

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

November 14, 2011

3:00 p.m.

* * * *

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
WILLIAM T. YOUNG LIBRARY AUDITORIUM
401 Hilltop Avenue
Lexington, Kentucky

* * * *

HOLLIE SWANSON, CHAIR

ROBERT GROSSMAN, VICE CHAIR

J. S. BUTLER, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

ANN CHASTANG, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

SWANSON:

Good afternoon. We are at quorum. Welcome to the November 14th edition of the Senate meeting. Here is my please slide. Please give your name and affiliation when you speak. Communicate with your constituency. Attend meetings. Respond to e-mails and web postings as appropriate. Acknowledge and respect others. Silence your electronic beepers. Thank you. We need a motion to waive Senate Rules 1.2.3 to allow the Senate the to consider the agenda because those

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
items were not sent six days in
advance. May I have a motion?
Motion to waive, Gail Brion,
College of Engineering.

BRI ON:

TRUSZCZYNSKI :

Mirek Truszczynski, College of
Engineering.

SWANSON:

Thank you. All in favor?

ASSEMBLY:

Aye.

SWANSON:

Opposed, abstained?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Motion carries, thank you. Minutes
from October 10th, 2011 were
presented. No changes were
received.

BROTHERS:

Excuse me, grammatical changes.

SWANSON:

There were some grammatical
changes?

BROTHERS:

Yes.

SWANSON:

All right, thank you. May I have a
motion to accept those minutes?

McCORMICK:

Katherine McCormick, College of
Education.

SWANSON:

May I have a second?

FIEDLER:

Ted Fiedler, Arts and Sciences.

SWANSON:

All in favor?

ASSEMBLY:

Aye.

SWANSON:

Opposed, abstained?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Motion carries, thank you. We'll
get off on the wrong foot. All
right, there are a few
announcements. We need one
volunteer for Tobacco Free Campus
Advisory Committee. Please contact
Sheila if you'd like to volunteer.
We are in the process of staff
performance evaluations. There's a
committee together. We need a
faculty person who supervises staff
who fills out their PE. So could
you please volunteer for that, if
possible. We have a couple of
opportunities to work on the Work
Life Advisory Committee. This came
out of the report that was
submitted early this fall. And one
of the things that came out with
respect to faculty is that we need
more career development for both
faculty and staff. So we would
like to see at least one volunteer
to work on that committee. And
then I asked Sheila if you had to
be burned out to be on this
committee or if you're anticipating
being burned out or if you're a
recovering burnout. But I think
any would be applicable. If you'd
like to volunteer to serve on the
burnout committee, please - I
suggested we called it stamp out
burnout. Please contact Sheila if
interested.

SPEAKER: Is this with the tobacco committee?
SWANSON: (Unintelligible) tobacco free committee, there may be.

GROSSMAN: I nominate Timothy Leary.
SWANSON: We have two web transmittals that are posted and about sixty courses and thirteen programs. So please take a look at those. We have a request. This came from IACUC committee. We are short on the courses that would apply to the Inquiry in the Humanities and Inquiry into the Social Sciences. So please consider submitting courses in these two areas, particularly at the 300 and 400 level. Do we have a representative from IACUC and they could tell folks when these courses would be due by? Do I remember correctly there was a December 2nd, is that -

BROTHERS: That sounds very close.
SWANSON: Doesn't that sound very close? I believe so, but please, if you're considering that, please get that in and they would really like to see that. All right, as you know, we've been deliberating, looking at our rules, considering changing to the Senate Council Chair. And keep in mind that does not apply to me. These rules would go in effect after my term is over. So the Senate Council has been reconsidering that verbiage. It looked like the last version wasn't very popular so we've been refining that and it's now - in looking something like this. So Lee Blonder and Connie Woods sent it to the Senate Rules Committee, and they are in the process of deliberating it, but the highlights include the following. Senators would nominate eligible Senate Council members for Chair. The nominees would submit a two hundred word election statement. Senators invited to offer opinion on the candidate via e-mail. Senate Council members would review the input from the Senators and the Senate Council members would elect the Senate Council Chair. One of the concerns is that it's the Senate Council member who see the action most close up; whereas the Senators only see the Chair function once a month. And then this would also propose creation of a Chair Elect position. So that we would have more experience going into the position. Any comments or

WATKINS: questions about that?
John Watkins, Public Health. Third
bullet down, Senators invited to
offer opinions on candidates via e-
mail. To whom?

SWANSON: I would assume that would be to the
Rules Committee. Connie or Lee,
could you clarify that?

WATKINS: Sort of implied to Senate Council
but it's not clear.

JONES: What was the question?

SWANSON: The question is Senators invited to
offer opinions on candidate via e-
mail. To whom would they offer?

JONES: The Senate Council members. The
website there would have the names
and addresses and the e-mails of
the Senate Council members. So -
To any Senate Council member?

SWANSON: Yes.

JONES: I would recommend clarity in the
language.

SWANSON: Okay, thank you. Any other
comments, questions?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Okay, thank you. We will continue
to deliberate. All right, and with
that, I will remind you that the
election for Senate Council Chair
and the Vice Chair is coming up.
We will continue under our old
rules, and so we will look for that
in December. And then also you
will be voting for new Senate
Council members. So when you put
your nominations in and your vote
in, please keep in mind that you
could be voting for the next Senate
Council Chair. And so you want to
make sure you have the right
candidates in play. We have the
voting nomination round November
28th to December 2nd. And each
Senator will nominate up to three.
Then our voting round December 12th
through 16th. And these are the
folks that are rolling off, Lee
Blonder, Tom Kelly, College of
Medicine. David Pienkowski,
Engineering, and Shelly Steiner,
Arts and Sciences are all rolling
off. And I'll be completing my
term in College of Medicine at the
end of May. So keep that in mind
when you think about balance. It's
really important for us to have
good balance with respect to
colleges. And then the other issue
that's starting to come up is
issues such as how do we contain
the integrity of the UKCore, for
example, those kinds of issues.
And when we have those kinds of

issues, then what we need is good balance with respect to whether we have appropriate representation for Humanities, for example. So right now it's my opinion we're a little heavy on the Engineering and Sciences end of things. Were you going to say something?

BUTLER: Yes, I was. J.S. Butler, Graduate. You stated it correctly. The word up there is wrong. In a preferential ballot you cannot compel anyone to rank order three. A person may rank order one or two. You said up to. That's correct. The word is not correct there.

SWANSON: Okay, thank you. Any other questions with respect to our nominations and elections?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Okay, if one wishes to campaign, one could do so. I'd like to introduce our Staff Senate Chair, Mike Adams. Mike, would you come forward, please.

ADAMS: Thank you, Chair Swanson. I'd like to introduce myself, Michael Adams. I'm with the Department of Biology. I have been elected for this term as Chair of the Staff Senate. I'm here to introduce myself and reintroduce the staff Senate for this year and talk about some issues that we're trying to do. Primarily we're trying to move outside of this idea of just staff looking outside into the University as a whole as a community. Some of the things we've been trying to do such as crisis we started this year, looks at people outside. It's like work life. And this crisis is ability for the staff to help staff with financial issues. We have a little kiddy or pool that if you don't make it through either through one time donation or you can have it as a withdrawal from your check that way through HR. And this committee will sit down and review people as they come forward and see what kind of financial needs they have and give them money. This takes them out of this unfortunate loop we have locally with its check into cash type of people take advantage of our people have financial problems because, you know, we've not had raises in awhile. It's one of those issues that we have that as your financial costs go up, your pay stays the same. And you get in

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
some problems. Another one that is hit that affects all of the community of the University is bullying. This has come out, I think, stress basically on economic side today. You go home. You're in a financial stress. You come to work. You're kind of angry, resentful. And we've had a lot of bullying. Not as much as power bullying but employees unemployed type issues. And we suggested this to HR, and they're actually working on this right now to bring up a real bullying policy so we have something to go on. What I'm here for is to look for your support. As the University Senate, you're our big brother, our older brother. And you -

SWANSON:
ADAMS:

Or sister. Sibling. And you've been here. You have history. We're very young. Ten years and we're still struggling trying to figure out who we are. We look to you for guidance and help. We have several ad hoc committees. One of them is the ombud that we created that we've worked together with. And I'd like to see some more of those kinds of committees and commitments with each other in the future for the betterment of the University. Thank you.

