

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE

Regular Session

March 8, 2004

3:00 p.m.

W. T. Young Library

First Floor Auditorium

Lexington, Kentucky

Dr. Jeffrey Dembo, Chair

An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

179 East Maxwell Street

Lexington, Kentucky 40515

(859) 254-0568

University of Kentucky Senate

March 8, 2004

* * * * *

JEFFREY DEMBO, CHAIR

GIFFORD BLYTON, PARLIAMENTARIAN

REBECCA SCOTT, SECRETARY TO SENATE COUNCIL

MARLA FRYE, COURT REPORTER

* * * * *

CHAIR DEMBO: Welcome to the March 2004

Senate Meeting. Let's go over the agenda briefly for today. We have some items that we had not completed from our last Senate Meeting, that includes the report from the Provost, and also a report from Dr. Nash on behalf of the IRIS project. Following that, we have another action item. Don't pay any attention to the date up there. It's still back in February. Following that, we have another action item we didn't get to last time, that is the proposal to change the definition of a family, a very timely topic I'd say. And after that, we're going to have discussion about the undergraduate writing requirement and I'll talk a little more about that in just a second. And the other thing - and forgive me, this is my fault, I forgot last time to ask us to approve the minutes from the December meeting. So

I'd like to bundle those together and see if there are any recommendations for changes in the December and in the February minutes for the University Senate. Without objections, I can consider that those are approved as - as they stand. I'd like to introduce one person to you. She's outside. Kim, are you there? Kim Judd is our honorary Sergeant-of-Arms for today. I wonder if you could poke your head out and see if Kim Judd could come in for a second. Kim, raise your hand, please. Kim is the treasurer of the Staff Senate and agreed to act as Sergeant-of-Arms. She understands full well that if anybody is disruptive, that she will resolve that issue quickly. She also, by the way, helped to co-author the - the editorial piece you may have seen in the Herald-Leader that was assigned by Sheila Brothers regarding the budget. I thought it was very well written. It was on target, and, I guess, the Legislature can't hear that enough times as to - as to how this all affects the quality of our educational admission. Other announcements? I want to see if anybody can bring us up to date, perhaps, somebody from LCC on where we are with

the legislative issues regarding LCC.

Becky, what have you got to report?

WOMACK: Becky Womack, LCC, just talked to Dr. Kerley about half an hour ago. As of midweek last week, there was 4 or 5 bills that had been left with - filed with the Legislature. We liked all but one. One of them, in essence, would have delayed any decision for another year and left us with the legislation legislative process would have taken place next year, and we would have been on probation for another year and at risk of losing our accreditation. So we -- we definitely didn't like that one and - and made sure that we let our legislator know. There's a lot of shaping going on right now, a lot of revising of language. It's in the Education Committee, so following it or at least Dr. Kerley's following it every day, so we're hoping to know something in two weeks or so.

CHAIR DEMBO: On other fronts, Richard Grossman is continuing to spearhead the graduation contract pilot proposal. He and I have had a number of conversations about the progress that's being made there. I think it's well on target with what was intended. And, Richard, is there anything new to report in that regard?

GROSSMAN: -- talk about it today.

CHAIR DEMBO: Excellent.

GROSSMAN: And then we have a Senate Council soiree for the Monday after spring break. So -- meet with Senate Council, as I promised you.

CHAIR DEMBO: Excellent.

GROSSMAN: Thanks for asking.

CHAIR DEMBO: The Board of Trustees' election for the faculty trustee, you probably have all gotten the announcement that nominations are open until March 19th. That's a week from this Friday. You need the name along with ten signatures. The space being vacated is Davy Jones who has filled in for Claire Pomeroy. And the Rule states that the person substituting will fill in for the remaining part of that term. So, that's why he had less than a full three-year term. The next person will start with a full three-year term. At the last moment, Kaveh Tagavi, who's the chair of the Rules Committee, pointed out, what looks like, a quirk in the rules regarding the election that under a very specific circumstance, it could be unclear as to who would - who would prevail. So we're going to work - work on that and run it through the Senate Council to see if we need to

change that in the very near future. I think that's it for announcements. And without further ado, I think, Mike, this is a good time to come up and - and talk to us. Do you want the lavalier or the...

NIETZEL: That's fine.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay.

NIETZEL: Thank you, Jeff. I appreciate the opportunity to talk to the Senate today. This is a chance to review the accomplishments of this year, and there are many, I think, as you will see. It really is because of some excellent work by all members of the University community that we can talk about a lot of achievements this year that we can be particularly proud of. But I would say a special tribute to - to the faculty for helping bring forward a number of important developments as well as on the educational and research front really outstanding progress under difficult circumstances. And some of my presentation will talk about what those difficult circumstances are. But it -- it is an opportunity for you, I think, to feel very good about what has been accomplished during this past year. A chance to survey some needs that the institution has, some challenges that we

are in the middle of trying to confront, and then, maybe, to suggest some prospects for future thinking or future opportunities for us. This will be available tomorrow or the day after at the provost site on the Web page, all of the slides. So, if you want to have -- download it or take a look at it, I think, we'll have it up by tomorrow, certainly by Wednesday. Let me, first of all, begin by looking at the context for the University. It's - it's very much like it was last year, that we have some remarkable needs in this State for higher education, and yet we have declining support from the State for it. So, it's an unhappy coincidence between what's needed and what's there to -- to fuel the - the growth by the institution. I do want to talk about the overall context a little bit with respect to what does an institution like UK need to provide to the State? What is it that the State is looking to us for? And there are five points. These five points were there last year, that overall we have very little educational attainment in the State of Kentucky. We'll talk a little bit about that. The research and development record in Kentucky still

remains in the bottom 10 of all states in the United States. High rates of poverty still continue to be a problem for the State. And then, we have this aspiration that's shared within the University, as well as given to us by the Legislature, to be one of the nation's leading public research universities. And we have a particular covenant with the Commonwealth that land grant universities in all states have, and that has some particular implications for how we prioritize and how we go about our business here.

So, let's look at the attainment issue first. This is to let you know that as we project into the future, eight years from now, there are going to be about 5,000 more students in Kentucky graduating from high school than there are back in 2001. For the United States, you see that growth as 11.3 percent. We're a little bit ahead of that at 14 percent. SRB stands for the southern region, and these are the individual states that make that up. So, there are going to be more students coming out of high school needing a college education over this next decade that, somehow, the Commonwealth is going to have to find a way to serve. This is a particularly troubling table, and it

basically shows what happens to the educational pipeline. If you look at the average in the United States, you start off with ninth grade students, a class of 100. Six years after they graduate from high school in the United States, 18 of those 100 have graduated from college. In Kentucky, it's a third of that rate, 12 out of 100 ninth graders graduate from college six years after they've graduated from high school. So that gives them the six-year graduation opportunity. That's a discouraging figure for us to look at and is one of the reasons why, I think you see, how important higher education and higher education reform in Kentucky remains. This is another troubling statistic, it shows the percentage of adults in Kentucky with a bachelor's degree or higher, again, almost 25 percent in the United States. In the Southern states, 22 percent, and you see we're fourth from the bottom in the region at 17 percent of adults with a college education or higher. Here's the figures for research and development per capita. The most recent ones I could find were for the year 2000. Despite the progress that we are making, and you will see it is excellent progress in terms of

the research profile for this University, we remain in the bottom 10 in R&D per capita. And, actually, of this \$68 here, the percent of that that is federal money is also very low in Kentucky in comparison to the other states. So, you see, it's about two-thirds of what the national average is, and that has not moved a great deal across the decade of the '90s. And then, finally, we come to how this translates overall into per capital personal income. You can see that Kentucky is in the next to the bottom rung of states. Basically, we're about \$2,500 per person under the United States' average for personal income. So, what should the University like this, which, no doubt, in terms of the scope of this University, in terms of the students that go here, in terms of the impact, this is the premiere institution of higher education in Kentucky. And what is it that we, in terms of big ideas or grand goals, need to be accomplishing for the state. I would suggest that there are four big themes. And I want to come back and fill these out a little bit more as we work through the presentation. One is that this is an institution that can help democratize society by equipping people with a lot more knowledge than

they have without an institution like this. That's true even for - for people who don't attend this University. We have an obligation for the discovery and the dissemination of information that goes beyond just the students who are at this campus. This is a place where we incubate ideas. Research and scholarship is a defining quality of what faculty at this University do across a spectrum that's not matched at any other institution in Kentucky. And by virtue of that, we can help Kentucky begin to imagine a future that without an institution like this, it would not imagine. I don't think there is another institution in this State that can be the intellectual heart and soul like we can. And that is a calling that the public -- the premiere public research University in a state should be responsive to. And then, finally, we uniquely prepare students here to help create that future. I've often talked about the fact that most good colleges and universities can educate students to take jobs, but at UK we're going to be educating students not just to take jobs but to make them. And that's going to be a difference with respect to the products that we turn out

here or should be a difference from the other very good institutions in the Commonwealth.

So, we have this covenant that land grant universities have that go back to the Merill Act in the 1860s. What is the covenant? What is the expectation? What is the promise that we make to the State of Kentucky? I would suggest it's four things. And, then, I'd like to go through and look at how we're doing, particularly in the first three. I'm not going to have as much to say just because of time constraints on service and outreach, a little bit.

First, is an excellent undergraduate education. And, I think, you're going to see some very good data about this in terms of what we are achieving here at UK. That we're the institution that provides important research and scholarship, again, across a vast domain of knowledge areas. That we provide outstanding professional and graduate education. I think, there's some very good data here to support that. And then, that the University is responsible for service and outreach that improves lives and society. I think, these are the contributions that we need to return to each time when we talk about

why an investment in the University of Kentucky is the distinctive investment that the State makes in higher education. And one way you do that is to help everyone in Kentucky, particularly our Legislature, understand that an education here is both a public good as well as conveying a personal advantage to the students who attend here. It's a public good in the following four ways. I have a little bit of backup on this. The discovery of new knowledge, the development of new intellectual talent, particularly, at the graduate and professional level where we have a signal kind of contribution to make in the State. This preparing students to make jobs not just to take them. And then the multiplication of external investments that you find at the University of Kentucky. Basically, for every dollar of external money that comes in to the research program here, we add 80 cents to that back into Kentucky's economy. That's a significant investment. If you think about this year, they'll be about a quarter of a million dollars of research expenditure at the - at UK. Here's a way to think about both a personal good - personal advantage and a public

good. The average lifetime earnings of a baccalaureate student is about a million dollars more over that of a high school graduate. If you think about the enrollment growth that's anticipated, if you think about progress in retention and graduation rates, this translates into a significant impact on the Commonwealth's economy. And I'll show you in a minute a slide that indicates how much more profound this lifetime earning effect is if you talk about professional and advanced degrees. And then the University does provide artistic, cultural, and performance opportunities as well through the library that we have, access to information that no other institution, I think, in this State can begin to match. Here is the chart that shows in constant '99 dollars the impact of higher levels of education. And here's a bachelor's degree. Here is a high school degree. If this were updated now in '03 dollars, this would actually be more than a million dollars difference. You can see what happens as you got up to a master's, to a professional degree, to a doctoral degree. The impact is considerable with respect to the economic effects that are achieved by virtue of the education of

students that a university like this provides. We must remain relevant to the State. I think, if you look at, as I'm going to here in a minute, the strategic plan, the 14 areas that we have identified for the State, what we have tried to do is look at areas that there's already excellence at or possibility for excellence at this University and marry those to Kentucky's problems and priorities in a way, again, that positions the University in an ideal way to be seen as - by public policy makers as the important institution in the State for progress overall for the citizens here. So, reminding you of what the 14 areas are in the strategic plan, there are five in the medical area: cardiovascular sciences, cancer, infectious diseases, neurosciences, and pharmaceutical sciences and toxicology. Each of these are areas within the medical academic health center where we have expertise or where we can develop it and have some considerable national prominence. Cultural studies of the Americas, which is in both arts and sciences, primarily, in arts and sciences in a number of departments, digital and now technologies, and emphasis in

engineering, although not exclusively in engineering, also some in - in ag and in arts and sciences, environmental and energy studies, international studies. I'll have something more to say about that with the hope that we could develop an undergraduate degree in international studies as a platform from - from which we could elevate the achievements in international education that the University should be making. Plant bioengineering, largely an ag, public policy, Martin School, Patterson School, College of Education, other areas, risk-related behavioral sciences which spans the Medical Center and the College of Communications and Arts and Sciences, teacher preparation, and then vocal music and performance. You'll recognize this as the 14 areas in the University's strategic plan. A list that addresses well the new economy initiative as well as some other CPE, Council on Post-Secondary Education, initiatives that have been announced for the State of Kentucky.

