

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * * *

SEPTEMBER 13, 2004

3:00 P.M.

* * * * *

W.T. YOUNG LIBRARY
FIRST FLOOR AUDITORIUM
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

* * * * *

AN/DOR REPORTING & VIDEO TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
179 EAST MAXWELL STREET
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40508
(859) 254-0568

* * * * *

ERNIE YANARELLA, CHAIR
GIFFORD BLYTON, PARLIAMENTARIAN
REBECCA SCOTT, SECRETARY TO SENATE COUNCIL
LISA E. HOINKE, COURT REPORTER

LISA E. HOINKE, COURT REPORTER
AN/DOR REPORTING & VIDEO TECHNOLOGY, INC.

CHAIR: Welcome to the first University Senate Meeting of the Fall.

I would like to, first of all, begin with some announcements and then attend to the minutes. First, some introductions of our front-line folks right up here. To my immediate left is Gifford Blyton, who is the Senate Parliamentarian. I'm very happy to welcome him back again this year. To his left is Rebecca Scott, the Administrative Coordinator of the Senate Council Office. To her left is Lisa Hoinke, who is the court reporter and will be taking a faithful transcript of this meeting. And in the second row, I'd like to ask Megan Cormney to stand up for just a second. Megan is our new part-time office assistant who is serving in a variety of functions including some very important assistance to us with University Senate matters. To my immediate right is James Sparks, the A.V.B. Support Person. He would have done this in the past, and will be helping us out with the visual facets.

I'd to welcome the new Senators who

have come on board this year. We just had about a 50-minute long orientation meeting with them. I was assisted by Davy Jones, and his excellent audio/visual aids that have provided an important perspective on the historical evolution of this body. Very quickly, the following individuals are new Senators and I will ask you at the end of my listing of these to welcome these people aboard: Stephanie Aken from Libraries; David Biagi from Design; Timothy Caudill from Medicine; Fuhua Cheng from Computer Science & Engineering; Nancy Clauter from Fine Arts; Mark Coyne from Agriculture; Ray Forgue from Agriculture; Lisa Gaetke from Agriculture; Mark Hanson from Engineering; Debra Harley from Education; Craig Infanger from Agriculture; Davy Jones from Toxicology; Sharon Lock from Nursing; Brandon Look from Arts & Sciences; Richard Mitchell from Dentistry; Steve Parker from Education; Meg Portillo from Design; Andrew Pulito from Medicine; David Randall from Medicine; Donna Smith from Agriculture; Joseph Sottile from Engineering; Carol Steltenkamp from Medicine;

John Thelin from Education; Enid Waldhart from Communication & Information Studies; and David Wise from Agriculture. Welcome one and all.

One of my tasks, very quickly, is to report on Senate Council actions that have over the summer or late spring been taken on behalf of the University Senate. I'm obliged by Senate Rules to communicate this to you. Let me be very quick and brief.

First, a change requested from the College of Communications in admissions deadlines. The College of Communications requested that external and internal applicants be treated differentially with respect to admission deadlines allowing external applicants to meet a later spring deadline than internal applicants. That motion was passed without dissent.

In regard to LCC Nursing readmission, this involved revising guidelines for readmission that would not disadvantage readmits by putting readmits in a preference category that would prevent them from being able to be readmitted. Now that

was not a very hard one for us to decide, I think. That was passed without descent.

Thirdly, the College of Dentistry's promotion policy and graduation policy was also dealt with at a May 3rd and then a May 10th meeting. This was intended to define the Doctor of Medicine program graduation requirements. The proposal was discussed and tabled at the May 3rd Senate Council meeting, and clarified by Dentistry staff and the motion was approved on May 10th of this past academic year.

Fourth, the School of Public Health GRE policy proposal: Here the School of Public Health requested exemption from requirement of the GRE for admission to the School of Public Health, and on May 3rd the motion to approve was passed without descent.

Fifth and finally, there was the question of the reorganization of the Center for Minimally Invasive Surgery. This involved the restructuring and formalization of the Center for Minimally Invasive Surgery.

It was approved by the Medical Center Faculty Council and by the Senate Academic

Organization & Structure Committee. After close scrutiny and some deliberation by the Senate Council, it was passed at its May 10th meeting.

One other action or series of actions that took place on behalf of the Senate, and that was the reinstatement of three students after second suspension with the support of the deans of their respective colleges.

Very quickly, during this past summer, three ad hoc committees were formed by the Senate Council.

The first was the ad hoc committee on enrollment management, which I'm happy to say is being chaired by one of our Senate Council members, Larry Grabau. This will look to find a means for initiating a faculty role in enrollment management determination, and I wish Larry and his committee great success in those efforts.

Secondly, the Senate Council formed the ad hoc committee on graduation writing requirement. This was requested by Janet Eldred. A Chair has yet to be named. This

is a further outgrowth of deliberations and policies that emanated last spring in regard to the English writing requirement.

And then, thirdly, an ad hoc committee on academic offenses policy, one requested by Bob Grossman, for which a Chair has yet to be named by the Senate Council. Here, the proposal is to have this committee work vigilantly over the coming semester in order to try to work out an academic offenses policy that has been updated and is in tune with the preferences of the University faculty.

Just a couple last announcements and points of information. There is a new University Senate web site up. Many of you who have gone to the web site have noticed that you've been redirected or now are directed to that new site. It's sleeker, more modern and I think in keeping with the forward spirit of the University of Kentucky; and we have Rebecca Scott to thank for her web design work over this past summer.

I would also like to mention in regard to Gifford Blyton, that he is back.

He is back in the saddle, and I'll be looking to him for advice and counsel on some of the trickier aspects of parliamentary procedure.

Gifford has served faithfully 33 years, some 2,000 hours of Senate service and on this coming Saturday, if I'm not mistaken, he will be celebrating his mere 96th birthday.

Gifford, we congratulate you.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIR: One last piece of business before we turn to, in many respects, the most important reason for our being here today, certainly the most important agenda item, the address by our President and, that is, the minutes of the April 12th University Senate Meeting.

Are there any corrections or revisions that you have in light of your reading of those minutes to the April 12th Senate Meeting?

Yes?

ALBEISETTI: Jim Albeisetti, Arts & Sciences.

On page 6, our now Senate Council Chairperson Yanarella is talking about sacrificed on the altar of budgetary

exigencies, I think that should be A-L-T-A-R
not E-R alter.

SCOTT: Thank you.

CHAIR: I appreciate that. I reviewed
them, and I stand corrected. Anything else?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Okay. If there are no further
corrections, the minutes stand as approved.

Each year as the University's
calendar begins, we look to the President of
the University for his vision and for his
assessment of the state of this University.
In speaking with the new Senators I've
pointed out that, indeed, the President of
this University is also the Chair of the
University Senate. I serve when his
responsibilities are delegated to me. It
gives me great pleasure to invite President
Todd to the lectern here, and we look forward
to an insightful and inspiring address to us.
Thank you.

PRESIDENT TODD: Thank you, Ernie. And I'll thank
Mark for helping me put this together.

I was talking to Professor Blyton
when I first got here, and he did tell me he

had been here for 34 years and I said some days it feels like I have been here that long as well.

It might be of interest for you to know, I just finished reading President Patterson's biography, and he was here for 41 years. And I told a group last week, I now know why he could last that long: There were no radio talk shows in those days. And so those seem to be the demise of academic efforts.

I want to give you a view of where we are relative to our strategic plan; I want to talk to you about some of our operations; and I want to leave time for questions at the end of this; and I appreciate the opportunity to share some of this with you.

When we put the strategic plan together, we also use that as an instrument with our budgeting process and I think it's really important for you all to see how we're measuring ourselves against that because you all are the ones that are putting the effort in to make all of this come about.

The goal for reaching for national

prominence, there are several measures if you've ever read through the plan. One of the ~~more~~ easier ones to measure is the endowment. We took a bit of a hit in 2002 and 3 because of the stock market. We were still putting money in, but the stock market was taking it out at an equal rate it seemed like. We got better treatment, I'm happy to say now, that at the last count I think we're up to 513 million with some monies that have come in this year. You all know with the "Bucks for Brains" Program, we got a third round of that, and that's really what's helped us build this endowment and we have 67 million in this last round. We've matched about 9 million of that. So if anybody knows of contributors, we're looking for them on a daily basis because this is what really helps us compete and we need to have more in here, and I'll say more about fund raising in a few moments.

If we're talking about attracting and graduating students, this measure really differentiates us from about every other institution. If I just pick another number

out of the air, University of Louisville's graduation rate is 35 percent. If I pick others out of the air, they're in the 30's and 40's. Murray is somewhere in the high 50's, I think. But to be in the 61 percent range and we're -- you know, we were targeting 60, I think we've exceeded our own expectations and it's my hope that with the quality of the incoming classes that we're now seeing that we'll be able to move well beyond that 60 percent graduation rate.

What I keep telling parents and students is that the best thing we can do relative to their cost of education is to get them out of here on time because we can raise tuition 10 or 15 percent more, but if they get out a year earlier that saves them housing cost, that saves them educational cost and so this number is one we're measuring and it's one, I'm proud to say, we're moving well in that category.

We talk about attracting outstanding students. The Provost and I were talking today. One of the things that's happened, you know, this semester our

application rates, I think it's on the next slide, we're up 13 percent, and with the selective admission criteria that we presently have, 91.4 percent of those students were automatically admitted. A few years back, we were in the mid 80's. And so we are getting a very good application pool now. The numbers that we have here show only a 2 percent -- actually, it's about 1.8 percent rounded to 2, in total growth of the University. The undergraduate enrollment was up 3 percent. Of course, the freshman class is large. I'm pleased to say, too, that as we have more students come in, the quality is improving on an annual basis, which I think will help our retention numbers and our graduation numbers which are important.

The non-resident enrollment was up 9 percent. Overall, the African-American enrollment was up 3 percent. I'll say more about that in a minute. We've had an improvement in the full-time rates, which was pleasing to see, up 3 percent; and in the legacy category, which brings about some of the non-resident enrollment, these are

students from alumni who live out of state, sending their children back here on in-state tuition, we were having 153 freshman, and those students I think will also be retained from first to second year and will graduate and will help our incoming numbers because they are children of successful parents. Wherever I go -- I was out in San Francisco recently. We had a meeting for alumni at the Bio Conference, and we had three parents to come up and say that their kids were coming back from the West Coast here because of this program. So I think it does help our alumni realize that we're trying to pay attention to them as well.

There's some further information on this. We had 35 National Merit Scholars, two National Achievement Scholars, two 75 Governor Scholars and 28 Governor School for the Arts. This is an area where I stuck our necks out. I'll say ours, really, I did it because I felt that we weren't offering anything to this Governor's Scholar's pool. It's costing us some money now, and I'll talk about that in a few minutes. But it's

retaining quite a few students who were going out of state previously, and is bringing to us students where I think they had wanted to come here in the past but when they stood up on graduation night and didn't get anything from UK they went elsewhere and I think they need to come here and they need to feel the kind of faculty we have; they need to feel the kind of research that goes on here; they need to come here so that the platform that they spring from later in life is higher than it would be if they had gone elsewhere. And so I'm very pleased with the turnout of that. We've just got to kind of cover the bet with some fund raising.

We set a record this year for Valedictorians, 157. We had a press conference this morning with Jonathan Miller on the [KAPTCAP](#) Program, and one young lady from Tates Creek High School said it was her dream to come to UK. I would say the years when my kids were in high school that they didn't always dream of coming to UK. They dreamed of going out of state. And we've been getting the top students out of the

schools here in Fayette County and throughout the rest of Kentucky, and what's happening, and you need to take a lot of credit for this, is that the way marketing works is that when they come here and they appreciate their educational experience -- we give a lot of credit to the admissions folks for bringing in these numbers, but they only see the admission folks up to admissions day. They see our faculty after that, and that's what keeps them here and that's what sends them back home telling other students that they should come and follow the same experience that they have had. So I'm real pleased with the quality of this class.

We were up 20 percent in African-American enrolled students this year, and really pleased with the 31 percent increase in applications. You saw recently where Don Witt got more responsibility. He and his team have done an outstanding job working with the Office of Multi-Cultural Affairs to try to help improve our status on this campus.

The top 24 percent of our freshman

class scored a 28 or higher on the ACT.

Speaking of the ACT, I think it's interesting for people to know where our class stands for a mid 50 percent for the freshman profile.

This is the UK National and the others in the State, and I would hope that you're feeling in your classrooms, I know you're feeling the volume, but I hope that you're feeling the quality as well; that you can see that we are doing well in that category.

I would say at this time, too, that we were targeting a smaller freshman class last year. Don't break out in applause too rapidly. It should be around 3900, would be our target. We think, too, that we can -- we'd love to bump that ACT range up a couple of points, and I know that you all are helping out by looking at modifying the selective admissions slightly in this arena.

But if we look at the numbers, and Mike and I went through them today too, the rate of our growth is declining. I had some numbers here that he gave me. In 2000 the overall enrollment was up 1133; in '03 it was up 522; in '04 it's up 482. So we're decelerating

the pace at which we're growing, and we're growing in the professional schools this year in particular. They've done well, and in the undergraduate population.

But if we're going to try to stick to a strategy of trying to compete with some of the top universities, we need to have a larger competitive student body but we've got to try to keep from blowing apart at the same time so I realize that issue.

You can sit back and you can wait, I think, for everything to be right for the State to be giving us money, then we can turn on the switch. But I think when we've got bright kids coming out of the schools here, we need to give them the opportunity to go to the place of their choice and we need to make it their choice and I think we've been doing that. We just need the finances to catch up.

Nobody can fault us, I don't think, for doing a quality job. We are not going after head count for head count sake. We're going after it for other reasons, and I think we're performing extremely well.

When we look at the other measure

we're not doing well here. I was surprised -- I meant to ask the question, this has got to do with faculty salaries. And if you look at the 89 number up there compared to 87-1/2, I can't believe the 1 percent raise made that much of a difference unless everybody else black slid. But this is an area where we have got to do better. I talked to the Governor, to Jenny Fox, to Tom Layzell, to anybody that will listen about this. You know, we've been using tuition as a way to get through this period of time. I think we're going to have to continue to look to tuition even though we have had increases these last two years. Kiplinger's report last year listed us as the fourth best value for in-state students in the 100 best value schools that they looked at, and they listed us as seventh best value for out-of-state students. And if you look at the applications going up 13 percent, our increases in tuition have not been a deterrent to application rates. But if we have to keep pushing on that lever to get the salaries where we need to have them, we're

going to have to do that.

We did use some of the monies that we brought in this year from tuition to keep healthcare down, which is just eating everybody else and you the Governor's having that problem with the teachers in the State right now. I'll show you some more things we're trying to do on healthcare, but I want you to know that we're -- we put this goal out there -- 90 percent of the benchmarks is not a flattering number either, but that's what we thought we could do in a three-year period and we haven't been doing that but it is high on our minds.

One of the things that I was talking to Ernie about the other day that I'm going to go ahead and ask the Employee Benefits Committee to do, is to look at a tuition policy for faculty and staffs' children. I've been wanting to do that for some time. I was actually shocked when I took this position to see what the other universities in the State did; that they've been much more forward thinking than what we have.

What I'd like for that committee to do is really to do a statistical analysis of what would happen if we extended that in some version to our employees and our staff; whether they could use the six hours to give to somebody or whether we could do some kind of tuition reduction. I'm not sure we can get to where it would be free for the employees. I wish it was. But I think it's time that we look at that as at least one way to get a benefit in to the faculty and staff during these tough salary times. So that's in process, or that will be as soon as I talk to that committee.

When we talk about discovery share to apply new knowledge, this is an area of where we have excelled in Federal competition and that's where you really go out and go head-to-head, as you know, because many of you do it, with the people who are in the top institutions. We set goals with CPE, which we've really beaten. I think 2004 is going to be another banner year. We don't show here our total research numbers, but you may have seen we 232 million in total research

dollars. The first two months of this year looking pretty good. NH funding for the agency is going to be hit. They're not going to get that increase that they've been getting, but I think we have more firepower aimed at that target than what we've had in the past and I would hope to see that we can continue to grow the research numbers that we have.

This is a measure of goal five, which is to nurture diversity of thought, culture, gender and ethnicity. There are other measures. This is the one that we actually are obligated to measure ourselves against because of the Kentucky Plan for Kentucky Resident African-American Students, and this does not include non-resident African-Americans, and we were up in that category again this year which is helpful. But the percentage enrollment, if you look at it, in '03 we're at 5.9 and '04 we're at 5.4, so we're missing that. We're having larger numbers of African-American students in the freshman class each year. We were up 30 percent last year, up 20 percent this year

but we're also bringing in other students so the percentages don't go up as rapidly or actually can go down.

The retention rate is very much above the target that we had set. The same thing with the overall undergraduate retention rate. The six-year graduation rate is a target that we've got work to do. What's interesting is that the first year retention rate for African-American students is probably slightly above our general population but the graduation rate isn't, and Bill Turner is looking at that trying to analyze, you know, where did we lose them.

One thing we did on retention and this has nothing to do with the diversity issue, it's just our overall retention, but we dropped last year by, what was it, Mike, a point and a half or --

NIETZEL: Two.

PRESIDENT TODD: About two percent. We gained it back this year for first to second-year retention. But I issued a study last year that Connie Ray and Roger Sugarman did to try to go find all those students who

didn't come back their sophomore year and try to analyze why they didn't come back, and we can get you that information. They've given a pre-presentation. We need to kind of boil it down. A lot of them say they want to go back closer to home. That's just a Kentucky thing.

If you look at our retention rate, the CPE measures it, they take into consideration that those kids didn't drop of school; that they went back to another university because in many cases we actually counsel our students to go to LCC and that shouldn't count against us from the State measures. So that's up in the 80s. But we analyzed this to see, you know, there's a certain percentage that didn't do well academically, so we know why they didn't come back, but then there are others, and so we've got data on that. It's my view you can't solve a problem unless you get the data and you can really look at it, and so we've got some data on it. But we do also need to figure out, where did we lose these African-American students between the first and

second year where the retention is higher than in the graduate rate; and the graduate enrollment is significantly above the targets that were set a few years ago, so we're making headway there.

The sixth goal is this one that's a little harder to measure. It's the one to elevate the quality of life of Kentuckians, and in some measures, one of the hard things you can measure physically, is the Patton applications. We were up last year, but those go up and down. And, you know, if somebody really told you you've got to drive this number, you can always drive this number because you can put in Patton applications that will not go anywhere so I'm not really -- I don't tightly gauge this one. There are some things, however, when I look at what we're doing with what I call victories outside the triangle, this is an effort to make sure that people understand that we are the flagship university; that the Commonwealth is our campus, the kind of things I've been saying for three years.

I was telling Mike Nietzel at lunch

that I've been reading another article that Terry Birdwhistell wrote about Dr. Patterson, and in 1906 is when Eastern Kentucky University and Western Kentucky University really formed and it came about largely because of the political pressures that people around the State felt like the University of Kentucky was really the University of Lexington and if they got enough votes to create enough of a push that they got funding for other teacher colleges in the State of Kentucky, and then they started expanding thereafter.

I think it's our obligation to do work in this State, and here are some of the things that we're doing. Paul Eakin and Wimberly Royster and some of the other professors got that 22 million dollar AMSP Grant, which is to improve math and science scores in the Appalachia and to look at the culture of why people don't do better there or how to motivate them. We announced this past year a 1.3 million dollar pool of money that we got out of the tobacco settlement money to work with the 19 most tobacco

dependent counties, and we started entrepreneurship center up there that's being operated with a lot of our people in the College of Ag. We got 5 million dollars to do a variety of things down in Paducah with the Gaseous Diffusion Plant. Some will be to investigate some of the environmental issues that are there. There is some money to look at how to develop new jobs using spent uranium for batteries and recovering some nickel that's got a million dollars worth of commercial potential. There's some health work in that 5 million dollars, but this is an earmark that Senator McConnell got us.

One thing that I failed to mention is that we have in the last three years taken our Federal earmarks from 5.4 million to 22.7 million this last year. I think there's an article in the Kernel today that said we're getting about 9 million more that's in the Senate budget from Senator McConnell.

When I took the position I said ~~publically~~publicly that I was going to declare peace with Louisville -- the University of Louisville, except for football

and basketball but -- declared too much peace there. But the intent was really to try to get the attention of Ann Northrop and Senator McConnell who both sat Appropriation Committees because between those two people, McConnell in particular, and Senator Hal Rogers, we've been able to get our Federal appropriation up which really speaks to these lower two. Congressman Rogers got us a million dollars to look at the lethal cancer instances in the Fifth Congressional District, and Al Cohen is working on that with the community physicians to try to bring the expertise that we have in the Markey Center down into those communities to try to analyze some of the issues that they have and improve their healthcare.

With cooperative extension, we've talked a lot about that and if the Senate budget goes through we'll get another \$900,000 for the HEEL Program, which is Health Education through Extension Leadership. This is a way that we are getting public health information out into the population through the extension service,

and that's been received extremely well. The College of Dentistry at the State Fair, we announced that we now have a joint faculty between Ag and Dentistry, the only school in the Nation that has that, for our dentistry professionals to get our extension agents to talk to their client base about oral health, which is clearly one of the real black marks or what I call Kentucky uglies in this State.

And when you're sending babies to bed drinking juice and Pepsi and you have to pull their teeth at 18 months old, they're not going to be a good oral health candidate to get us off the Jay Leno show. So that is an area where we are out there doing research and also doing good things through healthcare, through entrepreneurship and through some fundamental research down in Paducah.

The College of Fine Arts has an agent that they now share over in Pikeville, with Fine Arts and Ag to try to find a way to enhance that community's arts capacity. I was quite surprised when we had all of our ag agents in town several months ago, we had

five deans to speak to them, and the longest line was behind Bob Shay's desk because they wanted to figure if there was some way UK can help us with our arts.

So I believe that politically we need to be out across the State making a difference, doing things that are visible. We need to be marketing that more because we are doing a lot of good things and that kind of meets goal six.

Mike and I met with our Board at the Trustees' Meeting, and he will give you a more thorough presentation on these academic priorities for this year. You all will be intimately involved in some of these because when you look at the third one, the expand and revamp the Honor's Program, when you look at the curriculum reforms, I really appreciate Ernie's support. I know he sent an e-mail out recently to review the USP. I think that time has come, to be a major academic conversation we need to have and you all need to be intimately involved in that to see what we can do to make ourselves deliver to the students what they're going to need to

be able to live in this world that they now face.

I won't go through all of these because I want to make sure I leave time for questions. I will say something on the bottom about the Commonwealth collaboratives.

If we look at the strategic plan, there are 14 areas that we stress in there and we are looking at getting senior faculty involved with each of those 14 areas, looking at a compensation scheme to reward that activity so that we can reach out and do some meaningful things with the City, with the State in order to make good on our promise to change the State of Kentucky.

At No. 5, this is the true program where we charge that differential tuition for students that have over 60 hours of credit, and that half a million dollars that that generates on a recurring basis has helped us hire some faculty lines and the real goal is to reduce part-time teaching at that area because that's one of the SACS complaints. So if you look at the way we did tuition this last year, we've been trying to do some

differential tuition policies so we can put money where it'll be as effective as it can to help solve some of these problems that we have.

The winter intercession, Mike can speak more to that but it's a way to try to bring some experimentation, some innovation to the curriculum to do some offerings during that winter intercession period that can give the faculty some time to get an exciting thing going that they want to do, get some extra compensation, give the students a chance to level their load, maybe to reduce some of the large class sizes, but to help get them out of here on time. So I won't go through all those, but that's an area that I think is going to be really important this year to begin a detailed academic conversation on campus.

One of the announcements that we made recently was with Terry Mobley taking over this Vice-President of Institutional Advancement, and Mike Richey will be taking over Development on an interim period in an acting role. This will not create any more

positions. But we have to really integrate our PR, our alumni, our development efforts, like many of the other universities have, to allow us to tap a lot more people out there to help us run this place. We've got that potential, I believe, but I don't think we've been executing against it as strongly as we should.

When I talk about giving scholarships, with the Governor's Scholars, Governor's School for the Arts, in order to be competitive out there we have to have money in that category. And we walked away a bit from scholarship development when the Bucks for Brains money came because people could double their money by giving to research professorships, and that's been extremely helpful to us but those same people in the past were very likely giving us some scholarship money, so we're going to be putting a major focus on improving the scholarships that we can offer.

In new ways of giving, there's a couple of things have hit me since I've been

here. One is that we've not had a good place in order to have strong academic recognitions or strong development opportunities. Just last year our -- if we ran a quick summary -- a financial summary with our fairly weak financial system that doesn't give us everything we need, but between four hotels in the downtown area we spent 1.4 million dollars for food services off campus and what bothers me is that we have a lot of really influential people who go to our football games and go to our basketball games, but don't come to our campus. They go to Embassy Suites, they go to the Marriott and so forth and we take our academic talent off campus. We need to be bringing them on campus. We need to be bringing corporations on here who can go into a facility that has the proper kind of media so that they can give presentations; they can interact with our scientists, our professionals. We have a shot, if we want, to raise \$600 for students to go overseas. We can give them an overseas educational experience for just \$600, a round-trip plane ticket. And to be able to

have a black-tie dinner at 600 bucks a plate, invite 150 people here, could change 150 kids' lives. We don't have a place like that, and so we're looking at the Boone Center. It's closed down now. We're going to try to fix it up to where we'll get the membership back up, but more importantly we'll be able to use it as a campus facility where we can bring people on the campus to entertain them, to excite them and to raise money from them. If we had every dean doing a scholarship fund raiser in that facility, you know, twice a month, you know, we could raise a million dollars a year recurring and so that's happening.

When the main building comes back on board, we're going to bring back what was called the Chapel. We're going to call it the Lex-Mark Public Room because Lex-Mark just gave us a half million dollars for that building; the first major cash contribution that they have given us to name that. But it's going to be a room where we can have academic recognitions, we can bring in our major donors in that case and try to get them

more involved.

Back to the concept of the Boone Center, there will be a place in there we can seat 300 people, and there are many people that you know and our other faculty members know and our Board members know who are not an alumni of this University, who have never had any contact with it but who would come out for an entertaining evening with one of our scholars or some of our performers and pay \$500 if they thought they were going to help a scholarship happen, and that's the kind of fund raising we haven't done.

We've gone after the heavy hitters, the top ones, and you can probably take ten fingers and name most of the ones that give us a million dollars or more. But I want to broaden that base because we need our annual giving to be more substantial to help offset some of these scholarships, and it's my view if you get people coming in at 500 bucks then a few years later they might give you a 1,000 and a few years later they may have you 5,000 or 10,000 and they may leave you in their Will. So you got to keep on going.

Just a story on the Legacy Program, I gave a speech up in Northern Kentucky and a grandparent came up to me and said, man, I really like this Legacy Program because, you know, we own a farm, we didn't go to college, we want our kids to go to college, they went to UK, couldn't find a job so they had to leave the State and we never saw the grandkids. Well, now the grandkids are back on the Legacy Program. They bring their friends to the farm, and we fix them breakfast and it's great. And I said, that's great. I want your farm. I said, you know, your kids didn't want the farm, they left you so leave us your farm.

The other I'm doing, and I'll just throw this out. I've finally gotten a list of all the students I taught. I taught about 900 students and I kept all my grade books. They're good for things as you go along. I've approached three of my past students who are each going to become Fellows and give \$10,000, and they're going to write a letter on my behalf to these 900 students asking them to donate scholarship money back.

Ninety percent of those kids are engineers, making good money, have not given a penny to this institution. So we need to be thinking about how to broaden the base of investors in this institution, and I would bet that if Ernie were to sit down and write down the ten students that he remembers the best in his teaching career here and take the time to write a personal letter to them or somebody do it on his behalf, which we can do, we'll orchestrate to do that, that we'll be getting people to give that have not been giving. We have a tremendous base of alumni that we're not tapping. So enough of that, but I want us to be competitive in that area.

One of the things that we've had to do -- I put the number up there. We've been cut 73 million dollars. You know that. When I came into this position, having a 1.4 billion dollar budget and having to watch cash all my life when I started my businesses, I thought I can find some cash in here that we can use better; and we've done that, and I'm publishing a white paper on that that I will put up on the web site

fairly soon. We've actually redirected 35.4 million dollars in the first three years, and that was going to be our moving forward money. That was money that was already here that we found by doing some consolidations, by making some of the so-called self-supporting units be truly self-supporting and by recalculating our overhead rates and getting a higher return from the Federal Government and so forth. We went through all that, and that was going to be the fund money. However, they've taken back more than we've freed up so we have a thinner fighting machine, so when the budget's picked back up I think we'll be much better off for that.

Athletics has given us a million dollars a year for scholarships. One other thing you might notice: If you see this class of Kentucky, these ads that are running now, where we're recognizing the top sophomores across the State of Kentucky. It allows us to reach down in and find those top sophomores, develop a relationship with their counselors. We're running that on four TV stations around the State that are

volunteering and donating their time because they're athletic sponsors. We've gone after the Athletic sponsors saying do something for us academically. CHA Health, which is an athletic sponsor is putting up 160 thousand a year for four years to buy the air time to run those ads where we talk about academics, the importance of it and leadership and then we feature these students for 30 seconds. And that's 160 thousand dollars that we didn't have in a marketing budget to spend. So, we are leaning on the Athletic's group to give us access to their benefactors to do other things for us academically, and it's been pretty well received. We're making some headway.

The IRIS Project is a major project. It will be one we're all going to have to get used to because it's going to change the business practices. The worst thing we can do is to require that we still do everything the way we did it because we need a master computing system across this campus where we can be much better in the student records area and the finance area and

so forth, and we can't have all of our shadow systems. Where a lot of universities get caught is that they'll take that new software platform and they'll say, yes, but we want to get our reports this way and so they'll ask a consultant to write their reports.

Consultants love it. I used to be in that business, and they make a killing in that way. So we've tried to use an organizational method to bring our own people in to the IRIS Project so that when they go back to their locations they'll go back as champions and we'll be able to roll this out; but it's a high profile project.

Coldstream, I caught some flack because I hadn't done anything with it, but my view was we didn't have a strategy for it and I'd rather -- just to sell the land or lease the land was not the most important thing. We did hire John Parks, who ran the University of Illinois Research Campus and prior to that the Iowa State Research Campus.

We are now focusing on pharmaceutical, automotive services, aluminum and mass manufacturing and natural products, so we've

got a target of what we're looking for and I think we can make some headway out there that could compliment the research programs and help the local economy.

One thing I'm extremely proud of and I want to thank you all and the staff for, in particular, is what we've been able to do with healthcare. I'm doing another white paper that I think this one is finished, and we need to get it up on the web site. But if you look at what happened the first year that I was here, that 15 percent whack caused a whole lot of discussion around campus, if you recall, and we asked Tom Samuels to serve with the committee to really look at how we could keep that contained. My view, and I think I said it to the Senate that year is that, if you can envision a box, we're all in it. We're us. And any money we spend outside that box is money that I can't use and you can't use to drive your mission forward. We've done a suburb job of that, I think. If we just track the National average, which has also been coming down, we've saved 6.4 million dollars in this

period of time. If you put us against the State of Kentucky average, we've probably saved close to 10 million dollars in our own healthcare; and that's extremely important. We need to keep doing that. This approach actually won us a contract from the State, which is about a 9 million dollar contract, for our College of Pharmacy to apply some of these principles to the State Medicaid System and we believe we can save them about four times that 9 million dollar investment by using some of the practices we do through our Reach Program. But pay attention to this. If you start using some medication, there are pharmacists that we hire to help us solve these problems, and if you've read some of the details, I think we're helping improve people's lives at the same time. It's not all just about raising money, but they're getting just as good health care there.

The last slide that I have talks about kind of the evolution of how we are where we are. When I came into this position the top 20 challenge was out there. There was also money out there at that time. I've

been here three years and I want to make sure our next three years, as we talk about it, we're not just making some kind of hollow lame thing. We either need to take it off the table or put some structure behind it to say this is what it takes to get there. And you may not have felt it, but we've been actually operating against a strategy to figure out how to get there.

First, we had a task force on the futures that made a report in 2002, which made some decisions about where we should make some differential investments because we had certain areas of prominence that we felt we could push over the top and so that was in place.

Second, we had the task force to try to decide how are we going to measure this top 20 thing, and so that report had a lot of good faculty input and that's sitting out there now.

The third was we wrote a strategic plan about those and what things are we really going to measure and how are we going to get there. It's a three-year plan. It's

a short-term plan.

But now what I've been talking about, this top 20 business plan, is really how are you going to finance it and are you serious about it.

When House Bill One was passed they did not feel an obligation to put a financing plan behind it. They said, we want UK to be a top 20 institution. We want to have higher education; have 80,000 more students by 2020, but nobody said you need this many more faculty, you need this much square footage, you need these tuition policies for ~~accessability~~accessibility and so forth. There was no business plan behind that.

When they passed KERA, for K through 12 reform, they passed a 2 billion dollar tax, which is a recurring income stream to change the way we did K through 12 education to put technology in there and so forth to improve its assessment. So there at least was a financing plan, but we didn't have one.

And so my feeling is that what we need to do is to forecast where we think the

top 20 will be and how we're going to measure that in 2020, and put together a financing plan of how to get there and under that plan there will be tuition income, there'll be State appropriations; there'll be hospital revenues; there'll research income; there'll be auxiliary services and look at how we think we can get there. And if at some point along that line the State says, we can't give you our part of it, they shouldn't complain if we raise tuition to keep our salaries competitive and do the other things we have to do, or we have to push development to try to meet a target and we have to say this is your long-range target.

What happens, I think, in higher education is that we all kind of put up a request to the State Government for a two-year deal, they give of whatever they give us and that defines our strategy for the next two years and then we give them another two-year plan and then we see what they give us and so forth. We can't find any university, any public university that has done a longer range plan. I mean, everybody's

trying to be top 20 but nobody's talking about how to get there. There's a secondary reason for this, which I think makes this a very good academic exercise. We're not hiring any high-priced consultants. They can put that to rest. Because if you're going to do a plan, you've got to do it yourself. If you don't do the plan inside out and from your own gut, then it's not going to be good for somebody to come in and hand you a plan and pay them a lot of money for that. We may get some consultation just on helping us measure some parameters.

But there's another thing that I think is important for an academic institution. We are not taken seriously by legislators and by business folks. They just think we get enough money, and if we don't give them some then, you know, they can always find an English teacher; they can always, you know, they've got these reserves in the hospital, so we can always cut 2-1/2 percent of those. There's no common vocabulary, and this was really pointed out to me when I was having lunch in Michigan

this summer and the Vice-President of Boeing was on side and Mary Sue Coleman, the President of University of Michigan was on the other side, and Don said, you know, we don't give much money to universities any more because they're so inefficient. Well, Mary C. went through the roof. Well, we're efficient. You know, we are efficient; we're efficient. But how do we portray that to them? How do we talk about it in terms that they would understand? When you see McKean up there in the Federal Government saying that if we raise our tuition higher than the CPE that they're going to reduce our Federal Funding -- or two times the CPE, or whatever. You know, they don't even know what our job is in many cases.

And so I believe that going through this plan of how we think we can get there we can also use some expertise that's sitting here and around campus to put together a vocabulary so we can better justify it. When you talk about accountability to legislators and business people they think some hard dollars. We think about retention,

graduation, research levels, publications and those things. When we talk about the needs we have to do the liberal arts education, they see that as a cost to them. They don't understand the expense for that and why you have to have top quality people doing that and what the cost of that is.

So that's the role of these first things. They're rolling to a plan where we can -- and maybe the answer is: We can't become top 20 by 2020. Maybe we can by 2030, or if we become this by 2020, then this is what it takes. It's gotten the Governor's attention. They weren't sure what we were shooting for here, but to me it's just a logical extension, if you give somebody a challenge, then you got to figure out how you're going to get there. And since they didn't give it to us, it's our opportunity to work together to figure out how to do it.

And the last overlay for this is this academic priority. I think this is the first time since I've been here. We've laid out ten things that we want to be discussing on this campus this year: To really improve

the academic quality of the institution, and to update the USP Program, to really focus on honors and expand that opportunity, to put in this undergraduate center of excellence so that we can really coalesce some of these things we're doing so well into a way that we can market that better so that students will even come here better than the ones we're getting now.

And so I think that it can be an exciting time period these next few years to really go forward and accept the challenge they've given us until we prove we can't do it or we show them how we can do it, and I'm a can do kind of person. That's the way I want to do it.

I can't say enough about how this place has held together in the last three years because I don't think we can go through a tougher three years. In looking back over the history, I don't think they have ever been cut three years in a row like we've been cut. And the conversation in Frankfort is not focused on higher education funding right now. It does look like we might get back 20

million of the 41 million they cut. That hasn't been locked down yet, but that would help out some because we really haven't really ingested the 16.7 million 9 recurrent cut that they've given us yet; and it's out there, how we're trying to go about it and how to spread it out. But I'm extremely proud of how we made it through this three-year period, and I think that we've got some exciting times as times pick up but we've got to tell our story better and that's kind of our area. That's administration's area, is to make sure that we can better let people know what a heck of a place this is and what kind of work that's done here.

So I'm going to quit with that, Ernie. I've just got a few minutes for questions. I apologize. If I need to, I can come back and answer more questions but I'll take some now before I have to go to Washington.

CHAIR: If you have questions, please identify yourself.

ALBEISETTI: Jim ALBEISETTI, Arts & Sciences.
Did I hear you correct that there's

58 million dollars of Bucks for Brains money sitting there waiting for --

PRESIDENT TODD: To be matched.

ALBISETTI: -- to be matched? Does that expire at any point?

PRESIDENT TODD: No, it doesn't. We've matched two rounds of 67 million, and so this was -- they bonded this around to 67 and I think we've -- the last I heard we'd done only nine because that's just become available recently. So that money still out to be matched, so go for it.

CHAIR: Yes.

WISE: David Wise in Agriculture. I'm encouraged by the optimism and the listing of high standards in your address, and it seems -- you seem to disagree with a quote I read a couple of weeks ago in the Kernel, which may have been a misquote, in which you were quoted as saying you didn't want us to become an elite institution and as a faculty member, when I read that, I was upset and I thought, well, he's never going to say we don't want to maintain our elite basketball program and -- and I think -- I understood from the

context that you were talking about we don't want to have elite admission standards --

PRESIDENT TODD: Yes, that's --

WISE: -- but on the other hand it sounds like you are trying to move us in the direction of becoming an elite institution and I guess what -- what worried me is I'm afraid that in Kentucky it's not viewed as something to strive for, become an elite institution, where I think we -- we want to become an elite institution in a positive way.

PRESIDENT TODD: Would you call the University of Wisconsin or the University of Illinois elite or just a great universities?

WISE: Well, I went to Michigan so I'd say, yes.

PRESIDENT TODD: Bad choice there, I guess. I think probably it could be interpreted differently, but I was on the first committee that wrote the standards for selective admissions at UK back when I was a faculty member and the big rap we got is that UK was trying to become elitist and that we

weren't going to take the Kentucky kids and all this business. And so I'm pretty sensitive to that elite business, but greatness is fine and so that comment was about -- you know, we could just say that we're only going to bring in 3,000 freshman next year instead of 3900 and just have you all jack the standards up to that's all we took. We would be leaving an awful lot of good students on the table, and I don't think we want to become that type of an institution. We want to move them up a bit, but I don't think I've ever said anything to take away from the fact that I still think we can become a great institution but I'll watch my verbiage and I'll tell Mary Sue Coleman hello for you when I see her next.

CHAIR: One or two more questions? If not, we will send you on.

PRESIDENT TODD: Okay. Thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE)

PRESIDENT TODD: I appreciate that. Thank you.

CHAIR: Our next order of business is the proposed reorganization of Toxicology recommendation emanating up the way. The

proposal was to transfer the Graduate Center for Toxicology from the graduate school to the College of Medicine. This was affirmed by the Academic Council of the Medical Center and by the Senate Committee on Organization and Structure, and a positive recommendation of the Senate Council has been brought forth to the Senate and that recommendation is that the Senate approve the transfer of Toxicology from the graduate school to the College of Medicine with an effective date of transfer of September 1st, 2004.

We have a motion from the Senate Council. Do we have any comments on this? Also, is Mary Vore here? Mary, I wonder if you would speak for just a moment about the recommendation itself and in particular the desire for an effective date of transfer of September 1st?

Mary Vore, if you don't know her, is Director of the Graduate Center for Toxicology.

MS. VORE: Well, thank you for the opportunity to speak here. The Graduate Center for Toxicology has been debating this issue for

over two years now. Our minutes go back to well over two years when we began discussing the opportunity. It was instigated by the discussion about whether we should go in the then School of Public Health and we felt we wanted to take some ownership of where we went and how we came about discussing that.

So we have gone over for two years discussing with all interested parties, College of Pharmacy, School of Public Health and Chancellor Holsinger, with Provost Nietzel when he was interim Provost and many people. Then ended up working primarily with the College of Medicine because we felt that that was our best opportunity for growth; that was our best interaction that would facilitate the best collaborations; that where we have the most interaction now.

Then we got serious about that in the last year, and so we've been working intensively with -- I have with David Watt, we've worked with our Core Faculty, worked with our Executive Committee that consists also of joint faculty, worked with our joint faculty, worked with the Memorandum of

Understanding that you have before you, went through at least eight versions of that, and came to something that we were happy with, that everybody bought into and that we felt would really allow us to grow. That was our number one criteria, that we would be allowed to grow; that we would be in an environment that would foster our development and our furthering of our Graduate Program and our research and academic performance.

When we finally got it all approved through all of those committees then, I wanted to meet the Dean of the College of Medicine that was in under recruitment, wanted to make sure that this individual bought into our becoming a part of the College of Medicine. When all of those things finally were done, it was April or May and by the time we collected all the signatures it was after the Senate had finished its meetings and we were really ready and were planning, hoping that it would be effective July 1 and then realized that that would not be possible.

Ernie graciously met with the

Senate Council over the summer to consider our becoming a part of the College of Medicine that would coincide with the beginning of the academic year so that we could participate in Academic Programs with the College of Medicine. We are operating as if we were a part of their Integrated Biomedical Sciences Program, the IBS, so we're doing that.

Also as a part of becoming a -- the college -- the College of Medicine, there will be some faculty that will move from one department into our Graduate Center for Toxicology, and that's not -- they're already in the College of Medicine so that will not take effect until we become a part of the College of Medicine. These three faculty are -- very practical example: They all have NIH Grants due October 1. Where are they going to submit them? Are they going to go through path where they are now, are they going to wait for us to come in? So we can do it either way, but it will save so much red tape if we can go through tox rather than go through pathology, then have to redo all the

paperwork.

So I think a lot of our reason for wanting to move forward is to -- we feel like we've been treading water now for a few months, so we'd like to get on the same -- in the academic program during the academic year with the College of Medicine, facilitate this transfer and make it efficient, I think, and minimize red tape is probably the -- our main priority so...

I can answer any questions, or however you want me to do it.

CHAIR: We have a motion brought before the floor by the Senate Council with a positive recommendation. Are there comments or questions that you'd like to raise in regard to this? Steve Yates?

YATES: Steve Yates, Chemistry. I see functionally you're going to essentially be a Department of the College of Medicine. Why a Graduate Center? Why not a Department of Toxicology?

MS. VORE: Well, our status and our primary focus has been to be a graduate training program, and I do not see that that will

change. I think that we are going to keep our name, the Graduate Center for Toxicology.

Changing to a department has not been part of the discussions. I will say that we do function -- I function -- my name is the Director but I function as a Chair in terms of my interactions with our Core Faculty, if that answers your question. But I don't see us becoming a regular department. We'll maintain our status as the Graduate Center.

CHAIR: Other questions?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: There being none, let me call for a vote. All in favor of the motion to transfer the Graduate Center of Toxicology from the Graduate School to the College of Medicine with an effective date of transfer of September 1, 2004, please indicate by a show of hands.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: All opposed?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Any abstentions?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: The motion carries. Thank you.

Thank you, Mary.

MS. VORE: Thank you.

CHAIR: We appreciate your coming here.

Our next order of business is an update on the IRIS Project. Phyllis Nash, its Director, is going to give us an overview on this.

Phyllis, I find myself still needed to look very carefully at the acronym, Integrated Resources Information Systems. It still doesn't come out trippingly on the tongue, but with your help and a number of the presentations that you've given I've gotten a better sense of what's involved and the proportions of the task. So, please, if you would.

MS. NASH: Thank you for the opportunity to provide the update, and I agree with you the acronyms really are more difficult.

Hopefully, we'll begin to understand what this project is and we'll never have to even worry what IRIS stands for. We'll actually know it's our new computing system.

I appreciate the opportunity to be here and let you know about this project.

This is a project that's being staffed by people from across the institution, but this is a project of the University; not of the IRIS Project staff, and so I want to make sure that you understood at the outset what this project is.

It is the changing of the administrative computing systems that manage all of our administrative functions in the area of finance, human resources, inventory, purchasing and campus management which means that that's the SAP word for our Student Information System. So we are basically coming into this institution and taking out all of the systems that we've been fond of or hated, depending on where you were, but I can tell you that what we're doing will bring pain to almost everybody in the institution at some point in time and our only hope is that when we're finished you will say you're glad we did what we did.

We are going to do, again, what no other institution has done in that we are going to implement all four of these systems simultaneously. Now, they'll have different

go-live dates, so we'll bring them up at different times. But it's a lot of change for the campus to undertake, and so there's going to be some pain involved I will assure you.

In this project the University has partners. As you know, we picked SAP as our software. I was really glad when I heard all the problems that Mike Kennedy let me know that Indiana was having with PeopleSoft financial aid, 3,000 students didn't get their financial aid, and when the Judge allowed Oracle to move forward with their bid for PeopleSoft, I will tell you that I was pretty happy not to have been a PeopleSoft customer that day.

So we're working with SAP. Our hardware platform -- our hardware will be IBM. We are going to be using a DB2 database, so we'll moving forward with that; and then our partners who are helping us implement this are actually three different partners, all run by SAP as being the lead. We're using SAP Public Services, which is their arm of consultants. LSI is a firm out

of Massachusetts that had the absolute best references on implementing financials and material management, and then SIGMA is the financial aid package that SAP partners with.

And so those three consulting partners are working with us to implement SAP.

Now it takes a lot of folks to implement a system -- these major systems, and it really begins with the four major functional teams. We have functional and technical users from the campus in the four functional areas: Finance, Human Resources, Campus Management and Materials Management and they are the core of this project. And then they're supported by Project Management which is the role I'm helping to play; teams that will help us manage the change, communicate, help us do all the training; the project sponsors, the president and his staff and a Steering Committee. And I'll show you in just a minute, because you do have representation on that Steering Committee. And the lastly, by the subject matter experts who have -- individuals who are not full-time on the project but who come to the project to

bring their expertise.

I wanted to show you two groups of people who are serving on the Steering Committee. There are more. There are about 30 some people on this committee, but there are several from the provost area and then several who are faculty representatives and let me just jump to the faculty representatives. Jeff Dembo, your past Chair, is the liaison from the Senate to the project, and he serves on the Steering Committee. J. David Hardison is a faculty member in the College of Dentistry who is the functional lead for this project. And then Dean Sudharshan and Dave Watt both serve on the Coordinating Committee, sort of like the Executive Committee of the Steering Committee, and then finally I do still have a faculty role and I am the project lead.

This presentation, by the way, will be posted on the web both at the IRIS web site, and we'll ask Rebecca to post it on the Senate web site. So I'm going to jump over some of this information fairly quickly just to let you know it's here.

Basically, the University is responsible for the implementation; the consultants are not. We are responsible. We will be responsible for all of the decisions that are being made in this implementation, for the training that goes forward, for everything related to the project. But we're assisted, then, by SAP as the major project owner, and what their job primarily is is to help us get as much information as we can -- what they call knowledge transfer -- to make us as independent as quickly as possible, and that's really how we're going to judge whether or not they were successful; and, that is, how quickly we can kick them out and say we don't need you any more. So they are here primarily for that role.

Now there are several project assumptions that I thought it important that you at least get a look at or some introduction to. And, first of all, we will follow a phased approach, and we will begin by, in phase one, restoring the basic functionality, although that functionality may be done differently, we will restore the

basic functionality of those four major systems. For example: We will make sure the students get registered, we will make sure that students are admitted, we will make sure that we can graduate and give students transcripts, we will take care of the basic functionality, we'll make sure you get your paychecks. Those are the kinds of things that we'll focus on first in phase one.

We are going to very, very closely monitor and control the scope of this project so that we can deliver on time and within budget. It does not include us making major changes to SAP's software. That's one of the reasons we are in the problem we are in now with out software. We have software that nobody can support; no vender will support because it's been so customized, and every time there's an upgrade, which we haven't had in quite a while since they -- we can barely recognize this software, there's a major effort on the part of the University to put in all of those customizations. We will try our best to put it in as it is written.

In addition to that, if SAP has the

functionality in its system, we will ask that whatever system we have, use that functionality. That's one of the things we learn in doing site visits, that many schools -- universities around the country will go in and say, oh, you're running PeopleSoft or Oracle or SAP, and you'll find out that they're running a very small component of that major software and they're retaining a lot of their old systems. That doesn't make sense in terms of support, in terms of being able to take advantage of the integration that's the wonderful thing about these software programs. So we will ask that all of the systems across campus use the functionality in SAP.

We will also work to adopt the basic best business practices that are actually already built in to these software programs and built in to SAP. They have studied organizations, and they have their way of recommending that you do business in order to take advantage of best business practices. We intend to do that whenever possible, and that's another reason why this

project is going to be difficult and trying on us because in addition to learning new software; that is, how you go about doing the functionality, we will may be learning different ways of doing that functionality which will be a double stressor.

In the meantime, we are freezing any work on our current legacy systems; that's SIS, HRS, FRS unless we need that enhancement because of some regulation or some law change. We want to devote our energy and our time in getting the SAP Systems up as quickly as possible and not retain a system that we're going to shut down.

And then finally, probably the hardest thing that's going to be for this institution is that maintaining the cost and the schedule of this project really requires decision making and quickly -- quickly making decisions and not remunerating over and over and over but really understanding the issues and moving ahead. I think that's going to be a major challenge.

Well, SAP uses a certain

methodology called the ASAP, accelerated SAP methodology, to implement the software and so this is the methodology that we will be using in phase one. It starts with project preparation, and you can say that we've been in this stage for about five years and it -- and the next stage is actually business blueprinting or it's basically taking the software, identifying how we do business today, the various functions that we do, looking at SAP to see how they will allow us to do it within SAP and I'll tell you that that's one of the good things and one of the bad things is: SAP's very, very flexible and, therefore, we're going to have to make choices from a number of ways of doing business. We then use that blueprint to move into what they call realization, which is setting up SAP the way we've determined we want it to work.

Then in final preparation, the fourth phase of this project, you basically get the campus ready so that's when we'll come out and we'll do all of our training, we'll do all of our testing so that you

eventually move into going live on these systems and you hope that when you go live it's a non-event, it's barely noticed; that you've done enough preparation. Now, of course, there are going to be little issues that come up and so we will be supporting this all along.

Our consultants, we actually did contracts with them that divided this implementation into phases, quite honestly, because we wanted to hold their feet to the fire to keep them interested in making sure that we were happy during the blueprint phase. So we actually only contracted from -- during the -- for the blueprint with the -- the current consultants. That started actually on July 12th where we began their project prep, and will finish on December 17th when we will be -- we will have these documents that will lay out how we're going to use the SAP software.

I would alert you that about the first of December we're going to be sending out those blueprints across campus, and I would ask that you be available to take a

look at those blueprints and get feedback to us the first couple of weeks. Our hope is then that we will have the blueprint done before we leave for the winter break, and then when we come back after the winter break and for the New Year that we'll begin realization or configuration. It's only during blueprinting that we will determine the go-live dates. And, by the way, we'll stagger those dates. We're not going to bring up all four systems -- all parts of all four systems on the same day. We won't do that, I can promise you. But it's only in blueprinting that it's -- as you move to the blueprinting that you can determine, based on the scope, of when you will bring up those go-live dates. And I would ask Ernie to come back certainly in late November or in December to present to you all some of the major decisions and to talk with you about the go-live dates.

Now back to blueprinting, that's when I -- basically what we're doing during this phase, which will end on December 17th, is we are looking at the business processes

as they are; we're looking at within SAP to say what are our choices; and then we're basically making decisions about this is now how we're going to do this functionality within SAP.

The way that this process is managed is that you start through a number of workshops that start at a really, really high level just trying to understand the institution, and what the consultants are doing is they're trying to under the University of Kentucky's way of doing business and the team members are trying to understand the functionality in SAP and you hope that both of those groups get well informed so that through questionnaires, through these workshops, through talking with people that we will be able to develop this blueprint that will decide how we're going to use SAP.

In addition to this, we're going to be looking for any kind -- the reports that we have to generate, the interfaces that we're going to need to maintain because there will be some functionalities that we do not

replace within SAP, maybe they don't even have that functionality and we're going to need to write interfaces and then, certainly, conversion of data is going to be a major issue.

I just wanted to give you a quick glance at this because these are the kinds of workshops -- and probably campus management and HR have laid out theirs the best in terms of the number of workshops. Each one of these areas, we will be having between 30 and 50, depending on the area of workshop, as we get narrower, narrower in more, more detail and more decisions to make. We are letting Rebecca know when we're holding workshops so that information can go out to you all; we are contacting the colleges; we're working hard to get input at each and every one of these workshops from the campus. We're working really hard to make sure that every area that might have some uniqueness in how they do -- let's say admissions, for example. That's a good one. From -- whether that be the undergraduate programs, the graduate programs, the professional schools, they're

-- all of those unique needs are taken into consideration.

Now we do have campus staff involved in -- through asking those various people to be involved, and we call those our subject matter experts and what we ask -- asked those people to come in and do is to help us understand the details in how processes work. In addition to that, they'll be helping to design how the process is going to be working; they will be communication links between the insti -- between the project and their departments, and in addition to this these people will end up helping us do testing. We're asking actually that these people give us between six and ten hours a week during blueprinting alone.

Now some of the major things that are going to happen during this blueprinting phase is that we're going to have to be making decisions, and so one of the things we will be doing is if there's any decision that needs to be made by the Senate we'll be bringing those decision to -- directly to Ernie to ask him to have those worked

throughout the Senate. There are -- also may be some opportunities for improvement, I'll call them, that are not necessarily -- it's not necessary that we change these business practices, but if we see an opportunity that we think you -- the Senate ought to take a look at, we'll be bringing those to you as well.

One of the things that we have going on right now is an effort that's co-chaired by David Watt and Dale Austin -- Dale Austin's out of the Controller's Office -- looking at how we report faculty effort. You know we use a DOE. We're one of about five in the whole United States that uses the DOE to certify faculty effort. We're the only one in the State that uses that. University of Tennessee has worked with SAP to develop a methodology that they use, so we have a team of people from all across campus that are taking a looking at that system and they will be making recommendations about how -- what - - how we should go about measuring faculty effort. Jeff Dembo and Chuck Staben both are serving on that committee, and as well as, of

course, David Watt and we look forward to their recommendations in the near future.

How we're going to manage reporting, whether we're going to use the data warehouse or move to SAP's business warehouse will be determined. What we're going to do in terms of the portal, the entry into this site will have to be determined. We're going to work hard on how much data is going to be converted and brought into SAP versus how much we're going to have in the warehouse for reporting. Who owns data, we have elements of data that nobody owns. We're trying to make sure that somebody's responsible for every piece of data. I've already talked a little bit about the interfaces and, of course, reporting is incredibly important. One of the mistakes that other people have made in bringing these systems up was to not consider the reporting needs until they brought the systems up and relied on them. We won't make that mistake. We'll make our others, but we won't make that one. We're really beefing the IRIS web

site. It's uky.edu/IRIS/ and so I'm inviting you to come to the IRIS web site to stay abreast. E-email me at any point in time that you have a question; email me if you're interested in getting involved in any way with the project and certainly I'll offer to come back and speak to the Senate whenever you invite me.

Let me just -- can I -- is it okay to ask for questions?

CHAIR: One or two questions. Is there any?

MR. GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Arts & Sciences. As a user of a minority system, I just wanted to know that whatever systems you have will be accessible by machines other than PCs, such as systems running MAC and Lynx.

MS. NASH: Yeah. Certain MAC's. I haven't asked -- had that question asked about Lynx. One of the things we do need to look hard at is that the interface doesn't work as well on Netscape as it does on Microsoft Explorer, so -- I just was at a workshop about that very issue. So we certainly are attuned those issues and we'll doing everything possible to

make sure that MAC users have access to the system, and Lynx as well.

GROSSMAN: A lot of faculty in engineering use Lynx.

NASH: Right. And Fine Arts, too. I understand in Fine Arts -- almost all the faculty have MACs in Fine Arts. Probably the two major areas is that -- would you say that's correct?

UNIDENTIFIED: Medicine.

NASH: A few in medicine. Yes?

HOLMES: Holmes from B&E. If I understand your time table, did you say on December 17th you would show us --

NASH: No, not -- we hope to have the blueprint 80 percent done by the middle of November so it can be reviewed internally, and then by the 1st of December we want the blueprint coming out so that we have that couple of weeks -- the first two weeks in December for review external to the project.

HOLMES: Okay. What was the December 17th till time we left for the break --

NASH: December 17th consultants are done, their contract is over, they have to have all

the deliverables that they promised in the contract, and they're on a fixed-fee contract so that's the date that blueprinting officially ends.

HOLMES: Okay. So on December 1st, then, for about two weeks outsiders can comment on it?

NASH: Absolutely.

HOLMES: Okay.

NASH: And the other thing we hope to do, though, was we hope to bring major decisions to the campus as we're making them so that there's not major surprises on December 1st.

HOLMES: Okay.

NASH: Thank you.

CHAIR: Phyllis, let me thank you for really a scintillating presentation. This is going to change the face of this University in so many different ways, and I'm really pleased that Phyllis serving as the project lead.

Okay. Our last agenda item involves proposed changes to the Chair position of the Academic Council of the Medical Center. Let me underline the fact

that the Academic Council of the Medical Center is, indeed, a Council of the University Senate, as is the Undergraduate Council, the Graduate Council and the Senate Council.

It became clear to the Senate Council in its deliberations over the last year that the language of Senate Rule 1.3.4 demonstrated that it must be updated in light of the University restructuring. Last year the Senate Council ratified a provost decision to name David Watt as the ACMC Chair, the Senate ratified that position as an interim position. The specific impetus of the Senate Council recommendation, as you undoubtedly have seen from the materials, the documents that have been posted on the University Senate web page, involves a letter of December 9th, 2003 from the then Chair of the Senate Organization and Structure Committee, Kate Chard, which looked to how the restructuring of the University and the adoption of the provost system, the provost model, how that would bear on the ACMC and the Chair position.

On August 16th, as the minutes of that Senate Council meeting indicate, the Senate Council deliberated and has recommended with a positive -- has offered a positive recommendation, a motion to the University Senate, and that motion is the following: That the ACMC should be Chaired on an alphabetical rotating basis by the different Deans of the Medical Center or their designees from within their college every two years. This past without descent and has been forwarded to this body with a positive recommendation.

Are there any questions? Are there any comments? Is there any unclarity on this particular recommendation from the Senate Council? Yes?

ROUHIER: Jeanmarie Rouhier, Arts & Sciences.
Alphabetical by their last name or by their department?

CHAIR: I believe alphabetical by the college names.

ROUHIER: By their college?

CHAIR: By the college names.

ROUHIER: Okay.

CHAIR: So if I'm not mistaken, I believe Dentistry would be first. Okay. Another question? Yes?

PERRIER: Don Perrier. College of Pharmacy. Ever since we've changed the administrative structure I've found it very confusing as to what the Medical Center is. It was very clear before, various colleges reported to the Chancellor. It is totally unclear now. Our Dean of Pharmacy reports to the provost, and that I understand. Beyond that, I do not know what the Medical Center is and it'd be very helpful, since -- since this group does report to the Center, that they really revisit the name to see what that represents.

CHAIR: I would take this as a suggestion to the Senate Council. It's something that is out-of-bounds of this specific body. I typically until June first thought of the Medical Center as the place where I went to see my doctor and to be treated when necessary. Over the last few months I've learned a great deal about that specific entity known as the Medical Center, and I also am modest enough to know that I need to

know a great deal more; particularly, in the context of this provost model.

Other questions or comments in this regard? Jeff?

DEMBO: So is there any merit to consider spelling out the six colleges that the Senate Council might have intended to be embodied in that term Medical Center?

CHAIR: Would that be in the spirit of your question?

DEMBO: To a degree it would, but there's another issue. It's one that -- it's interesting that you pointed out that you envisioned as the Medical Center as going over to the UK Hospital, so the use of Medical Center is somewhat confusing, obviously. Health Science Colleges would take away that confusion in terms of relating to the Medical Center. Hence, I suggest considering another name. And if it is a Council of the Health Science Colleges, that explains what it is; it makes certain decisions related to the Health Science Colleges and it reports to the Senate, so then the Senate can determine who should be

the Chair. Are the Deans appropriate, and I just ask the question, or should it be a faculty member from one of those colleges?

CHAIR: Does someone from the Senate Council who supported this one to comment on that question, that query?

JONES: Several things were said --

CHAIR: Davy Jones.

JONES: What was it you wanted a comment on? Several things were said.

DEMBO: The first thing I think, Davy, the first thing is the name is confusing, Medical Center.

JONES: I think -- I think you're suggesting the six colleges. I think that would be a very good idea. It's probably beyond this right now --

DEMBO: I understand.

JONES: -- but it's something that should be explored by Council as a series of recommendations emanating from that --

DEMBO: Right. Yes, I'll -- you know, I support the motion. I'm just saying there's a -- there's a lot of confusion around what Medical Center means. The Council reports

here, therefore, should it be a Dean, and all these things are going to be considered, but I just...

CHAIR: Yes. I'm trying to get a sense of what areas of query are out-of-bounds here and what speaks more directly to the positive recommendation and motion.

JONES: I think there was discussed at a level of the Senate Committee Kate Chard chaired. For example: Should the Chair be elected from within the members for that year of the Council. So some of these kind of issues were addressed by that group, and actually the rotating Deans came from that. So that -- that has been digested.

CHAIR: Okay. Are there other questions, issues that need to be brought before this body in regard to the motion? Enid?

WALDHART: Enid Waldhart, Communication.

CHAIR: Welcome back, by the way, Enid.

WALDHART: I thought I understood what was going on. This committee is to be made up of Deans or just chaired by Deans?

CHAIR: It's to be chaired by Deans.

WALDHART: Okay.

MARTIN: Okay. Will so they can pick somebody, right?

WALDHART: So the designee --

SCOTT: I'm sorry. Names please. We need names.

MARTIN: Cathy Martin. I thought it said they could designate.

CHAIR: Or their designees. That's correct. The college Deans or their designees. Did you have a follow-up question, Enid?

WALDHART: No, I think that it -- I think that answers it. How many people altogether will this be? Is this one from each of the six --

BERGER: Oh, you mean the whole council? There's two members per college.

WALDHART: Okay. That was...

BERGER: And, you know, this --

CHAIR: Your name, please?

BERGER: Yeah, I'm sorry. Rolando Berger, Medicine. There's something I'm not clear because as I understand how this worked before there were two representatives per college. None of them were Deans necessarily, and so unless the whole election

process and so forth is going to be changed how is the Dean going to end up there being as Chairman? The way the thing is set up is -- as I understand it, is two members per college of the six Health Sciences. Correct me if I'm wrong, but that's what I understanding.

CHAIR: That's correct.

BERGER: Two members per college of the Health Science Colleges. They were elected with no regard to whether they were Deans or Chairs or anything else, and that's the group. So now is the Chair -- the Deans are going to rotate as a ex-officio Chair that would come in independent from the election process or...

CHAIR: That's -- that's correct.

BERGER: Is that the idea?

CHAIR: That is correct.

BERGER: The Chair will not be among the elected one, but the Chair would be named?

CHAIR: That's correct. Yes? Name, please.

GARRITY: Tom Garrity, Medicine. You know, the way it was before, you're right, elected

members of the Council, as I recall, Phyllis Nash, who was a Vice-Chancellor in the Medical Center, Chaired those committee meetings and so this is -- I guess you'd say, well, now that there is no longer a Medical Center Chancellor I suppose it made sense to have somebody who was in some sort of an administrative role, you know convene the meeting and, you know, Chair.

UNIDENTIFIED: So the Dean wouldn't be taking an active role --

GARRITY: That's what it seems now.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Chemistry. Will the Chair have a vote? I believe that needs to be made explicit one way or the other because if this person is ex-officio, who are they representing?

JONES: In the previous role, did Phyllis Nash have a vote?

GROSSMAN: I'm not sure.

SCOTT: I'm sorry, if you could identify yourselves when you speak for the court reporter.

JONES: Davy Jones.

SCOTT: Thank you.

CHAIR: This should have addressed that.

DEBSKI: Well, actually -- actually --

CHAIR: Liz --

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, Arts & Sciences.

Actually, we were just trying to correct the part of the Rules that had to do with the Chairing of the committee, and I honestly don't know if in the rest of the Rules it specified. I can tell you having served on this committee for a number of years, I don't remember a time when Phyllis Nash exercised her vote, if she had one, and David Watt --

UNIDENTIFIED: As Council you --

CHAIR: Yes, I would infer that that was the case.

DEBSKI: But, again, this particular part had to do only with the part about chairing and not to do with the composition as to --

CHAIR: The specific Rule is 1342, and it is silent on the voting rights of the Chair.

JONES: I think that maybe should be another issue that council --

CHAIR: As Liz Debski indicated, the main thrust of this particular recommendation is only to deal with part of the language in the

appropriate section of the Senate Rules that pertain to the ACMC and not other aspects. This -- this issue that has surfaced, the issue of the voting rights of the Chair is one that certainly the Senate Council and perhaps other bodies might wish to weigh in on. Other comments? Yes?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Chemistry, and I just have a question. This recommendation here, I don't understand Kate Chard's letter here.

CHAIR: Yes.

GROSSMAN: It refers to things that you haven't stated at all in this. I mean, in the first sentence: We recommend the creation of a new position for the Academic Affairs Committee. What does that mean, similar to the Graduate/Undergraduate Council and how is this addressing that recommendation?

CHAIR: Well, it seems to me that we should not infer from that specific letter that came from the Chair of the Senate Committee on Academic Organization & Structure that -- that reflects the particular motion is that is on the floor and that came from the Senate

Council itself. The Senate Council recommendation is narrower in scope and has a much more specific purpose in mind, and nothing more.

GROSSMAN: Okay.

CHAIR: Chair. This was in a sense part of the underlying evolution and history of the movement of this recommendation. Chuck?

STABEN: Chuck Staben, Arts & Sciences. I think that, for example, the Undergraduate Council -- and please correct me if I'm wrong; I get things wrong often. The Undergraduate Council is chaired by the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education; is it not?

CHAIR: That's correct.

STABEN: Phil Kraemer currently. And the Graduate Council by the Dean of College -- the Graduate School; correct?

CHAIR: Yes.

STABEN: So that by -- I think what's meant here, Bob, in this first sentence of the second -- second paragraph is that the recommendation to create a position and now is to the original position that Physical

Nash was holding, which was eliminated as a part of the provost reorganization and effected the Medical Center --

GROSSMAN: Yes.

STABEN: And given that's been decided not to create such a position, an alternative solution has been sought which might involve --

BERGER: The Deans --

STABEN: -- the Deans.

CHAIR: Okay. Is there anyone who wishes to speak against the motion? We seem to be very close to making a decision, and more or less on time in terms of completing our business for today.

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: There being none, there is a motion on the floor that has come from the Senate Council that the ACMC should be Chaired by an alphabetical rotating -- an alphabetical rotating basis by the different Deans of the Medical Center or their designees from within their college every two years. I will ask for a vote. All those in favor please raise your hands?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: All those opposed?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Are there any abstentions?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: The motion carries. Okay. We have no further business for today. I take it as sheer luck and the good efforts on the part of the other speakers to get us through in a timely fashion and not any magic on my part, there being no further business we stand adjourned. Thank you.

* * * *

* * * *

THEREUPON, the University of Kentucky Senate Council Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

* * * *

* * * *

STATE OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF CAMPBELL)

I, LISA E. HOINKE, the undersigned Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky at large, certify that the facts stated in the caption hereto are true; that at the time and place stated in said caption a University of Kentucky Senate Council Meeting was held; that said Senate Council Meeting was taken down in stenotype by me and later reduced to computer transcription under my direction, and the foregoing is a true record of the Senate Council Meeting.

My commission expires: January 23, 2007.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 10th day of October.

LISA E. HOINKE,
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE
K E N T U C K Y