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Welcome to the October meeting of the University Senate. We have a busy agenda today, so let me go over very briefly how we're going to structure the meeting.

There's not much to say about the minutes at present. The minutes from the last meeting are not available. This may not be as critical as in previous years since we have a full transcript at every meeting that's available as well, but the minutes from the September meeting will become available for your approval as soon as they are.

We have several resolutions, several announcements and then after that we will have some potential action items. We will have one discussion item, and then we have several reports from various people in the University community.

So, first in terms of announcements -- Well, let's do the resolutions first.

The first resolution that we have will be presented by Jim Hougland from Sociology. It's a memorial resolution.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

MR. HOUGLAND: Good afternoon.

Willis A. Sutton, Jr., Professor
Emeritus of Sociology at the University of Kentucky, passed away at the age of 85 on September 18, 2002. He was a faculty member at the University of Kentucky from 1952 until his retirement in 1982. He remained an active part of the intellectual life of the Department and also the civic life of Lexington until only a few months prior to his death.

Willis received his degrees from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and devoted his career to research, teaching and service related to his specialization in sociology of the community.

A few highlights of his career:

He served as Executive Director of the Bureau of Community Service from 1955 to 1965. He helped found and became the president in 1964 of the Kentucky Council for Community and Area Development. He directed a number of interdisciplinary training programs for development workers from India, Pakistan, the Philippines and Indonesia. He was an instructor in the University's training program for Peace Corps volunteers. In 1959 through 1960, under the auspices of the Ford Foundation, he lived in India and conducted research concerning the country's community development program. The research led to the publication of

In the last several years before his official retirement, he served as Chair of the Department of Sociology. As Chair, he successfully encouraged open communication within a diverse department, worked for the effective integration of undergraduate education into a research-oriented university, and introduced many procedures that continue to be used by the department.

Willis had the personal characteristics that make for a wonderful colleague and a highly successful faculty member and department Chair. He had a lively sense of intellectual curiosity, a profound interest in local and global affairs, a disciplined and superbly organized approach to his work, and an unflagging commitment to the welfare of his colleagues.

Those of us who were junior colleagues during his time as Chair found -- I count myself among those -- were very fortunate in that he willingly took the time to help us understand the vagaries of academia and the mysterious workings of the University's administration.

Willis Sutton is survived by his wife of sixty years, Dorothy Drake Sutton, "Dot," by three
children, six grandchildren, and one great grandson. He was an elder of Second Presbyterian Church and active in several civic organizations.

His passing represents a loss for the University of Kentucky, Lexington, and the discipline of Sociology.

Thank you.

CHAIR DEMBO: To pay tribute and in memoriam, could I ask that we all please rise for a moment.

(ALL RISE - SILENCE)

CHAIR DEMBO: If there are no objections, that will be recorded in the minutes of today's Senate meeting. (No response.) I have another resolution to be entered in response to the resolution recognizing Bill Fortune for his contributions to the University Senate, we received a letter from him dated September 23 that reads as follows:

(Reading:) Dear Jeff and Senate Council:

Thank you for the Senate resolution. I enjoyed for the most part my two years as Council Chair.
(LAUGHTER)

Being active in the Greater University brought me into contact with folks in every college, took me to places I never would have gone, and confirmed what I've always known: that UK faculty and staff are for the most part trying to do the best job possible to make UK a great University.

Sincerely, Bill.

Again, if there are no objections, I would like that to be entered in the University Senate minutes. (No response.)

And now a belated welcome to all of our new Senators, whom I failed to acknowledge at our first meeting. I thought we had a very nice orientation session following President Todd's discourse last time.

As a result of that there were several good ideas that were suggested. One of them you've already seen, and that is a reminder to be sent to all Senators prior to a Senate meeting to give Senators the opportunity to explain an absence in advance, and a few other ideas that we'd like to embrace over the rest of this year.
Other announcements: There were three committee Chairs elected by different committees. The Academic Planning and Priorities Committee. Professor John Hahn from Engineering was elected from that committee. The Admissions and Academic Standards Committee. Professor Mark Hanson was elected. And the Retroactive Withdrawals Committee. Professor Bret Ripley from LCC was elected. Thank you all very much for agreeing to serve.

Another announcement: In the next week there will be a broadcast message sent by me to all faculty with a couple of items. One of them is to enumerate the various administrative regulations that are up for consideration for revision. And most of these are based on recommendations from SACs. Some of them are based on internal reorganization, things relating to the Provost model, et cetera. So all faculty will be asked for input but I hope, especially, that the Senators will take a good moment to take a look at these and to read carefully any changes that you think should be questioned or revisited.
There was also a suggestion made at the
orientation meeting and by one committee: Why don't we
broadcast to all faculty at the University a
solicitation for suggestions on University Senate
activity? There may be issues at the local college or
departmental level or even broader issues that affect
many faculty but for which the Senate up to now has not
had a clearly organized response or has not examined
certain issues. So that's another thing that all
faculty will have the opportunity to do. And then the
Senate Council will discuss that and figure out what
the most appropriate ways might be to address the
issues brought up.

Again, in the way of announcements: I
think that Professor Canon, as Chair of the Rules and
Elections Committee, has an update for us on the Board
of Trustees election.

MR. CANON: Well, the deadline
for nominations was last Friday at 4:30 and we received
seven nominations, and I'll read them off in
alphabetical order.

Glen Collins of the College of
Agriculture. We have pictures, Jeff tells me, that are
taken off the Web and may not actually represent --
Second, Fred Debeer of the College of Medicine;
Third, Boyd Haley of the Arts and Sciences, Chemistry Department;
Fourth, Davie Jones of the Graduate School of Toxicology;
Fifth, Roy Moore of the College of Communication, Information Science in the Journalism Program;
Sixth, John Pacaro of the College of Pharmacy; and
Seventh, Ernest Yanerella of the College of Arts and Sciences, Department of Political Science.
That's not too bad.

The procedure is as follows:
The seven nominees will be sent to you by an electronic ballot, probably around the middle of next week, say around the 23rd of October. And, you know, we would probably ask you to respond back by the, I think it's the 8th of November would be the Friday. Things could get delayed a little, but this is what we're planning on. And there will be no information...
about the candidates distributed with the first ballot.

The three persons with the highest vote will then be put on a second ballot, unless one of the seven gets a majority. Otherwise, the three persons with the highest vote will be put on a second ballot and biographical information and statements about candidacy will be included for each of the three candidates. And you will be able to vote for a second choice on that ballot in case your first choice is not among the top two.

Now, we have a problem. The Senate Council has asked all of the colleges to get a list of eligible members of the faculty in, and only half have done so. And I'm going to name the delinquent colleges -- (laughter) -- and if any of the Deans are here of these colleges, get your staff working on it. We're going to need these names in as soon as possible and if you don't get them in, your faculty will be disfranchised. (Laughter)

Okay, we have not heard from Health Science; Architecture; Arts and Sciences, a big college; Communication and Information Studies; Education; the Graduate School; Law; Nursing; and LCC, also a big group. So get on your Deans or Associate
Deans to get these in. They've been sitting in the
Dean's office for a month.

CHAIR DEMBO: Thank you, Brad.

MR. _______: Brad?

MR. CANON: Yes.

MR. _______: The electronic ballot -- how are we going to handle the faculties that
don't have an e-mail address or maybe it's incorrect,
the one that's in the directory right now?

MR. CANON: I don't know. I'm not the technical person on this. Jeff is meeting with
a technical person on Wednesday. This could be a
problem -- people with incorrect e-mail addresses. Is
there anybody who doesn't have e-mail?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes, there are.

MR. KENNEDY: I think there are 400 faculty who do not have e-mail
addresses.

MR. CANON: Four hundred faculty? That's a lot.

MR. KENNEDY: I asked for all
of the e-mail addresses from the faculty and was told I
got all but 400.

COURT REPORTER: May I have
your name, please?
MR. KENNEDY: Michael Kennedy.

MR. CANON: I don't know if I can top that. That seems like an awfully large number. What are we, a backward University? (Laughter)

I mean, I can see certain people who sort of live ephemerally in their ivory tower not having e-mail.

CHAIR DEMBO: One advantage that we have in this particular case, since each college will be submitting an Excel spreadsheet a qualified faculty, then we don't necessarily have to rely on e-mail IDs, but it might require faculty to go to a computer to actually put their vote in. So that's what I have to work out with John Soherd from programming this week. Question--

MR. GESUND: Hans Gesund, Engineering. What happens to secret ballots?

MR. CANON: E-mail identifies the sender.

CHAIR DEMBO: Without going into to all the details, the way that this worked for the Staff Senate election was that when a vote comes in electronically, it goes into two databases. One, into the personnel database indicating that somebody in fact
voted one time and cannot vote again. And then
separated from that is the vote that goes into a
separate database to tally the number of votes for a
particular candidate. And the only person who would
have access to matching the two would be the systems
programmer. That's the way the Staff Senate election
did it, and it seemed like a good model to follow.

Professor Kraemer, did you have
another--

MR. KRAEMER: I just wanted to
point out that since the undergraduate council had the
distinct pleasure of running the elections for council
members, we discovered that there are some faculty who
are principally opposed to e-mail. So this is no
just-technical issue of how you get the ballots out
there. But perhaps at some point we have discussions
in the Senate that we want to dissuade anyone from
being principally opposed to electronic communications.
(Laughter)

CHAIR DEMBO: And we didn't
get a SACs recommendation for that?

MR. KRAEMER: Maybe next time,
Jeff.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Next on
the agenda are announcements we have to make of Senate Council actions. There were three rules waivers by the Senate Council since the Senate last met. Two were student reinstatements concerning students that had been suspended two times. The other was a grade change.

