

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

March 21, 2011

3:00 P.M.

* * * *

* * * *

SENATE COUNCIL OFFICE
LEXMARK PUBLIC ROOM
ROOM 209, MAIN BUILDING
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

* * * *

* * * *

AN/DOR REPORTING & VIDEO TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
179 EAST MAXWELL STREET
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40508
(859) 254-0568

* * * *

* * * *

HOLLIE SWANSON, CHAIR
DEBRA ANDERSON, VICE-CHAIR
CATHERINE SEAGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN
SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR
LISA E. HOINKE, COURT REPORTER

CHAIR:

Good morning -- good afternoon. It feels like morning a little bit. Good afternoon. This is our please slide: give your name and affiliation when you speak, communicate with your constituency, attend meetings, we do have forum or over forum; thank you, respond to e-mails and web postings, acknowledge and respect others; and this is Bob Grossman's special: silence your cell phones and beepers.

Minutes from February 14th are not yet ready. A few announcements. What the Senate Council has been up to. We met with a number of representatives in the College of

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt

Medicine because we heard that there were issues surrounding the space policies, and one of the reasons we decided to tackle this issue is because space is under the provost's purview and we decided then that makes it under our purview.

The other reason we decided to tackle this is thinking about what's happening in the future. We will more than likely be enhancing inter-disciplinary types of research and we foresaw these types of issues which most likely will become more apparent.

And so in response then -- so we met with them and really headed by Lee Blonder and Shelly Steiner. We issued a number of recommendations. Then we got a very nice response from the College of Medicine and we have the links to those policy recommendations.

But basically what we're asking for is appropriate faculty input at all stages of the process.

It has come to our attention -- and this is not new, that there are problems. There are issues associated with the timeliness of course and program approval. And so we have a subcommittee that is working on that issue. I've met with the provost several different times and we're looking at both short-term and long-term solutions for that. We've heard from Dr. Anderson, who is working with Mike Mullen, looking at a document handling system and we're hopeful that that will be in place during the summer, give us enough time to do a beta test. So, we're looking at a number of solutions to solve this problem.

I just wanted you to know I feel your pain.

If you want anything on senate council or senate agenda, please just contact me. We have a number of individuals who have expressed concerns in different areas, and we have the makeup of Senate Council and the appropriate administrator if necessary.

We are currently deliberating on changing the process by which we elect officers within the senate council and specifically the process by which we elect the senate council chair.

Our overall goal that we're looking at changing is to broaden the number of people who vote; that is, we would extend the voting to include the entire senate.

And so what we are looking for is we're looking for input from you about our process and how we can improve that.

The chair granted provisional approval for about (inaudible) Senate Council for about 50 gen ed courses. I read the provisional approval for about 25 distance learning courses from the College of Arts &

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
Sciences, and this was so they could get them ready for -- for merit weekend and get the appropriate assignments for the students.

It was submitted to the Senate Council and endorsed by provisional approval, and this is a one-time shot only.

There are currently web transmittals currently posted. Please review those.

I approved awarding of a Doctorate in -- in Public Health degree for Public Health science -- Public Health student. It was paperwork; that it was a paperwork issue.

I'd like to issue congratulations. As you recall, we had Founders Day on February 22nd. It was very well attended. I'd like to congratulate Dean Jeannine Blackwell and Heidi Anderson, who really were instrumental in putting this together. Thank you.

It was well attended, and these are provost awards for outstanding teachers. We had Eric Myrup. And I apologize if I mispronounce your name. Lynn Kelso from the College of Medicine; Paul Vincelli in Ag/Plant Pathology; Cyndy Harbett, in Communications; John Wilson, College of Medicine; the Provost; Jane Jensen, College of Ed. And you will recognize Jane as also a former Senate Council member. David Silverstein from the College of Engineering; Emily Dotson, Teaching Assistant winner from the College of Arts & Science, Gender and Women's Studies; and Seungahn Nah from Community & Leadership Development.

We also had a number of additional winners. Algernon Sydney Sullivan Medallion for non-student winner, Deborah Goonan. Now, these are awards that are typically given at the commencement. The Sullivan Medallion, graduating student winner, Anna Lisa Hays; the Albert D. and Elizabeth H. Kirwan Memorial Prize, Daret K. St. Clair; the will B. Sturgill Award, Michael Bardo; and the Provost Public Scholar Award went to Marcia Stanhope. And those individuals are pictured there. No, I'm sorry, that's the service award.

The Provost's Distinguished Service Professors, Robert McKnight, College of Public Health; Debra Harley, College of Education; Bruce Webb, College of Agriculture; Richard Milich, College of Arts & Sciences; Deborah Reed, College of Nursing; and Joseph Van Sickles, College of Dentistry. Congratulations.

We also have an awards -- award winners of the Sarah Bennett Holmes. This is (unintelligible) forum. Dana Walton-McCaulay, Associate Dean of Students for Student Conduct and Louise Graham, Professor of Law.

We also have our last sponsored

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
chat with administrators, with Robert Mock.
That's on Thursday, March 31st from 1:30 to
3:00. Robert is the Vice-President of
Student Affairs. And it will be here in the
library gallery.

I'd also like to draw your
attention to the South Africa and Kentucky
initiative. This is sponsored by the
Colleges of Arts & Science, Agriculture,
Education, Fine Arts and Public Health. The
web site is listed there.

There will be also a public
Convocation Ceremony on April 13th, and I
have Schatzki here. I want to ask him a
couple of questions. I understand next
year's endeavor will focus on China.

SCHATZKI: Yeah. The college is interested in
promoting a international focus every year,
and -- South Africa this year and we have a
committee currently working on coming up with
events for China.

As it indicates on the -- on the
screen there, we are interested in
partnering, and did this year, with other
colleges on a variety of events, whether
they're meeting type of events, speaker type
of events, film series we did or anything
else -- any one else is interested in, and
I'm here simply to encourage people who might
be interested in co-organizing and co-
sponsoring some event with -- to do with
China. And it's really quite open what to do
with China that might be.

I'm just here to encourage
participating. If -- if you know of
colleagues who are specifically interested in
China, would be interested in something then
have them contact either Mark Kornbluh, who's
the Dean, or myself and (unintelligible).

SWANSON: Is that restricted only for a week
or a longer period?

SCHATZKI: There's no real restriction. We
had a couple of visitors in who were here for
an extended period of time, for instance,
teaching courses; most of the events, of
course, are relatively short temporally but I
think we're open to any logistically feasible
suggestions.

SWANSON: Any questions?

Okay. Thank you.

Faculty trustee elections will be
held in mid April. That will be to fill the
seat currently held by Everett. Just a
reminder where we are with colleges. Everett
is in the College of Fine Arts. When we
elect the individual will serve from July
1st, 2011 to June 30th, 2014. If you have
any questions contact our office or if you're
interested in serving, we have Joe Peek here
that can fill you in about what's it all
about.

You don't have to write a monthly
report, do you?

PEEK:
SWANSON:
PEEK:
SWANSON:

No.
Okay. That's not really a comfort.
(Unintelligible) perhaps, so...
Senate elections will be held in
early April, and you'll receive further
information.

So for my report I'd like to remind
you that we are currently soliciting faculty
input. If you remember, we're holding an
inaugural, April 11th date, of the University
from the faculty perspective. I'll be
running the presentation. I have invited
Chair Britt Brockman to also attend, give a
little short presentation and so he's
accepted that, and we have already received
input from the Colleges of Communication.
Thank you Dean O'Hair; and also College of
Dentistry. Thank you Bob Jacob. So please
keep the input coming, and we'll give that
presentation in a timely manner.

I also attended the Future of the
Textbook meeting. This was a meeting that
was hosted by the Council of Postsecondary
Education. It had a number of publishers
there. I've given you the web site of those
publishers, and also given you the link to
that PowerPoint presentation.

ANDERSON: Our vice-chair, Debra Anderson.
I wanted to bring to your attention
the faculty award that the Senate Council has
developed, and it will be awarded at the May
Senate Meeting for this year.

What we have done is develop an
award to recognize the Senate Chair for her
or his outstanding contribution to the
University of Kentucky. And given criteria
are on the screen. I won't read them all
because I will send them to you in e-mail
later this week, and will as for nominations
from the Senate for that award.

So if you would pay attention to
that, and think about who from your college
has been an exemplar senator during their
time on the senate, we really appreciate
those nominations. Thank you.

SWANSON: Our Trustee report, Professor
Joe Peek.

PEEK: Like many of you, we had Spring
break last week and I was able to get out of
town a little bit. I went to Western
Kentucky first on the presidential forum
search, and then on Monday and Wednesday I
went with a group up to the University of
Cincinnati. It's not quite the same thing as
going on a cruise or hitting the beach.

But let me just say a couple of
things about what's going on. The Cincinnati
trip is part of an initiative by Senate
Council and staff senate as well, working
jointly.

This is something -- one of pet
thorns in the side of somebody or other, and
-- saying we need to have better grievance

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
procedures for faculty and staff.

And so I mentioned this to the Senate Council, Hollie grabbed it and ran with it and really pushed and then we hooked up with the staff senate and so now we've got a real momentum going so there was a trip to the University of Louisville to see exactly, you know, what they're doing because they have a new program.

While they were they could have looked into what was going on with the basketball program but there was really no point given they've already been knocked out.

We learned something from the -- you know, what was going on there. That was a new -- it's a relatively new program. I believe it's like only a year and a half old.

The one in Cincinnati is more interesting in a sense because they just celebrated their 40th anniversary, so they've been there a long time.

What's interesting, I think, about their program is that it's an ombud office with full-time staff, they're not faculty members or not representatives from staff. They're full-time people who know about the ombud and so they're trained in mediation and so forth, and they do student, faculty and staff all in one office.

And so I thought it was actually a pretty good model, because then if you form -- you know, you have a faculty -- group of faculty handling this it's, oh, they're biased to the faculty. You have a group of administrators, they're biased to the administration. This was nice because they're representing students, faculty and staff in the same office and they -- and what I learned was they only do informal complaints. Once it goes to a formal grievance, they're not in it. But what's great about it is that they handle -- they said something like only 5 percent of the cases brought to them actually go to a formal process. So they're able to do a lot of good things.

And so I was very impressed. I think that may be, you know, a decent model for what we might want to do here at UK.

The other thing I'm involved in is -- is -- through the Board of Trustees, the presidential search forum. We've had them out in the state; much like we've had them here on campus, and it's a long ways to western Kentucky, so I did like a 15-hour day, 450 miles or so.

But it was interesting, and it turns out -- and I had done one the week before as well. It turns out a lot of the issues are the same.

I think there's a feeling that we claim we're the flagship university but we're not acting like it in the sense that we've

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
got a lot of regional universities in the State, and UK is maybe first among equals but it's too much of a -- of a Lexington/Bluegrass regional university, that we could do something much more to get out into the corners of the State and show the flag and be much more aggressive in recruiting students.

I heard from a number of parents talking about their children and saying they got much better financial aid packages and so forth from some of the other universities. I'm not sure why the other universities, especially Western University, I'm not sure why they're able to come up with more financial aid than we are for the college students in this State but that seems to be the case, because I've heard it multiple times. And so I think there's more we could do and more that we should do as the flagship university of this State.

So we are getting out there and doing that, and we're going to give the Search Committee report, I think, so I won't say anything else about that.

The other thing that's going on at the last Board of Trustees meeting, and it was in the newspaper this morning on the front page, was about the Board of Trustees having a committee to look at governance of the Athletic Association.

And so I don't know what's going to happen on that. That just kind of happened at the last trustee meeting, and at the trustee meeting next week we'll know more about exactly what they're doing and perhaps -- well, we'll know, I guess, who's on the committee; I'm not, I'm sure.

But I think we'll know an awful lot by who is on the committee. It's going to be some faculty members and some administrators, and I think people from the community.

So I think we'll be able to tell a lot by the composition, but there's a lot of politics going on in terms of who ends up on what committee and so forth.

But my impression is, it is on the up-and-up. They really are open -- Britt Brockman, the Chair, really is open-minded about this. He's not saying I have an agenda underneath or I know what the answer is. He's actually, I think honestly, saying, I don't know for sure what the right answer is but there are best practices out there so let's start by finding out what are best practices; so, I'm very pleased with the approach he's taking on that.

