

SENATE MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

MAY 5, 2014

* * * *

* * * *

LEE X. BLONDER, CHAIR

CONNIE WOOD, VICE-CHAIR

J. S. BUTLER, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

LISA GRANT CRUMP, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

* * * *

BLONDER: Welcome to the May 5th, 2014
University Senate meeting. This is our
last meeting of this academic year.
The first item on our agenda,

it's

my pleasure to introduce President Eli
Capilouto, University Senate Chair, and he
is going to give end of the year remarks.
President Capilouto?

CAPILOUTO: Thank you, Lee. And before I go
I want to express my personal gratitude, I
know this is the last meeting in which you
hold this position, and you and I have
worked together, and I think it has been
mostly delightful for both of us. You have
served your constituents well.

I also want to thank whoever is
responsible here, I've asked this morning
at the University Senate, the answer I got
-- I asked who was responsible for making
it so that graduation was not the day after
the Kentucky Derby.

It may not mean much to you, but

in

my job, you stand and shake hands for 15 hours at the Kentucky Derby. And I love graduation, but shaking about 3500 hands the next day was sometimes challenging. So I thank you for that.

Lee asked me to give an update on what occurred in Frankfort relative to our budget and I'm going to do so and then I'll be turning it over to a couple of people who will elaborate in detail on how we're dealing with the consequence of those decisions.

Before I start I want to acknowledge profusely the work of Eric Monday, our Executive Vice President for Financial Affairs, Chris Riordan, our Provost, both of their respective areas, Angie Martin, Vice President for Financial Planning and Chief Budget Officer, and Lisa Wilson, the Associate Provost for Finance Operation, and a whole host of other people who are behind shaping what we will present to you today.

As most of you know, the Governor introduced a budget that reduced our operating revenues by \$7.1 million, that would have raised this to nearly \$58 million since 2008 of a annual recurring budget cut.

the

What was ultimately adopted by legislature was a 1.5 percent cut which totaled about \$4.3 million. I think the last time I was with you I explained that, you know, a tuition dollar is not the same as a state dollar. The state dollar is a full dollar, the tuition dollar is really a net dollar for us. So getting some operating back was very important.

projects

There were several capital projects that went back and forth during this legislative session. I'll just give you a quick update on those.

The first was our interest and request for consideration of a new Research Building, total cost of this would have been \$144 million. We wanted to partner with the state on this. We requested, and in the Governor's budget was a \$45 million ask, and the House voted to pass that.

The Senate then tried to restore all of the operating and did so by eliminating most of the capital projects. So it wasn't in the Senate version and it wasn't included in the final budget.

Next was renovate and expand our College of Law. This ended as it started in the Governor's budget with \$35 million in state bonds, we're required to raise the remaining \$30 million and issue debt during the period it takes for people to pay off

their pledges.

Another important item for us, and the University of Louisville especially, the two research universities, were the Bucks for Brains and Bucks for Bricks. It started off at \$33 million in all the reconciliation of the debt issues. This was almost included as capital because the state issues debt to fund the Bucks for Brains. This was left on the (inaudible).

renewal We also requested a capital and maintenance pool of \$25 million. The Provost went over with the deans, they had a whole list of projects that we wanted included. That, unfortunately, didn't make it.

There were three totally self-funded projects. We would take the responsibility of funding these. Expand and renovate the Student Center, \$160 million, that did make it. And we'll describe more about how we're going to finance that in a moment.

Renovate and upgrade UK Healthcare facilities, \$150 million there, (inaudible) hospital. A NICU, we're turning patients away, again totally self-finance. The last one -- and that did make it.

The last was construct a parking structure, which we badly need, the state has a strong aversion to total debt so this is one that was excluded. We're going to have to find another way to solve our parking needs.

So that's basically the capital projects and how they ended.

as To put this in context, though,

I've told people recently, this University in the last three years through philanthropy, partnerships, and some creative means and hard work, is now self-financing a billion dollars of construction. A billion dollars. Only \$35 million of that for the Law School is coming from the state.

certainly So high on my agenda are

these projects like Bucks for Brains, Bucks for Bricks, and a Research Building when we open that budget up again. Maybe two years.

Last year we were successful in getting them to open it up after one year. We're there every day. And there are lots of people I could thank for the efforts that we conduct there really 24/7. Steve Byars, our governmental relations person, who spends day in and day out in Frankfort, is just one.

So with that I want to turn it

over

to Vice President Monday. Before he starts, I also want to mention to you, you probably saw this headline, a week or so ago in the Courier Journal, panel okays tuition hikes.

So the Council on Postsecondary Education has authority on recommendations for our tuition, took tuition very seriously this year. They formed a work group, they used representatives from the campuses. They (inaudible) and they reached the conclusion, once they understood what the state budget was going to look like, that they would set a two year tuition ceiling. It would total 8 percent.

3.

What I mean by that, the universities could do is 4 and 4 or 5 and

From what we've heard, most universities are doing 5 and 3. That is the recommendation we will make to the Board and we'll elaborate on that in a moment.

They took that task seriously and we take the decision quite seriously. But I do appreciate how carefully they looked at these matters this year.

With that, I'll call Eric Monday.

MONDAY: Thank you, Mr. President. Good afternoon.

in

Let me start, and what we'll do

this presentation is I'll go through a number of the slides, the Provost will take us through a number of slides as well, as well as Angie Martin.

this

So let's start when we look at

budget and we look at how we approach tuition and fees with what were the principles as outlined by the President to this rule.

Number 1: Is how do we continue competitive faculty and staff pay? So how do we continue what we started last year with the 5 percent raise pool, how can we do that again this year.

Number 2: No across-the-board reallocations. As we all are aware, we made a number of reallocations in the last few years. How do we move away from that, that reallocation?

moderate

Lastly, how do we achieve

tuition and fee increases, that 3 to 5 percent level, understanding affordability, understanding that mix of students that we need, that we want.

So how do we achieve those three goals? And we're pleased to present to you today a tuition and fees package that helps us to achieve those three objectives.

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt

So where do we begin? We will bring the full budget to the Board for review and approval in June. But today we know the first two numbers.

of a 5 percent tuition and fee increase, as the President outlined, that we'll generate approximately 375, \$376 million in tuition, as well as we know our state appropriation, we took a reduction of 4.3 million. So our state appropriation will be 279.6 million.

So when we look at tuition and state appropriations from fiscal year '14, where it was 630 million, we look at fiscal year '15, that same bucket, those two rows is going to be 655 million.

2.7 We'll fill out the rest of the or \$2.8 billion budget as we go through the next few weeks in preparation for June.

At the May meeting, this Friday, the Board will consider an FCR, Finance Committee Resolution, on tuition and fees.

So what's the shift, what's the history of what we've had and who is paying, whether it's the students or the state. So if you look at the left top there you see \$468 million in revenue and what we call the operating budget in fiscal year '05.

That's grown to this year the operating budget was \$664 million, that's 664 of the 2.7 billion. In that 664 that was fiscal year '14, our students are paying 56 percent whereas the state appropriation or state support represents 44 percent.

Let's go back about nine or ten years and what was it? Well, in fiscal year '05, our students were contributing about 39 percent. So a student contribution of that total moves from 39 to 56. The state support goes from 61 to 44 and also about a 40 percent increase in the base.

So from that top number in fiscal year '08, where the state appropriation was \$335 million, what's represented in the red is the original budget. So when you see a line with red and blue it means that we took budget reductions within that fiscal year.

So in fiscal year '08, for reference, we began the year at \$335 million but didn't end the year. We also took reductions in '09 and in '10.

So from that peak of fiscal year '08 of 335 million, we're down approximately \$55 million for our \$280 million projected appropriation in fiscal years '15 and '16.

So let's transition from we're re

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt

Looking at this \$655 million. We now know the state appropriation, we know the reduction of the state appropriation, that's \$4.3 million, 4.258, you see that on the first row there. And then we look at what is the total funding need.

each

And I'm going to walk through

one of these rows. But the total funding need for the University, before we start to focus on the solution we began with that need.

Consistent with the President's directive in the principle as we shared at the beginning, we will be able to fund a 2 percent merit salary pool for faculty and staff for the upcoming fiscal year. So 7 percent, if we look at the last two years. Five percent last year, continuing this year with a 2 percent merit pool. It's roughly \$4.3 million per percent.

Next, investments in our faculty, \$970,000. There's two programs represented in that number, the Faculty Fighting Fund of \$500,000 that the Provost uses working with the deans to retain key faculty, as well as approximately \$470,000 for the promotion cycle, normally assisted to associate to full, that's funded out of Central.

Lastly, in the personnel category you see a line of approximately 1.9 million. That's benefits, miscellaneous benefits and other increases, whether that's health insurance, whether that's Workers' Compensation and other within that, for benefits and other.

If we move down from the personnel category we look at operating. You see the largest need is approximately \$11.7 million for student financial aid.

Later in the presentation we're going to show you a slide that shows the growth factor in student financial aid. Obviously, as tuition and fees goes

up, the financial aid program goes up.

Also represented here is a number of changes that have been implemented over the last few years, as well as some in this year to better insure that we're able to get the mix and size of the student body that we need at the University.

cost

Continuing down you see fixed

increases, including utilities, for about 2.1 million. We're projecting roughly a 2 percent increase in utility expenditures for next year, as well as some other fixed cost increases for our insurance programs.

The next line is the facilities transformation pool. This will now be going into fiscal year '15, the fifth year that we've been able to create a pool of

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
funds that adds a million dollars. So it will be \$5 million in fiscal year '15, that helps us start to attack our deferred maintenance backlog.