There was another Senate Council action based on a request from the College of Dentistry, Dr. Karen West. A clerical error had been made in publishing the College of Dentistry's calendar. The intent had been to have the graduation date coincide with the University's graduation date, but the wrong date was put in. The Council approved the request, the changes, and if there are no objections at the Senate level, then these changes will be put forward to the Registrar and other officials of the University. (No response.)

Okay, before we start on some of the action items, there's one report that we'll give right now. Professor Scollay from the Academic Ombud Office has to leave a little bit early, so instead of having her go later in the program, I'd like for her to come up right now and introduce herself and talk a little bit about the Ombud Office.
MS. SCOLLAY: Thanks, Jeff, and thanks for the opportunity to speak with you all. I don't have a report like the Ombud usually issues in terms of how many complaints and what kinds of complaints and from what colleges, but I would be happy to prepare that with the data from last year that the previous Ombud collected. If it would be informative to you, I'd be happy to get that for you. Jeff asked me to spend just a couple of minutes talking with you about the Ombud office and my approach to the Ombud office, given that I'm new in that position, though I've been here at the University of Kentucky for quite a long time.

When I interviewed with the Selection Committee at the beginning of the process that led to me being here today, they asked why do you want to do this, and I said that it was another way of University service and it would provide me an opportunity to get into parts of the University that I hadn't been in in quite a while, and I thought it would be another opportunity to work with students, particularly undergraduate students. So that was my initial approach.

Since becoming Ombud, I've had the
opportunity to learn much about the profession of Ombudding. I didn't know that it was a profession, but it is in fact. There are several national and international organizations of Ombuds, and my approach to the responsibilities that I now have is somewhat more complex than it was when I first started the job. Basically, my approach now comes from three different sets of wisdom and tradition and values.

Coming first out of the Center for Academic Integrity, of which the University of Kentucky is a member, and it's headquartered at Duke University, are the fundamentals values of the office as I am running it. They include honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility, both on the part of students and on the part of faculty and staff to the extent that they get involved in upholding the tradition of academic integrity.

Second, the scope of the work obviously comes from the Senate rules. Three major sections of the Senate rules, those that enumerate student academic rights, as one of my functions as Ombud is to protect student academic rights. Secondly, the section that delineates academic offenses and other specific offenses that students commit during their academic
program. And third, the Code of Faculty Responsibilities. I admitted to our Provost when I was talking to him not too long ago something that I probably shouldn't have and that was before I became Ombud, I didn't know there was a Code of Faculty Responsibilities. (Laughter)

Yeah, there is. And it's very important. And it has rather strong and powerful language in it about how we are to deal with one another and how we are to deal with students, and I have found that language to be very useful in a couple of cases already where students haven't been treated particularly appropriately by the instructors in their courses. So that's a very important document that I work with.

And, finally, from UCOA, the University and College Ombud Association, comes the governing principals through which my office functions, the procedures of my office. And those are independence, neutrality, and confidentiality. I think those are all very, very important and even though I've only been on the job three months, barely three months, I've had enumerable opportunities, occasions and challenges to invoke all three of those principals.
My primary objective for this year -- You may or may not know it, the Ombud position is a one-year appointment. I think that's to allow the University to correct a mistake if its made one and also to allow the Ombud to correct a mistake if he or she has made one in taking on the responsibilities.

My primary objective for this year is to raise the profile of the Ombud and the Office of Academic Ombud Services, particularly as a voice for academic integrity. And I've already been doing that in a variety of ways. I have spoken to several UK 101 classes. Jeff suggested that I tell you exactly how many, and I don't have that many fingers and toes. I think I've talked to about 28 UK 101 classes so far. That's 50-minute discussion of academic integrity, student rights and student academic offenses. I've also met with three or four different sets of new graduate students in their graduate student orientation and talked about issues of academic integrity and professionalism. And I met with the new TAs, and gave them a session on academic integrity, student rights and student offenses, academic offenses.

We have the brochure, which was developed by an earlier Academic Ombud. It's been
revised, and I think you all have a copy of it. And we have a Web site in process. It's actually up on the Web; the challenge is to find it. It is not part of the search indexes yet on the University of Kentucky Web page, but it will be soonly, and it's a work in progress. So over the course of this year, I hope to get out the beginning-of-semester reminders, the end-of-semester reminders, work on plagiarism and some work on academic integrity in addition to the material that's basically in the brochure.

So, again, I appreciate the opportunity to serve the University in this capacity. I hope I don't hear from any of you; but if I do, I hope I can help you out. Michele Soner is in the office about 12 hours every day. We accept e-mail, phone calls, drop-ins, whatever. Just contact us any way you can if you have a question or a concern.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR DEMBO: Later in the Agenda, Joe Anthony, the Academic Ombud at LCC, will be giving a report on his activity.

I want to review for Senators what the ten-day rule is and put it in perspective. The Agenda for the Senate, plus all recommendations, shall be
circulated to all members at least ten days prior to
the Senate meeting. This particular Senate meeting,
there were a number of committees and items that came
up in such a time that it was not possible to get it to
the Senate for the Agenda to comply with the ten-day
rule. However, all the matters were considered by the
appropriate committees and by the Senate Council.

So what I'd like to do is to, with
general consensus and without objections, to put three
items on the Agenda for today that would be action
items. One of them is a proposal to amend the Senate
Rules to adopt the term of what a "major" means. The
second is to change the Senate Rules to allow for a
specification of IB credit. And the third is a
proposal to establish a College of Design and a School
of Architecture. These are just the general
descriptions and having no objections means we can put
it on the floor at least for consideration and for
possible action.

MR. GESUND: So moved.
MR. CANON: Second.
CHAIR DEMBO: All in favor?
("AYE" VOICE VOTE: ALL)
CHAIR DEMBO: Thank you. All
opposed.

("NAY" VOICE VOTE: NONE)

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. So to start off with, we have Professor Waldhart, who is the Vice Chair of the Senate Council, to present the first topic.

MS. WALDHART: SACs reminded us that we do not have the definition of a "major" and that when they searched through our bulletin and through our regulations they discovered that we had no definition of a "major." So now we're proposing that we have a definition of a "major."

This has gone through the -- I was getting ready to say the Committee. The Office of the Registrar proposed this, it came to the Senate Council, the Senate Council made some adjustments in terms of wording, and this is what we propose for you.

A major is a primary area of study defined by a set of course and/or credit-hour requirements within specified disciplines. Within degree programs, majors may be further defined by requirements in an area of emphasis, also known as an option.
We offer this with the recommendation of the Senate Council, so it needs no second. It's up to you.

CHAIR DEMBO: So it is on the agenda. It's on the floor now because the Senate Council put it there. What discussion do you have, or questions?

MR. ROWLAND: I was just wondering--

CHAIR DEMBO: Please announce your name.

MR. ROWLAND: Dan Rowland from the Department of History.

Many majors are interdisciplinary and she used the word "discipline." I don't want to delay the discussion on a lot of other important things but maybe they don't -- "...within specified disciplines."

It seems to me many majors are interdisciplinary, by definition. So, maybe you could just strike that "within specified disciplines," or you could say it "within specified disciplines or among disciplines."

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Any responses? (No response.)

So the suggestion was to take out the term "specified disciplines," because there are some
interdisciplinary majors.

MR. ROWLAND: Right.

CHAIR DEMBO: I think the sentiment of the Senate Council was that it was important to say that there were recognized disciplines within which a major would be pursued, but I think the word -- that the letter "s" after disciplines could also be construed as to embrace what you're talking about.

MR. ROWLAND: That's fine with me. I don't want to delay anybody, but that's not the way that I would have read it.

CHAIR DEMBO: Any other comments? (No response.)

Okay, so it's on the floor now. Is there a motion to accept?

MR. GESUND: So moved.

MR. DESIMONE: Second.

CHAIR DEMBO: Any other discussion? (No response.)

All in favor of accepting the definition of a major say aye.

("AYE" VOICE VOTE: ALL)

CHAIR DEMBO: All opposed say
nay.

("NAY" VOICE VOTE: NONE)

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. The second item presented by Professor Waldhart is regarding IB credit.

MS. WALDHART: Some of you may not know about IB credit because you may have come from schools that didn't offer this. We are very familiar with AP credit, with CLEP credit, with other kinds of preparatory work. And last spring, I believe, Dr. Kraemer talked with us about the possibility of doing this International Baccalaureate kind of credit. (Power Point presentation)

As you see, these are accelerated programs -- I guess you can read it or do you want me to read it all the way through? The idea here is that students would come into college with this credit just like the AT credit that they currently get. There is a list of courses and departments.

Do you have that, Jeff?

CHAIR DEMBO: Yes.

MS. WALDHART: Okay. That you can sort of see what it is. Because it functions very much like the AP credit. So that depending on the
level that a student takes in terms of taking the exam, they would receive credit for the courses listed. And so, in that sense, it will operate very much like the AP credit currently does. You will see on the actual proposal that there were some things that were underlined and crossed out; those are changes that the Senate Council proposed and now offer it to you for your consideration.

CHAIR DEMBO: Also, just by way of background, in the bulletin as it exists on page 48 and 49 is a table enumerating the various types of credits students can get for AP exams and what score they would have to get, and this would be added in a very similar manner to the same table. These two pages show that the departments have already decided what types of credits students should get based on the score that they receive on the IB exam.

Is Cindy here? Cindy, do you have anything to add. Cindy Eiton from Central Advising.

MS. EITON: I'm from the College of Arts and Sciences. And, no.

CHAIR DEMBO: I'm sorry.

Undergraduate advising. Okay, is there a motion to accept this proposal to change the Senate rule to
reflect IB credit.

MR. TAGAVI: I don't think we need a motion.