Because I don't -- my personal view is I don't think there is much governance. One comment in the paper this morning by Bill Gatton, I believe, saying when he was on -- on the Board of the Athletic Association they met twice a year and it was like less than an

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
hour of time. So that's not a lot of
governance.

So I think we're probably not doing
as much as we should, and a related issue,
probably the last thing I'll say is another
issue is we have faculty representatives on
the Athletic Association and on other things,
and this was mentioned in passing at the
Senate Council meeting one time; the idea
that if I'm a faculty representative I really
should be a faculty representative, not
merely a faculty member.

And so the faculty should have some
input into who their representatives are.
So, yes, you do get to elect trustees, but
what about the faculty representatives to the
Athletic Association? Those are appointed by
the president, I believe.

So there are faculty members on the
Athletic Association, but no faculty members
had any input into who was going to represent
them. And so I think that's something that
ought to be looked at, and I'm sure there are
other examples but that one comes to mind
because of what was just in the news.

Are there any questions about this?
This is just like teaching a class. If
you'll hand out the exams, and we'll
(unintelligible).

GROSSMAN: Do I have to know this for the
exam?

PEEK: No.

SWANSON: Thank you. Now, we have Professor
Lee Meyer that will tell us about the
Presidential search.

MEYER: Thanks, Hollie. I'm going to
(unintelligible) Hollie over there and I
said, I'm making notes for this afternoon and
I left those on my desk; like we've all done
that. And -- but I can recreate most of what
I had.

The last time when I was here we
talked about the elements of the position
description, some of the confidentiality
issues and that was right before we were
going into a Prospect Review Committee.

And what that was, was when we all
reviewed a very number of (unintelligible),
less than a 100, more than 10 candidates, and
out of that meeting what we decided was -- we
selected about 20 people that we wanted to
get more information on.

So we are now going into the next
round. The first round interviews, they're
called, and at that time we were interviewing
about 18 candidates. We haven't eliminated
anyone yet, but what we're using these so we
can collect more information.

So we'll do that, and then we meet
on April -- no, following that then
Greenwood/Asher will go and do what they call
referencing, which is checking evaluations,
and they call this a 360-degree process where

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
they ask superiors, people on the same level, people that are managed by those prospects, and so get references from those different levels and then we'll get together, go through those, come up with a list of three to five candidates that then we'll recommend to the Board of Trustees for more extensive interviews.

And then out of that comes a recommendation, and we'll move forward from there.

So that's sort of the process as we're going from here. Joe, I think you accurately reflected the forums around the state. I think it was a very valuable exercise to do. If you do survey work, you know, you want to do the surveys and still the information getting back is redundant. That means, you know, you get consistency and I think we've got that.

And so the message about the interest and the engagement role at the University came through loud and clear, and I heard the same things Joe did. I went down to London and Somerset and heard the same stories about students going, in that case, to Eastern. We talked about can we get the best students, and we got mixed messages about that but a lot of them staying home. And part of that is the structural issue of first-generation students. And so they want to be closer to home, a few dollars makes a difference and so we could that information, actually, Mike, in our strategy, I think, with recruiting and retention.

So we learned a lot in those forums throughout the state. So, Shelly, does that basically cover what....

STEINER:

Yes.

MEYER:

Yes?

JONES:

Davy Jones, Toxicology.

I'm curious how the feedback that you got, to what extent did you sense the public's perception of the president at the University, is or isn't synonymous with their perception of the University? Is the president is being (unintelligible) or is there different perceptions there?

MEYER:

My reading on that was the president has a very important influence on the University; they're very aware of who the president is.

One of the people down in Somerset said something about the importance of integrity and that was reiterated by the group there and that's why eventually they pointed that out. That's something certainly that we would say universally, but putting that publically forward I think is important.

And so they see the role of president as really having a -- I think a substantive influence on the University and it reaches into that Pikeville to Paducah

range.
that? Joe, do you want to add anything to that?

PEEK: No.
MEYER: Other questions or comments?
BLACKWELL: Is the timetable working such that the -- the candidate would have a presence on campus before the end of the term?

MEYER: Oh, before July 1?
BLACKWELL: No, before May 5th?
MEYER: Oh, oh. Oh. No.
BLACKWELL: May --
MEYER: I very much doubt that. The target is to have someone selected and here July 1. My personal feeling is that either we'll hit or miss it by a mile. So we'll either get back or what will happen is we will -- you know, if we make one, maybe two offers and don't land somebody then what we'll wind up doing is going back a couple steps. And that's just my personal feelings.

NADEL: Alan Nadel, A&S.
I didn't take Jeanine's question to be that. I -- I think the question falls on the discussion last time, will the finalists appear on campus before the faculty leaves so the faculty may have some input into this process? Was the timeline designed so even if all three of them agree to appear on campus and they don't exercise their (unintelligible), the faculty won't be around to meet them.

PEEK: I think the timeline is May 1st. They were hoping to be able to make an offer by May 1st, as I recall, but that was a very ambitious plan.
So this week they're interviewing the -- doing the first round of interviews so that May 1st would be earliest.

NADEL: The target date --
(Unintelligible) offer --
PEEK: The target date would be late in April to bring the preferred candidate in, so that would --

NADEL: The preferred candidate.
PEEK: The preferred candidate.
NADEL: So after -- again, the last meeting there was a discussion of bringing three finalists here if they all agreed to come.

PEEK: Correct.
NADEL: That's no longer the case.
PEEK: No, no. The question what we will bring -- well, I think we're -- it's interpretation of words here. If they agree that confidentiality is not required, then those will be -- the visit will be public. But this -- the process will be the same. The only question is whether it's open or confidential.

NADEL: The question that came up last week is: If there were three to five finalists and all of them agree that it would not be confidential, that they, the three to five

finalists would come to the campus so the faculty could meet and give input about which of the three to five finalists they found preferable.

I take it this is not going to happen.

MEYER:
PEEK:

Unlikely.

But -- but that still is the plan.

The Board of Trustees passed two motions. The first motion was if all finalists agree, they'll come to campus. The second motion was recognizing that the first one, you know, isn't going to happen probably.

And so I brought this up. I said, why bother with the first one, you know, if you don't -- if it's not going to happen. And the second motion was that, you know, we'd bring the finalist to campus and show that finalist to the faculty staff and students before a contract is offered.

I believe, the -- the timeline for that is still May 1st.

NADEL:

So the timeline is May 1st for the faculty having the right to decide whether the first candidate is first or first?

PEEK:
NADEL:

Exactly.

In other words, I have no input at all in the selection process.

PEEK:

And that's why they've done the forums ahead of time, is so that you will have an opportunity, but you won't --

MEYER:

Well, the faculty will have the role to decide if the candidate we want to come in first or not first.

PEEK:

Yeah.

NADEL:
MEYER:

No, that --

Now, we haven't talked about how we're going to do that yet, and that's what we'll do the next time the whole --

NADEL:
MEYER:
NADEL:

Let me --

-- committee --

-- make this absolutely clear.

I'll speak slowly so it's in the minutes, not that anyone ever prepares them or reads them.

The faculty will have no voice in ranking the finalists whatsoever. That's correct; right?

MEYER:

I think the way it's going now, that is correct.

NADEL:
PEEK:

Thank you.

Other -- other than the input that has been done up to this point --

NADEL:
MEYER:
NADEL:

In ranking the finalist --

No.

Not in expressing general principals.

MEYER:

Correct.

NADEL:
DEBSKI:

Okay.

We do have input though from the faculty we elected to represent us on --

PEEK:
DEBSKI:

Yes.

It's not -- it's not as much as

NADEL: you would like, but we do have some input --
Okay. Let me amend that. Two of
the entire faculty will have input -- or
maybe five. The general faculty will not
have any opportunity to meet or question or
express any form of preference among the
finalists.

PEEK: Correct.
DEBSKI: Liz Debski, Biology.
I guess, I'm wondering what kind of
information are you learning from these
forums conducted all over? How are they
inputting it to the search progress?

MEYER: One thing you might find
interesting is go to the presidential search
and look at Britt Brockman's blog where he
has summarized some of the input from those
forums. What we're going to -- what I
personally use that for is questions that
were used during the -- during the interviews
and ask questions about engagement, about the
role of the -- bringing the, as Joe put it,
the flagship aspect of the University and
attracting students from throughout the
State.

DEBSKI: I guess what I'm trying to get a
sense of what are the characteristics of the
new president, you know, what kind of
background are we looking for? Are we
looking for someone who has (inaudible) or
academic credentials, are we looking for
somebody --

MEYER: That, I believe, is summarized in
the position description and the faculty
insisted that academic credibility be very
important. We are open to candidates from
non-traditional backgrounds so that would be,
I think, an interesting discussion on the
Search Committee, if we get somebody without
a traditional faculty history of work in a
University but we're still open to bring
somebody in like that and then when we look
at the candidates then I think we'll make
those decisions.

NADEL: Is a Ph.D. requisite?
MEYER: A terminal degree is requisite.
NADEL: A high school diploma?
(MANY TALKING AT ONCE)

MEYER: Okay. One more question.
THELIN: A response.
MEYER: Okay.
THELIN: There's a long tradition of JDs as
presidents and so I think your question is a
bit precarious.

NADEL: No, Dwight Eisenhower was the
President of Columbia without a Ph.D. or an
advanced terminal degree. He had a college
(unintelligible) so it was not -- it's a --
it's a very serious question.

MEYER: Thank you all, and thanks for the
input.

SWANSON: Thank you, Lee. One of the things
I learned from the Hopkinsville trip was that

they thought we didn't have as much of a presence with our academic as we did with our research throughout the state. And so when you think about how you could turn that around to a president, well, that's what you would want, is a president who would value faculty going out and talking about the research. Perhaps we could establish a speaker bureau or something like that.

And so I think those are the kinds of issues that we can turn into (unintelligible) of presidential candidates.

GROSSMAN: I have just a quick question. Last time we voted on the Honorary Degree candidates.

SWANSON: Yes. Were those approved by the Board of Trustees?

GROSSMAN: Next meeting.

PEEK: Next meeting?

GROSSMAN: Next week.

PEEK: Next week. Okay.

GROSSMAN: We have our QEP presentation by Professors Deanna Sellnow and Diane Snow, and let me just remind you about the extensive work these individuals have done with respect to QEP.

SWANSON: They have been to the senate multiple times, so I went to the dates and looked up exactly how many. You can see them listed there.

And then what I'd like to remind you, I know they will reiterate this, but what they have been doing then is presenting the QEP (unintelligible) to the SACS leadership team. And so these are individuals who meet on a monthly basis, and they've been talking about the QEP extensively and they'll be following that up.

And so those are the individuals on that, and I believe that's all I have to say. Deanna and Diane.

PEEK: (Unintelligible) on that - University of Cincinnati trip, I meant to say to and I don't think I did, Debra Anderson also went to represent the senate council as well as three staff members. So a group went up there.

SNOW: I'm here to talk to you about something that we've had faculty input on throughout the entire process. We're very proud of that.

SELLNOW: (Unintelligible) ----- maintain transparency; that this is actually a broad-based initiative -- all the way along.

It's called the QEP, Quality Enhancement Program, and it's required for this round SACS reaffirmation of accreditation and we've been working tirelessly for about a year and a half trying to get broad-based input to come up with a topic that makes sense for our University.

SNOW: Normally one of us speaks and the

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt

other one stands around like Harpo, but this one is so important that we're both going to talk to you today.

SELLNOW:

Okay. So in Fall 2009 we were called to form the prep-planning team and the members of that prep-planning team are on the web site that Hollie showed you, if you want to go to that site you can do that -- look at that.

That team developed a topic selection plan and a timeline for getting this plan to SACS when they need it, and then we brought that to the Senate for endorsement in December 2009.

And then in the Spring 2010, we formed a topic selection team to try to find out what kind of ideas the campus and community, student, staff, faculty and administration and anybody interested in the UK Community, what would be contributing to student learning broad-based on our campus, so we solicited big ideas from across the community.

SNOW:

So in -- last summer we all got together and looked at all of this data and it was really interesting project for us to see what's happening across campus and what people cared about.

And we met in this room for two days straight and we put all these ideas on the wall and grouped them all into various ways.