So it was 4 million this year, it will be 5 million next year. We'll be talking a little bit about how we're going to be more strategic in that transformation pool in just a moment.

The next you see is college incentive programs, \$5.5 million. Those are funds for the Provost, in some way similar to what you've heard in recent years about the TIF or tuition incentive funds. Other ways where the Provost can be strategic as we transition to the new financial model to incentivize and also reward and recognize where we have additional credit hour production and other ways. And the Provost takes the lead on that program.

Next you'll see a target reserve. You're going to see later in the presentation that our budget is based on a freshman class of 4800 and 66 percent of those are residents, 34 percent non-residents.

reserve What this reserve is, is a

for the chance that it doesn't come in at 4800. What if a class is only 4700, what if the mix is not 66, but it's a different number. And so that provides a reserve for that.

investments. And lastly, strategic

These are programs that the President determines to help us better align with our outcomes and our objectives over the year. This is a very small number this year of a million dollars in new funds.

For reference, in last year's presentation to this group, we talked about how we had 10 million to reallocate within the campus in last fiscal year. So this is a smaller number.

If you look at some of these needs, it's \$39 million. So if you think on that \$630 million base, or if you think about the \$655 million base in fiscal year '15, about a \$39 million need.

that? So how are we going to solve

Well, the first thing that we do is we look internally. Before we get to tuition and fees, how can we insure that we're driving for the habit of efficiency. Where can we find new revenues that can generate additional funds for the University, how do we redeploy funds and then we move to the tuition discussion.

examples So let me talk about some

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
within the efficiencies and new revenues of
approximately 3.2 million and the
redeployment of funds of 4.7.

When we talk about that 3.2
million, what we're talking about are
things such as renegotiating our life
insurance. So the program remains the
same, but we went to market and we were
able to save with the same program several
hundred thousand dollars for our life
insurance when we think about fiscal year
'15.

Another example of that is we're
going to pay our bills differently in
purchasing, something called (inaudible),
which is a product that allows us to pay
some of our vendors with a procurement
instrument and therefore we then generate a
rebate off that procurement instrument.

cash. Another example is operating

So at any one time the University has
sizeable amounts of revenues that we,
quote, keep in a bank account. Well, how
can we generate more interest income off of
those revenues, and we've developed some
strategies to take advantage of that as we
look at fiscal year '15.

Next, if we talk about the
redeployment of funds, what we did is we
went through every single line item of the
budget, and Angie and her staff in the
University Budget Office, worked to look at
how we were actually receiving revenues,
what was the actual versus the budget.

that There were several categories

came out. One, licensing. So everything
that you see that has a University of
Kentucky logo, trademark, we generate
income off of. That income is shared 50
percent with Athletics and 50 percent with
the University.

We had a budget on the University
side of \$1 million for that revenue. We go
and look back the last several years, we've
always generated closer to 2 million or
above off of that. So next year our budget
for that is going to be 2 million versus a
million.

Another category is we had a
reserve for staff benefits. Well, now we
have a much better ability to project what
the actual staff benefits are going to be.
So we're removing that reserve, freeing up
some flexibility to insure that we're
utilizing our resources to the best
possible way before we look at tuition and
fees.

And The next, we move to tuition and
fees. You see that \$27 million number.

you see a remaining funding gap which I'm
Page 8

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
going to describe in just a minute.

Let me go to this slide and I'll come back to the other. When you look at that \$28 million, 27 to \$28 million in revenue from tuition and fees, it's based on these assumptions: so the President shared with you that for a resident student, tuition rate increase is 5 percent, for a non-resident the rate increase is 8 percent based on the 4800 freshman, 66 percent resident, and a retention rate of 83 and a half percent. That's first to second year.

second For reference, our first to year retention rate this year was 82 and a half. So we're projecting a 1 percent increase in the first to second year retention.

you So if we go back to this slide see the 27.9. That's what we project will be generated off the 5 percent tuition and fee increase.

of We still have this remaining gap 3.3 million. So there's various ways to address that gap, what would be some type of cut, others to look at ways where we can be more strategic, and I believe, we believe that's what we've been able to do.

moment So you heard me talk about a ago the campus facilities transformation pool. In fiscal year '15, the one we're about to enter on July 1st, we have \$5 million in that fund.

that We also have four other funds have a similar purpose when we think about the transformation of the campus, specifically on the facilities side, and they are the debt service pool of 10.4 million. We also have a utilities renovation

fund of 2 million, a little less than a million in a classroom improvement fund and \$350,000 in a landscape improvement fund.

So if you look at how much do we have, what type of funds do we have to continue to transform the facilities enterprise, it's nearly \$19 million.

We know for fiscal year '15, we have one commitment on the Academic Science Building to pay the interest cost for the first year of that facility construction cycle and that's approximately 4.1 million.

We also are proposing that the funding gap at \$3.3 million, rather than doing any kind of reallocation or adjustment, that that 3.3 million will come out of this pool which means we'll still have \$11

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt

million, a little bit more than \$11 million, to continue the facility transformation, to do the deferred maintenance projects.

And we are going to have a more improved process of communication and discussion on how these funds are utilized and what their impact is across the campus.

So we talked about the 5 and 8 percent. What does that mean in terms of actual dollars?

So for an undergraduate lower division student in Fall of '13, that student paid \$4,983. In Fall of '14, your undergraduate lower division residents, 5232 or \$249 which is 5 percent.

You see the non-resident at 8 percent. Upper division is at 5 for resident, graduate is at 5 for a resident.

the

You'll see an asterisk there at

bottom. The President also referenced the great transformation of our Student Center.

million

The Student Center is \$175

project, 160 million of that project we have agency bond debt approval from, our (inaudible).

We have prepared a long term pro forma for that Student Center project. That long term pro forma called for a one-time increase in a renovation fee that will be dedicated outside of regular increases we can take advantage of, of \$30 per semester, rather than go above the 5 percent.

So one strategy that other institutions have done is they looked at your 5 percent threshold and then they add a fee on top of that, in essence, increasing tuition at a rate greater than the 5 percent.

We are able to do it and we are going to do it within that 5 percent. So our students will pay those rates in Fall of '14 which include the \$30 for the Student Center renovation fee.

So we are very excited and very pleased to be able to do that within our authority, rather than over the top or over and above that authority.

Now we're going to drill into a little bit of the differential in course and program fees and the Provost is going to talk about those.

RIORDAN: So Lisa Wilson and I worked with each one of colleges this year in terms of the strategy around some of their programs.

There were four graduate programs that we felt that we needed to take to the Board and ask for differential pricing on the tuition.

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt

As you just saw with Eric, all of our graduate programs are going at the same tuition rate, 5 percent for in state, 8 percent for out of state, with the exception of four programs.

Dentistry, Pharmacy, and Medicine are all going to the Board with a 3 percent in state, 3 percent out of state, and that's all due to market factors to remain competitive within their programs.

The Executive MBA, which you all just approved this past month with the University of Louisville, is also going to the Board with a fixed rate price at \$67,500 for the 17 month program in total. It's very much in line with the competitive market rates, and particularly for this area, it's a very standard pricing.

Those are the four programs that are going forward with differential rates. We're continuing to have conversations with each of the colleges about their graduate programs and the pressure that you're feeling in terms of the market. And I imagine in the future we'll continue to have more of these.

Fri day, Right now, the colleges, on we're turning in their course and program fees. We did cap that to a limit of 3 percent.

Again, really thinking about affordability for our students, we needed to keep that in check. And so we will be going to the Board in June with course and program fees. Angie?

talk MARTIN: Good afternoon. I get the fun part to actually

to you just a little bit and give you some information about affordability for our students because, of course, we are not blind to the fact that our tuition rates are increasing like most institutions throughout the country.

But we do realize that our trend actually is slowing. So what you've got here on the left-hand side is a schedule of our tuition and mandatory fees. This is for freshman and sophomore resident students over all the way back to 2003 and it shows you the average annual change for four years.

And so it's actually for 2014, it will be down to 5 percent. For fiscal year '14, '15, in accordance with the CPE guidelines that have been approved, we will be able to increase our undergraduate resident rate 3 percent next year.

On the right-hand side is our UK-funded student financial aid. This is what we call the institutional core scholarships. It does not include

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
restricted gifts or endowment spending
distributions.

funds This literally is that public
part of our tuition budget and state
appropriation budget that we turn around
and award to high quality students. We
also deal with diversity needs as well as
need-based issues.

You can see we had a substantial
uptake in that budget on the scholarship
side. A good portion of it has to do with
our intention on trying to recruit more out
of state students.

times Out of state students pay two
the rate, or they're assessed two times the
rate of our in state students, so we have
implemented some scholarship programs to
attract more out of state students, still
having them pay maybe one and a half times
our in state students rather than two. So
it still is a net positive to the
institution.

This looks at where our resident
undergraduate rate will be or was in
comparison to 11 benchmark institutions
that were identified as part of the
University Review Committee that the
President put together when he first came.

As you can see right now we are
still below the median at \$9,966. We don't
have a crystal ball to look to see where
we're going to be next year or the year
after. We have been surveying other states
and it does appear that the tuition rate
increases are varying dramatically.

Florida has already announced
a zero percent, but that follows about
three years of 15 percent increases, but
you can still see where they are at. Some
of the increases are as high as 9 percent.