SWANSON:

Thank you, Mike. We have an update on the document handling system. Right now it's being piloted in the College of Arts and Sciences. We have faculty - thank you - who have submitted electronic forms. The requests are primarily waiting on departmental approval and I've tried to see if there is any feedback yet but the answer is going well, no news is good news. We'll keep you updated. I mentioned to you before there's an AAUP meeting on Saturday, November 19th at the W.T. Young Library. That's right here from one to five. Please RSVP so they have an idea of how many. The purpose of this meeting is to look into a statewide chapter. There is a session on university budgets and we'll be talking more about our university budget as time goes on. I'd like to draw your attention to the expert's page that is on UKNOW. This is a list of experts that would be willing to talk to the media or to the public about

your range of topics and you may self-nominate. Contact Jay Blanton if you would like to be listed as an expert. For my Chair report, I wanted to tell you a little bit about an experiment I ran. After the last meeting we had two presentations. We had our QEP presentation on communication and then we also had a presentation from A&S Wired. As I was listening to them, I was just thinking well, how could I integrate those into activities that I'm currently involved with. And so what I did is I've got this class of second year graduate students. There's thirteen in the class. I asked them if they were interested in improving their speaking skills. And we talked about different audios we could find. And I remember the A&S Wired coffee chats. So I asked the group over in A&S if I bring my students over to participate in a coffee chat. I had eight of my students volunteer. We went over to Keeneland. We participated in their coffee chat. And I thought there's at least three objectives we could fulfill here. We could enhance across campus student focus collaborations. We could provide an opportunity to young scientists to practice public speaking and we could develop a pilot for possible implementation of our QEP once it's adopted. This is some photos I took of the students and so they're all talking to the first year students and they talked about careers. Many of them are from different countries so they talked about different cultural experiences that they had. And so, for example, the student from China said that since she was from a test driven culture, she really appreciated being here in the U.S. and faced with problem solving situations. I thought that was really cool. They were very inspiring for me. And then I contacted the QEP team. And I asked them how could the QEP have helped and enhance this program. And they said well, you're a bonehead pharmacologist; there's no help from you. I'm kidding. We talked about two things they could have done. I could have sent the students over to the QEP people and

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
they could have helped them practice. We could have talked about different ideas or just how to get the flow of words out and so on. And the second thing they could have helped with, we had four professors standing around, right? We had some from Psychology, two from Pharmacology. They could have helped us develop an assessment plan so I could have incorporated that into my grading. So at this point I used it only as a volunteer basis. I'd also like to tell you about some of the activities that your Senate Council has been involved with. As you know, the Provost asked us to look into redrafting of administrative regulations of faculty post review accountability and productivity. We got many volunteers to serve on this committee. But as we discussed it, we had some concerns that the role of the faculty in this endeavor was not clearly defined, and we were also requesting that a similar endeavor be initiated to focus on administrative activities. It would be a campus-wide look at accountability. We met with the Provost last week to obtain more clarity. I met with the President to discuss the need for an examination of administrative activities. The President has said that he is looking into organization of his area. And he'll be here in December to discuss his plans in more detail. I also then met with Trustee Joe Peek, and then with the assistance of the President, set up a meeting with the Vice President of Human Resources, Vice President of Financial Operations, and Treasurer, and Director of Institutional Resources. And the issue then is what is the key question to be addressed. And so, if you will, I proposed this hypothesis, and so here's the hypothesis, and I'm willing to hear some feedback. During the past ten years, UK's personnel expenditures on administrative activities have increased while those focused on instructional activities have remained flat or decreased. Does that sound like a reasonable hypothesis? Okay, so we'll start with that one. And then Joe Peek

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
and I decided that we would have five groups. So we're breaking folks into activities. So we'll have group one would be purely administrative activities. Group two would be faculty administrative activities. So those would be, for example, your department chairs. Group three - please turn off your electronic devices - group three would be purely instructional activities. So those would be DOE, for example, would be five percent or so less administration. Group four, instructional students centered support activities. So, for example, those would be activities that are focused on students advising. And group five would be non-instructional support activities. And those would be activities, for example, PDD. So Roger Sugarman and the rest of this group will be looking into this data, and then Joe and I will be getting together to look through it and see how well we can put things into those categories. And, of course, we have Connie Wood to provide statistical support. I assume we'll start de novo and perhaps -

WOOD:
SWANSON:

Oh, especially with five groups. Yes, of course. So I think we're covered here. We'll get going on that committee and we'll report back to you.

BUTLER:
SWANSON:

I'm still J. S. Butler, right? You're still J. S. Butler, Graduate School.

BUTLER:
SWANSON:
BUTLER:

Yeah, I also do statistics so - Excellent. And I'm interested in this topic. Did Trustee Peek say funny things? Have you said funny things yet?

SWANSON:
PEEK:

Rarely. Certainly they're less funny than I tend to think of.

SWANSON:
SPEAKER:

We'll give him some time. (Unintelligible) Arts and Sciences. I have a question. Where has research been going?

SWANSON:

That's an excellent question. I think what - Joe, you can cover me now. I think what Joe and I decided is that instructional but perhaps a better word would be academic because then you would cover instructional and research. Would that be appropriate?

PEEK:

The problem is we have to get categories so we can start. This is a rough cut. First we want to categorize every dollar of

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
personnel expense somewhere. And so with the instructional would be the research and I guess the service if you look at your DOEs, so kind of non-administrative. And so that's going to be lumped in there because someone that does more than one thing, we've got to split them some way and say a faculty who is a non-administrator, what do we do with their time. We're going to put it all instructional in the first pass.

SWANSON: The other issue we grveled with quite a bit is if we're looking at the last ten years, quite a bit of the activities have been focused over at UK Health Care. And so, for example, you'll have a lot of clinical activities. So we discussed whether to take the College of Medicine out, College of Dentistry out. But what we decided to start with - and we'll put them altogether - we'll have one where they're altogether and a second day to set taking them out so we can chair that, make that comparison. Any other comments?

JONES: I have some question. Reinette Jones, Library. Do we know who the members of the committee are?

SWANSON: Well, it's not exactly a committee per se. We're a little ad hoc group unless we would want to be. Would we want to be a committee, Joe?

PEEK: Actually I'm not in the group. I'm just chipping away from the outside edge, I think. So I'm an advisor to one of the members of the group. So - but you listed the members of that initial group.

SWANSON: That's right. So it's Angie Martin. Angie Martin and Kim Wilson and Roger Sugarman are the three that I'm working with.

PEEK: I'm much more effective on the outside making snide comments than actually being in it and taking responsibility.

SWANSON: Snide and funny.

TRUSZCZYNSKI: Mi rek Truszczynski, Engineering. Will we have any way to use the data? Can we compare the data with the data from any other unit that holds for us or is it just again data that we will know what holds for us but we will have no idea how it relates to whatever is outside?

SWANSON: That is an excellent question. And as I understand it, it depends on how other universities put

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
categories and expenditures. Does anybody want to flush that out any more?

PEEK: It's impossible to directly compare, but you can get a sense for but we're going to end up grouping these things in a specific way. And another university, if they report such information, we'll group it in their way. And so I don't think you can directly compare. You get sense.

TRUSZCZYNSKI: Is there a chance to collect single data from our university ten years ago?

SWANSON: Oh, yes, we're going to do a ten year look, yes, because we thought that would be most informative to see a trend.

GROSSMAN: If I can make a - Bob Grossman, Arts and Sciences. If I could make a suggestion, for the status report that you prepare for the President, you chose I think seven universities to compare us to based on whether they had an on campus medical center and a few other things. It might be useful to contact those places, tell them that we are starting this endeavor, and try to work with them to develop the same set of data for the same categories so that we can compare ourselves to other universities.

SWANSON: We could try that, sure. Any other comments, questions?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Just in case there were more questions, I asked Bill Swinford, the President's Chief of Staff, to be with us here today. And he will answer any more questions that you have about any of the events ongoing. And, again, the President will be here in December. But before Bill comes up here, let me tell you a little bit about him. He's a native of Cynthiana, Kentucky. He earned his Bachelor's degree from the University of Kentucky and his PhD from Ohio State in Political Science. He was a tenured Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Richmond before returning to Kentucky in 1999 to work for Gordon Davies at the Council on Post Secondary Education, and he served in a variety of capacities as counsel including Chief of Staff. He returned to UK in 2004 as Director of Policy Analysis and

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
then later as Assistant Vice
President for Financial Operations.
Bill has also been an Adjunct
Professor of Political Science and
is returning to UK teaching one
course every semester, including
this one. President Eli Capilouto
appointed Bill Chief of Staff this
July. Welcome, Bill. Thanks for
coming.

SWINFORD:

Thank you, Hollie. Thanks for
inviting me. I appreciate this
opportunity. I don't have a lot to
say by way of introduction other
than President Capilouto's tenure
is now a hundred thirty-six days
old, but who's counting? I'm
completely biased but I always have
to give credit to Hollie and the
other members of the search
committee and to our Board of
Trustees. I'm more convinced every
day that we got the right guy to
lead this institution. He's - as I
tell everyone, the President is
trying to do the right things for
the right reasons and really has
the best interest of the
institution at heart and I think
really wants to be aggressive in
how we approach the next days,
weeks, months, and years of this
institution. Particularly as you
all know better than I do and what
we're referring to as the new
normal where the economics of
higher education have changed
dramatically even in the last
thirty-six to forty-eight months.
So we have to think very
differently about the way we do our
work, about the way we build our
institution going forward. As you
see in the newspapers, the
committee that Hollie was kind
enough to chair, the University
Review Committee came to the
President and the Board with a
series of recommendations about
improving the institution and focus
primarily, though not exclusively,
of course, on undergraduate
education. Again, making the
comparison as Dr. Grossman pointed
out to seven institutions that we -
that the review committee felt were
appropriate to compare the
University to and see where our
gaps are, see where our
shortcomings are, and where the
opportunities are going forward.
As you also know from Trustee Peek
and the other members of the Board