MS. WALDHART: We don't need a motion.

CHAIR DEMBO: Don't need a motion. Okay, so we're ready for a vote then.

MR. CANON: Have the departments all approved these, credits or hours of credits or course numbers?

CHAIR DEMBO: Cindy?

MS. EITON: Yes, the directors of undergraduate studies in consultation with the Chairs in each of those departments were the ones who evaluated the curriculum, as well as the examinations in each of these areas through the International Baccalaureate and this is the credit that they proposed. We took the standard level or higher level of standards. The standard level courses are one year, which is the same as with AP courses. Higher level courses are a two-year program in that area. But, yes, the departments have all looked at those. And that's not total list; some of them are still being evaluated.

CHAIR DEMBO: One slide you
may not have seen is that faculty reps from the Arts and Sciences departments who had conducted the course reviews, the Associate Provost, a number of people met in this before it came forward.

Any other questions or discussion?

MR. PERRIER: Is there a limit on the number of...
go ahead, Cindy? Also, take a look at the asterisk
down at the bottom here.

MS. EITON: The proposal
that's before the Senate is to allow the departments to
make those decisions, just as they already do for AP
and CLEP and so forth.

CHAIR DEMBO: And the stimulus
for this was the increasing number of high schools
offering IB-type courses and wanting to know what types
of credit their students would get for it at the
University. Is that right, Cindy?

MS. EITON: That's right.

CHAIR DEMBO: Other questions?

Okay, so the motion on the floor is to accept this
proposed change in the rule to reflect IB credit.

All in favor, say aye.

("AYE" VOICE VOTE: ALL)

CHAIR DEMBO: All opposed say
nay.

("NAY" VOICE VOTE: NONE)

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay, the motion
passes.

The third action item is a proposal to
create a College of Design at the University of
Kentucky. Professor Waldhart?

MS. WALDHART: This is a bit more complicated proposal, but it comes out of activities from the committees from last year who were looking at changes in structure and the kinds of things that we might do to forward the University's position as a Top-Twenty institution.

The School of Interior Design and the College of Architecture proposed the creation of a new college, a College of Design. What it would currently do is take Interior Design, Architecture and Historic Preservation disciplines and consolidate them into one academic unit. This will increase the presence on campus, as we're looking at it, and they're hoping that this will also increase future interaction with other disciplines on campus, notably Engineering, Landscape Architecture and Geography.

But for right now, what we're just talking about are the three units being formed into an enlarged college with the new name, College of Design. This, as it says, reflects an increasing interaction of the disciplines nationally, and so that we offer this as a proposal.

This has been discussed in a number of
varieties and forums and programs. The Senate Council had particular concern about how the voting was actually done within the particular units, and so the question that the Senate Council raised as we looked at the proposal was simply to identify how that kind of response from the faculty had taken place.

The proposals that we had received indicated that this had all been done last spring and there are some changes that were made over the summertime. And so we wanted to make sure that the faculty had had input and that this was confidential input.

We had contacted -- the Senate Council Chair contacted the Interior Design faculty and because of the need for a timely vote and a timely response, what we decided was that it was acceptable for the faculty in the unit to vote and forward their vote to the Senate Council Chair, who then accumulated the votes. They were unanimous in favor of this change.

In the College or Architecture, there is no means for doing confidential ballots. Faculty is relatively small and so they had not needed this. And so it was agreed that the representatives from the College of Architecture who were elected
representatives would be here today to provide any
further indication of support from the College of
Architecture faculty.

Does that answer the questions?

CHAIR DEMBO: I'll add one
more thing to that, Enid. Just to put it into
perspective, this amalgamation of Interior Design and
the College of Architecture becoming the School of
Design would have occurred with acting Provost
Nietzel's proposed interim reorganization. So in that
case, these departments and colleges would not have had
to come up with formal proposals. However, because of
the Senate Council's indication that we felt that was
not the right way to go, it put it back to square one
and now these departments and colleges had to write up
formal proposals to satisfy the Senate rules.

Again, the concern of the Senate
Council, not just with this proposal but with all
future proposals, is that we ensure that all faculty
have the chance in a confidential and unencumbered
manner to voice their vote without any fear of
reprisal. So, to that end, all Interior Design faculty
very easily e-mailed the Senate Council office and the
vote was unanimous that all had read the proposal and
were in favor of it.

And I wonder, David, first, before we get it on the table, do you have Senators from your college? Is there a Senator from the College of Architecture? Would you care to speak on behalf, as the elected representative?

MS. PRIDE-WELLS: Michaele Pride-Wells of the College of Architecture.

Well, as suggested in the report, this has been the subject of ongoing discussions, debate, et cetera, both within our college and together with the School of Interior Design and also the Department of Landscape Architecture over the last couple of years.

We've had a task force operating together through the three disciplines. And I would say that, for the most part, although we did not have a vote within the College of Architecture specifically accepting the latest proposal draft. The discussion has always been that way. There's been kind of a consensus by the lack of disapproval, if you will -- lack of protest, I would say -- that has been an ongoing discussion and everybody's kind of come to this conclusion and supported the proposal in concept.

CHAIR DEMBO: So, Professor
Pride-Wells, if we were to have taken a confidential vote of the faculty, what you're saying is that the vast majority would have been in favor of the proposal.

MS. PRIDE-WELLS: Yes.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. So this is what the Senate Council was looking for before putting it on the agenda. And it sounds that it's been justified to the extent that it should be at least placed on the agenda before you.

Would Professor Dickson or Dean Mohney like to add to what's been said?

Ann, are you here?

MS. DICKSON: Yes, I'm right here.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Ann is the Chair of Interior Design.

MS. DICKSON: I don't know that I have anything extra to add to the discussion. This is something that we as a faculty in Interior Design have been working on for at least three years. And I can say I've been here 22 years and every year that I've been here I've had students say to me, why are we in the college we're in; and I learned the pat answer when I was first here, but I'll have to say it's
become much more difficult to answer them as the years have gone by. Because what's happened in the last 22 years is, this has been a national trend across the country with more and more universities combining these programs under a single college because these professions in the real world work together on a daily basis. And it only makes sense that they would have the opportunity in the university to also have some association with each other. I think it's something that must be done now for UK to be able to move forward.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Mohney?

MR. MOHNEY: Thank you, Jeff. I'm pleased to speak in favor of this. As Ann Dickson has pointed out, this is really the intertwining of a series of different threads that have been occurring for a decade or longer in the professional world, on this campus and in other places.

I think for the College of Architecture, the discussions have been wrapped up, and the discussion has gone on for six years about the movement to a graduate professional-degree program. That was
approved by the Senate last year; and, within that, it was understood that the opportunity for additional interactive governing programs was something to be sought out. So now this has become official in that regard.

The traditions within the College I think may be different than other academic units. In my nine years here, I don't know that we have ever had a confidential vote as part of the culture -- and it doesn't have to. If there are expectations from the Senate that it be made clear that we needed to have one, we probably would have. But to this point, we don't feel -- or I'm at least unaware that there's been a need for any kind of confidential statements.

We did encourage faculty to express their opinions, positive or negative, about this directly to the Senate Council and if you've heard negative reports, then you should take them credibly. But I think my sense of this is that this has been a long time coming, there's a broad base of support for it, a lot of good reasons to do that, so I'm in favor of it.

CHAIR DEMBO: I'd like to defer to a previous Senator, Henry deHaan, Professor in
the College of Architecture, and ask him to elaborate
from his point of view about interaction with the
Senate.

MR. deHAAN: My name is Henry
deHaan. I'm a faculty in the College of Architecture.

I think there's no question in our mind, in your mind, and also in the Senate that we need to merge. I think that it is not simply a trend; I think it is for our students, our faculty to interact and become better scholars. And certainly as the University is moving toward the new agenda that is part of the mission statement, I think our role in the community and neighborhood and in the State of Kentucky can only talk of excellence. And though the merging together is ultimately the question of being a new department, I think it is more to be part of a new whole that you'd be striving for.

Regarding the process, as my accent says I'm not an American, the democratic process, I have never seen it in action. I have been to every faculty meeting, assembly meeting, ad hoc committees, and you all know what that is. I have never seen such democratic endeavor being set in place. Faculty have ironed out these questions that arose if we merge. I
think we have had faculty meetings, we've had a faculty
retreat, we brought moderators, experts to help us. We
have rewritten the curriculum in the expectation that
we will be merging, but I have never heard anyone say
anything about this is not what one should do.

We all have our own ideas of what this
new college should be, but I would like to congratulate
our faculty, our Dean, and also the Dean and the
faculty of Interior Design, that we have all respected
each other in our difficult decisions.

And as the last point, this is nothing
new. The College of Design and the College of
Architecture have worked in tandem since several years.
I'm presently teaching Interior Design. It's a breath
of fresh air for my colleagues, and I think it would be
also an incredible endeavor. I think we're part of the
University. I think we need to be part of this bigger
picture, and I would just like to say that I think that
every faculty wants this college, this new College of
Design. And all voted -- have consciously -- Well,
without a formal ballot, we are all in favor of this
merger.

CHAIR DEMBO: Thank you.

On behalf of the Senate and in terms of
continuing careful and thorough deliberation of this proposal, the Academic Organization and Structure Committee considered it, and Professor Kay Chard will speak on behalf of that Committee. She's the Chair.

MS. CHARD: First of all, I want to thank my committee. We had an incredible amount of materials to review in a very, very short amount of time, including e-mails and other documents, so they get a big round of applause for doing vigorously.