Let's talk about student achievements then in terms of basic areas of education. I want to talk about who we're enrolling, how well we're doing at retaining and graduating them, what our

students have to say about their experiences here by virtue of our participation in the National Survey of Student Engagement. That's, typically, referred to as the NSSE, the largest database in terms of undergraduate evaluations that we have in the country, and then some institutional recognitions.

All right. This shows enrollment.

You'll see undergraduate enrollment here has increased since 2000 by about 1,300 students. That's a 7.6 percent increase.

And graduate enrollment has increased by about 1,000 students, over 20 percent during that same time frame. So, this has been a period of - I don't know if there's ever been a period where graduate and undergraduate have gone up at this great a level. This does match some national trends for enrollment growth at land grant universities as well. What's more interesting is we look at some of the quality indicators about this in a minute. Also, a number of African-American students, if you see the past three years, we've begun a nice trend up from - this 211 was the high point, I believe, in terms of the number.

Loretta, are you here?

BYARS: Yes.

NIETZEL: Is 211 our high point?

BYARS: Yes.

NIETZEL: So, we're - we're coming back

up towards that, and for next years, I can tell you at least, the number of admitted African-American students is up over 100 from - from the same time last year. Now, how many enroll - the yield is the crucial figure yet to -- to get.

Okay. This shows the first professional enrollment for 2003, a little bit higher.

You have constraints on the growth in these programs, but you'll see in every case except pharmacy - and I'll say something about that when I get there - a little bit of an increase. Dentistry, law, medicine. Pharmacy, I believe, this slight decrease is as we phase out the nontraditional Pharm D, we probably had a little decrease in terms of the total headcount, but that's going to be replaced by an increase in the number of students in the traditional Pharm D program.

This is a very interesting slide. A number of things I want to comment about here. This shows the number of students who have applied to the University, the number that have been admitted or accepted, and then this is the enrollment line. Now, what you'll

see here is that during this period of enrollment growth, we have been steadily accepting just about the same percentage of students each year, 81 percent, essentially, is the - the percent of students we've accepted who have applied. What has changed is a remarkable increase in the yield. These years right here, it's about 45 percent of the students who were accepted coming to the University. Here, you've gone up to 50 percent. A 6 percent increase in yield is a very, very big increase. You do not, typically, find that at other institutions from this short a time frame. And what this illustrates is that at - the enrollment growth has not been - and they'll be some other data to show this in a minute - has not been as a result of the University really deciding to accept a higher percentage of students. In fact, the percentage of students we're accepting, the percentage of those who were selective admits, has gone up dramatically. This is now at about 90 percent. What that means is that those are students we have to accept. That's an important thing as we think about enrollment growth here, that these students are automatically accepted into

the University because they meet - they meet our admission standards. For next year, this number is already over 10,300, the application. It's up over 10 percent. This number is at 8,000. So you can see that we are right on track for a class out here of about 4,000 students. Now, the - the enrollment growth is an issue that we're going to have to deal with either through the resource or the access side, but on the access side, it really does come down to a faculty decision about the criteria we use for selective admissions because the vast majority of these students are getting in automatically. I'm not suggesting we should raise those standards. There's really only two ways you influence this, probably, the - the standards or the cost, and it's something that is worth discussion when you think back about that figure of 5,000 more kids graduating from high school in eight years than what we have now.

This - okay - let's go ahead. This begins to look at the student profile in the first - among freshmen. It shows - this line shows National Merit finalists. This line shows valedictorians. And this shows Governor's scholars. You can see that

there has been a gradual decrease in the National Merits as we have reallocated money - money from funding these students to funding these students. The University still ranks, even in 2003, in the top 25 of public institutions with respect to National Merit finalists - first-time National Merit finalists. You can see that the valedictorians have increased to an all-time high, and, of course, right here when we introduce the scholarships for Governor's scholars, you see the dramatic impact on enrollment of those students. This represents 25 percent of all Governor's scholars and Governor's School for the Arts' students. It is more than all the Governor's scholars and Governor's School for the Arts' students enrolling in all the rest of the Kentucky institutions of higher education. This shows the middle-50 percent of ACT, an indication, again, of the quality being maintained as the class size increases. There are two bars here. The ACT range for institutional research is one that's based on the most recent ACT. And the registrars or the admissions is based on the combination of the best scores if they have more than one ACT that they've taken. And

that's - so you see this one's always a little bit better than the institutional research. The important thing to notice is that by either version that we use in fall 2003, you've actually had that mid-50 percent coming up a little bit, now being charted as 22 to 28 percent, which puts us in good company. This would be comparable, Phil, I think, it's to, probably, 5 or 6 out of the 19 benchmarks as far as that mid-50 percent ACT. Now, the next line addresses: Does that matter at all? This shows you the ACT composite score into some ranges. And this shows you the graduation rates by those ACT scores, four year, five year and six year. And you will see for every - whether we look at four, or five, six-year graduation rates, there is a linear relationship between ACT and graduate rates. So, as a measure - as one measure, not as the - as the sole, but as one measure of student preparation or capability, this is not a meaningless figure for us to continue to pay attention to. This is not a good story. This is our retention rate. It has been a sawtooth for as long as we have looked at it. Unfortunately, that's a low point, and that's a low point that corresponds to a big class. It's hard to

be convinced otherwise that there's not some unfortunate relationship between class size and first to second year retention. So, this is of concern.

There's some things that we need and that we can talk about here that can matter.

A number of good things happening: Jane Jenson being now the head of that first-year Task Force. We're making some other changes that in some to be considered that, I think, can address this, but it is troubling to see that pattern.

It's good to see this pattern.

This is the six-year graduation rate, a steady climb over these cohorts. All-time high and it now puts us into some really enviable kinds of comparisons in that the overall six-year graduation rate in Kentucky is 44 percent. So that's among the public universities. UK is remarkably ahead of the rest of the - our public institutions. If you look at public institutions' national average, it's 56 percent. So we have gone ahead of that for the first time. We still are very low compared to our benchmarks, many of whom will be in the 70s, and there may be a couple, Phil, that make 80. So, we've got a long ways to go, but this has

been an extremely good pattern to have sustained. And the early data suggests we'll make another increase next year in the graduation rate. So, while - while we suffer this first to second year instability, we're doing a good job once we - once we get through that crucial period of retaining to the sophomore year.

Degrees conferred, see up a little bit, the last two years in terms of baccalaureate degrees. Here, the associate degrees in the pale green, steady increase there. Graduate degrees, you see a decrease from '99 through '01 which accounted for a real slack period in - in enrollment in the Graduate School. And, now, this is picking back up. This past year, I would - I would be willing to be almost anything that number will increase, Jennie, and, again, because now we have the beginning of that 1,000 cohorts at least coming through the master's program, that increase of 1,000 graduate students. On the first professional, it's been pretty stable, as you would expect. Quite a nice jump back up to these levels from '02, '03 over '01, '02.

Let me do this one fairly quickly. This is the survey that

first-year students and senior students fill out at UK, along with seniors and first-year students at about 300 other institutions. And the items on this load on five factors: How academically challenged the students are; how active and collaborative their learning experiences are; what kind of interactions they have with faculty members; how enriching the educational experiences are on the campus; and how supportive overall the campus environment is. The same items for first year and for senior students. In the blue, you see UK - these are UK scores right here across - this is a scale with a number of items on it. And this is the predicted score that UK would have, based on the academic credentials and some qualities that the institution has. So you can either exceed your predicted, that's a good thing, or fall below your predicted, that's not a good thing. The residual out here shows whether you're doing better than the data would suggest you should, or that you're not doing as well. In 2001, for the - for the first-year students, there were three out of the five factors that we did a little bit better than was predicted.

Unfortunately, for our senior students, only one out of the five, which was interactions with faculty members, did we outperform the prediction. 2003 - I want to advance to 2003. First of all, you can see our senior students on all five dimensions. We are now outperforming the predicted, and on, again, three out of five for first-year students we're outperforming. If you go back and you compare this score to the 2001 score and come right down the line and do that, you'll see almost without exception some very good improvement. So, that's very encouraging data with respect to what our students are telling us about the educational experiences here. Now, what to make of these? You know, you can - you can be skeptical about what these mean. And yet, the fact that there are areas where we do better and where we do poorer, suggests that there's not some sort of halo or anchor effect that's disturbing these too much. It is a remarkable data set of over 300 institutions that you've got some pretty stable norms on. Other universities have introduced interventions deliberately intended to move some of these factor scores, and have found that, in fact, they do, adding some construct validity

to the idea here that we're measuring something meaningful. So this is something, I think, we should pay attention to as we look at the quality of undergraduate experience at the institution.

Institutional recognition, a year ago, top 15 public universities in terms of the number of first-time National Merit scholars. This year, we'll be in the top 25. In 2002, we were named a Truman Foundation Honor Institution. There aren't very many of those. Actually, as it turns out, I think, there are only three schools in the Southeast Conference that have won that. Last year, one of four institutions to be a Beckman scholar institution. And then a top 50 ranking in US News. Some of you may not be familiar with Kiplinger's which is the Best 100 Values in Public Education in the United States. UK ranks 44th on that. And in terms of costs, there are some wonderful comparisons about our cost of education at UK compared to other public universities. I'll give you one example: If you take tuition, room and board, and say that's the cost of education for a year at a public university, of the top

100 universities in the country in Kiplinger's Report, UK ranks fourth. It would put us first among the benchmarks. So, that's a statistic that we're going to be happy to share with legislators and others as over these next two or three weeks the issue of tuition increases comes up as it, no doubt, will.

What are some educational needs? I'll say something about the graduation agreement in a minute. That's making really good progress. A couple of revisions in the University's studies' program that I would urge you to give consideration to. One is the written requirement that you're going to discuss today. A faculty committee has done a very, very good job, I think, of coming up with a - a good alternative to the writing requirement we have, an unusual development in which we can do it better and cheaper. There is an oral com - a change in the oral com that USP has recommended that, I think, is still in the process of being looked at. I may say a little bit more about this in terms of some difficulties we have with SACS and why I would encourage the Senate to give very, very strong consideration to both of these with respect to some of the problems we're having with those two

parts of USP.

I do think we need to expand our honors program. Since 2000, there's been a report on the honors program recommending an expansion, perhaps, with a social science component to it. And, I think, we could, probably, reasonably, add, maybe, 40 students to the 300 students that we bring in in the honors program in the first year. And we're going to need to do that. We're going to need to find a way to have honors be a little bit - have a little bit more impact on the - on the first-year class than we have these last couple of years.