Page 12

of Trustees coming out of a retreat at the first part of October, the Trustees brought some clarity to what they hope would be the President's agenda going forward and, again, the focus was primarily although not exclusively undergraduate education but also a very healthy prioritization on the facility's needs across campus. As you all are exposed to every day, and as Trustee Peek knows, the President took the Trustees on a tour of campus and didn't show them the good stuff but showed them the places where we have enormous changes. And I think it was really eye opening for the Trustees to see that, to see some of our older dorms, to see some of our older instructional facilities, and they came away from that more determined than ever. The President needs to be very aggressive. As a first step, as you may have seen in the newspapers, the President reported to the Board that we went forward after the Board's October meeting with a request of proposals to solicit proposals from developers for the possibility of a significant overhaul of our residence facilities. And that period - we're in the midst of that period right now with the due date being November 22nd. The President appointed a review committee to take a look at those proposals and bring to him some recommendations about whether a public private partnership between the University and a private developer makes sense and is in the best interest of the institution. The President will be here in December to talk and give you more details on other initiatives he's interested in. But given that we have a legislative session beginning the third day of January, the President, of course, is focused on the operating budget needs of the institution and the facility's needs in terms of used space. So he's got - he's going to pull together some committees to look at those issues as well, and so there's a lot of stuff ongoing. We're still fairly new to all this, but the President has a sense of urgency that he's bringing to all of these tasks. And so I'm very, very, very confident and optimistic

about the kinds of changes I hope we'll see at the institution. Also given the new normal, the President wants to pull a group of individuals together, including deans and faculty and administrators to look at the way we budget. We have a budget that is in my description it's a superficial one, I suspect. We're very expense driven approach and fairly centralized and not terribly transparent. And the President wants to take another look at that, particularly the new normal where the answer is not going to come from Frankfort to the budget meetings at the institution. So we're going to have to think very differently about the way we budget. So these are things he'll talk with you about next month. These are things that will be talked about over the next several months. Again, it's part of a very aggressive agenda the Board of Trustees has urged the President to follow. I'm delighted with this role as Hollie described. I've been at it since July so we're all still learning. But I still get to teach every semester which is my first love in the Department of Political Science as an Adjunct. I get to teach - this semester I get to teach mostly seniors in a 400 level course. But in the past semesters I've also taught the 101 in large lecture sections. And that's - again, that's my first love, but I do this stuff on the side because of my love for the institution. So with that, I'm delighted to answer any questions you may have about what we're doing or what we're trying to accomplish, what you've seen in the papers about the facilities or the legislative session coming up.

ANDERSON:

Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. I'm curious to know, Penn State, what is the University of Kentucky is now in the process of doing to increase transparency, to work with whistle blowers, and all the different things that are going to be happening as a result of -

SWINFORD:

Thank you very much for starting us off with that really important question. As with you, I'm sure when those events first started unfolding at Penn State, it made you take a deep breath. And the

President immediately met with senior staff, including athletics but not limited to athletics, because as you point out, this is an issue that cuts across campuses, I think. We have hotlines that are available to faculty and staff to report anonymously issues of concern. We have regular training, for example, among our coaches about issues like this. We look very carefully, for example, at summer camps when we have youth on campus as part of instructional programs. But the President has urged every senior administrator to take another look at the things we do. If there are gaps, let's know about them now as opposed to the experience of Penn State. We don't know the gaps existed until it hit the front page of the paper. But the President, I assure you, takes this very, very seriously. There's more work to do. There's more work to do. We're working closely with HR and taking a look at the training programs for new employees but also for existing employees. Thank you.

SWANSON:

Bill, one question I heard about the dorms is if they are privately run, it seems that the overall objective is to have the classrooms in the dorm, similar to an A&S Wired. And so do you think those negotiations are difficult to do with a private organization or are they common?

SWINFORD:

That's a good question. When we issue the request for proposals after the October board meeting, we asked the developers to come to us with broad spectrum of scenarios all the way from where the developer - and we know there are examples of this across the country - where the developer does it all, build, does the architecture, builds, hires the resident advisors, does the programming (unintelligible.) At the other end of the spectrum we also ask to give us a scenario where all you do is build the facility. And the University of Kentucky maintains control over all the programming, over all the staffing, over all the room assignments, all of it. So we're really looking at a broad spectrum of possibilities. I think the committee that the President has put together to deal with this,

we'll get the requests for proposals November 22nd. As is normal with these sorts of things, they'll probably bring in three or four that are particularly intriguing. Try to narrow to one developer and then begin to have those discussions and see where along the spectrum it makes the most sense for the institution. Now I want to be very clear about this. We have not, we have not, we have not made the decision that we will go with a public private partnership. We're running parallel tracks, ladies and gentlemen, where on one hand we're looking at what a private developer could bring in terms of liquid capital and those sorts of things, expertise, experience, and the rest. But we're running a parallel track to see what we can absorb as an institution and continue to do dorms on our own but a much more aggressive pace. The President has been very clear that he wants a new dorm, six hundred beds open fall of '13. And if we follow the developer track or we follow it and continue to do things internally, the aim is to have a dorm open fall of '13. Now the other thing I'll tell you is part of all of this is we're going to undertake an analysis of our debt capacity, try to bring a fresh pair of eyes to that from an external consultant who will tell us what room we have. Again, the answer is not going to come from Frankfort, at least in the near term to do these kinds of things. Certainly on dorms but also on education, general facilities. So we need the President and the Board needs to get a very clear picture on what the institution's capacity is. Now I'm not telling you we're going to do this because people much, much smarter than me, I assure you, are going to make these decisions. But there's some pretty intriguing things going on around the country. You may have seen the century bonds that Ohio State University and MIT have issued, hundred year bonds so that they can take on substantial more capacity to build facilities on their campuses. There are all sorts of innovative approaches going on around the country. We're going to look at those, try to

figure out what makes the most financial sense for this institution. It's never been a better time to borrow and build, and that's got to figure in to our equation.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S. Just to follow up, Hollie mentioned the possibility of putting classrooms into the dorms. If you're going to put classrooms into the dorms, it starts to become an educational issue as well as a student life issue. And so are you going to bring faculty in to the design of the facility so that we can make sure that it meets educational needs?

SWINFORD: Absolutely, absolutely. When we talk with the developer about what makes the most sense and try to figure out how the jigsaw pieces fit together, if it becomes educational space, yes, sir. There's no question about that.

BLONDER: Lee Blonder, College of Medicine. Will there be any attempt to make these new buildings re-certified?

SWINFORD: That is front and center of any discussion we'll have. As you know, our newest facility that we just opened, the Davis Marksbury building is lead certified. And we have already talked internally and I assure you we'll talk with the developer about the best way to do that in a lead environment, yes, ma'am.

GREISSMAN: Richard Greissman. If I could go back to the project Hollie mentioned earlier about the administrative review, would it be helpful do you think to - in addition to the work that's being done locally look at IPEDS data on administrative expenditure?

SWINFORD: That's a good question. It's a tough question because as you all can probably guess, definitions don't often translate to one campus to another. And I'll defer to -

SWANSON: Could you define IPEDS?

SWINFORD: I wish I knew the acronym. What does IPEDS stand for?

SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

SWINFORD: Institutional Post Secondary Education Data Center. I think that does provide instruction on how to fill out the particular forms and how to plug numbers in. But even the instructions aren't defined enough to fully capture across the institution. So most

certainly we'll look at IPEDS data, and talk about organizational structure and staffing and the like. But my very limited experience with those kind of data sets is that you have to take them with a grain of salt because individual institutions define personnel in a multitude of ways. But it is informative and so certainly we'll take a look at that. To pick up the point on organizational structure, and the President certainly will talk about this more in December, but his first cut from his perspective is to take a look at the President's office and that means in addition to me but the direct reports to the President and see if we're appropriately configured. And so that's going to be a piece of this that he wants to take the first cut at beginning with his office to see if it's functional and appropriate and make decisions I would suspect pretty quickly on those issues. Bob Grossman, A&S. So what is the current status of the ombud office that was proposed by the - endorsed at least by the Staff Senate and the Board of Trustees has been discussing it?

GROSSMAN:

SWINFORD:

There's a faculty and staff - and I can be corrected on the logistics of this, but faculty and staff got together and put together a proposal and they in remarkable due diligence, I must say, met with all the stakeholders, met the Executive Vice President, met the Athletic Director, met with legal counsel, met with Terry Allen's office, and I have met with them on three occasions, mostly to ask questions and to ask them to pursue things a little bit further. The President now has that proposal. I think back to the question that was asked earlier about Penn State, I think we need to take an even closer look at such things now given what's come to light. I think the President is very intrigued by the concept, but he's still reviewing it. And as the committee told me - and I don't know how many of you have seen the document - but it was a concept paper as much as it was a detailed document. And so there may be a level of detail we need to get to, but it's certainly still in play, and it is in front of him for

consideration. No decisions have been made. But it's a thorough bit of work. I met with him on three occasions and probably to their chagrin on a couple of those occasions I asked for more data. I asked for more study of these things across the country so we got a better sense if they were best practices. And, again, that group has worked very hard with a very interesting concept.

SWANSON: Other questions? Thank you very much.

SWINFORD: Let me just thank you for this opportunity. I'm glad to come back any time if there are questions or issues or concerns. If the President is unable to be with you, it's a standing invitation. Also Bill.Swinford@uky.edu if you have questions or concerns, you want to speak with me privately, I'm glad to do that. The only way this works is if the faculty and the President and his administration try to the degree possible to stay on the same page. And I assure you we're working a good faith effort to get that done, but we need to hear from you. So any time I can be of help, I'd be glad to do that. I appreciate the time you've given me today. I know your schedules are busy.

SWANSON: Thank you, Bill. We appreciate that. We have our Vice Chair report, Robert Grossman.