So this looks at a University of
Kentucky resident student. This is for
Fall '13, it's all the full-time Kentucky
resident undergraduates. And the big pie
chart shows you that 85.5 percent of our
students receive some form of federal,
state, or institutional or private aid, a
gift, a grant. This is not loans.

is So none of this is loans. This
all money they did not have to work for and
they did not borrow.

over A pretty amazing statistic is
students, to the right is we looked at those

12,986 of these students. And on average,
of course we know how averages work, but on
average these students had out-of-pocket
costs, when you looked at tuition and
mandatory fees only compared to the amount

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
of aid that they were getting, of \$1,079.
What is surprising is that number is
actually \$200 less than it was the Fall
before.

And that's been our federal aid
programs have been increasing as well as,
of course, the University has been trying
to increase our scholarship programs as
well in order to attract the quality and
the diversity of the students.

PORTER: Angie?

MARTIN: Yes?

BROTHERS: Name
please.

PORTER: Todd Porter, Pharmacy.

In this slide does that include
KEES money?

MARTIN: Yes. It includes all -- the
state
part right there, the 27 percent, includes
three types of aid programs, it's the KEES
program and -- two types -- the CAPP
program, we're not eligible for the other -
- but the CAPP program is the state need-
based aid program. So the federal money
includes PELL grants as well as SEOG
grants.

that Now this looks at our students

we do have, what students we do have
financial information on. So I have to
explain the population we're able to look
at.

We looked at Fall 2013, these are
full-time dependent resident undergraduate
students that completed the FAFSA, the free
federal application that you must complete
if you want any sort of need-based aid by
the federal government or even the state,
you've got to complete a FAFSA.

So we had 8,814 students complete
the FAFSA. What we're able to do is that
the FAFSA tells us what the adjusted gross
income is on these dependent students.
That's the other criteria. These are
dependent. They are not non-traditional or
independent students.

So we broke those into quartiles,
evenly sized quartiles by family income.
And then looked at that family income by
quartile as also compared to what happened
on their aid situation, what did they get.

of So what you have are the four
quartiles across the bottom. So each one

these groups includes a little over 2200
students, the exact same size, and this
high average. That means we had 25 percent
of our students come from families with an
average AGI of \$178,000.

On the low end, we've got 25
percent of our students that are coming

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
from an average family income of only
\$17,521.

how And what the bars represent are

much, what was the average net tuition and
mandatory fees that these students have to
pay, again just looking at tuition and
fees.

But what this says is that out of
the \$4,966 that was the average Fall
semester tuition and fees, the high average
family income student had to pay \$2,515.

The low average family income
student actually got a refund of \$955. So
they got enough student financial aid to
cover their tuition and mandatory fees plus
\$955 to apply towards their room and board
and books.

Of course a big issue is
surrounding debt of students. And this is
actually the results of a project on
student debt, a national project that was
conducted.

And this is looking at Kentucky
postsecondary graduate, these are
baccalaureate graduates. And for the class
that graduated in 2012, in Kentucky the
average debt was \$22,384 of the students
that had debt.

an It's not that every student had

average of 22,384. 62 percent of our
students graduated with debt. That put us
in a ranking nationally from low to high,
low being the best, we were 10 out of 50.

and Now let's look at UK. We went

looked at -- actually it's a flip-side,
it's the same class. We looked at the Fall
2006 cohort. And we said, okay, of these
3,415 students, these are the Kentucky
residents, which was 81.5 percent of our
population in '06, 1,759 graduated in five
and a half years. That's when we took this
snap shot.

So what did those students end up
with? Well, 53 percent of them had no
student loans and 47 percent of the
graduates did leave with an average debt of
\$23,500.

much So our average debt is pretty

in the line with the previous side as far
as representative of Kentucky, a little bit
higher, but the percentage of our graduates
that had debt is lower, probably attributed
to the adjusted gross income of our
families and how they work.

This is a distribution of those
1,759 students. I do like to try to put
this in perspective of what this means. So
that means -- this was by the College
Board. And a worker aged 25 and older with

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
a high school degree earns \$33,800. It's
the national number.

is Basically the calculation simply

if you look at the difference in net take
home pay between a high school graduate and
a baccalaureate graduate, that difference
means you could pay off the \$23,500 loan in
two years if you applied everything toward
that.

MONDAY: Thanks, Angie. We have a couple
other slides we wanted to also share with
you of what we'll be proposing for our
rates for housing and dining.

same We take those to the Board the

time we that we take tuition and fees. So
a few slides.

When we think about housing, the
one thing you'll notice very quickly on
those first two rows is our traditional double
and our traditional single. And when we
talk about traditional, we're thinking
about the Towers Complex, the Kirwan-
Blanding Complex.

zero We're proposing for next year

percent increase on the double, and
actually a reduction of 19 percent on the
single. This is in response to lower
demand for our traditional housing for this
year. This is a very distinctive year in
our housing transformation.

We'll have about 2900 brand new
beds, I think it's 2982 to be exact, and
about 6200 in the total inventory. So
nearly half of the total inventory are
going to be beds that we constructed in the
last 12 months.

are The other 3400, or thereabouts,

going to be our traditional beds, or the
majority of those will be the traditional
beds.

So we have great demand for
housing. It far exceeds our capacity of
our new facilities.

we're When we look at traditional,

seeing some capacity opportunities and so
we want to respond to that on the pricing
side.

If you look at the others, the
Greek double and single, this is similar to
the housing traditional double. Then you
see the four person suite, that's Central
Hall I and II, there's a 3 percent increase
which is what the plan was when we started
our transformation on housing.

And then this year we're also
bringing on our two bedroom suites and our
four bedroom suites. We call those Type B
and Type C. Those will be in Champions

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
Court I and II, Haggin, and Woodl and Glen I and II. And the 3904 and the 4216 is the pricing. Those are the pricing that we set aside or set in place several years ago when we approved that housing.

So really outside of our traditional, and responding to the demand side, there's no change on this slide from what we had planned to do over the last few years.

We have -- yes, sir.

CAPILOUTO: Eric, would you mention the demand we have for those types of beds?

MONDAY: Yes, sir. When we look at the two bedroom suites and the four bedroom suites, as well as the UK premium, our demand is over 180 percent with 100 being full. So great demand. When we look at our traditional,

the demand is approximately 50 percent.

So you see this real opportunity for good conversations. Our enrollment management team, our housing team, our resident (inaudible) team have been working on this for months to make sure we manage expectations and we don't respond in a way that does not yield a student in a positive student experience.

for

This is a real distinctive year that as we think about that transformation. Yes, ma'am?

BRION: Gail Brion, College of Engineering.

you

When you look at the demand and compare it against the students receiving PELL grants and aids, where they're going to be staying on campus, are we creating two different areas based on how much assistance can be provided for students with low income?

MONDAY: We can look at that in more detail.

I think this year what we're seeing is so many of our new facilities are going to have Living Learning Programs in them.

So clearly if you want to stay in one of the newer facilities you're likely going to be in a Living Learning Program and that's what is going to take the majority of the beds.

Over time, though, that's a good thing that we'll look at. Look at pricing, look at those students, and how do we meet those needs.

When we think about that affordability index, housing and dining are clearly the bumps of that, and you'll see a little bit when we get to the dining slide how we're reacting to that. Great

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt

question, one we'll continue to watch.

BRION: Thank you.

MONDAY: Apartments, 3 percent. Just an
inflationary increase on the apartments.

We have between 5- and 600 apartments in
our inventory.

you'll
Lastly, dining rates. What

see here as well, you heard the Provost
talk about course and program fees at 3
percent, housing and dining trying to stay
within that 3 percent, tuition and fees may
be at 5.

But housing and dining, the other
costs that many of our students pay, trying
to center around 3 percent. There's two
exceptions on the 3 percent, we're a little
bit higher on that 3 percent, nearly 3.9
for our minimal plan to price that at 1350.

And then if you go down to the 21
meals per week row, you'll see that there's
no change proposed in that meal plan. That
meal plan is priced very aggressively, only
1.9 percent or a little less than 2 percent
of our students choose that meal plan. One
of the reasons is the price.

compare
It's not competitive if we

it to other institutions as well, so we're
keeping that the same in our proposal for
fiscal year '15. The others are at the 3
percent limit.

I would point out one last
thing on this slide. The first asterisk,
as we all know, there are ongoing
discussions in a possibility of bringing in
a partner to operate our dining services.

These are the upper limits of
price. So it is possible, should those
conversations continue, that the pricing
for fiscal year '15 for our students as it
relates to dining will be lower than what's
represented on this sheet. And should that
occur the President will report those new
rates and of course our students would pay
those lower rates. And those would be
reported to the Board.

we
Lastly, the next steps, May 9th,

will take this, this coming week, the end
of this week, we'll have two FCRs for the
housing and dining and tuition and
mandatory fees for approval and
consideration in front of the Board of
Trustees at the May meeting.

The June 10th meeting, just a
little bit more than a month away from the
May 9th, we'll have full consideration of
the operating budget of the Institution as
well as the capital budget.

CPE, the Council on Postsecondary
Education will take up, although they have

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt

provided an upper limit of 8 percent, they will actually take up our tuition and fees on June 20th. And then of course we'll be ready in August as you all will be as well. Mr. President?

CAPILOUTO: We want to open it up for questions. But I do want to emphatically state this: While we do have a strategy to target out of state students for a variety of reasons, they add diversity to our classes here at the University of Kentucky, they are people that develop an affinity from their short time here that lasts a lifetime.

We have raised \$52 million to support the reconstruction of the Gatton College of Business, I would imagine I can safely say probably well over half of that from individuals who haven't lived in this city since the time they were a college student. Just one tangible benefit for the diversity in the classes.

