

September 11, 2006 cri pt.TXT

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
SENATE MEETING MINUTES

\* \* \* \* \*

SEPTEMBER 11, 2006

3:00 PM

AUDITORIUM OF THE WILLIAM T. YOUNG LIBRARY

\* \* \* \* \*

KAVEH TAGAVI, CHAIR

GIFFORD BLYTON, PARLIAMENTARIAN

I N D E X

PAGES

MINUTES OF MEETING. . . . . 3-107

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE. . . . . 108

XCHAIR TAGAVI: As you know I'm going to be very brief. You know that President Todd is also the Chair of the Senate, and without much more saying, I'm going to invite him to come over and open this session of the Senate.

PRESIDENT TODD: All right. Thank you. I appreciate it. Thank you, sir. Well, thank you Kaveh. I welcome you to your presidency and look forward to working with you. We met a few times over the summer, and I look forward to working with all of you. Welcome back to the beginning of another school year. I do want to take a moment of privilege to take just a few moments to honor a couple of occasions that we're all thinking of on this particular day. One is the Comair Flight 5191. Like many people

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

across Lexington and throughout the Commonwealth, we were obviously stunned when that occurred. As you no doubt know, Larry Turner was our Associate Dean of the Cooperative Extension Service, one of the most perfect human beings I know. There was a tremendous service for Larry at Southland Christian Church and it was an inspiration to be a part of that on behalf of the faculty and staff and the students of this University. We also today remember the incidents that happened, and we'll always remember where we were at the time on September 11, the five-year anniversary of that tragic event. So I would ask us to stand for just a moment of silence in remembrance of those two occasions. Thank you. I don't mean to embarrass anyone, but I would like to ask Dr. Bernard to stand up if he would not mind. Many of you have seen his face on television. Turn around so they can see who you are. He is--he has represented this institution remarkably well during a time of--I know it's been trying for him and for his colleagues to care for the co-pilot who is still in our hospital, and we're proud of you, and we thank you for your handling of those situations. And I know it's been stressful, but you have shown like a bright star for us during a very difficult time. There's one last recognition before I talk about the state of the University as we gather today. I want to take a moment to recognize a truly remarkable person for this University. Gifford Blyton, who sits to our left, doesn't know we're going to do this, but it just so happened he heard I was going to be here, so he handed me something this morning. He didn't realize this was going to be used, I don't guess, so--Kaveh had given me some additional information, but it wasn't quite as detailed as what Professor Blyton provided me. He has served the University of Kentucky for 58 years. He has served under eight presidents. He has served the University Senate for 35 years, attending 272 regular meetings. He missed one. I, of course, asked him why, and his mother passed away, which, I think, we all excuse you for that. He has spent about 900 hours in Senate Meetings. He says he drove 1700 miles. Where were you coming from, anyway? Where

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

is your office around here, anyway?  
But he has served this Senate  
exemplarily well in the role of  
parliamentarian. And, Kaveh, I want  
to give full credit for having the  
concept that we should certainly  
recognize someone of his stature,  
of his contribution to this  
institution both academically and in  
the administrative of the legislative  
duties and for keeping all of you  
straight during his parliamentary  
role. I would like for Professor  
Blyton to stand up and come forward  
and present him with a plaque in  
recognition and appreciation of  
35 years of continuous service as  
parliamentarian of the University  
of Kentucky Senate presented on  
September 11, 2006.

CHAIR TAGAVI: I have one--as he said,  
I'd like to interject. It happens  
that in a week this young man is going  
to be 98 years old, and I know from  
sources that his favorite cake is  
chocolate cake. I have a chocolate  
cake for him, but we are not going to  
cut it here since all of you--and if  
I could ask you to join me in singing  
happy birthday for my friend here. Go  
ahead.

(SENATORS SING HAPPY BIRTHDAY)

CHAIR TAGAVI: Thank you. Thank you.

