

UKsenate3-17.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

MARCH 20, 2017

* * * *

* * * *

KATHERINE MCCORMICK, CHAIR

ERNIE BAILEY, VICE-CHAIR

KATE SEAGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

LISA GRANT CRUMP, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

* * * *

MCCORMICK: Welcome to the March Senate Meeting. Hopefully everyone has signed in and you've picked up those fabulous clickers. Remember that we are following Robert's Rules of Order. And I appreciate that you are civil, that you're a good citizen, and that you participate, hopefully, at a high level. One of the things about citizenship, is it can be both (inaudible) and pragmatic, and we've had a conversation already from a faculty member who would appreciate that you move toward the middle of the room because there are some faculty who need to leave, and so if you notice that there's folks who are struggling to get out, then please try to accommodate their schedules because you know they have to get to class with those -- with those fabulous students. All right. Remember to return the clicker to the table before you leave.

So there's an attendance slide. When it appears and the question is read, please vote. So here's the slide. Are you

UKsenate3-17.txt

here today, yes, no, or maybe? And yes, most of you certify that you're present.

The minutes from February the 13th were sent to you. There were no changes received, so unless I have objections here on the floor, those minutes will stand approved as distributed by unanimous consent. So I wanted to remind you, we put this in yellow and red, that you remember that because of Passover Seder, we will not be meeting at our normal day, but we'll be meeting on April the 17th. So put that in your calendar. I'm just giving you now some -- some announcements, things to think about and put on your calendar. We expect in April meeting, we will have an opportunity to meet with Interim Dean Phil Harley regarding the Honors College, and the kind of unfinished business that that transition committee that you approved and recommended in the -- in the spring, to work on some of those issues that were more primary rather than legislative.

The UK Core Inclusivity Committee, that requirement is working, moving forward. I know I saw Eric Sanday. I thought I saw him earlier. He's the chair of our -- that -- of our committee and we hope to bring that to you fairly soon, and hopefully, it will move through the Senate and the Senate Council before the semester's end. We're excited about the opportunity that that work provides us. Many of you participated in the campus visits for the position for Associate Provost for Student and Academic Life. We understand that that is on schedule, hopefully, for a July 1 start.

So I've asked the Provost to come and chat with you just a bit about what's happening at the national and state level, and so he's here, and I know that he'll be happy to take your questions regarding some of these important issues.

TRACY: Thank you, Katherine. Can you hear me in the back? So I want to talk about a few things today both at the federal level and the state level. So you might have seen that President Trump released his budget, which is a skinny budget. Let me just sort of define what that means. It's a skinny budget in that it is just the discretionary spending for defense and non-defense. So it's -- it's a skinny budget, not the full budget, which will come in May.

And there are some items on there that are of importance to us and so I wanted to let you know what we're doing about that, particularly with some of the issues. Let you know what those issues are that we've identified, and then ask you at the end if there are some things that you eventually get from your organizations or others that we've missed that you help us understand those.

UKsenate3-17.txt

But I think they really fall into three fundamental categories. One, I'll call the Arts and Humanities, and as you know, he has proposed an elimination of the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Endowment for the Arts. So that's one that is important to us and that we'll be working with our legislators on.

The second category, I'll call research and that is NIH research, in particular, which has been scheduled for a 20 percent cut. And the other is DOE, not distribution of effort, but the Department of Energy Research that is also scheduled for a potential cut. So that is the second category.

The third category that I'll refer to is what I'll call student support. And there are a number of programs in there that are affected in various ways. For instance, something called the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant, or SEOG, is a program for low-income students who are not PELL eligible. And the proposal is that that particular program would be eliminated.

There is a proposal in there to reduce the amount of money for work study students. There's also a proposal to eliminate the GEAR UP Program. Some of you may participate in GEAR UP, GEAR UP Kentucky. We have a -- one of those six year grants here at the -- at the state, and UK is a very active participant in that. That helps folks from poor or poverty based middle and high schools, helps them prepare for college and then helps them to succeed while they're in college. So it's actually a six year grant to get them all the way into college, and so that's one that has been proposed for elimination.

The TRIO Program is another program for low income and first generation students to support them in their transitions to college. And the last one that I'm going to mention, this category, PELL. There is -- there's not a proposal to reduced PELL, but it does propose to use most of the PELL surplus, which is about \$3.8 - \$3.9 billion to -- for other parts of the budget.

One of the things that we've been asking for, and I'll tell you a little bit about our advocacy efforts, is to make PELL year-round again, because now it just goes through the academic year. And for students who are wanting to take summer courses or transition programs, it's -- it's not applicable right now. So we've been arguing for that.

So the President, myself and several people from our delegation were in Washington in December and visited a number of our congressional and (inaudible) leadership. I see some of the deans in the

UKsenate3-17.txt

room who were there on that visit. And we argued or argued -- lobbied for the 21st Century Cures ACT, NIH funding in particular, and we also advocated for the continuation of PELL and year-round PELL, as well during that visit. We tried to stay very focused on those visits.

I then went back in February and met with congressional leaders about the PELL Program, in particular, Congressman Guthrie, who is on the House Education Committee, and offered some information in that. So we continue to do those advocacy efforts.

We are, and have been, actively engaged with out delegations, both in the House and the Senate, on all of these issues. So there's a lot of advocacy going on in that particular process. Remember that it is a process. So this is not the final budget. The legislature determines the budget. This is not the budget, but one that has been proposed. Every president proposes a budget knowing that it won't be enacted in it's entirety and that there will be some negotiations along the way. So we'll continue to advocate.

What we could use from you is again any intel that you might get on particular programs that I did not mention today. Feel free to send those on to me and I'll pass them on over to Eric King, which is our federal relations person. We'll be glad to do that.

The second thing you can do is to provide us with vignettes or stories of how your work has made an impact in people's lives. That really is the most powerful thing that we can give the legislators is -- are the stories, not how it funds your laboratory or your efforts, but how your work makes a difference in people's lives. Because those are their constituents in their districts and that really is the part that helps us the most. So, again, if you want to provide us with those, we love those stories. They're great for us to be able to tell those in Washington.

Obviously, as a private citizen, you are free to write your congressmen and senators. You must do -- I must remind you, on plain paper, as a private citizen, not mentioning your relationship to UK because that would be considered lobbying on the part of the University of Kentucky. So you are free to do that as private citizens, but please know that we are working very hard with our delegations to advocate and lobby for these programs and others that we think might have an impact upon us. So I'll stop with that one. I have a few more, but I'll stop with that one to see if there are any questions. Yes.

VISON :

Monica Blackmun Vison , College of

Fine Arts.

I actually had a chance to accost my congressman and I told him that as a -- as an art historian, I would be particularly worried about cuts to (inaudible) Humanities and National Endowment for the Arts. He said well, you know, I've been having all these great conversations with the University of Kentucky. So he is really impacted by these discussions and I'm grateful for that. He also said I should contact his scheduler and schedule if he has gotten back to me.

But I'm in kind of a weird position. I don't want to speak on behalf of the University, but I also would like him to know, you know, my experience personally with arts and humanities. Do you have any counsel for us?

TRACY:

well, I think, you know, certainly as a private citizen you can share your experiences, but if you have stories of -- of individuals in a community that has particularly benefitted, they've told you the benefits of your work or others work, that -- that's what we need, really.

I see Tom Harris back there. Sorry, Tom, I didn't see you, you're kind of hiding there. But Tom also -- you can pass those stories on to Tom, as Director or Vice President for University Relations, and Tom will help us put those stories together. So that's a way you can really help us. That -- those are the ways that we're most effective versus saying well, it would be great if you continue PELL. What -- for us when we do that, we talk about the percentage of students. Twenty-eight percent of our students are PELL recipients. We talk about the unmet financial need. We talk about \$23 million a year in PELL funding that our students receive. That's the kind of information they need. So what you can give us is very helpful. Thank you.

MCGILLIS:

Joe McGillis, Medicine. So you've given us a lot of facts. Are -- are those readily available on a website somewhere if we decide to write privately to our congressman?

TRACY:

Yeah, there are a number of places where the budget has been summarized. Inside Higher Ed had a real nice summary of the budget. If you subscribe to insidehighered, just go to insidehighered.com. You can sign up for their daily news letter. It's free. But they had a -- they had a number of stories. They had a very nice summary of this in there and links to different parts of it. It's just one that I -- I know is very readily available. But there are a number of places, and for higher education, that's a great place to look.

MCGILLIS:

I was being more UK centric. If we were -- were writing concerning things that

TRACY: affect us with (inaudible).
Yeah. Tom, we don't have a specific site that --

HARRIS: Not. Nothing detailed at this point, no.

TRACY: Yeah, we -- we're still trying to gather and do intel. Eric King and Tom are reading through the budget and the proposals, and trying to parse it out. I mean, the things that I mentioned are the things that I picked up on and others have shared, but we -- we're just really still in that gaining information phase. Yes.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S.
So this isn't exactly the budget, but it's still federal policy. The President came out with a new executive order on immigration that does not hold by courts, but certainly removed some of the arbitrariness of the last one, but still is really bad policy, in my opinion.
First of all, do we know how it's affected our ability to recruit from overseas at this point? And second, is the University continuing to try to lobby whoever in the administration, the federal administration or the -- or congress that recruitment from other countries is in our own interest?

TRACY: So the first part of your question is sort of do we know the impact and what (inaudible) and so forth. Yeah, that -- that process -- when we were in Washington in December, we spoke about these issues with all of our congressmen and we met with -- with literally the entire delegation while we were there, so we did speak about these issues. We continue to provide them with information about these kinds of things and so (inaudible) and we provide them with information. We, as I think Dr. Roberts shared with you, we know how many students for which countries that have come -- that are in our university community and how they're affected in different ways. And so we -- we continue to work on that, those particular processes. But help me with sort of the first part of what have I missed here in terms of what I've said. You had one more piece and I was trying to focus on that.

GROSSMAN: The affect on applications.

TRACY: Oh yeah, applications. Thank you.
So, nationally, yeah, there's about a 14 percent decrease in international applications and I'd say we're running pretty close to the national trends in that without giving out specific numbers on UK. I try not to do that (inaudible), but we're running in that similar ballpark. Interestingly, there was an article this morning on Canada and the applications for Canadian institutions are up significantly. But I will say that for many of those institutions, it's actually the same trajectory as the last year. So Canadian

institutions have been seeing a tremendous increase in international applicants for about the past five years, about a 15 percent per year growth. So for some institutions, it is a new growth, and for others, they're saying, yeah, it's up, but it looks just like it did last year. So I think most institutions would tell you that the trend is to have a lower number of international applications. The ones I talk to confirm it.

GROSSMAN: well, perhaps, this is something that can be shared with the people in Washington, then, that this has a direct impact on the experience of our students, our Kentucky and American students and also our bottom line.

TRACY: The American Council on Education, I was there last weekend for their annual meeting, and they've taken a very strong statement on this, and they're one of the major advocacy groups for higher education. They're taking a very strong stance on it and APLU has also made a number of comments about the importance of individuals from those countries to our educational and research missions in the United States. So the larger groups have advocated, as well.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.
Is our congressional delegation optimistic that they will have -- can influence what the President proposes?

TRACY: well, if you saw over the weekend, Congressman Rogers made a very public statement about the President's budget and the areas in which he disagreed. And in particular for him, the Appalachian Regional Commission was one that was in the budget for cutting, and he made a very strong statement. So I don't know their personal feelings, but that one, I know, is very public. The ones that I have spoken to are very much in support of PELL and seem to be supportive of year-round PELL. They were also supportive of NIH when we spoke to them, so I'm assuming that they have the same opinions now. I don't want to speak for them, but the -- the sense that we got on those two issues, in particular, obviously, the others I haven't spoken to them about it (inaudible), but those two, we received a lot of strong support. Okay. So we'll continue our advocacy efforts in that regard.

Now, let's talk a little bit about state issues. So Katherine asked me to speak about a few issues this morning -- this afternoon, sorry. Long day. The first is Senate Bill 107, which has to do with boards and boards of trustees. And so that particular piece of legislation is on the Governor's desk for signature. I'll give you a few pieces of it, and what's maybe a little different or -- or most pertinent, but first I need to say that we were given the

opportunity for input and that input was considered, and it did influence the legislation from the original version. So I will say that our President and others did a nice job, worked hard and our government relations, Tom Harris, those folks did a nice job of working with them, and so there were some inclusions of some things that we had advocated for.