We did review the proposal and what we noticed right off the bat is that there did seem to be a lot of approval for it, but there were a couple of areas that were still of concern to us. And the first, of course, was the vote. And it wasn't just the vote from Interior Design and Architecture; it was from the College of HES as a whole. And we did not see a vote there. We also noticed that there were a couple of things missing from the proposal. And that involved the budget from HES, the five staff lines from HES, and the courses from HES. So what we decided to do was e-mail all of the Deans involved -- the two Deans, the Association Dean, and then all of the Chairs -- to ask for some assurance
that all of these things would be taken care of. And we also e-mailed Provost Nietzel, and we had wonderful response. Every one of these people e-mailed me back in under 24 hours. And they did assure us that part of the reason why we couldn't address the budgetary issues and the staff lines is that until all of HES is disbanded, it's very hard to place this money in these lines in different places, and the other three departments in HES have not decided completely where they are going and if they are going together.

So as a Committee, we unanimously approved the proposal for the moving of one department, Interior Design, out of HES. But we did so with a stipulation that in the future make sure that this move is handled carefully where this budget material, these staff lines are carefully divided between the four departments and HES. And we also made a mandate within our committee that all proposals must come to us a week ahead of our meeting, and we now have set a monthly meeting that occurs on the last Monday of any given month, and that will give us plenty of time to contact people; and if we do need a vote in a College that doesn't particularly take a vote, we can get one and it will be much easier on everybody.
CHAIR DEMBO: Are there any questions for Professor Chard about the activities or the opinions of her Committee?

MR. CIBULL: Yes--

CHAIR DEMBO: Mike, give your name, please.

MR. CIBULL: Mike Cibull, College of Medicine.

How many faculty are there in the College of Architecture?

MR. deHAAN: Twenty-two.

MR. CIBULL: And you just eluded to the fact that something is going to happen to this other?

MS. CHARD: The three remaining departments in HES, it has been with us since they all have disbanded, and I can't speak for those.

MR. CIBULL: How does this affect them in the College of Design?

MS. CHARD: It's a -- From what I heard from all of the Department Chairs, they assume that the disbanding is a done deal, and that's a whole separate issue and wasn't put on our table. And that they will keep putting forward proposals to us as
to where they're going. There's been some talk of moving them together, but now there's some talk about separating them and putting them in different places. And we can't speak to those proposals. But there was unanimous support from the remaining three department Chairs for the move of Interior Design.

CHAIR DEMBO: Mike, did that answer the question?

MR. CIBULL: (Affirmative nodding.)

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Other questions?

MR. YATES: Steve Yates, Chemistry Department.

As I understand, there is also an action that this would create a Department of Historic Preservation. Is that correct?

CHAIR DEMBO: No. That was taken care of, I believe, last semester. David, is that right? The Department of Historic Preservation?

MR. MOHNEY: No. I don't think it was taken care of last semester.

CHAIR DEMBO: Let me ask our historian here, Ms. Todd.
MS. TODD: I'm sorry. What was the question?

CHAIR DEMBO: The Historic Preservation. That this action also creates a new Department of Historic Preservation, which I had thought had already been accomplished.

MS. TODD: No, no. This program -- Well, wait a minute. I'm sorry, I can't tell you that off the top of my head. The Department of Historic Preservation? I don't think so. There's a program --

CHAIR DEMBO: I see some hands in the audience.

MR. GESUND: Hans Gesund, Engineering.

I have a joint appointment in the College of Architecture and also an appointment in the Historic Preservation program as a faculty member. It's a program at this point within the College of Architecture. This will set it up as a department and the program Director will become the department Chair. The program Director is also the DDS of that program, of the Historic Preservation program. And they have even been very successful in attracting
funding for the program, so the program is well under way. In fact, I'm teaching a course in it at this point, a 500-level course. So it's a working program. I'm in favor of it becoming a department, though I doubt that it's going to affect any faculty member intimately.

And I think the whole thing, as a faculty member primarily in Engineering, but with the joint appointment and teaching in those programs, I'm heartily in favor of this.

CHAIR DEMBO: Dean Mohney.

MR. MOHNEY: Professor Gesund sits in on the College of Architecture faculty meetings and I call him our parliamentarian and he's a welcome presence there. But I think in this case he's mistaken. In fact, it will remain a program within the new College of Design. It will not be a department in

MR. GESUND: That's not what it says here.

MR. MOHNEY: It says clearly that the Master of Historic Preservation program -- presently they call it the Architectural -- will become a Department in the College of Design.

MR. GESUND: My mistake.
MS. CHARD: Page two, third paragraph, last sentence.

CHAIR DEMBO: Question?

MR. CIBULL: Well, I didn't get to ask my question. Because I was going to ask: If this is going to be established as a department, how many faculty have a primary assignment in that department?

CHAIR DEMBO: Dean Mohney.

MR. MOHNEY: One faculty member.

CHAIR DEMBO: So one faculty member has that as his primary appointment. But there are other faculty who have joint appointments?

MR. MOHNEY: I can't speak to that.

MR. DOMER: There are about 20--

CHAIR DEMBO: Please introduce yourself for the record.

MR. DOMER: Dennis Domer, Historic Preservation.

There are about 20 interdisciplinary faculty currently appointed to the department, many of
whom teach primary courses, required courses. And I think it's just a matter of how you view the University, and I view the University as an interdisciplinary place, not necessarily as a single discipline, which Historic Preservation is very interdisciplinary. So, to me, I have 20 active faculty members and it doesn't matter to me whether they're primarily there or secondarily there. I consider them to be an important foundation of people without whom I could not be able to work. And frankly, it doesn't matter to me whether we're a department or a program, if you want to know the truth. (Laughter) What difference does it make?

CHAIR DEMBO: So, Professor Domer, from a point of recruiting faculty or attracting students or gaining resources, then to you it wouldn't make a difference if it was a program or a department. Is that correct?

MR. DOMER: I don't see how it makes any difference at this University, no.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Response?

MR. GESUND: No, I'm not disagreeing with Professor Domer at all. What I wanted to say was that there are a number of other departments
in the University which have only one full-time regular faculty member and primarily consists of faculty from other disciplines who have joint appointments into that department. So it's not a unique sort of thing. It can go as a department.

We could, I suppose, change it to "program" on the floor, although I hesitate to make that big of change from the floor of this body.

CHAIR DEMBO: Dean Mohney?

MR. MOHNEY: One other point of clarification. We have an endowment that's been set up under RCTF for any Chair that will be a part of the Historic Preservation Program, and when that endowment's complete, which we anticipate will be soon, at that point we will be adding a person in that position and that will be a separate full-time faculty member.

CHAIR DEMBO: Does that imply that if there was a proposal to make it remain a program, that you'd lost that money?

MR. MOHNEY: No.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. There were some other hands up.

Professor Canon?
MR. CANON: Well, we are advisory to the administration on this, and I notice the Provost back there. And I just wanted to ask him, Mike, what are your thoughts on this?

MR. NIETZEL: Under the first version of this that I saw, I believe Historic Preservation was going to be retained as program status and not as a department.

Dave, when you and I talked about it, I think we had a discussion about it could go either way, and the final version took the form of a department. The envisioning of adding some faculty who might have primary appointments in this area suggests that perhaps establishing it as a unit would be a wise way to go so that the primary appointment could be there.

I'm, I guess, persuaded primarily by Dennis' comments that it will work either way. So I suspect it might be best to leave it as it is in the proposal now as a department. It appears as if there is a good potential for it to grow as a unit or primary appointment.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Kraemer?

MR. KRAEMER: Just a point, a
question, I guess, that, if there is going to be one
department of Historic Preservation, does that mean the
rest of the faculty are in a second department? Or can
you have a college with one department, so most of the
faculty are not in that department? Does it imply some
kind of structure beyond what we're talking about?

MR. GESUND: You have two

schools. You have a School of Interior Design and a
School of Architecture and the Department of Historic
Preservation.

CHAIR DEMBO: Other questions,

comments, discussion?

MR. ALBISETTI: Jim Albisetti,

History Department.

Teachers coming in and talking about a
College of Design included Landscape Architecture and,
as we were reported to Architecture Professors that
discussions included Landscape Architecture, yet it is
not part of this proposal. For information, we'd like
to know why not, what's happened to that idea?

CHAIR DEMBO: Who can answer
that?

MR. YANERELLA: I can't answer
it. In fact, there is another issue. My name is
Ernest Yanerella.

CHAIR DEMBO: Ernie, can I trouble you just to hang on for a second to see --

MR. YANERELLA: Well, what I wanted to ask is something that is quite related to this.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay.

MR. YANERELLA: It has to do with the organizational chart. Although Landscape Architecture does not appear at all in the proposal itself, there is a director for Landscape Architecture in the organizational chart for the college. And I'm puzzled by that.

CHAIR DEMBO: Dean Mohney, would you like to address that?

MR. MOHNEY: I think I can answer both questions.

There certainly have been discussions to say that the College of Design should be all encompassing for the design profession; and, I think, professional programs, and Landscape Architecture would be a welcome fit within that. They have -- faculty from Landscape Architecture have been involved in a number of meetings. They've participated in the ad hoc
committee that Chancellor Venters set up. They participated in full-day faculty retreats and in discussions that took place earlier this year.

At this point, they are unwilling as a group to join in on this proposal. I think we would hope that that would change. We went through several iterations with the organizational chart and it sounds like there may be a previous one that has been attached to this by mistake. I'll have to check that. But it should not be there on the proposal as it is, yet at some point in the future with Landscape Architecture's agreement, we hope that that might change.

CHAIR DEMBO: So, to review, at this point in time they're to remain within the College of Agriculture.

MR. MOHNEY: Yes.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. There was another hand up.

MR. YATES: I'm just trying to find some more information.

How many faculty total would be involved in this college? How many students? How many -- What degrees would be offered? How many graduate students?