PROFESSOR BLYTON: Well, I'm not quite 98.  
I'll be 98 next week, and you're all  
invited to the party. Be sure and  
bring a present. I certainly thank  
Lee Todd for this wonderful gift.  
When you're my age, you can call the  
President of the University by his  
first name. So, anyway, it's been  
wonderful serving you these years,  
and I hope I can continue for a while  
longer, so thank you for being such  
a good group. Thank you.

PRESIDENT TODD: What a way to start.  
That's great. Well, I appreciate the  
chance to come to you to give you  
essentially a State of the University  
Address to catch you up on some  
things that have gone on, answer any  
questions you have and tell you a few  
things that are--we are facing going  
forward. The--I gave a similar  
presentation to the Education  
Committee in Frankfort today, and I  
will tell you that it is imperative  
that we continue to impress on our  
legislature that what they did for us  
last year was give us really the first  
year of a 15-year budget if we're  
going to be successful, and I was  
there to remind them of that today.

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

I had some good listeners and will spend more time doing that in the near future.

If you look at House Bill 1, and for those of you who have not been here that long, it was passed in 1997, and the primary drive for reforming higher education according to Paul Patton at that time, who was the Governor, was that he looked at the per capita income for Kentucky and the surrounding states and found that we were falling behind, that we had not made the investments in education, and we were not keeping track of what some of our adjoining states were doing, much less the ones further west and further northeast from us, and so they reformed higher education. One thing that we said as we went around the state last year that was important for Kentuckians to understand is that those states, those 20 states where the Top 20 universities are located have higher median--medium incomes than the national average, higher educational attainment, lower poverty rates, and fewer citizens on Medicaid. One of the quantitative numbers that we came out with was, if this state had the same percentage of its population on Medicaid as the average Top 20 state--the average in the Top 20 states, we would save this state 850 million dollars a year, which would help us solve a number of our problems. If the educational levels are where they would be, the people would be healthier. We know all those things. So it's important for us to continue to remind the legislature and the governors and the others in Frankfort that they gave us this mandate in '97. I contend that they've basically forgotten that. I made a comment to most of the leaders last year that if we, on this campus, went to sleep one night, woke up the next morning and decided we weren't going to push for a Top 20 standing, that that was it, because there was nobody else in the state carrying our water for us and making us push in that direction. And so we took it upon ourselves to write a plan, as you know, but what helped me sell that plan last year was the performance that you all achieved on this campus since 1997. And during that period of time, I was here for a few of those years, and we were cut 70 million dollars for--in a

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

three-year period, so you were not given the resources that you needed to do that climb. However, the accomplishments speak for themselves. If you look at the enrollment, we're up at least ten percent. We'll be announcing this year's class tomorrow, but we have grown the student body rather substantially without growing the faculty. Our graduation rate was 48 back in 1997, and it's about 60 percent now, a 25 percent--or 24 percent increase in graduation rate. Last year, as you recall, we had a lot of challenges with respect to African-American students, but one thing that I think the public generally knows is our graduation rate for African-Americans is around 50 to 52 percent; whereas our counterparts in the state are far lower than that. The University of Louisville's is about 25 percent. Even their graduation rate for all populations is in the mid thirties. So we've done a pretty good job of getting this number up there where we need it. However, in order for us to be a Top 20 comparable, we've got to get 72 percent, so there's work to be done.

If you look at research, we've gone from 122 million to 290 million. I'm a bit--I'm kind of afraid to say this, but I will. That's why people don't like to show me numbers because I remember them and I talk about them, but for the first two months of this year--we track our research every month. About three days after the close of the month, we know what our research income was for that month of the awards received. For July and August of this year, we're a little over 100 million dollars already, and that's phenomenal. It may taper off, but the federal markets aren't looking as attractive, but we have more firepower now. We have more people shooting at those dollars. We have more people who are recruiting who bring dollars with them, and we have recurring contract investments where you all have won the faith of those contract monitors and those providers, and they give you those second and third and fourth grants. So those numbers are looking good for this year. Our endowment was under 200 million dollars, and it's at 645 now. That is a tremendous increase, again, if you consider what's happened in those intervening years where you