Know this, our doors are open first and widest for Kentucky, qualified Kentuckians, and that's always going to be the way it is. I just wanted to be clear about that.

I'll open it up for any -- oh, one last thing. Also embedded in our ability to construct that Student Center, and I think student is a misnomer, this is going to be a center for everybody.

This is going to be a place where you want to bring your guests, where you want to hold your meetings, where you want to invite the neighborhood. It's going to be a spectacular facility.

One of the reasons we're able to do this within what is just an inflationary increase, Eric didn't mention this to you, last year alone four universities introduced new Rec Center fees or Student Center fees over and above their tuition. Some of them were \$90 a semester, some of them were \$15/\$16 a credit hour, something like that.

To be able to do this is a feat also made possible (inaudible) because of the continued generosity we have through philanthropy.

In fact, somebody will be making a gift that will scholarship every Kentucky student for decades.

Any questions? Yes.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S. Is the entering class increasing in

number in '14-'15 and is that increase already put into those numbers?

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt

CAPILOUTO: What were our final numbers last year?

MONDAY: 4650.

CAPILOUTO: 4650, so we're projecting at 4800.

Last year we had, the word used in the office, a little more melt than we anticipated, meaning at the end fewer students came than we anticipated and you saw that we have a reserve fund in case that happens again.

The Provost has I think really brought some new energy, new ideas into our recruitment efforts especially (inaudible) and I think it will be even better next year so that we can achieve our targets.

And also as part of our tuition adjustments and all, just to let you know, we've reduced our Patterson and Singletary Awards this year recognizing there are some constraints here. But we increased our Parker Awards that really target a more diverse student population. Yes?

TRUSZCZYNSKI: Truszczynski, College of Engineering.

Two years ago we were given an outline of a budget for two years, explaining this would align us with the budget process in the state and so should we expect anytime soon similar details for what will happen in 2015/2016?

CAPILOUTO: Sure. So it was only up until the

last minute that CPE decided to do a two year recommendation on tuition. So we were a little uncertain about that. There was a debate back and forth of 8, 5 and 3, 4 and 4, or just maybe 4. So this is a number that was made certain a few weeks ago.

We will also have more

information,

which is becoming increasingly important to what we do, on exactly what size that entering class is and also what our retention numbers are.

We'll have more information and we'll certainly share that with you. But I

hope you can see from this we're already anticipating what we need to do in the second year. Very good question.

Okay. Before I leave, this is a the time of year where sometimes with sentimentality and great emotion students share with me how appreciative they are of their experience at the University of Kentucky. And some of them will make you cloud up and rain, you know all this, but as a beneficiary of these beautiful stories because of your work, I wanted to thank you deeply because you're making a difference in lives in small ways that turn into really big impacts in years to come. So thank you very much.

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt

BLONDER: Okay. Please as usual remember to

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

Next we have minutes and announcements. We did not receive any corrections to the minutes from April 14th, are there any corrections at this point? Then the minutes stand approved as distributed by unanimous consent.

Next some announcements. As you know, we are in the process of the Faculty Trustee election. We've had the nominating round, the first round of voting and that's over.

The top three vote getters were Paul Kearney in Medicine and Surgery, Robert Grossman, A and S Chemistry, and Sidney ("Wally") Whiteheart, Molecular and Cellular Biochemistry, College of Medicine.

The second and final round of voting is open through noon this Friday, May 9, so please vote and please encourage your colleagues to vote.

Next, the Senate Council approved

a minor non-standard calendar change for MA 109, MA 111, WRD 110, and UK 090. This is a one-time request.

The Senate Council also approved

a non-standard calendar for all courses offered through Education Abroad for the summer of 2014. And the Senate Council suggested that Education Abroad return to the Senate Council in the Fall with a proposal that would prevent Education Abroad from having to annually request a non-standard calendar.

Next, the Senate Council

conducted a campus-wide survey of the faculty again this year, to evaluate President Capilouto and provide input to the Board of Trustees.

Vice Chair, Connie Wood, will

give an update on that during the Vice Chair Report.

I wanted to report to you that the Senate Council met with the Board of Trustees Chair, Britt Brockman. The topics that we discussed included communication and consultation, dining services decision and process, the campus infrastructure and living and learning communities and UK's future.

Next I want to congratulate the following faculty who won the Provost

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt

Teaching Awards: Phil Harling, who is a Senator and Senate Council member, Pearl James, A and S English, Leon Sachs, A and S, Modern and Classical Languages, Literature and Culture, Brian Atkins, Medicine, Emergency Medicine, Andrea Friedrich, A and S, Psychology and Tammy Stevenson from AG, Dietetics and Human Nutrition.

The Senate Council approved an expedited process to change undergraduate programs for compliance with the new Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement. About 100 GCCR program changes will be on the web transmittal in the next few days. And we have two web transmittals that are currently posted. So please review them.

The Senate Council will also be hearing updates soon from the committee that's working on the foreign language requirement.

Next I'd like to give my Chair report. On behalf of the Senate Council and University Senate, it's my privilege to honor Richard Greissman, who is currently Assistant Provost in the Office of Faculty Advancement and Assessment.

Richard is retiring from UK on

June

30th. Richard was Provost Liaison to the Senate Council from 2004 to 2013. That role was originally established by Provost Mike (inaudible).

invaluable

Richard has performed an

service to faculty and the University Senate in that role and in his past and current positions.

His deep understanding of the principles (inaudible) including shared governance and academic freedom, his knowledge of and contributions to our administrative and governing regulations, and his unmatched ability to negotiate successful solutions for both faculty and the administration have made a positive impact on the lives of so many and on this University as an institute of higher learning.

Before I give Richard the plaque that we've created, I'd like to ask Davy Jones to come up. He wanted to say a few words. Davy?

JONES:

I just wanted to take advantage

of

the moment here to enhance what Lee has just said with my own personal perspective.

I have worked with Richard for

the

past 20 years and have seen firsthand that the faculty really are indebted to Richard for everything that he has done, much of

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt

which, he was attentive to invisibly behind the scenes but which has really positively impacted with the faculty.

The work with the faculty has codified right now in University's regulations, its muscular governing role over academic content. The wording we have in the regulations right now would not be there if it had not been for Richard over the years being there when needed to help guide the language to be what it is.

So we are indebted to him for our governing posture here at the University and from the other aspect, our careers, motions in the regulations, faculty personnel regulations, many of the safeguards that we have in the regulations today would not be there if it were not for Richard's efforts. The safety net that's there would have many holes in it if it wasn't for him.

And I would also add, on the individual case basis, Richard has -- the contributions have been immeasurable as the go to the person to get things solved. A 9:30 Sunday evening, give a call to Richard on his cell phone, Richard, we've got a problem, an issue that's going to hit the fan tomorrow morning at 8, can you help us navigate this to a soft landing.

issue

And sometimes it would be an coming from a faculty direction, sometimes it would be administration direction. In all of those, he was able to help some of these situations come to a good resolution.

And he was particularly adept at dealing with that guy, who is that guy, Jones? Is that that guy? There were sometimes when that guy was being particularly strident, as he does sometimes, and Richard would indulge that person and the next day still be friends with him. And I appreciate that very much as well.

BLONDER: Thank you, Davy. Richard, will you please come up? Richard, it's my pleasure and my honor to present you with this plaque which says: On behalf of past and present members of the University Senate Council, University Senate offers our deep appreciation for Richard's unwavering support of the University Senate. We will long remember Richard's wisdom as well as his efforts to promote faculty governance, academic programs, and the success of UK students.

GREISSMAN: I know how long this agenda is for today so I will not be long. I must say this: The Provost Liaison position was a one year experiment

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt

that 10 years later you were still willing to put up with me was a moment, was an error of remarkable generosity. I would urge you to keep that impulse close at hand. Thank you. It's been a privilege and it's been a good ride as they say in Kentucky.

BLONDER: Thank you and best of luck,
Richard.

GREISSMAN: Thank you.

BLONDER: Next we have the Vice Chair report,

Connie Wood.

WOOD: Every year the Senate Council, at least the last two years, has been conducting a survey of all faculty opinion on that year's performance of our President.

The survey that we sent out this year was exactly the same survey, just updated, and we had 710 persons respond to that survey for a response rate of around 28 percent. This is slightly less than we had last year, but not significantly so shall I say.

Several people have sent emails wanting to know if we are going to make the results of this survey public, the answer is yes. It has already been analyzed. Please don't ask questions because we will be presenting this to the Board of Trustees.

Last year Lee and I actually met with the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, and after the Board of Trustees had acted on the President's evaluation, which last year was in September, we will make it public by posting it on the Senate Council website.

So you will, and I thank every

one

of you for participating, and you certainly do have access to the results and we will post them for public. But we're not going to until the Board of Trustees has them. Are there any questions about that?

Well, I am very pleased to be

able

to present the Outstanding Senator Award. I think that one of the nominators, and we had several who nominated this person, said it best, and I'll see if you can guess who the recipient is.

His virtually encyclopedic assimilation and application of UK's ARs, GRs, and Senate Rules, coupled with his nearly unparalleled historical perspectives, places him head and shoulders above all others in helping UK maintain quality educational standards, fairness among all stakeholders in shared governance.

It's my pleasure to award this

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
year's Outstanding Senator Award to Davy

Jones.

JONES: Thank you very much.
WOOD: You're very welcome. Thank you.
BLONDER: Thank you, Connie.

Next we have our degree list approvals. The first degree list is the May 2014 degree list. We did receive a handful of degree additions, primarily the graduate level.