International studies, we could with one new course and a cap - a capstone introduce a baccalaureate degree in international studies. And we're one of the few universities who - we -- we may be the only university among the benchmarks that does not have an undergraduate program in international studies.

And then the winter term pilot is moving forward nicely, and, I think, we can do some good things with that next December. We already have eight courses nominated and several more on the way, I think, for - for us to consider. And

they involve a nice range of different kinds of courses.

The graduation agreement, Richard Grossman has been chairing this. Here is the group that has served on that committee. It cuts across a number of offices and colleges, all parts of the campus, and it has consulted extensively with students, with deans, with advisors, with Senate Council, and then a special Task Force that was appointed to look into this pilot project. Here are the programs currently. I'm not sure if this is all of them. This is nine programs. Again, you'll see a nice array across the colleges of programs that will participate in the graduation agreement. Ag Econ, three programs in Arts and Sciences, one in B&E, Telecom, Mechanical and Civil Engineering, Communications Disorders, Art History and Art Studio, Nursing, and Social Work. Richard, are there any other ones? Is that the --

GROSSMAN: No, that's the -- that's it, Mike.

NIETZEL: Okay.

GROSSMAN: For the first year.

NIETZEL: Okay. Briefly, and Janet Eldred will talk about this, I suspect, much more. But let me put my appeal in on this recommendation for changing the

university writing requirement. We have a writing requirement that's - that's pretty expensive. And if you look at in comparison to other universities, probably not moving toward a different emphasis on writing in the curriculum that many of them are - are achieving. We tend to have a writing requirement that emphasizes learning to write, as opposed to what you're seeing at many other institutions which is using writing as a way to learn. I think this proposal is - is a very good one. Right now, there are 6 credit hours in the first year, or if you take 101, 102, or 3 if you take 105, to satisfy the University's writing requirement. After that, there is no writing requirement for the University. Now, that puts us a bit out of step, as you will see, with what other institutions are doing. Eleven of our benchmarks require seven or more hours. The average is eight and a half. Minnesota requires somewhere between 16 to 18 hours of writing. And of the benchmarks, only North Carolina, in addition, of course, to us, lacks a second-tier writing requirement which means something after the first year. Right now, writing is something that

first-year students do in the first year, and then they can forget about it in terms of developing that craft or using that tool to intensify their learning within their major field of study. Three benchmarks, Purdue, North Carolina State, and Michigan, have requirements that are going to be very similar to the one, I think, that Janet will be talking about. Six of the seven, who require only six hours, require work beyond the sophomore level. So, you see, if you look at the benchmarks, both they tend to require more, and almost all of them require something beyond that freshman experience so that writing is seen as an intellectual activity integrated into the overall educational fabric of an undergraduate education. And 12 of the benchmarks have writing courses in the disciplines. The proposed change is that we would have a four-year first year writing course, one of those, and there would be no entrance requirements for that course. I'll let Janet talk more about the details. And then sometime after the first year, students would satisfy a second course, a 3-credit course, by completing one of the writing intensive, reading intensive, 200-level courses already offered in the English

Department. These aren't new courses. These are there. These are staffed with instructors that we, probably, have not been taking maximum advantage of in terms of their impact on - on the - the writing opportunities in the curriculum. This provides a way that other departments would not have to come up with writing new courses -- new writing courses, but if they wanted to, they could. So, it achieves a number of important things. It will reduce expenses, as Janet, I think, can talk a little bit about. Janet, where are you?

ELDRED: I'm right here.

NIETZEL: Okay. And it begins to move writing into -- more fully into the student's education rather than something they simply kick out of the way after the first year.

Moving to research and scholarship, real quickly. Total research, here you see a 50-percent increase from 2000 in terms of total grants and contracts. This was a record. And for this year, we are 14 percent ahead by the same time last year in terms of grants and contracts. So the University will cross, in all likelihood, will cross the quarter of a billion

dollar mark for the first time in its history. This shows just federal grants which accounts for almost 60 percent of that amount. You can - you can see that NIH and National Science Foundation account for the lion's share of that. I'm going to come to the NIH data in just a minute where UK is doing extremely well in terms of public universities. Okay.

Here's our NIH rankings. The College of Medicine is 32nd among all public medical schools. And there are nine departments in the University that rank in the top 20. The combination of Psychology and Behavioral Science, a non-degree department - non-degree granting department in the College of Medicine is first. Aging, third; Pharmacology is twelfth. Physiology, Anatomy and Neurobiology, Surgery, Public Health, Preventive Medicine, Family Practice, and Microimmunology. That's really a very, very good record in terms of NIH. That's significant because of the growth opportunities that we think are still going to be there as the NIH budget, hopefully, increases. There's now some question about how much discretionary increase there - there will be. Because of this, Lexington is actually 53rd among all cities in terms of

NIH grants and contracts in terms of fiscal-year appropriations. There has been - this shows you the increase due to RCTF. A four-fold increase in chairs and about a five-fold increase in endowed professorships at the University across these past five years.

What are some research and scholarship needs? I'm going to go a little more quickly on this. We - we need to increase proposals. This is a program that I started where if colleges exceeded certain goals for writing proposals, they got operating expenses. We had a baseline in the year 2000 of 541 proposals. We set that as a goal in '02. That's, actually, what we achieved in '03. That's what we achieved. These colleges, Arts and Sciences, Communication, Design, Engineering, Graduate School, and Social Work have had two consecutive years of increasing the proposals out of the door. Ag did not set a goal of increasing proposals but increasing the total dollar amount. They went up by 64 percent. After we set this goal, they declined a little bit the year after, but to be up by 62 percent in two years, still, we counted that as a victory. Okay.

Space is critical for this research program to continue to grow. This gives you an idea of about 700,000 gross square feet under construction or planned or open. This is BBSRB, 190,000 square feet. That building should be occupied in January. Health Sciences, of course, is occupied. Plant Science is occupied. Mechanical Engineering. Gill Hart, probably, shouldn't include this as a research facility. It's more of a clinical facility, although they'll be clinical research going on in it. And then the Biology and Pharmacy addition which in the Governor's bill has - we have authorization for 21 million of State debt support - debt-service support, 21 million from the University. Unfortunately, in the current budget, that's been put back a year. So, while we still have authority, there'd be no debt service provided until a year from now. So, that's not the best news, not the worst either. The authorization is still there.

The futures initiative, this was a plan whereby I made available about half of the salary for strategic hires in those areas that had been identified as part of the strategic plan. The idea was the provost would put up about half the

salary. The unit would put up about half the salary for three years. And then it would roll to the - finally to the units. There are 22 positions associated with this. Thirteen on the old North Campus goes down to right here, and then nine in the medical center. And you can see a pretty good array of programs represented there.

I wanted to update you on where we stand in the top 20. Most people think that the University's - the University of Florida's center provides the best data on this. I'll show you over the last four years. There are nine measures that we are evaluated on by the center. This - the cohort we're looking at here are just public institutions. And here are the four years for which we have data. Total research, federal, how much we have in our endowment, and how much is our annual giving. You can see a pretty stable pattern here. Federal research, nice improvement. Obviously, the endowment and the impact of RCTF has helped. Annual giving, we've had a couple of - of rough years here the past couple. We have not kept up on that one, as one might have expected we would. So, that's four measures. Then the next

table shows the other five. How many of our faculty are in one of the three national academies: Science, Engineering or Institute of Medicine? We don't do well here. How many of our faculty have won 1 of 15 national awards? A broader category than this. We have slipped there. How many doctorates do we award? Some progress. How many post-doctoral appointments? Do quite well there and nice progress. And this is our average SAT score. And we're fairly low there still when you look at the - the really premiere public research universities. UK is on 9 of these measures in the top 50 on 7 of them in 2003. And we're in the top 40 on 4 of them. So that can give you some - you can regard that as progress, as encouraging, as discouraging, as a stall. One could look at this in a variety of ways and make different interpretations about what's happened over the four years we've been tracking this.

Budget, now, okay, let's do State appropriations, tuition, real quickly, and then - this is a very grim slide. This shows since 2001 the cumulative decrease in funding from the State. It's \$74 million. This shows the recurring cuts that began in 2002,

6 million. The recurring cut that began in '03, 8.6. The recurring cut that begins this year and carries forward next, 5.5. A nonrecurring cut in 2001-2002, and then this real nasty one here which is the one that came from the attack on the restricted funds of about \$41 million, statewide. So across these four years, assuming that the budget holds that we have right now for next year, the University will have lost a cumulative \$74 million in state support. Until you look at the impact of this as you go out over the years for a recurring cut, you don't realize what's been taken out of us. Okay. This gives you an idea about that state funding that we're receiving per student, and this is equally ugly because what you see here is as the State appropriation has been going down, the number of full-time students has been going up as we have this enrollment growth, so that the state funding per student - here's your high point, 14,275 back in fiscal year '01, is now down to this 13,000. That's a 9-percent decrease per student in state funding. The juxtaposition of declining appropriation and increasing enrollment. Now, these state appropriation numbers

when you look more carefully at the - at the presentation on the Web, these numbers aren't going to be the same as some other ones you see because they are net of debt service and - and they include mandated programs. So, you see always the budget figures. Sometimes they have debt service in; sometimes they have mandated programs in. Just notice the asterisk here to describe what's included in this - in this figure.

What about tuition then? What has the University done in terms of tuition increases, and what are we thinking about? This is a comparison of the dollar increases that the benchmark have had in the past four years in their undergraduate resident tuition. If I were to show you nonresident tuition, UK would be the second lowest. What we show here is the resident tuition. UK is the fourth lowest in terms of the dollar increase across the period of time. Students don't pay percentages. They pay dollars. And so we're particularly interested in what that has meant in comparison, again, with the peer and aspiration group that we're contending with. What are we thinking about for next year? It's - it's premature to say, but last year we had 20 million --

\$22 million worth of obligations, and we had a 15 percent tuition increase. Next year we have about \$33 million worth of obligations if you look at the total budget, and we're trying to keep that tuition increase under 15 percent. But what you're likely to see, in addition to a tuition increase, is a further differentiation in terms of program fees, some differential tuition even at the undergraduate level. We started at the graduate level, at the professional level, but we're going to have to begin to look at allocating tuition in a way that tracks what the cost of education is in different programs. Some programs it costs four times more to offer a credit hour than it does in others. So, we are going to begin in some programs, engineering, B&E, some other graduate programs, to look at differential tuition or program fees to begin to address some of the real costs of education associated with whatever program it is that a student is enrolled in.

This shows where our resident tuition fees is with respect to the benchmarks. We remain ninth - no, actually, we - wait, I'm sorry, ninth is another figure. We remain, I think,

14th - 14th out -- out of the array.

This amount here is actually a little less than the median of all of the land grant universities. So, that's another good figure to keep in mind when you look at undergraduate tuition at UK. We have remained below the land grant median.

This shows our - the need for us to address faculty salaries. It's - it's not a good picture. This is LCC. You can see that the gap to the - to the national average for them has increased this past year. Next slide. And here is for UK, and you can see that we've gone in the wrong direction for the most recent year we have data on salaries. That's why salaries are at the very top of the strategic plan in terms of a priority, somehow addressing what is clearly compensation going in the wrong direction, vis-a-vis, the institutions with which we are competing. Okay.