It does clarify the process for removal of individual board members or entire boards and says that it must be for cause. For cause means, in terms of legislation, malfeasance, misfeasance, incompetence, or gross neglect of duty. So I -- I simply state the words that are in there. You do, once that is proposed for an individual or for a board, there's a 30-day period in which you can submit information to, I guess you'd call it refute those -- those claims or allegations. It then goes to the CPE or the Council on Post Secondary Education for consideration and a non-binding recommendation. And then the Governor takes that recommendation to make the final decision. So, it -- it does state that there's a process where the Governor can remove individual board members or entire boards. Again, for those reasons I just gave you. It also discusses the issue of proportional representation. You may have read in the papers about whether -- whether the representation is proportional, particularly around political lines. It does clarify that process. In fact, the representation is supposed to be proportional based on precedence, political affiliation, gender, minority, race, or professional qualifications. And so that is also addressed, but one thing that is -- wasn't changed from the original bill was that if it can be remedied in one cycle of replacement of board members and you can't remove somebody for those reasons, if the remedy can be taken care of by somebody cycling off within a cycle. Did I get that right, Tom?

HARRIS:

Right.

TRACY:

So if he does get a chance to, you know, if there is somebody that for two years of a cycle, somebody will be rotating off and can be replaced by somebody that would bring it into proportional representation, then that board member is not removed. So that was one, also, change from the original legislation. Dr. Jones.

JONES:

Yeah, Davy Jones, Toxicology.

What is the status of the Governor's ability to touch elected members of the board?

TRACY:

It's silent. So I assume that there is no ability -- it's not mentioned in the legislation at all.

BLONDER:

Lee Blonder, Medicine.

Yeah, I think that they do say that it's the gubernatorial appointee, versus the board, that this applies to.

TRACY: Yeah. Appointed, yeah. Right. It doesn't mention the elected members.

BLONDER: It doesn't apply to the faculty staff and student members of our board.

TRACEY: And that was the case with Louisville's Board, is that they remained.

JONES: And I guess just a follow up. Does this legislation address the ability or not of the governor to change the number of appointed members that constitute the board?

TRACY: No. It -- it keeps them where they are currently at. With Louisville at that changed number, it keeps them -- keeps us at 20 or whatever it is. At 20, 21, whatever that number is.

Heading right down the list of topics. Senate Bill 153 is performance based funding. You've heard a lot about that. The President was here and talked about that just briefly. It's -- it's -- where it sets forth a formula by which in the -- in the current or FY 18, that five percent of our current budget is based on this performance base, and I'll give you those broad categories in just a moment, that it be allocated on those performance measures of 35 percent of it based on student success outcomes. Things like degrees, and also degree production, student progression. So the numbers of students with, for instance, 30, 60 and 90 credit hours. Again, as a measure of progression. STEM plus H degrees and degrees by low income and under represented minority students.

So there is accounting for those various groups, as well. That's 35 percent. Another 35 percent is based on the credit hours earned. However, they're weighted for differences in cost structure. So some programs are more expensive than others and so they will have a weighting for the cost structure of different degrees, but also for the type and level of degrees. So bachelor's, master's, PhD and professional degrees as well. So there will be some weighting for that, but also across disciplines. For instance, an engineering degree is more costly to produce than maybe some other types of degrees, and so they'll will be weighted for that.

And then the remaining 30 percent is what I call O&M or Operations and Maintenance. It's a reasonably complicated formula to figure out how many square feet you have and how much money you put towards student success and a number of other factors, so call it O&M money, is the other 30 percent.

So in fiscal year 18, we have 5 percent at risk. That's the year that is

coming up. In fiscal year 19, there can be as much as 100 percent risk, but there is a 100 percent hold harmless. So they may be all at risk, but they're not at risk because there is a hold harmless provision for (inaudible). In FY 20, there is -- the legislature, general assembly will determine again how much is at risk. It could be upwards of 100 percent, but there is a one percent stop loss, meaning that your budget couldn't change by more than one percent.

In the next year, FY 21, that stop loss is two percent, and then it is undetermined past that point, whether there would be a stop loss beyond that point and how much of the budget would be at risk. So that's Senate Bill 153, performance based funding. I know there has been a lot in the newspapers about it and the President has come and spoken about that, as well. Questions on that?

O'HAIR: Dan O'Hair, Communication and Information.

You mentioned the changes that will occur in terms of the amount of risks, but what about the weightedness that would change? Are they going to remain constant, 35 percent, 35 percent, 30 percent?

TRACY: That's the plan in the Bill. Again, the legislature can always put in a new bill and change it at some point in time, but that's the -- the way it is for now, as we know it. I'm -- the one that is more interesting to me is how much is at risk. And I think that's got a little more interest in terms of how much --

O'HAIR: And how much 1 percent?

TRACY: Of us? \$267 million, so \$2.7 million, roughly, is the stop loss, where the stop loss is. It would be 524 for 2 percent. Five percent would be what? About 13 million (inaudible). Yes.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.

When the President was last here, he was optimistic that UK would perform well under these merit evaluations. Now that you've seen the Bill, do you still have the same confidence?

TRACY: Yeah, it was -- it -- it's fundamentally unchanged from when he saw it, when he spoke to you last. Dr. Grossman.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

So can this -- can there be winners under this Bill? People who end up with more than the money they would have earned without it?

TRACY: Yes.

GROSSMAN: Or is everyone a loser? Because everyone could lose money, but no one could gain money.

TRACY: And that was one of the worries going in, was that it was a -- that there could be all either stay the same or losers,

but there can be winners. And yes, there can be winners and losers.

GROSSMAN: So the 5 percent from all the universities is going to be pooled and then we could end up earning 6 percent or 7 percent instead of our --

TRACY: Something different than what we have now, right.

GROSSMAN: Thanks.

TRACY: Senate Bill 17 is the last one I'll mention to you. You may have read it in the paper or may have seen something about it. It's a religious and political freedom bill. You may or may not have seen that. What it does is -- and I'm going to read this just so I don't get it wrong, but it says, students (inaudible) allowed to express their religious and political views in their school work, artwork, speeches, and other ways, and it prohibits universities from putting unreasonable restrictions on student speech exercised outdoors on campus, and give -- and to give religious and political organizations equal access to public forums.

We have investigated this Bill quite extensively and it is no change from anything we do now, its constitution and the way we operate now. So if you hear anything about that, for us it means no change, but I know when the context sort of gets there, people start to wondering what has changed and for the University of Kentucky, nothing has changed. So it's fundamentally where we're at right now.

There were a number of bills that you were probably interested in that did not make it forward. The concealed carry bill did not go forward and so that was not considered in this legislative session. An issue -- a bill on bathrooms also was not taken forward. So there were a number of those issues that would have been probably of great interest to people, did not go forward.

So this is really the three fundamental bills (inaudible) education and master's degrees for teachers in high schools and K through 12, but other than that, these were really the three fundamental bills that we thought affected the University of Kentucky the most. Any other questions? All right. Well, thank you for your time.

MCCORMICK: (Inaudible). We really do want to extend a welcome to Dr. Sonja Feist-Price for her new role in the Vice President for Institutional Diversity Office. Good job, Sonja.

And so we have three announcements here and I do have faculty that I'd like to invite to share some progress and so Sharon Lock is here. And she is chairing what we're calling the Title Series Committee. If you remember, this is a series -- a committee that really will look carefully and

thoughtfully, they are bench marking of the ways in which we employ faculty. And she has, I think, a very learned group of faculty who are helping her in the area, committee chairs, as well as her own, SACPT. So welcome, Doctor.

LOCK:

well, I had the honor of chairing this, it's an ad hoc. We're calling it an ad hoc committee on Title Series. And as Katherine said, it's -- they're members of the Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure, as well as the chairs of the area committees. So, we have a good representation, I think, of the various Title Series.

So we met for the first time on February 28th, with the Provost, and I'm just going to sort of try to condense the charge a little bit. The charge was developed by the Senate Council in consultation with Provost Tracy. So the first part of it is to review UK's current Title Series system to determine the feasibility of changing the system to two title series, tenure eligible and non-tenure eligible, with ranks in both series at assistant, associate, and full professor.

And then the second part of it is to look at the inclusion of multi-year contracts, rolling or not, for faculty in the non-tenure eligible title series. So we met twice. Like I said, the first time we met was on February 28th to -- with the Provost, to review the charge. And so if I say something that you didn't say, let me know.

First of all, the one comment he made was, it would be nice to simplify the Title Series. That different departments interpret the various title series in different ways, as I'm sure some of you know, and just sort of as a reminder. And I don't think unless you're involved with some of these title series, you may not even realize, we have four tenure eligible title series, regular, special, extension, and librarian. And then the non-tenure eligible title series are clinical, lecturer, research, voluntary and adjunct. So it's a lot.

And then the other thing that we talked about at that meeting was the concern that all types of scholarship may not be recognized. So one thing that the Provost did was he's brought us all a copy, the committee, a copy of Boyer's book, Scholarship Reconsidered. So that's going to be one of our homework assignments, to review that, and I'm sure you all hopefully know about Boyer and how he looks at scholarships in different ways. It's not just strictly NIH research. It's, you know, various types of scholarship.

The second meeting we had, we just had an open discussion about the charge. We talked about the current ARs, and then looked

at, you know, sort of talked about what are we going to really be looking at. We are going to be looking at benchmarks. Sheila Brothers was very helpful in putting together a table for us to start looking at, our benchmarks and SEC schools, to look at what are they doing as far as tenure and non-tenure tracts. Right now, we have weekly meetings scheduled. We -- some of -- we may -- may or may not be meeting weekly. It just sort of depends on what we've got to do as far as, you know, if we haven't got all our work done, like homework for the following week, it may skip a week. We didn't meet over spring break because people were gone.

And so we really -- the Provost didn't really give us a deadline, but I -- I don't think it's -- it's not something we want to drag out, but it's not something we want to rush either. I think this is something that we all know has been discussed in years past. To my knowledge, it's the first time we've really had somebody just sit down and look at it. So that's going to be what we'll do, is we'll look at it and we'll come up with some recommendations. Is there a question in the back?

JONES: Davy Jones, Medicine. From the charge -- it seemed like the charge is premised on doing away with the instructor rank because you said it had tenure, tenure eligible, and assistant and associate professor.

LOCK: Yeah. Well, I don't know that I personally can answer that question. I -- I think we'll give that to the Provost. You -- did you use the term, opine, that we could opine that? So I don't think a decision has really been made on that. It's just --

JONES: That wasn't an oversight in your reading right there?

LOCK: No. No.

JONES: It's a substantive part of the consideration in the charge?

LOCK: No, it was not in the charge. The word instructor was not in the charge, if that answers your question.

SOULT: Allison Soult, A and S. As you're looking into this with the tenure and non-tenure eligible, is the discussion of voting rights for the non-tenured eligible being an issue? Because, I mean, you know, lecturers for other universities, some have voting rights within their college and some don't. And they are not here to speak for themselves.

LOCK: I mean that wasn't part of our charge.

TRACY: I would -- I would hope you comment on it.

LOCK: But we -- yeah.

MCCORMICK: And we are very diverse in the ways in which our colleges implement that, so we

LOCK: don't have a University-wide --
I mean, I know in the College of
Nursing, lecturers can vote within the
college, so....

MCCORMICK: Yeah, but it's a great -- thanks,
Allison, that's a good point.

JONES: I guess just on that note, I'd
point out, this has collapsed to the tenure
and tenure eligible -- the College of
Medicine has hundreds of voluntary faculty.
You think very carefully about voting rights.

LOCK: And I've personally thought about
that too. Because we -- nursing has that
too.

MCCORMICK: And one of the things that has come
to -- if you don't mind me commenting --

LOCK: No.

VOICE: In Sheila's work on benchmarking is
- we haven't been able to find a benchmark
institution whose -- who would -- who has a
similar model, let's just say that. So we're
interested in what they have and ways in
which it's implemented. But today, and she's
done some pretty intensive work, so far,
we've not -- we are dissimilar. Now, not
that being different is wrong, just....

JONES: Davy Jones.
This is a historical note. Our
having a number of different title series,
groups back to the 1960s, John Oswald,
President. He came from the University of
California and they have a whole bunch of
series like this. That's where we started.

LOCK: Got you. Well, that -- that's
helpful. We'll look at that.

