

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE

* * * * *

Regular Session

April 9, 2007

3:00 p.m.

W. T. Young Library
First Floor Auditorium
Lexington, Kentucky

Dr. Kaveh Tagavi, Chair

An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.
179 East Maxwell Street
Lexington, Kentucky 40508
(859)254-0568
University of Kentucky Senate

* * * * *

KAVEH TAGAVI, CHAIR

BRAD CANON, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, SECRETARY TO SENATE COUNCIL

ROBYN BARRETT, COURT REPORTER

* * * * *

|

1 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. The Senate will
2 come to order. I always wanted to
3 say that, so I'll say it. Okay.
4 The minutes from the March 19th
5 meeting are not ready yet. We
6 apologize for that, and it will be
7 ready in the next meeting. I have a
8 few announcements. As you remember,
9 our parliamentarian was not feeling
10 good, and he has some health
11 problems. He has already resigned
12 and I have asked you, and I will ask
13 you again, to keep him in your
14 prayers. The latest information I
15 have from Professor Blyton is that
16 he has been eating better and has
17 been gaining weight, which is very
18 good news; but of course, he still
19 has some of his health issues.
20 However, I am personally honored to
21 mention to you that Brad Canon,
22 which at one time was Senate Council
23 Chair, plus many other titles and
24 roles that he has had, has agreed to
25 help me for the remainder of this

1 academic year. I don't want to
2 sully his reputation when I say that
3 I have learned every trick regarding
4 rules from Brad, but that's not
5 really too far from the truth. So
6 I'm personally honored. Thank you
7 very much, Brad. I'm happy to see
8 you here. If you recall, I reported
9 to you that we sent a letter to the
10 legislature and the governor
11 regarding various -- legislation
12 regarding the relationship between
13 University of Kentucky and its
14 employees, and in that we supported
15 the position of the president. The
16 president send me a very nice
17 letter, and he wrote your name and
18 this institution, so I thought I'd
19 share this very kind excerpt of the
20 letter with you all. We must
21 have -- I'm sorry to say that we
22 must have a special meeting of the
23 Senate. It just was brought to my
24 attention -- Brad has already earned
25 his pay, by the way. He already

1 told me we put on the agenda list
2 that the next meeting is May 14th.
3 Perhaps we wanted to scare you so
4 that you would be grateful if we
5 changed it to May 7th. May 7th is
6 the day that grades are due. Grades
7 are due around 4 o'clock, but we
8 would ask you to please make sure
9 that you do your grades early.
10 Hopefully, since it's going to be on
11 the Internet, maybe you could submit
12 it by midnight, which means I will
13 be on my computer at 11:30 at night
14 entering my grades. So please
15 come. Our colleagues deserve our
16 attention, and they deserve their
17 creative license to be approved.
18 And the main reason we have this
19 meeting is because there are many
20 critical items that are coming to
21 our office and will be coming to our
22 office and ready for your approval.
23 So please mark your calendar; May
24 7th, that's the day when the grades
25 are due. We will have a special

1 Senate meeting. There's another
2 announcement. Every year, by the
3 rules of the Board of Trustees,
4 President Todd is evaluated, and
5 part of that evaluation -- the input
6 comes from many constituents. One
7 of them is Senate Council. Senate
8 Council has decided that in turn we
9 will talk to senators and to faculty
10 councils of the colleges to get your
11 input. We have the list of criteria
12 that President Todd will be
13 evaluated, based on that, and we
14 will share this with you very soon.
15 This group and the faculty councils
16 are the lifeline between the Senate
17 Council and the faculty at large.
18 Of course, once in a while if -- if
19 it's legitimate, as a chair of this
20 faculty body, I would be contacting
21 the faculty directly. But in many
22 situations, including this one, we
23 would like to ask you to get the
24 sense of your faculty and give us
25 your input. Board of Trustees

1 elections, I'm sure you have noticed
2 we had -- the first round of
3 nomination ended Friday. We have
4 five nominees. They are Richard
5 Clayton, Public Health; Steven
6 Gedney, Engineering; Joe Peek,
7 Business and Economics; Ernest
8 Yanarella, who is the incumbent,
9 Arts and Sciences; and David Watt,
10 Medicine. Next round will be --
11 which is the first round will be
12 April 16 to April 20th. Please
13 share this with your colleagues
14 again in your college so that they
15 would have the heads up. If a
16 second round is necessary, which
17 means if one person gets a majority,
18 then we don't need a second round,
19 but if we have a second round, the
20 top three candidates or maybe more
21 than that if there is ties -- if
22 there are ties. I'm not really sure
23 right now; I cannot think of whether
24 ties are broken by a lot or not.
25 The three will be on the second

1 round. In that second round, we
2 will ask you to vote for first
3 choice and second choice, and in
4 that round we would have a winner of
5 the election. Now, here is the part
6 that I'd like to ask you to discuss
7 this or inform your colleagues.
8 Potentially, the required IDs are
9 SAP's person's ID number. These ID
10 numbers are on your paycheck. I
11 think it starts with three zeroes
12 and then a four-digit. You also
13 need that, by the way, to enter your
14 grades, so you might as well do this
15 first so that you will be ready for
16 entering your grades. Perhaps date
17 of birth and your active directory
18 account ID. I am told whether or
19 not you know you have an AD ID, you
20 do have an AD ID. I didn't know I
21 had it till I became Senate Council
22 chair, and now I'm using it. It's
23 better than my previous ID with the
24 engineering service. One other
25 election, you are having elections

1 at the college level. I received
2 somewhat of a complaint from one
3 college. I don't want to name
4 names; but again, I'd like to tell
5 you that you are our ambassadors to
6 your colleges. Elections are
7 supposed to be, in essence, secret.
8 They are supposed to be accurate.
9 You could not have a candidate who
10 is ineligible and then simply say,
11 okay, we will disregard the vote for
12 the candidate because that basically
13 disturbs the election. So you are
14 our ambassadors. You have to be our
15 eyes and ears and remind your
16 college how elections should be
17 done. Next, first item on the
18 agenda is a memorial resolution for
19 Raymond Frederick Betts. It will be
20 given by Daniel Rowland. Of course,
21 Professor Emeritus Betts was
22 founding director of the Gaines
23 Center for the Humanities, and
24 Daniel Rowland is the present
25 Director of the Gaines Center. I

1 did a little research; I wanted to
2 get a picture. I was humbled with
3 the amount of achievements and
4 honors that Professor Betts had, and
5 this particular one took my
6 attention. There has been an HR 113
7 resolution in honor and kind
8 memories of -- of Professor Betts
9 on -- in Kentucky House of
10 Representatives. So with saying
11 that, please, Professor Rowland,
12 join us.

13 ROWLAND: Thank you, Kaveh. You can
14 imagine, if you were humbled, how
15 humbled I was to inherit Ray's job
16 as Director of the Gaines Center,
17 and so it's a deep honor and a great
18 pleasure for me to read this
19 memorial resolution.

20 Ray Betts was a protean figure
21 whose contributions to an
22 astonishing array of institutions
23 and endeavors make him one of the
24 most distinguished faculty members
25 ever to serve at this university.

1 The choice of Ray to receive an
2 honorary degree last year is a good
3 indication of how unusual his
4 achievements are. He was a scholar
5 of exceptional energy and
6 imagination, whose academic
7 interests centered on the history of
8 France, the subject which he was
9 hired to teach here. The idea of
10 confining Ray to this one area,
11 however, would be like holding
12 mercury in your hand. His
13 publications span a huge
14 intellectual territory, from topics
15 in the history of metropolitan
16 France to the study of French
17 colonies abroad, particularly in
18 Africa, to his last book, which
19 squeezed the history of popular
20 culture in the twentieth century
21 into the pages of a slender and
22 wonderfully imaginative volume.
23 Although history as a discipline
24 tends to be wary of theory and
25 theorizing, Ray loved theory, read

1 it eagerly, and applied it
2 energetically both to his teaching
3 and to his research. Contemporary
4 Africanists consider him one of the
5 foundation figures of their field,
6 and Ray was a pioneer in using
7 largely ignored types of evidence
8 like architecture (in which he had a
9 lifelong interest) to answer
10 historical questions. I can
11 honestly say that Ray is the most
12 imaginative historian I have known.
13 He always had a fresh idea, a new
14 approach to suggest, a perspective
15 that no one else had ever thought
16 of.

17 Ray was also deeply involved in
18 his several communities, again to a
19 degree that seems almost
20 unprecedented. He loved Lexington
21 and was constantly proposing ideas,
22 some realized and some not, to make
23 our town a more exciting place.
24 Among the latter was his scheme for
25 turning the Martin Luther King

1 viaduct over Vine Street into a kind
2 of Ponte Vecchio, complete with
3 merchants' stalls and jugglers;
4 among the former was a temporary
5 series of small exhibits along
6 Limestone Street from UK to
7 Transylvania tracing the history of
8 the street and the many things that
9 occurred on it. He was a founding
10 member of the Kentucky Association
11 of Teachers of History, an alliance
12 of history teachers at both the
13 college and high school levels from
14 every corner of the state, an
15 organization that continues to
16 flourish. He contributed in many
17 ways to the Kentucky Humanities
18 Council, as board member and as
19 speaker. At UK he founded or
20 co-founded many important and
21 innovative programs, including the
22 Emerging Leader Institute, UK 101,
23 and the series of historical markers
24 that now inform current students of
25 the history of UK's campus. And, of

1 course, he was a member of this body
2 and a notably successful faculty
3 representative on UK's Board of
4 Trustees.

5 Of all of Ray's contributions,
6 however, the one I know best, and
7 perhaps his greatest achievement,
8 was the creation of the Gaines
9 Center for the Humanities. The only
10 term I can find to describe this
11 deed is the Russian word "podvig," a
12 term used in epics and saints' lives
13 to describe the deed that made the
14 person a saint or epic hero. Like
15 an epic hero, Ray enlisted the help
16 of a remarkable group of supporters
17 led by John and Joan Gaines and
18 including President Otis Singletary
19 and Governor Ned Breathitt. These
20 impressive and diverse people were
21 drawn to the Center by Ray's
22 personal magnetism and what can only
23 be called his institutional
24 imagination.

25 When I became the director of

1 the Center in 1998, I felt that I
2 had inherited a splendid estate, one
3 which was populated by talented and
4 dedicated people and was well-
5 stocked with delightful features.
6 The architect of this whole estate
7 and its manager for 15 years was, of
8 course, Ray Betts. Over the last
9 nine years, I have become intimately
10 acquainted with each feature of the
11 Center and have never ceased to be
12 grateful for the many features that
13 Ray created: the intense process of
14 selecting new fellows, Exit Exams,
15 the Jury Projects, the Breathitt
16 Undergraduate Lectureship in the
17 Humanities, and the Bingham Seminar.
18 At the very founding of the Center,
19 Ray realized that the Center
20 physically connected UK to the
21 downtown -- a visual hyphen is the
22 way he put it -- and this led him to
23 start our major public programs, the
24 Bale Boone Symposium in the
25 Humanities and the Lafayette Seminar

1 in Public Issues. Time after time,
2 faculty members tell me that they
3 have found in the Gaines Center the
4 sort of experience that they were
5 seeking when they entered academe in
6 the first place. The university
7 gets to see its best students, the
8 most talented sons and daughters of
9 the Commonwealth, succeed beyond
10 their dreams, winning the most
11 competitive national scholarships
12 and going to the very best
13 professional and graduate programs.
14 All of this comes from Ray's
15 marvelous invention, a machine that
16 enriches all connected with it,
17 students, faculty, and the staff of
18 the Center, most especially, as I
19 can testify, the director of the
20 Center.

21 Our undergraduate fellows are,
22 of course, the heart of the Center.
23 We now have over 200 former Fellows,
24 and their impact is being felt all
25 over the country and the world. To

1 mention but one example of many,
2 three of the 12 Fellows who finished
3 their fellowships in 1999 have now
4 attended the John F. Kennedy School
5 of Government at Harvard and are now
6 making a major impact on our nation
7 as employees of the Center for
8 American Progress, Harvard
9 University, and Barak Obama's Senate
10 Office. Jeff Fugate, from this same
11 class and now finishing a degree in
12 architecture and urban planning from
13 MIT, recently wrote to our Board to
14 note the ways that Ray and the
15 Center had given him the courage and
16 self-confidence to apply to the best
17 programs in the country and then, as
18 one of the very few students from a
19 public university, to impress his
20 Ivy League colleagues with his work.
21 Former Fellows came to Ray's
22 memorial service on very short
23 notice from all over the country.
24 The ever-growing Fellowship at the
25 Gaines Center is surely Ray's most

1 important legacy. In his eulogy to
2 W. B. Yeats, W. H. Auden wrote that
3 Yates "became his admirers."
4 Through our lives in the Center,
5 Ray's marvelous invention, and
6 through our experience of his fierce
7 intelligence, his unrelenting high
8 standards, and his boundless
9 imagination, we have all become him,
10 and in us his legacy lives on.
11 Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: May I ask you to
13 please stand for a moment of silence
14 in honor of our colleague, Raymond
15 Frederick Betts. Thank you,
16 Professor Rowland. I need a motion
17 that the Senate approve this
18 memorial resolution and direct the
19 Senate Council office to transmit a
20 copy to Mrs. Irene Betts.

21 CLARK: So moved.

22 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Name, please.

23 CLARK: Harry Clark, Fine Arts.

24 BOLLINGER: Second.

25 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Name?

1 application gets to us within the
2 two years, but by the time the
3 committee is ready to make a
4 decision, two years has passed. And
5 it has created problems, and we
6 started giving waivers. And once we
7 give waiver for one set of
8 circumstances, you feel obligated to
9 give waiver for similar sets of
10 circumstances, and we tried to close
11 this kind of a gap. The language in
12 front of you, to the best of our
13 understanding, closes that gap.
14 Doug Michael is not here today;
15 otherwise, I would have asked him to
16 give the report regarding the
17 election since he presides over the
18 election and the rules and this is
19 part of the rules. Is Katherine
20 McCormick here? She is the chair of
21 retroactive withdrawal. I didn't
22 ask her to necessarily come because
23 this is somewhat straightforward.
24 Are there any questions regarding
25 this proposal which is coming to you

1 from the Senate Council with a
2 positive recommendation? Okay.
3 Therefore, I'm guessing that you-all
4 agree with this recommendation. All
5 those in favor of this proposal/
6 rule, please indicate so by raising
7 your hands. Opposed? Abstain?
8 It's unanimous; motion carries. Oh,
9 I guess it's too late to do this,
10 but I think I gave the essence of
11 the recommendation.

12 JONES: You have a parliamentarian.

13 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: We have a
14 parliamentarian.

15 CANON: What's the issue?

16 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: What is the issue,
17 Professor Jones?

18 JONES: Well --

19 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Does anybody have any
20 reservation regarding their vote?

21 This is what you voted on. Yes.

22 GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think we voted
23 on items two and three, but I would
24 like to move now that we approve two
25 and three.

1 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Thank you for moving
2 here. Any second for that
3 additional motion?
4 CIBULL: Second.
5 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Mike Cibull.
6 GROSSMAN: Oh, I'm Bob Grossman.
7 BROTHERS: I got it.
8 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: All those in favor of
9 this additional motion, please
10 indicate so by raising your hand.
11 Opposed? Abstain? Motion carries.
12 It's unanimous. Thank you for
13 letting me fix my errors.
14 CANON: Actually a motion from a Senate
15 Council meeting --
16 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Doesn't need --
17 CANON: -- doesn't need introduction,
18 but it doesn't matter.
19 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Thank you. The
20 next item is the degree list, and
21 there's only one person that I know
22 of in the universe who could set the
23 background for this action to its
24 perfection.
25 GROSSMAN: You mean he's not a candidate

1 for a degree? Professor Jones,
2 please.

3 JONES: Okay. I'm going to give you a
4 background in front of the two
5 actions that are actually going to
6 be before you. One of them will be
7 on the UK degree list; the other is
8 on the BCTC degree list. There's
9 some different nuances there, and at
10 each meeting you've been hearing
11 about some troubles involving the
12 BCTC list, so I'm going to try to
13 set in front of you how the process
14 is different for them than for us.
15 Just as a background, the state law
16 here, which we've had for some time,
17 empowers that the board can grant
18 degrees to graduates upon the
19 recommendation of the faculty. The
20 action today doesn't involve
21 primarily doesn't involve about the
22 honorary degrees, which you've done
23 earlier this year. There's a little
24 bit about honors in a moment, but
25 it's mostly this other action. I

1 just want to point out the state law
2 has in here two actions, actually,
3 that the faculty are empowered from
4 state legislature to do. Notice
5 that the board does not determine
6 who is a graduate. And if you go to
7 the legislative history of this and
8 the state law, what this means here
9 literally is the person who has
10 passed a course of study that is
11 required to earn a degree; the
12 person graduated the course of
13 study. So among that group, that
14 group is determined by the faculty,
15 not by the board. Then among that
16 group, the second action by the
17 faculty, which is what you'll do
18 here today, is decide which ones of
19 those graduates of the course of
20 study will be recommended to the
21 board for the separate action of
22 granting degrees. These two actions
23 are not the same thing. A person,
24 for example, could academically
25 complete all course of study, but

1 due to a cheating and an academic
2 discipline, getting expelled from
3 the university, doesn't get a
4 degree. Just because you
5 academically completed the course of
6 study under the faculty doesn't mean
7 the faculty then automatically
8 recommends you to the board for the
9 degree, so these are two separate
10 activities. Just as an example --
11 and bear with me, I always do these
12 kinds of things here -- you can see
13 the faculty very shortly after that
14 state law was passed, doing this in
15 echo of what we do today. Some
16 students names were presented where
17 they offer themselves as candidates
18 for graduation and for the award of
19 the degree, so those are two
20 separate actions here. And on
21 motion you, or at least at that time
22 it was the entire university faculty
23 were sitting here, recommended that
24 the degrees be conferred, except
25 that -- and there's this

1 stipulation, which we still have
2 today, that even though some of
3 these names are going forward, the
4 student hasn't passed their final
5 exams yet. You know, once they
6 satisfy the professors that those
7 last aspects of the course of study
8 have been passed, then they have
9 finished their graduation and will
10 be eligible for the degrees. More
11 recently, then, the faculty trustees
12 were very helpful in effectuating
13 that the board recognized that our
14 university is so large right now we
15 no longer have the entire university
16 faculty sitting here. The last time
17 that happened was 1963. Rather,
18 the -- you, being the elected
19 faculty senators, have the authority
20 by your election to represent the
21 faculty of the university for this
22 purpose of this -- these degrees.
23 Okay. Now, what we have on the
24 left-hand side is what we have at
25 the University of Kentucky by the

1 solid arrow. The unit faculties
2 down here are determining that the
3 people have passed the -- or
4 graduated from the courses of
5 study. Ministerially, the dean and
6 the registrar are getting this list
7 together. The dean's forwarding
8 this information; the registrar is
9 collating it. It does not go, then,
10 from the registrar to the board. It
11 goes to your body right here, as the
12 faculty, you know, as the quality
13 control academically have their last
14 finger on the pulse before it gets
15 to the board. The president is
16 ministerially in here as the
17 transmitter, and so that's why you
18 got last week a call from the Senate
19 Council Office: Please verify this
20 list one more time. And you saw,
21 described: Don't worry so much
22 about whether there are people on
23 here yet who have not yet completely
24 passed the course of study. They
25 don't get their degree until they're

1 ascertained to have done so, but are
2 there any omissions? This is what's
3 really important. The student wants
4 to have that diploma in their hand
5 and is entitled to have it in hand
6 as of this semester and doesn't
7 because the name has been omitted
8 entirely, or sometimes names are
9 misspelled so badly it seems like
10 somebody else is getting the degree,
11 or sometimes the wrong degree is
12 listed. These are various kinds of
13 omissions that are very important
14 for us to catch, and I think there
15 was at least one omission that was
16 again caught by somebody. We
17 appreciate that. So that's how the
18 first action item has come to be
19 that you're going to be acting on.
20 The second one, on KCTCS, once LCC
21 or BCC separated from UK, the state
22 legislature -- we didn't set this
23 up -- the state legislature set up
24 that that faculty determines who has
25 passed their courses of study.

1 Remember, these are for students who
2 are going to get UK degree names on
3 their diplomas. It goes to their
4 registrar locally; it goes to the
5 system-wide state registrar, who
6 generates sort of a list like right
7 here, but he does not forward it
8 back here to either this group or to
9 the statewide faculty senate that
10 they have. It's presented directly
11 to the board of regents, who pass
12 it. The board of regents then send
13 it to us as the faculty quality
14 control, but we don't know those
15 students, you know, so it's kind of
16 awkward. So what Sheila always does
17 is immediately sends the list back
18 over to this group: Are there any
19 omissions? But inevitably what
20 happens is, you know, there are some
21 omissions, but the way the state law
22 is set up, we cannot walk onto our
23 meeting here any omissions. We can
24 only act upon what names the board
25 of regents send us. So they send us

1 an incomplete list; it's found to be
2 incomplete because we back-channel
3 it over here, and what they do is
4 they get the omitted names into the
5 next list that comes forward. So
6 the list you have here actually has
7 some names on it that we determined
8 a cycle ago and have been omitted.
9 I spoke with the chair of this body
10 here, and he has promised me in
11 blood to work out a better internal
12 system where this entity right here,
13 before they print off the degree
14 list to go to the board, will run it
15 back down to this group and make
16 sure there are no omissions.
17 They're not doing it right now; they
18 could, so they're just trying to get
19 that down. That, then, is our
20 background to the two action items.

21 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Thank you very much.

22 Davy Jones is on sabbatical in
23 Texas. He says he came here for his
24 tax return; I just don't believe
25 it. I think he came for this item.

1 Okay. I would like to entertain a
2 motion that the elected university
3 faculty senators approve this degree
4 list for submission through the
5 President to the Board of Trustees
6 as recommended, the degrees to be
7 conferred by the board.

8 GROSSMAN: It doesn't mean this is
9 coming from the Senate Council?

10 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: It's not coming
11 from -- it is coming from Senate
12 Council. It does not need a motion
13 or a second. Thank you.

14 CANON: Didn't the Senate Council
15 approve this?

16 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Senate Council
17 approved this with no
18 recommendation, no positive no
19 negative. Do we need a motion?

20 CANON: You probably need a motion in
21 that case.

22 GROSSMAN: So moved, Bob Grossman.

23 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Thank you, Bob.

24 YANARELLA: Second, Ernie Yanarella.

25 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Are there any

1 discussions? Professor Dembo first,
2 and then I'll go to Ray Forgue. I'm
3 getting some names, yes.

4 DEMBO: As much as we understand the
5 rationale behind this and that it's
6 a finite period of time, I do wonder
7 if there still are some senators
8 that feel uncomfortable voting on
9 something over which they have no
10 choice but to vote in favor of.

11 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Is that a
12 rhetorical -- it's not my
13 understanding that senators have to
14 vote yes. Did you mean they cannot
15 amend it or they cannot vote yes or
16 no?

17 DEMBO: If, for example, a majority of
18 senators did not vote in favor of
19 the KCTCS graduates, what would be
20 the outcome?

21 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: I would not forward it
22 to the president, so he would
23 forward it to the board, and it's my
24 understanding that the board cannot
25 grant any degrees. Ray Forgue.

1 FORGUE: Ray Forgue, Family Studies.

2 What if there's -- if a name is not
3 on the list that you think should be
4 up there?

5 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Yes, please, go ahead
6 answer that question, Davy.

7 JONES: For the UK degree list, that has
8 happened in the past. Remember
9 several years ago with the Western
10 Kentucky University (inaudible due
11 to coughing) program, and we walked
12 those names onto the floor right
13 here. So this is not a passive vote
14 situation. For the UK degree list,
15 we very actively have our finger on
16 what's going on.

17 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: So to answer, Ray, is
18 if there are -- you could amend the
19 list, technically speaking.

20 FORGUE: Well, we have a student
21 scheduled to take a Ph.D. oral on
22 the 20th of this month, within the
23 time frame to graduate, and she's
24 not on the list.

25 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: My experience shows

1 that when some people think a person
2 is ready, there are many reasons,
3 and maybe I can ask Jacquie Hager to
4 correct me if I'm wrong. Reasons
5 such as unpaid bills that they might
6 not be then eligible to receive a
7 degree. So I would suggest not to
8 do this without any background check
9 and legwork.

10 FORGUE: Well, that's why I'm reluctant.

11 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Yes, Jacquie, please.

12 HAGER: Unpaid bills will not prevent a
13 student from having their name
14 presented to the board. It will
15 prevent them from receiving their
16 diploma, but they can still go ahead
17 and graduate. But the process is
18 that the colleges collect from the
19 students their intent to graduate.
20 And for the graduate students, that
21 goes through the graduate school.
22 If the student does not notify the
23 graduate school they intend to
24 graduate, then our office never
25 receives a notification that they

1 intend to graduate, and that is one
2 way that their name could be left
3 off, but the student must initiate
4 the request for graduation.

5 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: I have excellent help
6 from a variety of sources. I should
7 also add -- Sheila, please correct
8 me if I'm wrong -- this list was
9 announced to senators personally at
10 least seven days ago, six days ago.

11 BROTHERS: On Tuesday.

12 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: And in a situation
13 like the example that Professor
14 Forgue mentioned, we appreciate if
15 you inform us, so we will do the
16 investigation, and we will not be in
17 a situation where you want to add a
18 name somewhat on a guess. Although
19 we have gone over this, having extra
20 names is not as serious as not
21 having a name that should be there
22 and it's not. I lost my train of --
23 I don't know who was doing what.
24 Let me go to over there, Connie
25 Wood.

1 WOOD: Jacquie has already --

2 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Jacquie did it. Yes,
3 over there.

4 HALLMAN: If we have --

5 BROTHERS: I'm sorry; name, please?

6 HALLMAN: Diana Hallman, Fine Arts.

7 What's the process for -- who do we
8 send those to, and what's the
9 deadline?

10 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: The deadline is right
11 now. But six days ago, the deadline
12 was six days later. So maybe for
13 next time, you would consider this.
14 Let me go to back there.

15 JONES: Can I just add, procedurally,
16 what happens is if through a senator
17 it's found that there is an
18 omission, you contact back to the
19 Senate Council Office, Sheila up
20 there, and she immediately huddles
21 with Jacquie Hager in Don Witt's
22 office and an amended list is made
23 which gets into your handout here
24 today, so that name is not omitted.
25 So it's very important, when this

1 gets out to the senators a week in
2 advance, you do this behind the
3 scenes, contacting Sheila to get
4 these omissions unomitted.

5 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Over there.

6 GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman. If I'm not
7 mistaken, this is a list of people
8 who we're recommending be considered
9 for degrees, but only if they -- it
10 seems to me if you think there
11 should be someone on the list who is
12 not on the list, you should go ahead
13 and propose that the list be amended
14 now. And then afterwards people
15 will check to make sure whether they
16 should get their degrees in -- in a
17 few week's time.

18 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: I'm not necessarily
19 agreeing with you or disagreeing.
20 Jacquie, is there a hazard in what
21 Bob Grossman just mentioned?

22 HAGER: No.

23 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: No.

24 HAGER: We're not conferring the
25 degrees. That doesn't happen until

1 degree checkout occurs after, in
2 this particular case, graduation has
3 occurred because the final day for
4 grades is not until after
5 graduation.

6 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Okay. Then let me --
7 if there are any senators who are
8 somewhat confident that a name
9 should have been there, this is your
10 chance to add it, then. And I'm
11 very glad that you are showing so
12 much interest regarding an item
13 which is very important. I'll come
14 back to you. Connie Wood.

15 WOOD: With my history in the graduate
16 school, I think that we should be
17 very careful about adding names to
18 this list. This is a process which
19 is initiated by the student, and it
20 is the student prerogative to
21 initiate that graduation. There are
22 many students for many reasons,
23 especially at the graduate level,
24 who do not wish to have a May
25 degree. They would prefer to have

1 that degree be delayed until
2 August. That is a student
3 prerogative, and I would be very
4 uncomfortable with adding names of
5 students who have not completed the
6 application for degree process.

7 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Are there any other
8 comments?

9 FORGUE: I'm going to (inaudible due to
10 coughing) because in this case she's
11 on the wrong spot on the list.
12 She's under Master of Science rather
13 than Ph.D, so -- but maybe she
14 filled out the application for
15 degree card wrong and the Director
16 of Graduate Studies signed it and
17 didn't notice that, which is bad
18 because it was me.

19 HAGER: Send me that name and --

20 FORGUE: We'll worry about it later.
21 I'm not going to amend the motion.
22 Sorry about all this.

23 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Absolutely not. In
24 fact, in a way I am pleased that
25 there is some active consideration

1 of this item and it's not an item
2 that is rubber-stamped. We used to
3 have a senator who usually sits here
4 which always complained that this is
5 perfunctory. I don't see him now.

6 I wish he was here.

7 GROSSMAN: Do you need a mirror?

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That was Bob

9 Grossman.

10 CIBULL: This is worse than perfunctory.

11 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Are there any other

12 comments? All those in favor of
13 this -- I forgot; was this a motion,
14 or we decided this is not -- we
15 decided it was a motion. It was
16 moved and seconded. All those in
17 favor of this motion, please
18 indicate so by raising your hand.

19 Opposed? Abstain? It's unanimous;
20 motion carries. At the beginning of
21 this meeting, I was worried; what if
22 we finish before Professor Provost
23 Swamy gets here. For some reason
24 I'm no longer worried about that.
25 Okay. Next item is a similar item.

1 If you recall, three or four years
2 ago we accepted or approved a pilot
3 program for intersession and the
4 condition of that pilot was that in
5 three years we would then vote
6 again. It came to the Senate
7 Council, and it came in the form of
8 a report by Associate Provost for
9 Undergraduate Education, Professor
10 Phil Kraemer, so I will be asking
11 him now to please come to the podium
12 and give the same report to this
13 body.

14 KRAEMER: Good afternoon. There's
15 actually two things we're to
16 present. The first is the winter
17 session. The second the Provost is
18 presenting later, and he's a clever
19 man. He wanted to practice an old
20 rhetorical trick; in order to have
21 his presentation well-received, he
22 wanted an inferior presentation to
23 precede it. Hence, here I am. I
24 promise not to disappoint. The main
25 question for the Winter Intersession

1 was: Is this a good idea? Should
2 we continue to do this? And that
3 question actually breaks down into a
4 couple of subcomponent questions:
5 What is the purpose of the Winter
6 Intersession? Are we realizing that
7 purpose? And the more important
8 question that I think is on the mind
9 of the faculty was: Are we
10 reaching -- are we really providing
11 the kind of educational quality in
12 the intersession that we would
13 want? This is a compressed winter
14 session. This is a period in which
15 students complete courses within
16 about three weeks. So I'll try to
17 present some evidence to address
18 both of those questions in terms of
19 the purpose and whether or not we're
20 realizing that purpose. I'll give
21 you some evidence based on student
22 perspective. This is a sign that
23 says we have extra time, which is
24 not in your best interest because I
25 can make this very long. The

1 student perspective, we'll look at
2 some survey information and the
3 teacher course evaluation data that
4 we provide in most of our courses.
5 There's also a faculty perspective
6 that I think is very important for
7 you to appreciate. I won't dally
8 for too long here, anticipating many
9 questions, perhaps, to fill the
10 time. This is an example of the
11 course roster from 2004. I will
12 quickly scan over 2005 and 2006.
13 Realize we don't have many courses.
14 That's one point. There's also a
15 fairly modest distribution of
16 courses, primarily in the social
17 sciences and humanities, with a few
18 courses, as you will see later on,
19 at the graduate level. About 12 or
20 13 courses in each of the three
21 intersessions to date. There are
22 some courses that have been offered
23 in all three sessions, and those
24 provided a pretty good source of
25 information about the quality of

1 education. The real intent of the
2 Winter Intersession, as I recall it,
3 was to provide students another
4 opportunity to complete course work
5 in order to make progress to degree,
6 in addition to the fall and spring
7 semesters that are summer sessions.
8 It was never intended to be a
9 revenue source. So the real goal
10 here is to allow students an
11 opportunity to take courses to move
12 ahead in their progress of degree.
13 Now, with that intention in mind,
14 these data tend to support the
15 notion that Winter Intersession is
16 realizing that goal. Most of the
17 students are seniors, followed by
18 juniors, a few sophomores, and there
19 have been very few first-year
20 students. And that's probably a
21 good thing, if we think that the
22 compressed schedule is at all
23 challenging, so that it's the more
24 mature students who are completing
25 courses during this compressed

1 schedule. We asked students why did
2 they enroll, and the predominate
3 answer was to make progress to
4 degree, to get ahead, to catch up.
5 Very few of them indicated for
6 intellectual interest. Apparently
7 we are satisfying the intellectual
8 appetites of students quite well in
9 the spring and fall semester. We
10 asked them how satisfied they were
11 with the course offerings. This is
12 important in terms of whether we
13 wanted to expand the Winter
14 Intersession. You see about a third
15 of the students were somewhat
16 dissatisfied, suggesting we could
17 offer more courses and also a
18 greater variety of courses. More
19 than a third of the students were
20 rather indifferent or agnostic on
21 this question, and less than a third
22 were satisfied with what we
23 offered. These are now responses
24 that get to the question of whether
25 or not this compressed schedule is

1 providing educational quality. We
2 asked students explicitly about the
3 pace. Very few of them felt it was
4 too slow; most thought it was just
5 right; and a few did think it was
6 too fast. And this is really a
7 theme that I would end with at some
8 point, and that would be that the
9 Winter Intersession probably is not
10 meant for all students, probably not
11 meant for all courses, or even for
12 all instructors. One of the
13 considerations in terms of the
14 quality educational experience we
15 offer are the services available to
16 students that support these courses,
17 and one such service would be the
18 library. So we asked students
19 whether they were satisfied with the
20 availability of resources, and the
21 majority of students were either
22 indifferent or satisfied. But there
23 is a concern -- I'm losing the
24 clicker light here, I think -- some
25 increase in the dissatisfaction in

1 2006; that's the last Winter
2 Interession. We don't know yet
3 what that's about, but I think we do
4 need to keep in mind that students
5 not only need the library; they
6 perhaps need tutoring services, etc.
7 So I would advise that we ensure
8 that the services are available to
9 them. I remind you, this session
10 goes between the end of the fall
11 semester and the beginning of the
12 spring semester. One week of that,
13 the university is closed; and during
14 most of that period, it's a fairly
15 quiet time at the university. We
16 intentionally wanted students to
17 think about their experience during
18 the winter interession relative to
19 their experience during normal
20 semesters, and surprisingly the
21 majority, 50 percent, felt that it
22 was a better experience than they
23 had during spring or fall. Another
24 huge chunk felt it was about the
25 same, and very few felt that it was

1 worse than what we accomplish during
2 the fall and spring. Would you
3 enroll again? They seem to be
4 telling us yes. So in terms of
5 whether or not this is -- the
6 intersession is meeting our intent,
7 our goals, the students seem to be
8 telling us that it is, that we could
9 perhaps even expand it. The more
10 important data are to look at the
11 learning, per se. Now, we really
12 don't have any direct evidence on
13 the student learning outcomes; we
14 have indirect evidence. And I turn
15 primarily to the student, to the
16 course and faculty evaluations that
17 are done at the end of each course.
18 And there are two sets of items:
19 Some course items that look at
20 questions that should be informative
21 if the compressed schedule is
22 adversely affecting student
23 learning. Specifically, we asked
24 students whether their graded
25 assignments were returned promptly,

1 whether the grading was fair and
2 consistent, and whether the graded
3 assignments included comments. And
4 then I'll also present a graph of
5 four other questions we looked at of
6 instructor variables and student
7 learning outcome items. And here
8 the questions were: Was the
9 instructor available for
10 consultation? Again, a concern
11 during a compressed period. Did you
12 gain understanding of concepts and
13 principles? Their perception of the
14 quality of learning. Did the course
15 stimulate you to read further? And
16 finally, did writing assignments
17 help understanding course material?
18 Strongly disagree, disagree, agree,
19 and strongly agree, and if you look
20 at the data, I think students are
21 fairly content. They seem to be
22 telling us that the assignments are
23 returned promptly and that they view
24 the grading as fair and consistent
25 and that they are getting meaningful

1 feedback on the assignments. And
2 likewise here, these responses tend
3 to support the notion that their
4 perceptions are that the quality of
5 learning is where they would like
6 it, perhaps, that faculty are
7 available to consult. They feel
8 they are gaining understanding of
9 principles and concepts. They are
10 being stimulated to read more, which
11 is good. And most surprising,
12 perhaps, is that the writing -- the
13 feedback on writing assignments did
14 help them. Again, these are courses
15 that are conducted over a three-week
16 period. If you look at the overall
17 evaluations, both in terms of the
18 course and the instructors, these
19 are cumulative averages over all
20 three winter intersessions, over all
21 courses, and you see the students
22 are quite satisfied. Most of them
23 agree that the instructor is very
24 good. Average is a 3.4 for the
25 course evaluation and 3.5 for the

1 instructor evaluation. I wanted to
2 compare those data to data from the
3 same courses that were taught in the
4 regular semester. So I looked at
5 2004 and compared the Winter
6 Intersession for '04 to the adjacent
7 spring '04 session and also looked
8 at 2006 and compared the Winter
9 Intersession to the fall '06
10 semester session. Now, what you see
11 are the three possibilities here.
12 There are some courses in which
13 students compared the quality as
14 about equal. There are some
15 situations in which the interterm is
16 regarded as lower in quality and
17 some situations in which interterm
18 tends to score higher, but nothing
19 systematic that would indicate that
20 the students are feeling as though
21 these winter intersession courses
22 are inferior to what they would
23 expect during regular semesters.
24 I'm not going to linger on the
25 course distributions. I'll flash

1 through these very quickly, although
2 not too quickly, as I see the
3 indication that the Provost is not
4 here yet. I was looking for two
5 extremes. Are they getting all A's?
6 Are they all getting E's? Neither
7 extreme appears. If you're very
8 attentive to this presentation, you
9 may have already concluded that
10 there seems to be a positively
11 skewed distribution. One might
12 describe that as grade inflation.
13 These are courses in which you have
14 very few students enrolled. You
15 have, perhaps, a more intense
16 motivation to do well, if they are
17 indeed trying to catch up. And for
18 many courses, this may be a very
19 good way to learn. This is the only
20 course they're taking, so it's hard
21 to make much of the course
22 distribution data. So I'll just
23 quickly scan by, and finally we gave
24 a very brief survey to faculty who
25 taught in the Winter Intersession.

1 We asked three primary questions:
2 Was the Winter Intersession a good
3 educational experience for your
4 students? Did you cover the same
5 amount of material as you would in a
6 normal semester? And do you
7 recommend continuing Winter
8 Intersession? We had nine
9 respondents. A, B, C, G and H were
10 full-time faculty. D was a part-
11 time faculty instructor. E and F
12 were graduate students, and I was a
13 clinical title series faculty. So
14 what you see is that, in terms of
15 the question was it a good
16 experience from the faculty
17 perspective, the majority are saying
18 yes, only one no. The plus
19 indicates a rather robust yes: Yes,
20 indeed, it was a very good
21 experience. The asterisk indicates
22 a qualified yes. This indicates
23 yes, it was a good experience, but I
24 would not necessarily recommend it
25 for all students, nor would I

1 recommend that all courses be
2 available. For question two, notice
3 that three of the respondents said
4 they did not cover the same amount
5 of material, but the majority said
6 they did. And then finally: Would
7 you recommend continuing it? Again,
8 there's some -- majority are yeses,
9 one no, and a couple of robust
10 yeses. If you look at our three-
11 week compressed schedule relative to
12 best practices, I'd make two
13 points. Can you learn within three
14 weeks the standard courses?. If
15 you're unfamiliar with the Colorado
16 College program, students
17 essentially take one course at a
18 time. Courses usually go in three
19 weeks' duration. That's the only
20 course the student has. They're
21 concentrated. There is a precedent
22 for teaching material within three
23 weeks. The more important precedent
24 would be indicated by those research
25 universities that have winter

1 intersessions comparable to our
2 own. Maryland has been at it for a
3 long time. They have a very
4 extensive course offering. Cornell,
5 Ohio University, Delaware, Iowa,
6 Arizona. So I think there's
7 certainly precedent for the idea of
8 a Winter Intersession. Yes, it's
9 compressed. Yes, it could be
10 stressful for students. But I would
11 offer these conclusions: It appears
12 to be achieving its purpose; that's
13 promote progress to degree. It
14 gives students an opportunity to
15 catch up, get ahead. There's enough
16 interest from students to suggest
17 that we could expand the program. I
18 think that needs to be determined by
19 the faculty, the departments, the
20 deans of the colleges. There's no
21 evidence that the Winter
22 Intersession compromises student
23 learning, but certainly the caveat
24 would be that not all courses are
25 appropriate. Instructors generally

1 support the winter intersessions.
2 Ergo, I conclude that we should
3 continue with the Winter
4 Intersession. I'll give you one
5 personal reference. I've taught a
6 course here at UK, Psychology 260.
7 It's a statistics methodology
8 course. I taught it at other
9 research universities. I taught it
10 in a large lecture format, small
11 classes, during the spring, during
12 the fall and during the four-week
13 session. And during the four week
14 session, we met over four weeks, but
15 only four meetings per week. I can
16 tell you that the best learning that
17 I saw in that course was during that
18 four-week compressed session. I
19 think for some courses a compressed
20 calendar is a virtue. It was the
21 only course the students took. They
22 were focused for three hours a day.
23 They didn't even have time to
24 forget. They didn't have time to
25 get distracted, and many of them

1 found that it was a very enjoyable
2 learning experience. I'll be happy
3 to answer any questions you might
4 have. Make them long.

5 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Are there any
6 questions? Joe?

7 SOTTILE: Yeah, Joe Sottile,
8 Engineering. First of all, I've
9 taken three courses when I was in
10 school, each one less than three
11 weeks, and I think it's a great way
12 to learn. I think the fact that you
13 only have one course to focus on is
14 really a plus. So I've kind of
15 experienced it from that end; I
16 haven't taught it. And I suppose I
17 agree that not all courses are
18 suitable for it, but I really think
19 that the majority are. All right?
20 So I think it's great. I do have
21 two questions. One is: Did you do
22 any comparison on the GPA of the
23 students from, say, spring '04
24 versus winter session '04 to see how
25 they performed? And the second

1 thing is: I originally thought that
2 when this was proposed that you had
3 to have fairly large numbers in
4 order to justify doing it, that
5 there was kind of a break-off
6 number. And I saw some of these
7 were much lower than I expected,
8 which might indicate there's more
9 opportunities there than we
10 originally thought.

11 KRAEMER: The first question, no, we
12 didn't compare GPAs. The second, I
13 don't know if Phil has a better
14 answer than what I would give, but I
15 think the goal that our former
16 provost had for this, it was really
17 to provide an opportunity for
18 students to get ahead. And as long
19 as it was a break-even, I think, was
20 the concern. So rather than having
21 the normal limits that are often
22 imposed to do better than break
23 even, there was a willingness to
24 really experiment with this as a
25 pilot program and to see how well --

1 what attraction it would be over a
2 three-year period. Phil, I don't
3 know if you want to embellish that
4 at all.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're absolutely
6 correct. Mike Nietzel, then the
7 Provost, said let's try it; let's
8 see if we can do it. The only
9 directive was not to lose money on
10 it, so you can go with quite small
11 numbers in a class.

12 SOTTILE: What would be the smallest
13 number? I saw five. What's the
14 smallest number we could hope for,
15 for break-even?

16 KRAEMER: Some of these the students may
17 have dropped, so the data are,
18 maybe, a little dirty. Bob.

19 GROSSMAN: Yeah. First of all, very
20 nice assessment, and thank you. I
21 was quite skeptical of the project
22 when it was first proposed, but I
23 think you've done a really nice job
24 of showing that it works. I have a
25 question, though. You mentioned a

1 four-week session, summer session.

2 Is there any reason why that could
3 not be compressed down to three
4 weeks?

5 KRAEMER: I don't -- I don't see any
6 reason why it could not be
7 compressed. Again, for some courses
8 it might not be good. I'd like to
9 get even more radical. I'd like to
10 consider, couldn't we teach some of
11 our courses during fall and spring
12 semester in compressed format?
13 There may be some real virtues to
14 that.

15 GROSSMAN: Some of the language courses
16 already do that, actually.

17 KRAEMER: They do. They do.

18 GROSSMAN: For those of you who aren't
19 aware, some of the 101/102 and
20 201/202 language sequences are
21 taught within a single semester and
22 students -- I call it double-time
23 language. And in this university,
24 my advisees who have taken that said
25 it was great, especially because a

1 lot of them are required to take
2 four semesters of a language, so
3 this compresses that, the amount of
4 time.

5 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Any other question?

6 DEBSKI: Liz Debski, Biology. I'm
7 wondering if you made any assessment
8 about what the requirements for the
9 classes were, so I was struck by
10 that -- that bit about the writing
11 and how pleased they were. But I
12 also know from my own student
13 evaluations that students often
14 answer questions that have nothing
15 to do with the class like, you know,
16 I don't have a recitation, and they
17 go right ahead and answer those
18 questions on those recitations. And
19 so -- and so I'm wondering, you
20 know, were there many writing
21 assignments in these classes?
22 Because like engineering, I saw a
23 lot of engineering statistics.

24 KRAEMER: That was English, ENG.

25 DEBSKI: Oh.

1 did it. Yes. All right. I did
2 decide we do need a motion to
3 receive this report. Senate Council
4 has already received it, so I would
5 like the Senate to formally receive
6 this report. We need a motion.

7 GROSSMAN: So moved, Bob Grossman.

8 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: So we have a second
9 there.

10 WOOD: Right here.

11 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Connie Wood. Any
12 further discussion on this item?
13 All those in favor of receiving this
14 report, please indicate so by
15 raising your hand. Opposed?
16 Abstain? It was unanimous; motion
17 carries. Now, now we are to the
18 business of extending the Winter
19 Intersession pilot. The main reason
20 that we decided not to approve it
21 outright, but rather to extend it --
22 and, please, those of you who are
23 Senate Council members or Phil,
24 correct me if I stray. Today it
25 seems that I have made quite a few

1 mistakes. The reason was apparently
2 these courses were not included in
3 Provost Learning Outcome Assessment,
4 and we would want to have seen these
5 assessments for one cycle of three
6 years before we approve this perhaps
7 permanently. So with -- for that
8 reason, we have recommended that
9 this be approved for another pilot.
10 This particular motion does not
11 require a second because it came
12 from the Senate Council with a
13 positive recommendation, that the
14 Senate approve another three-year
15 pilot of the Winter Intersession for
16 2007/2008, 2008/2009, 2009/2010 and
17 that the courses involved be
18 included in the Provost Learning
19 Outcome Assessment and that such
20 data will be provided to the Senate
21 Council and Senate in time for
22 reapproval. Are there any further
23 discussion on this item? We don't
24 need a motion or a second. It's
25 already -- according to Robert's

1 Rule of Order, it's ready to be
2 voted on. No further discussion?
3 All those in favor, please indicate
4 so by raising your hands. Opposed?
5 Abstain? It's unanimous, and motion
6 carries. One more: Now we need to
7 approve the calendar, and we did say
8 contingent upon your approval. So
9 in case you did not approve the
10 pilot, then this will have been a
11 moot point and we would not have
12 presented it to you. We have the
13 calendar. I trust it's in your
14 handouts. This is coming from
15 Senate Council with a positive
16 recommendation. We don't need a
17 motion for it. Are there any
18 discussion on this calendar? We
19 receive these calendars from the
20 registrar, and it's -- we check it.
21 We expect that you check it. Very
22 rarely we have indicated some
23 corrections here and there, but
24 usually stuff that we see from the
25 very start are perfect. All those

1 in favor of approving the Winter
2 Annual Session 2007/2008 Calendar,
3 please indicate so by raising your
4 hands. Opposed? Abstain? It's
5 unanimous, and the motion carries.
6 Item number nine: If you recall --
7 of course, this is a long history.
8 I'm not going to go over it.
9 Provost Subbaswamy is here, so I
10 don't need to extend this. We have
11 had the external report; we have had
12 the GERA report; and a committee was
13 formed. Originally we expected that
14 perhaps a recommendation might be
15 made this year, but the committee,
16 even though they -- the message was
17 given to them, they realized and
18 they decided that they need extra
19 time and this item needs extra
20 attention. So in view of a proposal
21 in front of you, since this was
22 supposed to be the last meeting of
23 the semester, now we have a progress
24 report, again, by Associate Provost
25 for Undergraduate Education. Please

1 come and give us the progress
2 report.

3 KRAEMER: Well, thank you for having me
4 back so quickly. I'm going to be
5 very quick here. These are the
6 committee members. Some are
7 official committee members and
8 support. Myself; Steve Hoch, Dean
9 of A & S; Nancy Johnson, Business
10 and Economics; Larry Grabau,
11 representing both the Senate Council
12 and College of Agriculture; Kim
13 Anderson, College of Engineering;
14 Richard Greissman, Provost Office;
15 Deb Moore, Director of Assessment;
16 and Jen Skaggs, graduate assistant.
17 All of them are helping us. We've
18 been working very diligently. We're
19 meeting on a schedule designed to
20 meet weekly, but we really reached a
21 point where we recognized that we
22 couldn't bring forth something that
23 was somewhat formed; it had to be in
24 the finalized form. We want to
25 bring to you a proposal that's in

1 explicit, comprehensive detail; and
2 more importantly, we really feel
3 compelled to offer a rationale in
4 terms of a written document that
5 really presents this in a thoughtful
6 way that allows all to view the
7 proposal that we're going to offer
8 in a context, both in terms of the
9 university and the national scene.
10 There is a history that Kaveh
11 referred to. In terms of the
12 steering committee, it was appointed
13 basically to take the white paper
14 that the Provost distributed to the
15 faculty as a beginning point and to
16 incorporate the feedback from all
17 faculty who chose to provide
18 feedback. And there was quite a bit
19 of feedback for us to work with,
20 both from individuals and in some
21 cases it was representing curriculum
22 committees and departments, etc.,
23 very thoughtful feedback. Some of
24 it ranged from very brief accolades
25 to not so brief, not so accolade.

1 But it's important to really respond
2 to that feedback. In addition, the
3 group has been diligent in trying to
4 regard the national dialogue that is
5 moving ahead in terms of reform of
6 general education and to mold all of
7 that information into a concrete
8 proposal that would bring forth to
9 this body a framework that really
10 points to a curriculum. And to do
11 that, we really need a bit more
12 time. We're going to continue to
13 work over the summer. We're hoping
14 to incorporate some views of more
15 faculty in this phase and then bring
16 to you, early in the fall semester,
17 a very detailed proposal. I will
18 share with you a list of the
19 principles that we have been
20 emphasizing in our discussions.
21 Some of these were emphasized in the
22 white paper itself; some may be
23 new. The goal is about educational
24 enrichment to improve general
25 education for our students and for

1 this university. We're looking at
2 better preparation for citizenship
3 and living in a flat world. Some of
4 you may be uncomfortable with the
5 Friedman reference, but the reality
6 is that our students are going to
7 enter a very complicated world, a
8 world that's changing very quickly,
9 a dynamic world, and they have to be
10 prepared for that. They have to be
11 more flexible than students may have
12 been in the past. They have to have
13 nimble minds, ready to encounter
14 uncertainty. We have to recognize
15 the constraints under which we
16 operate. Some of those are fiscal
17 constraints, resources. Constraints
18 include enrollment pressures, but
19 the context is also important: The
20 context of our Top 20 aspirations,
21 the national context, the intense
22 scrutiny that is being given to
23 higher education as exemplified by
24 The Spellings Report. We are aiming
25 to provide a general education

1 curriculum that begins to introduce
2 students to scholarship, that rely
3 allows to us provide a kind of
4 education that truly only is
5 available at a research university.
6 So they really begin to appreciate
7 what defines this institution: That
8 all the faculty are engaged in some
9 form of scholarship. And the
10 students really need to be
11 introduced to that, both in terms of
12 inspiration, but also in terms of
13 what they really need to learn in
14 order to face the world ahead. We
15 want to emphasize assessment. We
16 think it's imperative that we be
17 able to define what the outcomes of
18 this curriculum will be, and we have
19 to be able to measure those
20 outcomes. That has not been the
21 case with the existing USP. There
22 is a practical desire to decrease
23 the number of credit hours
24 associated with the general
25 education curriculum. We want to

1 place an emphasis on inquiry and
2 problem-solving rather than content-
3 based survey courses. This is part
4 of the ambition in having students
5 prepared for a world of uncertainty,
6 a world where they may change jobs
7 three or four times within the first
8 five years upon graduation. And
9 it's more important that they be
10 able to retrain, learn, teach
11 themselves, than necessarily to
12 retain specific content. Now, we're
13 not giving up on content,
14 obviously. We want to emphasize the
15 development of evidence-based
16 thinking. It really is imperative
17 that any graduate of this
18 institution understands what's going
19 on in the debate between intelligent
20 design and evolution, that it's not
21 about which belief is correct; it's
22 really about how do those beliefs
23 develop. What's different about
24 scientific inquiry from other forms
25 of inquiry? And I'm not convinced

1 that our students necessarily get
2 that by dipping their toes twice
3 into the natural science pond, twice
4 into the social science, and twice
5 into the humanities pond, which is
6 the nature of our existing USP. We
7 want better integration of cognitive
8 skills, skills that can be practiced
9 throughout their experience here
10 within the majors themselves. Some
11 of the best learning for some of
12 these skills will be embedded in the
13 major, including writing, world
14 communication, quantitative skills.
15 Certainly information literacy is
16 becoming a paramount concern, and
17 very often the best practice for
18 that is going to be within the
19 major. So we want to avoid this
20 distinction between general
21 education and the major. We want to
22 think about quantitative reasoning
23 in a way that meets general
24 education goals, not necessarily
25 preparing students for the next math

1 course if they're going to pursue a
2 career in the STEM disciplines. We
3 have to find a way of really
4 redefining quantitative skills. We
5 want to consider a program that's
6 not confined to the first two years,
7 to take advantage, again, of being
8 able to get more from the majors
9 with respect to general education.
10 And we certainly want to include
11 enhanced pedagogy as part of what we
12 want to present to you, not just a
13 new curriculum, but a new way of
14 teaching, a new way of students
15 learning that is really a part of
16 something that will be quite
17 special. And finally, we want to
18 ensure that the responsibility for
19 general education is distributed
20 over more of the undergraduate
21 colleges and ideally all the
22 colleges so that we don't put the
23 extreme onus on one or two
24 colleges. Much of this is easier to
25 say than to do, but with enough

1 commitment that we have on the
2 committee, we're going to work very
3 hard to draft a compelling argument
4 for you to look at. I'm pleased
5 with the progress we've made. I do
6 want to thank all of you for the
7 thoughtful feedback you've
8 provided. We've been at this a long
9 time, and we hope to be able to
10 bring something worthy of that
11 investment done. And that's that.

12 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Thank you, professor
13 Kraemer. Please don't go too far.
14 Are there any questions for our
15 Associate Provost on this item?
16 Okay. Then what I'd like to suggest
17 is, similarly, I need a motion on
18 that. I'd like to recommend that
19 the Senate receive the USP Report,
20 Steering Committee Progress Report.

21 YANARELLA: So moved, Ernie Yanarella.

22 BOLLINGER: Second, Chris Bollinger.

23 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Is there any
24 discussion? All those in favor of
25 this motion, please indicate so by

1 raising your hands. Opposed?
2 Abstain? It's unanimous, and motion
3 carries. Okay. The next item is
4 the State of Academic Affairs
5 Address. I hope you could make this
6 a tradition which should have been
7 here maybe in the past. If you
8 recall, on the first meeting of the
9 year, we have the President; we have
10 the pleasure of having the President
11 here to give us the State of the
12 University Address. I think it is
13 equally befitting to have the last
14 item, for our Provost to give the
15 State of the Academic Affairs
16 Address. Swamy, please. Thank you
17 for coming sooner. I know how
18 precious your time. If my paycheck
19 could cover this coming couple of
20 minutes sooner, I am willing to. I
21 also want to make sure if Swamy
22 noticed that I have started using
23 the title Professor for Associate
24 Provost and the Provost. So even
25 though the HR doesn't consider the

1 deans and the Provost faculty and
2 they consider them staff, the Senate
3 and the Senators consider them
4 faculty. Did you notice that,
5 Swamy?

6 SUBBASWAMY: I did.

7 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Should I repeat it?

8 SUBBASWAMY: One more time.

9 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Professor.

10 SUBBASWAMY: Professor. That's what my
11 business card says.

12 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Exactly. That's also
13 true.

14 (SOTTO VOCE DISCUSSION.)

15 SUBBASWAMY: Isn't it a beautiful
16 campus? I think it is. Certainly
17 coming back nine years later, I
18 really think the campus has gotten
19 prettier. Those of you who have
20 just been here may not think so, but
21 there are a lot of uglier campuses;
22 believe me. Purdue, for example.
23 The Academic State of Affairs
24 Address sounds too formal. Those of
25 you who know me know that I don't

1 have a formal bone in me, so it will
2 be difficult for me to act very
3 dignified and give an address, so I
4 hope it's a conversation among
5 colleagues. Also, I suppose the
6 normal expectation, at least on the
7 part of the provosts, is that this
8 will be a time to brag about all the
9 wonderful things I have done and
10 show how my resume building is
11 working. But I hate to tell you I
12 will disappoint you and present some
13 challenges, and that's really the
14 emphasis of what I want to do here.
15 Wrong one. Left hand doesn't mean
16 that you press the left. Oh, here
17 we go. The first thing I want to do
18 is tell you that the business plan
19 funding model represents a
20 fundamental change in how the
21 university relates to the
22 legislature, to the Council on
23 Postsecondary Education. So whatever
24 else you may or may not think about
25 the business plan, the Top 20 and

1 all this, however cynical your
2 approach, I want you to understand
3 that the budgetary significance
4 should not be underestimated. It
5 just changes the nature of the
6 conversation. And I haven't taught
7 a physics class in a long time, so I
8 love writing equations. So the
9 prior approach was to say that
10 whatever money is left over after
11 you subtract mandated expenses,
12 utilities, and whatever else the
13 state might mandate that we spend
14 from revenue available, and revenue
15 available in general funds means two
16 things. One is however much the
17 state might give us by way of
18 increment and whatever tuition
19 increase -- tuition rate increase
20 might be allowed in conversation
21 with the Board of Trustees and the
22 legislature and so forth and the
23 Council on Postsecondary Education
24 in particular, and so whatever is
25 left is what's available for salary

1 pool and program enhancement. And
2 if mandated expenses either exceed
3 or equal revenue available, then you
4 can figure out what happens to the
5 equation. And that's typically what
6 has been the, I think, situation,
7 especially in the last few years at
8 the University of Kentucky. The
9 business plan approach starts from
10 the premise that there was a House
11 Bill 1 mandate that says we're
12 supposed to attain a Top 20 status
13 among colleges and universities, and
14 much as one might disagree with the
15 methodology, use some methodology,
16 come up with a price tag, and say:
17 Here's the price tag; here's how
18 much money is needed over a certain
19 period of time. And therefore, the
20 actual revenue request, then, is
21 mandated expenses plus the Top 20
22 investment pool, which consists of
23 salary pool and program
24 enhancement. And so it changes the
25 equation and puts the legislature in

1 a sense on the defensive because you
2 gave us a mandate and give us the
3 price tag, and this is how our
4 request is composed. And in
5 addition to that, an easy cheat
6 sheet for the legislature that says
7 this is how much money we need,
8 according to what you told us to do;
9 and therefore, you have a graph that
10 says -- yeah, there we go -- that
11 says that, depending on how much the
12 state legislature is willing to
13 give -- this was for the 2007, 2006,
14 2008 biannual -- said depending on
15 how much money you're willing to
16 give us, the tuition rate would be
17 correspondingly lower. You give us
18 more money; the tuition rate's
19 lower. And in fact, where we ended
20 up for 2007 was the state agreed to
21 give us about 18 million dollars,
22 and we agreed that the tuition raise
23 and fees would be about 9 percent.
24 And in fact, if they wanted the
25 tuition rate would be lower, all

1 they have to do is give us more
2 money. It makes it very simple
3 calculus. So I think it's really,
4 as I said, fundamentally takes the
5 Top 20 mandate from House Bill 1 in
6 1997 and turns it into something
7 concrete in a way in which the
8 conversation with the Council on
9 Postsecondary Education and the
10 legislature changes. And that
11 victory, for the biennium we're in,
12 even though the money really only
13 came in, in the second year of the
14 biennium, I think it's a critical
15 victory. And if we can sustain that
16 going forward over seven biennia, we
17 will have made tremendous progress
18 in pushing this tuition and its
19 benefits to the Commonwealth
20 significantly higher. Even without
21 the full business plan funding,
22 there's been a lot of progress, and
23 that's really a testament to the
24 faculty of this university.
25 Whatever else the limitations we may

1 have in achieving Top 20 status,
2 faculty talent and faculty
3 determination is not among those.
4 They're just outstanding faculty,
5 and the most recent evidence perhaps
6 is the Guggenheim Awards to
7 Professor Zunshine and Professor
8 Little in English and Anthropology,
9 respectively, and the Burroughs
10 Wellcome clinician award for
11 Dr. Ambati in Ophthalmology is
12 another example. These are simply
13 the highest levels of recognition
14 any faculty could get anywhere. And
15 if you look at the list of
16 institutions where these awards,
17 especially multiple Guggenheims and
18 things like that have gone, they are
19 the usual suspects among top
20 universities, and we are keeping
21 company with those, thanks to the
22 hard work of the faculty. The
23 talent is there. It's really a
24 question of other limitations that
25 we have to overcome. Apart from

1 that, here are some of the things
2 that have taken place in conjunction
3 with the business plan, I'm
4 thinking, at least. Initial step
5 toward faculty salary catch-up, and
6 market end catch-up is really how we
7 have to come at it because salaries
8 are stagnating, and that happened in
9 January. Faculty hiring catch-up to
10 cover prior enrollment growth. I
11 have more to say about this. So
12 there were 54 new general-fund
13 supported faculty lines that were
14 allocated and primarily to address
15 the prior enrollment growth. But of
16 course, obviously that also leads to
17 research enhancement because these
18 are always attached to faculty that
19 we've been recruiting. Economic
20 budget has been put on more robust
21 footing. In the last several years,
22 because of the flatness of the state
23 budget and so forth, a lot of things
24 that should have been covered on a
25 recurring budget were covered with

1 just fund balances on a nonrecurring
2 basis. And that's a precarious way
3 for the university to do business
4 and really makes planning very
5 difficult, and that has been taken
6 account -- taken care of. The
7 campus strategic plan was completed
8 that tries to translate the Top 20
9 Business Plan into an academic
10 plan. And based on that, the
11 colleges were called upon to update
12 and in some instances, perhaps,
13 develop strategic plans. And they
14 have been drafted, and I truly
15 appreciate the good work of the
16 faculty in doing this in time. And
17 they're currently under review, and
18 over the summer the deans and the
19 provost staff and other bodies will
20 get together and try to give
21 feedback to the colleges in terms of
22 perhaps some interlinkages among
23 different college strategic plans
24 and some campus-wide priorities that
25 might be established. Associate

1 Provost for Faculty Affairs Office
2 has been established, and I think
3 ours was critically needed. As I
4 said, the greatest strength we have
5 is faculty; any university does.
6 And we have been talking about
7 significant expansion of the
8 faculty. And so from recruitment to
9 work conditions to compensation to
10 issues to mentoring, I think we
11 really need to have a concerted
12 effort in that regard and examine a
13 lot of the ways we have done
14 business, perhaps do things better,
15 in concert with Top 20 aspirations.
16 And so that office and Dr. Heidi
17 Anderson, the Associate Provost for
18 Faculty Affairs, will be paying a
19 lot of attention to that. Research
20 administration is being streamlined,
21 and I think that formally reporting
22 (unintelligible) have changed, and
23 that really doesn't lead to
24 significant complications from the
25 trenches, but I think one important

1 example that I definitely can
2 mention to you is that for those of
3 you who are either department chairs
4 or associate deans, you will have
5 noticed that we have gone to a
6 one-stop shopping for startup costs
7 negotiations. So it's no longer
8 going here and there, but in the
9 office of the Vice President for
10 Research, the entire discussion
11 takes place. And then we work as
12 one administration rather than two
13 or three different administrations.
14 Diversity efforts are being
15 refocused and expanded. There's a
16 lot of confusion about who is in
17 charge of what and some
18 disagreements, but many of those
19 things have been ironed out. And
20 we're in the process of searching
21 for a Vice President for
22 Institutional Diversity, but in the
23 meantime we're also integrating a
24 lot of our diversity functions with
25 academic functions in general and

1 recruiting functions for general
2 student body, consistent with the
3 Michigan ruling, but also in a way
4 to serve all of our students of all
5 backgrounds better. You've heard
6 about the progress on GERA/USP
7 reform effort. What Professor Phil
8 Kraemer did not tell you is that
9 they have a deadline for presenting
10 a concrete curriculum for discussion
11 to the full faculty body, and that's
12 in fact the beginning of the fall
13 semester. So this development has
14 to take place through the faculty
15 committee we will appoint -- you and
16 I need to talk about that -- during
17 the summer and then will be expected
18 to actually bring something forward
19 in the fall semester. I appointed
20 Retention/Graduation Work Group in
21 order to look at our graduation
22 rates, and I'll have a lot more to
23 say about this. And this is really
24 the issue that I think we need to
25 address collectively as an

1 institution, and we're beginning to
2 implement some of that.
3 Recommendations on the Committee for
4 Research and Analysis of Success of
5 African-American Students at UK is
6 being implemented. This is a
7 committee that was appointed last
8 year as a result of some of the
9 recruitment failures we had as well
10 as there is, in fact, a graduation
11 rate differential between our
12 regular student body and then
13 minority student body. And
14 therefore, there was a really very
15 high-powered committee that looked
16 at what are the factors and then
17 have made recommendations to address
18 those, and that committee is still
19 working to do further research and
20 analysis. Student recruitment,
21 admissions and financial aid office
22 is being revamped and strengthened,
23 and I'll have a little more to say
24 about why that is. Next, talk about
25 Top 20 percent. Again, we can have

1 a lot of arguments and debates about
2 whether these measures that were
3 adopted by the university as a part
4 of the Top 20 Business Plan backdrop
5 really make sense. Are they
6 comprehensive? Are they the right
7 kinds of things? Are they all
8 outcome/output measures? Are they
9 mostly input measures? One can have
10 all kinds of debates. But if you
11 say that we want measures that are
12 based on nationally available data,
13 readily available data and readily
14 accepted data and so forth, they're
15 really quite limited in what you can
16 actually tap and which are regularly
17 updated. Remember, all of these
18 requirements will be necessary. If
19 you use all of those things, then
20 it'll be -- you'll be hard-pressed
21 to come up with a whole bunch of
22 different measures; but again, these
23 are flawed, and I acknowledge that
24 from the outset. But nonetheless,
25 at least for the near term, until we

1 complete our strategic planning
2 documents and come back with a more
3 comprehensive set of measures, this
4 is what we're stuck with. And we,
5 therefore, will be updating them and
6 show our position with regard to
7 other -- other research
8 universities. There are 90 of them,
9 so for your basis, when you show the
10 rankings, there are about 90 of
11 them, and the rankings will be with
12 regard to those 90 institutions. So
13 there are four domains:
14 Undergraduate Education, Graduate
15 Education -- I wish it were Graduate
16 and Professional Education, but
17 unfortunately the way it was adopted
18 is in terms of Graduate Education
19 because doctorates granted is one of
20 the numbers that's readily used in
21 many of the rankings. And Faculty
22 Recognition, Citations and Awards,
23 again, lots of things that are wrong
24 with just using citations. American
25 Analytics productivity measure had

1 not been put forward at the time,
2 and maybe as years go, one might
3 adopt those. Then research, of
4 course, you count dollars, and
5 that's sort of the easiest thing to
6 do, but that's not, obviously, the
7 best way of getting at the full
8 picture of research productivity and
9 research impact of any institution.
10 Acknowledging all of those, these
11 are clearly the nine measures that
12 the university currently operates
13 with. The SAT/ACT scores baseline
14 is the 2004 data, which was
15 presented in the analysis of the
16 budget plan, and then the spring
17 2007 update comes from all the
18 updated information reported for all
19 institutions, which some of them are
20 2005 data, I have to tell you; some
21 are 2006 data. But here are the
22 updates. So we were ranked 47th at
23 the baseline, and this is, of
24 course, before a dollar -- a penny
25 of any business plan funding has

1 actually gone into effect. So even
2 the 54 faculty lines, recruitment
3 has just been completed or is still
4 going on. Not all the faculty are
5 here, and we haven't been able to
6 see the impact. Georgia held 20th
7 when that baseline comparison was
8 done, ACT score of -- SAT of 1193;
9 we were at 1128. Kentucky remains
10 at 47th. There's movement.
11 Obviously, Georgia moved up a little
12 bit to the 20th place among public
13 research universities, and there is
14 a gap in terms of the student
15 profile. Student-to-faculty ratio,
16 we went from 17 to 18 and lost from
17 35th to 45th, slipped; and again,
18 this was at a time when
19 undergraduate enrollment grew by
20 about 2,000, not just in that period
21 but substantially without any
22 faculty being added. And, again,
23 there are things about these kinds
24 of rankings that we want to talk
25 about. This actually rounds the

1 numbers. The decimals aren't
2 capped, so if you're at 17.4, you're
3 17; if you're at 17.6, you're 18.
4 They're all bunched up, and so I
5 wouldn't take this terribly
6 seriously for the following reason:
7 It's a very coarse number. Just
8 take total head count divided by the
9 total faculty head count, and there
10 you are. That doesn't really tell
11 you what goes on in the different
12 classrooms, but this is how U.S.
13 News & World Report, among others,
14 reports student/faculty ratios, and
15 caveat emptor is all I have to say.
16 Six-year graduation rate, and this
17 is one that I really want to focus
18 on; I'll come back towards the end
19 of the talk. We were at 59.6
20 percent six-year graduation rate,
21 and this is a standard way in which,
22 nationally, numbers are measured and
23 reported. You take a cohort and six
24 years later ask, of the first-time
25 college students, how many have

1 graduated from your institution.
2 That's the standard measure. You
3 can argue about whether that's the
4 best measure, but that's the
5 standard measure that's used
6 nationally and will become a part
7 of, I'm sure, any kind of federal
8 accountability measures in addition
9 to other things. So we have to pay
10 attention to this whether we agree
11 with it or not. And that's the best
12 sort of outcomes measure we have at
13 this point, until a learning
14 outcomes measurement becomes
15 something that everyone adopts and
16 agrees on a methodology. The 20th
17 position is held by Clemson at 72.4
18 percent, so we're talking about a
19 12-percent or bigger than 12-percent
20 difference. That, in fact, changed
21 to where we have about 59.8. That
22 has climbed further in the latest
23 numbers that I'll show you. Clemson
24 held the 20th position, but their
25 graduation rate went up to 75.1

1 percent. And all the others that
2 you think of, the Michigans and
3 UCLAs and so forth, are much
4 higher. So that's the one place
5 where we look really, really bad in
6 terms of where we are, and it's the
7 hardest one to tackle. Doctorates
8 granted, we -- again, a lot of these
9 things don't really normalize for
10 faculty size and so forth. And so I
11 think until we grow to the size that
12 we think we're going to grow to,
13 we're going to stay somewhere in
14 these neighborhoods and not much you
15 can say. In terms of faculty
16 citations, there are other ways for
17 us to really verify that we have a
18 very productive faculty, and I think
19 it's a matter of simply supporting
20 them while hiring more faculty. And
21 I'm not -- there's not much else to
22 say there because, again, there's a
23 size effect that distorts some of
24 those things. Federal research --
25 skipped over one, but that's okay.

1 We were at 35th at 100 million
2 dollars of federal research dollars,
3 contracts. Florida was 20th at 167
4 million at that point, and the
5 latest comparison says we have moved
6 to 33rd at 130 million dollars but
7 210 for the 20th place holder;
8 that's Iowa. So the gap, in fact,
9 has grown significantly. You know,
10 everybody else isn't just sitting
11 around on their laurels. They're
12 also going in for additional faculty
13 expansion as well as additional
14 dollars, so this is not going to be
15 easy. There are facilities issues,
16 lots of challenges to talk about
17 some other time. Nonfederal
18 research, as a land grant
19 institution especially, we do a lot
20 of research that's for funds that
21 come from the state as well as other
22 agencies. And on that score, I
23 think we do quite well as a land
24 grant institution, rank 21st. I
25 want to also point out that when our

1 research dollars have grown,
2 obviously, and we're thankful to the
3 faculty for the hard work that that
4 represents; therefore, overhead
5 dollars grow. What happens to
6 that? Well, you have to invest more
7 and more of that into faculty
8 startup costs; and again, during in
9 the same period you can see that our
10 startup cost, investment coming out
11 of the Vice President for Research
12 Office has gone from about a million
13 and a half to almost a little over 8
14 million dollars in the most recent
15 year. So all of -- a lot of that
16 money simply has had to be put back
17 into investing in startup costs for
18 new faculty hires. Hiring in
19 chemistry, a topnotch assistant
20 professor can cost somewhere in 6-
21 to 700,000 dollars these days. All
22 right. Now I come to the retention
23 and six-year graduation rate. It's
24 a little busy graph. Bear with me.
25 The red, orange, whatever color

1 graph there represents the first
2 year/second year retention, starting
3 from about 1988 here all the way to
4 2003. The yellow line here
5 represents the six-year graduation
6 rate for cohorts that were
7 graduating in 1990 and so on. That
8 is so when you see this -- I'm
9 sorry. This is for the cohort that
10 graduated in 2003, which means this
11 is the class that entered in 1997,
12 the six-year graduation rate. So
13 what's plotted here in this graph
14 will get even more confusing on the
15 next one -- I apologize -- is that
16 this is the year of graduation,
17 which means if you want to look at
18 where the cohort was, that was six
19 years earlier. And I pointed out
20 that -- so there are lots of
21 questions. You look at this sort of
22 a graph and say what happened
23 that -- whether in the six years
24 preceding 1997, from '91 to '97 and
25 even thereafter, that our graduation

1 rate really shot up from 48.1
2 percent all the way straight to 61
3 percent. What miraculous things did
4 we do? How good were we that in
5 fact that came about, or was it
6 something about the student body?
7 You can ask a lot of questions. I
8 don't have an answer. We're working
9 on this. There are lots of
10 different things that were done. UK
11 101 was introduced. Central
12 advising was put in. Living-
13 learning communities were started.
14 Discovery seminars were expanded,
15 various other things. So all we can
16 say -- and also some other things we
17 ruled out easily. The class size
18 remained about the same, so it's not
19 that the class size declined. The
20 quality of the students as measured
21 by average ACT or high school GPAs
22 really didn't change very much
23 across that period. So it wasn't
24 the size of the class; it was not
25 the quality of the entering class,

1 but something else that was done
2 right, and a lot of times it's just
3 paying attention. I don't know if
4 there's a Malthus effect or
5 something like that. Somebody did
6 an experiment in which, if you just
7 observe something for a while, then
8 things improve for a short period of
9 time. I don't know if that is what
10 transpired here, but I think we
11 really need to try to understand
12 and, in fact, invite senators and
13 faculty at large to really think
14 about these issues and see what we
15 might have done and what we might
16 learn from this. This is really the
17 graduation rate in the more recent,
18 and what I'm plotting here on the
19 right hand, on the X axis, is the
20 year of entry rather than year of
21 graduation, so my explanation is
22 very simple. I left in 1997, and
23 things have been downhill ever
24 since. And now that I'm back, we
25 don't need to do anything else. You

1 know, this is back to that same
2 graph. The 61 is there, and since
3 then it's been declined, flat, and
4 declining. So this is really the
5 class that graduated last fall.
6 This is the class that graduated in
7 2006, and that decline is certainly
8 headed the wrong way for Top 20
9 contention with the Top 12, the fact
10 that we have to reach 75 to catch
11 up. This to me, apart from space
12 for research purposes, is the
13 greatest challenge. For at least
14 space, we know we have to go beg,
15 borrow, steal money here. It's not
16 clear what steps you must take to
17 turn that around, and I think that
18 that to us is the greatest
19 challenge. Certainly for my office
20 it's going to be the greatest
21 challenge, to try to understand and
22 see what can my office do in
23 collaboration with the deans, the
24 chairs and the faculty at large and
25 Vice President for Student Affairs,

1 all of these affairs. And in this
2 regard, some things you can rule
3 out. If you look at, again, our
4 retention rate is about 78 percent,
5 77 percent, which is at least 10
6 percentage points lower than the Top
7 20 Universities. If you look at who
8 left UK after their first year --
9 this is from the most recent cohort
10 or I don't know if it's a
11 combination -- is that not everyone
12 who left, left because they were in
13 poor academic standing. About half
14 of them were in good academic
15 standing when they left. So you
16 can't simply dismiss this by saying,
17 well, they just weren't doing well
18 and they were partying. Maybe they
19 were partying, but they were in good
20 standing. Then this is graduation
21 rates by ACT score ranges from 1995
22 to 1999 cohorts combined. And what
23 I want to point out here is that
24 even for the 28 and over ACT cohort,
25 it's about -- it's less than 70

1 percent. And then if you come to
2 the 25 to 27 ACT, it's really still
3 pathetically bad. And again, I want
4 to point out that if you look at
5 some of the details, including the
6 rankings in ACT scores where we were
7 45th versus graduation rate, we were
8 54th, you can't explain everything
9 by simply saying we have -- we're
10 admitting a lot of poorly qualified
11 students. I think even in terms of
12 the better-prepared students, if in
13 fact this is a measure of
14 preparation -- that's subject to
15 argument -- we are failing them, and
16 we're not quite producing the same
17 results as our benchmark
18 institutions. There lies a big
19 challenge for us. So the
20 recommendations so far in the first
21 report that has come, again, you
22 know, these are all fairly standard
23 things that any report you could
24 look back and go back five years,
25 ten years, twenty years and find

1 these things. The difference is
2 we're actually going to act on
3 these. Take steps to recruit
4 better-prepared students:
5 Obviously, that's an ongoing battle,
6 more easily said than done. In this
7 day and age, you essentially have to
8 buy the better-prepared students in
9 public universities. Everyone is
10 basically given free rides and all
11 sorts of perks to bring better-
12 qualified students. So it's a
13 vicious cycle in that your
14 reputation has to improve in order
15 for you to recruit a whole class of
16 better-qualified students, and that
17 won't improve until you start
18 admitting more better-qualified
19 students. Breaking that and the
20 amount of money you spend for your
21 scholarships increase, but also
22 marketing and the high-touch, as
23 they say. The better-qualified
24 students, you have to make ten
25 different phone calls and make them

1 want to come to UK. And there are a
2 lot of things that a lot of us can
3 do. I think that this is where
4 invoking the wonderful faculty we
5 have and having them get involved in
6 the recruitment effort of better-
7 qualified students, those that we
8 have admitted, increasing the yield
9 of the better-qualified students and
10 so forth is a part of what we're
11 going to have to do as a community.
12 Enhance professional academic
13 advising and academic intervention:
14 You know, again, the Senate can be
15 very helpful because we have, I
16 think, several rule changes we've
17 asked for. Let's say you have a
18 mid-term exam and you've discovered
19 that your first-year students aren't
20 doing well. Then what interventions
21 can take place, and is there time
22 enough for an advising session to
23 take place and say maybe you ought
24 to drop one of these course, for
25 example, you've taken on too much.

1 And in order to do that, you need a
2 withdrawal time frame that allows
3 that to happen. I think that's one
4 of the proposals in front of you.
5 So it really will take a collective
6 effort of all of us to make some of
7 these changes, increasing
8 (unintelligible) sections and so
9 forth, and I won't go into all of
10 those, but the point is that we
11 certainly have some evidence for
12 each of these things, that this is
13 probably the most important things
14 or the urgent things that we can
15 actually take -- implement. The
16 budget request that I'm putting
17 forward for the FYOH budget for the
18 coming year, in fact, reflects some
19 of these priorities from the Top 20
20 Business Plan as well as the
21 imperative that I mentioned.
22 Certainly faculty salary catch-up is
23 going to be a continuing issue for
24 us. Additional faculty, we will --
25 on top of the 54, we will add 20

1 additional lines, and they will be
2 allocated according to these Top 20
3 priorities. Increasing student
4 recruitment and admissions budget,
5 it's way underbudgeted. There are
6 lots of ways of measuring that. A
7 lot more money spent for students,
8 et cetera, and we've had growth as
9 well, and so we need to catch up on
10 that. Hiring additional
11 professional advisors, increase both
12 advising and interventions,
13 increasing graduate assistance, that
14 pertains to our graduate mandate and
15 graduate measures, so that's a
16 separate item. We'll work on that.
17 Supporting education abroad and
18 international recruiting, we need to
19 get started on that because
20 recruiting really top-quality
21 undergraduate students requires that
22 you have really outstanding programs
23 of all sorts, and that's got to be a
24 part of the effort. And operating
25 expenses, we have to catch up. As

1 we have grown, we haven't caught up
2 on operating expenses. Those are
3 the priorities. The importance of
4 integration and coordination: I
5 think an undergraduate education,
6 more so than in professional
7 education or in doctoral education,
8 it's a collective effort. The
9 metaphor of assembly line, you can
10 use; if you don't like it, use some
11 other metaphor. It's really each
12 station says: I'm doing a wonderful
13 job of teaching my civics class; I'm
14 doing a wonderful job of teaching my
15 English classes and so forth. But
16 the product that comes out at the
17 end isn't clearly either good enough
18 or many of the product items are
19 dropping off the assembly line. So
20 it really requires a collective
21 effort, coordinated effort, and it
22 really takes the whole campus. I
23 really think you can't simply say
24 this is somebody's problem, somebody
25 else's problem. It really takes the

1 whole campus. And why should
2 everyone care about undergraduate
3 education? And I want to point out
4 that this is a question that came up
5 in one of the strategic planning
6 open forums I held. You know, can't
7 we just simply (unintelligible) all
8 our graduate students and then have
9 a wonderful Top 20 institution. The
10 answer is no, but more recent
11 history demonstrates why that is
12 simply comical and why, going back,
13 the University of Michigan has
14 45,000 students and University of
15 California has 40,000 students and
16 so forth, undergraduate students,
17 mostly. Why is it that the Top 20
18 public institutions are large?
19 There's a secret to how there are no
20 undergraduates (inaudible),
21 especially parents of
22 undergraduates. What I show here is
23 at UK, the panel on the left shows
24 the growth in undergraduate head
25 count from 2002 to 2007 -- 2006.

1 These are fiscal years, so fall 2006
2 numbers, and that growth is about
3 2,100. There's been rapid growth in
4 our undergraduate enrollment in this
5 period of time. What the panel on
6 the right shows is the top graph
7 shows the state appropriation during
8 that same period for the University
9 of Kentucky, and this bottom line
10 graph here shows you tuition
11 revenue. Okay? At a time when
12 there was in fact both a decline and
13 just a flat, stagnant state support
14 during those six years, we have --
15 the University of Kentucky has grown
16 undergraduate enrollment and thereby
17 provided the revenue necessary for
18 running the university because it's
19 just a simple cost from year to year
20 of turning on light and perhaps
21 giving small percentage salary
22 increases that you received has come
23 out of that. That's not what I
24 meant to do, so go back to
25 previous. All right. Left hand,

1 not good left-handed.

2 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Previous.

3 SUBBASWAMY: Previous. There you go.

4 And so if you look at the numbers,
5 the tuition revenue during that
6 period has increased by 192 million
7 dollars or about 150 percent of what
8 it was in 2002. Since '02 our state
9 appropriation has been flat or in
10 decline. The increase in
11 undergraduate enrollment and revenue
12 has kept the entire university,
13 except for the clinical and hospital
14 enterprise, afloat during this
15 period of decline and stagnation.
16 In terms of the tuition revenue,
17 only about 10 percent is from the
18 professional schools. 90 percent is
19 from all the colleges that have
20 undergraduate programs. And so this
21 is in fact also the secret for why
22 Michigan is 45,000, Florida is
23 55,000 students, and so forth. It
24 is in fact an overall revenue
25 enhancement that helps. This also

1 shows the imperative that we do well
2 by our undergraduates. We
3 absolutely owe them for increasing
4 enrollment where we haven't added
5 faculty, we haven't added student
6 support, we haven't added anything
7 in the last four or five years. And
8 that's the reason that 40 of the 54
9 faculty that were added went to the
10 undergraduate colleges, because the
11 brunt of running the university, the
12 cost of living increases and so
13 forth, has been borne by our
14 undergraduate students, and we have
15 way far to go by way of reaching
16 student success rates, graduation
17 rates, retention rates, and of
18 course quality enhancement in
19 general that goes with that in order
20 to achieve that. So that's really
21 sort of my take-home message is that
22 we all have tremendous challenges in
23 front of us. There's capital
24 projects that I have not talked
25 about, maybe another occasion. But

1 as I said, there it's a matter of
2 bold strategy and lobbying and
3 private fundraising and so forth.
4 This is a much tougher nut to crack,
5 and it will take the whole campus.
6 And it's retentions, so the fact
7 that we're spending money on that,
8 everyone should support this.
9 Regardless of whether you are in a
10 professional school only or you're
11 on this side of the campus, you must
12 understand the basis for why this
13 investment needs to be made, what
14 has happened, and what's at stake.
15 The overall reputation of the
16 institution and your own corner of
17 the world will depend on the overall
18 reputation of our undergraduate
19 program as it applies to U.S. News &
20 World ranking, et cetera, as well.
21 So with that --

22 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: We appreciate it. Are
23 there any questions? Over here,
24 yes.

25 THELIN: John Thelin, Educational Policy

1 Studies. In your original
2 equations, comparing the old with
3 the new, the tendency is to put the
4 burden on state funding. But in
5 fact, compared to our benchmark
6 institutions, we do very well.
7 Kentucky is not a wealthy state, and
8 yet if you look at per capita
9 subsidies from the state, if our
10 faculty salaries ranked as high on
11 that list as they do on the per
12 capita subsidies to students, you'd
13 be very, very happy. We usually
14 rank about fourth or fifth among
15 20. Also, if you look at the state
16 funding as a percentage of the
17 overall university budget, UK is
18 treated quite, quite well compared
19 to our benchmark institutions. So I
20 think there's -- although that's
21 interesting on a new approach to put
22 this wishful thinking and put the
23 burden on the state, that's a
24 request; that's not a calculation.
25 That's really wishful thinking in

1 part. So my point --

2 SUBBASWAMY: Do you want a response?

3 No.

4 THELIN: Fine. But there's no mention,
5 for example, of private fundraising,
6 which I would argue is where most of
7 the flagship state universities have
8 really had a margin of excellence
9 that sets them apart. And they know
10 that there will be less dependency
11 on state funding, and they look to
12 other sources. And it's largely
13 part of fundraising, yet no mention
14 of that in our plans.

15 SUBBASWAMY: No, that's not true.

16 THELIN: Well, I mean in your
17 presentation.

18 SUBBASWAMY: Not in my presentation. I
19 was not presenting the whole
20 business plan. I was talking about
21 just the piece that pertains to what
22 we asked from the state and what we
23 get. If you look at the business
24 plan, it in fact says 40 percent of
25 what is needed to attain Top 20

1 status will come from self-generated
2 funds, and it also has a significant
3 component that is to come from
4 private fundraising. And in fact,
5 UK is having tremendous success in
6 private fundraising. One thing
7 about it is that those institutions
8 which started down this path,
9 started fundraising in the '60s and
10 '70s are way ahead, where their
11 endowments are now producing the
12 revenue, the income that's actually
13 subsidizing what goes on, whereas a
14 lot of the benefits for the increase
15 in fundraising that has now occurred
16 at UK will be garnered by our
17 successors and their successors and
18 so forth.

19 THELIN: The University of Virginia
20 started its first capital campaign
21 in 1992, and they're probably the
22 most productive. So it's -- there
23 are newcomers who are doing very,
24 very well. It's not only a function
25 of longevity.

1 SUBBASWAMY: It's not, but the fact
2 that, you know, it really did start
3 with Thomas Jefferson does benefit
4 in terms of the longevity. There is
5 a longevity factor in terms of the
6 kinds of alumni base and what
7 positions they occupy in life and in
8 politics and so forth. It does make
9 a difference. The University of
10 Kansas started in 1945 or '50, I
11 believe, in terms of fundraising,
12 one of the first public universities
13 to start that. And their situation
14 is not terribly different from that
15 of those who started much later
16 because their base is a farm base in
17 the middle of Kansas. It makes a
18 difference. Northeast schools, both
19 longevity and the connections that
20 they have -- longevity is a lot of
21 it, really. It makes a big
22 difference.

23 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Back there.

24 JONES: Davy Jones. You showed some
25 numbers, 54 additional faculty

1 lines, and this is to try to keep
2 pace with the growth. I'm presuming
3 that those were tenured track lines.

4 SUBBASWAMY: Absolutely, they're all
5 tenured track lines.

6 JONES: And to what extent are those
7 numbers affected by -- we're also
8 affected by simultaneous loss of
9 faculty due to retirement,
10 resignations. Has there been a net
11 increase?

12 SUBBASWAMY: There's a net increase, and
13 that was in fact what was promised
14 to the legislature; and that's in
15 fact what it is, a net increase. So
16 if you look at a college like Arts
17 and Sciences, they have their
18 replacement faculty plus whatever
19 was allocated out of this cost of
20 communication and elsewhere, yes.

21 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Over there.

22 BOLLINGER: Chris Bollinger, Economics.
23 One of the things that struck me,
24 you did an excellent job of
25 convincing me that our retention

1 problem is not a case of, well,
2 we're just letting in worse students
3 who can't handle it, in particular
4 the fact that 48 percent of the
5 students who don't return after
6 their first year left in good
7 standing academically. But then it
8 looked like that the actions that
9 are being taken, increased tutoring,
10 UK 101, et cetera, seemed to be
11 geared at the other half, those that
12 are not doing well in academic
13 standing. And so I'd like to just
14 sort of say I think you should look
15 at those 48 percent who left in good
16 standing, and the obvious question
17 to ask is: Where did they go? Why
18 are they not here the next year?

19 SUBBASWAMY: There is a -- there was, in
20 fact, a focus group formed and an
21 attempt made to poll them and so
22 forth. I don't have all the details
23 with me, but this is a work in
24 progress. It is easier -- in many
25 cases there, it's either lack of

1 community, you know, I needed to go
2 back home because I felt out of
3 place, those kinds of things,
4 financial aid issues and so forth.
5 So I think that those are in some
6 sense more easily handled than the
7 problem you have with our school
8 systems, and in fact a 3.0 -- 3.5
9 GPA from Kentucky high schools
10 doesn't necessarily lead to enough
11 preparation to succeed. And so we
12 have a big problem in terms of
13 making sure that the students who
14 are -- who think they are well-
15 prepared but may not still be well
16 enough prepared need some help. So
17 that's where, in fact, that
18 expensive piece is going to be. But
19 I think we need to somehow do
20 everything to turn around the
21 retention graduation rate. And it's
22 going to be a bootstrapping process:
23 You improve a little; therefore, you
24 get a better pipeline. And in order
25 to do that, teacher preparation

1 issues are there. Who are these
2 teachers? They're, for the most
3 part, people who we taught. So are
4 we doing a good enough job? And I
5 think there are significant
6 questions that have to be answered.

7 DEBSKI: Liz Debski. Actually, that was
8 pretty much my question except that
9 I was just wondering if it was
10 possible that those students were
11 transferring to other institutions.

12 SUBBASWAMY: Okay.

13 DEBSKI: And when we look at our
14 six-year graduation rate, does that
15 mean they have to graduate here or
16 does --

17 SUBBASWAMY: From here and that's how
18 all the national measures are. In
19 other words, Michigan can claim --
20 is a public university, Wisconsin, a
21 public university, and so forth.
22 They will, in fact -- it's the same
23 exact measure that we're comparing
24 on. So if they went from here to
25 Harvard and graduated, that doesn't

1 count, still, for us.

2 DEBSKI: For us. Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: Yes.

4 YANARELLA: Ernie Yanarella. Swamy, I
5 want to go back to that same chart
6 that John pointed out. You show the
7 issue of trade-off between the state
8 budget provisions and college
9 tuition and tuition increases. You
10 are as aware as I am, even though
11 I'm a political scientist, about the
12 developing political environment
13 that we are beginning to see emerge
14 over -- around the issue of college
15 affordability. Crit Luallen put out
16 a report that I think one of John's
17 colleagues -- former colleagues
18 challenged in terms of methodology,
19 but it plays --

20 SUBBASWAMY: I challenge that, too.

21 YANARELLA: -- a significant role in, I
22 think, countermobilizing some of the
23 anti-intellectual strains in our
24 Kentucky culture. Granted, there
25 are many ways to address the issue

1 of college affordability. We've
2 seen some of the scholarship
3 programs that the President
4 announced some months back as, I
5 think in some respects, a response
6 to this. How does the university
7 prepare for the possibility that
8 this becomes a very powerful
9 political symbol? You know, it's
10 entering into the governor's race,
11 and it seems to me that it's going
12 to be a very easy one to be treated
13 in a very simplistic fashion. What
14 kind of -- how can this university
15 address this in the context of
16 moving forward in terms of this Top
17 20 status, Top 20 Business Plan?

18 SUBBASWAMY: To -- I don't have an easy
19 answer or else, you know, as I said,
20 I could become a consultant. And
21 the easy answers are wrong, of
22 course. But in terms of every
23 university -- the Top 20
24 universities have some of the same
25 arguments just to state

1 (unintelligible). In other words,
2 every state is going to, or the
3 bulk. In fact, there have been
4 federal bills to try to limit
5 tuition growth and so forth, as you
6 know. The argument to be made, and
7 you're sitting very close to an
8 economist there, is in terms of the
9 benefit, that it's an investment in
10 which you gain, you know,
11 lifetime -- they keep reducing the
12 lifetime gain number. I don't
13 understand why economists keep doing
14 this. It used to be a million
15 dollars or so, and now it's down to
16 \$750,000 lifetime earning increase
17 or something like that. I guess
18 this is going to be sort of an
19 ongoing battle in terms of what
20 affordability -- there are much
21 larger issues, as you know. And I
22 will just mention one and then other
23 questions, perhaps. I mentioned to
24 you that the game that all public
25 universities along with private

1 universities have gotten into is not
2 need-based aid but merit-based aid,
3 which means that the son of a
4 wealthy -- who shall we pick on --
5 cardiologist would get a free ride,
6 offers of a free ride from ten
7 different universities because the
8 person has a certain SAT and ACT,
9 regardless of the need, right? And
10 that's money that could well have
11 gone to address the needs of someone
12 else who actually truly has an
13 income issue. So we've gotten into
14 a really weird situation in higher
15 education; and that's where, I
16 think, the point of, you know, chain
17 will have to come where there is a
18 collective or perhaps a forced
19 methodology of having to go for
20 need-based support rather than
21 entirely merit-based support. It
22 should be merit and need, in other
23 words. I think they will begin to
24 then see -- you know, when you have
25 30 percent, 40 percent discounting

1 literally in public universities,
2 then you're talking really about a
3 sticker price versus an actual
4 price, and it just goes crazy. You
5 discourage people because they don't
6 even know that they might be able to
7 get a lot of aid. So it has to be a
8 combined solution based on some
9 discipline on the part of
10 universities and then a way of
11 tackling need-based aid on the part
12 of the state and at the federal
13 level as well.

14 CHAIRMAN TAGAVI: One last quick
15 question and answer, and please keep
16 your questions. Swamy has promised
17 that he would stay and mingle with
18 us, and we need some more questions
19 next door. Last question.

20 SOTTILE: Joe Sottile, Engineering. One
21 thing I've noticed is we do have
22 some students who leave under good
23 academic standing because they're
24 having trouble with maybe a
25 particular subject which is a

1 prerequisite, and I think it's good
2 that you are looking at tutoring and
3 so on. For example, calculus is one
4 that people can't get past, even
5 though they drop out.

6 SUBBASWAMY: You're not going to pick on
7 chemistry?

8 SOTTILE: Well, I could, and also
9 physics.

10 SUBBASWAMY: No, people have already
11 left the university before they
12 (unintelligible).

13 SOTTILE: Second, just interestingly, I
14 looked at the two graphs, and I
15 noticed we have a little bit of
16 decline in retention or I guess
17 six-year graduation, maybe
18 coincident with our increase in
19 number of undergraduates. Maybe
20 there's a little bit of a time lag
21 there, but I'm wondering whether
22 there may be a bit of an inverse
23 correlation between those two. It
24 may be something to --

25 SUBBASWAMY: Oh, absolutely. You know,

1 in the gallery for interesting food
2 and delicious conversation.
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

STATE OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

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

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

My Commission Expires: November 24, 2007.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 13th day of December, 2004.

ROBYN BARRETT, CERTIFIED SHORTHAND

24

REPORTER, NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE AT
LARGE, KENTUCKY

25