We used the process of putting these up on the wall so everybody could kind of walk around and put themes together and see what mixed and matched, and then we eventually kept putting these into some kind of (unintelligible) where we came up with big ideas.

SELLNOW:

We were trying to come up with five or six themes that cut across the different constituents. If they polled a group that are related to UK students, staff, faculty, alumni, parents, community numbers.

And then in August of 2010 we rolled out the six themes, as we'll show you on the next slide, that came up from that summer retreat and invited proposals focused on any of those six themes that were -- the proposal was very simple. It was a 500-word proposal that you could submit online, you could attach your name to it or not and -- but (unintelligible) to do(unintelligible) identified in the proposals so that we could see that we were getting broad-based input -- on those proposals.

SNOW:

Some of those ideas that were submitted to us, fell into -- at least 63 proposals addressed these themes: developing engaged citizenship, expanding global awareness and involvement, fostering a supportive and vibrant campus culture, enhancing scholarship: critical thinking,

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
effective communication, and academic integrity. Advancing 21st Century teaching and learning, navigating successful transitions. And what we found to be fantastic in this process is that we had pretty good division across (unintelligible) and excellent representations from all faculty, staff and students --

SELLNOW: So in October the topic selection team met again and collected ten of the proposals and asked people to develop then into eight to ten page white papers and then in December the team met again to read the white papers and then forwarded four of those to the faculty leadership team, that the faculty leadership team could look at for broad-base involvement, broad-base impact on the campus community and manageable in terms of cost to implement.

SNOW: Remember QEP is one part of the SACS process, (unintelligible) where the (unintelligible) team should be (unintelligible) accurate of the SACS process (unintelligible).

SELLNOW: The white papers, we've got nine white papers. We did not get ten. One person didn't end up submitting a white paper that we invited.

What we did is with those white papers we had -- there was a primary writer but we put together teams to write the white papers based on similar QEP ideas that were proposed so we would ask the one -- the original proposer to form a team to create those white papers, and we had nine. They were -- you can see that we had the primary author which cut across the different constituent group and various topics of those nine papers.

SNOW: And let me add for people (unintelligible) -- reiterate this. There were ideas that came up that did not fall into the major categories and did not make it as far as the white paper discussion. But wherever we could we have put these ideas and -- given them to the right people on campus who could actually do something about those in terms of the faculty and students (unintelligible).

SELLNOW: So even if they -- they weren't the one that -- all the ones that weren't necessarily picked will still be addressed in some way, shape or form on a smaller scale at an appropriate place on campus, right?

SNOW: So we ended up with four proposals. Center for Civic Engagement. Global Curriculum Project, Thematic Year, Multimodal Communication Across the Curriculum.

SELLNOW: And those four proposals you can link to that if you want to read about them in more detail. The winner was, the Multimodal Communication Across the

Curriculum for a number of reasons. Probably the biggest reason was that it's not a brand new initiative that would get added to our _ plate for pursuing but it's in line with some of what's happening with the revision of the graduation writing requirement (unintelligible)----- in telecommunication required and (unintelligible) discipline at multimodal in nature so it extends out the new GenEd. And so it seemed like something that we might have to pursue anyway, so this will put some money behind that, what seems to be at the time an unfunded mandate.

SNOW: Although (unintelligible) some of you were suggesting from the get-go, I (unintelligible) communicators in all facets of that (unintelligible) but hopefully it's (unintelligible) across campus and we can (unintelligible) --

SELLNOW: Well, our next step, we're here today to get your endorsement on moving forward on the project because then what we'll do is we'll identify a topic development team, and that will be a team of experts related to these various kinds of communication forms across the campus to develop that 100-page QEP proposal plan that have to be submitted to SACS and get their approval so that we can then implement the (unintelligible).

SNOW: So that there will be a second (unintelligible)

SELLNOW: Yes. And then we'll make sure that the white paper topic that once selected I refer to the right places, then what we'll do is work on developing a campaign for announcing the topic in a way that might get people interested and excited about it, and their role in it.

YANARELLA: Question?

SELLNOW: Uh-huh.

YANARELLA: Ernie Yanarella, Arts & Sciences. I have two questions. One: What is a multimodal communications project? Still I'm not -- I don't really have a good handle on it.

And, secondly, how did you anticipate the reaction of SACS to this? I know that early on when you brought this issue to the Senate Council you indicated that a number of QEP proposals from other universities had been rejected. What precautions have you taken to make sure that this particular one would pass now?

SELLNOW: Okay. We -- there are other QEPs that are similar to this that have been accepted by SACS already, and vice-president Connie Ray has indicated that she thinks that this will be the kind of proposal that SACS will say it's not too big or too small.

So there are other schools that have had similar topic to this accepted. Oh, and in one (unintelligible) a communication

across the curriculum will -- is -- the proposal is only a conception at this point. The development team will flush it out number one, but the conceptual idea is creating satellite labs for students across the campus where they could go and get tutoring in these different areas, helping faculty across campus in terms of developing instruction for their classrooms in their field, assignments and grading rubrics and assessment rubrics for those assignments, when the -- after the graduation writing requirement becomes in the disciplines as opposed to overseen by (unintelligible) initiative. So they'll be that help for faculty.

It will be a steering committee of faculty members, much on a -- similar to the committee wise; (unintelligible) modeled GEOC is using right now. And there will be graduate students from across the campus that will also be able to help with making that link between disciplinary concepts and communication assignments (unintelligible).

Does that help?

YANARELLA:

That helps a little bit.

SNOW:

There's probably a high likelihood of success in this because this has been a project that many (unintelligible) and challenge that if (unintelligible) are (unintelligible) program. So we couldn't do something that was identical. What we've done (unintelligible) it would ducktail so nicely with what you just (unintelligible) likelihood of success.

SELLNOW:

And the effectability of the project, because one of the things (unintelligible) has been implemented, we have to assess its effectiveness on campus and send that report to SACS and this will be easily acceptable.

SWANSON:

We are asking an endorsements from the faculty senate. There's a motion from the Senate Council that the senate endorse the MCXC QEP topic.

The floor is open for debate, either pro or con.

NADEL:

Point of information, what is the alternative?

SWANSON:

Not endorsing.

NADEL:

I know that. What does that mean? What is the implication of not endorsing it?

GROSSMAN:

If I could address it, I believe that if this body does not endorse it that the committee will have to go back and choose a new plan because they need to demonstrate to SACS that it had broad support across the University. If this body chooses not to endorse it, that would say pretty much that we're not -- it says there's no support. Dr. Snow and Sellnow, is that your

SWANSON:

understanding?

SELLNOW:

Uh-huh.

SWANSON:

Okay. Further questions? Debate?

DEBSKI: Concerns? Okay. We have a motion on the --
Liz Debski, Biology.
So we're endorsing the development
of this topic? Will it come back to us later
on --

SELLNOW: (Unintelligible) again, when the
gets developed (unintelligible) that will
come after (unintelligible). Uh-huh.

SWANSON: Other questions? Okay. Let's go
ahead and vote.

All in favor. Opposed. Abstain.
Motion carries. Thank you.

So next on the agenda are committee
report from the Senate's Academic Programs
Committee chaired by Dan Wermeling. Dan?

WERMELING: Good afternoon everyone.

Now, the first program is related
to agriculture, is to integrate a graduate
program in plant and soil sciences, and so
the goal of this program is to integrate the
advanced MS and Ph.D. programs. Currently in
crop science, plant physiology, microbiology,
and biochemistry, horticulture and soil
science and creating basically one integrated
graduate program; there would be one director
of graduate studies (unintelligible).

The overall proposal, in addition
to the general features, was the request for
the new Doctoral Degree under this program,
MS they applied for two new courses, IPS 6.10
and 6.25 the syllabi are also attached. The
learning objectives and the assessment plan
is all included; in effect the committee
itself in reviewing thought it was one of the
best program proposals that we have seen. It
was well thought out and very succinct,
(unintelligible) we had virtually no
questions as reviewed by the committee.

So with that, I would like to offer
a motion to the senate that we approve the
new Ph.D. and integrated plant and soil
sciences effective in Fall of 2011.

SWANSON: We have a motion on the floor.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S.

Just a quick question. The
students who are currently in the other Ph.D.
program, will they stay in those others or
will they get their degrees in this new
program?

WERMELING: Current students in their program
will graduate in their current program so
they're not being forced to do something
else, and then the one question we had was
what happens to the old programs? And when
all the students who had the opportunity --
currently enrolled, have the opportunity to
complete, then they will come back to the
Senate to suspend or discontinue the other
programs.

BRION: Gayle Brion, College of
Engineering.

I noticed it says that under the
learning objective environmental science is

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
one of the areas, and then under the
structural model you have initial option.
I was wondering if environmental
science is going to be a proposed option to
this program later?

WERMELING: I can't answer that question, but
there's a member of the sponsor here, that
they can answer for us?

COYNE: Mark Coyne, College of Agriculture.
Gayle, it would -- it would be a
possibility for the faculty to come together
and try within that program, environmental
sciences, or its program opinion should be
created and so they would put together
faculty involved, the course work
(unintelligible). The program is designed so
that we could create new options to address
new and emerging options in science and end
up (unintelligible) and address
(unintelligible) and the needs of the
students.

BRION: Can you (unintelligible) Tracy
Farmer Center for sustainability or...

COYNE: It can. (Unintelligible) they have
something that hasn't been thought of quite
yet, but we certainly can. The ideas have to
be integrated program with lots of
(unintelligible) co-operations and across
disciplines is that it can involve creative
in both (unintelligible) that program working
time-to-time on the (unintelligible) is
obvious.

BRION: So is it proper (unintelligible)
throw out college agriculture and just remain
in the college center?

COYNE: If you're going to be
interdisciplinary and if the (unintelligible)
who also bring in faculty (unintelligible)
college you want. Those can go across
college lines, the purpose of --

BRION: Thank you.
WOOD: Connie Wood, Arts & Sciences.

I'm very interested in the options
that you currently offer, how they're being
requested in the awarding of the degree and
what is the approval process for new options?

COYNE: The option currently recognizes the
(unintelligible) to get it as a degree and
(unintelligible) what the optimum students,
so that's how that option is indicated.

WOOD: with a different degree.

COYNE: No, just saying that it would be
degree in specifies what the focus area
option of that student has been; allows them
to demonstrate they have a specialty in a
specific area whether it be in an area or
whether it be more sensitive.

WOOD: Your second question?
would the approval for new options

WOOD: --

COYNE: Yeah, it would --
WOOD: -- go back -- come back to the

Senate?

COYNE: The approval process for new options should not come back, to the best of my knowledge.

BROTHERS: New specialty and new options will come back to the senate.

COYNE: Okay. -

GROSSMAN: Oh, says Sheila.

SWANSON: other questions?
Okay. We have a motion on the floor to approve the new Ph.D. in integrated plant and soil sciences, effective Fall of 2011.

All in favor. Opposed, nay?
Abstain? Motion carries. Thank you.

WERMELING: Okay. The second proposal is the graduate certificate in Pharmaceutical Sciences. So this is from my home college. We have graduate certificates in three tracks; this is one of the three tracks that we're asking to do at this time and approve.

So this gives the doctorate pharmacy students an ability to earn a certificate in pharmaceutical sciences, and particularly focus on basic sciences.

The proposal has a rationale in the sense that we're trying to develop interest in various disciplines for our students, and in particular for pharmacy students that are on PhD track.

Most of our students come from outside the United States, and so we're interested in generating a more intramural interest in our graduate program overall; and we plan to focus some of the training into clinical training to residences or, as an example, more into pharmaceutical (unintelligible) which is the other track or this track.

There is a list of trained faculty who routinely participate in this. The outcomes of what the proposal desires is for the students to appreciate the role in drug discovery and the process of pharmaceutical product development, understand basic elements of experimental design, importance of experiments, statistical analysis, and interpretation of results, to have an increased understanding of the ethical use of animals in biomedical research in the interest of science and to develop an abstract and poster presentation describing the results of their recent project. The poster will be presented to a local or national pharmacy organization meetings.

The admission requirements are laid out in the program, and the certificate's specific requirements in terms of what hours of certain types of courses they need to complete.

There's also a schedule for completion, understanding that their course work is fairly structured in the College

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
Pharmacy. The proposers can outline how this would actually be completed within their curriculum.