BAILEY: Ernie Bailey, Agriculture, Food and
Environment.
We have a lot of extension faculty
and they quite like the extension title
series because it allows recognition of their
unique scholarships. And so if you -- there
would be a concern about losing that
(inaudible). One -- one -- one protection
there, is to have specific area committees.
And so if you were in a tenure tract title,
but then you designated yourself for -- for
an extension area committee that might be a
way around or a way to solve that
(inaudible).

LOCK: Steve Isaacs is on the committee
and he just anecdotally contacted somebody.
I want to say at Michigan maybe, Michigan
State. But wherever it -- they tenure
extension faculty, so I don't -- so we're
going to look at that, too, just to see where
they are. But that's a good idea.

MCCORMICK: One last question.

EDERINGTON: Josh Ederington, Economics, B and
E.
I was -- you talked about part of
the charges being simplification as being
part of the motivation and the fact that
different colleges interpret things

differently. I was wondering, is that a good thing or a bad thing or saying that you're going to discuss whether that's a good thing or a bad thing?

LOCK: I guess we're going to discuss it. I, you know, was it -- we just -- I was telling somebody a while ago about -- and now I've lost my train of thought. But yeah, we're going to talk about it.

MCCORMICK: And the discussion regarding diversity, was it about faculty voting in the college, in terms of curriculum and other matters specific to a college. That -- that is what mine meant in that comment.

LOCK: And I thought about what I had forgotten. The different -- the whole thing about different departments and interpreting things different ways and the criteria among -- and everything -- some criteria are very specific, some are very vague. One discussion we had was that if -- and this was just -- I mean, just a brief discussion about, you know, if an offer letter -- when you came to work and the offer letter said you (inaudible), it was very specific about what you need to do to get tenure, then, you know, that might be one way of dealing with it, or the job description, or something other than just these -- the vague -- the vagueness of some of the criteria in some departments. So, you know, we -- I -- I -- we haven't really had the discussion, but I'm assuming that each department would have their own way of doing, you know, the real detail of it.

MCCORMICK: I know that Sharon will appreciate the opportunity to work with you and I would suspect the deans may have a comment, one or two.

LOCK: Feel free to e-mail me. Our meetings are on Tuesdays at 9:30, 9:30 to 10:30. So just, you know, you might to e-mail me like on Mondays and we'll add it to the agenda. Thank you.

MCCORMICK: So, Carl and Rick, I think are here to talk to us just a little bit about the progress on graduate education. There's Carl.

MATTACOLA: Brett had to step out. Thank you. I'll give you a brief update of the Blue Ribbon Committee. Brett Spears and I have met several times. Our committee has met once as a large group and then we've met several times to review basically a survey that was commissioned by the graduate school from STAMATS. And the Blue Ribbon Committee has reviewed it and we've also had the research and graduate education committee and the Senate review it. We've received feedback from those groups. We've asked them to revise it. STAMATS has revised it, sent back a revision, and then we forwarded that also the graduate school this week to ask

them to provide any comments based on the suggested changes.

Once we receive that back, we're hoping to -- we're going to gather our community together, here in the next week or so, and then we'll speak to (inaudible). We'll probably need to get a UK Now piece out that just describes what our committee's charge is, send that survey to the graduate faculty at the University. And then use that as sort of one of the starting points for the committee to really move forward.

In addition to that, we have two student members on the committee, and they have also developed a similar survey that they want to send to the grad students. And Brett's been working with them, and we're working with them next week, to see what that looks like and help them so they -- they can move that information to get it to the graduate students and get feedback that we can use for our committees.

MCCORMICK: Do you want to tell them about the four subcommittees?

MATTACOLA: Happy to. So we have -- based on the things that we've generated from the documents and the information that the committee has reviewed and the conversations, we'll have four sub-committees that will break off into. Growth and Innovation is one. The Graduate Student Experience, and included in that will be student funding. Structure, included in that, we'll also probably have a component of funding. And then Evaluation Assessment/Quality. So those are the four areas where our committee will focus and the subjects will focus their energies.

MCCORMICK: Any questions for Carl?

MATTACOLA: Thank you.

MCCORMICK: Thank you. So a number of faculty and Senate leaders are going to move -- go to the Council on Post-secondary Education. The dean of the Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leaders, I see Mike Kennedy in the back of the room. Do you want to share the information about this work or the work the (inaudible).

KENNEDY: Only that COSFL has been clearly inactive for the last three or four years. It was very active before that. It's all the universities in the state. Four representatives, usually the trustees, Senate Council Chair, AAUP member (inaudible), and they basically dedicate for higher education with the governor and (inaudible). Of course meetings are open to any faculty, but we're limited to four voting representatives.

MCCORMICK: But you're all welcome on the 7th at 1:00 in Frankfort. All right. So I'd also like to talk a little bit about curriculum. I -- one of the charges for us this year, for the Senate office, was to work

toward moving the curriculum along. I have had opportunities to speak with faculty councils, as well as external committees, where one of the challenges that is typically cited is the slowness of our curriculum approval process. And so we are happy, happy to -- we'd do a happy dance, if you indulged us. We don't have any curriculum sitting in the Senate Council Office.

The only place that there might be unapproved programs is back in your offices if you had sent something through eCATS and it got sent back to you and you're sitting on it for -- for whatever reason, for revision or whether you really intend to move it forward.

And so that's basically because of the work of Sheila Brothers and Joanie Ett-Mims, who is here, as well as the other members of that team, Roshan Nikou from the graduate school and Jim Lindsey from HCCC. Our chairs have been fabulous. Carl is the chair of HCCC, Amy Spriggs is the chair of the undergraduate, and then Brian Jackson is the chair of the graduate council. So we are (inaudible) that we've been able to get this far along.

If you know of programs that haven't moved or if you know of courses that are sitting somewhere, let us know. But one of the -- in addition to the great people power is this system called Curriculog. Hopefully, many of you know this, and this is the way now that we're moving our proposals forward. And I've asked Sheila and Joanie, do you have some information to offer?

BROTHERS: Just a very short bit. I'll go through shortly how to get to the Curriculog site and how to log in and what to look for. There are a lot of bells and whistles in Curriculog. It's not necessarily intuitive the first time you do it. Curriculog also reuses the same icon in different places in Curriculog to indicate different means. So it's always interesting. If you go to the Senate's website, we've got a hotlink to Curriculog here. You can also just copy and paste it and put it in -- make a favorites in your -- in your browser.

When you log in, the log in is somewhat hidden. One of the more common questions Joanie and I get is, how do I log in, and it's up here in the corner. So your -- you'll use your UK link blue password and username, and when it signs you in, you'll have information here. So there's four tabs here. There's My Tasks, these are things that are waiting on me to do or something that's waiting on you to do. It's not something that you're -- it's not things that you're generally involved in, it's something that's waiting for you right now. My Proposals are the things that you have

UKsenate3-17.txt

initiated and that you have proposed in the system, so you can look -- look for and find them there. Watch List, I currently -- well, I guess I do have one.

As you look through proposals and you see them in Curriculog, there's a little star, and if you click that star, it's kind of like a favorites in Curriculog. So if you've got a collaborative, something or other going on with another department, you can watch the course and see where it is without looking through all the proposals.

And if you just want to look for any general proposal, there is a long list here. We're limited to 10 per page -- I think it's 10 per page. We've asked Curriculog if that can be expanded, and it's on their list of very important things to do, but not soon.

If you're looking for a specific course that's not in your purview, but you're interested in it and you want to find something out, you can just go to this advanced filter and then type in the keyword here and it will bring it up down below, just that single course.

For Senate purposes, when you come in, you get an e-mail from me that says that there's a Senate transmittal ready. What you're going to do, is you're going to navigate to the Agendas button at the top. There are four tabs for agendas. There are agendas -- generally, they fall into two categories: they're agendas somebody else made and agendas that you made. Very few of you, if any, will ever have anything in My Agendas or in My Archived Agendas, because you don't have the rights to make agendas. So, you can go to All Agendas to see the Senate web -- the Senate transmittal, as well as the undergraduate council and the graduate council, have their agendas for meetings here. So you're welcome to poke around and look.

When you get to the Senate transmittal, most things in Curriculog have -- it's a split screen. On the right is things that you can do and on the left is the data that you're looking at. And then most of the rows also have these buttons to the right. So your options here for this particular transmittal, if you wanted to print the transmittal, you can hit the print button and it will come up with a menu that has all 14 proposals in a long list here for some reason, if that were -- if that were important to you, you can just look through. This is just a series of multiple proposals, one right after the other.

So there may be a reason that that would be useful for you. Your other options, instead of print, you can view a summary, which is not terribly useful. It gives you a

UKsenate3-17.txt

short list of all the courses that are in -- on the agenda, along with the course title, but you can't really do anything else.

For your purposes, you probably want to view the agenda. So if you click on that icon, then you can scroll down a bit and these are -- this is the list of all the courses that are on this particular transmittal. They're generally -- they're generally alphabetical except for when they're not. Oftentimes, it will be alphabetical. If it's a large transmittal, it will be 1 through 50 will be alphabetical, and then 51 through 60 are just a random conglomeration of courses. And that's not a high priority for us to look for, but just keep in mind, if you're looking for a particular course and it's not alphabetically listed, it doesn't mean it's not there.

And then when you're -- when you look at a course, you're probably going to want to view the entire proposal, so you just click on that View Proposal and you will have the ability to scroll down and see the proposal and see the details in it. If you're looking at a -- if you're looking at a course change and you want to see what changes happened, when you log in, the first thing that comes up is this user tracking area. So you'll go down and you'll go to show current with markup and this is more or less a track changes feature in Curriculog. So if you want to know what the current and proposed is -- I hope they did this one right. No, I'm sorry. This one wasn't submitted properly. But if it's submitted properly, you'll see red crossed through and red added text. So it's very easy to see what was added to the proposal or what has changed.

Joanie and I are always around if you have questions about logging in or how to find something in Curriculog, you're welcome to find us. The council coordinators have divvied up the colleges amongst us, so we are dedicated liaisons to certain councils. But we'll pretty much answer any question you have for us when you call, but if it's really detailed, we may give you to the appropriate college liaison. Does anybody have any questions about Senate agendas? Okay.

MCCORMICK: One of the features of Curriculog is it tells you whose desk the proposal has stopped on, which is helpful, assuming it's not your desk. But we did -- there are glitches like, you know, are common in this kind of large scale (inaudible). For example, we had programs in my department that were being sent to a member of the healthcare enterprise -- a nurse on one of the floors. And so, (inaudible) where's our stuff, where's our stuff, where's our stuff, and our department would say, I don't know, I

don't know. Well, actually that lady was -- was actually approving them. And so, just FYI, if something does, you know, happen for you in a timely manner, you know, make sure that the person who is approving them is actually the person who is supposed to be approving them. So, yeah, we were able to figure it out, but it was just kind of a mystery there for a bit.

So I'll try to move -- move quickly through things. The Senate Council acted on your behalf for these proposals, four of them, I think, because it was important due to time constraints and other issues. And so we heard a proposal about an additional date for May commencement. I'm sure that many of you are aware of this, so there -- a ceremony was added on Friday, plus one on Saturday and Sunday. We voted not to oppose. As you can see, this is carefully written for May 27, but we requested a formal proposal to review for a permanent change. We were -- we certainly were responsive to this, but, you know, May comes at the same time every year, and so, we were hopeful that we might get more information about this earlier than we did. And I see Dean (inaudible), her college is one of these that was going to be on Friday. So she had to give up her opportunity to go to the Oaks in order to attend graduation.

Our intent on this Dentistry calendar approval was to better balance the course load, and again, they needed to send this out sooner, rather than later, so they could notify their students and so we did act on your behalf with those -- that approval.

The Academic Evaluation, we are going to actually talk about this a little bit later in the Agenda, but in order to move this forward, we did make this approval. I see David (inaudible) in the audience. So we approved the proposal to make mid-term grades due on midnight of the Monday after the 9th week, instead of the midnight of the Friday of the 9th week, so that faculty would have more time, especially those faculty who had large courses, who were giving mid-terms and then were trying to get them graded prior to the close of business or at least midnight on Friday. So we'll ask for this to be a permanent change a little bit later, but we did get that permission and that went out.