GROSSMAN: So last - at the last meeting we had a videographer video tape the meeting and the video tape came out pretty well. It was pretty good quality and the audio was pretty good quality, too. But as we were discussing what to do with this video and what the possibilities were, we discussed it at Senate Council. We also discussed it with the office that helped us arrange it in the first place. Realize the video wasn't really going to serve the purpose that we wanted it for, which is to provide a record that would be searchable and would last for a long time. The other thing that we noticed, of course, you remember the last Senate meeting, there were two extremely long reports and the Senate Council didn't feel like a transcription of those reports was really necessary to have for posterity. So the current idea is to just do an audio

reporting of the Senate meeting and then just take parts of the meeting that we feel ought to be transcribed and just have those parts transcribed and we'll keep the audio for the rest of the meeting in case at some future time someone wants to listen to it. But we think that doing it this way might save us a lot of money which is the purpose of this exercise but also provide a transcript that is searchable and permanent. So that's kind of where things stand. We're still exploring the possibility. As you can see, we still have our court reporter here transcribing the full meeting. So we haven't made any final decisions yet. Any questions?

(No audible response.)

GROSSMAN:
SWANSON:

Okay, thank you.

Thank you, Bob. We have our Trustee report, Joe Peek.

PEEK:

So you just heard from Bill Swinford. I don't know, is this supposed to be like a sixty minute counterpoint on Saturday Night Live version?

SWANSON:
PEEK:

You have to be funnier than he was. Well, that's tough. I can look funnier. I don't know. I actually learned a couple things from his talk as well. A couple things that I think are very important is that we're not messing around here. President Capilouto, you know, we had the retreat and three and a half weeks later it's like we're sitting on a (unintelligible.) So there is no messing around here. I think we're going to see some buildings. It's going to start with the dorm things. I think the way I view the RP is an opportunity to get free consulting reports from a bunch of, you know, builders who are in the middle of this stuff, and we're going to end up learning an awful lot because we don't know for sure what's the best practice, and of the couple of best practices out there, which ones are appropriate for us. And so I view it as a pretty good idea to try to find out. And I think that's part of the RP process is get a better sense of what we're talking about here. So I'm pretty happy about that. Kind of related to that, you mention like the lead certification and so forth. Something that happened at the last Trustee

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
meeting was a couple of the students spoke, you know, at the committee level, you know, through the new GR that allows better access to the Trustees, and they talked about coal and about our coal burning plants and so forth. Subsequently last week I met with a couple of the students who are involved in that for awhile to talk about what they think is going on, what they think UK should do. Through any given week I end up talking to a lot of people, kind of in between my meetings with my parole officer. I think they were very sharp. They're students here. They're very committed and so forth. And one of the really nice things is that they're going to go up to Ball State which is noted for, you know, doing the geothermal and so forth. And Bob Wiseman is going to take them up there. I think that's a tremendous initiative. They're going up there fact finding trying to understand just what's going on up there because Bob Wiseman had mentioned to some of the Trustees - actually to all of the Trustees - that for this particular geographic location wind isn't going to work, solar isn't going to work. The thing that might work would be the geothermal. And so - is that something we can do for the campus, no, because you'd be drilling, you know, a zillion holes. But it's something we can do building by building perhaps depending on the cost. And so, for example, we build a new dorm. It's possible we could do the heating and air conditioning through geothermal for that dorm. So although there's probably an ex-governor of Alaska that might have different ideas about how we can drill, but certainly on a building by building basis it's something worth thinking about. I personally don't know how much more it costs. It may be a lot. It may be a little. Another thing to think about is the PR that we get. I think it helps. It could help the image of the University. That could have - that could be a factor that doesn't show up on the bottom line directly in terms of money in the sense it might make it more attractive in recruiting students and faculty and

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
staff. Another thing that's just come out, the Honors Academy, it was mentioned at the Trustee meeting and then we just received an e-mail where they're looking for someone to head up the Honors Academy. I think that's a great step forward. I think that's something that will better serve the students here at UK, the citizens of Kentucky, and the faculty in terms of having something that's competitive. I think, you know, and from what I've seen of it, it looks like it is going to be a dramatic improvement. And so that's a really important step, I think, because we can talk about rankings. We can talk about a lot of stuff. We need to start doing things. And that's kind of what I'm seeing is that we are starting to do things. Another thing that was mentioned, that Bill mentioned, was reorganizing the President's office and then that ties back to Hollie's earlier comment with the Senate Council in terms of looking at faculty productivity and also administrative productivity. The fact that the President is going to look at reorganizing his office, and I think that's consistent with what he did as a Provost at UAB, to me that's leading from the front. In other words, I guarantee we the University is going to be reorganized in some sense because of the financial problems that we have. So it seems to me that's actually a nice strategic move on the part of the President to say hey, I'm not going to ask you to do anything I won't do myself. And so everything is on the table in that sense. So we'll reorganize the President's office, the Provost's office, maybe the Dean's office. Again, I think that's a good signal. It's not that it's good for you; it's good for all of us. And so he's willing to take part. We'll see what happens. I take it as a good signal. Another thing that may not yet be on the radar for many of you has to do - it was actually in the paper Saturday, I think, about we have a lot of endowments that are under water. And so there's an issue going on between the CP and the University. Much negotiation has gone on. I

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
don't know all the details. But I did in among the many meetings that I've had lately, last week I did talk to Angie Martin for quite awhile trying to understand what's going on. And she was, as always, she's very open and very straightforward and informative. So I have a much better understanding than I had before I walked into her office. But what is going to happen is that we are going to be paying back some money into the under water endowments. Now, who's paying who? Well, it turns out we're just taking out of one pocket and putting into another. This is all internal to the University. But it is an issue that CPE and I think it's like 7.6 million, but that's really just the half that's RCTF money. So there's really 15 point something that these endowments are under water. I personally am not so worried about paying back that 7.6 million. The issue that concerns me is going forward because going forward the CPE at the moment is requiring us to spend only the income going forward. I think that's a real issue because the way in which income is defined is not total return; it's merely a portion of return. The interest and dividends in realized capital gains, much of the investment that we're doing with our endowment doesn't give dividend interest. It gives capital gains eventually and we're doing more alternative investments. For example, if you're doing growth stocks no income because there's no dividend so it's all back end loaded is the problem. And so that means on the front end we're going to be squeezed so I'm worried about that. And so the payout, we're going to be cutting the payout where I think less than fifty percent. That's going to be a problem of the income flow or the ability to spend out of those endowments going forward. Part of the idea on managing endowments, if you think about economics and finance and Ken Troske from the Economics Department was quoted in the newspaper saying this doesn't make sense in terms of modern financial theory. The idea is to smooth those pay-outs so that in the same way that in the late '90s

when we had twenty some percent return from the stock market year after year for about four or five years, we didn't spend, you know, twenty or twenty-five percent. And so you smooth through the cycle. And so the idea is that when times are really good, you don't spend at all. When times are really bad, you don't cut it back to nothing or nearly nothing because we cannot afford to have stock go funding of our protocols. If we deviate a program today because the endowments are under water, that's done damage way to the future of a program. So my understanding from talking to Angie is that, you know, the administration is aware of this problem very much so and that they will try, you know - it's on their mind to try and soften the blow somehow. But this is being imposed externally so now the next step is okay, how do we minimize the damages to our programs and to our students. And so they are thinking about that as we must. I think that's all I have to say. So if you have questions?

BRI ON:

I have a comment. Gail Bri on, College of Engineering. At one time one of the problems with these endowments and not being able to spend them is that many student stipends are responsible for this and we got the endowment at the same time when we were shifting from a mode where if you were a graduate student from out of state you would pay in-state tuition. So we're getting more tuition into the institution and many of these funds were used kind of counter balance that. I'm just - would like to propose that they consider one way of softening this is to have a short term renewal of that program that out of state graduate students were paying in-state tuition as they did before to soften, lessen the blow on graduate programs.

PEEK:

Okay, and there are specific programs that are at risk that, for example, you know, the RCTF money goes to the faculty with RCTF positions, right? But it also goes to student scholarships.

BRI ON:

Right.

PEEK:

And so there are some programs that rely heavily on RCTF money or money from endowments that were partially funded or matched because of RCTF

money that could do a lot of damage to an ongoing program. And I think that joint BS MBA program with engineering in the business school is one such program where I think they use a lot of that money to fund scholarships.

STEINER: Shelly Steiner, A&S. Who invests the endowment money? I've never known that.

PEEK: The University. And so there is an investment committee of the Board of Trustees that supposedly oversees that. There's a - is it R. V. Kuhns, I think, is a consultant that the University has hired that helps choose firms that manage portions of the endowments. So the endowment is a portfolio of many endowments. And so R. V. Kuhns, for example, recommends weights or shares of the portfolio into certain asset categories.

STEINER: So we don't have a professional advisor, professional person like Yale or these other places that handles -

PEEK: Well, yes. I mean, you know, out of our finance office, Frank Butler's office, there are people here working, but I don't believe their expertise is managing mutual funds. So we don't manage any mutual funds. We're investing and so we do have an outside consultant that provides advice.

STEINER: It sounds odd that there aren't high dividends yield into stocks.

PEEK: Oh, but there are.

STEINER: (Unintelligible.)

PEEK: There are high dividend stocks. There are high interest bearing bonds but you want a diversified portfolio, right? I mean it's very easy to find high interest paying bonds, Greek bonds, for example, Italian. But you want to diversify. And so we have actually been moving away from the stock market which personally I'm not sure that's the right way to go, but that's the way we're going. And we're moving to some hedge funds and funds. We've got some real estate investments. So we're trying to get diversified in part to get rid of some of the volatility. Does that answer your question?

STEINER: Yes, but I guess what I'm getting at is there's not a lot of transparency in who's handling and how they handle it. If you ask

Yale or Harvard, these are top flight investment universities. You find out exactly what they're doing. They issue a report. They issue what their gains are, what their losses are.

PEEK: Certainly. I see those reports. I don't know if they're public record or not. Does anyone know? I would think they probably are. So you could find out, you know, who we have money with and their performance. Like I get monthly updates on that. But there is a question of should we hire expertise within the University or is that something that's specialized and we should out-source. And I think we've chosen to out-source and say there are people with expertise out there and we'll rely on those experts as opposed to building our own staff; that it's more efficient and more cost effective to hire that expertise than to own that expertise.

NOONAN: Dan Noonan, College of Medicine. With respect to that inevitable reorganization issue you mentioned, do you have any feel for how that might be handled and is it going to be you, selected administrators, deciding exactly the re-organizational aspects or do you think there's going to be some input from faculty, staff, et cetera?

PEEK: I don't know. I'm just speculating, right. Rarely do I base what I say on facts. So - but I am very sure that there will be a reorganization just for no other reason because of financial circumstances. What that - how that happens, and what all is affected, you know, I don't know. But I would expect that we will be reviewing what's going on at the college level, maybe department level. In fact, there already is this movement on activity based accounting or responsibility, so I think we're moving in the direction of trying to get an accounting system so that we can actually do cost benefit analysis so we can actually figure out what units are doing and departments and so forth to get some sense of efficiency, productivity, these sorts of things. I don't know what's going to happen, only that something is

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
going to happen. I would hope and expect the faculty would be involved because it's simple. It's what we're up to.

NOONAN: You key on saying we, we, we, we is. That was just my question.

PEEK: As Hollie and I talked about it, the only thing we know for sure is our jobs should be protected. I'm not sure about the rest of you guys. We'll do what we have for you, but we've solidified our own positions. No, nobody knows what's going to happen. Bill would have better insights than I would have. But I would think given the way other things would go, there would be faculty input.

SWINFORD: I think we're going to come at this from multiple angles. I think what I was describing is first the President taking a look at his direct reports. We're talking at that level. I think consequent to a review of our budgeting system, I think partly those conversations would drive the look at the organization. I mean we're already kind of nibbling at the edges with the concept of service centers, for example, that brings services across colleges and the number of initiatives like that. I can assure you that if and when an organizational analysis reaches down beyond the President's level, absolutely, faculty will be engaged in those discussions going forward. I couldn't tell you today what those look like or what the end game would be because I think that remains to be seen. But I think Trustee Peek is right given the new normal.

PEEK: The administration agrees, finally.
SWINFORD: Given the way we've got to approach the challenges the University faces fiscally, it may be that the current model of how we're structured just is untenable. And those are discussions we have to have and the faculty will be engaged.

PEEK: Thank you.
SARKEY: Kevin Sarkey, College of Medicine. What makes me nervous is when I hear the evaluations are going to be done primarily based on the hours. What value do you put on good instruction? How do you quantify that? That's a problem.

SWINFORD: And I agree with you. I think that part of what we need to engage in

the business of it - and I think this partially plays from the Provost's request, if I'm not mistaken, about issues of assessment of both administrators and faculty in trying to get the quality of undergraduate instruction. I get - I share that with you and I get very concerned when what the newspaper's report is simply about the facilities and money. I can assure you that when we talk about undergraduate education in Hollie's review committee that got into these conversations, the quality of the instruction was a constant theme across all of those discussions and will continue to be a constant theme across all those discussions. The Honors Academy that was mentioned becomes important as an example. It's not enough just to declare somebody to be Honors. We need to have a thorough discussion about what that means, what it entails, and what faculty resources are involved to make it a meaningful exercise. So I assure that thread is running throughout those discussions.

PEEK: And so much of what of the productivity or the result of faculty activities, for example, isn't - you can't measure it. It's not dollars. What the University does for this state doesn't show up directly. It shows up indirectly in terms of moving us forward, raising standards of living, improving health. A lot of that you can't tie back to well, the tuition revenue or grants received or whatever.

BRI ON: Gail Brion, College of Engineering. To be so gauche as to bring up another issue of money that was in the report but that I'm not hearing much play about is the base salaries of University of Kentucky faculty being below that of our benchmarks. And what do you hear the Board of Trustees talking about this issue? What are their thoughts; what are their ideas?

PEEK: Nothing specifically other than there is a recognition that if we want to move ahead, you know, we're going to need to be competitive and we're going to have to do more to attract better students and retain our students. We're going to have to do more to attract better

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
faculty and retain our best faculty and so forth. So I think there is that recognition. But I don't recall hearing any specific, you know, recommendation about what are you going to do about that other than there is a feeling we do want to get better; we do want to move forward. The Honors program, that's, you know, that's a statement that says we are going to get better. You know, more dorms, you know, modern dorms. We are going to get better. That's going to help us attract better students and retain students. So we're doing things so we're not just talking about it. I'm glad to see we're actually doing something now, you know, taking steps. We don't know how they're going to pan out. We don't know how much it's going to cost.

JONES: Just very quickly back on the previous question. No program or department can be abolished, transferred or consolidated without a proposal coming through the University Senate. And the University Senate process for that is very specific. It wants to see the department faculty vote. It wants to see the college vote on that before the Senate then assesses how it feels about the vote.

PEEK: I think there's going to be faculty input anyway. But that guarantees there's going to be faculty input.

SWANSON: Thank you. We have our Parliamentary report, J. S. Butler.

BUTLER: Later on there are three committee reports. So I want to remind you they have all been received already. They're right here. They're received. Someone may wish to move to vote to adopt such report. That causes it to change from being just a committee report to being a Senate document. This is not required, but if anyone wishes to do so, the correct action is to move to adopt the report at the given time. Thank you.

SWANSON: Thank you. We have the December 2011 degree list. As a result of your activities, we've had several changes. We removed one PhD student and added two more. We added two DNP students. Could I have - pardon - I'm sorry, we removed one and added one. We came

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
out even. Okay, thank you. Could I have a motion?

JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology. I move that the degree list be approved for submission to the Board of Trustees for controlled degrees.

SWANSON: Is there a second?

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing, second.

SWANSON: All in favor?

ASSEMBLY: Aye.

SWANSON: Opposed, abstained?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Motion carries, thank you. We have Director of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, Dr. Mia Alexander-Snow. Dr. Snow gave us this presentation to the Senate Council at our retreat and we thought it was very useful to look at these issues of assessments. Mia is also serving on our program committee and helping us improve our assessment planning. Mia, thanks so much for joining us.

SNOW: Thank you, Chair Swanson, and thank you for inviting me to this afternoon's Senate meeting. As Hollie has said, I was invited back here after doing this presentation for the Senate Council in the summer. And I kept it. I kept it because I wanted to be sure that we're all on the same kind of common page of understanding of what institutional effectiveness is and pretty much the role of the University Senate and UK's assessment (unintelligible.) My presentation is only going to be about ten minutes long. I've been asked to capsule a forty-five minute conversation into ten minutes. And that's what it was on August 5th. It was pretty much a conversation about the University Senate and UK's assessment (unintelligible.) What is the role of the University Senate with assessment? My office, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness encompasses strategic planning, annual progress, assessment, and program review. What does that all mean? When they all work together, you see institutional effectiveness. Whether you realize it or not, we have been engaged in conversations about institutional effectiveness this afternoon. We were talking about from the idea of transparency, where the President

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
is going with his initiative, where the University needs to be moving in terms of finding an organizational structure that supports what is it that we do, the mission of the institution. So this is what we're going to talk about, and I'll bring some questions - address questions later. Okay, the end of the conversation ten minutes we'll kind of talk about what is institutional effectiveness, what is assessment. How does a University Senate assess UK in meeting its institutional effectiveness efforts? The last time we met, at least the last time I was here, I think Heidi Anderson had talked about this wonderful booklet that everybody loves. Well, you all are very important to this booklet, not so much in compliance but you're important to this booklet because you are in very many ways the mission of the institution. You serve the institution with its teaching, research, and service. I did come from faculty. I was not always administration. Prior to coming here I was a faculty member, and I taught higher education policy studies. And the passion is it starts with the faculty. Faculty engagement. So how do we monitor? And then most importantly the program review process. The role of the program review process and how it forms your work from the Senate. You all have heard this conversation. We've had this conversation about institutional effectiveness, what is it. It's ongoing. It's integrated. It's institution wide and it's all those things. We've talked about it this afternoon, as I said. But the key thing about the whole idea of the institutional effectiveness is how effective is the University in meeting its mission, its goals, and its outcomes. And then it involves a continuous conversation of continuing looking for improvement. So what is assessment? Those are all the activities that we do to assess effectiveness. As faculty, we do it every day in the classrooms; do we not? You have students come in, have assignments, their assignments are there for a reason. Yes, we love our discipline. We love the materials.