So we have a recommendation that the Elected Faculty Senators approve the revised May 2014 degree list for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board.

just

Is there discussion? This is

for the Elected Faculty Senators to vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

2014

Next we have the early August

degree list. We received a couple of additions at the undergraduate level.

We have a recommendation that the Elected Faculty Senators approve the revised early August 2014 degree list for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board.

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

Next item on the agenda is committee reports. Andrew Hippisley, Chair of Senate's Academic Programs Committee, is going to present the proposed new Master of Science in Information Communication Technology. Andrew?

HIPPISLEY: This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees the establishment of a new graduate program, this is the MS in Information Communication Technology in the School of Library and Information Sciences within the College of Communication and Information.

was

This proposal falls closely on the heels of the bachelor's in ICT, which

approved by the Senate earlier this session. ICT emphasizes, as you remember then, the application of information technology and less on the design and implementation of IT.

What distinguishes the bachelor's from the master's is advanced knowledge in the key areas as well as its application to different areas, namely health, technology analytics, and policy and regulations.

Graduates of this program are

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
expected to enter the workforce at the leadership levels. Career destinations that will be enumerated include Computer Analysts, Technical Writers, Media and Communications and Instructional Coordinators.

are There are 36 hours, 18 of them

core. It includes ICT in Society Information and Representation and Access. There's a practicum worth 6 credits.

There are a full set of student learning outcomes in place. One of them, for example, identify the foundational concepts of information retrieval, analyze the performance of retrieval systems and be able to apply these concepts in practice.

There's an assessment plan in place. And there's a program assessment plan as well.

need Admissions, you don't strictly

a bachelor's in ICT to get into the program. The GPA has to be 3.0. And so on.

There is a faculty of record in place. Basically these are all only the LIS faculty. The director will be the school's director.

Our committee had a couple of issues which were highly satisfactory in responding to. First of all, we can see initially how this was distinct from the recently implemented bachelor's.

The answer was that the three tracks that are being offered here aren't available at the bachelor's level. And these concentrations will lead to jobs requiring (inaudible) students.

The second question was that the preparation of this degree is far more in depth. The courses are more theoretical and there's a much higher level of detail.

whi ch We also had another question

was if this degree advances the knowledge and training provided at the bachelor's level how is ICT not the basic level qualification, and the answer was there is an expectation that candidates enrolling will have the sufficient skills, the applied skills already and if not there's a careful plan for remedial courses to take care of those students to get up to speed so they can (inaudible).

BLONDER: Thank you, Andrew. So we have a motion on the floor, positive from Senate Council, that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Master of Science in Information Communication Technology within the College of Communication and Information.

Is there discussion? Yes?

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt

NAGA: Uwe Naga, Arts and Sciences.
Has this been discussed with the
Computer Science Department?

HIPPISLEY: Yes. The Computer Science
Department has seen the proposal in detail
and has written to say that they're okay
with that.

JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology.
So just to clarify. This is a
degree that's being housed at the level of
the college and not within a unit within
the college?

HIPPISLEY: This is in the School of Library
and Information Sciences which is within
the college.

JONES: Can we amend the recommendation
then to include that?

BLONDER: So we have an amendment on the
floor, we need a second?

BRION: Gail Brion.
BLONDER: Is there discussion of the
amendment? Okay. Back to the main motion.
Is there any further discussion of the
motion as amended?

BUTLER: Okay. You interpreted there to
be
unanimous consensus.

BLONDER: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. So we have
an amendment and it was seconded. We need
to vote.

BUTLER:

What exactly was it? What?

BLONDER: So the recommendation that the
Senate approve the establishment of a new
Master of Science in Information
Communication Technology within the School
of Library and Information Science within
the College of Communication and
Information.

So is there discussion of that?
All in favor of the amendment? Opposed?
Abstained? The amendment carries.

Now we're back to the motion as
amended. Any further discussion? All in
favor of the motion as amended? Opposed?
Abstained? Motion as amended carries.
Thank you.

Next we have a proposed new
Bachelor of Public Health and Andrew will
present that proposal.

HIPPISLEY: So this is a recommendation that
the University Senate approve for
submission to the Board of Trustees the
establishment of a new bachelor's program,
Public Health in the College of Public
Health.

The main point of Public Health
is
to avert disease at the population level by
influencing policy and (inaudible)
environmental, physical and social levels.
This
There is a good motivation for

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt

bachelor's, Kentucky is ranked 43rd in the country for unhealthy states. College of Public Health already has a graduate program in Public Health which is highly successful. They want to expand the undergraduate level to help the need for training in Public Health in the state.

Moreover, a Bachelor's degree in this field is part of a nationwide trend. Of the 49 accredited Public Health Colleges, 30 percent have a bachelor's program.

So evidence, they already have accumulated evidence that this will be a great success at UK. Each semester roughly 200 students take the course CPH 201 Introduction to Public Health. Public Health offers alternatives to medical school.

about

So I'll tell you a little bit

the assessment, they have a full set of categorized student learning outcomes which will be assessed in the normal way. They also have a careful program assessment which includes student surveys.

The curriculum is 120 credits. I won't go into too much detail there. Let me just say that there are 39 major requirements which are divided into required Public Health courses, for example, Health and Medical Care Delivery Systems. Some Public Health electives, for example, Sexual Health, and electives within the major including, for example, Environmental Sociology. There's also a capstone course, CPH 470, and a GWR, there's two.

They estimate between 100 and 150 students from other majors. This is based on comparisons with places like Johns Hopkins which has more than 300 students doing this degree per year.

on

They did exactly what was going

in the University at large to make sure what they were doing was complimentary. There are five (inaudible) undergraduate programs in Human Health Sciences, (inaudible) Leadership and Management, Education (inaudible), health promotion degrees in the College of Education. This, what's being proposed is distinct from all of these because it emphasizes population health and health prevention.

There's a carefully thought out faculty of record. Basically, most of the faculty in the college. No new resources are needed initially. And I'll send it back.

BLONDER: Thank you, Andrew. So we have a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the Senate approve the establishment

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
of a new Bachelor in Public Health within
the College of Public Health.

Is there discussion? Davy?

JONES: Same question. Is this going to
be
tacked at the college level or in a unit
within the college?

BLONDER: The proposers would like it to be
at the college level, is that correct?

UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible).

BLONDER: Other questions? Discussion?
Items? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained?
Motion carries. Thank you.

Next item on the agenda is the
proposed new dual degree program PharmD and
MS in Pharmaceutical Sciences and Andrew
will present that.

HIPPISLEY: So this is a recommendation that
the University Senate approve the
establishment of a new dual degree program
between Doctor of Pharmacy and MS
Pharmaceutical Sciences, within the College
of Pharmacy.

This is very straightforward. 18
credits will be shared between the two
cross programs. The effect will be to
reduce the time to degree, both degrees, if
you add them together, from six years to
five years.

There is already in existence, it
will be 164 credits, Doctor of Pharmacy.

It's very typical for students to link this
with another specialty, for example, the
college had a good track record in the
PharmD/MPA joint degree, the PharmD/MBA
joint degree, and recently dual degrees
between PharmD/MPH and PharmD/MSPAS.

There is already in existence, of
course, the MS in Pharmaceutical Sciences.

And corollary of this proposal is to end up
replacing the existing graduate certificate
in Pharmaceutical Science Research.

The college already knows of five
students who have basically chosen to do
this dual degree on the promise that it
will actually exist.

The admissions criteria is
already

in place for both programs and they will be
maintained, students have to enter both
programs in the legal way.

There's a program assessment plan
in place as well.

BLONDER: Thank you, Andrew. So we have a
recommendation, positive from Senate

Council, that the Senate approve the
establishment of a new dual degree program
between Doctor of Pharmacy and MS
Pharmaceutical Sciences in the College of
Pharmacy.

Is there discussion? Hearing
none,

all in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
carries. Thank you.
Next we have a proposed new
undergraduate certificate in Leadership
Studies. Andrew is going to present that.
HIPPI SLEY: This is a recommendation that the
University Senate approve the establishment
of a new undergraduate certificate,
Leadership Studies, within the College of
Education.

The program main pillars are --
they call them pillars, these are core
Leadership concepts, team and
organizational leaderships and community
leadership and relationships. And linked
to each is a set of its own student
learning outcomes.

The idea is that this certificate
will compliment programs in the College of
Agriculture and the College of Education.
For example, pre-service teachers will do
this to enhance their leadership skills.

The expectation is 15 students
doing this the first year and by the third
year they imagine 45 students.

There are 18 credits. These

courses are distributed into sets across
these pillars that I just mentioned. So as
an example, from the Community Leadership
and Relationship pillar is CLD 430 Leading
in Communities.

Then there are 6 credits of
electives, for example, MGT 410 Analysis of
Organizational Behavior.

offered Most of what's going to be

will be online. There are SLOs as I
mentioned, but there is also a plan to
assess them. And the program will be
assessed in the usual way, student
satisfaction surveys and scores.

The academic home will be, as I
mentioned, the College of Education. There
will be two directors, there will be co-
directors, one from Department of Education
and Leadership and the other one from the
Department of Community and Leadership
Development.

The faculty of record are drawn
from the two colleges.

BLONDER: Thank you, Andrew. So we have a
motion on the floor, positive
recommendation from Senate Council, that
the Senate approve the establishment of a
new undergraduate certificate in Leadership
Studies in the College of Education.

none, Is there discussion? Hearing

all in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion
carries. Thank you.

Next we have a proposed new BA in
Health Society and Populations. Andrew?

HIPPI SLEY: This is the last one, I think.