We also waived on a one time basis the relevant Senate Rules that allowed the interim academic officer of undergraduate education and the interim associate provost -- assistant provost for student and academic support to administratively move University admitted but college unregistered students. So these were just students who had formerly been in undergraduate education. They were moving to colleges and they -- we needed to

do this in a fashion that had a time limit. Because as you'll see, the next slide requires -- the Registrar requires that this happen more quickly than -- than waiting until you -- we could share this with you. And so we approved that, again, on an interim basis, and those colleges have now all been transferred. That's a big move. And are all admissible or all, you know, living in colleges now. So that was hard work and we really appreciated the work of the interim assistant provost in making that happen.

We did actually say that we would waive the academic calendar restrictions so that if cases arose where that decision could not be made by 2/26, then -- then we would allow some -- some flexibility on that. But again, all those students, I think there were 2,000 plus students, moved out of those undeclared in -- that had been formerly in undergraduate education and are now in colleges in what is to be called exploratory studies.

We also approved a calendar change for first year medical students. And I just want to remind you that the search committee for the Executive Vice President for Health Affairs is continuing, and for the Associate Provost for Student and Academic Life, again, also ongoing. And then the completed search for our Vice President for Institutional Diversity that yielded Dr. Feist-Price. Ernie?

BAILEY: So in the last five years we've had an award for an outstanding senator and I believe that we're going to discuss this at the next Senate Council meeting because we wanted to tweak this perhaps. (Inaudible) elected one individual, and some other things that we have discussed or considered discussing was opening it to multiple people, and also extending it so that non-senators who have provided service to the Senate was able -- who served on committees, might also be eligible. So future report or future announcement coming. Please think of people that would be deserving of this award. So we're going to have to send something out this week, huh?

BROTHERS: The deadline is flexible.

BAILEY: I heard about this, this week.

MCCORMICK: Thank you. Kate, do you have anything?

SEAGO: No.

MCCORMICK: All right, Bob and Lee, you're up.

BLONDER: Our report was going to be on the Senate Bill 107, which Provost Tracy did an excellent job of explaining that, so we will not be reporting on that.

GROSSMAN: We did have one more Trustees meeting since the last Senate meeting and it was fairly uneventful. There were no surprises or controversial issues there. I

UKsenate3-17.txt

will say, I was a little surprised to hear the Provost talk about President Trump's skinny budget, but then I realized, of course, he wouldn't issue a fat budget because he would find that very unattractive. Any -- does anyone have any questions for us?

BLONDER: The next Board meeting is in May, so if you want to review the agenda, it comes out a few days before. You can contact us if you have any questions or issues or comments. Thank you.

MCCORMICK: All right. Joe Fink.

FINK: Thank you. Good afternoon. It's time for my annual report from the University Appeals Board. As I stood in the back of the room, I spotted a number of alumni of the Appeals Board in the audience. There are also a couple of former ombuds here. So there are other people to handle questions besides me. Let's look at some information about the Appeals Board.

First, what's the jurisdiction? We deal primarily with academic matters, either allegations of cheating or plagiarism, or where a student is alleging that there was, perhaps, a deviation from the syllabus and a student didn't get a fair and just evaluation of their performance. As you will see some -- with some numbers we have on a later slide, that's the vast majority of what we do.

We also, on occasion, handle disciplinary appeals. These come up not through the academic ombuds' office, but through the Dean of Students' office. And that is situations where a student is proposed to be expelled from the University or had other kinds of actions taken with regard to some behavioral issues that they have. So that's the primary jurisdiction.

The appeal process is that -- let's use the academic type of case - they will start with Laura in the Academic Ombuds Office. She does a fantastic job of working with these students doing intake, making sure the students are positioned to bring with them all the papers they need, all the information to formulate their appeal and so forth.

Then they meet with the ombud. The ombud investigates the matter, talks to the faculty member involved, talks to the student involved, talks to any other relevant parties. And then the ombud makes a conclusion, does the case have merit? If the determination is that the case has merit, the ombud then writes a review memo and sends that on to the University Appeals Board. If the ombud's decision is that the case does not have merit, then the student is sent a memo that essentially says, I've looked into this matter and I've concluded your issue does not contain merit.

UKsenate3-17.txt

You have 30 days to request a review of that matter by the University Appeals Board. If that student decides to pursue that avenue, the student does not appear before the appeals board. It is not a hearing. It is a review. And the student makes a written submission to the appeals board, and the very narrow question to be addressed at that point is should the student be granted a hearing. And that's the only question on the table at that point. And that's what we call a no-merit case. All right.

If the decision is, yes, the student should be given a hearing, then in the subsequent occasion, the student will be notified and invited to participate, as will be the -- the faculty member involved in the matter. If the ombud, on the other hand, has decided that the merit -- that the thing does have merit, the case does have merit, this summary memo comes to me, I distribute it to the University Appeals Board members. The appeals board members respond whether they can make a hearing at a given point. I usually try to distribute to the members of the Appeals Board somewhere around 15 to 20 potential time slots to have a hearing, as we'll talk about here in a minute.

The Appeals Board is composed of 30 people: 18 faculty, 12 students. In order to have a hearing, you have to have a quorum of at least 5 out of 8 be faculty and so at least 1, 2, or 3 can be a student. Now, it is permissible under the rules to have all 8 be faculty. I have never done that in the 19 years I've been doing this. I've always tried to have at least one student member on the panel hearing the case and so far we've been successful with that.

So 8 people constitute a quorum for the Appeals Board. Well, if there are 30 people on the Appeals Board and you need 8 for a quorum, sounds like not much of a problem, right? Huge problem. Huge problem getting a quorum of the University Appeals Board with the right mix of people. Number one challenge that I'll talk about later on, getting the members of the Appeals Board to respond to e-mails. No surprise there, right?

My circulations dates for the hearing, I'd like to -- I try to put them two, three, four weeks out, so there is time to get the package out to the people, to the parties, to the panel members and so forth. And getting -- getting a quorum is a real challenge.

University Appeals Board has practices and procedures that are accessible off the ombuds' website. You can go look at those if you want. It's a question and answer format document that outlines how the

Appeals Board does its -- its practices, how it conducts its affairs, that sort of thing.

I want to emphasize that an Appeals Board hearing is not an adversarial process. It is a fact finding process. And so the idea is that students come in, it's a very tense situation for the students, particularly if you're a freshman taking on a faculty member of something like that. That can be a very strenuous situation.

So we try to put the student at ease and our goal is to get -- get at what really happened here. And so, the student, the faculty member, the members of the panel hearing the case all have the same packet of material, well in advance of the -- of the hearing, so everybody is dealing with the same information. So we have the student come in. The student -- oops, we don't want to go there yet. The student -- student indicates what he or she is appealing, and then after the student has had his or her say, then we turn to the faculty member and say, okay, what is your take on all this? What is your perspective on the matter, and the faculty weighs in. The student is there to hear everything the faculty says. The faculty member is there to hear everything the student member says. But there is no questioning one another across the table. All the questions come from members of the Appeals Board panel, not from the parties themselves, okay.

Now, if they feel there is some pressing question that they want to have considered to be asked, they can write it down and pass it to me and I'll make a determination whether to ask the question or not. But there's no direct questioning across the table from student to faculty or faculty to student, okay.

Once all the questions have been exhausted, I always try to go back to the student at the end, and at the very end say, what is your preferred outcome? What are you seeking to have happen as a result of this process? And we want to get from the student a clean statement, what I want is X, so that the panel is very clear on exactly what it is the student is seeking, okay.

At that point, the student leaves, the faculty members leave and the members of the panel reach a decision on that case before the next case is called. We will rarely have an appeals panel meeting with only one case. And the reason, it's so hard to get them together. So usually, it's two cases or three cases on the agenda when we -- when we have a meeting, okay.

Here are some numbers for you. These are -- start at 2010, over here on the left, goes over to last year, which is 15-16. You can see the trend is fewer cases.

UKsenate3-17.txt

The number of cheating or plagiarism cases has gone down. One of the explanations I would point to, is increasing coverage of plagiarism discussion in UK 101, and a lot of courses have content addressing what is plagiarism. Existence of the internet has fostered plagiarism. People working on a paper, saying, oh, I like that paragraph, I'll just cut and paste that right in my paper, you know, that sort of thing. But you can see the trend is that it is going down.

Fair and just evaluation, that's the one where the faculty member has said at the beginning of the course, we're going to determine your grade this way and then someway over the flow of the course changed it and said no, we're going to determine your grade that way. You can't do that.

A no merit review, that's the one where the ombud looked into the matter, concluded the matter lacked merit, sent the letter to the student, no merit, and the student asked for a review. College honor code, there are a number of colleges, professional schools typically that have college level honor codes. You can see we haven't had one of those since 2012- 13. Code of student conduct, look at the drop off there from 14- 15, down to 15- 16. Seventeen down to three. That's great. Those are messy cases. They are really messy cases, and that -- that I think reflects the -- the job is being done at the dean of student's office to handle hearings appropriately, to make sure that they act in conformity with the code of student conduct and legal expectations and so forth.

Oh, and the bottom line, did the student prevail. Last year, 14 cases out of 19, the student prevailed. This past year, most recent year, 11 out of 25 students prevailed. So over the run of things, it's about half the time. About half the time, the student prevails. Bob.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.
What you just said for prevailed, for me, those numbers doesn't make any sense if you look at the first few numbers. You can't have 26 students prevail out of 19 cases.

FINK: Yeah, wonder where that came from?

GROSSMAN: So, I think it's 26 prevailed and 19 did not prevail.

FINK: I see. Okay. Yeah, maybe that's it. That's right. Sorry, didn't catch that. What are some continuing challenges? Faculty complying with the syllabus. It seems so simple, but you -- once you pass out that syllabus at the beginning of the semester, you can't change how you're going to determine the grade. You have to conform your behavior to that, okay.

Other continuing challenges, the

one about getting Appeals Board members to respond. One of the challenges that has been a particular challenge this year, have a number of members on the Appeals Board who are in a -- in a clinical college, where they have patient care responsibilities and they are only free Friday afternoons. That's the only time of the week they can do a hearing, Friday afternoon. And so, they are essentially not available to participate in hearings. So that makes it a real challenge to schedule hearings. Questions. Yes.

DEBSKI:

Liz Debski, A and S.

Is there any one that assesses sort of the Appeals Board performance, or do you, as a committee, ever assess your own performance to make sure that you are considering the facts as opposed to, you know, appearing too sympathetic towards the student?

FINK:

I've never heard anybody say we're too sympathetic to the students.

DEBSKI:

I'll say that. And actually, I've heard that a lot. That -- that -- that in a number of recent cases, the -- sort of the Appeals Board hasn't really emphasized the data and the facts, but rather has now sided with a sympathetic student.

FINK:

I would -- I would take the opposite view, that it's usually the faculty member who comes ill prepared to the hearing that leads to that -- that outcome, the student's outcome.

DEBSKI:

I -- I would disagree with that -

FINK:

I've been doing it for 18 years.

DEBSKI:

- very strongly, based on my own experience. I would also worry about sort of the drop off in numbers. I mean, you explained it as the students getting more information earlier, but it could be just that faculty no longer feel that it is in their -- in their best interest to pursue these cases. Do you ever worry about that?

FINK:

No. The faculty I've seen come to the Appeals Board are pretty vehement in pursuing their matters.

DEBSKI:

I'm sure the ones that appear before you are pretty vehement, but I worry about the ones that aren't -- are choosing not to pursue the cases.

FINK:

Well, it is a time consuming matter and it -- it's time consuming for the student and the faculty member.

DEBSKI:

Yes, it is.

FINK:

And it's very emotional for - for both sides, I think.

DEBSKI:

Yes, it is.

FINK:

And we try to take that into account.