I'm just trying to -- Because this doesn't seem much
larger than many departments in the University. What constitutes a department and what constitutes a college?

COURT REPORTER: May I have your name, please?

MR. YATES: Steve Yates.

MR. MOHNEY: Architecture presently consists of about 320 Bachelor of Architecture degree students, and the Historic Preservation Program, I guess we probably have about 50 students at this point. In Interior Design the numbers are approaching 200 in total.

Professor Dixon, is that right?

MS. DIXON: That's correct.

MR. MOHNEY: Part of the difficulty in answering this is the transition that Architecture's making toward the graduate program. We anticipate the numbers are going to change in some respects over the next couple of years as our graduate curriculum is implemented. But the numbers that we have given to the Provost to anticipate in the future, roughly about 550 or so students altogether, undergraduate and graduate, in the College of Design.

MR. TAGAVI: And faculty?
MR. MOHNEY: Faculty, about 30. Twenty-two in Architecture right now; six in Interior Design; one, and eventually two, in Historic Preservation. But I would add that we have a substantial component of part-time instruction. We have been well served by a number of available professionals who come in to teach our design studios. They number more than a dozen. It's a very good model of professional education. You get the experience of people who are working within that profession, as well as the academic side. So there's some component of part-time instruction as well.

MR. GESUND: As well as many joint appointments from within the University faculty.

CHAIR DEMBO: Excellent questions. What other ones do you have?

MR. STABEN: Chuck Staben, Biology.

Why are the two schools as opposed to departments?

MR. MOHNEY: There's a tradition in professional schools to be a school. I think we're accepting that. The School of Interior Design was set up within the last two years, and that
was done and accomplished.

Given that circumstance of fact, we thought it made sense then for Architecture to move towards a School of Architecture and, again, fall into a model that is fairly typical at other academic institutions.

CHAIR DEMBO: And that may differ from some of the reasons why your school became a department. Other comments or questions?

MS. PORTIO: I have a comment.

CHAIR DEMBO: Please identify yourself.

MS. PORTIO: Meg Portio from Interior Design.

I'd like to just recognize the strong support of design students that have turned out for the Senate meeting. We really put the students as the centerpiece of this proposal. There's lots of opportunities shared -- technology for shared studies abroad, for shared internships within the profession. These students, in a professional sense, when they graduate, will work shoulder to shoulder in firms and again, our students just overwhelmingly support and are extremely excited about this potential new unit on
CHAIR DEMBO: Thank you, Meg. We've heard a number of comments in favor of the proposal, a number of questions about the proposal. Are there any comments speaking against the proposal?

MR. YATES: Steve Yates again. I just have a question. What constitutes a college and what constitutes a department? Because it's clear that a college seems to constitute more administration and more expense. What could be done in this college that could not be done in the Department of Design or within some existing college?

CHAIR DEMBO: I wonder if Dr. Nietzel might address that. Do you have any comments, Mike, about that?

MR. NIETZEL: There's really no additional cost of administration being created here. It's no change in terms of the status of the college. This is a bigger college in terms of faculty than Social Work. It's a bigger college in terms of faculty and students than Law, and also in terms of students in Social Work.

There are histories associated with
certain disciplines that tend to suggest the level of
school or college as the one that you organize that
discipline in a University. Often that has to do with
some expectations in terms of professional crediting
agencies. I think that is at play when you talk about
the disciplines that are in involved here.

Does accreditation mandate a certain
level of organization? Probably not, but there is a
fairly strong expectation -- I think Hans can speak to
that as well -- for it to be at a certain level.

Historically, schools and colleges have been -- in the
case of those professional -- in terms of the
disciplines in which we're preparing professionals --
has been the level that typically we've organized from.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor
Gesund.

MR. GESUND: Just briefly,
yes, it is an accreditation, a professional
accreditation, as opposed to a SACs problem.
The expectation in Engineering, for
instance, is that we are departments and we get
accredited as departments. In Architecture, it's the
expectation that they will be either a school or a
college.
Historically, when I first came to the University almost 25 years ago, Architecture was a program within the Department of Civil Engineering in the College of Engineering. Eventually, it moved out and became a separate department in the College of Engineering. Under urging of the accrediting people in Architecture, the accrediting commission in Architecture, it was spun off into a separate college, a free-standing college. And it's been that right along until now, oh for about the past 30, 35 years, it has been a separate college. Now it's going to be amalgamated into a College of Design as a school. And I believe Interior Design has just recently become a school growing from a department.

The expectation is that it's a somewhat higher level of organization and it's in response to what is done nationally and what the accrediting agencies expect, because both Interior Design and Architecture have to be accredited by their professional organizations, just like in Engineering.

CHAIR DEMBO: The question is a good one because as we see further proposals coming across this year, these are the types of things that the Senate needs to know to choose the best course of
action.

MR. FRYE: Michael Frye, College of Fine Arts.

I guess, could Provost Nietzel comment on the differences between a program and a department?

CHAIR DEMBO: The question is to distinguish between a program and a department.

Dr. Nietzel?

MR. NIETZEL: A department is an academic unit in which academic appointments can be made. Programs are not academic units. Gerontology, for example, is a program. It does not have tenured faculty appointments. If it were a department, you would anticipate there would have been.

CHAIR DEMBO: Did that answer the question, or not quite?

MR. FRYE: Not quite. I mean aren't there programs on campus with academic appointments? Mine, for example.

MR. NIETZEL: What department are you a member of?

MR. FRYE: Well, okay, that's a good point. I'm in the Theater Department.

MR. NIETZEL: That's where
your tenure line would reside.

MR. FRYE: So that it's possible to have one-person departments.

MR. NIETZEL: You'd have a hell of a lot of work to do, but I guess yes.

(Laughter)

MR. CANON: Well, there should be consensus in the faculty meetings.

(Laughter)

CHAIR DEMBO: Question?

MS. DWYER: Roberta Dwyer, College of Agriculture.

Considering the overwhelming support of the faculty and the students, I'd like to call the question on this particular issue.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay, the question has been called. This requires a two-thirds vote to stop debate.

All in favor of limiting debate, signify by saying aye.

("AYE" VOICE VOTE: ALL)

CHAIR DEMBO: All opposed, say nay.

("NAY" VOICE VOTE: NONE)
CHAIR DEMBO: Okay, so the question now comes up. No further discussion.

The motion on the floor is to create a College of Design, which would encompass the School the Architecture, the School of Interior Design, and it would include a Department of Historic Preservation.

All in favor of this proposal signify by saying aye.

("AYE" VOICE VOTE: ALL BUT FOR 2)

CHAIR DEMBO: All opposed say nay.

("NAY" VOICE VOTE: 2)

CHAIR DEMBO: The proposal passes.

The next step now is it goes with our recommendation to administration and if they concur, it goes to the Board of Trustees.

Congratulations.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIR DEMBO: That was a good and thorough discussion. Thank you very much.

At this time -- we'll wait just a second. (Pause while crowd calms down.)

I wanted to now distinguish between a
discussion and an action item. The Senate rules say that when there is a major policy type of decision to be made, that it's frequently helpful to first place it on the floor of the Senate for discussion only so that Senators can muse over it, discuss it amongst themselves and with their constituents, raise the appropriate questions and then it can come back at a future Senate meeting for action.

So that's what we're doing today. We're discussing a report that was put together by Professor Maloney concerning teacher and course evaluations. And for today, it's for discussion only.

Professor Maloney?

MR. MALONEY: Usually it's just a combination of questions.

CHAIR DEMBO: Well, I wonder if you could summarize, just briefly, the essence of what your report was, which is available on the Senate Web site. Appreciate it.

MR. MALONEY: Our committee took a look at the current system of doing teacher evaluation and came to the conclusion we think it's broken for a variety of reasons.

What we began to look at was that, if we
want to encourage innovative teaching, we have to provide a mechanism that allows faculty to achieve evaluations of those efforts and not be locked into using a standardized format. So we took a look at different schools and what they were doing. And one model came up to us time and again, which is basically to allow the individual faculty member to select evaluation items based upon what they're trying to do in their courses, recognizing that a lecture course should probably be evaluated differently than a seminar course. A laboratory should be evaluated differently than a dance studio.

We found a model to use that's used at the University of Michigan where the Center for Research and Learning and Teaching conducts their system. And at the beginning of each semester the faculty member receives a little booklet showing that there are five mandatory questions required university-wide and allowing the individual faculty member to select from a pool of approximately 300 questions, broken down into about 30 different areas, and they can design their own evaluation form. It then goes back to the Center, the Center produces the tailored instruments, and they are delivered to the faculty and
administered in the same manner that we do here. So we were looking at developing this type of approach. We began to look at how we'd administer it, though, and a lot of the discussion centered around getting it out of the classroom, the way we do it now, because we heard horror stories from students that some faculty stand in the classroom and stand and stare at the students while they fill out the forms to try and intimidate them. What we talked about was moving this to the Web. We talked to other schools that had done it on the Web and it's basically a failure, because only approximately 30 percent of the students participate in that system. We held a series of focus groups on this campus to find out what students thought. The students said they would not use the Web approach except for two circumstances. One is if they actually hated the Professor, and the second was they absolutely loved him. And our current participation rate is about 69 percent when we administer in class. So we didn't feel that we could go to a system that gives us 30 percent participation. We then began to look at ways we could do this. The University currently uses scanning equipment produced by one particular company, that for
the life of me I can't remember their name now. They also offer a software package that would allow us to develop these tailored instructor-assessment instruments. One of the nice things about the system that they have is that it allows the instructor a choice of seven different methods in which to administer it. You can select to e-mail it to your students. You can put it on the Web. You can print out a hard copy. You can do it the same way we do it now.

So what the committee decided to recommend was to move toward this system that allows the individual faculty member to tailor the evaluation instrument to their own particular class, recognizing that for university-wide purposes we did need a set of common questions.

The one comment we got back from faculty we surveyed was: Who cares what we use because all the administration wants to look at are questions 19 and 20 as to, is this a good instructor or is this a good course. We looked at adding to these two questions some questions about the individual's performance in treating students fairly, the individual's performance in recognizing diversity. And so we recommended, I
think, that four or five questions be required of all instructors across the University, and we felt that this should be done in all departments because there are a series of departments that do not use the current system. We recommended that the instructors be able to tailor their instruments. And we looked at this also in the context of the teaching portfolio, because Linda Worley, when she was Chair of the Center for Teaching and Learning, did a survey of Chairs and basically found out that the teaching portfolio has little value and, as a lot of people said about research papers, they are written by one and read by three, that is the reviewers. There's a lot of feeling that the teacher's portfolio is written by one and read by none.

And so what we wanted to do was to begin to put some validity into the teacher portfolio and that is that the teaching portfolio would be used by the instructors to state their philosophies, what they're trying to do with classes, and then the information achieved or obtained or gotten back from the teaching assessment would be then used to support the claims that are in the teaching portfolio. And we
felt that by doing this we could begin to encourage more innovative teaching on campus.

And so that's the gist of the report.

CHAIR DEMBO: Are there any questions for Professor Maloney?

MR. JANOSKI: Tom Janoski, Sociology.

Is there any consideration of having professionals or faculty members come to class for evaluations and sort of have a professional/student mix in terms of evaluations?

MR. MALONEY: There was some discussion about it. We never came to a conclusion. When we started to discuss it, one of the first questions we said is: How do we know our colleagues know anything about teaching?

MR. JANOSKI: Or the Teaching Development Center or something like that.

MR. MALONEY: Okay. What we saw for the role of the Teaching and Learning Center was that when an individual faculty member wants to develop their assessment device, they would make an appointment with the Center and come over and work with them to put together the instrument. What we saw was
the Center would become sort of the focus of how this effort is put together. But, Tom, we never got to the point of looking at, do we want to have outside observers come in and observe the teaching.

MS. ________: Jan ________, English Studies.

The Teaching and Learning Center already does that by appointment. They will come in and by arrangement do various types of observations for each class for formative purposes.

MR. CIBULL: Mike Cibull, College of Medicine.

Is there any sort of remedial course that you're trying to develop for professors who don't quite make the grade the first two times so that not only is it punitive but it may be something that you can educate them with?

MR. MALONEY: I think the Center has that capability now. They do offer enrichment courses and improving instructional techniques and the like now.

MR. CIBULL: What I mean is, that after so many bad ratings, do they say you have to go to school?
(LAUGHTER)

MR. MALONEY: That's a departmental issue.

MR. CIBULL: You'll be doing it forever. You'll just evaluate and evaluate and evaluate and nothing will ever get done. So the question is, should you not bring that up?

MR. MALONEY: Well, one of the problems we discussed just a little bit -- and Phil Kraemer was on it and others can speak up.

One of the concerns we had about his is that despite the fact that we talk about how valuable teaching is, we don't really look at it very closely here. There's too much of a perception that unless the students are ripping the door off the Dean's office to complain, you're a good professor or a good teacher. And that's why we would like to see this evaluation done such that the instructor can really take it seriously and begin to look at how they can improve.

Now, we're not going to be able to reach everybody because there's going to be some people that say: Teaching is something I have to do to have my job; what I'm here to do is research.

MR. CIBULL: What other
criteria of teaching has been used for evaluations besides a student evaluation? I mean, I don't consider a student evaluation to be the, perhaps, the only way that education should be judged.

I'm in the College of Medicine and there are objective criteria as to how a student -- whether the student learns the material or not. Whether that's through the instructor or not, I don't know. But the end result is does the student learn that material, not whether the instructor is loved by the student or hated by the student. So what other criteria are there for evaluation besides this one?

CHAIR DEMBO: I think that the questions are delving a little bit away from the specific task that Professor Maloney had and that is teacher and course evaluations as done by students. The idea of faculty evaluation is a very complex issue, and I think it continues to evolve. I think there's a number of questions that still need to be answered right now as to how Department Chairs and area committees use this information, what other criteria are appropriate in this day and age. And quite honestly, President Todd has talked a whole lot about being a good citizen of the community. What parameters
are there to identify how much of a community player
you are at present? I don't think there are very many.
So that this is the bigger issue. This is one
ingredient of it, though.

MR. MALONEY: We talked and
looked at systems that will go out and survey alumni
about their experience with a particular professor. I
think imagination is the only thing we need to look at
other ways of doing it.

As Jeff said, what we were trying to
basically look at a system where we evaluate the
performance of a professor and a course.

MS. JENG: Ling Hwey Jeng,
Library and Information Science.

I just want to see if I understand what
you are presenting here. Is it correct that you are
presenting, proposing a computer program or a computer
package that would allow individual faculty members to
choose from maybe a data bank of questions so that the
individual faculty members could choose whatever the
question he or she wants and then tailor-made a
evaluation, teaching evaluation form for his or her
class?

MR. MALONEY: Correct.
MS. JENG: Well, my question is, if that's correct -- There are two questions actually. One is what is the fiscal impact of getting such software in terms of teaching evaluation campus wide? I have no idea about how much we're spending money on the original, the traditional way.

The other question I have I think it's a more important one. And that is, if individual faculty members can pick and choose of what he or she wants the student to evaluate, then what other criteria the faculty are supposed to have to follow in order for the department to have fair assessment of different faculty members, among different faculty members?

MR. MALONEY: Let me address your last question first. That's why we recommended the four or five common questions asked for every instructor.

MR. JENG: So, basically, those four or five questions are the only ones that you could really use to compare individual faculty members?

MR. MALONEY: Yes. Because if I'm teaching a graduate seminar with six Ph.D. students, should I be evaluated with the same criteria as somebody teaching a freshman mid-term course with
500 students?

MS. JENG: So those four or five questions are really the crucial ones. If they ask them right, then there'll be a fair assessment.

But if the questions are not right, then tough.

MR. MALONEY: Well, if you say the four or five are the only ones we're going to look at for a correct assessment, to me that's for the bureaucrat's assessment.

MS. JENG: I see.

MR. MALONEY: We're looking at the other side from a developmental standpoint of being able to have individual instructors get information to help them become a better instructor. And that, to me, is what the real objective of teaching evaluations should be.

Now, as far as the financial impact or fiscal impact, something that struck us in looking at this is, the University of Michigan has 42,000 students. They do 12,000 course evaluations a year, and they do it with two people and a P.C. We spend that many people, from what I understand, trying to track down the information out of the SIS system just to find out who to send the information to do the
teaching evaluation. And so one aspect of this is if we're ever going to get any savings, we've got to reorganize that whole system. Because what people told me in the institution -- Well, the assessment is, it takes them till mid-semester to even get a record as to who's teaching what on campus.

What we're looking at -- and it was in the report -- this software would cost roughly $12,000 to buy for the campus and it would be housed over in the Center for Teaching and Learning. Other than that, in terms of what we would have to do to streamline the system, we don't have an estimate for that.

MR. TAGAVI: I'm a bit con--

MR. MALONEY: Are you still in the Senate?

(Laughter)

MR. TAGAVI: I'm a bit confused on this formative feedback, which is the focus of recommendations six, seven and eight.

Let me read the pertinent part which confused me. On six, it says, "...collection of formative feedback would be voluntary." Seven, it says, "...these are available only to the instructor." But then eight it says, "...these formative assessment
should be included, or part of it should be included, 
in the teaching portfolio."

Aside from the somewhat contradictory 
nature, let's say I get the formative assessment, which 
are only confidential to me, and the student filling it 
in say, we hate your style or your course, or your 
style. And then what stops me to put in the teaching 
portfolio that everyone loves me. This is only 
confidential to me. How do you make sure this is 
accurate information?

MR. MALONEY: Tagavi, we look 
at breaking this down into a summative function and a 
formative function.

The summative function is that there's 
five mandatory across-the-board questions. That's 
where the student's going to tell you they hate your 
guts. We were looking at the formative part this way: 
The administrative regs say we have to do teaching 
evaluation, but it doesn't say how we have to do it. 
So if we do the summative where you have the five 
mandatory questions, that takes care of that. We were 
looking at the other side of it as how do we get 
instructors to improve.

And we got some feedback from faculty
that they did not want their Chairs getting this
information because it puts a chilling effect on their
willingness to try new methods. If their Chair gets it
and finds out that the students hated that approach,
they're going to say, that's a rotten teacher. So we
looked at it as it states there.

Only the summative part is required.
The formative part is optional. When an instructor
does use it for formative purposes, the data does not
go back to the Chair. It goes solely to the
instructor, and then it's up to the instructor to
decide how they want to use that in their teaching
portfolio. But now we're back to the question, is
anybody reading the teaching portfolios.

Yes?

MR. THOM: Bill Thom from
Agriculture.

I am a little bit concerned that it
seems like we're diminishing, with this proposal, we're
diminishing the input of students. And I think we have
to be careful that we don't downplay their intelligence
to make intelligent decisions about teaching, because
they are the primary audience that we're teaching to.

Now, you may have questions about, well, are they able
to judge professional teaching. But remember, they're the receiving audience. And so, I think we still have to put a good bit of emphasis on the audience that we're teaching to. And I think, perhaps, instead of maybe four or five questions, we still ought to have maybe half. If you're going to end up with 20 questions, half of those should be standard questions so that our clientele, our students, our audience, can still have a major input, because they're our primary audience.

MS. WALDHART: Enid Waldhart.

I don't think that this attempt is diminishing student input at all. In fact, I think that what the whole purpose is to make the student input more meaningful. And that as you're selecting questions -- lots of the questions don't apply, you know, like did the person turn back papers the next day or something like that where they had some things that some classes have lots of them and some classes don't have very much. And if you know what it is that your course is trying to do, then, in fact, this is a way to get the best kind of feedback from the students about what they're teaching.

So I see this as being something that
could be very, very helpful. And it may actually
encourage faculty who up to this point sort of poo-
pooed the notion of doing course evaluations because
they're forced to use the questions that don't seem to
apply to the particular kinds of things that they're
trying to do. So I see this as being something that's
even more important for providing good student
feedback.

Is that correct?

MR. MALONEY: Yeah. Now, I'll
answer your question.

In the report we also recommended that
colleges and departments have the right to establish
their own set of mandatory questions. We just felt
that there wasn't a way across a campus this broad to
get much of a consensus on any more than about five.
So if Agriculture wants to add five more, you've got
that opportunity to do that.

CHAIR DEMBO: I'm going to end
the discussion on this now because we have three
reports.

Bill, thank you very much. I'm sure
there will be a lot of other questions that come up.

There are three short reports that I
would like you to consider sticking around for. The first is Dr. Nash's report on the Work/Life Committee, the task force. The second one will be from Professor Joe Anthony from LCC to give his report as Academic Ombud. The third will be Professor Lee Edgerton, to report on the current status of our Provost search.

MS. NASH: Thank you very much for sticking around to hear about this latest task force at the University of Kentucky.

As you know, life is getting more complicated for many of us. Today's employees are likely to be working a second job more than any time in the past. They are likely to be getting an advanced education. They are more likely to be raising children as a single parent. They are more likely to have their parents that they're needing to take care of; and they're less likely to have a support network as we're so much more mobile than we've been in the past.

All of this makes it very difficult for people to balance their work and their life. I should say also that we as Americans are working longer hours more than anybody else around the world. Somehow this doesn't make sense, but we haven't figured out where the rest of the world is -- has done -- how to balance
our work and life. And so for those of you who remember that childhood game where you would take an egg and put it on a spoon and run from one place to the other, that's really symbolic of how much of us are trying to manage our life in the handle of work.

And, so, President Todd has put together a very large task force. We have about 35 or so members, many of whom are actually Senate members; but staff members and people from around the campus to take a look at -- and I should say, Karen Combs and I are co-chairing this -- to take a look at this issue of work/life. And work/life is really defined as those issues which help individuals balance employment, but also their personal and their family priorities.

Many of you -- I don't if any of you happened to be watching 60 Minutes last night, but if you did there was a great segment on SAS and the work/life effort that they have at their institution, and they found that most software companies have about a 20- to 25-percent turnover and because of the strong work/life effort at SAS, they have a three percent turnover. So work/life benefits not only employees, but it benefits the employer, too.

Some of the ways in which employers
benefit is that employees, just like at SAS, will have
greater loyalty and therefore greater retention at the
institution, but also productivity improves. One of
the things that we have heard as the work/life force is
that across campus some of our supervisors are afraid
that we're going basically give away the store and that
there's not going to be anybody around to do the work.
Well, that's certainly not the intention of a
work/life effort. It's to make sure that our employees
can be as productive as possible because we're being
responsive to their need to balance their work and
their life.

Certainly, many areas will show that not
only does productivity increase, but the quality of
work will increase, as well. We'll be able to build
more effective work environments, and that can lead to
greater customer retention, whether those customers be
our students or our employees being -- serving each
other, whatever those might be.

President Todd formed this task force in
August and asked that we get recommendations to him by
February 15. And so, one of the first things that we
did as a work force was to select issues that we could
work on and get some quick turn around. And I'll talk
about those in a minute. But we also wanted to formulate our vision and our mission. And, really, our vision of what the University of Kentucky should be as a place of employment is where everyone excels. And our mission, then, is to enhance satisfaction and effectiveness by implementing not only initiatives, but policies and procedures and practices that really assist people in fulfilling their personal and their job-related responsibilities.

We hope to help people understand this work/life effort and that's it's actually a national movement. And some people are suggesting that it should be life/work rather than work/life, that you have your priorities backwards already if you're not thinking about your life in the first place. But we really want to create and change our culture to make sure that we help our employees balance work and life; that we develop communication channels, and one of the reasons I'm here today is so that we can get information we well as share information; that we create and incorporate initiatives that help people balance; and that we create partnerships where we can to enhance employees' work environment.

This effort really came out of the
Commission on Women. As the Commission went around to
do their open forums across campus, they kept hearing
about a series of issues that came up over and over and
over. And as Caroline Brock was taking a look at this
set of issues, she happened to be reading the local
paper and learned that our own Fayette County
government had had this effort -- really, that they
called work/life going on for some period of time. And
that one of our own faculty, Dr. Jennifer Slomberg in
the College of Social Work, is a national expert in
work/life. So Caroline went to Dr. Slomberg and said,
what are all of these things; and Jennifer said to her,
that's work/life and there's a major movement across
the nation to bring these programs into various
businesses and universities.

So the President -- the Commission went
to the President and said, we'd like to form a task
force around this issue. And the President said, let's
go for it. We have the support of Human Resources, and
there's really wide interest in this effort across
campus.

In June, the President had a retreat on
work/life for about 60-or-so campus leaders, and that
really then led to the formation of this task force in
August. We held a day-long retreat in August and then
have been having bi-weekly meetings. Again, I
indicated we have put ourself on a pretty short time
line because we think we need to get moving in this
area, and so we have three initiatives that we're going
to be bringing forth to the President by November 15,
and then a long-term plan by February 15.

Thus far, the committee has developed a
communication plan -- and, again, this is part of
going out to the campus and letting people know
what's going on, and we'll be setting up forums across
campus to get input as well.

There are three issues that we chose to
deal with that we want to make recommendations by
November 15. One has to do with our leave benefits,
one of those being the funeral benefit. Right now, if
your spouse or your child dies, you are allowed by
University regulations to take three days of sick
leave. Well, anyone who has lost a child, anyone who
has lost a spouse knows that you're not ready to come
back to work in three days. And so we think that
that's one issue, one of the lead issues that we can
address pretty quickly. And the small work group
that's working on this, leaves, they're actually
thinking about extending or making a recommendation to extend some of the benefits that we have for temporary disability leave, to let you also take care of your parents, whether or not they live in your home. Right now, you only can take sick leave if your parent that you're responsible for is living in your home. Well, for those of us who our parents don't live in our home but who need care, we may need it more than the person who actually has the person in their home. So there will be a set of recommendations about leave.

Second of all, we thought that one issue is that it's hard to know what benefits we have. Actually, the University of Kentucky already has a rich amount of benefits and then the Elder Care Program, which is a nationally recognized program, our Wellness Program. So we're going to try to be, under Topsi Stanton's leadership, putting together a clearinghouse so that you can go to one site and find out all about any benefits for all employees at the University of Kentucky. And then, the last thing that we're working on in the short run has to do with casual dress or days and events. And I will have to tell you that our staff on the committee said that they didn't think that this would apply to faculty because they already dress
casually. (Laughter)

But, some recommendation for maybe Spirit Days where people will wear blue and white and -- actually, one of our local hospitals has this policy, but we don't have it at the University of Kentucky. So we actually think that this may do a lot to create a sense of spirit and community. Certainly, our staff on our committee think and believe that this can be a very helpful thing.

Also, I will tell you that probably the top thing that was on our list in terms of things that we should take a look at was the creation of an employee ombud, but the Staff Senate is actually exploring that right now. And we decided that there's a lot, too much work to go around to duplicate, so the Staff Senate -- the Chair of the Staff Senate sits, as does the Chair of the University Senate, sit on the task force. So when that proposal comes forward from the Staff Senate, we'll have a chance on the Work/Life Task Force to review that and, hopefully, get behind that proposal.

We have divided all of the recommendations. One of the first things that we did was to generate a list of possible initiatives related
to work/life, and there must be 250-or-so items that we came up with -- and by the way, they're on the web site and you can go take a look. We then took all of those and divided them into six areas. The first one being workplace culture and employee development because, quite honestly, we believe that we can have the best policies in the world, the best programs in the world, but if we don't have a culture that supports employees actually using those benefits, they'll be for naught. And so we have one group that's really going to concentrate on how we go about changing the culture. Then we will have a group looking at dependent care -- and we may change the name of that one based on our meeting today, as well. But that will include child care, elder care and family support.

Work practice arrangements, which has -- there's lots of things that that can be. Things like flex time, work-at-home programs, that kind of thing. A group will look at all of our benefits, a group will look at wellness, and a group will look at leaves, broader than the very short term that we're looking at them right now.

We decided very consciously, again, not to work on a couple of areas, one being the health
benefit. Because the Employee Benefit Committee actually has a sub-group that's looking at the health benefit and making recommendations about that. So, again, we didn't want to duplicate. Quite honestly, with compensation, with the budget the way it is, we thought that it did not make a lot of sense to spend a lot of time right now on compensation since the state budget's looking so poor.

And then, finally, we have a large number of things that we put under personal services; like, for example, you're out of town on a research meeting and you live alone, you have nobody to walk your dog, the University sends somebody over to walk your dog. We thought we probably ought to -- that compilation of services we probably ought to put on the back burner and get some of the major serious benefits on the table first. So we've categorized those things and certainly, hopefully, in the future our work/life effort address some of those issues.

The other major thing that we will work on and we will actually pick up at our next meeting is, how do we institutionalize this effort. Everybody on this committee, on this Work/Life Task Force, is a volunteer; we have other jobs. And so how we make sure
that we get the culture moving and changing and get
des these initiatives going in a way that will
institutionalize it, we think is probably our most
important activity.