So

this is a recommendation that the University Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees the establishment of a new BA program, Health, Society, and Populations, which will be within the College of Arts and Sciences.

This proposal will provide opportunity to pursue health-related programs at UK from the perspective of the social sciences and in that way would compliment other health-related undergraduate degree programs.

So the general aim is to give students an understanding of how multiple interacting forces combine to create unequal distribution of health outcomes, for example, genetic reasons, environmental, social and cultural factors.

The students then end up with a much more (inaudible) perspective as well as the skills to succeed in entry level health-related careers as well as health-related professional skills.

aimed

Some of the careers that are

at with this proposal are Health Advocacy, Case Management, Health Counseling, Health Marketing and Communications.

The A and S requirements plus UK core gives students this multi-level skills of communication, problem solving, and analytical skills. Something extra.

places

This is being done at other

like MSU and University of Iowa, which has a certificate in Global Health.

The particular benchmark program that this one parallels is something that's being done in colleges -- which college is it? I lost my place here -- Penn.

There are key student learning outcomes. One of them right now is ability to articulate and apply the core principles of integrated social science approach to population health outcomes. (Inaudible).

Interestingly enough, the CIP (inaudible) which is giving this (inaudible) multidisciplinary studies reflects its multidisciplinary nature.

There are a number of concentrations, I'll name a few, Global Health, Health Ecologies, Social Ecologies and (inaudible) Illness. Each of these has their own set of student learning outcomes.

it's

The breakdown of the courses,

highly sensible. There's a GCCR course. There's stats and math courses students have to do. There are two science courses which they have to do. They must do Basic Ideas of Biology.

There are various social sciences

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
courses they have to do as well as society
and health courses.

There's also a capstone whose aim
is to design and evaluate health-related
intervention programs.

They anticipate about 40 majors
by 2015 and this is based on what they see
going on in allied programs from other
universities.

a There's a faculty of record with
list of rules. There will be two co-
directors and there are letters of support
from the College of Public Health as well
as the College of Education.

BLONDER: Thank you, Andrew. So we have a
positive recommendation from the Senate --
yes?

BUTLER: J. S. Butler, Graduate School.
Relevant to the writing
requirement

and I'll call the GCCR, I'd like to know
whether there is or is not an Oxford comma
in the name of this?

The agenda, the presentation to
Senate Council, page 178, wacked the Oxford
comma, but it has it here on the screen
Health, Society, and Population. So do you
wish to have such a comma there or not?

HIPPISLEY: I believe in the Oxford comma, so
I
would say yes.

BUTLER: I like the Oxford comma too. But
that does not match what the Senate Council
passed nor what the agenda shows. So I
wish to call that to your attention.

HIPPISLEY: Maybe we should defer to the Dean
of Arts and Sciences.

BLONDER: Do the proposers have a
preference?

KORNBLUH: We'll
I
defer to
the
Chair
of
the
Senate Academic Program Committee.

BUTLER: I would prefer to have that
personally as (inaudible) the Graduate
School.

BLONDER: Does that have to be an amendment
then?

BUTLER: I so offer, yes.
Second.

BLONDER: Okay. All in favor of this
Oxford

comma? Opposed? Abstained? Okay. The
amendment carries. The Oxford comma is --

GROSSMAN: May
I
just

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt

offe
r a
comm
ent?
Yes,

it's funny, but several years ago a new Department of Orthopaedics was voted by this group. It went to the Board of Trustees and we had to re-vote it because we omitted the A in orthopaedics that the department wanted and was not put in at this level.

So it had to go through and had to go back to the Board of Trustees after that. So although yes, this is funny, there is a reason to do it.

BLONDER: Gail?

BRION: Gail Bri on, College of Engineering.

Similar to the other two recommendations, this is not being housed within a department but in the College of Arts and Sciences directly? I just want to be sure I understand this correctly.

HIPPISLEY: Directly in Arts and Sciences.

KORNBLUH: With a faculty of record.

BLONDER: So we have an amended motion on the floor. Is there further discussion? So all in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries as amended. Thank you very much.

The next item on the agenda is Senate Academic Organization and Structure Committee. Greg Wasilkowski is Chair of that committee, but Greg was unable to be here today, he's not feeling well, so Roger Brown is going to present the proposed name change from the Department of Theatre to the Department of Theatre and Dance. Roger?

BROWN: So this is, as far as I know, an uncontentious proposal to change the name of what's currently the Department of Theatre in the College of Fine Arts to the Department of Theatre and Dance.

Just some quick background here, about four years ago the College of Education suspended a Dance Minor and transferred that instruction to the College of Fine Arts.

Since that time this Body has approved a Dance Minor in the Department of Theatre and that's been, by all accounts, very successful.

Currently, there are 50 students enrolled in Dance Minor from eight different colleges, generating now 25

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
percent of the total departmental credit hours. And this Dance Minor also contributes significantly to the interdisciplinary certificate in Musical Theatre.

documented
Upon review, there's now enthusiastic support from the faculty in the Department of Theatre, the Chairs of all the Departments in the College of Fine Arts, and the College Advisory Council in the College of Fine Arts, and the dean in that college. There's also approval from the Provost, and I'll add that the Chair of the (inaudible) and Health Promotions has also supported this proposal, as has the dean from that same college, the College of Education.

BLONDER: Thank you, Roger. So we have a recommendation from Senate Council that the University Senate endorse the change of the name of Department of Theatre to the Department of Theatre and Dance in the College of Fine Arts.

none,
Is there discussion? Hearing all in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries, thank you. Thank you, Roger.
Next Greg Graf, are you here?
Greg, proposed change in the College of Health Sciences Probation and Suspension Policy.

GRAF: I'll be very quick. This is a proposal in the College of Health Sciences Undergraduate Probation and Suspension Policy. It establishes clear guidelines for students going on probation, through mediation, an establishment of suspension, qualifiers for suspension.

It outlines removal from suspension policies, it establishes a governing body and academic standing committee chaired by the Assistant Dean of Student Affairs.

It has an appellate process established, as well as a decision for (inaudible) for putting students on mediation, removal from probation.

SAOSC
It gets wide support from the and is approved by Senate Council.

BLONDER: So we have a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the University Senate approve the proposed change to the College of Health Sciences Probation and Suspension Policy.

none,
Is there discussion? Hearing all in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you, Greg.
Next Senate Rules and Elections Committee, Davy Jones is going to present the In Memoriam Honorary Degree diploma

language. Davy?

JONES: Okay. A few meetings ago we had met, where we had recommended to the Board

of

Trustees to establish a new category of honorary degree, a posthumous honorary degree, to those students that died that during their enrollment in a degree program here at UK.

Our recommendation went to the Board of Trustees, what you sent for a recommendation, and they approved it. So this new category of honorary degree exists now.

The last remaining aspect is for this Body to decide what will be the contents displayed on this new category of honorary degree.

The Rules Committee has suggested this as a display, presented this to Senate Council approved it, Senate Council has endorsed this. And this now comes to the Senate, we are the final decision-maker on what the language will be.

So upon the recommendation of the University Faculty and approval of the Board of Trustees, the President of the University (inaudible) and it will be the name of the individual, and In Memoriam Honorary degree. (Inaudible).

The font here is not necessarily what the font's going to be, it's the wording that you're looking at right now. So the President, Chair of the Board, Dean, University Registrar, (inaudible).

BLONDER: So we have a recommendation positive from Senate Council that the University Senate approve the proposed language of In Memoriam Honorary Degree diploma.

Is there discussion? Yes?

BUTLER: J. S. Butler, Graduate School. You didn't actually read the wording that's there. You read Chair of the Board of Trustees, it clearly does not say Chair.

JONES: It should say - we have a Chair of Board of Trustees. Yes.

BLONDER: So this needs to be -

JONES: Yeah.

BUTLER: (Inaudible).

BLONDER: So we need to correct this then.

BUTLER: So moved.

JONES: We make the final approval here on this. It should be Chairman of the Board or Chair --

BLONDER: Chair, Chair of the Board.

BUTLER: So moved.

GROSSMAN: Seco
nd.
Bob

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt

Grossman,
A and S.

BLONDER: So this is an amendment to the diploma. All right. Is there discussion? All in favor of the amendment? Opposed? Abstained? Amendment carries.

Now we're back to the motion as amended. Is there further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you.

The next item is also a Senate Rules and Elections Committee item, and it's going to be presented by Bob Grossman, who is a member of the Senate Rules and Elections Committee.

This is a proposed revision of Governing Regulation XI (University Appeals Board). Bob?

GROSSMAN: Whi
e
she'
s
brin
ging
up
the
actu
al

Language of the new proposed revisions for the GR, I want to give you a little bit of a history lesson.

This has to do with the Appeals Board, the relationship between the Appeals Board and the University Senate.

around So from at least the 1970s,

1970 to 2005, the Governing Regulations of the University and the Administrative Regulations of the University clearly stated that the University Appeals Board -- the authority of the University Appeals Board to act (inaudible) was clearly regulated by the University Senate.

for So the University Senate said,

example, for a long time the minimum penalty for cheating in class was an E in the class, and that was a rule that the Appeals Board had to follow.

Around 2004/2005, there was a completely unrelated dispute about a Student Government Election, and it ended up going to -- the Appeals Board got involved, and then the parties went to court, and a court ruled that there was no authority in the University Rules for the Appeals Board to make a decision about the Student Government Election.

administration So as a result, the

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
put together a revision to GR XI, which was the relevant rule, that would give the Appeals Board authority to decide whether procedures had been followed in the Student Government Election.

At the same time, they also made changes to the provisions that affected the relationship -- that authorized the relationship of the University Senate and the University Appeals Board. And they added new language that had never been in the rules before.

Up to this time, the rules had always said that the Appeals Board, once an appeals board, that it had appellate jurisdiction.

But in 2005, that language was revised to say that in particular cases, especially when a student contests guilt of an academic offense, or when the student can contest a violation of their academic rights, such as a grade being unfairly given, the Appeals Board had original jurisdiction. That was the proposed new language.

Now, at the time when this language was proposed, the Senate Council was told by

several people, and we have this in the Senate Council minutes from the time, including a representative from UK Office of General Counsel, that the proposed language did not affect the authority of the University Senate to set the rules by which the Appeals Board operated. We were told explicitly, it did not change the relationship of the University Senate and the Appeals Board.

So we took them on their word and we endorsed the proposed changes to the GR as based on what we were told at the time.

Since that time we have had a new general legal counsel join the University. And this year he issued an opinion saying oh, the original jurisdiction doesn't mean what you were told at all. We were told that what original jurisdiction meant was that the Appeals Board could hear new evidence that had not been introduced earlier. That was all it meant.

This new general counsel believes not only does it mean they can hear new evidence, but they can completely disregard the University Senate Rules.

So for example, the University Senate Rules say that if a student is found guilty of cheating, that a record of it shall be placed in the student's record. So if the student cheats again, we will be able to find out that the student is a repeat cheater and give a harsher punishment accordingly.

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
According to this new ruling by

our

General Counsel, that's not true. The University Appeals Board is under no obligation, whatsoever, to say that this person was guilty of cheating and a record of that needs to be put in the student's record. In fact, he can say, yeah, the student cheated, but it shouldn't - no record should be made of this. They now have the authority to do that.

to

Even more disturbing, according to the current general counsel -- well, according to the University Senate Rules, the Appeals Board can change a grade that an instructor gave to a student only if it is proven that the grade was given as anything other than a good faith assessment of the student's performance in the class.

that

The general counsel has ruled that the Appeals Board doesn't need to follow that (inaudible). In other words, they can change the grade for any reason they want. If a student says, I was given this grade and I don't think it's fair because it's going to ruin my chance at getting into medical school, that is good enough reason for the Appeals Board to change the grade, according to the this new general counsel's ruling.

The Rules and Elections Committee is upset about this for several reasons. First of all -- but anyway, we decided that we should propose a solution for this problem.

And the solution to the problem is simply to replace the language about original jurisdiction in GR XI with language about appellate jurisdiction. This will restore pre-2005 language, it will restore the authority of the University Senate to set the rules by which the Appeals Board operates.

much

The appellate jurisdiction is more restricted than original jurisdiction. The University Senate does still have the authority to expand the jurisdiction of the Appeals Board to more than just appellate jurisdiction.

Appeals

So this Body could say the Board has the authority to hear new information that was not presented earlier in the whole judicial process. But that's something that the University Senate would need to then give the Appeals Board. But this will restore the authority.

So there's two changes that are proposed. The first part here, which explicitly again states the University

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
Senate Rules define the procedures the UAB shall use in these cases and the scope of the actions that the UAB can take.

We think this language is unambiguous and a new general counsel could not possibly misinterpret this. Although, you never know with lawyers.

Sorry, apologies to any of our colleagues from the College of Law. I guess I just lost all those votes.

And then here, also, in cases of violation of academic rights, the UAB shall have appellate jurisdiction, and the same sentence here.

BLONDER: Okay. We have a motion. Sheila, bring that back to the motion.

GROSSMAN: One
othe
r
thin
g I
shou
ld
ment
ion
is

that the language on original jurisdiction that affects student affairs, the Rules and Elections Committee decided not to touch that language at all.

with

If the students have a problem

that language they should make a separate proposal (inaudible).

BLONDER: So we have a positive recommendation from Senate Council that the University Senate endorse the proposed language to Governing Regulation XI (University Appeals Board).

Are there questions or discussion items? Liz?

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S. Bob, you confused me a little because I thought at the Senate Council you had said that there was nothing to prohibit new evidence being introduced to the Appeals Board, and now it seemed that you were saying the Senate would have to give the authority, which is not given here, for that to happen.

GROSSMAN: Ther
e is
an
Appe
als
Boar
d --

currently, the procedures as the Appeals Board usually operates now, there is nothing to prohibit them from hearing new information. They call, they set an appointment, they set a time for the hearing, they invite the student to come.

The student can say, should say, whatever they want in their defense, if they so choose. So there's nothing prohibiting it.

All I'm saying is if the Appeals Board feels like they want that (inaudible) solicit in the language they can -- they should just come to the University Senate. Or any other authority, they should just come to the University Senate and say we would like the authority to solicit (inaudible).

DEBSKI: Yeah. But again, there's nothing prohibiting it at this point?

GROSSMAN: No. I don't think - Marc y?

DEATON: That's how it operates now.

DEBSKI: Yeah, yeah. I know. I've served on the Appeals Board. But I want to make sure the good part is in the --

DEATON: May I ask a question?

BLONDER: Yes, just state your name.

DEATON: Marcy Deaton, from Legal Office.

BLONDER: Thank you.

DEATON: To change all the original jurisdictions to appellate, it could happen that the Senate Rules then said no, a student can't appear. We want a strict appellate review of the evidence already presented. And the Legal Office would have to object to that.

GROSSMAN: The rule is, I think the rules

as they are stated now, say that the student makes his or her case to the Appeals Board. So that ruling is already there.

BLONDER: Are there any other questions or comments? Yes?

RIORDAN: Chris Riordan, Provost. Marcy, would you be willing to share the opinion of the Legal Office on

what

the original ruling was?

DEATON: Like now?

RIORDAN: Yes.

DEATON: Which opinion?

GROSSMAN: You mean what original

juri
sdic
tion

means?

RIORDAN: Yeah. I mean, I just think for clarification because he was talking about general counsel's opinion, and I don't know if he got the full --

DEATON: Yeah. When this change happened like Bob said, in 2005, before that it simply said appellate jurisdiction (inaudible) and now it says (inaudible). And they're very different. Original jurisdiction means very broadly that the UAB can hear the student, new evidence, the faculty member, make a new decision. It's as if it's never been heard before.

The distinction is in a true appellate jurisdiction, like our courts of appeal, they look at the evidence from the trial court, whatever was filed before, whatever was said before, and that's it, they can't take new evidence, they don't hear the parties again, they don't get to ask questions.

So you do not want these types here to be strictly appellate. We feel strongly that the students do need to be heard, the UAB needs to continue to be able to question them, the professor to be involved, and more like original jurisdiction.

is,

I think where the disagreement is about the sanctions at the end of that process.

GROSSMAN: The
disa
gree
ment
is -
-
the
prob
lem

is that the University Senate has always set the rules by which the Appeals Board operates and the sanctions for particular cases.

And according to the general counsel's theory of what original jurisdiction means, which again contradicts what we were told in 2005 what original jurisdiction means, but according to this new general counsel's theory, the Appeals Board does not have to follow any of the rules of the University Senate.

JONES: On sanctions.

GROSSMAN: On
case
s
wher
e

they
have
orig
inal

jurisdiction.

DEATON: It does say, in his defense, somewhere in his opinion, clearly he agreed that the Appeals Board cannot go and make up a new grade. They cannot rule to cut off the student's hand. They cannot make up new sanctions.

opinion, It says somewhere in that

that the sanctions the UAB imposes have to be consistent with the grading systems and others of you can expel someone, suspend someone, but you can't make them run around the library and paint their face blue.

So beyond that, it goes a little broader than I think the Senate Rules Committee wanted, in that in true original jurisdiction, it's not just a theory, it's the Black's Law Dictionary definition, is it if the case is never to go to court.

So if a prior general counsel interpreted it differently then we apologize. But that is what the current opinion is.

GROSSMAN:
rdle
ss
of
what
Marc
y is
sayi
ng

Rega

that original jurisdiction means, the solution to the problem that has been created is because we were unintentionally misled in 2005 as to what original jurisdiction meant.

The solution to the problem is to get rid of the words original jurisdiction, so there's no question that the University Senate has authority over academic relationships at this University. It's what SACS was told also. This ruling removes the authority of the Senate over academic relationships.

BLONDER: Gail?

BRION: Gail Bri on, College of Engineering.

Just to make sure that I understand, to sum up. This reinstates the original intent, before the change was made in 2005, that the Appeals Board was to have appellate jurisdiction even though they hear new arguments from the students and they can ask questions as prescribed under Senate Rules?

DEATON: It sounds like what you're asking for is some kind of blend of original and

appellate.

BRION: Yes.

DEATON: A lot of the processes and new processes that the students had under original, but then more limited at the end like appellate would be.

BLONDER: Davy?

JONES: Maybe from a different way. And Marcy's confirmed the Senate can do this and it's actually there now.

Appellate and as further and extended beyond limitations known as the Senate rules may provide, which we do provide, they can go and have a hearing, they can have new evidence, but it's the Senate Rules that do that rather than being in their own universe.

BRION: But we're correcting an inadvertent change that was made by not a full understanding of the definition of original and appellate.

JONES: Yes. By the previous of general counsel's interpretation being different from the present general counsel's interpretation.

DEATON: So I'll also caution you that, should a future Senate Rules Committee want to change the rules to be more restrictive, at some point, if the Appeals Board can only make the decision that's already been made, you've eliminated due process.

GROSSMAN: There's no intention to do that.

I think what Gail's saying is we're intending to restore the original intention of what we were told the rules would be in 2005.

BLONDER: Connie?

WOOD: Connie Wood, Arts and Sciences.

Just for the record, currently under 6.4.4, Appeals to the Board, there is the statement that the Appeals Board shall sit as a fact finding body and determine et cetera and so forth, the Board may call witnesses on its own initiative and may continue the hearing for this purpose.

So by the current Senate Rules, we have extended that ability to the Appeals Board.

BLONDER: Are there other comments? Liz?

DEBSKI: One more quick question. Liz Debski, A and S.

Just operationally, so either the Appeals Board can uphold the penalty given

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
by the professor or it can say no, so
you're either guilty or not guilty?

GROSSMAN: It
depe
nds
on
what
's
bei n
g

appeal ed.
DEBSKI :

Well, let's just say plagiarism.
GROSSMAN: So

if
the
stud
ent
is
appe
alin
g

their guilt, then yes. The Appeals Board
can say yes, the student is guilty of doing
this, or no, the student is not guilty of
doing this.

DEBSKI : And then if they're appealing
the --

GROSSMAN: --
the
seve
ri ty
?

DEBSKI : -- the severity of the penalty,
yeah.

GROSSMAN: Ther
e is
a
mi ni
mum
pena
l ty.
The

rules set minimum and maximum penalties
depending on the nature of the case. And
this is one of the problems.

For example, if the instructor
says the student deserves an XE for this
offense, say it's a first offense and the
instructor says an X, and the student
deserves an XE.

Appeals Under the Senate Rules, the

Board can't say, oh, we don't like this
person, we're going to say they should be
suspended, which is a harsher penalty. But
under the original jurisdiction theory,
they can do that, the Appeals Board can
increase a penalty that the instructor
imposed.

DEBSKI : But they could get a lesser
penal ty.

GROSSMAN: Acco
rdi n

g to
the
Univ
ersi
ty
Sena
te

Rules, they could get a lesser penalty with the floor being set, also. So if the student has committed offense before, the minimum for a second offense is an E in the course. Under the original jurisdiction theory, the Appeals Board could ignore prior offenses and give them just a zero for the assignment.

But if we restore the authority of the University Senate Rules, then the minimum penalty even the Appeals Board could give is an E, so they could say, oh, the student does deserve an XE this time, but we're going to reduce it to an E.

They're not authorized to reduce it even further, and they're certainly not authorized to say, we don't want to put a record of this in the student's record.

BLONDER: Are there other comments? We have a motion on the floor. All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Motion carries. Thank you, Bob. Thank you, Marcy.

GROSSMAN: So this is a recommendation from

the University Senate to the Board of Trustees. It will now be up to the Board of Trustees, they can decide.

DEATON: It has to go through the President to the Board.

GROSSMAN: Davy?

JONES: It goes through the President. The

GROSSMAN: Presi
den
t,
as
Chai
r of
the

University Senate.

BLONDER: The next item on the agenda is an update on the Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, Ben Withers, is going to do an introduction, and then we're going to hear from Co-

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
Chairs, Matt Giancarlo, and Deanna Sellnow.
WITHERS: Thank you, Lee. Realizing that
I'm
one of the last (inaudible) between you and
a lovely spring day, I will take every
effort to remove myself as quickly as
possible.

new

Last May, the Senate approved a
graduation requirement in communication and
composition, and it asked us to come back
in May to show that this could be
implemented.

We are here with the Co-Chairs of
the committee, who have done a Herculean
job this year, making sure that we could do
this.

In short, this was necessary
because of the change from USP to the new
UKCore, where we went from an English 104
requirement and a graduation writing
requirement, to a place where we're asking
students to prepare communication in
multiple mode, so written communication
and/or oral or visual communication.

And then we asked the faculty in
each department to identify where in their
programs they would achieve this
requirement, or to contract with another
department to make sure that this occurred.

work
year

As you'll see in a moment, the
that was done over the last period of a
was just absolutely phenomenal. I remember
this time last year having difficulty
sleeping because I was going oh, my God,
how can we get this done. Matt and Deanna
have showed us how it could be done. I'll
turn it over them and you can see what
we've done.

SELLNOW: We'll be really short. First of
all, one of the things that we did right
away in the beginning of the Fall was try
to identify a committee that represented a
broad cross-section of the University, and
these are the members of the GCCR Committee
that did all of the vetting, so we tried to
make sure that we represented across the
campus, and also ex-officio's that were --
could inform us of how these processes
could actually be implemented in the
Registrar's Office.

GIANCARLO: In the Fall of 2013, we
identified
the GCCR Committee members and we committed
a plan and a time table for vetting the
proposals and communicating with the campus
community.

learning

We also collected student
outcomes which were generated by each
individual program that relate to

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
composition and/or communication in
multimodal forms.

SELLNOW: And then in Spring, once we had
all of those SLOs in place, what we did, we
created a proposal submission and
evaluation forms and processes for how to
go about vetting these proposals. We
collected and vetted proposals and actually
it was 79 of 89 or was it --

GIANCARLO: 79 of 89.

SELLNOW: 79 of 89 majors were actually
approved. There were a couple that had
been suspended so we didn't need to worry
about those majors that were suspended.

the

But at any rate, 90 percent of
undergraduate degree programming, degree
granting programs have submitted, and we
vetted and forwarded the proposals with the
GCCR requirement. So we're really pleased
that people have gotten on board with that.

We also, as part of helping that
process happen, we did a soft launch, this
Fall, of the Faculty Fellows Program, the
first cohort, which you will remember,
that's our OEP, our Presentation U, and so
we had 26 faculty members from across the
campus who participated with us with an
Implementation Team to help revise and
refine their syllabi so they would have
these GCCR components in the syllabi.

in

That same cohort will work again
the Fall and the Spring to get to plan for
instruction and new instruction, grading,
and assessing of those projects.

GIANCARLO: The next slide gives a brief
summary of the numbers of what we're
looking at. The most updated numbers for
student coverage are actually slightly
lower.

We had a couple of late-breaking
changes in our information from the College
of Education and also, I believe, the
College of Design. We actually did get a
proposal from Architecture so (inaudible).

did

For those programs for which we
not receive proposals, which as we said is
relatively few, it's only 10 out of about
90, we have already contacted the programs,
and in a number of cases they already have
proposals that are ready to go, it's just
that something impeded them from going
through the expedited process that we
(inaudible) Fall and Spring.

The upshot is that 90 percent of
the campus is ready to go, this is a
requirement that kicks in after 30 hours,
for the undergraduate students, so, in
fact, we have about a year of lead time
before we have students who will be
clamoring to take these GCCR courses.

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt

In that time we will be establishing the review process as the normal part of the course proposal, vetting and approval procedure that we are all familiar with.

SELLNOW: Going forward, we will continue to support this initiative process through Presentation U, and the Faculty Fellows will be soliciting a call here within the next couple of weeks for the next cohort of Faculty Fellows.

And remember that every single semester there's a new cohort of 25 Faculty Fellows that the Implementation Team of experts will work with to get their curriculum and instruction ready so that they feel good about how they can do this in their courses.

WITHERS: That's it. Questions or comments?

GROSSMAN: Bravo.

SELLNOW: In order to have done what we've done over the course of this year, that team, that group of people worked like crazy. Really like crazy. Every week we met for an hour and a half to two hours. And in between times, every one of these members would go back to the units and departments that they represent and work with the faculty of record to get things up to speed and resubmit their proposals. It was amazing.

GIANCARLO: So if you see familiar names from your colleges and programs, please thank them.

SELLNOW: Thank them, yes. And thank you.
BLONDER: Thank you very much. We have one last thing that we need to do before we adjourn, and that's to pass the gavel.

This is my last Senate Council meeting as Senate Council Chair. It's been a pleasure to do this job. I thank you so much for the privilege. And I've enjoyed working with so many of you in getting to know the way this University operates at the higher level.

Andrew, is going to be our Senate Council Chair come June 1st, and I'd like everyone to welcome him.

HIPPISLEY: Before Lee goes, I want to say a few words. On behalf of Senate Council, on behalf of Senate, on behalf of the University, I'd like to thank Lee for two years of tireless service, especially that first year, we will never forget in the history of Kentucky. I won't go into detail. And as a token of thanks, this door actually opens.

BLONDER: Oh, how sweet.

HIPPISLEY: And one last thing. There's a well-known saying, behind every Chair,

UKSenateMeeting-5-5-14.txt
there is a great Vice-Chair. So I'd like
also on behalf of the Senate Council, on
behalf of the Senate, on behalf of the
University, to thank the Vice-Chair for two
years of wonderful service to all of us.
Connie Wood?

HIPPISLEY: Oh, a question?

LARSON: Susan Larson, Arts and Sciences.
I was asked by a number of my constituents
to express my gratitude to the entire

Senate

Council, but especially to Lee Blonder,
(inaudible) detail, but there is a phrase
at the end of the memo that was written by
Senate Council (inaudible) Lee Blonder,
(inaudible) in the Fall of 2012, a memo to
President Capilouto, there's language
expressed promoting the values espoused in
our government, with governing regulations
particularly with mutual respect and human
dignity in all future personnel actions.
And that's a very, very memorable moment.
So not just my gratitude, but gratitude
from a number of my constituents.

BLONDER: Thank you so much.

HIPPISLEY: I move to adjourn --

BLONDER: Ask for a motion.

HIPPISLEY: I need a motion to adjourn.

UNIDENTIFIED: So moved.

UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

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 23rd day of
July, 2014.

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

NOTARY ID 440572