

SENATE MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

FEBRUARY 10, 2014

* * * *

* * * *

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

* * * *

* * * *

BLONDER: I'd like to call the meeting to order. Welcome to the first meeting of 2014 of the University Senate.

Just some reminders. Please remember to sign in when you arrive, give your name and affiliation when you speak, attend the meetings, respond to emails and web postings as appropriate, acknowledge and respect others, silence your electronic devices, and communicate with your constituency.

The first agenda item are the minutes from December 10, 2013 and then I have some announcements. We didn't receive any changes to the minutes.

Are there any corrections at this point? Okay. Then there being no corrections, the minutes stand approved as distributed by unanimous consent.

Starting with the announcements, we're going to be beginning our annual exercise in identifying nominees for the various area committees, et cetera.

UKSenateMeeting-2-10-14.txt

So please be on the lookout for an email from Ms. Brothers this week and next week soliciting nominations, and please send in nominations.

The Senate Council accepted the report of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Education Funding. If you recall, this committee began its work last spring and gave a report to Senate Council.

It was decided that we would send that report to three different committees. The first is the Senate Committee on Research and Graduate Education, the second is the Strategic Planning Committee on Graduate and Professional Education, and the third is the Provost Ad Hoc Review Committee of Graduate Scholarship and Fellowship Awards.

At the December 16th Senate Council meeting Alice Christ, College of Fine Arts, was elected Senate Council Vice Chair. Her term will begin June 1st, 2014 and will end May 30th, 2015. Congratulations to Alice.

Due to some changes in the Senate Rules from May 2012, new minors are no longer reviewed by the Senate Academic Programs Committee.

New minors are approved by lack of objection on web transmittals along with course approval proposals and program changes.

Next, the Senate Council approved some minor calendar changes on behalf of the Senate. First, we added the recently approved April 15 deadline for graduate students to apply for the early August degree list to the appropriate calendars.

And second, we approved the addition of dates of the National Conference on Undergrad Research. That's April 3rd to the 5th. And a note to contract the Registrar for more information, and this goes on the 2013/2014 calendar.

And the Senate Council also approved the addition of dates identifying the percentage withdrawal of refunds for the College of Dentistry 2014/2015 calendar.

Next, we approved, I approved as Senate Council Chair, additions to the degree list. One undergraduate student was added to the December 2013 degree list and one graduate student added to December 2013 degree list. These are due to administrative error.

We also, if you remember, instituted a hardship policy. And I was able to approve one graduate student who applied based on hardship to the December 2013 degree list.

We have, upcoming, a Faculty Trustee election. This is held in the spring and the voting is scheduled for April. Trustee Irina Voro is completing her first

UKSenateMeeting-2-10-14.txt
term which ends June 30th, 2014.

The term for the newly elected trustee will be July 1st, 2014 through June 30th, 2017.

After the eligibility list is determined, there will be a petition round followed by one or two election rounds depending on the number of candidates. So consider this and be on the lookout for emails regarding this.

For my Chair report, I wanted to let you know that the President has sent me a link to a webinar on Faculty Governance. And the main speaker is a former AAUP Committee Chair.

So Senate Council participated in this webinar and we listened to the discussion. The discussion focused on the history of Faculty Governance in the United States, Faculty Senate versus University Senate, the pros and cons of each type of Senate. And the status of contingent faculty.

The Senate Council is going to purchase the DVD for this and we'll let you know when we have it, and anyone who is interested can borrow it and watch it and see what these kinds of issues that were raised.

Next we have the Trustee Report and John Wilson has agreed to give that. John?

WILSON:

Good afternoon. Lee wanted to give me a few minutes to talk briefly about the last Board meeting and give folks a chance to raise concerns and ask questions.

And I just wanted to mention a couple of things that will be happening in the next few months that are certainly very important for faculty.

Two issues which were certainly -- surrounded the last Board meeting, one was the approval of the next phase of dorm construction and that involves some concerns about the demolition of certain properties. And that was a lively discussion prior to and at the Board meeting.

The data we received is that dorm construction has been enormously successful in terms of changing the dorm and educational environment for students. Some of the numbers are (inaudible).

The phases of the dorm construction are meant to provide a new wave of rooms available each year. The rooms available in August, the new sets of dorms coming online are oversubscribed already.

Most interesting to me is you think about the freshman who want to live as sophomores on campus, that number has typically been less than 10 percent. So 90 percent of the freshman leave campus after their freshman year.

This year that number has increased substantially. I'm hoping the figure is

somewhere in the range of 16 percent which is in one year, is a substantial change.

Even more interesting to me as a teacher is the vast expansion of living learning communities. I think, you know, the final outcome of this certainly awaits a long trial.

But I think, you know, the faculty community has stepped up to provide some really exciting learning opportunities for students. And students seem to be wanting these and wanting to engage in them.

So the next phase of dorm construction, you know, provides another opportunity to expand these.

I will move onto another issue but I wanted to give people a chance to ask questions or voice concerns about the dorm --

ARTHUR:

Mary Arthur, College of Ag.

So I have a bunch of questions, can I ask them all at once?

WILSON:

Well, sure.

ARTHUR:

Okay. Because I'm wondering how it is that they are stating that the new dorms, the new beds for next fall, are already oversubscribed when I know that the living learning program that I'm involved with, we only have maybe 20 out of 160 students who have signed up so far.

So I just wonder where this oversubscribed bed comes from.

WILSON:

Yes.

ARTHUR:

I'm wondering where the students are all going to eat. I'm wondering where the cars are all going to go. And I'm wondering who is addressing the fact that the cost of the new dorms is about \$2,000 more than the cost of the old dorms and less than the cost of living off campus.

WILSON:

You may have to remind me about some of these questions.

One of the things I want to do, and to get faculty more informed about the decision process that your Trustees make, is to give you links to the data so that you can follow through the same process.

I'm not going to try to reconstruct that for you today. These are applications for the new dorms. Not necessarily every single component is my understanding.

I think lots of concerns about - I'm not taking these in order so you're going to have to remind me. Lots of concerns about dining and parking.

And dining, let me hold that to the discussion of the dining services issue (inaudible).

Parking is a continuing problem. Our understanding is that while we're waiting for a comprehensive parking plan to develop, which is currently in process, the new parking structure is part of the budget request going (inaudible).

UKSenateMeeting-2-10-14.txt

And at the last Board meeting, a lot of 250 spaces was approved for construction behind the (inaudible). I don't think that that solves any problems, but it's - I think you should know that it is high on the agenda of things to be looked at.

Now parking and dining, that may not adequately answer your -

GROSSMAN:

Cost.

WILSON:

Cost.

ARTHUR:

You said you would show us a link or you could send us a link that would -

WILSON:

I will send you a link, particularly about the cost issues, which is I think - it's our understanding that it's - students seem to be, if the cost is that less, is that much lower out in town, then I'm at a loss to understand why our dorms are currently oversubscribed.

But I will send you a link which will show you the data about those projections.

One of the things that people have said is that the cost of the dorms will rapidly get beyond the means of students. And I think that's - the cost of higher education in general is that same thing.