We have a Web site. Ours is really very
easy to remember. It's ukedu/worklife, unless we
change it, and then it might be lifework. But right
now it's worklife. There on the worklife, you can get
all of our meeting notes and agenda items and lots of
resources about work/life, and we have a list surf that
we've created, so you can actually go to the Web site
and join the list surf. And so any of your
recommendations that you want to get to us, that'll be
an easy way for you to get those to the Work/Life Task
Force.

I really thank you for allowing me to
come to this group today to let you know what's going
on, and I hope that you'll get involved in helping to
make this one of the best places in the nation to work.

Jeff, do we have time for questions or
comments?

CHAIR DEMBO: If there are one
or two brief questions. (No response.)

Thank you so much Phyllis.
Two more brief reports. One from Professor Joe Anthony, the Academic Ombud at LCC for his -- is this your fifth year now, Joe? Sixth?

MR. ANTHONY: Seventh.
CHAIR DEMBO: Time flies.
MR. ANTHONY: Hello.

This is the second full year that we've had the system of UK Ombud in two different locations, and it seems to be working pretty well.

I would like to thank a few people:
Susan Scollay, who talked to you before; Michele Soma, who is the permanent civil service representative in the Board there; Jeff, who thinks he can run but he can't hide. You know, I call him up with Ombud questions even though he's no longer the Ombud. And mostly the faculty, who most of the time is very cooperative in what are sometimes unpleasant situations.

I just want to give you a kind of idea of the kinds of problems or difficulties the Ombud faces. The first one is, I categorize as gray disputes. And that's overwhelmingly, I guess, in volume, the most complaints or difficulties. You'd be surprised. The first kind of gray dispute that comes
is simply a mistake, transcription or whatever. A woman just came to me a month or so ago and thought she should have an A and got a D. Waited two months, and she should have had an A, and it was simply a mistake. It might surprise you that people wait that long, but they do. Of course, there's some lucky D student who probably is going around with an A and I haven't heard from him yet, or her, you know. (Laughter) So you never get the other kind, but you'd be surprised.

Another kind of gray dispute is more problematic. And it may come out of criteria that at least could be interpreted in different ways. I mean, evaluation criteria and criteria that seems to the student, perhaps, overly subjective; and it is not necessarily overly subjective, but it seems to the student. And I talk to the faculty and try to clear it up or I urge faculty to make as concrete as possible evaluation criteria.

Related to that is a different kind of problem -- and, perhaps, it's more located at LCC, but probably not entirely -- which is criteria or grades that come from a holistic evaluation by the faculty of the student in some area. It may be clinic or it may be something of that sort, and it is a judgment that
doesn't seem to break down into concrete ways. And so there's often disputes that come out of that. Again, I urge faculty to make it as concrete as possible, even though it is an overall professional evaluation by the faculty of the student. And I certainly respect that, that professional evaluation. But if it can be made concrete in behaviors, and if it can be given to the student on a regular basis rather than at the end of the process, that sometimes helps also. Sometimes, we've had to go back or the faculty has gone back and really done that at the end of the term when challenged. In other words, acted as if these were regular evaluations. So it makes for difficulty.

Another problem that I don't know if UK has, but they probably do -- the main campus -- is a problem with faulty record-keeping, especially with adjunct faculty who may have left and left behind very incomplete records of how a grade was achieved. I've tried to call foreign countries occasionally -- and Chairs are very reluctant to change a grade, even when I think the student has made a fairly good case, simply because -- well, Chairs should be reluctant to change a faculty person's grade. And I think a student has the right to clear explanation of how a grade was achieved;
and when a faculty member has left town or the country
and not left behind clear records, then the student
feels cheated at that. The obvious solution is, of
course, for departments to make sure that clear records
are kept and that they're available for at least
through the appeal period.

So those are -- that's a great part of
what I do. Now, there are other categories of
difficulties, like something I call personality and
security difficulties. Well, let me go back to the
gray disputes first. One last comment. Of course a
great majority of gray disputes are without merit. The
evaluation was clear and the student is simply unhappy.
And I try to explain to the student that "tough" is
not a violation of their rights. (Laughter) Not even
"tough and unpleasant."

And we have personality and security
difficulties, and I sometimes have to deal with them.
They're not many of those, but they take up a great
deal of time. There's one that's going on now. I was
telling a colleague that it reminds me of my kids who
used to torture us with that song out of Lambkins.
"This is the song that never ends," you know, and it
has a round. You use to threaten your children with
blood if they sang it one more time, especially in the
car, you know. But there are a very few security and
personality problems that arise to the Ombud or the
Dean level but when you do have one, it does seem like
it goes on for a long time. And I saw your Dean of
Students leave. We have our own Dean of Students that
we involve, but your Dean of Students is bigger.
(Laughter) Sometimes we wish for him.

Sometimes I'm asked by faculty as to how
to handle a dangerous, or what they perceive as a
dangerous or threatening situation. Again, that's very
upsetting and happens rarely. But I try to advise them
how to handle it. Other people are involved in this
too, of course, but sometimes I get approached there.

A lot of my time is spent simply
facilitating communication. It's either because
communication has broken down or the faculty member is
unapproachable or is perceived as unapproachable, an
uncomfortable person to talk to. With the student's
permission, I might convey this problem to the faculty
person and convey their concerns, and the concerns
might be a lot of the teaching things you were just
talking about. There might be perceived disrespect in
the tone of voice of the professor, perceived or real
disrespect, if some of the stories are correct, you know. Pacing, the kind of explanation given. And since I'm confidential unless it rises to something else, I try to get the faculty not to shrink in horror when they see my name on their phone, you know, since I don't go to anybody unless, again, it's a very serious situation.

One of those serious situations is a difficult one, and I'm uncomfortable talking about it, which is basically the core competency of a particular class or a particular instructor. And I'm not a person who can judge the core competency of any professor. But, with a depth and number of complaints over a period of time, I feel that in fact a student's rights might be violated by a core incompetency on an instructor's part. I'm not the judge of that, but I feel it's my duty sometimes to bring that to somebody else's attention. I don't bring ordinary complaints or even second or third complaints to anybody's attention, but I will bring to Dean or Chairs what I perceive of as a possible core competency question. It's a very difficult thing, and I really don't want to be known as the guy who goes around judging whether other people are competent or not. You notice I don't do Power
Point or anything else. I have my own competency questions, you know. (Laughter) But I do feel like there are -- the gentlemen before asked about evaluation after evaluation. I do think there are people who might qualify for poster child for post-tenure review, you know. And that's a very difficult question, but I do bring that in.

Another big question, of course, another area, is plagiarism and cheating. They also take a lot of time. And I feel like part of my job is to advise the faculty on how to go about formally charging somebody. A lot of faculty, though, don't want to formally charge anybody because you know, of course, that the minimum penalty for a formal conviction is an E for the course with the E identified as cheating or plagiarized, plagiarism. So a lot of faculty want to, in fact, use it as a teaching moment or process. And I have a template that I draw up for faculty that protects them so that if, for example, they have penalized a student but not gone to the formal process -- penalized the student an E for a paper or an E for a test -- that they give the student this memo that the student signs and says that the student agrees that they've had good reason to do this. The student doesn't admit it, but
it has good reason to do this. So in the worst-case scenario, which I have actually seen, the student doesn't come back later on and say, "if you wanted to penalize me, you should have formally charged me." All right. But that won't happen in the great majority of times. And especially at LCC, we really do want to, most of the time, use plagiarism as a teaching moment, all right, because it may come out of panic or ignorance or just stupidity rather than malevolence.

So we do that.

So I have a duel role there, advising a student on his or her rights, and faculty about how to process. And I feel a little uncomfortable about that sometimes, like I'm two-faced. But I am two-faced, so we go on with that.

We still have a lot of questions at LCC about excused absences. This is new for us, just two years, though most of them we've handled fairly well. And we have our own peculiarities at LCC, which means that we, our instructors are allowed to formulate their own withdrawal policies after mid-term. Most of the time that's fine. But sometimes, again, there are difficult or subjective-seeming reasons for allowing somebody to withdraw.
A lot of other duties, from making appointments at mental health clinics to just listening to students, et cetera. I think this position's very necessary. It offers the students another outlet. I'm confidential. I'm sympathetic. And I occasionally prove useful to the student. I think I'm useful to the faculty occasionally too. They know that I'm unimportant. In other words, I'm not in the hierarchy. I don't evaluate them and I'm confidential. And so I get a lot of requests for advice which a Chair might not get because they do evaluate them. And I can assure, most of the time, the faculty that their problems are not new. Nothing's new.

Is there any question? (No response.) Thank you.

CHAIR DEMBO: Thank you, Joe, very much.

One more report from Professor Edgerton regarding the Provost Search.

MR. EDGERTON: I'll make just four real quick comments.

One, we're still accepting applications. If you know some people that you think would be good, send us their name or ask them to send in an
application.

Secondly, we're seeking out a firm to do background checks. As of last I heard, no firms have jumped forward and said we really want this job, so I don't know where that stands. But we are trying to find someone on the outside who will do some of that work for us.

Thirdly, if you want to find out in more detail what's going on in the committee, if you go to the UK home page on the lower left-hand corner, go down to administration, that will bring up a small screen, one option of which is the Provost search, and you can get the details about what's happening at that point.

Lastly, we will be meeting again this Thursday at 7:30 a.m. in the Library of the Faculty Club. It will be open for a short while, and we will take comments from anyone who would like to come and comment to the committee about something that they think is important relative to that search. Then it will be closed for consideration of the applicants.

CHAIR DEMBO: Thank you for the good and thoughtful work you did.

All in favor of adjourning, please rise.
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