DEBSKI:

So, I mean, is the -- I mean, is there any sort of, again, assessment as to -- I mean, maybe a survey of faculty or students to see how the process worked from both of

their points of view or something like that?
 FINK: well, the only meaningful data would come from people who have had appeals, been involved in appeals. The people who have not been involved in the process --
 DEBSKI: Yeah, I know, but that's what I'm suggesting, that you might send surveys out to people who have appeared, appeared before your Appeals Board, both students and faculty, to see -- to see how well they thought they were served by the process.
 FINK: I mean, that's a possibility. We sure don't have the staff to do that. I can tell you that.
 BUTLER: J.S. Butler, Graduate School. So it's not just -- there's a comment and a numerical question. The comment, I -- I know other faculty and I've never been to your body, but I know faculty who have. And so it would be possible to have an opinion without having been there, and just to be clear, I tend to be more pro student than my fellow faculty. Second --
 MCCORMICK: Are you volunteering?
 BUTLER: Actually, as Joe knows, I would probably be very eager to be a part of this. So that would be up to you perhaps.
 FINK: I'm not involved in selecting the members of the Appeals Board. They never ask me. They never ask me.
 BUTLER: You said about 175 cases over six years. I didn't see any particular trend and I'm a statistician, okay. So I didn't see any particular trend up or down. It just bounces around. How many graduate students, out of 175 or so?
 FINK: I would -- no more than 15, if that. Probably ten. Now, if you differentiate the graduate students from professional students, the professional students appeal way out of proportion to their numbers. Medicine, dentistry, law, pharmacy, they appeal way out of proportion to their numbers.
 BUTLER: Well, my -- my constituency is graduate students and they would be very few, but the professional schools are heavily represented?
 FINK: Right.
 BUTLER: Uh-huh. Okay. Thank you.
 MCCORMICK: A few more questions, then we need to move....
 JONES: Davy Jones, Medicine. I guess two things (inaudible) comment. In terms of oversight on performance, the Senate Council is the one that short lists the names to the President for -- this is for faculty. The Senate Council has maybe a pseudo oversight role there and could inform itself on, you know, past performance of members or what not. What -- what kind of -- who is responsible for orienting new members?

UKsenate3-17.txt

FINK: I do that. I do that.
JONES: You do that.
MCCORMICK: Joe.
MCGILLIS: Yeah, Joe McGillis, Medicine.
Davy answered part of my question,
I guess. I was curious, since you don't
select members, how -- how are members
selected, and generally, what's their term?
FINK: well, there are 18 faculty and 12
students. Students have a one year term.
Faculty have a three year term. The students
can be reappointed. I think the longest
serving student we had was five consecutive
years, undergrad plus law school.
There are some faculty who are
repeaters on the University Appeals Board. A
lot of times they'll go off for a while and
then come back. I think there -- as far as I
know -- right now, there is a call out.
I saw an e-mail go out a couple of
weeks ago, faculty sign up for these various
committees, and one of the things listed was
the University Appeals Board. And so people
can self-nominate for that and then, I guess,
Senate Council.
JONES: Yeah, that's --
FINK: Yeah, I guess that's the process.
I just get a list of, you know, effective
July 1st, these are the new -- new
appointees.
MCCORMICK: In fact, many of you responded to
our -- our request to nominate, to self-
nominate or nominate others, and actually, I
should have included that in our
announcements. We populated with the
nominations, all of the area committees as
well as the UAB and a number of other
committees, we forwarded that to UK Legal.
We did that in March. We normally don't do
that until May, which does -- is a little bit
problematic since many of you are away by the
end of May. So it is a process that involves
multiple, I guess, steps.
But if any of you are interested in
the UAB inclusion or participating in that
system, please send Sheila your -- an e-mail
and we'll -- we'll move, you know, move --
we'll make that nomination. Again, we don't
-- we make nominations, but we don't select
the people who are -- in the end, constitute
the UAB. It's 4:20, so we need to move on.
JONES: One -- one more question. How -
how many of these, you know, like tough split
decisions, you know, five to four vote or the
votes unanimous or --
FINK: well, this past year for the first
time, we had a tie. First time since I've
been doing this. And it -- it was four to
four. They took some time, talked about it
further. Had a revote, still four to four.
Then like the Supreme Court, tie vote, lower
decision stands. And so, the decision at the
lower level, the faculty member's level,

stood. I'd say 10 percent.

Now, those who are on the Appeals Board have heard me talk about a -- a rule that a former member advanced, saying we should never -- we should never have a unanimous vote. And this was based on a faculty member of the College of Medicine, who was on a tenure review committee and the committee voted unanimously to deny tenure of a faculty member. And the next day, he ended up in the elevator with the guy and the guy knew how he voted because it was unanimous. He knew how everybody voted.

And so, the -- this evidence was -- this argument was you should never have a unanimous vote. Now, this is -- this is artificial. Some -- in fact, I lay this out for the members of the Appeals Board and some people are comfortable with that. Others say no, that's too contrived. I want to (inaudible) the way I feel, and so some members do that and some don't. Thank you.

MCCORMICK: Thank you, Joe. All right. Moving on. This is the item I referenced earlier. Anna Bosch, speaking on behalf of the associate deans, was intended to be here today, but is unable to do, so I will try to share with you this -- this proposed change to the Senate Rules as proposed originally by Arts and Science on behalf of Chemistry, Biology, and a number of their faculty who had fairly large evaluations, but in the end, it was supported by all of the associate deans.

So the Senate reads, all teachers must inform the undergraduate students in their courses of their current progress based on the criteria in the syllabus before the following dates, so the end of the Monday. This used to be Friday. And the third day of the 5th week for the eight week summer term and the 2nd day of the third week for the four week summer term.

So the motion from Senate Council is that the Senate approve a change to Senate Rule 6.1.3.8.1 so that instead of mid-term grades being due on the Friday of the end of the 9th week, for fall and spring semesters, mid-term grades would be due at the end of the Monday following the end of the 9th week. And I'll put David on the spot here. Michelle is here, also. Has this caused us any difficult in the Registrar's Office?

TIMONEY: No, it's -- it's a pretty simple process for us to update the academic calendar within SAP. So there are no issues that I can think of, at least from the Registrar's side.

MCCORMICK: Thank you. All right. So this is the motion on the floor, it comes from Senate Council. It doesn't need a second. Discussion?

FARRELL: I'll just say it's a great idea.
BROTHERS: Name, please.
FARRELL: And thank you for doing this.
Herman Farrell, College of Fine Arts.
I've always found that there is a lot of pressure at mid-term to get your -- your grades in on that Friday night, and then you end up pushing back your -- your exam or whatever, you know, requirement that's coming in during that week. So this give just a little more flexibility. So I appreciate it.

MCCORMICK: One of the things that the associate deans shared with us is that what happens, then, is if you feel that pressure, you tend to report those grades that were prior to mid-term, which are not always accurate, and so, in the sense, you know, a mid-term may make a huge difference in the student's status toward progress in that program. And so we certainly want to support efforts that are authentic and that support our students.

All right. I'll ask you to vote, in favor, opposed, abstained, for this motion, that Senate approve a change in Senate Rule 6.1.3.8.1, so that instead of mid-term grades being due on the Friday, they're due on Monday. Please vote. Aren't you happy you get to use your clicker?

And I was told I moved through this too quickly and so I'll try to give you a little bit more time to deliberate. Well, it looks like everybody is finished. All right. So you're in favor of this. So this motion passes.

So this is a motion that came to us through Scott Yost's committee. I've asked Scott to be present. It also came through the Senate Council through one of our one of our Senate Council members, SGA President Rowan Reid, and so Rowan is here to also answer questions.

And so this is the change that comes to you, again, through the endorsement of the Senate Council as a committee. So again, it doesn't need a second because it's coming through Senate Council as a committee. It was -- the motion was made by Margaret Schroeder, in the College of Education, and seconded by Bob Grossman, in the College of Arts and Sciences.

So this is the proposed change in the language regarding the types of excused absences. And it reads, interviews for full time job opportunities post-graduation and interviews for graduate or professional school. The students must notify the instructor of record prior to the occurrence of such absences. Instructors of record have the right to request appropriate verification. So this ready for discussion on the floor.

REID: Rowan Reid, I'm here for Student

Government Association. I'm currently serving as President, and like Katherine said, this has gone through our bodies and this is something that we think is really important for students.

Throughout the past year, I've heard of many students having difficulties with their professors in excusing them for job interviews for graduate professional school interviews. Most of the time this is happening in upper level classes, so students that are graduating in the coming semester. We think of this as a reasonable request, considering the other things allowed to be excused absences, such as club sports, educational trips provided by student organization, things like that.

We believe that while the classroom is extremely important, we think that the purpose of coming to college and getting a degree, is to get our first shot or start our career. And this is the first step in doing so, and so we would like to propose that, this change. And I would be happy to answer any questions if anyone has any.

ALLAIRE: Gloria Allaire in Arts and Sciences.

Did you consider the possibility also of summer internships that maybe build towards a career?

REID: We did consider summer internships. We thought that it would be more pleasing to faculty if we limited the scope for this. Of course, under faculty's discretion, they would also be able to do summer internships. We just thought a more narrow line set would be the best for starting out with this policy.

MCCORMICK: Kaveh?

TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi in Engineering.

I'm sorry to be cynical, but how difficult is it to get your friend or your neighbor or your grandfather or your uncle or another student to give you an interview? I mean, it doesn't even say the employer has to be registered with the Department of State -- of the state as a company. And I could hire any of you. I could give you an interview definitely.

This just makes it too open for if a student is not ready to take their exam, if they want to want to look at the exam and then have a make up exam, all they have to do is to just say, I have an interview. And then it puts the burden on the professor to say, give me a letter. So they provide an e-mail. Now, you have to investigate. It just -- just makes it too easy.

MCCORMICK: Margaret.

SCHROEDER: Margaret Schroeder, College of Education.

That did get brought up in Senate Council and we did talk about it. I thought,

and other members of Senate Council thought, that the language of full time job opportunity post-graduation and interview for graduate professional school, helped to clarify those very concerns that you just brought up.

TAGAVI: How?

SCHROEDER: Because they're seeking full-time employment post-graduation in an interview for a graduate school or professional school, and so, if they want to go work for their neighbor's company, then I -- I mean, personally I don't think that we can discriminate against that.

TAGAVI: It doesn't even say that it has to be a company.

MCCORMICK: Mark.

WHITAKER: I'm Mark Whitaker, College of Arts and Sciences.

I would like to speak up in favor of this. It seems to me that the wording is appropriate to do the job this proposal asks. That is to say, students don't have a lot of power to determine when they are being interviewed for full-time jobs or for post-graduate (inaudible) educational opportunities. That power is in the hands of those doing the interview.

That being the case, they don't have a lot of options. If a student came to me and said, well, I -- you know, I can't come to this or that day or even -- or even take this exam, because I have a very important interview for a job that I may get. I might ask, well, can you get some verification. And then if I got verification from the people doing the interviewing, that both the interview was legit and the people doing the interviewing were an actual business, I don't see no reason why I would have a problem with that. I think this is appropriate, and I -- I'd like to speak up in favor of it.

MCCORMICK: Thank you. Scott Yost, I think he mentioned that he came to our council, and I'd like for Scott to share the statement from their committee.

YOST: This proposal did come through the Senate Academic Standards and Admissions or policy committee. And it -- it -- the students brought it to us, and committee unanimously voted against this policy. We actually took it to the Senate Council with a -- or went to Senate Council with a negative recommendation for, certainly, some of these reasons. Number one, that when we had this conversation, one was the belief that this is not a widespread problem, and maybe we just run in small circles, but, you know, most faculty seem to be reasonable when it comes to these things as far as students getting jobs afterwards.

The confusion that it could cause

when it comes to the -- you know, there are critical things in a classroom that the instructors of record have control over and, you know, team projects, group presentations, final exam type stuff and how this might create issues with that when they're usually is flexibility from employers. Usually, I say usually. There are exceptions. Usually flexibility by employers if the students would be more proactive and be more willing to take and say, you know, we -- you know, I have an exam that day. Can I take it and schedule my interview some other time?

There was some recommendations as far as dealing with potential -- if there are faculty who are -- tend to be more troublesome, shall we say, and more rigid with the students. If the -- you know, there could be a conversation held within the colleges, maybe associate deans encourage people to say, look, this is the future of our students, let's take and allow them some more flexibility, so we'd be willing to work with them, if you will.

So we had -- there was, in the Senate Council, and I don't want to put words in anybody's mouth, but there was a conversation about the medical school and the hazards of the match day or interview day, when that is a specific, very specific day and, of course, -- and I'll just back after thoughts after that. You know, if you have a -- if a student, who is going to medical school, chances are the medical faculty know that day as it exists and they are going to be more lenient towards scheduling things not to conflict with that day.

So there's a number of those types of things that just.... The other -- the other thing that I know we -- we talked about or at least (inaudible) after the fact. The committee (inaudible) there. This -- the instructor of record has a right to request appropriate verification. I'm not quite sure -- I can see where this would cause more confusion with in the future leading to an ombud review of what was considered appropriate and how the faculty addressed that to the students. Did they have forethought and put it in the syllabi, and things like that. And so there's a lot of confusion for something that wasn't perceived as a problem overall. So that's from the committee.

VOICE:

(Inaudible), I'm a student representative from the College of Medicine.