But we also at the end of the semester or the end of their career, their four years, however long it takes for them to graduate, we assess them with a degree. The degree is the conformance that they have the competency and the skills to be able to perform and do whatever they say they're going to do. So as faculty in the classroom, we give quizzes; we give capsule assignments; we give group assignments. And along the way we are assessing our students to see whether or not they meet the competency skills necessary to be able to perform or to be successful in their careers. So assessment is for the University monitoring the University's effectiveness, using the assessment results to insure quality enhancement. So all these activities that we're engaged in is to insure quality and quality assurance of our academic programs and the University's ability to meet its mission. So we're here. So what about the University Senate? How does it help? Well, you all have the most important role. I'm here to support. My office is here to support you in what it is that we do in the classroom, what we do for our students. But particularly you all are about quality assurance of the education mission. It's a faculty; it's a University Senate that determines the broad academic policies of the University. And this is all from you all. The University Senate approves and submits all new academic programs and makes final decisions and recommendations to changes of these programs. It is the University Senate that decides whether to terminate academic programs. And then it's also the University Senate to either establish, alterate, abolish, or report relationships of education union. So it's a very - it's a very important piece. So my question to you as I go through these different pieces, how are you helping to help UK in its institutional effectiveness effort? The last time Heidi Anderson talked about strategic planning. And again this (unintelligible.) The strategic planning is the start. It's the mission. It defines where we go as

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt

a university in terms of its mission and how we're going to get there. Many departments engage in strategic planning recently. October 31st was the deadline to get those strategic plans in at the department level. Why? Because you're supposed to lead changing and moving your plans to support where the University is moving. Engage in annual progress reports. Every year, October 31st, you report on how well your unit is doing in meeting its mission, meeting its goals, its outcomes. But this is the real important piece. Periodic program review. This is identified in the administrative regulations. It is the periodic program review that is the primary vehicle for assessment of educational and administrative units and for documentation of institutional effectiveness. It is the program review process that shows that we are engaged, actively engaged in institutional effectiveness. Institutional effectiveness for the University of Kentucky is related to its mission, teaching and research and service. So most of you have been through the periodic reviews, I would think, and here is the process. And here's how it can inform the work. You start off with a swat analysis because we're - each department or academic program does an internal study and review and provides recommendations of where it needs to move forward. Do an environmental analysis, those type of things. It's very similar to what President Capilouto did when he came here. One of the first things they did was do an analysis of the state of the University. What are the strengths; what are the weaknesses; what are the opportunities; and what are the threats and had the review and created a recommendation. Then we bring in an external review. An external review is someone from the outside who comes in and reviews and provides additional information so we can put forth recommendations. But it is the key, the recommendations going into the implementation that creates the quality enhancement agenda and then the annual progress reports. My question to you all, at what point

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
does a University Senate - is engaged in program review? Does anyone know? Think about that. Program review is the primary vehicle for this institution to show institutional effectiveness and what role is the University Senate in this program review process. Well, let's ask some questions. And I'll leave you with some questions. How do current policies and procedures support or hinder the University Senate's mission and goals? What current policies and procedures support or hinder the quality and effectiveness of UK educational units and academic programs? But it's the third and fourth that are important to me. To what degree does the University Senate in its leadership demonstrate an explicit use of assessment results? Institutional effectiveness is only as good as it is assessed. And already we're on a great start with President Capilouto. What does he do? He comes in and starts engaging, assessing, evaluating, where we are as a university. To what degree does the University Senate and its leadership engage in the systematic review of educational units and academic programs at the university program level and how can the Senate be more intentional in its efforts? And I'm going to leave it up for questions.

SWANSON:

LEE:

SNOW:

LEE:

SNOW:

Questions?
Carl Lee, Arts and Sciences. So where are - how can we access the assessment results and the results of the program reviews?
You can access them through your department because your department will actually have it or you can contact my office and we can give you the different assessments at the different programs for review. So they have to be requested individually?
More or less, yes. Each of the programs, the department - every program, department, educational unit goes through a five to seven year periodic review. So you should have the catalog somewhere within your department, that program review. And if you do not have it, then you should be able to get it from our office and we will provide it for you.

LEE: I'm thinking more as a Senator, explicit use of assessment results, not just my department, but is there an easy process for the Senators to get that information?

SWANSON: You're saying to look at any program?

LEE: Yes.

SNOW: It's a request of the Senate Committee.

SWANSON: Would you like to make a motion?

LEE: I'm not sure what motion.

SWANSON: That a request the Senate would need to make.

LEE: It has to be requested. It's not just available?

SNOW: I don't know. The only thing I'm presenting to you - and that's a great question to think about because here it is, you have all these program reviews that are going on. Currently we have about eighty-nine that are going on administratively and educational within the academic unit. The process typically is it stays in-house. It goes. It has the department or the unit work create it. Then it goes to the next level up which is the dean or the vice president who does the review. And then it goes - and they have conversations. And then so maybe it's something to think about in terms of the policies and procedures that are in place here for the Senate. What policies - I'll ask the question, what policies and procedures do you have in place that ask to review these program reviews to know what's going on.

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. I wonder if it's possible to put these on the website, have a link perhaps from the Senate website to the program evaluations so they are transparent.

SNOW: Great, I mean that's a great idea. Again, it's something that the Senate would have to decide how it would like to proceed to review because the Senate has the authority to review.

ANDERSON: Heidi Anderson, Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Well, I think the idea that has just come up about making this more transparent are very good points. Let us take us under consideration and talk with Chair Swanson about how to make that information happen.

SWANSON: Now one thing I'll like you to know that - he's not here today - but Mike Mullen said he was overlooking his charge of the Undergraduate Council and there is a charge to the Undergraduate Council to undergo periodic reviews so that is written in our SRs. But I don't know about the Graduate Council.

SNOW: There is as well for the graduate.

GROSSMAN: For undergo or to review?

SWANSON: To review.

ANDERSON: To be reviewed and to undergo.

SWANSON: I think we need to take another look at what we have in place.

ANDERSON: Yes.

SWANSON: Could you mention the committee that I'm on and the progress and your task?

SNOW: The committee -

SWANSON: We're looking at the process.

SNOW: Currently we are looking at the - we call it the program review redesign, and it represents faculty across colleges here, faculty from College of Engineering, College of Arts and Sciences, College of Communication, College of Social Work. Come together to look at the design and review of the program - the program review at UK, particularly how does it affect accredited units, how does it affect non-accredited units. We're also looking at it from the perspective institute and centers and what needs to be a part of those program reviews so that one, it's not a duplication of effort, and, two, that it is transparent and that it is brought forward so that it does support the needs of the faculty as well as the institutional mission for teaching and research.

SWANSON: Thank you very much.

SNOW: Thank you.

SWANSON: We'd like to hear next from our Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure. Jim Geddes is the Chair, but he is not here today. And so Greg Wasilkowski will be presenting in his behalf.

WASILKOWSKI : So I'm going to disappoint you. I will talk only for one minute. Okay, so I'm only the messenger up here so please don't kill me. I'll just substitute for our Chair who could not attend and noting a member of the committee I was until September of this year. And during last year we had eight cases concerning promotion and tenure.

One case was withdrawn before we were - had a chance to discuss it. One case is still pending. So we were able to send our commendation concerning six such cases, which we did, to the President some time ago. We heard from the President concerning these first cases and all cases President follow our recommendation. That's all.

SWANSON: I think you had a few recommendations.

WASILKOWSKI: Yes, we also had a number of recommendations. We noticed that there were (unintelligible) in various applications. They were not very serious, but some of them were but some of them were very serious and so we recommended a couple of things. Some of them, for example, strong support for ombud for faculty and staff. What else? For instance, such things like letter state from dean and the chair, they state precisely for (unintelligible) promotion and tenure or whether promotion or tenure because we had some very strange cases where the letter was very explicit in this concerns, was very, as you say it was very clear, this concerns both promotion and tenure and at the very end there was only mentioned about promotions of the faculty. (Unintelligible) so -

SWANSON: Okay, other questions?

JONES: I just note that one of the recommendations will come to the Senate in the form of change of the Senate rules. It's relating to how much time the appealing faculty member has to get their full appeal documentation in to the committee. That was kind of floating. And now there's going to be a firmer deadline. That's a change in the Senate rules. We'll see that later this year.

WASILKOWSKI: Exactly. One case is this pending case that's pending. We've got documentation of intent to file appeal in May and the whole document received somewhere in September. So very, very long delay and we would like to shorten it.

SWANSON: That makes it really difficult that people are on term contracts and they're in their seventh year.

WASILKOWSKI: But the full report is available on our Senate web page?

BROTHERS: Yes, it's posted with the agenda.

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt

WASILKOWSKI :
SWANSON:

Thank you.
Thank you. We have a report from our faculty evaluation of the President committee. Our Senate Council members have been working on that and we have Mark Coyne reporting.

COYNE:

Okay, so speaking of evaluation, the purpose really of me speaking to you today is provide information about the process that we're starting for presidential evaluation on behalf of the University Senate. This is a Senate Council activity. Earlier this year the Senate Council was invited to help develop some improved methods of evaluating presidential performance. And this was partly driven by dissatisfaction with previous evaluation of presidential performance, both because of where the matrix came from as well as whether that information was being used in a positive way. And so this ad hoc committee consisting of myself and Greg Wasilkowski was created to look at developing a way for faculty to get greater input into the presidential evaluation process. And so we've been working on a template of questions to be delivered in the form of a survey that will perform this evaluation. Those questions and the process itself is on a power point that's on the University Senate Council website. You can take a look at where we're going with this process and the sorts of questions that we think may be useful to address presidential performance. And remember that these are questions that are really preliminary in nature and what we invite you to do when you look at the sample questions we have there is to come up with your own questions for how best does the faculty give input to the presidential evaluation process. The idea being that this is an formative evaluation, presidential performance, but more importantly it is a way to inform the Board of Trustees as to those questions about the way the University is run and about the way the President is running the University, what we think are the important questions that they should be considering in their evaluation process as well. So we

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
invite you to look at that power point and look at the design that we're thinking of doing. It's a question of - we'll have questions that will provide some more - a rating as well as useful commentary. We are looking for assistance in developing the appropriate way to deliver that survey to the faculty in its entirety and then to be able to use that information in a positive way. Again, how can we ask the questions that will make the President do a better job in terms of his overall performance and/or help him to do a better job in his overall performance. So if you have additional questions about the process, just contact me or Greg and we'll be glad to answer any questions about that. But we are looking for your input and your participation in this process both developing the questions and developing the survey itself.

WATKINS:

John Watkins, Public Health. Is this the sort of thing that we can go back to our constituents with so they can go to the Senate?

COYNE:

We absolutely want you to go back to your constituents and say this is where the process is going, what do you think. Is it the way you want the process to go. And if it is, are there other questions to ask. But we definitely want you to go to your constituents, have them look at what we're proposing to do, and give commentary.

WATKINS:

Thank you.

CONNERS:

Mark, I'm Terry Conners from the College of Agriculture. In many institutions the President will actually face the University Provost is the internal face. Is there any thought given to something similar for the Provost?

COYNE:

We have not - I don't know that we have been asked to do that. We've only been asked to make our contribution to presidential evaluation.

CONNERS:

It might really help to clarify some of the goals that we as a faculty are trying to move forward.

SWANSON:

WASILKOWSKI :

We can certainly bring that up. Greg Wasilkowski. I would like to add that it's very important that we get those questions, suggestions from all faculty because they would perhaps hopefully would be used by Board of Trustees as to adopt them

in a way we would like the President to be evaluated. So also the questions what they are from, whom how many people participate in this endeavor is very, very important to put a strong weight on the Trustees that this is something we really want to be President evaluating (unintelligible) yes.

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. Will there be or has there been an e-mail sent to the faculty asking that kind of input?

WASILKOWSKI: No, we just got it.

ANDERSON: Just started, but there will be?

SWANSON: Well, I wasn't intending on doing a broadcast e-mail unless you think it would be helpful I would do that. Would that be helpful?

ANDERSON: I don't know. I was responding to Greg saying they'd like to have more input.

WASILKOWSKI: Yes, but actually encourage to work with your -

ANDERSON: In our college and get that information to you, okay.

SWANSON: Davy?

JONES: And maybe Joe can step in here. To what extent have you gotten your arms around in order for us to effectively evaluate the President, what information will we be able to solicit from the President that we can utilize in this process?

COYNE: I don't know that we've ever addressed that particular question with respect to this evaluation process. Our attempt to say or set up the meeting, for example, with the President, how would you like to be, what are the important questions that you think we should ask. We're more or less rebuff. So what information that we get is really what information we can glean from the transparency that currently exists in the administration.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Arts and Sciences. I just thought it would be useful to offer a little bit of background about how this effort arose. Under the previous presidential regime, the - each trustee had one vote for evaluating the President and the faculty also had one vote. So we were less than five percent of the input into the President's evaluation. And, furthermore, the Trustees did not see the faculty opinion when they were coming to their conclusions about how the President was doing. So our input

only arrived at the Chair of the Board of Trustees who then assembled with the other Trustees' points of view. Of course, that included two faculty Trustees with their points of view and that's how the President's evaluation was done. So as you can imagine, our input into that process was minuscule. So one of the things that Mark has said several times is to try to get our opinion to all the Trustees so that when they vote on the evaluation of the President, they are considering in their vote the opinions of the faculty and that way hopefully our opinion will count for more than less than five percent.

COYNE: One of the issues would be given the types of questions that we solicit, we would hope the Board of Trustees would ask the question why are they asking these particular questions. Why is this a concern.

THYNE: Clayton Thyne, Arts and Sciences. If you could put that in a broadcast message because when I e-mail, I'm in charge of e-mail of my constituents. It's kind of hard to - I don't know the background that Bob knows and stuff. If you could summarize it, it would be a lot nicer.

SWANSON: Sure, we could do that.
PEEK: Joe Peek. I think what's coming out of this is sort of a point that if we want to have some influence, first our vote has to count, which I think it didn't before. And the more important thing is to be able to influence the evaluation to the other Trustees. So in the past the Trustees have been sort of in a bubble. The only information they had was for the most part was information provided by the President and his PR staff. And so I think getting ahead of the curve and coming up with what are the things we think are important and then coming up with our questions and getting those to the Board of Trustees so that it might influence the questions that are put on the questionnaire for the Trustees because that - what questions are asked is a very good indicator of what's important. And so that might start directing the way Trustees think about it. It might start directing or affecting the way the President thinks about the

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
job as well. So I view this as
kind of getting ahead of the curve
and having an influence not only on
the ultimate evaluations but on the
kind of thinking that goes into
making those evaluations.

FINKE:

Rafael Finke, College of
Engineering. I just looked at the
Senate Council website and it does
not have what you advertise, at
least not for one that is publicly
available.

BROTHERS:

It's on the Senate web page for
today.

FINKE:

Okay, thank you.

SWANSON:

Any other questions?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Thank you very much. So just to
clarify, I've been in
communications with Chair Brockman
about this issue, and one of the
questions we had was whether or not
we could have a face to face
conversation with President
Capilouto, and I'm sure Brockman
just didn't feel that that was
appropriate to have that kind of a
conversation. And so once we
finish this process, I'll be
relaying the results of our process
to Chair Brockman. Any other
questions about the process?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Okay, the last bit is just to -
I've asked the Senate Council
whether or not you are tired of
this because I've seen quite a bit
of it. But I thought the answer
was that they thought that you as a
body had not probably seen it in
detail and seen it at the same way
that we had presented it - that I
had presented it to the Board of
Trustees for their retreat. So I'd
like to give you the same
presentation that I gave to them
and any time you want to ask
questions, just stop me and what
I'd like to tell you about is
really the process and how we went
about what we did. To start off
with, this is the makeup of our
committee that we worked with. And
one of the things that we did, as
you know, we worked with Peering
Consulting. And when I met with
Peering Consulting, the first thing
they said was to treat them like my
staff. And so when they showed me
the first piece of data, I asked
them to go back and calculate the
area under the curve because I'm a
pharmacologist and they did

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
nothing. That was just like my staff. So we're off on the right foot. What they did is they have a lot of expertise in looking at strategic planning and they had looked at several other universities. And so they would help us in gathering all of the data and then they would give the committee members homework. And so, for example, one piece of homework that we had after our first committee meeting is to come up with a list of strengths and so that each committee member would give me that, and then I would sit down with the consultants, and we would work with the language, try to bring things into these broad categories and then report back to the committee and it would be pretty interesting because sometimes it would be like a game of telephone, oh, is that what you meant as we wordsmith things along. And so as Bill mentioned, one of the things that came up quite a bit in the work of this committee is that idea of quality, making sure that we have quality programs. And we looked at the academics of it. And, again, think about this as a very broad brush stroke kind of look. And so this is what we came up as a list of our strengths. And then we looked at our challenges. And I'll show you the data, but the undergraduate retention was what really popped out at us. And, of course, the other thing that we looked at was the infrastructure which we've heard a lot about since then. But then these are the other problems that we thought we saw as faculty, staff, and administrators. Delivery of consistent quality of our education. Maintenance of a high number of programs. And I think that's a question we're going to have to look at is that breadth in-depth kind of issue. Are we maximizing the potential of our faculty and staff. And that gets into some of those development questions that we have. Culture of inclusiveness. And what we meant there was not just what people look like but our views and our different religious beliefs, if you will, our different political beliefs. Are we inclusive in the way we think about that? And then the other thing we have a concern

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
as we've talked about is this near normal condition of our financial status. So our financial resource base and how is that going to shift and how do we move our priorities in response to that. When we looked at improvements, what could we build on? We look for areas of distinctiveness. And one thing that we thought about and many of us are not native of Kentucky, but why do we stay here? What attracts us to Kentucky? It is a unique culture and a unique sense of history. And when we look at us as a university, do we really take advantage of that? So probably the equine center would be something that takes full advantage. I've proposed opening a tasting for bourbon, and I'm getting a lot of volunteer faculty. But the other -

GROSSMAN: Is that before or after the burnout committee?

SWANSON: We'll marry them.

WASILKOWSKI: Is there tobacco, too?

SWANSON: And the other thing we thought about for areas of distinctiveness, and this really came up during the presidential search is that when you look at us as a campus, we're one of the few that has a comprehensive medical center and land grant mission and the number of professional schools that we have. And so that should be a strength and are we really capitalizing on that. When we looked at the benchmarks then, what we did first is we asked what would be the criteria and so what the committee said, it had to be land grant. It had to be a high quality undergraduate education. You had to have a medical center on campus and it had to have a similar research profile. Now, of course, not all of these fit that particular bill. And so, for example, you'll see University of Michigan here. University of Michigan and then we have Michigan State, number thirty-four. So University of Michigan has the medical school on campus and then research would be very high. Michigan State land grant and medical school on campus. And so one of the things we wanted to think about is just looking at that as a state and ask all right, here's your land grant; here's your flagship, what kind of decisions

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
did they make and how did that affect their academic programs. Similarly with the University of Iowa we do not have a land grant with the University of Iowa but there are characteristics in there that we thought were similar. We had a lot of disagreement between - about University of North Carolina. And many of our committee members thought that that type of university is not who we should be. And that's something that President Capilouto has said over and over again. It's not really the number; it's what do we want to look like. Who do we want to be? So the argument about UNC is that they are very exclusive and they're pricing themselves - they're not including the constituents of the state. So that was a conversation that we went back and forth with extensively. And so one way we looked at who we were was to look at our research expenditures. So, for example, here we are right here in this part of the curve. Now, keep in mind we did total RND expenditures. Many of these campuses are much larger than we are with respect to number of faculty, and we considered whether or not we should break it down per faculty number, but our consultants didn't like that idea at all. And they suggested we just take the raw numbers for comparative purposes. And then, for example, let's look at this balance, this federal dollars versus total dollars. And so this darker line here are your federal dollars and so if you look at total, we are similar to Iowa except that Iowa has a much greater percentage with respect to federal dollars. And when President Capilouto saw this in the way he talked about this graph to the Board, he sat right next to me so we could have a conversation ongoing. And Bill asked me if that was going to make me uncomfortable to have the President so close, and you know, now that I'm a smart aleck, and I said well, I'll try not to spit on him. And Bill said well, inadvertently I hope. But anyhow President Capilouto described this dark versus this light here, this total funding. He called it the soul of the University because in here are all