Let me go through a few efforts and show you cumulative recurring saving of about \$21 million in terms of restructuring and reorganization. The initial reorganization in terms of the administration, 1.5, the next year about 7 million in reallocations from various one source to another, for a total of about 8-1/2 million. This, basically,

involves some changes with respect to how we took cuts in the second year when we had - the second year of recurring cuts that began in 2001-2002. When we went to the full provost model, there was a lot of reorganization in terms of the Medical Center and the integration of offices there. That was a \$2 million pickup.

We implemented a miscellaneous fringe benefits model that charged the fringe benefits to self-supporting units and to federal grants and contracts rather than paying those out of the general fund. That picked up 3.9. We allocated costs of certain central services, purchasing, payroll, police, to self-supporting units. Prior to that, that had been picked up on the general fund. It was moved off. That was another 3.1. A management program developed for pharmaceutical purchases and hospital purchases, a sharing agreement, saved about a million dollars. And then general funds were removed from several units, requiring them over a period of two or three years to become self-sufficient. Robotics, I believe, that was 500,000. Development office parking, Environmental, Health and Safety, that picked up almost 3 million.

The total there is - is over 21 million.

What should we be looking at in terms of the combination of goals and savings, because it's clear for this biennium, there's not going to, I think, be new state money? Here's what I would suggest we have a discussion about across campus: What are the corps missions and areas of greatest promise? That's where we're going to continue to need to put our focus. Are there some areas that we could focus on that would leverage resources? I'll suggest one in a minute for you to think about. Are there ways to have new mixtures of current resources that will make us more efficient and still maintain educational quality? The writing program is an example. There are some other examples in terms of undergraduate students that, I think, we could look at. And then, are there some areas that we should look at where we pull back a little bit in terms of investments because they're, frankly, ones that, perhaps, don't either, in terms of centrality or promise, justify the investment that has traditionally been there.

There have been some significant organizational administrative issues. Let me talk about each of these

briefly. Let's go to the administrative.

In the past three years, the amount of change at this institution organizationally has been unprecedented.

And I made a list of things that have happened in these three years for us to look back on in terms of structural changes. The provost model was a significant one. The creation of the College of Design and final resolution of Human Environmental Sciences. We centralized institutional research and institutional effectiveness under Vice President Connie Ray. The Medical Center and North Campus budget offices have now been completely integrated. We have been, for the most part, through a successful SACS reaccreditation. There are still four important issues. I'm not talking about LCC. I'm talking about UK. There are four important issues out there that I'm going to mention at least one about in a minute because we have to be attentive to this and find a solution.

We've had a new Master Plan by Air Saint Gross (PHONETICALLY). And then you have had a complete change in terms of the administrative central leadership with the appointment of a Provost, an Executive Vice President for Financial

Affairs -- that's Dick Siemer, of course -- Executive Vice President for Health Affairs, Mike Carr; Executive Vice President for Research, Wendy Baldwin; and Pat Terrell, Vice President for Student Affairs. Seven new deans have been hired in the past two years, and for the first time, we have a full complement now of deans, full-time deans at the head of all the colleges with the appointment just at the last Board meeting of Jay Perman for the College of Medicine.

Let me go back here to SACS.

We are under quite a bit of scrutiny from SACS, for what they believe is an over-reliance, on part-time instructors and TAs. As an example, we hire 187 - Janet, is that right - part-time instructors --

ELDRED: That was --

NIETZEL: - 187 part-time instructors for the writing program?

ELDRED: That's how many slots are filled.

NIETZEL: That's how many slots are filled, okay.

ELDRED: And it's - that was two years ago, so it's up closer to 200 going and over that.

NIETZEL: In oral com, I don't know how many it is, Enid, but it's a huge number

of TAs and part-time instructors. Have any idea what that number would be?

WALDHART: -- sorry.

NIETZEL: Okay. But we have to find a way to address this because we are about 8 percent higher in the use of part-time instructors and TAs than our peer institutions. In a sense, SACS is correct about the fact that we've made some progress the last two years by hiring some full-time lecturers, but that is a figure that we are going to have to put a dent in, one way or the other. And, so, we're going to need to look at courses in which they're heavy consumers of PTIs and TAs and see is there a better way for us to do it. I think Janet's writing one is going to be a wonderful illustration of how we can put a dent in it. There are others that we need to take a very serious look at or we're going to have problems with this particular issue. The oral com, is one that I would suggest we need to look at equally closely on that - on that point.

Let me go back, though, just a minute. One more back, Mark. Okay. LCC, I think, we're pretty much - there was an update on LCC that, I believe,

will come out of the committee on Wednesday. I think, they have settled on - there are five different bills or resolutions. I think, they've settled on the one they're going to go forward with. If they do a resolution, as soon as that resolution is passed, the - it becomes effective immediately. And every indication we have from SACS is that that will resolve the governance issues, and I would hope, would get LCC off probation at that point. That would be a very, very good thing for them and for their students if we could get that resolved.

College of Public Health, that's one that's going to be coming forward before the Senate. I want to talk about that real, real quickly because it's an example of one of those areas where, I think, it can leverage resources. I was going to present to you the budget figures for the College of Public Health, but we don't have time to do that. I'll be happy to come back at the time it's considered at the Senate and do it so that you can see what, frankly, I think, has always been a significant concern and a very legitimate one is: Is the money there for a College of Public Health? Do we have, in place, the lines, the staff, the operating

expenses for the five units that would be part of a College of Public Health? And, so, that's one that we - I don't want to rush through. I want to go ahead and be able to present that and, hopefully, answer questions the Senate would have to show, in fact, that it's there. Many of these units already exist, and what we're looking at is a reorganization to bring them into a college structure. Let me suggest there are five reasons why - substantive reasons why you want to think - why a College of Public Health would be a good idea for the University, even in the financial situation where we find ourselves now. One is that, in terms of health indicators, Kentucky is doing miserably. This state is, on a variety of measures, at the bottom with respect to public health. If you look at overall health outcomes, we're 39th out of the 50 states. And then if you look at the individual indices that make up that overall health outcome, like obesity and smoking rates, on many of those we're in the bottom ten or five states. So, there is a profound need that has dramatic economic impact on this state to - to improve the overall health of Kentucky. Second, it is a clear state priority. I

think that the CPE has now indicated that they will be supportive of a public health initiative with UK taking the lead in terms of having a college other universities having program. And the state has made it clear, with some legislation currently being considered, that it will be a priority for them. It's a national priority. Of our benchmarks, nine have accredited Colleges of Public Health and two more are looking at introducing. And they're doing that because they're also in context in which public health is a significant quality of life but also economic factor for those states to cope with. And also, that there's a lot of money out there to be invested in public health initiatives. fourth, there are some resources, federal resources, that only accredited colleges of public health can compete. And those are significant resources. We are handicapped at this University by having many of the public health programs, but not having the opportunity because we lack the accreditation standard - status to go after money that is earmarked only for accredited colleges of public health. So we're leaving money on the federal table that could come to UK if we had the - the organizational structure here

that would - would legitimize us in public health eyes. Finally, we've got about 120 students in these programs who, at one time or the other, regardless of whether we think this might have been a good or bad message to send, we're led to believe they were going to graduate from an accredited unit. And that's something that we -- we may want to do differently in the future in terms of how things are started. This was started a long time ago, but we now have students in that standing or in that limbo that, I think, we have an obligation to address. Those are both master's students and doctor of public health students. That's a significant, I think some students would say, contractual expectation that they have with the University. So, I hope, we can come back and talk about public health. But I do, at least, want to begin the conversation by saying there are very good reasons for us to consider it and then, hopefully, be able to answer what, I know, would be skepticism, hopefully never, cynicism about whether the money is there to actually support this unit. Okay. Now, let's go forward, and I'll get done in five minutes.

You think about a University

like this - as I put this together, I thought how we manage some real interesting paradoxes helps define how good we can be and how, in terms of faculty, staff, students and administration, you come together to make the institution be better, or you let it languish and kind of drift. These paradoxes are really present, I think, for all significant major public research universities. And here are some of them: The first one is obvious from things that you have seen. More and more demand for our education with declining state support. How do you manage that? Do you become essentially an elite public institution? I doubt whether we can do that in the State of Kentucky. That's not been part of the covenant that we have had with the state. We're expected to be constantly entangled with real world issues, and, yet, why many of us are here is that we're devoted to thinking about the abstract, the experimental - experimental, and even the whimsical part of life and the world. And how you marry those is important. How you, on the one hand, address practical issues and the same time protect the freedom of the University to think about what it wants to think about

in many, many areas is an important paradox to resolve. We don't have an impact unless we have the scale that we have here. And, yet, our success, I think, depends on still two people and having a particularly good relationship between a student and a faculty member. So, how, in an institution like this, can we keep that intimacy of the learner and the - and the - and the teacher protected, and at the same time, maintain the scope that makes us quite special and that allows us to have the impact in this state that we need to have. How do we take student's and faculty's private curiosities which, I think if you encourage them, makes for the best kind of learning environment here, how do we do - how do we indulge those and help society understand that they're going to get huge social benefits from that at the same time? That when a student really begins to sink his or her teeth into a major or into a profession, because that's the interest that's captivated them, just like it's captivated the faculty member that's inspired them to be in that program, that's how you get the ultimate social benefits from the University. How do we expand access

without lessening excellence? Honors is the way. Many universities try to cope with that. There are other ways to cope with that, but it's something that, particularly, UK is going to have to contend with because if you look at the outstanding students in the State of Kentucky, they generally are choosing whether to go here or some institution out of state. That's where we lose most of our really good students is to some institution out of State. How do we have the global reach that we need but enjoy the local embrace and support that we have to have? Issues of how the - the community accepts our students, accepts campus life, accepts the kinds of activities and priorities that we establish on this campus, how they feed into those and support those at the same time, we're sure that we're educating people for the modern world that extends far, far beyond Lexington. And then, finally, how do we stay obsessed with quality and the process; it's very important to a faculty, in particular, but still be expected to become more efficient and accountable as we do that? That's a tough struggle. You'll see some of those struggles coming forward as we talk about a joint program in engineering

with Western Kentucky and UK where there are some practical issues, very unpleasant ones, quite frankly, that we have had to contend with at the same time we've wanted to marshal this obsession with quality and process. How you make those two work together so that the University can be proud of what it is doing and, yet, fulfill these expectations that people external to the University often have, or - or believe they have, stronger than -- than we do, is a significant challenge for us to accept. I think that's it. I don't know, Jeff, if you want - if we have time for any questions. I - I know it's been a while - gone on for a while, but I could take a couple if - if we do have time.

CHAIR DEMBO: We do have time for one or two questions.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Chemistry. You know, I think, I asked you this last time too. I'll ask it again: One of the things that we, as faculty, find very frustrating is the budgets, is that as our operating budgets are cut, the service units at the University also have their operating budgets cut, but they just increase their charges to

compensate. And we don't have any way to increase charges, and we have no control over that price-setting process. So, I was wondering if any progress has been made in addressing some of those problems?

NIETZEL: Well, there - there have been, Bob, some - I mean, the - the budget cutting has not been - it -- it has been more dramatic on the nonacademic side than on the academic side. Every time we have taken recurring cuts in the University, it is begun, first of all, with the principle that the academic unit cut will be smaller than the nonacademic unit cut. So, that has - there are recurring general fund dollars in -- in those units that you're talking about. And they have had to absorb that at a higher level than we have had. You're right about the problem of turning around and increasing, essentially, the fees to you that have to be paid. It's not unlike, of course, what students say we're doing to them with - with tuition. So this is - this can get - it's ugly, depending on who the - who - who the doer is, but it's kind of what we're forced to do with students, frankly. I - I agree with your frustration on it. I do think there - that Dick Siemer is

attempting to make sure that those costs and the services that you're given are responsive to academic needs. I hope we see improvement in that, and I think we need to continue to have the policy of having budget cuts on those units be heavier than they are on - on the academic ones. I can't give you, I think, a completely sanguine response to it, but I do think Dick is very concerned about it, and you should continue to, as I know you will, let us hear about those problems.