I can actually speak to a lot of your concerns on this issue as this was something that I navigated just this previous year.

As an applicant applying to the Colleges of Medicine across the country, and fortunately, having been well prepared by

UKsenate3-17.txt

many of you, I was fairly competitive for that acceptance. Consequently, I could travel throughout the United States in order to -- to interview with several of these selected. Unfortunately for me, I was also enrolled full-time as a student here at the University of Kentucky and several of my interviews fell during the finals week of my fall semester. Most of my professors were fairly lenient and understanding. Unfortunately, some were not. And consequently, I was unable to make my interview date at the University of Tennessee. An interview for which I'm still waiting.

After informing them that I was -- had an exam that day, they informed me that I would be selected for their next round of interviews and would be contacted later on down the line. A contact that never seemed to materialize. Fortunately, I was accepted to the University of Kentucky College of Medicine.

But I can speak to this being a widespread issue for many of my peers. I know the vast majority of applicants to the Colleges of Medicine across the country are not just applying to the university that they attend. They're applying to a variety of schools, both in state and out of state.

I think this legislation is important for two specific reasons, not just to protect the students, but also to protect the educator, the instructor of record, who allows that student to go off and interview.

I know a lot of students, a lot of my friends, a lot of my peers, who elected to go on these interview dates in spite of admonitions from their professors and consequently were docked in appropriate ways.

I know others who attempted to say that they were doing this and did not receive appropriate verification and were consequently allowed to continue to go on their path, which I think is the concern that you're issuing. What happens if students are trying to cheat the system or trying to prevent themselves from having to take an exam and using this as an excuse?

I think having this piece of legislation as part of the Senate Rules provides the opportunity for you all to establish what appropriate verification is. And allowing for that establishment of appropriate verification puts the burden on the student to prove that they do have that appropriate verification. Consequently, you eliminate a lot of concerns that you may have about non real job opportunities or imagined opportunities, where they're, you know, going to interview for a job that may or may not exist.

I think this is a unique

opportunity for this board and this body to express their support for the students as they're preparing for the world after college and really give them a unique opportunity to be more prepared, especially as we get more and more competitive and as we improve the curriculums that our students are going through.

Our students that we're graduating are more and more competitive for more and more selective programs and they're going to be required to interview at more and more prestigious places, where they have less and less ability to dictate their own schedules.

So I do think this is a very important addition to what is already, I would (inaudible) an exemplary (inaudible) set of rules and one that this body has in the past has changed in order to make sure that they were serving the best interests of students. And so I urge you all to continue doing so. And on behalf of the students like myself, I thank you for your consideration.

MCCORMICK:

Bob.

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, A and S.

Yeah, I -- thank you very much. You've said a lot of the things that I was going to say.

I would like to address a few comments that some of my colleagues made. First of all, this may not affect a large number of students, but for the students it does affect, it affects them deeply and dramatically. Second, the notion that all of the students' professors are going to know that match day is on March the 8th and therefore, you know, they shouldn't schedule an exam that day is just ludicrous.

Students are taking courses in all sorts of departments, all through their senior year, and there is no expectation that someone, for example, I'm sorry, I'm going to take on Art, the College of Fine Arts, would know that match day is being held on a certain day and the students should not be expected to -- to have to show up that day.

Another point is that the -- the appropriate verification here seems very, to me, clear and I think we could -- I could propose language that would make it even more clear, but I don't think it's necessary. The appropriate verification should include evidence from the student that they have to miss class that day and a letter from -- I'm sorry that any old employer, you know, if someone wants to go work for Pizza Hut during the summer, you know, they're -- okay, get a letter from Pizza Hut saying that you need to come this day and you can't come the day after. Pretty simple.

I really don't see that this is going to lead to a flood of students trying to postpone their exams a day or two for --

for any reason that they can. I look at the -- the religious absence rule, which is -- also requires the exercise of judgment on the part of the faculty to decide is this a legitimate religious holiday that the student is requesting an absence for or is it not. And I haven't heard any problems with students claiming that they belong to the -- the church of Elvis Presley and today is a real important day because it is Elvis Presley -- the anniversary of the issue of his first album and I can't possibly come to class that day.

So -- so I do strongly support this -- this measure. I think for -- for those students who are going to graduate or professional school, especially, or for those who are interviewing for jobs far away from Lexington, this could really make the difference. After all, we are here to prepare our students for the world.

MCCORMICK: I'd like to be strict, so I know Liz had a comment, and then I'll take the comment from the back (inaudible).

DEBSKI: I did have a comment, but the previous speaker, the student, said it much better than I would. Yeah.

MCCORMICK: So you waive your --

DEBSKI: I do. Yeah.

MCCORMICK: Yes, sir.

NICHOLS: My name is Trevor Nichols. I'm a representative from the College of Law. As a student, I think those who would try to beat the system using this language would be a vast minority of students, and it's not only finals that this language would cover. I want to go to class, and a lot of my professors are very strict in their attendance policies, even stricter than what the bar requires. Some classes only allow up to three absences, and being a law student, being originally from Louisville, I realize that life happens. Sometimes you're sick and then those goes towards your absences. Sometimes you have a death in the family. Sometimes you have a religious holiday. There are a number of circumstances that many professors are absolutely understanding of -- of an excused absence.

I also understand that many students outside of -- this is similar to the match day in medicine, we have on campus interviews that are organized through the College of Law. The vast majority of law students do not get their jobs through those on campus interviews. The vast majority of law students have to go to firms or have to go to other places of employment to interview during these class times, but otherwise would not be excused by professors.

I've had professors explicitly say that interviews have to be covered, in the syllabus, through the amount of absences that

they allow. So I don't think that this is something that students would hop on to take advantage or exploit. I think it's an opportunity for students to advance their careers and make the best decisions for them, and this is the best way to do it.

MCCORMICK: I have opportunity for one more. Only one, so Joe, did you have something?

MCGILLIS: Yeah, I'll make this quick. A lot of the discussions we had in Senate Council dealt more with potential abuses for job opportunities, so I think there was a consensus. Can I offer an amendment on this?

MCCORMICK: Margaret?

MCGILLIS: So I would suggest we amendment it to say that interviews for graduate or professional school are covered, but then ask the students and -- and the appropriate committee to take a closer look at full-time job opportunities and to change the language so that it would be more explicit in terms of --

MCCORMICK: So, Katie, give me some guidance here.

SEAGO: well, if he wants to propose official change to the language, then he would propose it and somebody would have to second it.

MCCORMICK: And it would have to be --

GROSSMAN: He proposed it, so I'm seconding it.

MCCORMICK: Okay.

MCGILLIS: So I propose that we change it to read that interviews for graduate or professional school for now approve that and then ask them to -- either the appropriate committee or the students to come back with their final language for full-time job opportunities so that it is a little more clearly defined to address some of the potential concerns a lot of the faculty have raised.

SEAGO: Is there -- no. Excuse me. Is there a second to that?

CROSS: Second. Al Cross, Communication.

SEAGO: Okay. Now discussion can open on the proposed change.

MCCORMICK: Kaveh?

TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering.

I was going to mention Pizza Hut, but I forgot. My friend over here mentioned Pizza Hut. This doesn't even require that the interview would be in the field of the student's study. I'm not so much worried about missing a class. My worry as an instructor is -- and I don't think every student is going to do that, but the one or two in a class of 100 that do this is, it's unfair to the other 98, that if they don't want to take an exam, all they need is to get a friend of theirs, who is a manager of a Pizza Hut or a McDonald's or a Subway, and

get an interview on the exam day. It's really --

GROSSMAN: Please confine your comments to the proposal.

SEAGO: Proposal amendment change.

TAGAVI: I am confining to that --

SEAGO: Because he moved --

TAGAVI: The Chair can tell me if I'm out of order. I don't need you to tell me that. I am actually speaking to the amendment. The amendment says drop that and I'm saying why it should be dropped. I'm exactly speaking to the amendment.

MCCORMICK: So you're supporting the amendment. Mark.

WHITAKER: I'd like to oppose the amendment.

I think that we all understand what a full time job opportunity is and I think denying a student, who has an opportunity to interview for a full-time job, the ability to go to that interview, is kind of silly. I -- I think it's very unlikely that students are going to hook up a fake interview with a manager they happen to know at Pizza Hut in order to get out of an exam. There are easier ways to get out of an exam (inaudible). You can get out of an exam for, say that it is a special religious holiday in your unique religion.

This one would require lots of prior work and -- and logistics. So I -- I think the language of the -- the language of the original amendment should stand as it is and I oppose this change.

MCCORMICK: All right. So the gentleman in the gray. No? Herman and then Rowan and Davy, but we do need to move on.

FARRELL: Sure. Quickly, Herman Farrell, College of Fine Arts.

I would echo the comments from my colleague who just spoke. I oppose this amendment. I think that full-time job opportunities are important. I think if there is any question about what that actually means, the appropriate verification would clarify it.

MCCORMICK: Thank you. All right. Davy.

JONES: I'm totally unclear of what this full-time job opportunity means and verification that there's an interview does not clarify about whether the situation is full-time job within the meaning of Senate intent. Is full-time job, one day of eight hours, a week of eight hours, a month of eight hours a day to day to day, a summer? I don't know what full-time job means here.

MCCORMICK: Okay. Rowan.

REID: I would just like to say I'm opposed to this amendment. I think that it is really important that we're not discriminating against certain types of full-time job opportunities, because realistically, if you're a business major,

maybe a manager position at Pizza Hut is your first career step.

I just do not believe that this needs to be clarified any further and the appropriate verification is written the same way throughout this policy. I literally took that word for word from the rest of the policy. So that is already something that is throughout the policy and it gives the professor the right to ask for whatever they may deem is necessary to prove that this is a full-time job opportunity. It cannot be changed, whatever it may be.

So I'm in opposition to this amendment. I would not accept it as a friendly amendment if that's -- if I don't if that's Margaret's or whatever the motion was. That's all.

MCCORMICK: So Sheila is going to prepare a slide for you to vote on the amendment and then we'll vote on the University motion.

TAGAVI: Parliamentary inquiry?

MCCORMICK: Yes.

TAGAVI: Only a question could stop discussion. We cannot stop the discussion on our own.

FIEDLER: I call the question. Ted Fiedler Arts & Sciences.

SEAGO: So we'll vote on the amendment.

MCCORMICK: All right. So all in favor of the amendment that was proposed by Joe McGillis. This is the amendment only.

GROSSMAN: It's not letting me vote.

MCCORMICK: Just a moment.

BROTHERS: Just do it by a show of hands.

MCCORMICK: I'm not sure why --

MCCORMICK: Yeah, let's just do it by a show of hands. There we go. Now. All right. Everybody vote. Favor of the amendment 15, opposed 56.

SEAGO: Amendment does not carry.

MCCORMICK: The proposal stands as written. All right. So now we're ready to vote on the original proposal. Are you ready, Sheila?

BROTHERS: Yes.

MCCORMICK: All right. Everybody finished? The -- it's in favor. 57 passed. 13 opposed. Thank you very much. Margaret Schroeder has kindly agreed to move the items regarding the academic proposals. So do we need to have a motion to reorder the Agenda or can we move forward?

SEAGO: Margaret, you changed the Agenda?

MCCORMICK: Yes. Margaret do you --

SCHROEDER: I move that we move to Agenda Item No. 7, and move Agenda Item No. 6 to April Senate meeting.

MCCORMICK: A second?

MILLS: Second.

BAILEY: Name please.

MILLS: Lakin Mills, College of Pharmacy.

MCCORMICK: Okay, then. We have the opportunity --

GROSSMAN: Did we vote?

SEAGI: We have to vote.

BROTHERS: Do this one by a show of hands.

MCCORMICK: Just show of hands that you're okay with changing.

SEAGO: All in favor and then any opposed?

MCCORMICK: Any opposed? All right. Ayes have it. Thank you. So this is information that I think is helpful to us as we think about next year. Lance Broeking and Melody (inaudible) is going to share with you information about the parking and the parking allocations to come.