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
of our activities that we have to serve the state, our extension services, our contract services, and then this is primarily, not exclusively, but primarily our NIH dollars. And one of the arguments he made to the Board was that he knew how to get this number from here up to here. But he didn't think that - he thought the cost of the University would be very high. And, again, he didn't think that that was where we want to be as an institution. And so this is something that we spent quite a bit of time on are these ACT scores. And you can see from 2001 to 2010 that our average ACT scores have gone up. We're near the middle. So we're very similar to - here's Minnesota here, and Missouri, Iowa, Michigan State, Arizona. Arizona, actually we're quite similar here, but one of the things that you'll see is the breadth of our ACT scores, and so the discussion we had then was whether we should be moving this number up. And most of the committee members agreed that that should be a goal to not have so much breadth. And one of the arguments and I guess Connie Wood is gone now but when I presented this data to Senate Council, Connie Wood said that explains if I'm trying to explain statistics to these guys up here and then these kids down here are asking me what's the square root of four and so I relayed that notion to the Board of Trustees that that is our difficulty that we can't be teaching this large breadth of students and expect a wonderful outcome.

ARTHUR: Do we have any information on the relationship -

BROTHERS: Name, please.

ARTHUR: Mary Arthur, College of Ag. The relationship between ACT scores as a metric of their preparation and relationship to their retention?

SWANSON: Yes, there is a relationship between - so the question was the relationship between the ACT scores and the retention rates and there is a relationship. And there was a survey that Roger Sugarman had done a number of years ago. It looked at the retention rates and also asked why they were dropping out. And with these lower ACT scores, often the students would say they

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
were unprepared, academically under-prepared. But then if you went into these higher ACT scores and asked why they left, they said they weren't challenged. And so that's why this notion of enhancing the academic experience for the undergraduates has really come up to the top. But there's problems in here. And, you know, the other discussion we had amongst the committee members was if you do make our University more exclusive, is that going against our land grant principle of inclusiveness. And so that's an issue I think we're still going to struggle with, and one of the possible solutions is you don't say no to these kids but you start developing, you know, you can get here, but let us help you; this is the path that you are going to take. And so you might have a slightly different path than that well-prepared student. So I expect that's where the conversation is going to go. So with our retention rates, you can see especially right here, here's after that first year and so 2006-2007 so we made good progress right here. But then this loss after the second year, this is really quite high. And when you look at the total, we lose nearly three out of ten by the third year. And so that is the number we want to change. Now, a number of that studies, too, that we looked at said that these live and learning communities really help with retention rates and so, again, that's why we're going in that direction with the dorms. The six year graduation rate, so here we are. This is us. And this is a shock. I sent that to the Board of Trustees. When the committee saw this piece of data, we all said ow, just like you said. So here's Michigan State. Here is Arizona is keeping us company. But there's just a huge change here. One of our committee members said after he went out and after he saw this data, he went out and talked to his neighbor and he said if I told you that you are going to make a six year investment and you had a roughly fifty-five percent of making return, would you consider that a good investment. That's essentially what we're asking the kids to do or their parents. So

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
these are our recommendations then. Sustaining and accelerating improvement in the undergraduate education. We focus on education. It's broader now into experience, but we thought as faculty education. The facilities then. One of the things that Bob Wiseman did is he had a map and he asked, you know, in a typical day of an undergraduate student where would they spend majority of their time and it turned out the majority of their time would be spent on these aging facilities. And those are the ones that we took the Board of Trustees members to. And then we also looked at some case studies, the ones that are developing these learning communities. And so one of them was University of Georgia That's got a nice facility. And then we look at University of Minnesota. And you'll see here. Here they are at around fifty percent graduation retention rate at 1993. And this is their ten year look. And so they did all of these improvements. We don't know when one was effective.

BRI ON: Gail Bri on, College of Engineering. Can you go back one slide? How do we get our heads around the fact that the percentage of undergraduates living on campus is actually decreasing and that kind of seems to be overall and we're going to be building more facilities to try to have more undergraduate living on campus? This seems to be counter intuitive.

SWANSON: Except that the students that you talked to, the reason they don't want to live there is that the facilities aren't that good. So the idea is to try to make it feel more like a community. The data seems to indicate and other universities that have made this investment, they have increased residents living and that's directly related to retention rates.

BRI ON: And it also provides more revenue for the University in terms of just living and eating and parking.

SWANSON: And parking, yes.

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. I'm also curious how we're doing making our campus a 24/7 campus and that would increase the number of students who live here and who stay here to retain them. However,

we're really looking at not what the students are doing during their class time only but what kind of activities are we involving them in whether research or music or bringing in the right kinds of speakers, all those kinds of things that go into the package of keeping kids active and engaged.

SWANSON: Yeah, that came out really clearly when we went through the student center. And we had the director of the student center talk about ours and compare it to these other campuses and how lively those are on other campuses. Yeah, that's a good point, especially the kids that we have now. And the other thing we talked about quite a bit is what an impact the social network and the way kids learn and live today and how are we going to attract those types of learners.

ANDERSON: And I'm not even necessarily - I know we need a lot of work on our buildings, but I'm thinking that the social piece needs to be - is as important, if not more important to get them to stay on campus. Students aren't going to care if their buildings are old as long as they're functional but if they're engaged in the campus.

SWANSON: Right, right. Does anybody else have comments on that, someone who might have better expertise than I do?

(No audible response.)
SWANSON: So if you look at a lot of these things that we're doing right now that the University of Minnesota has done, so I think we'll have to take a look at each one of these things and see which types of things do we want to focus, what's the best bang for our buck. And so we came up with a recommendation to renew the physical infrastructure. And then this is our infamous faculty salary slide. And what you'll see here is that when we recruit in with our assistant professors we do okay. But we have our compression issue such that here we are at the University of Kentucky with a full professor salary and Michigan, they're not that much higher but then here's their average full professor salary. And so we have a compression issue. And then we also looked at UK Work/Life Survey and we looked at people who are

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
considering leaving and salary is the primary reason. So we recommended that the President identify colleges where faculty salary shortcomings exist and target resources to those units. And then the other thing that we had is those are the things that really jumped out. Those three things were what jumped out at us. And then these were the things that we thought would require more campus discussion and more planning so put that on a slower type of venue. And so one of the things that we thought we needed to do is more innovation with respect to research graduate education, clinical opportunities, and engagement. Getting back to our reaching our full potential. And then prioritization. Our resources, our financial resources, are they aligned with our priorities. And that's the key reason for this budget reorganization. And then staff salary and human resources. We also talked quite a bit about how our human resources departments are managed, the whole processes that we're looking at. And then these were what was called defining questions. And what happened here was that this was when I as Chair would ask this question, one of these questions, and we had a great committee. They're very outspoken. And I would feel like I planted a bomb in the room, and then they all went off into their corners and came out with their dukes up. And so we called those kind of questions - whenever that happened, we called that a defining question. And so this is whole land grant flagship. How are we going to be both? Are those contraindicated or can we find those two things to align? What does the top three mean? Is it something we abandon? Is it an aspiration? What do we do with this top twenty? And the (unintelligible) said well, it's mandated by the state. It's in the state bill. So it's not like you can discard it. But how do we approach it then? How can the University enhance its culture of academic excellence? How should UK continue to elevate the quality of incoming students? Some people would argue that we have to go back

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
to the K through 12 and improve the
input of the student. Some people
would argue that we have to
increase our out of state and
international students and start it
from that end of the spectrum. And
that gets us to the last question,
should the University increase the
number of non-resident students
and, if so, how does that affect
the resident students? Thank you.

BRI ON:

I think I heard earlier that I
could make a motion that this
report become a part of Senate
record.

SWANSON:

Well, you could if you wish.

BRI ON:

Gail Bri on, College of Engineering.
I wish to make a motion to adopt
this report as part of the record.

WASI LKOWSKI :

Second. Greg Wasilkowski, College
of Engineering. Second.

SWANSON:

Any discussion?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

All those in favor?

ASSEMBLY:

Aye.

SWANSON:

Opposed, abstained?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Motion carries. Thank you very
much. We are - anytime you want to
bring more input into the process,
as I said before, I have monthly
meetings with President Capilouto
and I'll be happy to pass anything
along. Do I have a motion to
adjourn?

GROSSMAN:

So moved. Bob Grossman, A&S.

SWANSON:

Meeting is adjourned. Thank you.
We'll see you in December.

(Thereupon, the University of
Kentucky Senate Council Meeting for
November 14, 2011 was adjourned.)

STATE OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

I, ANN E. CHASTANG, the undersigned Notary
Public in and for the State of Kentucky at Large,
certify that the facts stated in the caption hereto are
true; that at the time and place stated in said
caption, the UK Senate Council Meeting, was taken down
in stenotype by me and later reduced to computer
transcription by me, and the foregoing is a true record
of the proceedings which took place during said
meeting.

My commission expires: May 12, 2015.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL 11-14-11.txt
hand and seal of office on this the 12th day of
December, 2011.

ANN E. CHASTANG,
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE
K E N T U C K Y
ID #442199