CHAIR DEMBO: We'll take one more question.

NIETZEL: Yeah, Kaveh.

TAGAVI: Yeah, I notice you didn't use the term "contract" in connection with graduation contract. I'm just hoping that it wasn't a type of sensor. I was always not in favor of the word "contract." You are using contract agreement. Is that a change in that?

NIETZEL: That's a change. We liked the word - would you like the word "agreement" better?

TAGAVI: Thank you, yes.

NIETZEL: Yes, we do too.

TAGAVI: It was problem contract --

NIETZEL: I think agreement is now the language everywhere in which that's

referred, and it is -- it is better.

TAGAVI: I agree.

NIETZEL: Yeah.

CHAIR DEMBO: Thank you, Mike, very much.

NIETZEL: Okay, thank you.

(AUDIENCE APPLAUDS)

CHAIR DEMBO: This - this will be the plan for the - the remainder of the meeting. We do need to get a discussion about the writing proposal. Thereafter, we're going to try to get the action item of the definition of a family and with patience, Dr. Nash, if we can reserve the last 10 minutes for you. So my goal here is to spend no more than 25 minutes talking about this. Let me describe to you what's happened. Back in December of 2002, Vice Provost Kraemer came before the Senate to discuss what was then discussed, I think, among USP and the writing program where proposed changes that would be coming down the line. From my recollection in reviewing the transcript, there were a number of good questions that came up at that Senate meeting. It's been since discussed, modified, very thoroughly presented at many different levels: Undergraduate Council, the Advising Network, USP Committee, the Senate Council. So, my goal is for - to do several things here.

First, is to have Janet and colleagues very briefly describe the essence of what this is. Secondly, is to have members of the various councils and committees that it's gone through, give input along the way. The next step would be for the Senate to ascertain if it wishes to waive the ten-day rule. As a reminder, this did not get formalized on the agenda within 10 days time. That's what the Senate Rules currently are. And as an aside, that was a rule that was carried over from the time that mailings went out to everybody. Now that we do it electronically, we've charged the Rules Committee with looking at, maybe, a more moderate view of how long in advance of a Senate meeting something actually has to get on the agenda. Once you've heard enough, you can decide by your vote whether to waive the ten-day rule to actually make this actionable item for which a motion could be brought to the floor and voted on, but I want all the information to be brought up right up front. So, Janet, this would be a good time for you to present the essence of the proposal. Up here with her is Ellen Rosenman, the current acting Chair of English, soon to be permanent Chair of

English.

ELDRED: Permanent chair.

CHAIR DEMBO: Yeah.

ELDRED: I don't have one of those pointers. I'm not really good at power point. So, I still use the templates, and, you know, it will go through. Okay. So, we'll just have to do it like this. Okay. I just want to say, first of all, that I don't have a problem with something being expensive if it's effective. The problem that we have with the writing program is that it is, both, expensive and not particularly effective. It's a model from 1970s. Such models were very popular. Throw as much as you could into the first year. When assessment came along, and programs had to start assessing how well these programs did, they didn't do particularly well, and most universities have moved to something like a writing across a curriculum or a two-tiered model of some sort. So, ours is not particularly effective for several reasons. It's a first-year-only requirement. So writing skills atrophy, and we - we know that. That writing skills that aren't used, if skills aren't used, that they decline over time. We know from the assessment with students that they view something

as - they'll - they'll say, well, careful writing in drafts and editing and revision are something you do for English classes, but you don't have to do it for anyone else because they don't care. So, when you get those papers that look like nobody has read them but you, you know, the pages are out of order and the fonts go - messed up, and, you know, they're - you just think how - did anybody read this? The answer is, no, you're the first person who's read it. You know, they kind of took it out and, likely, didn't even read it on the screen. It is inefficient. Part of 102 repeats 101, in part, because we have so many sections taught by nonfaculty that we can't count on the instruction being given in 105, and so we repeat part of that in 102. These are older figures that 187-plus sections two years ago with the smaller first-year class were staffed by part-time instructors. I'm not going to go through a lot of this because Mike did it, but - on his -- his slides. But I do want to say, the students in the Honors Program already satisfied the writing requirement through the curriculum, and, in fact, do more writing, and that right now, we don't

have any exemptions except through transfer credit. You saw the benchmarks. Some of the goals we have, to encourage students to write throughout their college career so that writing skills grow rather than atrophy, and this is a proposal that moves us down that path. But it - it doesn't get us to the end point, I think, we want to be at. But it - it's at least moving us in the right direction to encourage students to learn through writing throughout their college careers. And then the last two is we want to move toward writing across the curriculum, and we hope that this is the first step.

Proposed change, most UK students would take a four-unit first-year writing course to satisfy the first-year writing requirement. And there would no entrance requirement for that course. Most students would place into that. Sometime after achieving sophomore status but before graduation, students would satisfy the second condition by successfully completing one of the writing-intensive reading-intensive 200-level courses offered through the English Department. When we brought the proposal up last year, it was for a full-blown

writing-across-the-curriculum program.

And this body, rightly, said there's not funding to support that at this time.

And with the budget cuts coming through, there is less funding to support a kind of full-blown whack. This particular proposal says, we will continue to deliver instruction through English; we will reallocate the resources we have; we will continue to offer the instruction through English; and then as resources become available, USP will work on creating mechanisms so that other colleges and programs can be on board.

We hope this is an interim proposal, but it needs to stand solid as - as it is.

We really would like this proposal to pave the way for future courses outside of the English Department at that upper division level.

For now in this interim proposal, courses satisfying the 200-plus requirement include the following: 230, 231, 232, 233, and 234, are new courses that went through just last year. For the first time, we have proposed that we have some first-year exemptions. We have kept them high, and so, it's not going to be easy for students to exempt, but we can, at least, make an offer if we're

trying to recruit good students and bring them in. 15 of the 19 benchmarks offer exemption. We have not in the past. And there will be no exemption from the 200-level or above requirement, and this is fairly consistent, again, with our benchmarks who say, if the purpose of doing this is to encourage students to write across the careers, you really don't want to exempt them from the - the second tier. And so, that is pretty much the end of - of all the slides I had. And then I - I wanted Ellen to talk a little bit about the English Department support of the proposal.

ROSENMAN: Okay. I'm so primitive, I don't even have power point. I'm just going talk. The English Department was strongly in favor of this proposal when it was voted on in the fall. I think, the vote was 13 to 1. And it was clear that it was both a better program pedagogically than we have now, a much better use of our resources. We know that students learn to write best if they continue to practice, and also if they're writing about a rich content area. And this proposal addresses both of those. It also solves one of the main concerns that we've had for a long time about the freshman composition program as it now

exists; we said - which is that it is staffed almost, almost entirely by part-time instructors and teaching assistants. We have -- you've heard the statistic now three times, but next year there will be over 200 sections taught by PTIs. And all - almost all of the rest of them taught by TAs. One faculty member every other year teaches one section of freshmen comp. And having seen the retention statistics from the Provost, I think, it's pretty clear that this is not a student's best introduction into college life. With the new proposal, probably, about 25 percent of the courses would be taught by full-time faculty members. And if you take out Business Writing, which is something that English professors don't really know how to do. It's really a separate field. Those English literature courses, probably, about 60 percent of those will be taught by faculty members. So, in that respect, it's just a much better writing experience for students at UK then - then dealing so much with part-time instructors and with TAs. And it also will be very helpful for us in fulfilling the SACS' requirements for TAs because it will make it easier for us to

take first-year MAs out of the classroom from teaching their own courses and allow them to be supervised and trained before they actually teach. So, it seems to be a better educational experience for students. It helps us meet our problem of proliferating adjunct instructors which is a problem nationwide and very hard to make any inroads on. It's a better use of resources, and it does, as Janet says, pave the way for a more full-blown writing-across-the-curriculum program which seems to be the direction that writing is going. Okay. Any questions?

CHAIR DEMBO: Well, what I'd like to do is to hold off on questions for us because I want to put this in a couple of perspectives. First is that there's no effort to prevent a thorough and thoughtful discussion about this, but there is a time concern of which you need to be aware of. Cindy Iten or Joanne Davis, active in the Advising Network, maybe, you could - Joanne is chair of the Advising Network. Could you put this in the perspective of how a decision, or the timing of a Senate decision, could impact what your job is?

DAVIS: Certainly. On March 19, 20 and 26 and 27, the University will hold Merit

Weekend registrations. These are for incoming freshmen who have ACT composites of 27 or higher and SAT scores of 1240 or higher. This is the top of our pool. They will be registering -- if there's no decision made, they will be registering before - with - with a major part of their component unresolved. There are going to be, probably, close to 800 students. When I left my office at 2:40, there were 726 already confirmed to attend at one of those two conferences. And so, not having this resolved at the time that we meet with them creates a big unknown. For them, it puts the advisors in a position of not giving the best that we can give them in terms of planning and advising scheduling. It will mean if the proposal is, indeed, approved, then back to those students and another means of getting them registered, it just creates a lot of questions for students who come expecting answers, first of all, and the exemptions will be of considerable concern to them because that is a big change that the exemptions provided for in the proposal are quite different from what this group of students, in particular, is used to with the AP credit that they've been awarded in the past and

all know about. And so, our Advising Network has asked that it be brought to the Senate for consideration prior to the vote - prior to the first Merit Weekend on the 19th and 20th.

CHAIR DEMBO: Hence, knowing a decision, either way earlier rather than later, helps everybody.

DAVIS: Right.

CHAIR DEMBO: Also, to that end, the writing program and the Registrar's Office have worked out a, I guess, a deal whereby both possible options have already been scheduled in terms of room allocation. Jacquie, do you want to make a comment about that?

HAGER: Sure. We worked with the English Department early on when we heard this was coming up. And, basically, what Janet and I have done is talked about the various scenarios that would need to be built into the scheduling. We're prepared to implement either one, depending on what this body does.

SPEAKER: That was - that was kind of a royalty --

DAVIS: Jacquie did most of that work. And I said, wow, that's really good.

CHAIR DEMBO: That's how Jacquie tends to work. So, rather than reinvent the wheel, I'd like for, first, somebody from

Undergraduate Council if you have any comments to make about the deliberation that went on in that body, followed by USP, and then the Senate Council. Is there anybody from Undergraduate Council who would like to - to make any comments or, Phil, if you want to summarize what you heard.

KRAEMER: I'll speak to both. I don't want to preclude anyone else from having the opportunity. But the course change that we're talking about here going from the two 3-credit hour courses to one 4-credit course, was evaluated by the Undergraduate Council, and it was approved. The USP Committee, this is a proposal that goes back more than one year. This has been under development for quite some time. The USP Committee thoroughly looked at the proposal submitted last year. We brought that to the Senate for discussion, and we took very seriously all the comments. And, again, the royal we was Janet who redrafted to incorporate those suggestions. And the USP Committee has looked at this new proposal very thoroughly and - and is highly supportive of it. But, again, I don't want to preclude if anyone else in the

Council or USP -- Steve.

CHAIR DEMBO: Steve.