BROEKGING: wonderful. well, first of all, I'd like to thank everybody for inviting Melody and myself to attend this meeting. Particularly, Katherine and a number of you that have set through some of this discussion already. Just as a real quick background, we've had a number of discussions with a variety of different groups regarding some of our proposed permit allocation changes for 2017- 18. We've spoken with the Staff Senate Council, the -- the Faculty Senate Council, Student Government. We've been with the healthcare leadership, a number of different groups. I think we're already on the agenda for Staff Senate in another couple of weeks. And so we really -- we really appreciate the opportunity to come before you all and have a -- have a quick discussion about this as well. Just to give you a little bit of background where we're at in the process also, is these are proposed changes that we've vetted through a number of different groups, and we feel like this is the direction the University is heading. But before we make any kind of final decisions, we want to make sure we -- we put it before a number of groups and have folks let us know if there's any major things that we've overlooked or unanticipated consequences in the process that -- that we may have overlooked. So really appreciate your -- your feedback on this.

I'll try to go really quick. I know I'm probably the only thing between you and adjournment. So I tend to talk about parking for hours, but I'll try to condense it into 10, 15 minutes, as quickly as I can. I'm not going to go through all of this. The intent of this is really just to say a couple of things. One, that our allocation changes we're recommending for next year are primarily focused around the recommendations that came from the 2015 Transportation Master Plan.

It recommended four major areas of improvement. I won't read each one of those. The one -- the one that we're talking about

today that's the most important is restructure of the parking permit system, moving us toward a tiered allocation system or zone parking system, which will provide users with more choice and predictability.

During our feedback cycle of the Transportation Master Plan, we heard loud and clear from the campus community that the one thing that is missing in our -- in our current system in addition to more parking, is choice and predictability within the parking system. And so, by research in parking permits, this will (inaudible) providing users with choice and predictability, creating financial incentives within the -- within the system, and then also try to reduce the traffic congestion associated with people searching for a parking space, the typical hunting, the typical hunting license that most people refer to.

Just as a real quick (inaudible), this bottom thing is really just intended to give you -- and you've probably seen this before, but just a background in terms of how we're shifting. So our -- our system in the past was essentially everybody got the same permit. You had access to the same lots, and the only way you could control your own destiny is by getting here earlier in the day. So probably if you get here at 7:00 in the morning, you know parking is not a problem. If you get here at 11:00 during the day, parking is a problem.

This new system in terms of moving us toward a tiered system, where we price parking based on availability and proximity, allows us to create a variety of options at different price points as well. So we already have a similar system to this in the healthcare environment, and we're -- we're -- and we piloted a little bit on our main campus as well, in looking to shift it more broadly.

So just to give you a sense, on the far -- your far right, reserve parking. Core is what we call the eplus system right now, if you're -- if you're involved or familiar with that pilot program. Intermediate is the zone where we typically have all of our employee parking permits, commuter parking permits, residential currently today. Periphery is a zone that we introduced last year, that we'll talk about just real briefly. Remote is something that -- that we're introducing this year, and off peak is the -- the typical evening permit.

Just in terms of prices, we -- we're thinking about as we move forward, pricing everything based off the intermediate zone, and so we'll talk a little bit more about that real quickly as well, just to give you a sense of what -- where we're at this

year.

So last year was our first baby step into tiered parking. We took a very baby step where we introduced a periphery zone. So you'll see the intermediate is in the blue, the reserved is in the purple. What looks to be a brown color, but is really more wine color, is the -- is the core permits, and then the periphery is the gray. So the gray is what we introduced last year.

We created a price differential between your intermediate parking and periphery parking. There's only a \$3 difference between those this year. We intend, over time, that that will grow as we -- as we start to raise prices over the years. Our intent is to maintain or to hold the periphery zone constant, and that will stay at 34 to create a broader price differential between those. Really, this past year was just more of a recognition that there is a difference between parking on the periphery and parking close to where you want to be.

As we think about this year, the things that we're looking to introduce is a remote zone. So that's what you see up here as -- represented by green. The periphery remains essentially unchanged. Expanding the -- the reserve parking ever so slightly by about 30 parking spaces and we'll talk briefly about that. And then the biggest change is in the core zone. So this is creating kind of a step down from reserve parking. It's not quite as proximate as your reserved parking, and this is more of a first come, first serve zone as opposed to reserve, which is more restricted by grade or by assignment. We can talk a little bit about that more broadly as well.

Let me just kind of walk you into how we're looking to zone this starting at -- at the remote zone. So, right now, if you're familiar with the (inaudible) Shawneetown area, we have a large number of under-utilized spaces, and I won't go into all the details behind why that exists, but there's an opportunity to create a discounted parking zone for -- what we're looking at this year is or on campus residential students. So, there's a number of students that we found, through our surveys, that use their cars relatively infrequently. I think the common misnomer about -- among employees are that all students don't use their cars, and that is simply not true. There's a large percentage of students that use it for jobs or academic assignments, elder care issues, all those sorts of things. And so there is a need for folks to come and go throughout the day as students. But there's a large percentage that parents may send them with their car, they use it very infrequently and

they could benefit from parking on the periphery and having less access to their car, but still it's on the bus system and it would be the discounted price. And so, we're looking at pricing it at half of what the traditional intermediate zone would be priced at, and only offering it to the first 200 folks this year as just kind of a pilot introductory program. And what that will essentially do is free up 200 real spaces at the stadium. I know that doesn't necessarily mean anything to faculty and staff, but that essentially gives us a margin in our parking system. As you know, right now, things are very tight in terms of supply and demand, and so this gives us a little bit of margin within -- within the parking supply.

Second thing is, we're moving all of our -- the majority of our residential parking into the intermediate zone. So this is just a -- a slide that shows you where all the student parking is, and I've just kind of put arrows to the general residential areas. Not all residential areas would go into the core, but primarily the ones that are in high demand. And so you'll see the things that are in that brown color, and I know it doesn't really represent really well, that's generally where our residential parking is. Residential parking has for years operated like a reserved parking system because it's -- (inaudible) for one, they're guaranteed a space outside their door, which is very proximate. And so for years, we've charged the same thing for that kind of parking that we do for stadium parking. So this is more of a recognition that there is a difference between the levels of proximity and predictability within the parking. So these spaces would be in the core zone, which is -- we're proposing at one and a half times of intermediate, so \$56 going into next year.

So now you can start to see that there really is price differential within the different zones allowing people to pick their parking based on what's important to them and then they pay accordingly. So all the way from core parking for students to periphery parking. So \$56, periphery is \$34 and \$18.50 out at the -- out at the remote zone. You start to see where people can choose based on amenities.

So shifting a little bit to employees now, talking about employees and how we're going to also introduce more core parking for employees. The sports center garage, which is PS 7 up by Johnson Center up off Sports Center Drive, across from the old football offices, you may recall a couple of years ago, that was an employee lot. We transitioned it a number of years ago or three or four years ago into the student residential area. We're recommending now

that we can zone employees -- so part of the problem that we've had is we haven't been able to zone our employees. And so this will allow us for the first time to introduce a certain number of spaces. So we're looking at about 130 employee spaces that will open up back in the sports center garage for employees in that area. And just as a nuance, when I say sports center garage, those two areas, Complex Drive and the garage itself, are both kind of considered one group. So if you were to choose a E7 permit, you would be able to park on Complex Drive or in the garage itself.

The second area that we're looking to change is the woodland Avenue lot. If you're familiar with that, it's across from woodland Glen, off woodland Avenue, next to W.T. Young Library. That currently is a residential lot. We're recommending shifting that away from a residential lot and into the intermediate zone. So again, this is a first come, first serve hunting license zone, the \$37, which are traditionally known as the epermit. And there's a couple of reasons for that. One is, if you've ever been down woodland Drive, you know that people park along the road in the bike lanes because there just simply is no loading, unloading spaces. That includes Jimmy Johns, after hours, parents that are coming to visit their kids, of which I'm one, and come in that area from time to time. And so you recognize that that's a major problem. So by turning that away from residential parking, which is 24 hour controlled, we can allow folks, after 3:30 in the evening, to move from the stadium to the -- closer to the dorms to load laundry, for the parents to pick up their children, Jimmy Johns and Pizza Hut to show up after hours. So that is a lot of about 108 spaces.

The third thing that is impacting employees, somewhat, is the Rose Street garage. So right now the Rose Street garage is 100 percent employee parking and we are proposing introducing a number of residential spaces into that structure for the first time. So we're talking about 325 spaces, I think is what we're proposing for this coming year. So the majority of those spaces -- I think it's roughly -- I can't remember the exact number -- 1200 spaces in that garage, somewhere in that range. So the majority will still be employee parking. Some will be residential parking, and there is a number of reasons for that. So by making this a core parking zone, we -- we get a couple of advantages. One, students and employees come and go at different times, so if you're familiar with that part of campus, you know that traffic congestion is a major issue on Hilltop, University. By introducing mixed

users groups in that area, their arrival and departure times happen at different times, allowing for a better flow of traffic from that perspective. And the second thing is, is by making this a zoned lot, we guarantee you -- if you were to purchase a core parking permit, essentially you're guaranteeing yourself 99.5 percent of the time you're going to find a space in this garage. And no more is it a hunting license. You would have a permit to park in that garage. And what that will allow you to do is arrive when you want to arrive. I mean, I can't tell you how many times I see people sitting in their cars eating breakfast, putting their makeup on, because they have to get a parking space. This allows you to control your own destiny. So if you're a faculty member who doesn't have a class until 10:00, you don't have to come in at 7 just to find that space. You can arrive at a time that's more convenient to you. And so again, this is a response to what we heard during the -- the campus survey by creating that level of predictability within the system.

One thing I didn't talk about is in addition to traffic congestion and pedestrian safety, the traffic backups right now also impact our campus bus system, which is what we're relying on for folks to get from the remote and periphery parking to the parts of campus. And so the more that gets bogged down, the less that's useful for our clientele.

Just real quick, the Prall Street lot, if you're familiar with the -- the Seminary area, the Seminary Drive is already in the core zone. It's part of our eplus pilot program. We're adding Prall Street to that as well, that's just a small change, an addition in that area. Funkhouser Drive, this is an area that creates a tremendous amount of traffic congestion on Rose Street, if you're familiar with all the traffic that happens on there. People dropping off, picking up, employees searching for a parking space in the campus core, hoping to find that elusive parking space.

Our goal is to turn Funkhouser and Library Drive into more of a restricted area, with Library Drive being more of an ADA accessible area, and Funkhouser Drive being -- moving into our reserve tier, which is essentially -- we're talking about mirroring it in a similar way that we do for healthcare, which is these are spaces that parking wouldn't determine who's important, but instead we would assign these spaces to the Provost and the President's Office and the EVPFA. They would have a certain number of spaces, that they would have a choice as to how they wanted to allocate those spaces to their various constituents for purchase.

It's not like these would be free spaces, but they would purchase those spaces. And we're talking 30 spaces.

So this is not a large change, but it's more of a recognition that there are certain levels of positions that have the need to have that level of proximity and access to their vehicles.

So that is the -- that is the changes that we're looking at for this coming year. Just a couple of things in terms of how this would get implemented. So I know that there -- there are a number of questions that we generally get about how would we roll this out.

Our price points again, we're talking about remaining the same for all intermediate parking permits. So if you currently have an epermit and that's what you want to stay at, there will be no increase in -- in rates for next year. The only way your rates would go up is if you chose to move into the core zone or purchase one of these core permits.

The intent behind the core is that it would be first come, first serve. So eventually, there will be a wait list. So as we roll this out for the first time, we don't to have everybody sitting by their computer like they're trying to get tickets to a concert. Instead, there will be a period of about two weeks where folks will have the ability to sign up for a lottery. The first draw would be done during the lottery. After that, the lottery would form the basis for if we have any excess permit or people that are interested in the permits that didn't get them, that would form the basis for the wait list and then it would be a true wait list from that point forward. That's generally what we're looking for. Yes, sir.

KENNEDY: I have a comment and question about the relationship between UK parking and BCTC parking. Unfortunately, I had a meeting at BCTC and pulled into a UK parking spot E and got a ticket and was informed when I found the officer that oh, no, this is -- this is a sub lot, that only you have to have a BCTC sticker.

The person who wrote the ticket was a University officer. The the appeal had to go to the University. So the University is completely involved in that, but it doesn't recognize (inaudible). And so it seems to me if BCTC wants to have lots, then maybe you have a (inaudible) sticker or green stickers or something.

BROEKING: If you would, you're welcome to send me an e-mail about that and I'll be happy to touch base with you. I'm sure we can work something out. That's a change this year. There's a lot of history behind (inaudible) program.

KENNEDY: Does this affect the emeriti faculty costs for parking?

BROEKING: Our goal is that all permits would stay -- stay the same unless somebody chose to move into that core zone. And generally, I would think of as a -- as a retiree or emeritus faculty, you probably wouldn't want to do that.