But dorms and market pressure, the University is not responsible to fill the dorms for the purposes of contract. There's no minimum amount of beds that have to be filled.

So that's the responsibility of the private part of this. So if there's market pressure on cost, it simply will not be able to charge that.

I don't know if that addresses the longer term question.

The shorter term question, I think the link may help you understand.

RIORDAN:

May I also add --

WILSON:

Sure.

RIORDAN:

Chris Riordan, Provost.

So one of the other things to know that we're changing is that the application deadline for live and learn programs this year is April 15th.

And we also have a priority deadline of February 15th. So we haven't quite hit the time line where the students are actually submitting their applications. So we don't quite know the full demand for the various programs that are going on.

To get into a better cycle we just recently met and put together a whole master calendar where we're going to have an early addition (inaudible) up in December and then have applications in February.

What this will do for the live and learn programs, this will help our colleges and our faculty better plan for the number of students that will be interested in it.

This happened so quickly we're just

a little bit off cycle in terms of the timing.

So many of the colleges have not received all of the applications that may be coming their way for the live and learn programs because that deadline hasn't come yet.

WILSON:

So I hope that helps a little bit. Once again, after you look at the links, or even before you look at the links, feel free to call or write me and we can talk about the specifics.

The other thing I just want to add in, I'm not an architect, make no pretense about fine arts. It pains me when I walk by that beautiful house that is on the list, the Bluegrass Trust list.

Even I can see that that is a beautiful piece of art. The problem that the Trustees faced is this issue of competing priorities and relative cost.

So one of the things I will send is the link to what that quadrant would look like with the new construction. Because a lot of effort is being put at re-purposing a major building and an old building in the middle of that quadrant.

And that's where the planners have chosen to put resources. I was stunned to learn that moving that house would cost \$1 million.

And so it's an issue of where does one take that from in order to save that one house. And that's the cold reality that the planners and the Trustees have to face.

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, A and S. So in terms of the decisions that were made about - or how the decisions were made about which properties to save and which ones to demolish, is there a public -- a report or a discussion that could be made, a record of discussion that could be made about how those, you know, what the - what the planners recommended and things like that?

Because the newspaper, of course, just talks to the Bluegrass Trust people and didn't really explain the logic other than oh yes, we considered all that.

But it didn't show exactly what was considered, what the pros and cons were.

Also, I'm going to encourage maybe someone in the University to send a picture of the inside of (inaudible). Because, you know, the newspaper and everything was advocating saving that building and I've been in that building and oh, my God.

WILSON:

Anything you save needs to be re-purposed in some way and the cost of re-purposing things meet the cost. It's enormous.

So the resources are limited and difficult choices need to be made. But I agree with you. The fact that that was not a

UKSenateMeeting-2-10-14.txt

cut and dried process needs to be much more evident to people (inaudible).

The second issue, which although it was technically not part of the Board agenda is certainly heavy into the press, that was a part of the discussion around the Board is the dining services issue.

And this is a - the outsourcing of dining services, with the RFD currently being discussed, is something that was controversial for many of the Trustees as well as other parts of the campus community.

I can simply say that the Trustees as a group have sent a strong message that different aspects of dining services that have been important issues in the press, the safety and security of employees, currently UK employees.

The educational programs that were connected with dining services and the local food purchases is something that we've been assured is going to be part of the RFD.

One of the major goals, if they are not to be met then, in fact, I think that you will have a considerable amount of disappointment with the Trustees.

That message has been heard. Now that process continues and I think that's something that the devil is always in the details on these things. And that's something that requires monitoring over a much longer term.

I think that one of the abiding issues, and this goes back to where are people going to eat, is that we have to solve this problem fairly quickly in terms of new dining facilities and where are we going to get the money for this type of capital construction.

I think this dovetails with the proposed two and a half percent cut in our state budget which is - it's hard to describe what that means.

We went through a very difficult process last year and the last two years dealing with budget cuts. And the faculty stood up and said, you know, we want to talk about this more. We want to be part of that process.

I think that's going to be important that that takes place again if that budget cut becomes a reality, which is still a ways off.

But just to convey, two and a half percent cut is roughly 7 million out of, a little bit more than that, out of our recurring budget.

To make up that 7 million out of a recurring budget we would have to get more than a \$140 million endowment in order to replace those funds.

So it isn't just finding 7 million to cover this next year's budget, it's

UKSenateMeeting-2-10-14.txt

finding 7 million from now and forever to make up that loss.

So that discussion is going to be critical that faculty be actively involved.

And that that becomes a fiscal reality in solving that problem, implementing new budget models and trying to renovate an entire campus, programming for students, in the midst of the budget cuts like this, is extremely challenging and stressful for everyone.

And I think we have to focus on expecting that we will get the same sort of compromise that eventually we want. But that's going to depend on a lot of work by the faculty as well as administration.

Other comments or questions?

The last thing I would say is you will also be getting a number of different surveys and questions about other aspects of the academic environment.

I'm on a committee that's involved with the (inaudible) learning management system, Blackboard. And the possibilities for change in that area (inaudible).

When you get an email about this, please let us know, we will be holding public forums, et cetera. But we need the input from our faculty on this as well as student input. Please help us with this as we move forward.

Once again, you will be getting an email from me with links to a variety of resources. Please feel free to email me or phone me if you want to discuss any of these things. And once again, I will be coming around to colleges, but certainly I'm happy to talk to any individuals. Thank you.

BLONDER:

Thank you, John.

The next item on the agenda are committee reports and the first item is the Senate Academic Organization and Structure Committee, Greg Wasilkowski, Chair, is going to discuss the proposed new Department of Writing, Rhetoric and Digital Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences.

WASILKOWSKI:

So our committee discussed this quite extensively for a long time. It was a difficult process. But at the very end, a majority, significant majority of the committee decided to vote positively to endorse this proposal.

And the reason, the main reason for making such a decision were as follows: first of all, the rhetoric and the composition are now separate areas of research and there are -- there is a number of schools that have separate departments, one for English, another for rhetoric and composition. So this is not something strange.

Secondly, this proposal to create this new department got very, very strong

UKSenateMeeting-2-10-14.txt
support from department, from English department.

If I recall this incorrectly, if I am wrong, only one faculty from WRD voted against. And among English faculty who are not associated with WRD, only -- there were only three negative votes. That's a very strong support.

Another reason is that this proposal received very strong support from the Provost and the Dean of College of Arts and Sciences, and it was also expressed that this creation of new department did not require extra resources both financial and human.

And actually, although not formally, actually this division has been separated from the English part of the department and having own budget, having own separate reporting lines, Dean, having their own internal governing structures. And they are also separated by different floors and others in office towers.

And also the Director of the division that will be the Chair of the department is already a member of this Arts and Sciences College of - College Council of Chairs.

So that's for us, the majority on the committee seem to be quite natural way was just to endorse this proposal.

BLONDER:

So thank you, Greg.

We have a motion on the floor from the Senate Council that the University Senate endorse the creation of the Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences. Is there discussion?

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, A and S.

I have just a question about the graduate program in this that was in the joint department, now will there be two separate - will there be a -- no, they'll just still be an English Graduate Program in English and the WRD people who are already graduate faculty in that will continue to remain in that graduate faculty, is that the case?