YATES: Steve Yates, Chemistry

Department. I've seen this proposal from three perspectives, from the Arts and Sciences Council, from the University Studies Committee, and here in the Senate. And, quite frankly, I've tried to be skeptical, as Mike as suggested, but not cynical in -- in looking at it. And, I think, that it has merged as a very progressive proposal. I think the overwhelming thing that sways me is that this leads to an increase in the quality of education because, while it wasn't emphasized by either - either of the young ladies, in fact, you're going to have a better pool of instructors to choose from. And, I think, this is - this, by all means, is going to lead to better instruction. I very strongly support this proposal.

CHAIR DEMBO: Thank you, Steve. Is there anybody else from the USP Committee, Arts and Sciences Faculty Council, or the Undergraduate Council that wants to comment? Okay. At the Senate Council level, there was also a lively discussion, and while the Senate Council ultimately voted to send it forward to the Senate with a positive

recommendation, the vote was not a unanimous one. And, I think, that you should hear both - both perspectives. So who from the Senate Council would like to present their perspective? Professor Tagavi.

TAGAVI: Yes. Actually, there was not enough time on the Senate Council, so to be fair to - to my colleagues, I did bring this up because we were entangled on a D, which is possible or not I'll take -- talk about that later. But this technical writing, it seems to me that if you want to become top 20, you have to have a technical writing. Now, we have Business Writing, and I think we should have Business Writing. And I ask you, Janet, how many you have. I'm not going to say the number yet. You told me a number, and then I asked my colleagues, how many Business Writing do you think we have? And I asked them, they said, well, I don't know. It's like, make a guess. I was told 5, 10, 15. And I told them it's 50. I have no problem with having Business Writing 50 courses of classes, but I think in Engineering College, sciences, they also deserve to have technical writing, and it's very important.

CHAIR DEMBO: Other members from the Senate Council that want to present their perspectives. Well, I'll summarize by saying that there were some who felt that this was not a step in the right direction, that it represented diminishing the - the education that was to occur. There's one more point. You were asked about how many sections --

ELDRED: Yes, the - the humanities, USP.

CHAIR DEMBO: Right. I don't know if that's relevant information, but one of the specific questions that came up with Janet - why don't you describe the information?

ELDRED: The question asked was how many students in other departments take the 200-level lit courses, and I didn't bring those. I did circulate those numbers with the Senate Council. They're not - it's, you know, five from Biology, five - it's a long, long list. The biggest number is either English - I think, it's 60 percent - does that sound right, Jeff - English or secondary ed. So - and the secondary ed people - is that right, Kaveh? You might --

TAGAVI: Yes.

ELDRED: -- remember those numbers better. The secondary ed people do

this - the English major but with a more writing-intensive focus. So, that's not unusual. And then the rest of them, really just go across a very, very long list. I think, journalism was up there with more than seven students. But - but it's, actually, a few from here, a few from there, a few from here.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Debski.

DEBSKI: Yeah. I guess, the concern was that, specifically, this 200-level course could also count for USP in their humanities. And so, basically, the idea was that you were getting double credit for this course. And - and, I'm wondering, that was from the - that recommendation was from the USP Committee rather than - rather than the English Department.

ELDRED: No. I think --

DEBSKI: Is that right?

ELDRED: - I think from both. I think, the English Department had a real problem with turning the 200-level courses into another writing course. The English Department was very happy to have those courses as USP courses. The content is protected somewhat that way, and they had a problem with saying, why is the same course different? You know, why - okay,

the student takes it this time, it counts for USP; the student takes it again, it counts for writing. Nothing's changed. It's the same course. And so, I think, there were two ideas there that, one, that the USP requirement protected the humanities content of those courses so that we just didn't end up with a two-tiered writing requirement where content somehow disappears from that second tier.

DEBSKI: But in terms of diminishing, I guess, that would be one of the points that, I know myself, I felt that that might certainly lessen the requirements, and put together with the oral communication and - and the possibility that that might be dropped, and the cross disciplinary - it was - it seemed, to me, that there was a pattern, and that we were sort of chipping away at the USP requirements.

CHAIR DEMBO: Dean Hoch.

HOCH: I just want to - Jeff, could you just inform the Senate what was the vote at the Senate Council meeting?
Seven?

CHAIR DEMBO: Let's see if I have it.

SCOTT: Eight.

CHAIR DEMBO: It was, what, eight to --

SCOTT: Eight to two, to the best of my

recollection.

CHAIR DEMBO: Are there any other questions that need to be answered for the Senate to decide if it has enough information to consider waiving the ten-day rule? Additional information is needed?

GESUND: HANS GESUND, Civil Engineering.

Two questions, really. The first one concerns engineering. We have to have the technical writing as part of this revamping. We simply cannot go with business or any of these other things. If you have ever bought a VCR, DVD player, TV, any of these things, and have tried to read the instructions for activating these things, you will understand how very, very, very important good technical writing is. We need to have that included, the technical writing course. So, that - there is no way Engineering can go without that. Number two, what does this do for transfer - to transfer students? How will you handle transfer students who have had 101, 102, all over the country, let alone all over the Commonwealth?

ELDRED: First of all, I'd like to say that Business Writing is staffed entirely by adjuncts who get - who are paid \$2,625 a course. We have been working on

that course. It's very difficult to -
to find people to teach it. Our - the
CP has designated -- this campus has a
Ph.D. and a graduate program in
literature. The Ph.D. and the graduate
program in writing is at the University
of Louisville. What this means is that
we have, right now, two faculty members
in writing, Brandon Roorda, who is
director of the writing program now, and
I am in writing. That's it for faculty
members in writing. The other thing
is - is - is that it's - this money
for Business Writing comes directly out
of the English Department and the Arts
and Sciences budget. And there is no
additional money in there to build 204.
And so, part of the thing is is that we
don't have - first of all, we don't have
the expertise. We don't have the staff.
And already with the adjunct situation,
it is very difficult, as Professor Yates
alluded to, for us to find people who are
qualified to teach in those courses and
the - the problem is directly a problem
of compensation. When you are paying
people \$2,625 to teach a course, it's,
you know, it's rather --

GESUND: Well, this is all very well.

But you have - you're going to have to
teach the Engineering students in - in

the Business Writing then. They've got to go somewhere. They'll probably all want to go into the Business Writing as the nearest thing to their hearts. So why not take some of the money that you're going to have to spend for the Engineering students anyway, and put that into English 204, the technical writing course?

ELDRED: It's very simple --

GESUND: It just doesn't make sense.

ELDRED: - don't have the faculty to teach it. Don't have the expertise --

GESUND: Well, if you can buy it - you can hire some people to do that.

ELDRED: This is a Dean question.

GESUND: You're offering the course right now. It's in the - it's in the schedule book. It's in the catalog. If you can offer it with, I don't know, three or four sections, I presume you can offer it with ten or twelve. It shouldn't be that difficult if you want to do it. And what I'm detecting is a great reluctance on the part of the people who should be doing this, to do it, and I resent that. I resent it deeply.

ELDRED: I would -- I would just respectfully say that, I think, the

Engineering College would be a good place to house technical writing.

GESUND: We haven't got the budget, either.

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

GESUND: I'll make you a deal, you transfer 10 or 15 or 20 sections worth of funding to College of Engineering, and we'll do it. All you've got to do is give us the funds.

ELDRED: They're not - they're not a whole lot. 10 times, you know, \$2,625 --

GESUND: We can hire graduate students just like you can. And then you haven't answered the other question.

ELDRED: The transfer agreement is laid out. What we're doing is if a student has - it's - it's partly - and, Cindy, actually, I'm going to ask you to help me with this. But it's partly already outlined in articulation agreements that are beyond us. So, if a student completes 101 and 102, they have satisfied the first-year writing requirement, and would take the second tier. If a student completes only 101, they have the option of either taking a 102 or going into the four-unit 105. If a student earns an AP of three on the language exam, they will receive credit for English 101, and can take either 102

or 105 - 104 is the -- the number now.
But if we have students transferring with
writing-across-the-curriculum courses
at - at an upper division, we'll -
we'll evaluate those now on a - on a
case-by-case basis. They don't have to,
necessarily, be literature. We want them
to be writing-intensive. Literature
courses that transfer will not
automatically be counted as the second
tier because they might not have been
writing intensive.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Hahn.

HAHN: You have mentioned it's in the
proposal.

ELDRED: Yes.

HAHN: And I would like to know what's
planned for the future because when the
Undergraduate Studies Committee of this
University looked at it many years ago,
we had intended for TAs from English to
be in our writing-intensive courses. We
need them very badly. I follow what Hans
is saying. I dig through about 100 pages
per student per semester of writing, and
I think that's more intensive than any of
the other courses. And what I would like
to see is help in that particular area.

ELDRED: And you've got the Provost
here.

HAHN: I would really like to know when this is an interim proposal, and I would like to have it labeled that, that everybody knows we're going to do something in the future.

ELDRED: I like that idea very much.

CHIEF DEMBO: Professor Yanarella.

YANARELLA: I was one of those who supported the proposal in the Senate Council, and, I think, some of the comments that have been made may give a somewhat distorted view on the eight people who supported the particular proposal in the Senate Council. I thought - it was my impression that this was a - an indication of strong support by those eight people who voted, and - and, clearly, the strong questioning by those who voted against this. We had a very lively follow-up discussion on our list serve, and I thought that there was a very thorough airing of many of the issues that took place within the debate itself. Those who came to the Senate Council to explain the proposal, came in full force, the Dean of my college, as well as Janet, several members, Randall Roorda, who's also involved in putting this together, John - John Pica to talk about the - the issue of - that would follow in terms of going one way or

another. And I thought that - I thought that those people had generally ready answers and certainly responded quite well to a number of the issues and concerns that were raised. I also had the distinct impression that - that some of those individuals who were skeptical of this or raised serious question, were - were treating this as a kind of surrogate for a very important issue that we - we need to come to grips with, both on the faculty side and the administrative side. And that is to say, what do we do and to what extent should budget cuts and rising enrollments drive our conception of - of liberal education? That's an issue that, I think, all of us should be part of, but I don't think that this particular proposal should be held hostage to it. As - as I've - I've been involved on the periphery on this for a number of years, and I know that this has gone through, and there have been very thoughtful engagements of this, not only within those standard representative bodies, but also on other committees. And it seems to be me that the - the case has been made strongly and powerfully for this as an interim - as an interim effort

working towards
writing-across-the-curriculum input. I
certainly support that. I think that
those of us who are involved in modern
studies and had the opportunity to deploy
the kinds of - of methods that are going
to become an integral aspect of this -
of this alternative to the present
system, feel very comfortable in -
in - in seeing this being integrated,
and certainly, when - if you ask the
bottom-line question, and that is, will
the quality of the experience of -
of - of the writing requirement be
enhanced, I think, that the eight people
who voted in support of this on the
Senate Council, concluded that it would.

CHAIR DEMBO: One of the other problems with
the time issue is that if the Senate does
not want to consider it today by waiving
the ten-day rule, it still needs to be
considered sometime before the next
meeting of the Senate, meaning, that we
would call a special meeting of the
Senate, specifically, for that issue.
So, you've at least heard enough about
this proposal to know whether you want to
put it on the floor or not.

SPEAKER: Why - why is that?

CHAIR DEMBO: The Senate Council has the
power to call a special meeting of the

Senate when it's necessary. If we wait until the April 6th meeting of the University Senate, it will be too late for the Advising Network to properly get the word out as to which way the Senate has voted. So, that would probably require having a Senate meeting on or about March 22nd. So, this would be the time if a motion is to come forward.

Professor Waldhart.

WALDHART: I move that we waive the ten-day rule in this case. I think, we've had enough advance notice, and I would like for us to vote on it today.

CHAIR DEMBO: Is there a second for that?

GROSSMAN: Second.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay.

SCOTT: Name?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. So, the discussion now is merely whether we're going to vote on waiving the ten-day rule to make this an actionable item at this meeting. Is there any discussion about that? Anybody want to speak against the motion?

Professor Tagavi.

TAGAVI: We have been doing this - I've been here 20 years, maybe, we have been 101, 102 for even more than that. What is the rush? This came out to senators

Thursday night. I'd like to ask, maybe, show of hands who read every one of these? Is it - is it good practice to - to vote on this when there was a two-day notice, two of them Saturday and Sunday, or three days notice, two of them Saturday and Sunday? Is there any rush? I'd like to know. Does - does it have to be this year other than the fact that we are going to save - we are going to save one extra year? I acknowledge that, but other than that, is SACS breathing on our necks that we have to do it this year rather than next year?

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Eldred.

ELDRED: Not so much SACS, although SACS would like us to get the number down, obviously. The budget is breathing down our necks, and we will have to make cuts. One of the things that's very nice about the proposal is that it drops the number of students in a class to 22, and it means that we hire fewer part-time instructors which means, as Professor Yates pointed out, that we have a better quality pool.

TAGAVI: From what? Drop to 22 from what?

ELDRED: 25, but with the budget next year, that number will go up to 27. Now, the - the recommended number is 15. The

national average is 18. So, even at 22, we're above that but we're moving in the right direction. Now, in order to cap those numbers at 27, we are increasing the Business Writing to 112. That's how the budget numbers would work out. 112 students in a section of Business Writing. Alternately, we would have to go to 30, 31, 32 in all the first-year writing courses which definitely moves us in a direction - and we also have to locate - we are now well over the 200 section, so we have to find more people who have an MA in English and 18 hours to be SACS qualified to - so that we don't have issues with our accrediting agencies. And it's harder. It's hard to get in that pool.

ROORDA: I'm Randall Roorda. I'm the present director of the writing program, and I wanted to amplify one other aspect of that change. If the enrollment in the 101 and the 102 courses goes from 25 to 27 or 28 because our teachers are contractually supposed to be spending 10 hours a week teaching this class, I'm going to have to reduce the amount of writing that students do in that class. That's going to be further dilution of the care and experience in this.

ELDRED: And, again, that has to do with the graduate students that they're not supposed to be contracted for any more than 20 hours a week. We already have a problem in English that the students are doing more work than that. As a result of that, even though three classes is considered full time for graduate students, ours have a special arrangement whereby two courses counts because of that. And - and, you know, our graduate students now are talking about unionizing, as have many graduate students across the nation. And so, we have to, particularly, for student -- for classes led by graduate students be very concerned about how much time they're spending grading papers. And when you add more students to the class --

TAGAVI: Can I follow up on that, please? There is fingerprints of rushing this. For example, I don't want to pick on this. The - the application is changing, of course. But it's my understanding this is a new course. The application says 105, but it's my understanding that this is actually 104. It is not a technicality. This is not a technicality in a sense that if this is called 105, we are going to be ending up with one course. If it's 104, we are

going to end up with two courses. It's called accidental writing. I don't think this is accidental writing. This is just writing.

CHAIR DEMBO: Enid, is there a point about the ten-day rule?

WALDHART: Yes, this is. And I - I believe that this issue is not something that is rushed. I think it has finally come to fulfillment for a time that has been - I mean, it has been talked about and talked about and talked about. I believe we have had enough time, and I believe that the proposal that we got by e-mail did include the -- the revision. So, I think, that all of the --

TAGAVI: No, it did not.

WALDHART: Okay, I'm sorry about that. I think that what's here is ready to be voted on.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Other --

BLACKWELL: Call the question.

CHAIR DEMBO: Call the question means to - we need to vote on stopping debate. We needs two-thirds vote. So, all --

TAGAVI: Debate for extension --

CHAIR DEMBO: Debate for waiving the ten-day rule. Okay. I have to rely on the honesty of eligible senators to vote. All those in favor of stopping debate,

please raise your hands? Okay. All opposed. I believe the motion carries, so it comes to a vote. All in favor of waiving the ten-day rule to permit an actionable motion to come to the floor regarding the Writing Proposal, please raise your hands. Okay. All opposed. Eleven opposed. Any abstentions? Okay. So, I'll now entertain a motion regarding the Writing Proposal.

SPEAKER: Senate Council brings it to the floor --

CHAIR DEMBO: Well, the Senate Council couldn't bring it to the floor because it wasn't within 10 days. Professor Durant.

DURANT: Dick Durant. I propose that we approve the proposal.

YATES: Second.

CHAIR DEMBO: Second, Professor Yates. Okay, now, discussion about the proposal itself. Professor Gesund.

GESUND: I move an amendment that English 204, Technical Writing, be added to the classes that are approved for whatever this does.

TAGAVI: Second tier.

GESUND: - for the second tier as - as fulfilling the Writing Requirement.

TAGAVI: Second.

CHAIR DEMBO: Is there a second to that? Second, Professor Tagavi.

CHAIR DEMBO: Discussion about the amendment.

Professor Waldhart.

WALDHART: I would like to have us vote

very strongly against this amendment. I

think the proposal, the way it's

included, indicates that there will be a

chance for a large number of courses

that - that may be existing on the

University that fulfill that, and that, I

think, that's where the discussion about

the English 204 belongs. I don't think

it belongs as part of this proposal. It

would seem like a very reasonable kind of

thing but it isn't part of the proposal

now, and probably would require some kind

of adjustment about the curriculum which

English already has a list of courses

that meet that now. Now, that doesn't

mean that's the only courses that are

going to be there. And I think, Hans,

that this is one of those courses that

think about later, but it should not

affect what we're talking about right

now.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Edgerton, was your

hand up?

EDGERTON: Well, it was - it was just

emotionally up. I - I don't --

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

EDGERTON: My comment is not - is not

pertinent to this amendment.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Any other comments about the amendment? Professor Debski.

DEBSKI: Well, am I correct in assuming that for next year if this passes, you just need the 104 and 105, right, because it will start - it will start with that class.

ELDRED: There's a year gap.

WALDHART: There's a year gap.

DEBSKI: We have another year to add the 200-level courses?

ELDRED: Right. Yes. Right. And USP is talking about those 200 levels as we speak, yes.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Hoch.

HOCH: Yes. It's my understanding last year, I wasn't here, but when it came before the Senate, we were told that the course list that was being proposed would result in unfunded mandate, and therefore we should not include any courses like - like what you're proposing because there are currently no - no resources to do it with. So, we went back. We took all the advice the Senate gave us, and we came up with a proposal that had no unfunded mandate in it. Now, the advice we're getting is, no, we need to put these courses back in, and then have an unfunded mandate. The

reason I'm concerned --

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

HOCH: The reason I'm concerned is, one, when we started Business Writing, we had four sections of Business Writing. We now have 48 or 49 sections of Business Writing. So, if we're going to do it, that's fine, but that's -- you know, that's cost us \$125,000 a year to run. So, I don't want another unfunded mandate being passed by the Senate and being posed on the college. So, I can assure you that even if we include the, you know, Technical Writing course, the College of Arts and Sciences is under no obligation to fund any sections, and we won't. So we won't solve your problem.

GESUND: That's not true because you have to educate the engineering students. You're going to have to accommodate them in some of the second tier - in the second-tier sections. So, all you're really having to do is to move some of the second-tier sections into 204. Some of the funding of other sections because the engineering students are going to be with you, and the worst of it is, they're going to be in courses that they don't want to be taking. And so, they are not going to do well. One of the things you

proposed here that was a justification for this was that the students would be more interested. That was one of the things the Provost brought up, that the students would be more interested. The engineering students are not going to be interested in literature, in Shakespeare, or anything else. They will take Business Writing, and you could move some of the funds from Business Writing into Technical Writing. And I - I no numbers, believe me, I'm an engineer. I know numbers.

CHAIR DEMBO: Ellen. Then Roberta.

ROSEMAN: I'd like to respond to that because, in principle, I certainly agree it would be a good idea to have engineer Technical Writing courses. But you can't just change the title of the course and have it be a legitimate writing course in another discipline. To create a Technical Writing course requires expertise in Technical Writing, which nobody in the English Department has, requires developing a curriculum; it requires getting somebody who's really competent to teach it, and it requires assessment. And all of this is time and money that can't just be transferred from Business Writing because it's a totally different course. It's like saying, get

somebody who's teaching Shakespeare to teach Technical Writing. It just won't be the kind of rich content-based writing course that really justifies a second-tier requirement.

CHAIR DEMBO: Dr. Dwyer. Then Dr. DeSimone.

DWYER: I would like to call the question on the discussion of this amendment.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay.

DeSIMONE: Second.

CHAIR DEMBO: No discussion on this. This is to bring to a close the - the vote is now to bring to the close of discussion of the amendment proposed by Dr. Gesund. Okay. All in favor of closing discussion on that, please raise your hand. Okay. All opposed. Okay. Five opposed. Any abstentions - six. Okay. So, now, the vote is to accept or not accept the amendment offered by Professor Gesund. All in favor of the amendment, as offered, please raise your hands. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Okay. All opposed to the amendment. Okay. The amendment fails. We're back to the original motion now. Professor Durant.

DURANT: I'd like to propose an amendment to the exemption. As it now stands all freshmen who enter the

University of Kentucky either take a writing course or exempt it because they have taken a bypass examination which shows that they are - that they're far enough along to only take one course.

This new proposal suggests that we use three criteria by which students could be exempted from the first four course if this passes, for credit. They could have a standard score of 32 on the English section of the ACT, 700 SAT, or 405 in the English Language Exam. That third section is - is quite reasonable.

That - that's a test that tests how good people are at writing. The first - the first two tests show how good students are with writing tasks, but it doesn't test their writing skills. The reason this seems, to me, important is that I've had some experience with students, good students, who have come in with good scores on these tests because, of course, some of them come to the Honors Program and some of them come to the English 105 --. My experience is that those students very much need writing instruction, and that they need the kind of writing instruction they get in English 104 as well as the -- course. One of the arguments against this is this will put us at a disadvantage in

comparison to other schools who allow students exemptions. I - I think that there is a rich medley of that kind of exceptions at various schools, but in general, we won't --, and if we ask students whether or not they - they need such courses, they will tell us uniformly they do not. This is not an informed opinion. The other unstated and real problem with my suggestion is that there are some 300 - or were some 300 students who entered the - last fall who were exempted from this. This is - this is - Is this not pertinent to speak?

CHAIR DEMBO: This is all an introduction?

DURANT: Yeah.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay.

DURANT: It's a long introduction.

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

GROSSMAN: He wants you to propose your amendment.

DURANT: So, my amendment is that we drop the - we say that students who have an AP English Language Exam of 405 receive exemption from English 104 and drop the exemptions from the ACT and the SAT.

CHAIR DEMBO: So your proposal is to keep the exemption for the AP score and to drop the exemption because of

standardized test scores.

DURANT: Yes.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Is there a second to that?

ALBISETTI: Second. Jim Albisetti.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Albisetti.

Discussion on this proposed amendment.

Reactions from the Writing Program or the English Department.

ALBISETTI: Well, benchmark institutions do

this a lot different ways. There are several, as Steve mentioned, five of them who do have exemptions through ACT, SAT

or AP. There are several others that have -- exemption by AP exam as - as

Davis said. There's just a lot of different ways of doing this. There are a lot of other factors involved here too.

Some of it has to do with the presence or absence of remediation which we don't have --. Some - some of it has to do

with - with the presence of honors sections and whether you place into those by one means or other. I think that I

would like to see the proposal go forth in its current state because - because,

I think, that the argument for greater - for being more competitive and attracting students into the Honors Program falls

generally on - is a strong argument.

CHAIR DEMBO: So, you're speaking against the

amendment then?

ALBISETTI: Yes, I am.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Is there anybody that wants to speak for the amendment?

ELDRED: - Motion.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Motion to limit debate.

I will note that Professor Eldred had her hand raised and was going to add something, but we've called the question. So, all in favor of stopping debate on the proposed amendment, please raise your hand. Okay. All opposed to limiting debate. Okay. So, now we call the question on the amendment. The amendment is to eliminate the - the ACT, SAT scores and to keep the AP scores in the proposal, correct?

SPEAKER: Yes.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. All in favor of that amendment, please raise your hands. Could you help me count?

SPEAKER: Five.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. All opposed to the amendment. Keep your hands raised, please. Unless it's an emotional vote, in which case...

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

JUDD: Thirty-two.

CHAIR DEMBO: Thank you very much. Okay. We're back to the original motion now on

the floor. Professor Ford.

FORD: I'm not going to make an amendment.

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

FORD: I have a question and I'm supportive of the proposal because I perceive that it will - especially if you go to writing across the curriculum, will improve things. But I'm wondering where the efficiencies are, and I'm - this is clarification, maybe, somebody can help me. If we go to this new system, we'll have 4 credits and then the second 3 credits. Right now we have 6 credits. So, to me, that seems like there's more resources being needed - needed. So, I'm trying to figure out where the efficiency comes in, and it sounds like the efficiency comes in when the fact the students who take the second-tier course can use it also for a humanities requirement or USP, that then we will be able to provide some type of an overlap that will reduce the overall demand for course unit. Is that an appropriate portrayal of this?

HOCH: Well, also that a lot more regular faculty are involved in the instruction.

FORD: Yes. But when you move all those students out of English 102, in a

sense, and move them into the second tier, who's going to teach all those students -- unless you're going to have course sizes in the second tier that are much higher than what we currently allow in 102? Is that also correct?

HOCH: No. But they'll be, you know, break up - they'll be break up, you know, smaller groups, correct? It's going to be a much more efficient use of the PTIs and TAs because they'll be a larger lecture and then a breakup. The numbers work out what --

FORD: So, you're going to have a large section with --

ELDRED: Not necessarily. Some of them are individual. It really depends on --

FORD: I know. But, I mean, there will be more of that that will allow the PTIs to be used that way rather than as primary instructors in the course?

ELDRED: Yes. The tiers.

CHAIR DEMBO: Dean Blackwell. Then Professor Albisetti.

BLACKWELL: Just to speak to that for just a minute. One of the things that, unfortunately and cynically, we can factor into the - the actual numbers is the attrition rate for - for upper-tier freshmen into the second year. The other

thing that's a more positive kind of figure, eventually this will be the case and directly with English majors, is that those courses are in your pre-major courses or they fit into the curriculum of a major, and therefore there - it will be, if you will, double-dipping. We're thinking about this already in the German major about how we can use a course that would be a writing-intensive course as part of our pre-major requirements. And so, I think, that that's one of the pluses where you'll see the savings, if you will.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Albisetti, Professor Grossman, Professor Tagavi.

ALBISETTI: I'm concerned whether someone teaching the course is still only going to get \$2,625.

ELDRED: 3,400.

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

ALBISETTI: A reasonable compensation for --

ELDRED: It - it's the same per - per whatever, yes.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Grossman.

GROSSMAN: I also support this proposal because I think it will improve education, and - and as a chemistry professor, I think my chemistry - I would also like to see some type of

writing or like to see it done in the
Chemistry Department, and, I think,
nevertheless until that happens, my
chemistry students would very much like
to learn some Shakespeare.

(AUDIENCE CLAPS)

GROSSMAN: There are enough choices in
these courses that, I think, that could
satisfy these - these curiosities, but
I - what I would like to hear is what is
going to be the process by which courses
in other departments are evaluated to
whether they are reading-intensive,
writing-intensive. I - I know they need
to be writing-intensive. Do they need to
be reading-intensive and what counts as
reading-intensive?

CHAIR DEMBO: Is there an answer to that
question?

ELDRED: Yes. USP will - will be -
this proposal that we're voting on is the
interim where everything is delivered
through English. USP will be doing that,
working on where there's funding, where
there's not, and also an assessment which
is very important for our accreditation.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Tagavi. Professor
Baxter.

TAGAVI: I'd like to open an amendment.
As a compromise to the other amendment

for admitting that you - reject it, it's my understanding that right now Business Writing which is closest to Technical Writing, that's why -- and my colleagues are concerned, it's only - the first priority is given to Business students, and usually it fills up. So, I'd like to make an amendment that we open Business - that we open the priority to the entire University, not just Engineering and -- and Business. So, at least, engineering students would have a fair competition into getting their second best choice, and they don't have to do Old Testament or Survey of Western Literature or some other courses that they would prefer not to get, and they would prefer to have Technical Writing. And by the way, you said you don't have Technical Writing expert, you're already teaching it, so there must be some expert. Otherwise, unless you're teaching without any experts.

ELDRED: That's --

TAGAVI: So, that's what I meant.

GESUND: Second.

CHAIR DEMBO: Let me see if I can restate it.

You - that right now priority is given to Business Writing for folks in the Gatten College, and you want to see that priority given equal -- equal weighting

to all University students.

TAGAVI: Yes.

CHAIR DEMBO: And it was seconded by
Professor Gesund.

TAGAVI: Be fair to everybody.

GROSSMAN: Is this a matter for the Senate
to decide?

TAGAVI: -- meetings.

GROSSMAN: I mean, who sets this policy?

TAGAVI: So, then, maybe, we should
discuss that. I can't make a decision
which major is more entitled to be in a
course. That's an academic educational
decision. I'm offering that amendment.

SPEAKER: Do you have a question?

BURGER: Burger, Medicine. The proposal
as I read it and as I understand it, does
not include, one way or the other, who is
eligible for what course or who is not.
There is nothing in the proposal about
setting a policy who gets admitted or
what the priorities are. Am I correct in
understanding that?

CHAIR DEMBO: That -- that's correct.

BURGER: So, that is a nonseconded point
because that's not part of the policy
we're discussing.

TAGAVI: But what -- add something which
is not already part of the proposal. I
agree with you. It's not part of the

proposal. But one could add it, and I'm doing that.

CHAIR DEMBO: This is - so this is administrative - administrative practice but not educational policy right - right now; is that right, Mike?

ELDRED: In the -- bottleneck, to -- to be honest with you, just, you know, have a bottleneck, and it is a pre-major for Business, and so we have no people -- business.

CHAIR DEMBO: And I don't think that the Gatton College is prepared to talk about that item right now either.

HORICK: My name is Susan Horick. I'm an advisor in the College of Business. I do want to say that English 203 is required for all our majors as a part of our accreditation as the College of Business. So, the access to that course is the only choice that our business majors would have. They're required to take it, anyway. And where other majors - other students in other majors would have other courses to choose from the priority has to be given to the students who have to have that particular course to graduate.

TAGAVI: If that's what gets priority, we'll make that required for our college. That is not a fair practice between the

two colleges.

GROSSMAN: Kaveh, your points are good,
but we have a larger proposal. Can I -
may I just make a suggestion that this
discussion be postponed to a later
meeting?

TAGAVI: No, it's second --

GROSSMAN: Well, if -- if -- you can
withdraw it if your seconder agrees.
It's up to you.

GESUND: Neither one of us agrees.

KERN: I think, if I remember Roberts'
Rules, I can object to consideration of
the question, and that will bring it to a
closure.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Blyton.

BLYTON: You have to rule on the
objection. He's objecting - why don't
they vote it down if you object to it.

SPEAKER: I'd like to call the question.

ELDRED: Yes.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay.

ELDRED: Second.

CHAIR DEMBO: So, we're calling the --

YATES: I call a quorum. Is there a
quorum?

CHAIR DEMBO: Senate Rules we require...

SCOTT: Forty-five.

CHAIR DEMBO: Forty-five. Who's a registered
senator? Kim, could you please? Thanks.

SPEAKER: We count ex officio.

CHAIR DEMBO: There's voting and nonvoting ex officio.

SPEAKER: This is voting?

CHAIR DEMBO: This is voting. Uh-huh
(AFFIRMATIVE).

JUDD: Forty-eight.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. So we have a quorum.

SPEAKER: Lock the door.

(AUDIENCE LAUGHS)

CHAIR DEMBO: So we've called the question to stop debate on Professor Tagavi's amendment. Okay. All in favor of stopping debate, raise your hand. All in favor of continuing debate, raise your hand. Okay. So, now we're calling the question. All in favor of Professor's Tagavi's amendment, please raise your hand. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Okay. All opposed to the amendment. Okay. So the amendment fails. If I could add one other thing, I know - I appreciate your patience, but this is an important point to get through. The point was raised that the course name has been changed from English 105 to 104. That was with the advice of the Registrar that that was the more appropriate moniker to put on it. And it is true that the wrong course form was filed. They filed a major course change instead of a new course

form which, in my opinion, is a technicality and doesn't affect the merits of the proposal itself. That's my view as Senate Council Chair. Professor Kern.

KERN: Before anyone else leaves, may we call the question to a vote, this proposal, up or down?

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Second?

YATES: Second.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. So this would stop discussion about the major proposal which has not been amended successfully; am I correct?

SPEAKER: Correct.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. All in favor of stopping debate, please raise your hand. Okay. All opposed. 1, 2, 3, 4. Okay. Any abstentions? Okay. So - you already voted against it.

TAGAVI: No. I abstain.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Okay. So, the main motion on the floor has not been changed or amended. It's to change the writing requirements as proposed to a new course, English 104. All in favor of the motion, please raise your hands. Kim, let's get a count on this.

JUDD: Thirty-five.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. All opposed to the

proposal, please raise your hands.

JUDD: Five.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Any abstentions. We have a quorum. Should we add the votes together?

JUDD: No.

CHAIR DEMBO: No, nobody had left - had left the room, right?

SPEAKER: One just went out.

CHAIR DEMBO: Oh, okay. So we're down to 47, then. We have one more action item that technically can wait until the next meeting. So - and, Phyllis, thank you for your patience. Do you have an announcement you want to make, Phyllis? Thank you very much for - for sticking around.

* * * * *

(MEETING CONCLUDED AT 5:20 P.M.)

* * * * *

STATE OF KENTUCKY)

)

COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

I, MARLA FRYE, Certified Shorthand Reporter, BCR, and the undersigned Notary Public, in and for the State of Kentucky at Large, certify that the foregoing transcript of the captioned meeting of the University of Kentucky Senate is a true, complete and accurate transcript of said proceedings as taken down in stenotype by me and later reduced to computer-aided transcription under my direction, and the foregoing is a true record of these proceedings.

I further certify that I am not employed by nor related to any member of the University of Kentucky Senate, and I have no personal interest in any matter before this Council.

My commission expires: August 25, 2007.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunder set my hand and seal of office on this the _____ day of _____, 2004.

MARLA FRYE, CSR, BCR

NOTARY PUBLIC

STATE-AT-LARGE

K E N T U C K Y