And there are a host of courses, looks like at least a dozen, that would be the elective courses that the students would take.

We expect about five to eight students per year to actually participate out of 130 students here. So this is not one of the larger tracks.

So I would like to make a motion, then, to approve the proposed new graduate certificate in Pharmaceutical Sciences, effective Fall 2011.

SWANSON: Thank you. Would anyone like to consider the pros and cons of the motion?
All right. We're ready to vote.
All in favor say aye. Opposed nay. Abstain.
Motion carries. Thank you.

We have a committee, Senate's Admission and Academic Standards Committee chaired by Alison Davis.

DAVIS: Good afternoon. The Senate's Admission and Academic Standards Committee reviewed this proposal, which would change the type of grade for courses that are practice experience courses in the College of Pharmacy.

This would affect approximately eight courses plus potentially new courses that might be developed. Currently the courses are either pass/fail or on a standard grade, A, B, C, etcetera, and due to the clinical nature of these courses and the fact that there's kind of an inconsistent evaluation by potentially voluntary faculty or so forth to evaluate them, they thought that this might be the best new grading, and they included pass with honors, pass and fail, and they chose to put it down that way because pass/fail might give the -- might not provide the incentive to the students to do the very best that they could do.

We, as a group, decided that we felt this proposal was fine after talking to the contact person, and we would like to make a motion to approve the new grade type for the College of Pharmacy's practice experience courses, effective fall 2011.

SWANSON: We have a motion on the floor. Any questions? Would anybody like to discuss the pros or cons?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman.
Just a clarification. So these grades will only apply to College of Pharmacy's practice experience courses and no other courses on campus will have the option of doing this grading?

DAVIS: It's only for the particular courses. Any course that incorporates this grade type will go through the typical approval process, but only for these courses

DUNCAN: - Marilyn Duncan, College of
Medicine.
I have a question. Will there be e
criteria for the students to know what --
sort of what is expected to pass with honors
(unintelligible) --

FREEMAN: Yes, the --
SWANSON: Trish Freeman, College --
FREEMAN: Trish Freeman, College of Pharmacy,
the course director for the practice
experience courses.
All the courses will have grading
rubrics associated with them that are
competency based, and the volunteer faculty
will evaluate using those standard rubrics
and only the honors are the exceptionally
high level of activity that the student
performs at, basically, at the level of a
practicing pharmacist instead of at the
student level.
So it's clear to the students ahead
of time what the honors criteria are.

SWANSON: Any further questions?
Discussions?
All right. Let's go ahead and
vote. All those in favor say aye. Opposed
nay. Abstain. Motion carries. Thank you.
We have the Senate's Academic
Organization and Structure Committee Chair
Dwight Denison. Dwight.

DENISON: Good afternoon.
This is a pretty straightforward
proposal to update or change the name of the
Department of Family Studies to the
Department of Family Sciences.
And this is to bring it in line, be
consistent with the degrees that we have
currently offered or course names that have
been changed recently to reflect change in
the discipline.
The name change was approved by
departmental faculty, the integrated
curriculum committee and the regular
curriculum committee and it was reviewed by
our committee.
We move that it be approved by the
senate.

FINKEL: Raphael Finkel, College of
Engineering.
I was a little surprised to see
that the name of the degree is in the
singular, Family Science, but the proposed
name of the department is in the plural,
Family Sciences. Was this a typo?

DENISON: That's a good question.
JONES: Davy Jones.
If I could add to that. A few
years ago we had to come back and deal again
with a department name because of a single
letter typed out.
So if there's something here that
can be straightened out, it would be helpful.

DENISON: Let me go to the proposal itself
and see what -- is there anybody here from
Family Sciences?

BROTHERS: No, I'm sorry, the contact person
had to go home; he was ill and there was no
one else from the department that could
attend.
(DISCUSSION BY MANY; UNINTELLIGIBLE AND
INDISTINGUISHABLE)

DAVIS: Hollie?
SWANSON: Yes.
DAVIS: Alison Davis, College of Ag.
It is my belief that their -- that
their intention is to be Department of Family
Sciences, but I --

SWANSON: Is that what the degree is, Family
Sciences? (Unintelligible) -- ?

DENISON: Yes.
SWANSON: Jeanine?
BLACKWELL: It's my understanding that they
have not asked to change the name of the
degree yet; that that is in process right
now, but there will be another proposal for
the change of the name of the degree coming
forward.

DENISON: Right. Maybe the undergraduate has
already been changed?

BLACKWELL: I think that it just -- at least
the graduate discussed -- graduate council,
so that will be coming forward --

BROTHERS: The undergraduate degree has
already been changed and the web transmittal
that is currently up for Senate review has
the Ph.D. and the Master's name change on it
as well.

BLACKWELL: That's what I thought.
SWANSON: Do you know what the name of the --
(Unintelligible)

GROSSMAN: I would like to propose that we
table this until such time as there is
clarification from the department.

UNIDENTIFIED: Second.
UNIDENTIFIED: Second.
FINKEL: Second.
SWANSON: The proposal is tabled. Thank you,
Bob.

GROSSMAN: we didn't vote.
SWANSON: Oh, we need to vote. All right.
would anybody like to discuss the propos --
(Unintelligible) -- Don't have to
say when you take off the table.

SWANSON: (Unintelligible) --
NADEL: (Unintelligible) --
(MANY TALKING AT ONCE)

BROTHERS: I'm sorry, who made the motion?
SWANSON: Bob Grossman.
BROTHERS: Okay.
SWANSON: Second was?
FINKEL: Raphael Finkel.
SWANSON: Okay.
BROTHERS: I'm sorry, table until when?
GROSSMAN: Until such time as there is a
representative from the department to tell us

NADEL: exactly what it is they want.
Point of order. There has to be a
vote to take something off the table, so
motion to table is always (unintelligible) --
SWANSON: We're voting to take it off the
table?
NADEL: No, voting to table it. It doesn't
come off the table until there's a separate
motion so you don't have to include when it
comes off.
SWANSON: All right. The motion is take it
off the table.
NADEL: No, to put it on the table.
SWANSON: On the table. All those in favor
say aye. Opposed nay? Abstain. Motion
carries. Thank you.
All right. Item No. 4, the August
2010 KCTC candidate for credentials. The
last such list from KCTCS, unless both
institutions request an exception, the
recommendation is that the elected faculty
senators approve the August 2010 KCTCS list
of candidates for credentials, for submission
through the President to the Board of
Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be
conferred by the Board.
Discussion?
All those in favor? Opposed nay.
Abstain. Motion carries. Thank you.
Discussion No. 5, the proposed on
Entrepreneurial Leaves of Absence. There are
some edits. On the last page of the form
please note that strike out and so it's
completed six years of continuous service,
period. The Provost may grant an exception
to the six-year eligibility rule when there
is compelling benefit to the University.
Are there questions on that?
Davy Jones?
JONES: Yeah. So the exception... Never
mind.
SWANSON: Other questions?
So we have a recommendation from
Senate Council that the Senate endorse the
proposed changes to Governing Regulations
10.B.2.d.vii.
FINKEL: Raphael Finkel, College of
Engineering.
I'm a little unclear now. I was
before, even before this was struck out.
When it says continuous service, what does
that mean with respect to a sabbatical
interruption?
SWANSON: We thought that was -- having that
phrase in there made it confusing.
FINKEL: So what does it mean without that
phrase?
SWANSON: Continuous service. Richard, maybe
you can help me out. Continuous service
would mean that -- go ahead, Dan.
WERMELING: This was discussed at Senate
Council, and sabbaticals and other forms of

leave are acceptable.

SWANSON: Yes.

WERMELING: I asked that question
(unintelligible) --

FINKEL: So a sabbatical does not interrupt
--

SWANSON: That's right --
FINKEL: (Unintelligible) -- serve as a year
in service (unintelligible) --

WERMELING: In service.

SWANSON: Or medical leave, same -- same type
of thing. --

GROSSMAN: (Unintelligible) might say that a
leave, which does not involve doing
University academic type of business would
interrupt so that the medical leave would
interrupt the service; a sabbatical would
not. That's my understanding.

SWANSON: Richard, is that correct?

GREISSMAN: Well, you know -- right. A
sabbatical is a disruption of continuous
service in terms of eligibility for future
sabbatical.

FINKEL: Right.

GREISSMAN: But what's meant here is that a
sabbatical doesn't interrupt the six years
before one can apply for entrepreneurial
leave.

FINKEL: And medical leave?

GREISSMAN: Medical leave.... whatever medical
leave -- it's in another part of GR. It says
how medical leave affects one's status. I
believe it is not continuous unless the
person is untenured and asks to have the
tenure clock stopped during the time of the
medical leave, as permitted.
So if someone takes medical leave
it's not considered discontinuation of service
except (unintelligible) tenure clock stopped.
That's all. Okay?

SWANSON: Further questions?
We have a motion on the floor.
Would anyone like to discuss the pros and
cons?
Okay. We're ready to vote. All in
favor say aye. Opposed nay. Abstain.
Motion carries. Thank you.

FINK: All right. We have University
Appeals Board Report, Professor Joe Fink, UAB
Hearing Officer. Joe?
What I would like to do is review
for you some procedures related to the
University of Appeals Board, and do an update
how it works. If you have any questions,
there are several members of the Appeal of
Board in the audience, so please feel free to
chip in.
What's the jurisdiction of the
University Appeals Board? You deal with
primarily with two kinds of cases. About 90
percent of the business that comes our way is
an academic appeal, either a grade challenge
by a student or student has been charged with

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
an academic offense of cheating or
plagiarism.

The other 10 percent of our cases
are disciplinary appeals. The former come
through the academic ombud; the latter come
through Dean of Students office. Okay?

So there are different pathways on
their way to the University Appeals Board.
In the course of a year we'll handle,
typically in a year, 25 to 30 cases.

The appeal process, the student --
and we'll use an academic appeal for this
discussion. A student appeals to the ombud
office, so I should acknowledge Michelle
Silver and Lee Edgerton who do fantastic work
with students.

The numbers reflect that. They
handle something like 300 cases a year; we
handle 25 to 30. And that tells you that
they have resolved them at a level before
they get escalated to us, which is a really
positive outcome I think for the students.

If the ombud concludes that the
matter has merit, he passes it on to the
University Appeals Board by sending a memo
that summarizes the facts and at the end,
appends a recommendation.

When I receive it I then notify the
Appeals Board and I try to collect them so we
have enough to justify getting a meeting
together. I will notify the Appeals Board
that I have three cases and here are 15
potential time slots when we can have a
hearing, please phone me if you can make it.

The Appeals Board has 30 members,
18 of whom are faculty, 12 of whom are
students, a quorum is eight plus me. Okay?

So you would think with those
numbers, 30 people, quorum of eight; no big
deal. It is really tough to get a quorum.
That is the largest surprise for me when I
started doing this a number of years ago, how
difficult it is to get a quorum of the
University Appeals Board.

Our composition we talked about.
Once we have -- I should go back and say once
we have the quorum identified and we're going
to have a hearing, the student is notified,
the faculty members are notified and the
student is allowed to bring an advisor if he
or she wishes to come with them.

That happens in clear minority of
cases. Students typically don't do that.
The written material is submitted to the
members of the panel, the eight people who
are going to actually hear the case, in
advance of the hearing. So they have a
chance to familiarize themselves with
whatever the issue is, what are some of the
arguments they might hear and so forth.

Then on the day of the hearing the
student shows up, the faculty member
hopefully shows up and the student leads off.

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt

The student says, I'm appealing my grade, I think I should have a "B" instead of "C", here's why, you know, that sort of thing.

And then after the student has made his statement then there are questions from the Appeals Board, then the faculty member weighs in with the faculty member's perspective, then finally the student gets a chance to make sort of a closing statement.

We always try to remember to ask the student, what is your preferred outcome? what would you like to see happen as a result of this process? Sometimes they get their wish; sometimes they don't, but at least we're clear on what they're hoping for as part of that process.

The student then leaves, the faculty member then leaves, the panel deliberates on that case right away before they call the next case.

We almost never have an Appeals Board hearing with one case. It's usually two or three, four -- this morning we had five cases, tomorrow morning we have five cases. So it is time consuming.

What are some of the challenges facing the University Appeals Board? The number one challenge in my view is that faculty members do not show up to backup their decisions.

You would be surprised how much faculty members do not show up even though they've been notified about the Appeals Board hearing and that the desire for them to come and participate to say why they made this decision, even though they're notified and so forth. That's a continuing challenge that I find worrisome.

Some of the other challenges, getting a quorum we talked about. Over the years that I've been doing it, we've seen an increased number of plagiarism cases. And I think the -- that could be clearly attributed to the internet. Oh, boy, there's a great paragraph; that would sound great in my paper; let me cut and paste that right into my paper. You know, that sort of thing.

So we -- and now that software exists to uncover that, faculty members are more attuned into that, and we're getting more allegations of treating and plagiarism cases.

Grade challenges continue to be an issue. One thing you should be aware of is the University Appeals Board has in it's authority to confer a grade of "P" for pass. And one unique wrinkle is that the student is in a major and the course in question is a required course for that major.

Typically, you cannot take a required course in your major pass/fail. But if it's a "P" that comes from the appeal board, that "P" will suffice for a required

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
course in your major. Okay. So that's a little bit of a -- of a different grading.

We try to conduct the Appeals Board hearings in a very informal fashion. As you would anticipate some of the students are rather nervous.

A quorum to the Appeals Board is eight people; at least five of who must be faculty members; at least one of whom must be a student.

We had a disciplinary appeal last week during spring break, and I was absolutely surprised that we could get a student during spring break to participate in the hearing, but we did. And so we were able to have a hearing last week.

So that's -- that's about it with regard to the University Appeals Board. Are there any questions I could try to answer about that? Davy.

JONES: Yeah, two questions. First, as long the -- in terms of quorum, as long as the minimum five faculty are there, in theory it could happen that all the student members show up, then actually there's more student members on the Board there than faculty --

FINK: No. As soon as I get eight, I cut it off.

JONES: Second question, occasionally, once every five to eight years I'll get a call from a faculty member who's really upset that the Board went against the faculty member and their complaint is there's nothing in writing explaining why they went against the faculty --

FINK: That's right. That's true.

JONES: What -- what -- what documentation or record exist in any of the decisions (unintelligible) --

FINK: Immediately after the morning's hearing -- well, let's use today as an example. I go back to the office and I send an e-mail to the student, copy the instructor, copy anyone else who was in the pathway, the ombud and Provost and all those folks. It's very brief. As you know the University Appeals Board met today, the decision was: Your grade of "B" be changed to grade of "A". Please let me know if you have any questions about this. And that's it. Okay? No rationale, no justification and -- and ordinarily it's more of an issue when it cuts the other way, where the student does not prevail. And the student is looking for some kind of explanation. We don't want to open that door. It'll -- it'll open a debate about why this and why that. The other issue is that unlike the Supreme Court judges, which has a fixed membership over time, over a relatively long period of time, eight out of 30 can vary quite a bit. The composition of a panel for this case can be quite different from a panel for last week's

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
case because it's eight out of 30 and so as far as the institutional memory of how things have been done in the past is me. That's why I -- as part of the quorum, I have to be there. So I just sort of bring that consistency.

JONES: In terms, though, maybe of trying to help this same problem not happen over again, is there some kind of end-of-the-year report with some recommendations on practices or something that you --

FINK: Don't do that, but on occasion I will either hold my own or at the behest of panel members who heard the case, say -- they'll say, we need to call this department chair. They've got a problem in their department.

A case we had this morning. Young lady was given a test in a course where she was to get some accommodations. She was put in a room to take a test where people were walking through all the time, the photocopier was in the room, there were all kinds of things going on and it was an absolutely miserable situation, as -- as she described it. Faculty member didn't show up to dispute that, so we had to go with what she said and she prevailed.

JONES: So --
Well, you just -- you just gave us a rationale?

FINK: Yeah.

JONES: Yeah.

FINK: But I don't want to get -- open that door. I'll also -- I'll spend my life on the phone talking to people.

GROSSMAN: All these cases go to the ombud's office first and the ombud always writes up a summary of the case that includes the faculty member's perspective and the student's perspective, and a copy of that is always sent to the faculty member as well as the student as well as the Appeals Board.

So if the Appeal's Board then comes back and says, this is our decision, the reasons for the decision are usually pretty clear from the ombud's report.

FINK: And the -- and the decision letter is copied to the department chair.

We had a case maybe two years ago where a faculty member would post office hours, but would sit in her office and when students would knock on the door, she wouldn't answer the door.

And -- they could see her sitting in there, and -- and they would knock on the door and she would just ignore them. She was complying with posting her office hours but -- I mean, those are the things that come --

UNIDENTIFIED: (Unintelligible) --

FINK: (Unintelligible) Appeals Board, but we -- we're -- they're a lot -- unfortunately, there are a number of stories

like this where these things happen and it's just --

JONES: Do you have any generic statistics on the proportion of cases that were decided in favor of --

FINK: Students win half the time. There are exactly -- it's almost exactly 50 percent. And that's true over 11 years of history. And so it's -- some students come in and present a very good case, they have done their homework, their -- they have their arguments well marshaled, they can present them in an articulate fashion.

Other students come in and get totally tongue-tied, go off in left field, it's -- it's all over the map.

Bob?

GROSSMAN:

But if I can just add: Remember the 90 percent of the cases never reach the Appeals Board; and since almost all of them are initiated by the student, that most of the student cases do not end up to the student's satisfaction, and only if they actually get to the Appeals Board -- and, in fact, for grade appeals, the ombud has to essentially endorse the student's -- well, even -- even says for grade appeals but there's an additional barrier to the student actually getting to the Appeals Board (unintelligible) grade appeals.

FINK:

Right. There's a -- there's a process that if the ombud evaluates the case and determines that the case in his view lacks merit, he sends the student what's called a no-merit letter. I have concluded that your case is not worth passing on to the Appeals Board.

Well, the student can appeal that determination. Now, if the student appeals that, they don't appear before the Appeals Board. It's purely paper review, and at that point it's a very narrow questions: Should the student be granted a hearing.

And this morning we had two of those kinds of cases, no-merit reviews. In one case the student did not get a hearing, but in the second one the student was given a hearing.

And so those no-merit reviews where the ombud has made the threshold determination that this -- this case lacks merit; you have sort of a different process, and that the student would -- subsequently didn't get a hearing, though.

It's a great opportunity for the University to do fairness. To provide an outlet for students who have some grievance, like the students knocking on the door and a faculty member in sitting there and not -- not acknowledging the students.

There has to be some way to do that. Michelle and Lee Edgerton do a great job in working with the students and

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
mediating disputes between students and
faculty.

And it is a job I would not want,
absolutely, being the ombud, but I hope
somebody does because they're soliciting
people to be ombud right now. So, if you
have any friends. Ombud is -- Michelle, is
half time; right? Half time --
Half time.

MICHELLE:

FINK: Other questions about the
University Appeals Board?
Shall we march on to the other
thing?

SWANSON:
FINK:

Let's march on.
Faculty Athletics Representative.
That's me. I'll change my notes here. I've
been doing this since July 1st of 2009. I
should have given a report last year but I
didn't because I didn't know I was suppose to
do that, but now I do so I'm here. And I
apologize for missing you last year.

What is the Faculty Athletics
Representative to the SEC and the NCAA? What
is -- what's this person suppose to do?
Well, there is a position description -- this
is it. I won't read it to you, you can read.
But basically being an advisor outside the
athletics program. So I'm not part of the
administrative structure of the athletics
program at all. Okay? And this is what I'm
suppose to be doing.

There's some more description:
Oversight and advice in the administration of
an institutional athletics program and is in
place to promote academic integrity in
intercollegiate athletics.

The president made it very clear to
me when he called me over to the discuss this
with me that any consideration of my
appointment or reappointment was totally
based on a commitment to rules' compliance.

My role is primarily a compliance
role. Fortunately, we have a super
compliance student and athletics, Sandy Bell
is here. Sandy, would you stand up? I think
a lot of people probably see your name in the
paper but they don't know who Sandy Bell is.
This is Sandy Bell. She leads the compliance
group. There are four people in that place
-- or five. Four?

BELL:
FINK:
BELL:
FINK:

We now have --

Five.

-- internet --

Yeah. We have a person who does
nothing but monitor Twitter, Facebook, the
internet, all that stuff for all those -- all
of the things that are out there.

So anyway, I'm suppose to promote
academic integrity in intercollegiate
athletics, to facilitate -- and this
integration they talk about, to promote
institutional control of athletics on campus.

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt

The reason I highlighted this in yellow is because one of the major initiatives I had this past fall was a series of what I call academic athletic forums. These were three late-afternoon discussions held at the Whitehall Classroom Building. First, we featured the head coach of softball, head coach of volleyball and coach of baseball just talking about how they view their role and so forth.

The second involved the head coach of men's basketball, and then the third one involved a panel of representatives from the Center for Academic & Tutorial Services.

The turnout for those was bizmo. In the first one we had 60 people, the second one we had 68 people and the last we had about 20 people.

Part of that was attributable to the fact that the University stopped doing e-mail blasts right before to announce events, starting doing -- stopped those -- right before we had these forums. So there was a real challenge in getting the word out. So I sent out e-mails to a lot of people I knew who thought -- I thought might be interested but still the turnouts were very, very light.

So those -- those have not been continued. We did evaluations. The evaluations were super. I hope to get a publication out of it. I wrote it up over the weekend. And when I look at the numbers, the numbers were great in terms of what the people who attended thought of the -- of the session.

But the idea was to integrate athletics and academic components of the University. That's part what I'm suppose to be doing.

Another thing that works toward that end is we have something, you may not be aware of it, called the Academic Integrity Committee. Academic Integrity Committee meets twice a semester. It's composed of representatives from admissions, registrar, student financial aid, Mike's on it from Undergraduate Education. I hope I'm -- we've got some compliance folks; the folks from the Center for Academic Tutorial Services come, and then if we -- if there's some issues to be discussed we'll pull in other folks as well.

And that's a very informal roundtable discussion where we talk about what rules changes are coming down the pike. The rules in athletics, I'm sure you're aware, are unbelievable; unbelievable. And how Sandy stays on top of these things, I have no idea but she does.

So we talk about that and we talk about ways to work together to facilitate communication across the various units and so

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
forth. So that group meets twice -- twice a semester every semester and, in fact, the athletic rep chairs that.

Some other things I do: I'm a member of this NCAA Cabinet, primarily focuses on the financial relationship between the student athlete and the institution.

I'm also recently been appointed to the Executive Committee of the Southeastern Conference. I haven't gone to any meetings with them yet, so I'm not really sure what that entails.

These -- earlier it was mentioned that there are faculty members on the UK Athletics Board of Directors. This is who they are: Scott Kelley is marketing; Kathi Kern is history; Lionel Williamson is from Ag Econ; Bruce Walcott is electrical engineering.

And they have been with that Board much longer than I, and they're probably better sources of information about what goes on there than I am because I've only been to about -- about two meetings, and they -- they have longer tenure than I.

Focus of the faculty rep is to be on academics and compliance, not financial matters. So I spend a lot of time with Sandy and her colleges going over squad lists, making sure students are on track for their progress toward a degree.

I have to sign a whole bunch of documents. On my distribution of effort form this responsibility takes the place at 25 percent, and the first year I did it I kept track of every meeting I went to and it is 25 percent plus. It takes a lot of time.

So -- but I've -- I've tried to make sure that I interact with the students athletes to the extent I can. There's a group called the Student Athlete Advisory Committee, meets monthly in the evenings, there's a representative from each of the sports where they talk about different issues and so forth.

What have I learned while in this position? I know a little bit about this because when I Director of Admissions for eight years back in the '80s and into the '90s, I dealt with athletic issues, I dealt with certification, student athletes and -- and so forth. And Sandy and I have worked together back then.

But I have learned -- learned some other things as well. One of the requirements that the NCAA has is that the institution do exit interviews with student athletes who have completed their eligibility to compete.

So last spring John Butler and I, and the compliance group interviewed 34, there was some -- maybe 35 graduating student athletes. The idea is they have exhausted

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
their eligibility so the coach can no longer have any influence over them with regard to playing time, scholarship, whatever. How was their experience at UK? How were they treated as a student athlete?

And those are some of the kinds of questions that John and I asked that -- and the key question in my view is, when we asked them if you were back in high school and you knew then what you know now about the University of Kentucky, would you still enroll as a student athlete at the University of Kentucky? A 100 percent said yes; a 100 percent said they would still come to the University of Kentucky.

And when you talk to them about why, it's, yeah. It's the coach, but -- the coaches think it's all the coach but a lot of it is their teammates. I could picture myself as part of that team. When I came here I bonded with the women's softball team and -- and I really made some life-long friends there.

They like being on a campus that has the health professions programs along with the traditional undergraduate programs so that if they're going to change majors into something like that, they can still be here.

One thing that I think comes out, and comes out loud for me because I grew up in Pennsylvania, when they -- when the people from -- the top students athletes from the north, the one thing that attracts them to UK is the southernness of the place. Yes, sir and no, sir, please and thank you.

Well, I grew up in Philadelphia and that was a shock for me because the students didn't treat me that way as a faculty member. I didn't hear that much in Philadelphia. But when I came to Kentucky I heard it, and I -- I label that southernness. And I think that's a real plus for the University of Kentucky. It's something that the student athletes recognized.

Now, let me ask you one of the questions that came up this summer, and this is something you need to think about. Last summer I went around and had a one-on-one meeting with the head -- each of the head coaches, and the very first meeting was with the head coach of the women's volleyball team, Greg Skinner. And I'm asking him, how did you get into coaching, you know, what are some of the issues you have, that sort of thing?

And he said, let me ask you a question. As you know, volleyball is big in California, so we recruit some in California. If I had a student who had narrowed down their choice of institution to UK and Stanford, what should I tell that student about why they should come to UK versus

Stanford?

That was a good question. That was a really good question. Think about that question. Think about how you would answer that question to an 18-year-old and their parents and so forth. Why come to UK over Stanford. It's a really good question.

What surprises have I encountered while in this position? The biggest surprise I had early on was one of the things I have to do is when there has been grade change involving a student athlete, I have to call the instructor. Maybe the original grade that was entered with the registrar's office was a "C" and later on it got changed to a "B".

If it's a student athlete involved I have to call the instructor and essentially ask the question: Did anybody in athletics try to influence you to make this grade change?

Boy, did I expect a lot of push back. I expected cut (unintelligible) kind of results from the Appeals Board experience, you know. Why you messing with my grades, you know, that kind of thing.

So the first time I called an instructor and asked about a grade change, I was -- it was amazing the reaction I got. I was taken back by the reaction. She said, thank you so much for asking. I'm glad to know somebody is watching this. I have no problem at all with telling you exactly what transpired. When the semester ended I had misrecorded a grade for a student and -- and he truly earned a "B" but somehow I miscalculated it to be a "C" and that's what prompted a grade change. But she was glad to know somebody was -- was asking that question. A very different response than what I expected, so that was one surprise I had.

The other surprise I had is the variety of majors that we see among the 500 plus student athletes we have at the University of Kentucky.

A lot of times I think we forget what a broad mix of student athletes we have. You know, we get so fixated on the basketball team or the football team, how about the rifle team? Just won their first national championship. How many of you even know if you have a rifle student in your class? Okay?

I mean, think about the student athlete and the time they spend on practice and other competition related things and then they're doing everything else you expect of them in class and some of them are getting super grades.

Sandy, I think, it's -- is it women's soccer has the highest team GPA?

Yes.

BELL:

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt

FINK:

women's soccer has the highest team GPA of all the -- on a team-by-team basis. And last spring the composite for all 500 plus student athletes was above a 3.0 for the first time.

Now, think about that. Five hundred students contribute to that average GPA, and it was still above a 3.0; that's pretty good.

The last point I want to make is that we are extremely fortunate to have super stars in the compliance group. Sandy asks the hard questions; she not afraid to ask the hard questions. The people she works with deals with the forms and the myriad submissions that NCAA and the SEC expect, they do it very, very well.

And so I think because of Sandy's proactive nature, some of which was detailed in a Sports Illustrated article last week about -- talking about John Calipari and how he -- how he approaches various things.

Sandy gets out in front of issues. And Sandy says, well, don't do it this way; do it that way. Comply with the rules. Here's how you comply with the rules and that's extremely vital.

So that's my two cents worth. It's interesting. I'm married to an Ohio State grad, and these are interesting times at our house.

WOOD:

I hope you're sleeping on the couch.

FINK:

Any questions I can try to answer. I probably went longer than you hoped, but... Yes, John.

THELIN:

You mentioned the focus was on academic compliance, student athletes as opposed to, I think, finance -- financial matters. Who -- who defined that charge?

FINK:

The president.

THELIN:

Does it seem a little peculiar that the faculty have no role in either defining the charge or appointment, selection?

FINK:

That's something the -- when the -- faculty reps and the SEC institution get together we talk about a lot. I mentioned I was doing a manuscript reporting on the academic athletic forums and I went back and found two articles in the Chronicle in 1991, 20 years ago. It raised exactly that question; so that question has been asked for 20 years. How should the faculty rep be appointed? What should the faculty rep control? What's the accountability of the faculty versus the administration? Those are issues that have persisted for quite some time.

THELIN:

So in 1991, is it like Haley's Comet, are we waiting to (inaudible) --

FINK:

Could be; could be. Yes, Bob.

GROSSMAN:

Yeah. Just kind of following up, is this position of yours established by the

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
University or required by the NCAA?
It's required by the NCAA. Every

FINK:

institution has one. Some of you may remember a faculty member here named Dan Fulks who was in accounting. Dan is the faculty athletic rep for Transy now.

GROSSMAN:

And just to follow-up, so the NCAA doesn't define what the person in this job is suppose to do? It is defined by the President?

FINK:

There's one -- there's one paragraph in the constitution and it appears two different places, that's virtually identical wording, but it's really defined by the institution. Am I correct on that, Sandy?

BELL:

I mean, it's a very clear job description that comes out from the NCAA --

FINK:

That's right.

BELL:

-- and it is standard for all faculty athletic reps --

GROSSMAN:

Could you get that --

BELL:

-- but it's very clear in the bylaws of the NCAA and the Southeastern Conference that athletic departments are under the ultimate control of the President, and it is his -- he has ultimate responsibility for athletics which I think is why here the appointment comes through the president.

GROSSMAN:

Could you make that paragraph available to Sheila --

FINK:

Sure.

GROSSMAN:

So that -- to post on the senate website just so we can see because if you're our representative and -- and when you (unintelligible) hard, we don't know, it would be nice to see what the job description is.

FINK:

Right. Sure.

WERMELING:

To both of you: Is there are any prohibition in the rules that prohibit the appointment by the faculty of their representative versus an appointment by the president? Is it expressly prohibited or is it permissive?

FINK:

The -- as I recall, the wording says the President shall designate a faculty athletic representative, da, da, da, da. I can send you that one this evening, as well; it's just a short paragraph.

DUNCAN:

May I ask a question related to --

BROTHERS:

Name please?

DUNCAN:

Marilyn Duncan, Medicine.

-- the Appeals Board? Is this something to which a faculty member can bring a situation? Suppose an administrator arbitrarily changes grades for a course? Is that grounds for (unintelligible)?

FINK:

I don't think it's an Appeals Board thing. It's more of an administrative --

DUNCAN:

More administrative?

FINK:

Yes, if the --

WERMELING: Might be --
FINK: The faculty member determined what the grades were and somehow they got adjusted by someone else in the hierarchy --
DUNCAN: Submitted those and six months later they were changed.
JONES: The Senate Rules are very clear, there's a very narrow area in which -- I believe it's the department chair (unintelligible) but I think the department chair, that would supercede that.
There's no vision in the senate rules for something foggy to happen higher up than that. So that -- that worries me.
SWANSON: I wonder if there was an Appeals Board (unintelligible/inaudible) --
(DISCUSSION BY MANY)
FINK: Yeah, because if someone is medaling with your ability as a faculty member's privileges. Yes?
NADEL: If a star basketball player is constantly sexually harassing his TA in a course and the coach does nothing about that, where should that problem be taken?
FINK: Sandy Bell. Sbell@uky.edu.
BELL: well, he should already know that. Bring it to me.
NADEL: well, it happened last year nothing happened.
BELL: Who did you take it to?
NADEL: (Unintelligible) --
BELL: We can have that discussion, please.
SWANSON: Other questions?
I have a question about your survey. So, was this survey on students that were recent grads? What about people who are about five years out (unintelligible) any way to query them?
FINK: I haven't seen anything.
SWANSON: Thank you.
Dean Birdwhistell will give us the State of the Library report.
BIRDWHISTELL: Good afternoon. It's kind of appropriate to go after Joe talking about athletics. I can remember years ago former director of libraries, Paul Lewis, when he was trying to get a new building, trying to get the collections budget increased, he went around saying that he just hoped we could have a library that the basketball team could be proud of. Well, we do. So good things -- good things do happen.
I appreciate the opportunity to come in today and share with you some of the information and news about this UK Library. It's my understanding this happens every two years, and so this is interesting to be here.
I want to share with you some of the interesting initiatives that we have underway, and then talk a little bit about the budget challenges we face in UK Library, which are not much different from the -- of

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
the challenges that -- from the rest of the University.

I wanted to start out by showing you the libraries that we're talking about that are part of the UK Libraries. Many of you may know that we continue to consolidate our service points. There was a time back in the '60s and '70s when we wanted more and more branch libraries. As the nature of information has changed and the budget situation has changed, we're working to consolidate branch libraries which in fact frees up faculty and staff positions for repurchasing, and also frees up much needed academic space at each of your colleges.

But, on the other hand, we continue to try to provide the specialized services to you as faculty and to your colleges. We are using imbedded librarians who may not have a library in your college but may have office space and work directly with your faculty and your students on collection issues and on the information literacy library instruction.

I wanted to point out to the members of the Senate the Library Committee, Tracy Campbell is the chair of that committee -- and you think they don't have any -- any influence but one of the things Tracy asked me when I became the dean, there was a sign right here (indicating) that said storage.

I don't know if you all remember that but every time you'd take a picture of someone speaking at UK at the library all you'd see is a big sign that said storage.

So proving that I could get something done, it's gone. It might be the only thing I get done (unintelligible). But -- so we appreciate their support.

I want to talk later about, you know, some of the exciting initiatives with technology things we're doing. But -- but this is really -- this is really where it all happens, in the UK Library.

These are the things that you depend on, attending to basics, you know, the work that Mary Beth Thomson and her group does in collections and technical services in building and in maintaining these collections; it's a very, very difficult job and it's changing every day in terms of how materials are purchased and how library materials are purchased.

We work very hard to support teaching, learning and research. We're working in the area of information literacy, and that means providing instruction when you need it for your students on how best to use the library, what the best sources are, all the way from undergrad up to your doctoral students.

We work very closely with UKIT to provide the best information technology. We have some ideas in the works. You know, the

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
hub down in the lower level of this building has been a huge success for our undergraduates. We're looking at that same model for other parts of this library. As libraries become less and less storage facilities and more and more learning environments we hope that can transform some other areas of the library to make that happen.

And so we spend a lot of time still with reference, circulation, interlibrary loan. And also Davy Jones is here, back in -- when I University Archivist he played a big role in helping us really improve our university public records program, and so many people don't know that the libraries actually run the public records program for the University.

So this is one of the initiatives that I wanted to share with you. Some of you may have heard about it already. It's called UKnowledge. It's a digital collection of unique scholarship managed by UK Libraries, and the material in it is created by UK faculty, staff and students.

It captures, organizes, preserves and provides worldwide access to UK's faculty and student publications, (unintelligible) dissertations and journals.

And this is something you're going to be hearing more about in the future. It's just now up and running. Pat Wilson, one of our senior librarians who's director of digital scholarships and is working on this full time and is being -- is contacting your colleges and your departments to get the material from you all and from your students into this digital commerce.

So in a digital environment and a Google book world, libraries have access to a lot of the same materials, and so there's more and more emphasis on -- on unique materials. What makes a research library unique?

Well, we're very fortunate to have a lot of unique collections here at UK, and they play an important in research and they can play an even more important role in some of your teaching.

This is a collection, I always like to highlight, the Hugh Peal collection. It came here in 1982. It's a collection of some of the world's most distinguished collections of original letters from the early English Romantics, including Robert Burns, William Wordsworth, Sir Walter Scott, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Lord Byron and John Keats. And it's just a fantastic collection.

When -- when it came here in 1982, the world said, where is it going? And it was given to us by an 1982 graduate of UK. He was a graduate of what's now the Gatton College. He became an attorney and a -- a

fantastic collector of books and manuscripts.

So this is the kind of collection that has tremendous research potential and, as I talk later on about what we're trying to digitize, this is the type of collection we want to digitize and make available not only to researchers here on campus but researchers around the world.

Now, what do we have to do with the Keeneland Library, you might ask. Well, the Keeneland Library has one of the world's most comprehensive research collections on the history of the thoroughbred.

In addition to the daily racing form, which many of you may use at the track, the library contains thousands of books, journals, photographs, audio/video materials and racing memorabilia.

We are working with the Keeneland Library in partnership to raise an endowment of money coming to UK that would allow UK to take over administration of the Keeneland Library and to transform it into the International Thoroughbred Research Library. So, in fact, it would become part of UK Library's special collections if the private money can be raised.

Some of you may not have a background in oral history, and so it's not surprising that I would highlight this. Louie Nunn Center for Oral History here at UK is one of the best oral history centers in the country. Now, what I want to show you here are two recent things that have gone on to give you an idea of -- of the type of work that's going on there. On the left you see From Combat to Kentucky, and those are interviews with Kentucky Veterans from the Iraq and Afghan wars. They came from these -- these veterans come out of small-town, Kentucky and National Guard Units. They come back and now they're being interviewed about their experiences leaving their hometowns, going to war and then coming back. And, of course, they're going over there as -- as guard units.

A lot of these veterans are ending up in higher education at UK, at the community college system and so we're working, putting a team together around the state to collect these interviews.

And some of the interviews that have already been collected have been used as the basis of a theatrical production that was held at UK just last year.

On the other side of that former UK faculty member Angene Wilson and her husband, Jack Wilson, spent a few years interviewing Veterans from the Peace Corps who were either from Kentucky or came back to Kentucky after their time in the Peace Corps.

And so they put those interviews together in a book recently published by the

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
University Press of Kentucky, and it's been a very -- it's been very well received.

But we're doing more than just collecting interviews. We have 8,000 interviews, but we're actually leading in access to oral history interviews on the web.

Last November Dr. Doug Boyd, not to be confused with the Doug Boyd in the administration building. We have a Doug Boyd as well, who's Director of the Nunn Center, and he spoke to the Library of Congress Folklife Center, board and staff, about technologies developed by UK Libraries to deliver oral history online, and that was just last November.

So we're leading in terms of trying to provide digital access to those types of materials.

The Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education contracts with UK Libraries to create and administer the Kentuckiana Digital Library. It is the gateway to very unique digitized collections, housed in archives across Kentucky.

We're also working with the College of Education to develop curriculum materials so that this type of private source materials can be used in K through 12 classrooms around Kentucky.

This is something we're very proud of, the National Digital Newspaper Program commonly known as NDNF. It's the partnership between NEH and the Library of Congress to digitize historic newspapers prior to 1923.

And UK has been a part of this national movement since its conception in 2005. It does sound kind of braggy to say this, but NEH decided that UK Libraries knew how to transform microfilm to digital, in terms of libraries, so well that it made it a condition that anyone getting a grant had to come to Kentucky the summer before they were to start to learn how to do it. So we're very proud of that.

This was just in the news recently. Senator Georgia Davis Powers gave her collection to the University of Kentucky Libraries. She served 21 years as a member of the Kentucky State Senate, and she was elected in 1967 to the Senate. She became the person of color and the first woman elected to the Kentucky State Senate so you can imagine the historical importance of this.

Okay. That's the good news. This is what you probably came to hear. This is our UK Libraries' budget. It's not that complicated if it's in this form.

We've got most of the money in salaries, collections. We have an operating budget that is still in -- it's sort of structured in balance. We have to -- we generally have a 2 to \$300,000 deficit at the

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
beginning of each in our operating budget.

We actually bring the endowments over the course of the year through salary savings and other types of efficiencies but that is the state recurring budget.

So you can imagine that any cuts that have to come out of UK Libraries' budget have to come from these two areas.

We're always trying to figure out a way to do things with less money and to make the money go further. One of the things we're doing, the Agricultural Information Center, now that Agricultural is being repurposed, using an embedded librarian, taking out the UKAG to provide the necessary service out there but to sort of hold down the -- the actual branch operation out there and that's one of the places we were keeping an embedded librarian. That saves one staff position that we can then reassign.

Let's go back. The Medical AV Library is being consolidated into the Medical Center Library, again, we'll keep a librarian with an office over in the nursing building but that's also saving one staff position.

And then the Medical Center Library Technical Services merged into the Central Library resulting in a savings of one and a half positions.

We try to do our best to -- to go after grants. During the last budget cycle we received almost two million dollars in grants. We're looking at strategies to try to improve that as we -- as we move forward.

I mentioned the Uknowledge. When we were trying to figure out to get that started, we were at the point where it had to get implemented on this campus, we were a little bit behind. We estimated it would take \$300,000 over two years to get that going.

That money was not available outside of the Library Budget, so we made some tough decisions internally. Reassigned a Senior Librarian. We'll probably just have a staff person in that. We've allocated a graduate assistantship for that, and we're using other personnel within the libraries to make that happened.

So that's just sort of the reality of where we are today. If you want -- if something has to be done, we've got to figure out a way to do it. We cannot wait for outside money to come our way.

Again, we look for savings, and we're trying to reduce our -- our operating budget 5 percent. We have a plan for the summer. We're going to implement an automated payroll system. Libraries has a lot of employees and it takes a lot of time sheets for our staff, and the automated payrolls will save probably -- almost a full

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
staff position in the dean's office plus
hours and hours of staff time across the
library system.

This year we've delayed our new
computer lease. If you look at the computers
throughout the library system, they're
getting a little age on them. We've
stretched it well beyond what we normally
would, but by doing that and a little luck
they've kept working, we captured \$215,000.
And in a budget like ours with the challenges
we're facing, that's essential and that's a
credit to the people in our library's
technology division who are able to make that
happened.

We've talked about the -- you know,
the need to perhaps reduce staffing. We've
already lost 14 positions over the last three
years; nine staff, five senior faculty. And
that -- in an organization like ours, that is
truly significant in terms of just the public
service areas that we have, the behind the
scenes work that we have to do.

We've done internal reallocations
of the collections budget. When new
curriculum initiatives are made on campus, we
do our best to try and support that. Like in
areas of Asian Studies Program, Gender &
Women's Studies. I've already talked about
how we reallocated money to support
UKnowledge and then, of course, we have to
continually look for either new money or
reallocated money to support the digitizing
of our unique materials so that we do not
fall too far behind on that.

Every year if we didn't get a new
dollar to our budget, these are the kind of
costs that we're -- we're facing. They go up
four to six percent, science, technology and
medical resources increase at least 6
percent. Book prices in FY 2010 increased
2.3 percent.

We're very proud that we have a
large collection endowment. You'll hear
people talk about that a lot, you know, that
it's to the second -- it's the hi -- it's the
highest endowment of any public research
university in the country.

We have a -- an Endowment Committee
that monitors collections budget and also the
endowment conditions. They actually moved to
decrease expenditure pay out on our endowment
before the university did to make sure that
we didn't get underwater in that.

The endowment grew to 80 million
dollars, and then fell to 56 -- 56.9, almost
57 million dollars in 2009. We're roughly up
to close to 62 million dollars right now. So
we hope that -- that keeps going up.

We spend about 2 million dollars
off of that endowment annually. We try not
to put recurring costs on that in case the
endowment were to go back down but we're able

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
to make one-time purchases and -- with that
endowment money.

So based on the budget projections
that we have received this year, this is what
we're looking at.

Let's start with the Medical Center
Library. If you take in the percentage cut
that we've been asked to factor in plus the
increase in cost and the lack of one-time
money that we normally -- well, not normally,
but we have gotten in the past. Two years
ago we got a million dollars non-recurring;
last year we got a half million dollars non-
recurring; this year we're not sure that
we'll get any. We're -- we're not expecting
any. So the Medical Center Library will face
a reduction of a \$181,000. That's a 5.7
percent reduction.

The rest of the university
Libraries are looking at \$660,000, that's a
6.7 percent decrease. That means that the --
and the monograph budget will be decreased 20
percent.

Now, this is happening with UK
Libraries saving money this year and carrying
forward a half a million dollars that we're
going to put into the collections budget for
next year. So a half million dollars is
coming forward to try and soften this -- this
cut.

But libraries are facing, going
forward, this is a -- this was a phrase at
the last Association of Research Libraries
meeting, and I liked it. Partner or Perish.
Librarians are great collaborators; we
partner with people. We partnered with the
Kentucky Virtual Library in purchasing
journals for the public universities in
Kentucky and for the public libraries and for
the school libraries.

We work with the Association of
Southeast Research Libraries on a shared
journal project. We're working with the same
organization on how to better partner to work
on -- as a -- on the government documents as
the Depository Library of the Southeast. So
we have to continue looking for those
opportunities.

We have to continue to look for
private funding. We need to grow the Young
Endowment. It hasn't expanded a lot in
recent years. We're trying to target medical
and science. They're the fastest growing,
most expensive areas. I've talked to the
Provost about this; I've talked with the
members of the Young family about this, and
I've talked with UK Healthcare Development
about it. We're hoping something will come
from that.

We need to increase the number of
endowed graduate assistantships we have. We
need to raise money to deal with our unique
collections and most of that is for

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
digitizing those so we can make them
available.

Most of all, we need your support,
and I appreciate the support that the
University gives UK Libraries. Provost
Subbaswamy has told me on many occasions that
he's never been to a university where he felt
there is more support for the libraries than
here at UK. And I told him, in meeting with
the dean a few months ago, as we're getting
ready to head into this budgetary cycle, that
the test of that love will be proved this
year as we move through these difficult
times.

So thank you all very much. I'm
sorry I went over the time. I'll be happy to
answer your questions.

UNIDENTIFIED: I just have a quick question. The
14 positions that were eliminated, were those
by attrition?

BIRDWHISTELL: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED: Okay.

BIRDWHISTELL: All but one.

UNIDENTIFIED: All but one?

BIRDWHISTELL: Uh-huh.

UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you.

BIRDWHISTELL: Davy.

JONES: Just a historical note for the
people here. For many decades our colleagues
in the librarian rank were basically orphan
faculty. They -- they weren't members of an
educational unit. They answered to a
director who was an administrative staffer.

And it wasn't until 2005 actually
that the librarian faculty were gathered
together, and -- and a college was
established; the library is the equivalent of
a college. And they -- they -- there's a
faculty body that makes the educational
policy in their college. It's -- it's a very
recent improvement of their position.

SWANSON: Other questions?

BIRDWHISTELL: I've learned not to argue with
Davy. Thank you. Anybody? Okay.

SWANSON: I hope you'll bear with us and I
apologize to Mike, but I'd really like to
move forward because I'm concerned we only
have two more Senate meetings left.
Mike, thanks for allowing us to put
you last.

MULLEN: The last few times I've been here
I've talked about general education, and
today is no exception but I'm not here to
talk about the University of Kentucky's
general education program today. I'm
actually here to talk a little bit about
what's going on at the State level, and I'll
try to keep this relatively brief because
it's after five.

But, I think it's important that
the Faculty Senate know what's going on at
the State level as we go forward, so my
purpose here today is to share some changes

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
in the statewide course transfer policy with special reference to general education across the State.

Some of you may recall that last year during the budget cycle the legislature was looking very closely at education issues, both in the -- with Senate Bill 1 and House Bill 160. And House Bill 160 was revised in a number of ways but most important for this discussion was the revision that said that the Kentucky Community Technical College System would align all of their work across their system to -- for AA and AS degrees, and also there had to be clear pathways for designated majors for students who got AAs or ASS; not double AAASS, but either Associate of Arts or Associate of Sciences, they have clear pathways upon completion to move into universities to obtain degree programs.

A second part of that and the reason I'm here today is that there was a mandate to specify statewide GenEd learning outcomes, and then thirdly was to establish a statewide course classification system which would allow for the ease of monitoring and transferring, not only GenEd across institutions but also for transferring courses in general across institutions.

And so there's been a lot work for the past year now. A lot of the faculty at this University working with faculty across the state to look at how do we facilitate and move forward in this way to -- to honor the spirit of what the legislature has said we shall do.

Just an overview. When we talk about transfers, it's actually an area that we haven't done as well in with respect to KCTCS in recent years. I've highlighted us in the middle. I did not put all of the institutions on here. Many of the institutions have very low transfer rates.

We tend to have the highest transfer rates most years, and you notice our rates are steadily decreasing. Certainly, the movement of the KCTCS system away from UK and all the factors to do with that. The ultimate movement of BCTC out of the UK system. Rising tuitions we think plays a role, and there are some at the state level in the legislature who feel the transfer policies on the part of the University of Kentucky had a role in this. I'm not sure that that is a generality that can be proved.

But, nonetheless, you can see we've been dropping. EKU has been -- has been picking up, and many BCTC students actually end up going to EKU in addition to UK.

So the proposed statewide transfer policy, which is not final yet but is nearing finality, has these kinds of things in it. It emphasizes that there will be common student learning outcomes in five categories

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
at the state level. Say, well, five. We only have four. Well, that's why faculty had to sit down and figure out where courses in each of our programs were going to end up at.

Every campus has its own GenEd program, and the State -- we're trying to keep the State from telling us that every campus will have the same GenEd program both at KCTCS, Murray State and University of Kentucky.

And so we have to have the kind of collegiality that allows us then to look at what the outcome should be. Once -- those outcomes are now in place. It was interesting. We listed our outcomes with every university, put them into a document without identification, and it was difficult in some cases to identify which ones were our outcomes and which ones were somebody else's outcomes.

Most of us have been using the AACU LEAP framework in the last several years to rethink our GenEd at all of our campuses, hence the emphasis on student learning outcomes.

We are also being encouraged to allow for completion of the AA and AS. We want to push KCTCS to keep kids there as long as possible to get that Associate's degree before they come here, and we also think that the work that's going on now will enhance cooperation across institutions to improve the quality of transfer advising, which sometimes has been problematic.

I just simply throw up the GenEd transfer categories that are in place, these categories were set up essentially at the state level; arts and humanities, these look fairly familiar, social/behavioral sciences, communications and natural sciences, quantitative reasoning.

The ranges are the ranges of hours at different universities. For instance, in our communications it would be six hours, but other places it'll be nine hours, arts and humanities we would be six under this framework because we would essentially map our inquiry areas in arts and humanities into that category. You can see the framework.

The third column is the transcript code. When we talk about students leaving an institution and coming, they're going to have these codes on courses that satisfy these areas on their transcripts, and you can see your faculty representatives who work across the State with representatives from every other university and the KCTCS system to come up with a common set of outcomes.

I just throw this up just as an example. These are the written and oral communication outcomes that are at the state level and they'll be logged -- we've agreed

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
that these are the kinds of things we expect our students to be able to do when they graduate from any of our universities, and these look pretty similar, pretty familiar. The kind of thing we'd expect to see for our communication student learning outcome.

The tricky part has been getting folks to sit down and think about outcomes versus seat time. We've had that same transition. How do we think about outcomes versus seat time.

And essentially what is now coming into play is for a student at -- at one institution, they can leave that institution and transfer to another location, after having no certification for general education or they can be category certified or they can be core certified.

Category certification -- assume a student comes to the University of Kentucky, they've taken Com I and COM II, we're going to map that to the oral and written communications but they don't take anything else here and then they transfer to western. Unlikely scenario. That student would leave here as core certified in communication, but they've -- or not core certified, as category certified in communications.

Western has to honor that. Western can't now say, well, I'm sorry, you didn't take English 101 and 102 as we teach it. You have to take it over again. Western would have to allow that student to come in as having met the state learning outcomes for communication.

A student at any institution that completes all of the categories would leave that institution core certified. So a student comes here, takes all of our general education, accrues the 30 hours, those would all map into those areas, went to western; they're done. Even if western has a 36-hour Gen Ed, they're finished. They will have completed it.

Similar to what we do with the General Ed Transfer Agreement with community college students who leave having finished General Education at the community college. So that's kind of where we're at the state level.

A couple of things about institutional responsibility. That first category ought to say sending institution. The sending institution has a number of responsibilities. We ought to know as a sending institution what are the rules and regulations at the state level. How do we advise students who we know are going to transfer. This is going to mostly impact KCTCS students.

So advisors have to know the courses that they're going to take, that they're going to meet the requirements at the

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
state level and how they're going to fit at the institution they move to. Accessibility simply means we've got to make everybody in the system, students, faculty advisors aware of what's going on, so there will be websites at the state level and it's expected it will also have information regarding how general education and transfer takes place on all our university websites as well.

Certification on transcripts. It is our responsibility when a student leaves a sending institution to make sure the transcript reflects the fact that a student has been either category or core certified so that the receiving institution can know what's going on with that student.

We, as a receiving institution, have to accept those coded courses for accepting completion of GenEd. So, again, the student comes here and they are category certified in two areas, they've still got to finish the other three areas as per our GenEd Program here.

We can't refute what they send unless we sense an administrative error. In other words, we as the University now are in a position where we are being asked to trust faculty at all institutions to be sure that the course work is, indeed, meeting these learning outcomes.

The third part is assessment. There's language that mirrors what's access. Access -- we should be expecting -- assessing student learning outcomes for general education at the University.

That's still to be expected, though we also must take that a step further and monitor assessment of student learning outcomes at the state level.

So that really gives us as a system the opportunity to look at whether or not students coming from one sector or another are truly meeting the learning outcomes that we are saying we expect at the state level and we'll have faculty from each university involved on a regular basis in this monitoring of the attainment of student learning outcomes on a systemwide level as we move forward.

Implementation date. Fall 2012. There will be some of you in this room that will be asked to participate as we think about tagging courses and making sure that our general education program is mapped to the right places in the statewide framework. So that's our timeline, is Fall 2012.

I've given you some resources here. If you want to take a look at any of those feel free, but we thought it was important for you to understand what was going on at the state level with respect to transfer of all credit but particularly with transferring general education.

That's all I have. Questions, comments, concerns, thoughts? Scott? Engineering.

YOST: What about out of state transfers?

MULLEN: That is not governed by this. This is entirely intra -- an intrastate concern, so we are going to also then have to be looking at, as we've done for years, what does it mean when a student brings course work from the University of Illinois or from Montana State Community College -- I didn't say that right, (unintelligible) State Community College, whatever the case may be, we have -- we'll still have to evaluate those as we've done in the past to look for equivalencies. So that's -- that is not a part of this.

SWANSON: Mike, when you say (unintelligible)

MULLEN: -- well, in the past when we've asked for equivalencies, those would go back to the department that taught the course. So if student is (unintelligible) a course in history, we would ask the history department to assist with the equivalencies.

Ernie.

YANARELLA: Mike, it seems it's going a lot more smoothly than some of us feared it might. Are there -- are there things that still keep you up at night with regard to the direction that this going and the possibilities of -- of greater stringency with respect to GenEd?

MULLEN: I'll tell you what keeps me awake with respect to this particular issue; and, that is, if we don't do this well we will get what they wanted prior to this bill, and that was a system where everybody has to do the same -- same general education program, same course numbering, same courses.

We do not want to go the direction out of the State of Louisiana which is what they were trying to model this on, so I -- I am hopeful that we'll be able to maintain this really robust dialogue statewide, with the input of faculty who are really engaged in general education on this campus to maintain this -- this discussion and keep us looking forward in the spirit of transparency and the spirit of trying to make sure that the students who move through the system at various campuses can do so in as straight a line as possible.

So I just -- I just hope that we -- that this doesn't get derailed because I know the legislature, if it is derailed, will come back and say, now we're going to go here and we don't want to go there.

Mike?

KOVASH: Mike Kovash, Arts & Sciences.

Mike, do we allow students who are not UK students at present, access to our -- the free audit program so that they can enter

their own -- what they've completed elsewhere and do an -- an instant equivalency from the book values so they can see where they would fall, were they to come here?

MULLEN: I don't know that they can get into APEX, but there is a statewide facility for doing that. It's -- right now it's -- it's -- I can't remember the name of it. We're moving to -- can someone --

UNIDENTIFIED: I think it's a transfer equivalency tab on our --

MULLEN: Right. Right. And so there are -- yeah, I guess there is a place to go to in the admissions office that actually do that. There's a link to the state -- state system (unintelligible) your map. And we're moving to a new system, a transfer equivalency system which will be completely transparent and the student will be able to log in and do exactly that, the transfer analysis of -- and -- and be able to tell how do I sit in terms of where I go, and they could choose to compare Western versus Eastern, UK versus UL and get a feel for --

KOVASH: And it will be at the degree level? Say, I want to be in this department and --

MULLEN: Right.

KOVASH: -- and this --

MULLEN: That's -- that's -- that is where we're headed exactly.

KOVASH: Okay. Thank you.

DAVE: Dave (Unintelligible) --

Once this transfer arrangement gets worked out is this something that we'll have to approve or will this take affect regardless of what --

MULLEN: That's a really good question. We -- it's -- right now all the campuses are doing exactly what I'm doing. We're talking to our Senate Coun -- to our Senators about what's going on at the state level.

It would certainly be, I think, in our best interest to have -- to have this go to the point of endorsement on something that we all agree is workable.

Richard, I don't know. Do you have a feel for that? I hadn't really pondered that question.

GREISSMAN: well, I think the one thing that probably couldn't be done is to say we're not going to do this nor anything else --

MULLEN: Right.

GREISSMAN: -- but we can't -- we can't contradict state law.

The problem is that given all this has been done at the state level with faculties from all the universities and colleges, including UK, to now say we're not going to do it, is to put up an (unintelligible) --

UNIDENTIFIED: And suffer the consequence?

GREISSMAN: -- and suffer -- yeah. I -- I wouldn't want to soft pedal what Mike is

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
saying about what the state wants to do initially, and -- and in the confines of this room with perhaps (indicating reporter).... Were it not for Carl Rollins, the Education Chair of the House, we would have been in big trouble. He called, asked our liaisons to work on a revision of the language because he realized instantly that what was proposed was draconian and we were able to suggest ultimate language that was acceptable to Carl and his committee, other universities, but there are those chomping at the bit to impose a single system.

So, I want to be careful what I say. And this is an ultimate faculty prerogative, but at the same time it's -- it's complicated by the politics of this state. We probably -- I think Mike had it just right when he said we probably had about the best possible outcome we could have expected.

MULLEN: I'm sure -- just adding to that. I started in this job April 17th. By August 17th of 2009 I was actually chairing the (unintelligible) -- the name. And my first day on that Friday -- the previous Friday I was asked if I would -- would you go to Frankfort and go to the Governor's Higher Education Working Group.

Oh, by the way, you'll be on a panel on transfer issues. I had no clue what was going on. But on that day I'm sitting on the panel and a state senator is excoriating the higher education system for our -- for our resistance to smooth transfer of courses and he pointed directly at me and blamed the University of Kentucky for the majority of the problems.

I had no where to go but down from there. It was a really interesting first day on the job. I had to bite my tongue because the anecdotes he was using I knew were false, but perception is reality when you get into these kind of things and you don't -- you have to change their perception in Frankfort.

SWANSON: Further questions? Thank you so much.

MULLEN: You're welcome.

SWANSON: Could I have a motion to adjourn?

UNIDENTIFIED: So moved.

* * * * *

WHEREUPON, the University of Kentucky Senate Committee Meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

* * * * *

□ STATE OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF CAMPBELL)

I, LISA E. HOINKE, the undersigned Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky at large, certify that the facts stated in the caption hereto are true; that at the time and place stated in said caption the UK Senate Council Meeting was taken down in

UKSenateCouncil-03-21-11.txt
stenotype by me and later reduced to computer
transcription under my direction, and the foregoing is
a true record of the proceedings which took place
during said meeting.

My commission expires: January 27, 2015.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
hand and seal of office on this the 23rd day of
June, 2011.

LISA E. HOINKE,
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE
K E N T U C K Y
ID No. 435798