MOUNTFORD:

If they want us, yes.

BLONDER:

Do you want to identify yourself?

MOUNTFORD:

Yes, thank you. I'm Roxanne Mountford. We're in A and S.

GROSSMAN:

What do you mean? If who wants you?

KORNBLU:

Mark Kornblu, College of Arts and Sciences.

Yes, the English faculty has asked that WRD faculty continue to participate in the graduate program. But it will only be housed in one department.

GROSSMAN:

Thanks.

WASILKOWSKI:

I forgot to mention also there is a significant number of (inaudible) English to

serve on this new department, forty something.

KORNBLU: So the largest service courses are the composition and communication courses. They will be in WRD. And they have a large number of TAs and so a large percentage of the English TAs will continue to work in WRD.

The two department Chairs and the (inaudible) will work together.

BLONDER: Are there other questions or discussion points?

Okay. This motion is coming from committee, it doesn't require a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you. Thank you, Greg.

The next item on the agenda, Senate's Academic Programs Committee, Andrew Hippisley, Chair, this is the proposed BA/BS in Writing, Rhetoric and Digital Studies.

However, it came to our attention recently that there are details of the Writing, Rhetoric and Digital Studies proposal that may need to be revised.

And the proposers in the College of Arts and Sciences would prefer that the complete proposal come to the March Senate meeting.

Therefore, I would like to entertain a motion to postpone the discussion and the motion to approve the proposal establishing a new BA/BS in Writing, Rhetoric and Digital Studies to the March University Senate meeting.

WASILKOWSKI: Second. Greg Wasilkowski.

BLONDER: I need someone to make the motion.

UNIDENTIFIED: So moved.

BLONDER: Second? Is there discussion of this? Hearing no discussion, all in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

Next item on the agenda is the proposed new Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing, and Andrew Hippisley, Chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee will present this. Andrew?

HIPPISLEY: So this is a recommendation that the University Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees the establishment of a new MFA program, Creative Writing, in the Department of English within the College of Arts and Sciences.

Currently there is no 100 percent residency MFA program in the State of Kentucky, a state famous for its creative writers. So this is a long-awaited response to a need in the Commonwealth.

This will put UK on a par with benchmark institutions. It will be modeled on programs at Columbia and the University of Virginia which are the top-tier MFA programs.

In fact, this proposal really should be seen as an expansion of something

UKSenateMeeting-2-10-14.txt

already very successful in the Department of English. In the BA in English they have a focus in creative writing.

This will be successful because of the good variety that we have in English, Wendell Berry was there, Guy Davenport, Nikki Finney and Jane Vance. They're all people that used to be there.

Some famous people that are there right now, Frank X Walker, Julia Johnson. And there is - because of these great people, there is already a creative infrastructure they have there that's creating journals and outlets housed in English.

The MFA will be Plan A only. The main points of the degree will be a thesis which is a 120 page piece of creative writing, fiction or nonfiction, or 48 poems.

There will be 24 hours of course work as well, nine of which are the creative workshop, which is the heart of the course work.

There will be - what else - students will do other hours from existing graduate courses in English and they'll have an obligatory 3 credits outside of English. For example, from Gender & Women's Studies and maybe Appalachian Studies.

There is a strong list of sensible student learning outcomes and an assessment plan for the program and learning outcomes.

The enrollment plans is to have six to eight students to start with, but proposers are very confident that the case will be open and many more will come as the years go on.

The college has promised resourcing for these students who come in through TAships. There will be an aim to have many of the undergraduates who do the focus in writing to become MFA students in English.

There's a mix of funded and self-funded students. That's the plan.

They have a faculty of record. Currently, they will have Julia Johnson as the Director. But directors in the future will be appointed by the Chair in English.

There are letters of support from the Dean of Arts and Sciences, the Chair of English, and the DGS and DUS in English.

BLONDER:

So we have a recommendation positive from Senate Council that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing in the Department of English within the College of Arts and Sciences.

Is there discussion? Hearing none, all in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

Next item on the agenda is the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Historic Preservation. Andrew?

UKSenateMeeting-2-10-14.txt

HI PPI SLEY: Yes. So it's the recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate, Historic Preservation within the College of Design.

Desi gn. Currently, there is a Master's in Historic Preservation in the Department of Historic Preservation within the College of

The proposed certificate will increase exposure to the discipline, especially given to design professionals who are working on what's called adaptive reuse.

Graduate students from history, anthropology, archaeology, political science, fine arts, communications, economics, as well as the design disciplines, are already attracted to the MA. So some of those will be attracted to the certificate.

There's a certificate of this kind at University of Georgia, University of Maryland, Tulane and Rutgers.

The structure is very familiar to certificates. There will be 12 credits, two core courses, one on the Introduction to Historic Preservation and one on Dynamics of Historic Preservation.

Then students will chose two electives to give the certificate a particular focus. So for example, areas of concentration could be Preservation and Design or Preservation and Planning and Rural Preservation.

There's a full set of student learning outcomes. One of them is, for example, explain the relationship between historic preservation and allied fields.

Each of these concentrations has its own set of student learning outcomes. It's very thorough.

There's a faculty of record in place. The Director will be the current DGS for the Master's, in this case it's Allison CarlI-White right now. And faculty of record for the certificate will be the same as the faculty of record in the Master's.

There's a detailed plan to assess the student learning outcomes. There's a detailed plan to assess the program as well.

There are letters of support from the Department of Anthropology, which has an architectural program.

BLONDER: So we have a motion on the floor, positive from Senate Council, that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Historic Preservation within the College of Design.

GROSSMAN: Is there discussion or questions?
Bob Grossman, A and S.

You said there's a Department of Historic Preservation.

HI PPI SLEY: Right.

GROSSMAN: So why is it that the graduate

UKSenateMeeting-2-10-14.txt

certificate is not being housed in the department, especially considering the faculty are coextensive with the Master's Program in Historic Preservation? Why is it not being held in the department rather than the college?

HIPPISLEY: So there's not a good answer to that. It really should be housed in the same academic home as the Master's.

So we would actually like to come back to Senate Council. Perhaps I should suggest this, we'd like to amend.

BLONDER: You can make --

HIPPISLEY: Can I make - I'd like to amend the proposal to read instead of approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Historic Preservation in the Department of Historic Preservation within the College of Design.

GROSSMAN: I'll second that.

BLONDER: Okay, is there discussion?

We do have a letter from the faculty of record and Allison Carll-White supporting this is what they want.

GROSSMAN: That's good to know.

BLONDER: Is there discussion?

DURHAM: Rick Durham?? College of Agriculture.

Do you know if Landscape and Architecture was involved in these discussions?

HIPPISLEY: Mary, do you remember?

DESANTIS: I don't think we -

DURHAM: I know that they have had some involvement in the Historic Preservation.

HIPPISLEY: The proposers can answer that question.

BLONDER: Yes?

CARLL-WHITE: Ned -

BROTHERS: I'm sorry, your name, please?

CARLL-WHITE: Oh, Allison Carll-White, Department of Historic Preservation.

Ned Crankshaw has a joint appointment with Historic Preservation and he was involved in the discussions and voted to support the certificate.

BLONDER: Other questions, points of discussion?

So we need to vote on the amendment which is to include establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Historic Preservation in the Department of Historic Preservation.

So all in favor of the amendment? Opposed? Abstained? Okay, the amendment carries.

Now we're going to back to vote on the motion as amended so that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Historic Preservation in the Department of Historic Preservation within the College of Design.

Is there discussion of that amended motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained?

UKSenateMeeting-2-10-14.txt

Okay, the amended motion carries. Thank you.

Next item on the agenda again is Andrew Hippisley, Chair of Senate Academic Programs Committee, and this is a proposed new University Scholars Program, BA/BS in Philosophy and MA in Philosophy. Andrew?

HIPPISLEY: So this is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new University Scholars Program for a Master's of Arts in Philosophy in the Department of Philosophy within the College of Arts and Sciences.

There is at this point an MA in Philosophy and a BA/BS in Philosophy. Programs, this particular proposal is to save students time to graduation as is common with all University Scholars aim.

So students will - they will be allowed to take some of their BA credits towards the MA. In fact, up to 12.

To be accepted onto the program a student must have 90 hours under their belt and a 3.5 in Philosophy and they must be accepted to the graduate school in the normal fashion.

Once admitted students can then take 500 level, 600 level or 700 level courses.

The DGS and the DUS at that point both together advise students into how to finish their BA and how to complete the MA.

BLONDER: So we have a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate approve the establishment of a new University Scholars Program for a BA/BS and an MA in Philosophy in the Department of Philosophy in the College of Arts and Sciences.

WASILKOWSKI: Questions? Discussion? Yes. Greg Wasilkowski, Engineering. Is there MS in Philosophy? Is there MS, Master of Sciences?

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S. I'd just like to propose a minor editorial thing.

The program does not belong to a scholar so can I - scholar should not have an apostrophe. In the recommendation, University Scholars Program, no apostrophe.

BLONDER: Thank you. May we make that change without going through an amendment?

GROSSMAN: You may.

BLONDER: Other questions or discussion points?

Okay. Let's vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

Next again, Andrew Hippisley, Chair of Senate Academic Programs Committee, will present the proposed new Undergraduate Certificate in Health Communication. Andrew?

HIPPISLEY: This is a recommendation that the

UKSenateMeeting-2-10-14.txt

University Senate approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate, Health Communications in the Department of Communications within the College of Communication and Information.

There is a Graduate Health Communication program already in existence. It has a good track record. Faculty on it are very - have a good track record in funding.

The doctoral program, in fact, is ranked 6th in the country. So that's the context in which this proposal is being made.

The meaning is to enhance communication within a health complex, primarily for pre-professional health science students.

This aim actually entails another aim which to increase the number of high achieving students in the College of Communication and Information.

The target audience primarily majors in Business, Communication or Health.

There are 15 credits planned, 9 of which are core. These include two Communications credits, Taking Control of your Health, Introduction to Health Communication and a Public Health credit, Foundations of Health Behavior. Or they can do a Public Health Through Popular Film course. And there are two electives from a list. For example, COM 535 Risk and Crisis Communication.

There are a number of curricular requirements, co-curricular requirements. For example, students go to workshops in communication etiquette and networking. They also attend Health Communication Research Collaborative seminars. These co-curricular requirements are folded into the core courses.

There are a number of student learning outcomes outlined and an assessment plan in place. The program is also assessed through various student surveys.

Faculty of record has been identified. The Director of the certificate will be the DUS in the Department of Communications. That's currently Don Helme. Other members on the faculty record will be Chairs of Departments of Communication, Health Behavior and Kinesiology and Health Promotion.

There are supporting members from the College of Communication and Information and the College of Public Health.

BLONDER:

Thank you, Andrew. So we have a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in Health Communication in the Department of Communication within the College of Communication and Information.

UKSenateMeeting-2-10-14.txt

STEWART: Is there discussion? Yes.
Sharon Stewart, College of Health Sciences.
We have several undergraduate degrees in the Health Sciences, one being the Human Health Science Center Graduate Degree and another one is Clinical Leadership and Management.
And I would see possibilities for a lot of interaction between the two or three, that some of our courses might have been an interest in creating this, at least the elective courses that are part of this proposal.
But the other is a lot of our students would be interested I think in this as a possible addition to their major course of study.
I don't know at this point what can be done about it, but I wish there had been more interaction between the two colleges in creating this.
COHEN: Two things.
BROTHERS: Your name, please?
COHEN: Elisia Cohen, I'm the Chair of the Department of Communication and original proposal of the certificate.
First you are looking for courses that were broadly acceptable to students as part of the certificate and so there might - I don't know too much about the program. A lack of familiarity and I guess relationship comes along with perhaps lack of knowledge for some courses without prerequisites.
So the way that we've written this, other courses can be added as electives within this program. I would be open to that.
And then second, in terms of overlap, we were - we have an undergraduate track in our department in Health Communication so - and I know that there's been some work in Health Sciences.
And we saw that as sort of a different -- again, I hope that majors in Health Sciences might use this instead of a minor or something like that.
But the way that the certificate is written is such that the program director with a Chair could decide that these other courses could be elective, probably not part of the core of the program (inaudible).
GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.
Elisia, if I could just comment on what you said. It should be the faculty of record that makes the decisions about expanding the courses requiring the degree, not the program director.
COHEN: The faculty?
GROSSMAN: The faculty of record for this. There is a faculty of record for the undergraduate certificate?
HIPPI SLEY: There is.

COHEN: Yes.

GROSSMAN: Okay. They are the ones who make the decision about the curriculum, not the program director.

COHEN: Okay. We can convene the faculty of record to add other courses if people were interested. Not a problem.

BLONDER: Are there other comments or questions? Okay. We have this motion on the floor - yes?

WASILKOWSKI: Greg Wasikowski, Engineering. I would like to know more about communication or lack of communication of the College of Communication and Information with other colleges.

HIPPISLEY: Has there been any communication with College of Public Health?

COHEN: Well, the certificate is in Health Communication, we have a graduate certificate with the College of Public Health and Health Communication. We just frankly didn't know that there would be some undergraduate classes without electives that would be part of it.

And I think that in the process through Undergraduate Council and recent conversations with Dr. Helme we learned about health promotion and their (inaudible) of their degree. We just haven't had the other opportunity to do that.

I think also, you know, there are some specific things that we're looking for in courses that would be health to bring together.

There are some communication elements and the health behavior outcome elements in the College of Public Health that are part of the core that would be distinct from a management program or - I'm not exactly sure how the Health Science courses would relate to this.

STEWART: I think they would relate - Sharon Stewart, College of Health Sciences.

I think it's worth having a discussion. I think there would be some nice possibilities.

MCCORMICK: Can we table this so that there would be some opportunity for discussion along those colleges because it does look to me like this is - as Greg suggested -- an area where the communication needs to occur.

BLONDER: Yes.

BUTLER: J. S. Butler, Parliamentarian.

Yes, of course, this may be tabled or postponed. But table is somewhat indefinite, postpone is March or something.

If you meant just table until further discussions have been held, that is straightforward.

MCCORMICK: I move that this recommendation be tabled until the colleges who appear to be impacted have an opportunity to -

WASILKOWSKI: Second.

BLONDER: All right. This requires a majority?

BUTLER: Yes.

BLONDER: Is there discussion? Can we have discussion?

BUTLER: Yes.

BLONDER: Discussion?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.
I don't see any reason to table this. There's nothing that -- the discussions can happen regardless, even if we vote to establish this today.
There's nothing that Dr. Stewart said that should -- that says that this program is treading on people's toes or anything like that.
It's just a -- I think that's correct. So they can -- they should have their meetings, they should discuss whether there's synergies in their programs, but I think we can go ahead and vote to approve this.

STEWART: Sharon Stewart, again.
I'm all right with that. I think if we can just talk together, that's sort of what I'm thinking of in the first place. I just would hope that we could have a discussion, maybe look at some possibilities. I think we can all benefit from it.

BLONDER: We do have a motion on the floor that's been seconded. Yes, John?

WATKINS: John Watkins, College of Public Health.
The Dean of College of Public Health has signed off on this positively and it has even gone -- even before that it has gone through that faculty council so it's been approved in that Healthcare College.

BLONDER: Other discussion points?
So we're going to have to vote on the motion to table this. All in favor of tabling this proposal so that the parties involved or impacted can have more discussion raise your hand. All opposed to tabling it? Abstains?
Okay. The tabling motion has failed so we're back to the original motion which is a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in Health Communications in the Department of Communications within the College of Communication and Information.
Should we go ahead and vote on this now? Have we had adequate discussion? Any further points on this? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.
Next item on the agenda is Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, that committee is chaired by Greg Graf, but Greg was not able to come today so Armando Prats came out of --

PRATS: Came out of sabbatical.

UKSenateMeeting-2-10-14.txt

BLONDER: - came out of sabbatical and this is Conditional Admissions for International Undergraduate Students and a proposed revision of Senate Rule 4.2.1.1.G. Armando?

GROSSMAN: This explains your seedy look.

PRATS: I'm working on it. This requires some context first and then if I get in trouble there are people here to bail me out.

Homeland Security has advised all universities of the need to codify their pathways to admission of international students since many universities have developed new pathways in recent years, and UK has indeed done so as well, on a pilot basis.

So now we admit international students conditionally pending their completion of English language training. This does not violate any rules but it is not explicitly codified as a pathway for international students.

So the Office of the Vice Provost for International Studies has drafted four proposals, and I need to sort of sort that out also, for changes to the bulletin language.

Now, Davy Jones - is he here? No, yeah, okay - has since clarified that we are not voting on the four - Susan, how am I doing here?

CARVALHO: Great.

PRATS: -- that we're not voting on the four different supposed changes to the bulletin since the Senate does not have the power to change the bulletin.

So what we want is the approval of Senate Rules change, not the approval of the four bulletin language changes.

So the changes again are codification of current practice which created pathways for international undergraduate students to be admitted to UK to be tested on arrival and to have appropriate language training assistance both before admission and after admission.

So the important thing to note is that there is no change to our admission standards.

However, I would also like to share a couple of figures, to the effect that in 1997, UK had 703 international undergraduate students, which went down to 169 in 2005, and is back at 610 in 2013.

So that is a sufficient reason, obviously, for us to take some action on this recommendation.

Davy, how am I doing here?

JONES: You're doing fine.

PRATS: So again we are voting on the proposed changes to SR 4.2.1.1.G. That's not in front of -

BLONDER: I'll read the recommendation.

PRATS: Because I can't read off of this

page. This is just a mess, yeah.
BLONDER: So we have a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate approve the language on Conditional Admissions for International Undergraduate Students as well as the proposed changes to Senate Rules 4.2.1.1.G.
Are there any questions or discussion points? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you, Armando.
PRATS: Can I go back now?
BLONDER: Yes, you can go back to sabbatical. The next agenda item is Senate Rules and Elections Committee, Davy Jones, Chairs that committee. And this is In Memoriam Posthumous Degree proposal. We have a motion, several slides that Davy is going to present us with.
JONES: So what we have for action by the elected Faculty Senators here today is to create a new category of Honorary Degree.
You're familiar with the traditional honorary degrees, in fact, after me, Jeannine will be handling some action on the regular honorary degrees and there are a criteria of a merit for those honorary degrees.
You're also familiar with the earned degrees, the degree list that we vote on periodically here.
Now occasionally we have a tragic situation in which there's a death of a student and occasions where the student has actually completed the degree requirements, but died before graduation and commencement.
The records, the degree list that we get from the Registrar still has that student's name on it because that student had completed their earning of the degree requirement that goes to the Board and the Board approves.
And the transcript shows degrees awarded. There's a little note there on the transcript saying it was conferred posthumously, the earned degree is there.
The niche that we don't have something for at the University of Kentucky right now is when a student dies before having completed the requirement for earning the degree.
The President has talked to some of the Senate leadership that there are situations in which the President is consoling the grieving family and is looking for substantive ways to express the University's militant and remembrance for having been honored by that student's presence in our University community.
And so the President asked if we could do something that would able him to provide something more substantive and so this is the proposal that you have today in

UKSenateMeeting-2-10-14.txt
which we're going to be - you're going to be voting on recommending to the Board of Trustees the creation of a new category of honorary degree, an In Memoriam Honorary Degree.

So this is for the students who have not earned the regular degree. It's not the typical honorary degree in which the criteria are service to Kentucky and the community and whatnot, this is a separate new category of honorary degree.

So I've just walked you through the purpose here. Now the way this would work and the criteria for a person to be recommended for this would be that if the person has died, the level of college will ascertain that if this person was a student, they were enrolled in a degree program, and they were in good academic standing.

If those conditions are met, then the college forwards that name up to the Registrar and the Registrar includes that name on the degree -- the regular degree list that we have.

There will be a separate category on that, In Memorial Posthumous degrees in which the name would there.

So this will be processed along with the regular degree list. The name will be in a separate section for that.

Now when it reaches -- when that degree list reaches action here by the elected Faculty Senators, there is a clause there for our hand to be specifically on that, and that is for the following purpose: If we have a Columbine situation and a student commits a heinous or terrorist act and dies in relation to the commission of that, this body here can decide well, we're going to decline to send that person's name forward to the Board to get an In Memorial Posthumous reward to honorary degree.

So that would be extremely rarely and most cases would fall within the approving sending that name forward as part of the regular degree list, but we constitutently have our fingers there just in case in the rare situation.

Operationally, this is a pretend. This is not the real thing. But there is a separate diploma called the conventional honorary degrees and this is modeled after that.

So this is the kind of thing that the University would be able to bestow to the family reflecting our commemoration that we're honored about that student having been a part of our community.

If you adopt this today and it goes to the Board and the Board approves this, then coming back to the Senate here will be what do we want this wording to actually look like.

UKSenateMeeting-2-10-14.txt

Just a little brief historical background. There is a previous occasion in which we have had a special category of honorary degree.

When US entered World War I, there was a situation here in which students were leaving to join military service before having earned their degree and the provisions here were those individuals were going to be awarded an honorary degree.

Now this provision expired at the end of World War I, but the occasion we're at today is somewhat similar. The Governing Regulations of the Board of Trustees do empower and recognize elected Faculty Senators here to recommend policies about honorary degrees, and not just on individual candidates.

And so the bottom Senate Rule bearers, what we're exercising today, which is the elected Faculty Senators are going to be voting on whether to propose to the Board of Trustees this new category of honorary degree for this purpose.

BLONDER: So we have a recommendation that the elected Faculty Senators approve the proposed new Senate Rules language regarding Posthumous degrees and forward it to the Board of Trustees for final approval. This is from the Senate Council.

GROSSMAN: Is there discussion?
Bob Grossman, A and S.
So just a bit of clarification.
What we have in front of us is language proposed to go into the Senate Rules or into the GRs?

JONES: Into the Senate Rules.
GROSSMAN: Into the Senate Rules. So there's no section identifying in which it will go, but that's the job of the Rules and Elections Committee?

JONES: But there's a very logical place where this would go in the Senate Rules.
GROSSMAN: But then the recommendation is also to the Board of Trustees to establish the rule regarding this or not?

JONES: In this particular situation they would be approving our Senate Rule containing this.

We did something like this a few years ago when we proposed new criteria for the regular honorary degrees. The language in our Senate Rules on that is actually approved by the Board.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.
Does it have a time limit on this?
I mean could family of a student who died ten years ago, a couple years ago, now apply for an honorary degree?

JONES: No. This is going to be going forward.

DEBSKI: Forward?
JONES: Yes.

UKSenateMeeting-2-10-14.txt
DEBSKI : And it says that somewhere?
JONES: There's nothing in here saying it's retroactive. We can clarify that as we would like it to take effect immediately or something so that it's forward.
DEBSKI : Yes, I would appreciate that.
BLONDER: J. S. ?
BUTLER: J. S. Butler, Graduate School.
This is not the first time I kind of get myself in trouble as an ACLU member.
Okay.
The proposal, it's obvious the purpose. So a student enters the military, is killed and action, and this is determined by appropriate military methods, then I see no problem. That is exactly what we did before. And one, it's perfectly straightforward, we don't do to determine that, that's military.
Frankly, you're asking us to try the student post (inaudible). You're asking us to charge this students under certain circumstances and find the student guilty under circumstances when the Tstudent cannot in any way shape or form defend himself or herself. I'm a member of the ACLU, I find that objectionable.
JONES: The Senate's under -- would be under no obligation not to send that degree.
BLONDER: Bob?
GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.
To address that, this is not a matter of a trial resulting in someone's freedom or lack of freedom. This is a matter of an honoring of a student by University and should that student receive an honor or not is a matter of judgement not a matter of a state making a decision about someone's freedom.
I don't see it has anything to do with similarities.
WATKINS: John Watkins, Public Health.
Is there any merit to considering the level of the degree to which the student is working at the time?
JONES: It's part of enrollment that's actually referred to there. This is any degree. Enrolled in an undergraduate, graduate or professional degree.
It just has to be some degree-seeking status.
WATKINS: But in recognizing say on that piece of paper that is being granted, I'm trying to consider, for example, a person who is moving towards a doctorate and is killed in action, I suppose, as a student here at the University, and does it matter more to the surviving family and friends, whoever it is, that it's a posthumous graduate degree, an undergraduate degree or professional degree and if that even matters?
JONES: The question you've raised isn't actually an issue right now. The Board may

not even approve this.

If they do it will come back here,
what should the diploma actually state.

WATKINS:

Okay.

TRUSZCZYNSKI:

Mirek Truszczynski, Engineering.

I feel somewhat sympathetic with
your point. And if I understand your point
correctly, you object to this part when we
speak about heinous crime or whatever act,
and we make the determination that it was or
not.

Wouldn't it be simply better to say
that there is process through which the
family can notify the department, the
department can request the Senate to make a
determination without making any evaluation
on why it is made or not. The Senate then
simply says yes or no without trying to judge
the person on whatever possible actions
(inaudible).

JONES:

Can you clarify? I didn't quite
follow.

CHRIST:

I actually -

BLONDER:

Name?

CHRIST:

Alice Christ, College of Fine Arts.

In a way I have kind of the
opposite objection to Professor Butler
because, and I agree with you, putting and
inserting a heinous act condition is
different from any of the criteria we usually
use when we consider awarding degrees for
students.

And I consider that it would just
be a normal courtesy to the family and
friends that the Senate would normally take a
look at that college record of acceptable
good standing and progress towards whatever
degree it is and simply approve it.

But my understanding was that that
whole stage was to be skipped in the
interests of expedition in the President's
Office and therefore this special phrase was
inserted to preserve our freedom to object if
there was a reason to object.

I think that is being a little
over our bounds. It's providing for things
that are unlikely to really happen.

DIETZ:

Hank Dietz, Engineering.

I like the idea of having -

BROTHERS:

Name please?

DIETZ:

Hank Dietz, Engineering.

I like the idea of having it be
something that's explicitly requested. And
rather than have an exact kind of wording,
have something that just says that we judge
appropriateness of awarding that degree.

Because I can see things like
suppose you have a kid who is using drugs and
giving drugs to his friends and gets into a
car accident and kills himself and some of
his friends, et cetera. Is that a heinous
act? I don't want to be judging that.

JONES:

What is it that you would rather

DIETZ: have happen?
I would rather have something, you know, that triggers the evaluation of this based on an externally made request, you know, the family requests something like that.

JONES: And rather than saying, you know, it's exception for heinous acts, say something about that we would judge the appropriateness of that particular award.

DIETZ: And rather than singling out the heinous act case for our judgement, every case would be for our judgement.

BLONDER: It's only based on the appropriateness as we judge it.

BAILEY: Ernie?
Ernie Bailey, College of Ag.
All we have to do is for item C, is just state that the Senate will vote to approve or disapprove and forward it to the University President and take out the last couple sentences.

JONES: Yeah, on C there, yes.
The elected Faculty Senators shall forward the request by the degree list process to the President for transmittal to the Board for final action.

BAILEY: Now that provides no vote at all.
No. Just say that the Senate will vote to approve or disapprove and then forward it. Just take out all the -

JONES: So he's saying take out from here, from the word however, and say elected Faculty Senators shall vote on whether to forward the request.

BLONDER: Is that a motion you're making, an amendment? Did you want to -

BAILEY: Yes.

CHRIST: Second.

BAILEY: In essence, yes.

BLONDER: So you would like to move to remove from however down and Alice Christ has seconded that.

GROSSMAN: And to change shall forward the request to shall vote whether to forward the request.

BAILEY: The first sentence saying that the Senate - let me find this.

BLONDER: The elected Faculty Senators shall vote -

BAILEY: The elected Faculty will vote, may vote, or will vote. I don't -

BLONDER: Shall vote.

BAILEY: - shall vote to approve or disapprove the recommendation. And then the next sentence and delete the rest of it.

BLONDER: Did you get that, Sheila?

BROTHERS: I think so. You're removing the phrase however, if the student's death was in connection with the student committing a heinous act then.
It will just say the elected Faculty Senators shall vote to approve or

disapprove the recommendation and then the final sentence beginning in such rare cases, that is -

- BAILEY: No, no. No, no.
The first sentence will be the elected Faculty Senators shall vote to approve or disapprove the recommendation. The next sentence will be the first sentence that already exists.
- BLONDER: Did you want to reread that?
BROTHERS: I'd like somebody to make sure I have it right.
So the first sentence will be the elected Faculty Senators shall vote to approve or disapprove the recommendation. The request by the degree list ----
- JONES: No, period.
BROTHERS: Period.
JONES: And then just keep the next sentence.
BROTHERS: However, if the student's -
JONES: No, no. The elected Faculty Senators shall forward the request by the -
- BAILEY: Everything from however on is gone.
JONES: If approved the elected Faculty Senators shall forward.
- BROTHERS: Okay.
BLONDER: Sheila, would you mind reading that, please?
BROTHERS: Yes. Give me just a second, please. I'd like to make sure I've got it.
Okay. Elected Faculty Senators shall vote to approve or disapprove the recommendation. If approved the elected Faculty Senators shall forward the request by the degree list process to the University President for transmittal to the Board of Trustees for final action.
- BLONDER: So that's the motion and Alice has seconded it.
Is there discussion?
- GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.
There is a reason why the Senate Rules and Elections Committee formulated the language this way which is that the President wanted something that would be almost automatic.
The language in the proposed amendment does not say that the - that the vast majority of the cases, this would be approved.
This language was chosen to say that only in extraordinary circumstances will the recommendation be disapproved.
Now you can weigh the relative merits of the different options, but that's the reasoning for this language here.
- HULSE: David Hulse, College of Business and Economics.
Is the intention that if the Senate votes not to approve that that stops the process?
- JONES: That stops it.

UKSenateMeeting-2-10-14.txt

HULSE: Whether it's heinous or not, it's really a matter for the Senate to decide.

JONES: Any bar that has to be crossed is now removed by removing the word heinous.

DURHAM: Rick Durham, College of Agriculture.
So the only way this procedure, point 2, moves forward is if the President recommends someone to get an honorary degree?

JONES: No. The President has no stopping role.

DURHAM: Anybody can do it.

JONES: The President has no role.

DURHAM: So anybody can propose --

JONES: I think the family or the Chair of the student's home department initiate it.

GROSSMAN: And the Dean.

DURHAM: So is there an automatic part of the degree granted for any student that dies, or this process done for any student that dies?

JONES: It has to be initiated by the family or the Chair of the student's department or the Dean of the college. And it will only stop if we decide there was a heinous act.
Except if the amendment is approved then it can be stopped for anything.

BAILEY: I don't see how we have the -
Ernie Bailey, College of Ag.
I don't see how we have the ability to deliberate on that. That's not what we do.

JONES: We have disciplinary actions about students all the time.

BAILEY: But we don't -

JONES: We delegate it to a committee.

BAILEY: Are you proposing that we investigate or just simply collect (inaudible).

JONES: The Senate Council could. If this goes through Senate Council, the Senate Council will debate and make a recommendation whether it's heinous or not.
They could have a committee look at it. This would be very rare.

CHRIST: Alice Christ, College of Fine Arts.
I just don't see the urgency for rushing it through because we don't have graduations every week.
It seems perfectly possible to send it through on a regular schedule according to the regular prerogatives of faculty to award degrees and really not worry about whether we would investigate deeply the moral character of every single person who might be nominated for an In Memorial Honorary Degree.

JONES: It's not the person's job needs this degree next week.

CHRIST: Yeah. I think we should stick with the regular Senate responsibilities which are to award degrees, recommend for, that is the

faculty responsibility is to recommend for the degree. We should just follow that and not --

GROSSMAN: Well, the proposed amendment -
Bob Grossman, A and S.

- the proposed amendment will have us voting on every single case and deciding whether it should be approved or disapproved.

JONES: Even if it weren't heinous you're voting on it as well.

CHRIST: We're voting on every student.

GROSSMAN: But the proposed - the language up here, currently up here, says only in the case of the student committing a heinous act would we need to even consider whether to disapprove it.

The proposed amendment pretty much says in every single case we're going to have to decide whether to approve it or disapprove it.

That's what it says. Vote to approve or disapprove. So you're still going to want to look at every single case unless you just want to do a blanket. If they die they get a degree regardless.

JONES: That takes us out of any discretion on who gets....

JOHNSON: Julia Johnson, College of Arts and Sciences.

How about cutting the first half of that sentence, the second sentence cut from however to elected, and then just begin with - so first sentence says -

BLONDER: We can't - we have a motion on the floor that's been seconded.

JOHNSON: Can I move to -

BLONDER: Amend the amendment?

JOHNSON: Yes. Because I think that's part of the problem that's under discussion now.

BUTLER: You have two options.

JOHNSON: Okay.

BUTLER: If what you are proposing is an alteration of the current amendment it could be stated in a straightforward way like adding words or deleting words, then go on and make an amendment to amendment if that works. But it sounds like you might be trying to replace the motion now and that's when you say I wish to replace the current motion with a different. So that you would want to do if it's currently rewriting the whole thing.

JOHNSON: No. I think it's an amendment to the amendment.

BLONDER: Do you want to state what you are proposing?

JOHNSON: So the language of the first sentence on C would remain the same. The second sentence would be cut all the way to elected Faculty Senators may vote to disapprove forwarding the recommendation period and then continue.

BLONDER: So we would have the first

JOHNSON: sentence as is and the last sentence as is?
Yes. And the second sentence would read -

BROTHERS: The elected Faculty Senators shall -

JONES: On to here.

BLONDER: So do you want to read it as you would have it be?

JOHNSON: The elected Faculty Senators shall forward the request by the degree list process to the University President for transmittal to the Board of Trustees for final action.

The elected Faculty Senators may vote to disapprove forwarding the recommendation. In such rare cases the elected Faculty Senators would provide through the Senate Council a written justification of the disapproval to the President (inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED: I'll second that.

BLONDER: Is that considered an amendment to the amendment?

CHRIST: I'll accept that as a friendly amendment and a second.

BLONDER: All right. So we've got this amended amendment and it's seconded.

DEBSKI: Ernie was the first, Ernie has to accept it.

BLONDER: That's not actually something that we do.

BUTLER: Just go with procedure. The motion has been made to alter the proposed change. That's what you did. It's on the floor.

BLONDER: Okay. So it's seconded. So is there further discussion?

BROTHERS: I'm sorry. Who seconded the amendment?

CHRIST: (Inaudible)

BROTHERS: Okay.

BLONDER: Greg?

WASILKOWSKI: Greg Wasilkowski, Engineering. I have a question, how this special action will be triggered.

JOHNSON: We don't know.

JONES: The degree list is voted on. So in the occasion that the degree list is before the Senate.

WASILKOWSKI: We vote to disapprove for the recommendation, what would trigger this action? We're not going to do it for every case.

JONES: The degree list will be put up for a vote and we'll say is there any discussion, and somebody will go this person did a Columbine, this name should be removed from the degree list.

BLONDER: Further discussion? Ernie?

BAILEY: Ernie.

I just want to understand. So basically the degree list would come forward. If someone in the Senate wants to bring an issue up, they can bring the issue up.

If there's a vote to disapprove it then it would be polite to send a letter to the President explaining the reason. That's what this is about?

JONES: Yes.
BAILEY: That's how it will work.
JONES: Yes.
BAILEY: Okay.
BLONDER: Other comments? So now we're going to vote, right?
BUTLER: The current vote is whether to substitute the language proposed.
BLONDER: Okay.
BUTLER: Your substitute language.
BLONDER: All in favor of substituting the language? Only the elected Faculty Senators can vote on this. All the elected Faculty Senators in favor of voting on this, okay. Thank you. Opposed elected Faculty Senators? Okay. Abstained? Okay. The motion carries. So now --
BUTLER: So now as an amendment your words are now on the floor.
JOHNSON: Okay.
BLONDER: So -
BUTLER: You might infer that that passed through. But all the group actually did was to prefer your words to his.
BLONDER: So now the recommendation as amended is that the elected Faculty Senators approve the amended new rules language regarding Posthumous Degrees to forward to the Board for final approval.
BUTLER: Correct.
BLONDER: Is there any discussion of this? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you very much.
The next item on the agenda, we have two honorary degree recommendations to the May commencement and Jeannine Blackwell, Dean of the Graduate School will present this.
KENNEDY: I'd like just to commend the Parliamentarian and Chair for weathering through an amazing parliamentary storm.
BLONDER: Thank you very much.
BLACKWELL: I dare any of you all to have an amendment to (inaudible) honorary degrees. Thank you very much.
I am here to present the two recommendations for nominations from the Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees that is appointed by the President and by the University Senate.
This is for May 2014 and we have two degrees.
But first I would like to thank the members of the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees and there you see them lined up.
GROSSMAN: Armando is on sabbatical.
BLACKWELL: Pardon?
GROSSMAN: Armando is on sabbatical.

BLACKWELL:

Armando is on sabbatical but he turns up for these meetings.

The first nominee is Dr. Harrison B. Wilson, II who served as President of Norfolk State University of Virginia for 22 years.

He earned his BS in Health and Physical Education and Sociology at Kentucky State University back in the '40s and earned his MS and DHS as Doctor of Health Sciences from Indiana University in Bloomington.

He was born and raised in Pendleton County, Kentucky.

Dr. Harrison Wilson was of course the President from the '70s until 1997. He was Executive Assistant to the President before that at Fisk University.

Before that in Cooperative Education at Tennessee State University and before that he was Professor of Health and Physical Education at Tennessee State.

He has had many different Board and Executive Committee memberships, on the Army Advisory Panel on ROTC Affairs. He's a Board member of Bell Atlantic at Virginia, Board member of the Virginia Chamber of Commerce, the Commonwealth of Virginia Senate Ethic Council and the National Association of Equal Opportunity in Higher Education.

He has received the Distinguished Alumni Service Award from Indiana, the Honorary Doctorate of Humane Letters from Eastern Virginia University Medical School, Honorary Doctorate from Kentucky State and B'nai B'rith Great American Traditions Award shared with his wife, Dr. Lucy Reed Wilson.

So that is our first nominee.

Our second is Paul W. Chellgren, currently operating partner of Snow Phillips. He's former Chair and CEO of Ashland, Incorporated who earned his BS in Accounting at the University of Kentucky, his MBA at Harvard and his DDE from Oxford University.

He has many Board memberships and this is just a sampling of those, the Greater Cincinnati Foundation, the American Friends of University College, the Northern Kentucky University Foundation, the Eastern Kentucky University Foundation, and a bunch of other Boards, smaller liberal arts colleges in the state of Kentucky.

He is the Former Vice Chair of the National Foundation for Advancement in the Arts, on the Board of Directors at the Taft Museum of Art, the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, the Cincinnati Institute of Fine Arts and the Paul Chellgren Collection at the Speed Art Museum in Louisville, Kentucky.

Giving back to UK students and to UK itself, he established the Chellgren Center for Undergraduate Excellence and the Chellgren Fund for Excellence at the University of Kentucky which supports

UKSenateMeeting-2-10-14.txt
approximately 35 Chellgren Fellows per year,
these are Undergraduate Fellows.

He has served as a mentor, panelist
and speaker at multiple, many UK student
events and several colleges. And a donor of
multiple student scholarships at UK and also
other Kentucky universities.

He has served multiple terms of
service on the UK Board of Trustees,
including serving as Board Chair. He's in
the Gatton College Hall of Fame, on the
Centre College Board of Trustees. He's the
Chair of the Marshall University Foundation
and supporter of many, many of our campus
building and educational initiatives
including the W.T. Young Library, the Main
Building Restoration and others that are also
currently underway.

Those are the two nominations that
have come forward from the Committee and the
Committee has recommended to Senate Council
that they both be awarded the Honorary
Doctorate of Letters.

Any questions?

BLONDER: Okay. So we have a - we do these
motions separately, one for each person.

So we have a recommendation from
the University Joint Committee on Honorary
Degrees in the Senate Council that the
elected Faculty Senators approve Harrison B.
Wilson, II as the recipient of an Honorary
Doctor of Letters for submission through the
President to the Board of Trustees as the
recommended recipient of an Honorary Degree
to be conferred by the Board.

Is there discussion? Okay, only
elected Faculty Senators vote. All in favor?
Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries.

Next we have a recommendation from
the University Joint Committee on Honorary
Degrees in the Senate Council that the
elected Faculty Senators approve Paul W.
Chellgren as the recipient of an Honorary
Doctor of Letters for submission through the
President to the Board of Trustees as the
recommended recipient of an Honorary Degree
to be conferred by the Board.

Discussion?

DURHAM: Are these considered --

BROTHERS: Name please.

DURHAM: Rick Durham, College of
Agriculture.

Are these considered confidential
at this time?

BLACKWELL: Yes. These are confidential until
after passage by the Board of Trustees.
That's when they become public.

BLONDER: Other questions?

Okay. Elected Faculty Senators,
all in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion
carries. Thank you very much. And please
keep this confidential until such time as the
Board has approved.

UKSenateMeeting-2-10-14.txt
 BLACKWELL: Right.
 BLONDER: Thank you. Okay. We're at the end
 of our Senate meeting, thank you all. And
 may I please have a motion to adjourn?
 WASILKOWSKI: So moved.
 BLONDER: Second?
 BROWN: Second.
 BLONDER: All in favor? Thank you. Next
 meeting is March the 10th.

C E R T I F I C A T E O F S E R V I C E

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)
 COUNTY OF HARRISON)

I, LISA GRANT CRUMP, the undersigned Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky at Large, certify that the facts stated in the caption hereto are true; that I was not present at said proceedings; that said proceedings were transcribed from the digital file(s) in this matter by me or under my direction; and that the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings to the best of our ability to hear and transcribe same from the digital file(s).

My commission expires: April 6, 2015.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 14th day of March, 2014.

 LISA GRANT CRUMP
 NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE
 K E N T U C K Y
 NOTARY ID 440572