KENNEDY: Thank you.

FARRELL: So I have two quick questions. So from what I understand from what I just heard, there is going to be a net reduction in intermediate spaces because you -- you're switching over that whole lot outside here to core? My second question is what is the actual relationship between the number of employees and the number of employee spaces and permit holders? Because I'm wondering, is there going to be any efforts in the next couple of years to increase spaces rather than to just make us pay more for -- for access?

BROEKING: So let me answer your second question first. In terms of parking spaces, the hardest thing in my job is trying to make sure that we're balancing supply with demand. I mean, I have a lot in common with the economics group because, you know, at the end of the day that's what is most important to me is making sure that we have enough spaces for the -- for the demand that's there.

The problem with our parking system is we generally have enough parking. It's just generally not where people want it, at least with our current system today.

FARRELL: What are the numbers?

BROEKING: If you were to go on to the parking areas right now, we are probably about 350 spaces to the positive, more supply than demand. If you were here on the first day of classes this last year, which is generally the worst day of the year, first or second day of classes, we were at a break even point. We had some space available in our overflow areas, so I still feel like we have a little bit of supply within the system. But as I look to next year, we're always looking at what are the -- what are the growth points? What are the things that are going to take parking away? Where are we looking at increased demand? And then, we try to balance that.

So just to answer your first question, which maybe goes to some of your second question as well. So if -- if you're doing a balance sheet in terms of what we're losing on the employee side, so 130 spaces in the garage, 108 spaces, woodland Avenue, 350, so it's a net loss of about 112 spaces from the employees in the central part of campus. So we're also looking like how do we offset that. So I'm always looking for opportunities to offset the -- any kind of

additional supply or any kind of additional demand.

In this case, I'm trying to offset the supply issue. So these are just things that I know of that we're working towards for -- for the next fall. We're looking at gaining at least 110 spaces.

I think you read in the paper the other day, it looks like the city is going to sell us the Senior Citizen Center, which gives us a little bit of flexibility in the orange lot, which is a supply for the healthcare environment. So that -- we'll probably be closer to 230, and that's just based on the things that I know of today that we're looking at doing.

So we're always looking to offset that loss, but in terms of the 112 (inaudible) losses to employees, also keep in mind that we're trying to be responsive and reactive to what is going on with the student world as well.

So University Flats is opening up, as well as Lewis Hall, which is adding, I think, 1100 beds on campus. Right now, north campus residents don't have any residential parking. Their only option is the stadium, so we're trying to be reactive to that and responsive to their needs and shifting some parking in -- in that realm, so that we're responding to, you know, what we hear from that group as well. Sir.

GIANCARLO: Quick question. You remarked --

BAILEY: Name please.

GIANCARLO: Matthew Giancarlo, Arts & Sciences.

You remarked about how Funkhouser is going to be changed. Do you know what's happening with Rose Street?

BROEKING: I'll defer to Melody. I would say that it's -- there is a lot of uncertainty with Rose Street. Is that a -- is that a fair assessment?

FLOWERS: I think that's a good summary of Rose Street.

BROEKING: I would say that the University has a strong desire to close Rose Street. The city is reluctant to do so and there hasn't been any final decisions. But I know the University is actively working with the city to try to come up with a resolution. Yes, ma'am.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.

Is handicapped parking going to be changed at all or is it going to be expanded or do you think there is a need for it or is there going to be a price increase?

BROEKING: So -- so our ADA parking is a whole separate item in terms of need and issues. Generally, there is always a need for ADA, particularly close to our buildings. There is a challenge with that, though, that sometimes you just can't get parking near the buildings.

UKsenate3-17.txt

The ADA, American with Disabilities Act, essentially requires that we provide the best access that we possibly can of what we have, and so we try to do that, but what we've been shifting more towards is remote park and ride. And then we also have para-transit service that we're offering that we're working with the student disability resource center, as well as Patty Bender's office, to make sure that we're meeting the needs of folks.

Just -- to answer your question, the initial reaction is the ADA parking will go unchanged into next year. There's still some discussion about how that looks, but essentially, we're not looking to do any major changes. Yes, ma'am.

ALLAIRE: Yeah, I guess it is a given despite your statistics and your balancing act, if anybody wants to park close to their destination, Rose Street lot is hideous, and I'm talking trying to get to the library, say oh, for a Senate meeting or research. This lot out here, for years, has had no parking gate since we crash through it all the time. So what kind -- Rose Street, you can go in there and there's mostly students driving around you can see, and there is no kind of control to access that.

So if I have an E permit, there can be who knows how many students sitting in there studying, eating their lunch, putting on their makeup, and I can't find a space. So that seems ridiculous to me. Can you not -- if you're going to raise the price especially so the people are more or less guaranteed during business hours to be able to get near this area, and that's not talking about the hideous traffic from woodland over, are you going to have gates on this lot?

BROEKING: Yes. So to answer your question, there -- there's a number of reasons why the gates are currently up. Primarily because during the morning rush hour, the traffic peak that comes in won't -- if you try to regulate that by people swiping their permit on the way in, that backs the traffic up too far and so we, for years, had the gates up during the peak times and then the exit gates down. Because of that you end -- and then after hours we allow student residents and people with K permits to park after hours to access the library. So people will slide in there after hours and even with the gates going down during the day, we still had issues with the students getting into the garage and it being an enforcement issue. And so we're regularly in the garage enforcing it.

In terms of where we see it going with the core zone, we are in the process, and there's RFP on the street right now, to replace the University's access and revenue

control system. One of the areas -- it's not in the primary, we're doing two garages initially, and both of them in the healthcare world, but we are getting price contracts set for future -- for future expansion campus wide, as well.

Our intent is to evaluate, after we shift it to core zone, evaluate what the inflow and outflow is of that garage. If we have the ability and we feel like that the traffic is sparse enough coming in -- it's sparse enough, essentially regulating itself, where two entrances and two exits will handle the demand, our intent is to add gates back into that facility. Yes, ma'am.

VISONA: I'm afraid I'm philosophically opposed to the idea that --

BAILEY: Name please.

VISONA: Monica Visona, College of Fine Arts.

I'm philosophically opposed to having more expensive tickets for students who want to park closer in. I'm thinking that -- about my students and the ones who actually need a car, because they have elder care issues or because they have jobs that have bad hours or such, are the ones who can't afford those additional costs and the ones who can afford the additional costs have cars primarily because they can.

And I think that as a member of the faculty who can afford (inaudible) car, it's going to create -- these are issues for me, to hear that my student can park their vehicle in the middle of campus because they're willing to pay (inaudible). So I -- I understand that the administration has special needs and the administration is able to give out permits, essentially in regards to the status of the individual involved, but there has to be a more equitable way of, I think, allocating (inaudible) students.

BROEKING: I understand what you're saying. I'll let Melody (inaudible).

FLOWERS: I just want -- I just want to make sure we don't have any misconceptions about how the permits will be allocated, because I heard ability to allocate permits based on status, and honestly, there's no perfect way to do this yet. (Inaudible).

VISONA: But there is parking (inaudible) administrators, right?

VOICE: There is a small number and very limited, less than a lot of people would want and that is -- that is limited to -- that is not even a little blip on the entire... The core, the real changes that we're talking about here, really is about self-opting in, if you, because of your need, want, desire, ability, whatever it is. Our whole point, what I keep saying, I don't want say it, but I don't care what your title is, how much money you make, what your job is, whether

you're a student -- it -- it's -- you choose -- what we heard was make choices available and give people the option to choose for themselves.

VISONA: Right. But our more impoverished students do not have that option, whereas our rich students are people that take advantage of it. That's what I think the issue is, that the -- this (inaudible) is being made for economic reasons because of the way you are deciding who gets to (inaudible). That's my issue.

MCCORMICK: Can we have one more?

SANDMEYER: Well, thank you. My question, I am a bike user and so I use scratch offs --

BROTHERS: Name please.

SANDMEYER: Oh, I'm sorry. Bob Sandmeyer, Arts and Sciences. I apologize.

So I didn't really hear how that would affect that kind of -- that kind of parking permit. And it seems to me -- tell me if I'm wrong -- it seems to me that it will actually decrease opportunity for scratch offs. And then, just a second question, which is, has there been any thought about how those who have scratch offs could then use those gated E lots, which are -- right now unavailable to them?

BROEKING: Yes. So to answer your second question, of course, yes. Through our RFP, on our new access revenue control system, our goal is to create a system that allows people to buy daily parking without having to use the archaic scratch off parking. So that is coming down the road.

In the interim, if -- you're right, in the sense that the intermediate zone today will be reduced because whatever goes in the core zone will be unavailable for folks that are in the intermediate zone. So it will limit some of the access. The numbers will theoretically stay relatively the same. But again, if you can't find space within the existing intermediate zone, you're able to with your intermediate (inaudible) permit park down, as well, so you can go to the periphery zone, as well. So that's something I didn't really talk about. If you -- if you have that intermediate -- I'm sorry if you have a core permit, you're allowed to only park in your core zone. It doesn't give you access to all the core zones, just your designated lot, but then you can also park down in intermediate or periphery. If you have an intermediate parking permit, it will allow you to have access to all the intermediate lots and park down into the periphery, as well, so....

MCCORMICK: Just one more question. Ernie, you've had your hand up for quite a while.

BAILEY: The question I had was the -- we want our off campus students to come and use

UKsenate3-17.txt

the library in the evening, and at present, the library lots are controlled in the evenings. I noticed on your form, it said that there -- it looked like parking control had stopped at 5:00. So this next year, our students can be able to come in after hours and park in the library without getting ticketed?

BROEKING: So generally, intermediate lots go off control for -- I'm sorry, go off control for their designation at 3:30 in the afternoon. So if I have a K permit or an E permit, I can have access to most lots on campus. That doesn't apply to some. There is one lot around the library that's a 24 hour employee lot for access for the employees.

The parking garage today is available at 3:30 in the evening, if I have K or a (inaudible) permit. So as we move that into the core zone, that will go to 5:00. So we'll still have access after 5:00. But the goal is that if you have a core permit, what we've learned through some of our pilot programs is that people want to have access to their facility when they come back if, you know, they have to check out at the end of the day. They've maybe done some work off campus and have to come back and they need to have a parking space.

When we did the pilot program, we originally had that as a 24 hour control and we learned from actually the -- the people that have the E plus permits and the core permits, they were the ones that came back to us and said we want this to be on control only until five in the evening and off control in the evening and on the weekends, so that our student researchers can have access to these areas. Students that need to have design work and whatnot, have access to those facilities. So we heard from the users that that's what they wanted.

So as we roll this out, the only change for the -- for the Rose Street garage will be going from 3:30 access to 5 -- 5:00 p.m. access. So we'll still have after hours access.

BAILEY: I got lost. I'm sorry. And so the library, is that controlled after 5 in this new system?

BROEKING: Yes. You have to have a permit until 7:30 at night, but any permit. So from 5:00 until 7:30, you have to have just paper. It can be an E permit. It can be a K permit, residential or commuter, whatever. After 7:30 at night, it's just controlled for no parking on fire lanes and disabled and that sort of stuff.

BAILEY: I just advocated it for the benefit of students using the library and to encourage them to do so would be great (inaudible).

PORTER: I told my daughter she could park in there in the evening and she got a ticket for parking in that structure. Now, maybe it was before 7:30, but I don't see any reason why that could not be free to everyone. So students could go to the library without having to have permits, because even the permit's expensive.

BROEKING: There are (inaudible) permits. Our (Inaudible) permits are half the price of an intermediate permit, so \$18.50 a month to have access after hours. Now, keep in mind that we also are adjusting in our transit service as well. So we're still giving all of our students, faculty, and staff, free access on LexTran, and they're welcome to access campus that way as well, if they don't want to buy the parking.

MCCORMICK: So there's information about this proposal or plan on the Senate website. Melody and Lance shared the PowerPoint, as well as other supportive documents. So it's available. I know that they're happy to take questions from you post-today. Their ears aren't closed, their shop's not closed at close of business (inaudible) a little bit later.

MCGILLIS: Motion to adjourn.

MCCORMICK: Thank you, Joe.

MCCORMICK: Second?

YOST: Second, Scott Yost.

* * * * *

The meeting adjourned at 5:23 p.m.

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

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

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

My commission expires: April 6, 2019.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 25th day of May, 2017.

LISA GRANT CRUMP
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE