you like it, somebody moves to adopt it. It becomes a Senate document. That is

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
approval. It is not required.
Although the members of the
committee would probably like to
hear about it if you don't like it.
That would probably be good to tell
them. So confusion is often
whether you do or don't have to do
something. Well, no. You don't
have to do anything. But if the
Senate adopts it, it becomes a
Senate document. All right, as far
as more technical stuff, if it
comes up, it's my job to advise. I
will point out that we have had a
discussion as my role of Senator as
opposed to Parliamentarian. It's
very straightforward. The Chair is
in charge of the meeting and I am
not. I am the advisor. That's it,
just advisor. Chair is in charge.
So to the extent I participate as a
Senator, I interact with the Chair
the same as anyone else here does
to the extent that the chair seeks
advice, I become the
Parliamentarian. It should be
perfectly clear which is which but
the chair is always in charge and
always decides. I'm the advisor.
Thank you.

SWANSON:

Thank you, J.S. We have our
Trustee's report, Professor Joe
Peek.

PEEK:

Speaking of receiving e-mail in
your inbox which you don't agree,
so I'm just going to make a couple
of comments and then rather than me
telling you what I want you to
know, it's probably more productive
for you to ask me questions. And
then, you know, I'll try to tell
you what you want to know. So
you're in class. I can tell them
whatever I want. But I wasn't
going to treat you like students.
So one quick thing is the ombud.
We've talked about this ombud's
office initiative. It's still
ongoing. It's almost finished.
It's going to happen. But there's
some little details here and there.
I think in my view it's to try and
let the station -- and I don't
think there's anybody that's going
to get up on the tracks and try and
stop it because they'll get run
over. It's going to happen. And I
think it's a good thing for the
University. The other thing is the
Board of Trustees' retreat where we
spent a weekend, you know, talking
about issues. I think the way in
which Holly and her committee's

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

report was done is really good. It's a technique that many of you are familiar with from your first meeting with Alcoholics Anonymous where basically you first get up and say we're UK and we've got a problem. In my mind, we have not seen anyone at UK really stand up and say we've got a problem. There's too much happy talk. There's too much spinning. And so I thought that was a tremendous breakthrough that we actually saw some of our failings or some of our weaknesses because if we don't get them out there in front, I think they don't get dealt with. And so I applaud the approach taken by that committee in saying let's talk about what the issues really are and then we're in a position to maybe we can start addressing them. And I think, you know, two obvious things, you know, were the facilities. And the Trustees took a tour of the facilities and saw that we're in really bad shape. I think some of the Trustees were not aware of how bad of shape we were in. And then, of course, another big emphasis was undergraduate education. There is an -- and in my mind those two areas have been kind of forgotten about for quite some time, and we need to put some focus on those. However, there are concerns what about the other things because there are lots of things we need to work on. And so undergraduate education, absolutely. Facilities, absolutely. World peace, who can complain, right? So what about other things? What about research? What about graduate education? Yeah, those are important and those are priorities. But I think it was like well, let's do some catching up here but I don't -- that should not be taken as research is unimportant or that graduate education is unimportant. That wasn't the statement that I heard. It was saying, you know, we really got to start catching this up, and there's also a political aspect to it. For anyone interested in reality, that is if you go to the legislature or the citizens and start saying hey, we need to do this or that, if you talk about undergraduate education, I think you will get more support than if

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

you say well, we need to increase graduate student stipends or something like that. So I think politically that's probably the right approach. Also, high quality undergraduate programs feed into graduate programs because it's going to enhance our reputation. It's going to help us attract faculty. It's going to help us attract graduate students and perhaps even research funding. So it wasn't that those are forgotten, right? They're in there. They're in that mix. So probably I should answer questions that you have unless they're difficult. Then my time is up. So what questions do you have, anyone?

DEBSKI:

Liz Debski, A and S. So you didn't mention something that's been in the paper is there has to be a decision about whether you're going to renovate Rupp or build a new arena. Is that going to derail some of the focus on undergraduate education and new facilities here?

PEEK:

I have a clear personal opinion on that. If you look at Sunday's paper, Bill Gatton expressed an opinion on that. As a person, right now as a person and a backer of UK and so forth, you know, not as a Trustee necessarily, and I agree with him. The money isn't there. And so we can talk about oh, well, let's have a new arena or even a major renovation. I'm against it personally. We don't have the money. UK doesn't have the money. The state doesn't have the money. The city doesn't have the money. And if someone comes and says it's not going to cost you anything, it's going to cost somebody something. And even if say the state says use the state debt capacity, you know, to build it, the problem is it's not UK money, it's the state money. In the minds of the people in Frankfort, they just gave UK money and it will crowd out. We have to think about trade offs and opportunity costs. And we have such -- I don't know -- extraordinary needs for facilities on this campus. The idea that we would use our limited debt capacity and our limited resources to build a new arena is crazy talk to me. That's my personal opinion on that. I don't see where the money is

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
going to come from. And if it does
come from somewhere, I guarantee in
the thought process it will be
attributed to that's part of what
UK might have otherwise gotten for
an academic building, for example.
You know, but that's just me
talking. Other questions?

KOVASH:

Mike Kovash, Arts and Sciences.
One aspect of that report which
stood out to me was the choice of
benchmarks used. This seemed quite
in contrast, for example, what
Subbaswamy reports which looks more
like the basketball schedule. And
so is there a right answer to this
when we -- maybe the Trustees
discussed this as well. What is
the set of benchmarks that we rank
ourselves?

PEEK:

There are two sets of benchmarks.
You have the business plan and the
CP. They're each, you know,
they're like twenty and the overlap
is great. As I recall, it's like
twenty-seven total, all right. And
then what Hollie's committee did
was they said well, let's think
about it in a slightly different
way and they came up with a
different set of benchmarks. They
said well, let's find institutions
that are similar to ours across a
number of dimensions. And so it
was like medical school and land
grant and a couple other things.

SWANSON:

Strong undergraduate and then a
good research program, four
criteria.

PEEK:

Right. So they came up with their
own group. It was idiotic what
they did, but I can't say that.
No, but I mean actually I think
that's a good way of doing it. And
we're trying to see who is like us
in some respects and then it's a
matter of no one is like us in
every respect because we're into
almost everything. We're doing ag.
We're doing engineering. We're
doing pharmacy. We're doing
medical. We're doing business
school. We have everything. And
an awful lot of the big
universities, big state
universities don't have a medical
school or don't have a medical
school on the campus. They have it
kind of a separate campus.

SWANSON:

The other question we asked is who
is like us and who do we want to be
more like? Who would we aspire to
be? Trying to balance all of that.

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

PEEK:

So there's not a right answer because you're trading off. There is no one exactly. We're unique as is almost everyone else.

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, A and S. The emphasis on facilities is great especially from someone from the perspective someone who lives in chem/phys. When the President was here last month, I asked him about how was the University going to finance new buildings, and he just said oh, well, we need to be creative. So -- but he didn't say anything more than that. Has the Board of Trustees discussed any of this creativity and how it's going to actually implement a new building program?

PEEK:

I think the President has committed himself to having something tangible at the next Board of Trustees meeting, the 24th or 25th of this month. I think what's being talked about, for example, for dorms would be a public private partnership because that way we can lever resources. So -- and a lot of universities are doing that. So what you do is, you know, you get a contract with a private developer who would build the dorm and own the dorm like a land lease. I don't know the details. And then they would rent them to students and, I guess, manage them. And so we're not putting up our capital or our debt capacity.

GROSSMAN:

PEEK:

How about academic buildings? Academic buildings are completely different, I think. And so, again, this is my personal plan how would I do it if I were in charge which is never going to happen anywhere, I mean not even in my own house. But if that happened in some other universe, then I would use the public private partnership, and I would use that for things like dorms, a new student center, things that have revenue attached to them. And then I would use our debt capacity, anything we could get out of the state, all the private donations we could get, and then I would build the classroom buildings, the lab buildings that we need because if we're going to grow the University, there are bottlenecks we face. We must have the classrooms and the teaching capacity so the students can actually satisfy graduation

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
requirements. And so we probably need at least another building with labs so that we can handle all these freshman and sophomores that we'd be bringing in here. And so if we had nicer dorms and nicer student center, that will make us a more attractive campus. When students go on tours, where do they go? They go look at dorms, dorm rooms. They look at the student center. They may look at classrooms a little. That will help us attract, I think. Then the question is can we serve those students. And if we only enhance our dorms, I guess they'll be happy in the dorms, but what are they going to do for classrooms? And so I think there has to be a sequencing there. But part of what will pay for these things would be more tuition from more students. But, yeah, I think we can't do a public private partnership on a classroom building, for example, because we don't have the dedicated fees like the dorm room. Someone over here and I'll come back.

TRUCZCYNYSKI:

Miroslaw Truczczynski. Coming back to benchmarks, I think it's very important that we as a university have a single well-reasoned and commonly accepted set of benchmarks. Somehow it's clearly related -- aligned -- with what our goals are and what our priorities are. I think that we are using too many of those, and sometimes we tend to cut our wings.

PEEK:

I think there's a lot of adjustments that are made depending on what we're trying to do or look like at that. And so -- but it is difficult to come down with one set that's perfect. You're going to be trading these off. So I don't know what the right side is.

BRION:

Gail Brion, Engineering. This may be my own naivete, but how are we supposed to pay for classroom buildings when we can't pay for anything else? What is the normal funding schedule? Where have they found the money? I don't know the answer.

PEEK:

If you look around, you'll see they haven't found the money anywhere.

BRION:

There have been new buildings erected.

PEEK:

Yeah, well, I know the Engineering building, for example, near my building has been done. You were

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

STEINER:

going to answer her question?
Yeah, It's not that they haven't found money. Tuition represents a very important revenue stream which has not been counted. It just isn't counted as part of revenue. The hospital, they talk about 800 million. Tuition is around 400 million. They just don't. So that has to become part of the revenue stream, recognized revenue stream not only for administrators to use for this, that, and the other thing but also for building backup. It's a very steady stream. We've had consistent growth and it's just that nobody's wanted to do it. We've challenged over the year why aren't you -- chemistry/physics has gone from tenth to nothing. It's a will as much as it is money. The legislature would be -- you could easily sell this project. Over the last twenty years they haven't done a thing. We haven't had new buildings for classrooms in forty years. Chemistry/physics could go sixty-five years without a new lab building. There's just been no will to do it and there's been no stated will. We've got this mumbo jumbo about the medical campus, this and that. The will is the problem, not so much the funding in my opinion.

BRION:

And that we haven't had some kind of set idea of where (inaudible) should go.

STEINER:

The leadership has not -- the past president has not had a will to increase, for instance, the natural science laboratories on campus. He just hasn't. The administration just hasn't backed it up. The administration before that which is when most of the building happened in Kentucky, no will to do that. It's been an imbalance in my view of the -- in the medical campus. And I'm not -- that's a very important part of the University. I'm not anti medical campus. It's a very important part both the prestige and many other things. But there has to be a balance one building here, one building there. It's been all one building there, another building there. The next ten years are also planned out by the administration. The next BBRSB is already online. That's the next building to be built. And I think the undergraduates are getting

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
screwed. That's basically what I think the basic issue is.

SWANSON: That was Shelly Steiner, Arts and Sciences.

PEEK: To clarify this, what I think Shelly may have been pointing to, there is an analogy in municipal finance, the difference between general obligation bonds and revenue bonds. For so a dorm, that's like a revenue bond in that there is a dedicated stream of revenues associated with the building. But tuition is like general tax revenue or general obligation. And so you can't issue a bond tied to that as easily or in the same way as to a specific project. But also a problem we have is we don't have bond authority. We should have but we don't. If we have bonding authority, they'll say I'm not coming to the state to ask you to do this for me. I'm coming to the state to ask you to let me do it for myself. And to this point, the legislature has not been willing to say okay, we'll set you free. We'll let you do it for yourself. We'll let you issue bonds and make the payments on those bonds. And I think it's a control issue. It's politics, surprisingly.

VAN NAGEL: Van Nagel, Arts and Sciences. I have a question concerning the university (unintelligible) report maybe that's the wrong place. But since you mentioned it, I'll ask anyway. You talk about this emphasis on education. And to me like this is something new. And I'm surprised by that. During the last year I haven't (unintelligible) undergraduate education. To me Arts and Sciences, this is absolutely nothing new. And that's just a comment. The question I have, I mean there are some proposed actions and one of them is continue to innovate and delivery of classes which sounds good but in the fine print basically it talks about large classes. And I wonder if expressing of large classes is really the way to move in undergraduate education. What's your take on this?

PEEK: Probably there are many people out in the audience that have a better idea than I do about these sorts of things. But I think we've talked

about undergraduate education. I'm not sure how much has been done. And so I think that's really the acid test here is okay, we're talking about what's going to be done. And I think we're going to start knowing here very soon. There are many ways we can change undergraduate education. We may have different opinions about whether those changes are for the good or for the bad.

VAN NAGEL: Well, I'm saying we just approved the University core change and now it's called UK Core. Isn't that the big change we just made?

PEEK: Yeah.

VAN NAGEL: Is this called an action?

PEEK: That's an action, yeah.

CONNERS: Conners, Agriculture. Joe, I've got a quick question for you. The people I speak with are all curious to know where the Trustees went on their tour, whether or not it was their personal favor disaster site they visited. Is there some place I can refer them to?

PEEK: I don't know. We had a schedule that got cut short because we ran out of time. But we started on the north campus going through I think three dorms and then the student center and then the Fine Arts building. Didn't we run out of time? And there were a couple more on the agenda, but we ran out of time on that. So the idea was this wasn't necessarily to show the worst buildings on campus, but it was to give some sense of where a freshman might spend their time if they were going to come here, what buildings they might end up in either living or doing classes.

CONNERS: I guess it's kind of unfortunate you didn't have a sample of all the different colleges.

PEEK: Yeah, yeah, it's just that we ended up running way over time and so they had to start just cutting stuff. But they did try. They talked about that at the retreat a little bit about the facilities and some of the problems. Any other?

SWANSON: Bob Greissman. Bob, would you like to make any comments on that?

GREISSMAN: Trustee Peek is doing a fine job. We did include Ag in our report on Saturday.

SWANSON: Well, that was the idea was that we wanted to see where the majority of the initial students, the freshman, sophomores where would they be

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

spending their time and try to focus. We had limited time, so, what, two and a half hours.

PEEK: Yeah, it wasn't a lot. I was riding on the bus drinking champagne. And so I don't have a clear memory of all the places we went. Now, (inaudible) had that beer special. So I think it was a -- they had a purpose. They can't show us everything so they said okay, what do we do? Sort of like how do you select our peer institutions? Well, what is a freshman going to see? And that's kind of what we saw. And it was eye opening. As I said, a lot of the Trustees really weren't aware that our facilities were in as bad of shape as they are. We really, really need to do something.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S. I guess that's what I kind of wonder about because, you know, we've all made kind of fun over the years of the Trustees with the dedicated elevator going straight up to the building. And I guess I'm wondering how often do the Trustees go around and look at the actual buildings on campus in the different areas? This seems to be, you know, a big event that they went around and looked at some of the facilities where I kind of think that they'd want to do that rather routinely.

PEEK: My understanding is that each Halloween they do. But I think you're right. But I'll tell you, I had never been to those dorms on north campus. I work here. But I had no reason to be over there. So I don't know that many of them -- I mean they come. They go to the administration building for meetings. They go to Patterson Office Tower for meetings. They go to some events at some of the other places, the Perry Center, for example. But I don't think they're going to be in the basement of the Fine Arts building or somewhere like that. They're not going to see that. So a good point is maybe the Trustees should be better informed about the facilities so you can say -- so I say hey, I think some were surprised. You could easily say well, they shouldn't have been. And by the way, what do you mean we sometimes make fun of Trustees? So --

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

DEBSKI:

Just the elevator, just the dedicated elevator.

PEEK:

Just the elevator. You know, there are a lot of Trustees that really care about the place and really wanting to make this a better place. So I think this tour was a fantastic thing because they saw what was going on and now they're energized to do something about it. Thank you.

SWANSON:

Thank you very much. I'd also like to remind you that in June President Capilouto took not all of the Trustees but many of them down to University of Alabama Tuscaloosa so that they could see this is our competition. This is what our competition looks like. And so now they have a clear picture of what it could look like and what the reality is. And I think that was really useful. Moving on to agenda item number three, we have a SACS reaffirmation update. And to present that to us today is our Interim Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness, Heidi Anderson. Welcome.

ANDERSON:

while Sheila is changing the slides, I'll go ahead and adjust the microphone. I hope you can hear me in the back. If not, just please give me a wave and let me know. Thank you, Chair Swanson. Hollie, I don't know if I should thank you for putting me to follow Trustee Peek or not. Those of you who know me know that I'm not nearly as humorous as Trustee Peek is so it won't be the same type of presentation. I also want to thank the Senate Council members for asking me to be here. And let me start by saying there's the keyboard so I know how to work the slides. And the other thing is those of you who also know me know that I hate being tied to a podium. So, Hollie, I thank you for that as well. I can't move around if you're typing this. I'll try to stay within the confines here. Let me begin by saying SACS. I was talking to some junior faculty, some new faculty, and they said what is this SACS word? I won't tell you since I'm being taped what they actually said. But I say oh, it's really S-A-C-S.

BRION:
ANDERSON:

Right on.

That went over better. Joe, do you
Page 17

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
see what you've done?

PEEK:
ANDERSON:

I'm the warmup.

I told you I wasn't as funny as he was. Anyway it stands for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. And something that many of us in this room probably are familiar with, how many of you were here the last time SACS came and visited the University of Kentucky? Wow, that's quite a few. Now how many like me were not here? And that's quite a few. And the reason I ask you, of everyone who raised your hands, how many of you believe in quality assurance and quality programs? I wanted to --

PEEK:
ANDERSON:

And world peace.

And I think those who didn't, I think you would say that most of us in this room believe in quality and we believe in trying to achieve quality and use information to improve. And I see a lot of heads nodding so I think you agree with me. So my point in saying that is don't shoot the messenger here today. It's about quality. It's about something that we all believe in, and I just really want to make sure I set the tone here to make sure the SACS that came ten years ago no longer exists. They are a new, different animal. They're a different group. And so I thought what I would do at Hollie's request is give you a little bit of a primer about who they are. And that's kind of how we're going to proceed. So I'm going to set the stage here for kind of explaining to you a different group of individuals. SACS -- and I will continue to use the abbreviation -- they basically changed their approach to accreditation. Those of you who are new to the role of accreditation, you know that there are eight regional accrediting bodies within the country and SACS is one of those. And regional bodies in this country -- basically I say this country because in other countries, as you know, they may have a Minister of Education or something of that nature that looks at education a different way. In the U.S. we assign this to a peer volunteer group to give us a sample approval on how our programs are, the quality of the programs. And they are our peers. 2001, they decided to really significantly

change their focus. And you see on this slide they changed it to look at the extent to which an institution actually has made a commitment to focus on number one, student learning, to enhance its quality of its educational programs, and to engage in continuous improvement. Very different than when they came before. And the other thing they did was send this little booklet out that basically you have to comply with all their principles. So in the past, they had these must statements. Now they changed things to these principles. And they ask that we comply with that. What SACS is doing is different also from the last time and that's why I wanted to get the show of hands as to who was here and who was not. Many of us were not here at that time. Really it's a multi-phase process that they're going through. They first asked the institution to prepare a document that's called the compliance certification document. That document then is sent to them at a certain time and it will be reviewed by an offsite committee. Some of you in the future may be part of those offsite committees. But that offsite committee gathers together in Atlanta. They probably are sequestered in a room, a hotel place for a number of days, maybe weeks. Not weeks, just days, seriously. But they have about seven to maybe a dozen of these institutions to review. And they look the same. They're kind of like other institutions like us. So those of you who have traveled, and I know most of you probably have gone to your own conferences, you know what it's kind of like when you're not at home in your own bed in your own home, after a few days you're kind of missing that place probably and tired of the conference. Think about that from these SACS reviewers. They're basically looking at all of this stuff in that particular place and they're trying to make a determination is the institution compliant or not with over eighty plus standards. And I put that picture in your head because it's important to understand many of them are reviewing programs on an

electronic basis and ours will be an electronic document this time. The last time it was a lot of paper. So the point I'm trying to make with that vision is that we want to make sure we're very concise, clear, and logical up front because if I were in a room for about a week looking at that many documents, I think if it wasn't clear, I'd probably just say noncompliant and go with it, okay? So that's an important message I want to bring to you. The other thing that SACS has changed is this whole focus of looking at student learning outcomes, and that is the Quality Enhancement Plan. That's the second document that we have to prepare. And you've heard a lot of information about that from the co-chairs, Diane Snow and Deanna Sellnow. And they will be presenting this afternoon so I won't tell you a lot about that. But it's very important to notice that the key word that SACS is focusing on with the QEP is our feasibility. Can we actually pull it off? What I'm going to do is give you an overview of really quickly the time line, what the process is, and answer any questions. We have to submit this compliance documentation in September 10 of next year. After we submit it, as I told you, an offsite review committee November of next year will be looking at it, and then we have to follow that with presenting the QEP. And then SACS will then send an onsite committee here in April of 2013 -- those dates up there as you see -- to really focus on our QEP. If we happen to have been noncompliant in some these areas which we should not, they will then -- or if there's something they need more information, they'll key in on that, but only if that's the case. So we really want them focusing on the QEP and being not bothered that we are noncompliant in any area. That means, as of today, we have 335 days in which to get this document complete and to them. And I shave off about seven days to this because you want to send it a few days ahead. We don't want it to arrive on the date that it's due. So I always kind of look at it a week in advance, ten days

before that. So we have less than 300 days to get this thing complete. What the compliance certification report includes are these particular three areas. There are over twelve core requirements, sixteen exact. There are over fifty plus standards and seven federal requirements. We have to make sure we adhere to all of that. The key thing I'm trying to bring to your attention to this body especially since you report back to your colleges and your other Senators is the last line which is of those sixteen core requirements we have to show compliance the first time around on all of those. If not, we get sanctioned. What does "sanctioned" mean? "Sanctioned" means that they either will give us a warning or probation. It depends on the severity of the noncompliance. And what does that mean for all of us who are at the University, whether faculty, staff, students? Sanctioned basically means that if you receive that from any of the regional, but especially from SACS, then -- actually all of the regionals -- you are not eligible for federal financial funding. That means our students would not be eligible for financial aid. That means our faculty who get NIH or NSF funding would not be eligible for those types of funds. So the last point I just try to make is bring it home to you and let you know that that means we're all in this together because they look at actually a reaffirming of accreditation for one institution, not bits and pieces. And so a lot of people have been working behind the scenes to make sure that that doesn't happen to us. These are the areas that are covered by all of those standards. Since you will be getting a copy of this later, I won't go into each one in detail. And as I said, Diane and Deanna will talk to you about the QEP in just a moment. But what I really would like to spend a few more minutes on is focusing on what SACS has identified are the critical areas that have been problematic for institutions since they've moved toward this particular direction. And those are listed on this slide. And you see, I'll

start with the faculty qualifications. And I'm going to talk a little bit just about three of these. Institutional effectiveness, the faculty qualifications, and faculty competence. Let's start with the update on faculty credentials. What does SACS look for? SACS is asking each and every institution to justify that we have competent faculty to teach -- I'm sorry, to participate in all of our missions. So that's research, service teaching. They look at the whole thing. They give credence to the institution looking at the primary consideration being the highest degree earned in the discipline. But these other things that you see listed on the slide apply as well. So let me tell you how that works. When SACS came ten years ago, the University of Kentucky was found very noncompliant in this area for a number of reasons. Connie Ray and I worked together. When I arrived in 2002, I started kind of working with her in some of these areas because the accreditation with Pharmacy. But she kind of talked to me about where were we noncompliant and why. And one thing that happened in 2002, SACS is looking to make sure we have competent faculty based on transcripts, based on how they teach a particular course, based on their credentials. And we didn't have transcripts in the files for everyone at that time. So what happened, Connie and Diane Gagel got together and said we need to put a system in place, an electronic system that will help us the next time around. Through the help of Diane Gagel, a faculty data base was created, and this particular data base allows us now to actually look at the credentials at the time of hire, and then we do it every semester to make sure we have correct credentials on file. This is what we actually do. We review the transcripts at two levels. In the colleges, this is usually your department chairs or director. They look at the transcript. It goes to the provost level, and it's reviewed there as well. We assign inside the data base, they're assigned a code called a CIP code. Many of you

know that's the classification of instructional programs. That's a Department of Education code. But it's similar across all universities of higher education so you can use it for tracking and reporting those types of things. If there is a disconnect between that CIP code for the course and a faculty member's transcript, then other details are put forth together in a document that the department chair prepares called a justification. And we also validate internationally. Now, all of that you look on the slide and say what does Heidi mean about all of this? Let me give you an example. I have a PhD in Pharmacy. I have background in assessment, evaluation, accreditation. I have a background in leadership. And I have those backgrounds in other training that I've had through the years. College of Education could say Heidi, will you come over here and teach a primer course in let's say leadership. I'd say okay, you know, I'm going over there to do this primer course. SACS might come and look at the credentials and say what is Heidi Anderson with her PhD in Pharmacy doing over in the College of Ed leadership class? Well, that's where somebody in the department has filled out the other justification, and they listed out these other seminars, programs, workshops, training that I've got in my background. That's that last part where the department chair has then shown how it is aligned. And many of you that was happening over spring and summer with your credentials in some of our areas because you may have credentials that are in the discipline, but you may be doing some cross-teaching, some other particular aspects. This is to help us make sure we comply with SACS and that we can respond to them. Again, keep in mind, these reviewers are off in a room at Atlanta. I have asked four people recently who have been on these SACS reviews and what they have told me is they review one hundred percent all credentials for every faculty on those institutions. So, for example, Angie Martin went to -- she reviewed I think it was University of Georgia, one of the Georgia

schools that was similar to us, over 3,000 faculty. And they had a team of people look at all of the credentials for those 3,000 faculty. So I expect they're probably going to do the same with us. So because of this, I'm trying to make sure that we have everything in order. I apologize you may not be able to see this too well in the back. Victor, can you see it just a little bit? Okay, what this is just really showing you is what I just told you, words, we've had to put we put a process in place here back in the spring. And I thank Connie Ray dearly because she really had the vision to have us think about three years ago she took Kabi Tagabi and myself to a SACS's annual meeting to try to learn all this stuff and get ready and give her advice on what to do. And what we did, we focused on the faculty roster this summer and we basically have collected data that SACS is looking for. They want to see the transcript of every faculty member and our type one TAs because they instruct classes. They want to see the CV, the syllabus for the course that you're teaching, and any justifications if it's not aligned like I described. We had a team of people this summer working to do this. I am pleased to report today we are at almost a hundred percent complete with having the transcripts in electronic fashion for SACS. And we've redacted any personal information so that no one sees that they're in a secure site. And this is just listing all of our colleges. The other thing I'd like to say publically is we think -- I don't expect you to see this slide. The only word I want you to focus on is thank you. A lot of people are behind the scenes who helped pull this off while many of you -- we were away on summer break or something. So a lot of people have been involved with this. The QEP, the only thing I say about that is Diane and Deanna are wonderful leaders for this. As you know, they talked to you about it before. Last year they told you that the topic that was selected was multimodal communication across the curriculum, and they'll be giving you more of an update in just a

moment. The next area I've spent some time on real quick and I'd like rather take questions on is institutional effectiveness. What does SACS mean by this? This is -- has to be an ongoing, integrated institution-wide systematic review, and we have to show continuous improvement in two -- actually it's in four areas, but I'm going to talk to you about two of them. The two that I'm going to tell you about are strategic planning that happens in all of our units and student learning outcomes. This is under the leadership of Dr. Mia Alexander Snow and Mia is here today in case we have questions. Like Joe, only ask me the easy ones. We'll give the tough ones to Mia and Tara Rose. And just briefly we have over close to almost 200 units on the campus that do strategic plans. Those are reviewed annually. We have over 200 degree programs -- 250 -- and those are also reviewed annually by a team. And you can see the deadlines here. And I thought you might be interested in what the SACS is looking for in this regard. Under student learning assessment, SACS is looking to make sure that we meet these particular criteria for each one of our 250 plus degree programs. But we see in blue they really are going to focus in on the improvement action plan. So every unit has to submit a report that shows these five criteria as it relates to student learning outcomes and how are you going to improve based on the results. This is an example of what some of the colleges received from this committee. The committee is the University Assessment Committee, and I think they've been mentioned here in senate meetings before. That committee represents -- has a representative from every college on the campus and every unit. They meet monthly. And then they review all of these reports and give feedback back to the colleges, back to your units so that you can go ahead and know where to complete. And you see their report, for example, let's say this is our pharmacy practice and we had a Master's in that which doesn't exist. But say we were complete. But if this was -- where are my

pharmaceutical scientist friends? I see them back there. And their Bachelor's of Science they started but they're not complete yet. So you get the idea that whatever in the college, whatever numbers of disciplines you have and whatever number of degrees, the University Assessment Committee lets you know where its action improvement plan is at. As far as strategic plans, where are we as far as to date with the data? Our over 250 -- I'm sorry, 190 units fit into one of these five categories. You can see the blue bar. We want the blue bar to go down. We want the green bars to go way up and no more orange bars. So as of today, we're really not doing too bad. In the President's unit, you see there's about seven units there. That's things like athletics, public relations. If you want more, I can give you the details. The EVPFA includes things like -- Mia, what's that?

SNOW:

Campus services.

ANDERSON:

Thank you. Campus services. What else?

SNOW:

Faculty management, financial operation.

ANDERSON:

The provost area includes things like the CTSA that we just received, faculty affairs office, international. The educational units are all of our colleges, and then the academic support are things like student affairs, research, and I'm missing one.

SNOW:

Undergraduate.

ANDERSON:

Undergraduate education, thank you. Basically you can see where we stand right now on all of those particular strategic plans, and we have a lot of work still to do and some things to get completed. As far as next steps, we have a team that SACS says you have to have a leadership team that starts with the President, the Provost, the Senate Council Chair -- Hollie Swanson is on that team -- and they are leading this charge throughout the University. This is what that team is doing at this particular time, reviewing narratives, reviewing the documents, preparing the faculty roster, and going -- editing the compliance certification core at this particular time and trying to resolve any areas where we see

noncompliance. These are the activities that are coming up. And I thought as faculty in your different areas if you can please just let people be aware. It's nothing that you have to do because someone in your college has already been designated as the point person to collect your course syllabi, to remind you that please update your CV by December, and then those will be pulled together by a central person in your college. We also -- then that central person will send them over to our office January 24th. And then in the winter and spring we need to get the syllabi that you teach maybe winter or spring also by March. And then finally any final faculty credentials that need to be complete by March 30th. And I thought this body would want to be aware of those deadlines of things that are impacting you. The final thing that I won't spend any time on is SACS says we have to report any substantive changes. Changes like in numbers, large numbers of credit hours. Changes if you have distance learning. Davy Jones is helping me make sure that Senate rules are complying with these kind of changes and also keeping track of any reporting or that kind of thing that's going to happen. These are the compliance certification dates. And the only thing to bring your attention to here is that basically the onsite visit is April 9th. I'm losing my voice. What I'd like to do now is just pause and answer any questions. The only thing to say on this slide is we are aware that many people on campus were not familiar with the changes of SACS. So we thought we'd do a campus awareness campaign, and you can see we have you on the list. I participated by going to the College of Fine Arts at a retreat with the provost and the deans explaining a lot of this. You have the Board of Trustees will have a meeting to update them on their roll with all of these principals in December. And any other place you think that we need to come or I need to come, please let me know. Questions? I would quickly -- because Hollie said I only had about fifteen minutes, and these

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

are people I'd like to thank publicly. A lot more people than this, but this is a team that's helping do a lot of this behind the scenes work so we are not bothering you.

SWANSON:

Questions?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Thank you very much, Heidi.

ANDERSON:

Okay, excellent.

SWANSON:

Next up, as a continuation of our SACS effort, we have an update of QEP from Drs. Deanna Sellnow and Diane Snow. Welcome.

SNOW:

All right, we're happy to be here again to tell you a little bit more about the QEP and tell you what we've done since the last time we've seen you. We're going to spend just a little bit of time today telling you about how we're updating the campus, about what's going on with the QEP, about some team building that we've done within our current committee to try to accomplish these tasks. Some of the issues that we've had to address, we'd like your input on some of these. And the big job that Heidi referred to of drafting this hundred page document that is part of our SACS re-accreditation.

SELLNOW:

So one thing that we've been doing this fall and we probably visited as many (unintelligible) we're trying to visit as many units across campus against this semester like we did the three semesters previous to try to get people to know what QEP is, where we're at in the process of the QEP so that one of the things that SACS is going to decide whether or not to endorse our QEP is if it's been a transparent and broad based involvement across the campus. So these reporting updates that we've been doing across the campus are really a key component of getting our QEP endorsed.

SNOW:

what we'd like to do for you first is just show you what it is we're taking around the campus. If you haven't seen this personally yourself in your unit, you can assume a lot of people have. We hope by the time we're finished we'll going to reach everyone on campus one way or another.

SELLNOW:

So we start off, this is the little song and dance that we've been doing across the campus. Our QEP is MCXC. And what in the world is

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
that? We start by reminding everybody -- hopefully they know -- but remind them that QEP stands for Quality Enhancement Plan and that it's one of the I guess sixteen -- we thought it was twelve -- core requirements for SACS reaffirmation of accreditation. And again, we try to reiterate that it's a well-defined and focused topic or issue related to enhancing student learning that's been vetted with the campus community as something to focus on.

SNOW: We're introducing people to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools for the first time. So what is our QEP? From the process that you all know about that we've gone through since fall of 2009, our QEP is multimodal communication across the curriculum or MCXC and we tell people why are we here today? That we're the cheerleaders. We're trying to provide information and generate a buzz so that everybody will be very excited about our QEP when the time comes.

SELLNOW: So then we next go into just a history because we assume that not everybody has been up to speed all the way through the process of how do we get to where we are today because it has been broad based and transparent. And so we remind them that in the fall of 2009 we had a pre-planning team and that pre-planning team was a small group of individuals that had been to some of the SACS QEP training sessions on the previous summers. And what we did is we reviewed the SACS re-accreditation QEP processes and processes that other schools went through and we created a time line and we created an approach to do this broad based involvement by campus to get a topic and a plan ready for SACS.

SNOW: In the spring and summer of 2010 we started the topic selection team. And this is where you heard us across campus trying to collect big ideas and identify various themes that people were interested in as a topic addressing student learning.

SELLNOW: And that was a really big task because we had a very large team that tried to touch on all the different aspects of the campus so that we had a really large group of broad based involvement. We

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
collected editorials from the Herald Leader, the student newspapers, had people put in their big ideas. And then in the summer of 2010, we sat down in a room in the student center for two days as a group and looked for cross-cutting themes that seemed to come from all these different stakeholder groups of our campus. And then we rolled out these six themes in the fall of 2010.

SNOW:

And then we made a call out for proposals that relate to one of those six themes. From those we invited white papers. We had ten white papers and we forwarded four of those to the SACS leadership team that Heidi just talked about, and they chose the top one which is multimodal communication across the curriculum. One of the selection criteria for that was a plan that would dovetail very nicely with some of the things that we were interested in already on campus, for example, UK Core.

SELLNOW:

And so the topic selection team forwarded four ideas out of the ten white papers that we thought seemed would be feasible and good projects for the University of Kentucky to the SACS leadership team. We did that strategically because we know that in these economic times we didn't want to pick a topic that wouldn't be feasible for the campus at this time when we have so many things that we need to do. So the leadership team picked one of those four and ultimately unanimously picked that topic.

SNOW:

So spring of 2011 we have started the third of our four teams related to the QEP, and this is the document development team. That's the one that's now in session. We have about forty members on this team, and we are all working collectively together to put together this one hundred page document from people who are the grounders looking at the literature and getting information for us to the builders who are putting the plan together based on the white paper. People who are on the assessment team to figure out how we're going to not only assess whether we're successful with our project should we do that but in the process that we are using to get to that point.

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

SELLNOW:

And actually there are a few people on the document development team in here. Will you just raise your hand. So you've got some fellow Senators that are part of this document development team that is simply drafting the hundred page document, taking what was a ten page white paper and flushing it out in more detail. So the next thing is why the grounders have done a really good job in terms of the background literature. But why multimodal communication across the curriculum? And this is going to be part of our actual one hundred page document. And we have five good reasons. The first one which is maybe the most important one is the Association of American Colleges and Universities does a survey of employers and college graduates. They do this every couple of years. And this is what they published in 2007. And you'll see that when employers were asked what are the ten skills that they want most, teamwork, reasoning, oral and written communication, organizing information came up on the top of all their lists. They really emerged to the top. And they also did a survey of graduates, recent college graduates themselves, and you'll see that the same things came up as what they felt were the most important things to learn in their college education.

SNOW:

Number two, we're not doing such a great job at that, and that's another good reason why we should be focusing on it. Only one in four employers thinks colleges are doing a good job. Eighty-nine percent said colleges should place greater emphasis on developing students' ability to effectively communicate orally and in writing. And eighty-one percent said critical and analytical reasoning skills are still a deficit.

SELLNOW:

So that's kind of humbling for a communication person up here. Okay, there are a couple of other reasons besides those two. One is reason number three is the UK Core, which is a focus on undergraduate education that we've been employing and that we just rolled out in full action oriented this fall. The UK Core, you might remember that it's founded on several design

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
principles. One of the design principles of the UK Core is vertical integration. Of these four learning outcomes that we're supposed to be introducing students to in their first year or two on campus, what is supposed to happen is those same four learning outcomes show up again in the student's major before they graduate, vertical integration, so that it's more designed towards the kind of professions and outcomes that that major is supposed to be preparing students for. And learning outcome number two is written, oral, and visual communication. So this is the first one for vertical integration into the majors of the four learning outcomes.

SNOW: I'm just going to interject my own opinion here. When we were discussing earlier that we might be a little bit deficit in paying attention to undergraduate education, I'll remind everyone about UK Core. This has been a really huge focus on undergraduate education that's involved a lot of people in this campus, a lot of hard work, and that the QEP is also focused on undergraduate education, student learning, and student outcomes. So I think we are addressing undergraduate education.

SELLNOW: And the fourth reason is the graduation writing requirement, the GWR. For a number of years we were experimenting with piloting a graduation writing requirement that students had to do before they could graduate from UK, and the idea with the GWR was actually to get the writing to happen and occur within the majors. It wasn't supposed to be a vertical integration thing. But that didn't really happen across the campus. The English Department was ending up servicing a lot of the major portion of the students in the GWR. And because of that, that graduation writing requirement was an academic research paper that wasn't necessarily the kind of writing that a particular major might expect of their graduates. Like a lab report, for example, is not really the same as an academic fifteen page research paper. So there were some things that didn't happen with that. That is being

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
reconceived and it's here at the
Senate somewhere into a
communication requirement in the
major which is much more free than
the writing requirement. In other
words, the kind of communication
that you all think that your
students should have when they
graduate for the professions that
you're trying to prepare them for,
you're supposed to be able to
design what that would be yourself.
Now we're not in the QEP saying you
have to do this. We're just saying
the QEP actually provides support
for this if and when you maybe
decide to do it. This is not the
QEP. Okay.

SNOW: When we give this presentation
around campus, I'd say the number
one thing we hear is from faculty
saying is this something else we
need to do. So I want to remind
everyone. This is a gift. This is
a present we're working on handing
to you with a bow on it saying if
you would like your students to be
better communicators in the
assignments that you're giving them
and when they reach their careers,
take advantage of this thing that
we're doing and send them to these
centers that will help them be
better communicators.

SELLNOW: So, again, I just want to make that
clear because that's been one of
the things people have been saying
you're making us do this. No,
we're not. We're here to provide
intrastructural support if you
choose to do this.

SNOW: And as faculty members we
understand it's one more thing to
do. And then number five is we're
number one. We're very unique. We
are unique in this effort. As you
look across the United States and
people who have done their QEPs,
there have been other universities
that have done communication that
involves oral or written or visual
but we are one of the first to be
putting all of these together into
a written, oral, and visual
communication data set and giving
it a very digital emphasis. So
we're at the leading edge in this
effort.

SELLNOW: So that sounds really good. The
next thing we do in our campus
updates is we say that sounds
really good but what exactly is
this MCXC thing going to look like?

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

And it's really going to have two major components to it. One will be faculty development, and that will be for faculty who chose to that they can have help and assistance in designing communication based instruction, assignments, and assessment tools. Again, if they choose, that support will be there for them. And for students it will be tutoring services to help them create and refine the classroom communication projects that might be flat static print. It might be face to face communication like consultation skills. And it might be digital, online.

SNOW: So this is what we have to do from this point on. This is fall of 2011. We are, as we said, drafting this one hundred page document. We are developing the initial stages of a PR campaign along with the PR people. And we are giving these QEP updates across the entire campus.

SELLNOW: And that's really important because we will have a draft. Mind you it's a draft of the one hundred page QEP document done by December 15th. And that's really crucial because we need spring of 2012 to then vet that with the campus community so that you can have an opportunity to say yes, no, this would be better, to have some input again, broad based input into what this looks like.

SNOW: Please help us in this effort and go back to your constituencies and tell them that they will have an opportunity to supply more information to this. It is not written in stone at this point. In fall of 2012 begins the approval process. Once we have a document that we all agree is exactly what we want to do, then this will go through all of the processes all the way up to the Board of Trustees.

SELLNOW: That will simply get us to where we need to be with the final one hundred page document that's a plan that we need to deliver to SACS January 2013. So there's not really any extra time. We're one semester out. We have to get this done. Because as Heidi mentioned, April 9th through 11th, 2013 is when SACS will come to campus to see whether our QEP that we're

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
proposing is feasible for this
group on this campus. And one of
the things that they've told us
time and time again is that they'll
stop anybody on the sidewalk and
say what's your QEP? And we surely
don't want somebody to say what's a
QEP, right? And we also want
people to say it's multimodal
communication across the
curriculum. So that's crucial.

SNOW: In your spare time, in that Tuesday
morning 2 a.m. to 3 a.m. in your
spare time go to the computer and
look up some other universities'
QEPs and some of the very creative
things those students have done.
They have all kinds of videos and
flash mobs and various kinds of PR
campaigns to tell everyone about
it.

SELLNOW: And then we always close with a
little quiz time because, again, we
want to see if everyone fell asleep
or were checking their e-mail while
we went through our spiel. What's
a QEP?

ASSEMBLY: Quality Enhancement Plan.

SELLNOW: And what's our QEP?

ASSEMBLY: MCXC.

SELLNOW: Very good. And what's it going to
look like?

SNOW: Faculty part and a student part.

SELLNOW: A hundred pages. Faculty
consultation and student tutoring.
And why? Why did we pick
multimodal communication across the
curriculum?

GROSSMAN: Employers want it.

SELLNOW: All right, very good. Now, you can
imagine we are just a little bit
tired of doing this 5,427 times.
So we had the brainy idea why don't
we put this into a video and we can
send that around campus a little
bit at the times we can't go. So
we started the D and D show, and we
really don't want to do too much of
this, but we'll just show you what
this looks like for right now until
we make it better.

SNOW: If you come up for a time and we
can't make it, you might see these
two.

SNOW: (Thereupon, the video was played.)
All right, that's good. We're not
actors but we play one at UK.

SELLNOW: And actually we sent this link to
all of the college deans, and so
they are supposed to be sharing it
with their faculty and staff. So
we'll see.

SNOW: So we wanted to introduce you a

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

little bit to the actual plan so you know some of the nuts and bolts of what's going into this one hundred page document. So we began with some team building. And we had what we call the builders. And the builders are the people putting the document together. The grounders are the people that were supplying them with all the basic information. These two groups have combined at this point. We now have all the literature search that we need done and we're working on the document itself. So we have the -- there were linkers and promoters. The linkers were the people who were going out to link with the campus and do this updating process. The promoters were essentially the PR people, the real PR campaign involving our PR staff. So now we have these two as separate. Their PR campaign is off doing their thing of coming up with slogans, and Deanna and I have taken on this updating process for ourselves and a few people on the committee. Then we also have one group dedicated just to the finances related to this. And what we've asked them to do is put together a modular budget. So when we have instructors -- for example, an instructor with this background who would do this job, how much would that cost us? Then when we get to the end and we have this bigger plan, we can adjust it according to the finances that we have available. And then the assessors, who I said before, are going to assess not only the end product but how we're getting to that end product.

SELLNOW:

And we've also had some issues with this particular team. The stakes got higher or something. I don't know. At any rate when we got to this third team which was supposed to be according to the plan, the pre-planning document that we had put together way back in the fall of 2009, this was supposed to be a smaller group of people who are experts in whatever topic got picked. And then there would be ad hoc committees that would serve as resources to make sure they weren't missing something for the different units across the campus. However, what ended up happening is many people wanted to be involved. For

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
the first time, lots and lots of people wanted to be involved in representing. So instead of having a team of ten or twelve people, we have a team of about forty people in our document development team that is only drafting a document that's going to get vetted with the whole community next semester. Remember the Kelsey Grammar thing on Cheers when somebody asked him what he did? He said I'm a professor. He said oh, what do you do? I profess. We have found out that that's what most of you do. So everybody has an opinion about how this should go. And that's fantastic. We're very happy about that.

SNOW:

GROSSMAN:
SELLNOW:

You just found that out? We met with the Senate Council at their last meeting last week and asked if this could be the end of adding people to the community, and they gave us their blessing, which we are appreciative of.

SNOW:

Okay, so now we're moving on. Now we had to come up with another level of strategy here because with our forty member team, we had different people thinking different things about what we were doing. And that came out kind of slowly as we got into major discussions. So Deanna and I went back and formed what Heidi called a primer. We are teaching people from step one now exactly what we mean by all of these parts so we're all working with the same language and same goals. So we had to start with what do we mean by multimodal communication across the curriculum?

SELLNOW:

We broke it down. Multimodal, if a mode is a particular type or form of something, then multimodal is at least two types or form of something. And communication is a process of managing messages for the purposes of creating meaning. So multimodal communication is at least two types or forms of communication. In our case three types, written, oral, and visual. And, again, I remind you, this is quite unique as a QEP topic. This is a visual representation of that for people who like to see it in pictures more than words. And someone yelled at us for not having permission to use that in the bottom corner.

SNOW:

SELLNOW: FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
This is just another way of conceptualizing that sometimes communication might be private personal, or it might be public in general. It might be for the purposes of interaction, participation, collaboration, or it might be for publishing, distributing, broadcasting. And, again, this is that idea of freeing up what communication means so that it's appropriate to the professions that you're training your students to be ready for.

SNOW: In our one hundred page document we have twenty-five pages that we can put appendices in and this is one image that we'll probably use to make this point.

SELLNOW: Another way to think about this is intrapersonal communication can be private and to the self. That might be a form of communication in terms of reflection, comprehension, or analysis.

SNOW: Interpersonal communication is one to one form and maintain relationships, acquaintances, colleagues, friends, and intimacy.

SELLNOW: A small group communication is few to few, and that might be the goal to accomplish a common purpose, family groups, social groups, support groups, service groups, work groups.

SNOW: And public is to many. You can find message to many public speaking, mass performance studies, something like we're doing right now.

SELLNOW: So the broadness, the broad nature of what communication means, we're hoping that people see themselves in there somewhere. In terms of channels, the kind of communication that a different major might be looking for, it might be static, which is the typical flat print, research papers, lab reports, essays, even greeting card, billboard, poster, flyers, or it might be face to face, conversation, consultation, debate, small group discussions, panel discussions, public speeches. It might be digital via cell phone, telephone, computer, or Internet. So the channels makes a difference, too.

SNOW: And we're talking about helping our students be better communicators. We're really looking at a very wide range of communication skills.

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

What we have learned along the way is that everyone everybody wants to be a part of this and wants a part of the action. So that's why we have gone back to giving everybody this basic information. We've gone to the idea that we're going to put together this draft first and then bring it across campus so everybody has a say-so in it. And why we increased our membership to this committee to a larger number. And this has been another issue that we have faced along with some of these others. And that is public relations. We have an excellent public relations team headed by Jay Blanton. And they have done some amazing things. Already gone on Facebook and made a page for us, UK-MCXC. If you haven't liked it already, please go like at it. And we have videos and articles. You've probably seen some that are in the UK Now and various -- the Colonel. And we have developed focus groups across campus to try to give us some ideas about how we can bring this MCXC concept to something that's a little bit snazzier for our undergraduate population. And a problem that we're having right now is actually finding that brand.

SELLNOW:

It's been kind of a struggle for us so if anyone in here has a great idea about how to canvas the campus population and in particular the student population, try to get them to come up with some ideas for logos or slogans that will work for this concept, so we don't have to keep saying multimodal communication across the curriculum or MCXC, either one.

BRION:

Chatty Cats.

SELLNOW:

Huh?

BRION:

Chatty Cats.

SELLNOW:

Then I always throw in my plug. I like Communi-Cats.

SNOW:

We've had a long list of them. We're going to let our PR people take care of this because they're experts in this regard and they know how to roll these things out into campus and get buzz going and get people involved. Any of these ideas, we'll take that one back as well. Any ideas that you have, please let us know.

SELLNOW:

So right now we're in the process again of drafting this one hundred page document. And what we planned

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

-- that will be about what we planned to do, our rationale, and how we're going to assess whether or not we're successful. Here's what we've got so far. Just let you know, and, again, it's just a draft, but here's what we got. The purpose is to prepare the University of Kentucky undergraduate, graduate, and professional students to employ effective integrated oral, written, and visual communication skills as producers and critical consumers as expected of professionals in their chosen fields. And I think that last phrase is very key.

SNOW:

The rationality of these five things that we just told you about that employers wanted, we need to do a better job. We need vertical integration, the CRM, and then we're among the trend setters in this arena.

SELLNOW:

The fact now, the structure, the faculty development and student tutoring, we just want to tell you a little bit about how we're flushing this out because, again, this has been an issue for us in terms of people saying I want to do. I already do this. We already do this. We should have this in our unit. And it can't be an empire in any unit. Can't be in the communication department. It has to be a campus wide involvement. Very important. And so in terms of faculty development, we're going to collaborate. We're proposing that this QEP group will collaborate with self and (unintelligible) enhancement of learning and teaching to provide the kinds of consultations and workshops that faculty might be interested in being involved with. So that collaboration piece with existing human resources on campus is important. The other piece of the faculty development is the thing that we're proposing that's a faculty fellows program. And there will be three cohorts. And each cohort will be responsible for working through this in a three year process. Their first year they'll attend workshops and revise their syllabi and collect baseline data for assessment in terms of how their students are doing in whatever kind of communication they're talking about. The second

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

year they'll implement it and collect data again to assess. And they'll start to serve as a consultant peer mentor to the new people who come in as a year one cohort. And then year three, they'll assess and compare the two sets of data and they'll continue to be a consultant mentor. What we're trying to do with this is not saying everybody on campus has to do this. But we're saying that it's campus involvement. We invite people to apply to be a faculty fellow so that we'll try to get some grass roots going across the campus rather than saying impose this on everybody.

SNOW:

According to the regulation of SACS, the beginning of this had to be a broad based project. So we've done that part. We've involved the entire campus in the development of this idea as a focus. But the project itself when we get to the implementation stage, which is the fourth committee in the fourth stage of this after it's approved, that can be a very small set. We can have a small number of faculty addressing a small number of students and then assess how well it's doing. If for some reason this isn't working out, there is no reason why we would want to bring this particular project to the entire campus, for example. So I don't want you to be thinking in terms of we have to give this to everyone all the time across the entire campus.

SELLNOW:

And in terms of student tutoring, we've been talking about different lab facility options and we will probably write up in the plan as different options because space is so critical and hard to find on this campus. So we've been hearing some different possibilities. One is a centrally located center with some satellite labs from partner units across campus. Various colleges already have labs. Some colleges. So they might be able to partner with us for the students in their majors. Just have one centrally located center. Or there's been talk of three centers, one on the north campus, the central campus, and the south campus in satellites. Another has been to re-purpose the basement in William T. Young to include the

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
(unintelligible.) Another has been
to re-purpose the academic
enhancement of the study to include
the center. So that's going to be
proposed as options.

SNOW: Our forty member team did a field
trip just recently down to the hub
to see how that space could work
for us, and it is a really terrific
space.

SELLNOW: And the labs would be staffed by
peer tutors that would assist
fellow students with lower division
projects. Peer mentors to assist
students with upper division
projects. Graduate mentors and
post op mentors to help with the
training and supervision of the
tutors and the mentors.

SNOW: Also collaborate with the study
with the academic enhancement in
the writing center to develop and
employ the best practices because
these groups have already been
through this. They know how to
work with students. They know how
to pay tutors. They've been
involved with this for a long time.
So we're not going to reinvent the
wheel here. We're talking about
taking advantage of the wonderful
resources that we already have and
using these to develop this
project.

SELLNOW: So, again, the collaboration of
human resources already exists on
campus. I think that partnering
piece is important that we make
that clear that that's happening.

SNOW: This is how we envision the
administrative component of this.
There will be a program director
that would be a full-time tenured
faculty member with appropriate
expertise and hired to oversee all
facets of the program. And this
person would be assisted by an
interdisciplinary advisory board,
ten to fifteen faculty experts.

SELLNOW: And there would be three associate
directors that would be either
part of the DOE or an annual
stipend. But they would each focus
on one of the aspects. One would
be an associate director for
student services to help with the
labs, the tutoring. One for
faculty services to help with the
faculty consultations and
workshops. And one for assessment.
And the committee was pretty
unanimous about having that person
being half time for the MCXC but

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

half time for the university assessment. So, again, that collaboration and partnering across appropriate units on campus would happen.

SNOW:

Where we are right now. Our teams have posted to Sharepoint which is our site for communication among all of us so we don't always have to get together. For October 5th the assessors had a draft of where they are. The financiers had a draft of theirs, and the PR campaign has a draft of what they have come to. So now those are up and visual to everybody on the team and feedback is required on these by everyone on the committee by October 12th. Our next meeting is October 20th and we'll discuss each of these three drafts and which pieces of this will get put into the major draft. And then in the meantime Deanna and I are continuing to write the hundred page document.

SELLNOW:

Sometimes you have to give yourself the applause. Questions, comments?

STEIN:

Rich Stein, Arts and Sciences. Somewhere about nine hundred power point slides ago I missed the point between SACS requiring a Quality Enhancement Plan and the driving force of a hundred page document. I'm not entirely sure who came up with the nomenclature MCXC or the sort of content of that as our Quality Enhancement Plan.

SELLNOW:

Well, the one hundred page document is the QEP. The one hundred page document --

STEIN:

The germ or the core of the idea then.

SELLNOW:

The core of the idea is what we've been doing since January of 2010 when we started soliciting big ideas from across the campus and we got over the two hundred big ideas. Then we also collected the assessment reports from the various units across campus. We collected two year's worth of the Colonel and two year's worth of press releases that went out into the Herald newspaper. And we sat ourselves down and looked at all of these big ideas and looked for themes about student learning and we came up with six themes. And then in the fall of 2010 we asked for proposals where people could put a five hundred word paragraph about addressing one of these themes.

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

And MCXC was one of them. Service learning was one of them. Thematic first year experience was one of them. Then we, as a team, this thirty person team, sat down and decided that all of these sixty-seven proposals I think we got in the fall, we picked ten. We asked people to develop a ten page white paper flushing it out. And then we met in December of that year and looked at those ten white papers and as a team decided to submit four to the SACS leadership team of which they picked one, and they picked MCXC.

SNOW: And MCXC is just an abbreviation for multimodal communication across the curriculum.

STEIN: I got that. I promise you I got that. I will answer that when they ask me when I walk across campus. I heard that.

SNOW: As you can tell, that's not a very good campaign slogan, across campus, especially for young folks. They're not going to say that. So that's why we have our PR team working on something that's catchier, snappier, better, that they're going to want to say that we're going to want to have on banners, people wearing on buttons, t-shirts. So that's happening. So bear with us while we're in the transition between an idea and the PR campaign.

SWANSON: We have time for one more question, please.

SMYTH-PINNEY: Julia Smith-Pinney, Design. How did visual come into this?

SELLNOW: It's one of the four learning outcomes for UK Core is written, oral, and visual. And so if it's going to be vertical integration of one of those learning outcomes, written, oral, visual is that learning element.

SNOW: We're very excited about that part. Ben Withers is working on our team and Margo Bryant. So we have some people in design who are really creative. We're excited about that.

SWANSON: All right, well, thank you very much. If you have further questions, please don't hesitate to contact Diana or Deanna. I'm sure they'd be pleased to answer them. We'd like to move on now to agenda item number five. This is again looking at the proposed changes to Senate Rules 5.2.4.7. Dr. Jones,

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
Chair of the Rules Committee, would
you like to give us a brief
introduction?

JONES:

This is the issue with final exams
and length of final exams that we
talked about at the last meeting.
The issue had arisen in relation to
the two hours that are being
scheduled by the registrar and does
this mean (unintelligible) must be
available two hours or does the
instructor have the option to make
it some period of time that's less
than that. So the body sent it
back to the Senate to chew on it
some more, make it more clear what
was being proposed to the Senate.
In the meantime I did some
legislature history work to try to
see if we could discern what the
intent was in the Senate rules, and
this is something that actually I
think the Senate has kind of let it
get away from itself. It thinks
there's some institutional memory,
remembering some things that -- to
bring it back into focus. So to go
back to define what was the actual
intent, I had to go way back to the
1930s, our Senate rules, and that's
the last time the Senate rules
actually made clear its intent. It
says that final exams cannot be
longer than three hours. That
seems to indicate to the Senate
Council the intent that this is
something that's up to the
discretion of the instructor how
long it's going to be. Just the
Senate puts a cap on the end of it.
It wasn't the intent that you must
be available the entire time to the
student but rather the instructor
has some block on how long it can
be. Those who have seen the Senate
history know that shortly after
that the Senate got abolished and
it got reconstructed. But after
that time the administration
stopped printing Senate rules and
went through several decades where
it's all in the Senate minutes, not
in the Senate rules and where is
our librarian? They keep the
Senate minutes now offsite. I
can't go -- I have to go to the
cave to find this. The only full
copy of the Senate rules are not on
campus anymore. But in any event
with the help of Jacquie Hager, we
jumped to 1969, and at that moment
was the first time that the final
exam schedule, which had been

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
printed always separately, came
printed together with the UK
bulletin so we found right there is
the first time we can track it.
It's a two hour exam rather than a
three hour exam. But the
legislative intent probably meant
the instructor could make it two
hours but doesn't have to make the
full two hours. And finally we get
to our current language right now
in which we make some reference to
how long it's being scheduled by
the registrar. But there's nothing
in the Senate rules saying how long
the final exam has to be. We're
posting off some inertia here and
the registrar office has been very
clear they're not deciding on a
technological reason whether it
should be two hours. They're
trying to operate off what they
think Senate intent is and we have
to go way, way back for Senate
intent. So if we look at the
language here with the Senate
Council has come up with trying to
make this more clear, you can see
in part A stating very clear the
registrar shall schedule it to be
for two hours. Some of the
faculties of the colleges that have
special calendars can request
something that's different than
that. And you notice in item C the
instructor may allow the students
to have less than the full period.
But the Senate Council chewed on
this. This would be new. The
instructors' decision how long the
final exam is going to be up to two
hours, but if it's not going to be
the full two hours, then at least
two weeks before the final exam let
the students know that they're not
going to have the full two hours so
they can make their plans how to
study and manage their time. So,
again, A is going to be two hours.
C making it clear the instructor
decides where it fits. It doesn't
say the instructor has to start it
at the beginning but any time in
that two hours as long as you fit
it in that two hours, that's up to
the discretion of the instructor.
Summer sessions and summer terms
are a little bit different. Again,
the Senate rules say that the final
exam basically is the last class
period. Now, even up until today
we were trying to work this out.
What this implies, so just be aware

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
of this, the last class date for
four week is -- during four week
they're meeting two hours at a
time. During eight week they're
meeting less than that. So in an
eight week class which is meeting
once a day, the classes are sixty
minutes long. And because we've
declared here in the Senate rules
and have for some time that the
eight weeks summer term final exam
is on the last period, it cannot be
longer than one hour. It cannot be
longer than sixty minutes. If
that's an issue, maybe we want to
come back to visit that. But it
would -- just be aware of that.
Being the summer term, the last
class session -- but, again, within
whatever amount of time it is, it's
up to the instructor how long a
final exam is going to be.
Thank you very much, Davy. So I'd
like to hear a motion. The
recommended motion is that the
Senate approve proposed new
language of SR 5.2.4.7 effective
immediately. May I hear a motion?
So moved. Shelly Steiner.

SWANSON:

STEINER:
GETCHELL:
SWANSON:
GETCHELL:
SWANSON:

BUTLER:

JONES:
BUTLER:
SWANSON:
JONES:
BUTLER:

JONES:

BUTLER:
SWANSON:
BUTLER:
JONES:

BUTLER:
SWANSON:

Second.
And you are?
Tom Getchell, Medicine.
Would there be anybody who would
like to discuss in favor or against
the motion?

J.S. Butler, Graduate. As the
Senator from there, I have two
questions. Which colleges have
Senate approval for their own
special exam?
Medicine, Dentistry, and Law.
Thank you.

Any other questions?
And Pharmacy.

I have a second question. What is
the effect of this on graduate or
other evening classes that meet for
two and a half hours and up to now
have final exams which were
specified to be held within the
scheduled time of the class which
would then be two and a half hours?
Are those classes within the
meaning of the schedule that's
controlled by the registrar's
scheduling?

Yes.
Jacquie says they are.
What would the effect be on those?
This would make it a two hour
limit.
I'm opposed to this.
Any other?

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

BRION: Gail Brion, College of Engineering. I'm kind of seeing a conflict between section C where the instructor may allow students less than the full scheduled period scheduled and the case of take-home examinations where the student will be able to turn it in up to the end of the scheduled examination which would make the professor unable to make the scheduled examination shorter than the two hours.

JONES: Do you want to propose a solution?

VAN NAGEL: what is the argument here? I mean you just (unintelligible) out dates and (unintelligible.)

BRION: If the professor has given a take-home exam and they want people to turn it in in the first hour rather than sitting around for two hours of the scheduled exam, this does not allow them to do that. The professor has to accept it for the complete two hours which seems to abrogate the authority of the professor to set an exam that's shorter than two hours.

JONES: Or at least must be handed in before the end.

BRION: Exactly. But the professor will be sitting in the room for two hours waiting for people to hand in the exams when if they would have given an in-class exam your exam is going to be fifteen minutes. It's just inconsistent.

FIEDLER: Ted Fiedler, Arts and Sciences. Frankly, I think this is micro management gone amuck. You know, professors who give take-home exams tend not to sit in their classrooms waiting for the exams to be handed in, okay?

SWANSON: Does it say that you have to sit in your classroom and wait for the exam?

FIEDLER: Well, that was the implication.

BRION: Before the end of the regularly scheduled examination period, I would assume that would also be --

SWANSON: Does it say that it has to be handed in to the professor?

JONES: It doesn't say it has to be the classroom either.

SWANSON: Any other comments?

DEBSKI: Yeah, Liz Debski, A and S. So I guess I'm wondering, I teach some rather large classes and especially at the end of the final weeks there's always students who are rushing in having overslept or something like that. And basically

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

they may come in with half an hour left of the scheduled exam time. And then what you typically do is just let them continue past that time. Does this not allow that?

JONES: Oh, I'm sorry, I was still thinking about hers. Sorry.

DEBSKI: Well, if you have a student come in very late to the exam during this scheduled exam period, can you not allow that student to continue taking the exam for the full time when it goes over the scheduled exam period?

JONES: when the instructor issues the policy like by two weeks before, that policy I think could contain.

DEBSKI: It could contain that if you oversleep, you can come in and take the exam later?

JONES: what I'm saying is we're trying to give as much discretion to the instructor to handle --

DEBSKI: why change it? Then why change the rules?

SWANSON: We're clarifying the rule. We're not changing anything. We're just trying to put some clarity on it. All right, I'm going to go ahead and ask for a vote. All right, two more and then I'm going to ask for a vote.

HULSE: David Hulse, College of Economics. I have a colleague who teaches a large section in (unintelligible) setting, but she administers her exam through blackboard. If I read this correctly, she could schedule that final exam whenever she wants during finals week because she is not requiring students to take the exam in a particular place at a particular -- in a particular place. Is that true?

JONES: That's what the opening paragraph would say here.

HULSE: So this colleague of mine could schedule her exam, her final exam at any time during finals week if she wants?

JONES: That's the reading of this, yes.

HULSE: I'm not asking the (unintelligible.) I mean is that true?

JONES: Yes, yes. What we're trying to do here is the registrar is trying to schedule the exam length and (unintelligible) according to the senate's intent. Right now there is nothing in the senate rule to tell the registrar you're correctly scheduling two hour blocks here. At the minimum, we've got to, you

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

know, have the registrar have a basis for scheduling two hour blocks, three hour blocks, a one hour block. So we've got to get some kind of structure there that we don't have now while preserving as much the discretion of the instructor possible.

HULSE: I understand that. But what's the rationale for allowing that discretion for someone who has been administering the exam by a blackboard versus someone administering it in a classroom?

JONES: The rules committee doesn't make policy. We're just trying to find the language the Senate wants. If you want --

SWANSON: We'll have one more comment. We need to move on. It's getting late. One more comment.

CONNERS: Harry Conners, Agriculture. Hollie, my question is very similar to his. I was just questioning, I guess, something that I could find no objection to myself because my question was whether the word was sufficient to include distance learning opportunities, things like that. I didn't know having any boundaries on something like that moving forward.

SWANSON: Davy, can you answer that?

JONES: If in distance learning they're requiring the student to be at a particular place at the local community college or something at a particular time, then the opening sentence here would say that that rule applies.

SWANSON: Thank you. I'm going to go ahead and ask for a vote.

HULSE: I'd like to move that we strike the inappropriate place from the motion.

SWANSON: Are you making an amendment?

HULSE: Yes.

SWANSON: So do we need to vote for a new amendment then? Is there a second on that amendment?

YOST: I'll second. Scott Yost, College of Engineering.

SWANSON: Okay, discussion? All right, let's go ahead and vote on the amendment. Pardon me.

CHRIST: Alice Christ, Fine Arts. I think the emphasis on particular place is because the conflict of the room schedule is the main problem. That's the only problem about letting students stay late or how long you're -- so you do have to solve that problem.

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

SWANSON:

Thank you. All right, let's go ahead and vote on the amendment then. All in favor of the amendment, raise your hand. Opposed? Abstained? The amendment is voted down. Let's go back to the original motion. All those in favor of the motion so that would be as it reads now. All in favor? Opposed?

SOHNER:
SWANSON:

We have fifteen. Abstained? Motion carries; is that correct, Michelle?

SOHNER:
SWANSON:

Yes.
Thank you very much. We're going to change the order a little bit so that we can get to our next item of business. It has come to the attention of Senate Council that there are calendars gone awry. And as you know, the calendars are controlled by the faculty and mainly this body. So what's happened here is this is a summary slide that shows especially with the summer sessions. So you'll notice that the summer sessions theoretically are within two sections. So you've got this short four week here. So it's supposed to start May 10th and end June 7th. And then you have the second summer session, it starts June 9th and June 4th. But willy-nilly has prevailed and so here's willy over here, May 10th to June 21. Here's nilly starting here. So the problem is multi-fold. It affects the students. And so, for example, if you are a student and you're right here taking this course, so you wouldn't have your final exam until June 23rd. As a student you might assume that you can go to student health, for example. But no, the registrar has said that the course is over on June 7th. And so you will have not been covered by your student health. Those are some kind of problems. How do we calculate enrollment? And then the other problem is if this continues to go along these lines that this creates hardship for our registrar's office because what they have to do is manually enter all these things. And the other thing that's happening is on these drop and add dates, they're making them up as they go. So we're saying maybe we should look into this and this is what's proposed. What we would like to do is we've

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
got a short term and a long term
fix to this. The long term fix is
to form a committee. Form a
committee and look at the academics
of it and say why this period of
time versus this period of time.
So from a pedagogical standpoint,
what would be an appropriate time?
So let's look at that. But in the
meantime, as many of you know, in
these colleges offering these
courses, these are on the books
now, right, and so we don't want to
interfere with courses that are
ongoing and impede the ability of
our students to take these. And so
this is the recommendation from the
Senate Council and the intent of
this recommendation is to allow
these courses to go on over the
summer while we deliver it over the
academics. And so the
recommendation from Senate Council
is that the Senate permit six week
courses that begin at the beginning
of the four week session and permit
six week courses that begin two
weeks after the beginning. That's
consistent with the table I showed
you of the eight week session
summer 2012 over. May I hear a
motion?

BRION: I so move. Gail Brion.

SWANSON: Second?

MEYER: Lee Meyer, Ag.

SWANSON: Discussion?

PRATS: Armando Prats, English Department.
Does that alter the number of
courses a student can take during
the summer or not?

SWANSON: It would depend then how the
enrollment is counted and it
perhaps may. Does anybody have a
better answer than I just gave? I
think the question is we don't
really know. It depends on how
that's counted when they overlap.

PRATS: I'm just suggesting somebody at the
registrar.

KORNBLUH: Certainly the intent of the two
six-week sessions is to encourage
and permit students to take more
credits during the summer and to
allow the particular -- the second
six weeks has allowed the students
to start a little later when some
student couldn't start at the
beginning of the eight weeks.

FIEDLER: Ted Fiedler, Arts and Sciences.
We've been offering language
courses over six weeks for
pedagogical reasons. It's simply a
fact that students retain more if

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

they learn it over a slightly longer period of time. It would be a real disadvantage to us if we got rid of six week sessions. I'm very strongly in favor of that. We've been doing that since the 1980s. So I'm a little puzzled that this has become a problem now.

SWANSON: Those are the kind of issues we want this committee to look into. All right, any others about the motion?

YOST: Scott Yost, College of Engineering. So if we don't approve the motion, are we basically eliminating all these things for next year, is that what it is, or are we saying no to stuff that has been going on or -- Well, it goes against our rules. Davy, do you have an answer to that?

SWANSON: Davy, do you have an answer to that?

JONES: These courses are being held in non-compliance with the Senate rules which raises all kinds of liability issues. SACS, for example.

SWANSON: So by not approving this temporary YOST: fix, we're telling the University community we're not allowing them anymore?

SWANSON: Pretty much.

YOST: Okay, I just wanted to be clear.

SWANSON: Thank you. One more and then I'll stop.

DEBSKI: Yeah, I guess I'm wondering how this all came to be in the first place?

SWANSON: why does willy-nilly happen? Have you read about the chaos theory?

DEBSKI: I know all about the chaos theory. But really I mean basically this is all supposed to come through the Senate and clearly there's been no concern for our ability to look at the curriculum and look at the calendars. That's one of the very basic ideas of what the Senate does.

SWANSON: That's true. Thank you for the comment, but I'm going to push us forward, and I'm going to ask for a vote. All in favor?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Opposed?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Abstained?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Motion carries. Thank you. All right, the next item on our agenda is item number six. And we'd like to welcome Dean Kornbluh, Christina Alcalde, Jeff Rice, and Nathan Dewart. And they will be telling

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
us about A&S wired. Welcome.

KORNBLUH:

So the pleasure of being at the end when everyone wants to get out of here, we'll do this as quick as possible. We asked for the opportunity to explain A&S wired a little bit to the Senate. This is the first residential college at UK. This is a term that's used around the country to describe a living learning experience that's faculty run and on a large scale. We've had living learning communities here at UK for a long time. In the language those are always small things around twenty-five is the model. At UK these are mostly run by student life, not by faculty. So what we wanted to do was to create a faculty run living learning experience. That's what A&S wired is. We have three faculty members that are going to talk about it this year. They have two graduate assistants, eight peer mentors, and an administrative support for this. They're teaching fourteen courses are being offered to these students. Here are three faculty directors and I'm going to let them talk in about thirty seconds. This year we look to create this in a very short time frame. We finally got approval to use a dorm in January so our goal is at least half of this dorm. The dorm is Keeneland Hall, one of the older on north side campus dorm. We have 177 students this year. The important thing to stress is this is not just for Arts and Science students. They're for all first year students. The students, these 177 students, come from nine colleges, forty-three majors. On purpose they represent the full diversity of students at UK. So we have Singletary Scholars and the top honors students and we've got some of the academic readiness students that were the last ones admitted to the program. We purposely have an extremely diverse student body. We made sure we had men, the last ones to sign up for everything, not just women. We have a large representation of minority students. We have students from out of state, international students as well. We took this old dorm. We renovated the first floor in the basement. This dorm is attractive because it

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

has opportunity to put in living learning spaces. You're not as lucky as the Board of Trustees. We're not taking you over there. We'll show you some brief pictures. We took what was probably one of the worst classrooms on campus in the basement there. We turn them into two high tech classrooms. Nathan in the classroom using that. These pictures look much better on the screen. We'll put them up there. This is upstairs. We purposely created space where students could gather with each other and talk and use their computers, sort of collaborative learning space. This is a basement that was virtually never used. It was called the dungeon last year by students who lived in the dorm. We made it bright. We put in useable furniture. A lot of high tech screens and connections so they could connect their computers and I pads to this. The goal of this was to sort of leap ahead instead of keep talking about where we want to be in 2020. Start to create a laboratory for creating a 2020 education right now. So our goal is to reintegrate curricular with co-curricular experiences, facilitate a different type of faculty student interaction that didn't occur enough on this campus. Facilitate a type of student to student engagement to model this and to use the type of technology the students come to campus with today in a born digital generation very purposely so that we can get them to think how to use this communication. Every student got an Ipad. Jeff's going to tell you a little bit about how we're using them. Here's pictures of them. I'll get out of the way and let Christina and Jeff and Nathan tell you a little bit about it.

ALCALDE:

I'll try to be very quick but also give you a typical overview of what we're doing. So one of the cornerstones of wired are these eight week courses, and every student takes two eight week courses their first year. And these eight week courses are small. They're up to twenty-five students. And we really emphasize active learning and experimental learning. And they're taught by faculty from all over. So we have -- right now

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

we have courses like the African Experience in Kentucky. I'm teaching a course called Migration Stories where I'm teaming up with the Carnegie Center and my students are working with ESL students there and tutoring immigrant children to learn more about (unintelligible) immigration worldwide but also in our community. Jeff's going to be teaching Eating Kentucky and Nathan's teaching Social Connections. Those are just some of the courses. We also have the Vietnam War. Another one, Second Life. So there's lots and lots of different courses we're teaching. And beyond those courses, what we emphasize in those courses is really close faculty to student connections. And then it's also outside the classroom. So one of the more popular things we've done so far as far as co-curricular activities are the coffee chats. I think we showed a picture of one of those we have up there. And the coffee chats are once a week every single Wednesday at 4:00. We invite someone, either a leader from the community organization or a faculty member from across campus. So in two weeks, for example, we have Dean Tim Tracey from the College of Pharmacy coming and speaking to students. And one of our students, Tyler Stark, actually invite him because he's interested in pursuing a career in pharmacy. And so we also have someone from the College of Law, Melinda Price, coming. We have lots of people from all over UK coming and talking to students in a very approachable way. And basically the goal of these coffee chats is to show students that we're approachable. Sit down over coffee, over sweets, talk about our research but in a very comfortable way. No lecturing, just sitting around. And we've had twenty to thirty students or more every single week. So it's been a really exciting part of that. I know we're out of time so that's all I'll say. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

DeWALL:

Hello, I'm Nathan and I'm going to use my fifteen seconds to talk to you about a lot of the research

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

we're doing at wired. A lot of residential colleges across the country, they do a lot of talking about the good that they do and -- but rarely do they do sort of careful systematic analysis of the students over time. But that's one thing that we're doing with wired. Dean Kornbluh built a lab for us to conduct research in the basement. So what we're doing is a longitudinal investigation of these students in terms of their mental well-being, physical well-being, academic outcomes, motivations, their social network, where they are within the context of the wired social communities. And we're collaborating with members of the Gatton School of Business who are experts in social analysis. And from colleagues across the University to sort of look at how the wired experience is changing these students. And it's affecting not only the wired students but it's also affecting the students here at the University. So, for example, one of my PhD students working in my laboratory just began his dissertation students looking at wired students on various outcomes. So it's sort of going both ways. And Jeff.

RICE:

As Mark said, every student and every instructor gets one of these little devices, Ipad. I've had two. We live in the age of mobile computing. Phone, your laptop, the Ipad. What we're trying to do is extend pedagogy to the mobile. Students in class are able to use these devices, of course, but outside of class with the extracurricular activities, anybody teaching (unintelligible), video production students are downloading the app as opposed to the software program so we're talking about a slightly different kind of logic. Note-taking, like (unintelligible), which comes with video and audio capabilities, I-movie, presentations, which is keynote on here. We've seen virtually the same thing as Power Point basically. We're talking about audio recording, word processing with pages and really trying to transform the learning experience particularly for the first year student who has the opportunity now to engage with computing. It

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt
happens at the University because
regardless of what everybody feels
about blackboard, nobody uses
blackboard graduating from the
University of Kentucky. That's it.
They're more than likely to use
this device or use a device of a
similar kind of logic. As I took
my one year old the other day to
the doctor to get checked up, the
nurse pulls out an Ipad. And
you've seen doctors use other kinds
of mobile devices, engineers,
educators. This is the time to be
thinking about (unintelligible) and
in terms of retention issues, this
is the way to get students to be
thinking technologically as opposed
to something (unintelligible.)
Thank you.

KORNBLUH:

So just to take away is that we
really are trying to build an
academic community here without
reintegrating undergraduate
education and in some fundamental
way about reasserting faculty
control. My goal here was to get
some really creative faculty
members and turn this over to them.
And to be honest, this relates back
to what Joe's report was at the
beginning of this meeting. If
we're talking about reinvigorating
undergraduate education, my primary
concern is that we really think
about doing this in a way that the
faculty controls and takes back
questions of dorms and student life
and really important questions and
decides those questions for --
around academic issues. We've had
so little control of the student
life side of campus. None of us
ever get to discuss whether
sorority rush should be the first
thing that all women coming to this
campus deal with, and we never get
to discuss the fact that K week has
no academic content. So this is
taking students where they live,
their lives, saying faculty members
let's link the education back into
everything they're doing. Any
questions?

DEBSKI:

Does the faculty get an Ipad as
well?

KORNBLUH:

In our college you do get computer
equipment. If you have needs for
your teachers, we'll get it to you.

SPEAKER:

What proportion of students?

KORNBLUH:

So this dorm holds 300 -- next year
we hope to have 300 students there
which is, what, about eight percent
Page 58

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

of the entering class. Both I and I know the provost see this as a model to think about how we move forward. So I know that when there's a discussion of new dorms the biggest issue on my mind is that we want to have classrooms in there. We want to have space for faculty to have offices. We want to make sure that the educational experience is the centerpiece in thinking about how those new dorms are designed and put together. So this is a school for doing that. The type of thing that Nathan and his colleagues are trying to do, to think about what piece works and what doesn't and really affect students' success will help us, I think, in planning for these new dorms (unintelligible.)

BRION:

Gail Brion, College of Engineering. And you guys are working together with the multimodal communications people because it seems like an obvious fit here. I am on the QEP as well.

DeWALL:
KORNBLUH:
SWANSON:

Thank you very much.
Thank you. That's very exciting. Our last item on the agenda is item number eight. And what this is an initial discussion of proposed new policies for faculty productivity and accountability. And so this comes out of really -- it comes to us from Texas. In Texas they started to ask the question, and this is the legislators, just what are those lazy professors doing anyhow. And so they published some spreadsheets and what they had in Texas and these spreadsheets, Professor X taught so many classes and then this is the number of dollars that were brought in and this is how much we pay Professor X. And clearly they're not worth their pay, right? So that was Texas. And then this caught the attention of the people in Florida. And the Florida legislature thinks this sounds like a really, really good idea. And the reason we're talking about it now is to try to head off efforts from Frankfort. And so the idea is do we as professionals need to have control over this issue and we need to say what we consider to be productive faculty. And so this is back in the hands of the faculty, an evaluation of your peers. And so I wanted to give you a head's up.

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 10-10-11.txt

This is the way we've designed this vetting. So the provost has initiated the broad plan about how faculty performance should be assessed. And what we're asking for is volunteers and we want to get a broad campus representation. So we're asking for faculty to volunteer to serve on this ad hoc committee. They do not have to be Senators. So anybody can volunteer and we already have two volunteers. Not in this body even. And so then what we'll be soliciting more volunteers. What this committee will be charged with is looking through this plan, making recommendations. I'm also asking that you solicit input from all of the college faculty. So I'll help you coordinate with the chairs of the college faculty so that we can get as much input as we can. Now, at the same time, the individual units will be looking at faculty productivity within the unit and specifying what you consider to be productivity within your own unit, within your own discipline. We need to have this finished, reviewed, approved by Senate for April 2013. That's our goal. And so working backwards from that we would like to see a final report to the Senate Council on February 1. That would allow us to have two readings in the Senate. Okay, any questions, comments?

SPEAKER:

Did you mean April 2013?

SWANSON:

Did I mean that? You know, I just got ahead of myself. That is. Yes, so it should be 2012. For some reason I was missing 2012 (unintelligible.) No, that's a mistake. That should be 2012. Any other comments, questions? (No audible response.)

SWANSON:

All right, it should be fun, right? I was on the faculty performance review appeals committee last summer and learned a lot about the problems that we currently have. I'll share any insights that you'd like when we get into this. Thank you very much. The next order of business is a motion to adjourn. Hearing no objection, our meeting is adjourned. Thank you. (Thereupon, the University of Kentucky Senate Council Meeting for October 10, 2011 was adjourned.)

STATE OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

I, ANN E. CHASTANG, the undersigned Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky at Large, certify that the facts stated in the caption hereto are true; that at the time and place stated in said caption, the UK Senate Council Meeting, was taken down in stenotype by me and later reduced to computer transcription by me, and the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings which took place during said meeting.

My commission expires: May 12, 2015.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 28th day of October, 2011.

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