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

had .com failures, 9/11, Enron. Stock market returns have not been what you have wanted. You've always been afraid to open your TIA Kraft envelope to see what happened and how much you gave away. But we've increased that much. This billion dollar campaign that we're in the midst of, which is a huge number for a state like Kentucky, we're at 950 million at the end of tomorrow's board meeting because we're going to recognize about 15 million dollars more of gifts. If you look at the endowed shares and the endowed professorships, the numbers there are almost unbelievable. The Bucks for Brain Program has allowed us to endow many of you who have served this institution for several years with distinction, and now we are able to give you some recognition for that, and it's allowed us to add to the family of scholars at this institution. So I'm very proud of this platform that we went into the legislative session with last year basically saying, you asked us to be Top 20; you didn't define it; you didn't fund us, but we've done our share, but now here's what we need to go further.

In the plan, if you look at the changes that we're talking about, we're saying that we'd either grow our undergraduate population by 6200 additional students. Assuming our graduation rate improves to 72 percent, we'll be providing the number of bachelor candidates that this state needs to have an effective work force. Professional -- first professionals would go up 750, post-docs 375, faculty 625. We're talking about getting our research expenders up to the 800 million dollar range, generating more bachelor's degrees and more doctorates, because those are the people who generate the jobs for the future. So that's the plan. We have a 2012 checkpoint in an intermediate slot so we can see if we're making the kind of progress we need to make. The plan--and I talked to you about it last year--took about 18 months.

What was really interesting is we began to--since we were getting funding for it, overnight most other universities in the state had a business plan. It just happened just like that, for some reason. This one took a long time, and it's something

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

that gave us a chance to look inside, to think about what we wanted to achieve. And what I'm pleased to say is that if you look at that plan--I still urge you to do so. There's a short version and a long version on the website, but the first--out of four major domains, we're going to measure, the first one is the quality of the undergraduate program, and the second is the quality of the graduate program, the third is the quality of our faculty, and fourth is research. We had several communication forums with that last year that I list here. One thing that I probably don't list is that I did take the editor of the Herald-Leader to breakfast the day before we released the plan to them, and I told her that they could kill us with a big headline that said something like: UK Needs Two Billion Dollars To Be Top 20. You know, if you add up all the money we need between now and then, we're going to get most of that anyway, but don't take a headline out of context. Look at the plan, decide, you know, to write something that will make sure that the readers continue to read your article. They did a tremendous job. The title of the headline I'll not forget. It's Rally Around the Flagship, and they had a two-page full spread about the article where they actually did some research and did some good work for us showing why our pharmacy program had slipped from third down to eight, because North Carolina had had a new facility, and went into some actual positive investigative research on our behalf. But we tried to be very open with all of our briefings on that. If you look at the challenge we face, we had to change the conversation in Frankfort. The way that universities were funded was with a formula that applied to the community college system, to the comprehensive universities, and to UK and U of L, far too simplistic for the complexity of today's organizations. And just hang with me for a second and I'll explain that what they were doing is that they would let each university pick 19 benchmarks that you wanted to catch. They did cut out some of the gaming that was played the first time around because everybody just chose the ones who were best funded, but they actually made you look at other parameters. Once the university

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

selected those 19 comparison benchmarks, then they would look at the tuition that was charged by those benchmarks and the state appropriation per student, so that gave them two numbers of how much cash that that institution had--those benchmarks had to educate those students. And then they looked at your institution and calculated those same two numbers, and there was a gap, and so their whole strategy was to close that gap over a three-year period. The trouble with our situation was that we had--we're trying to catch people who are up here (INDICATING), and I was telling them throughout 12 months that our benchmarks had a 1,000 more professors than we had, a billion dollars more in endowment than we had, a 100 million dollars more per year in annual giving. All of those kick off resources that add to their general state appropriation and their tuition that gave them a decided advantage over us, plus they had research space that had been paid for for many years. So we had to have an accelerator. We had to have something different to help us achieve anything like the goal that they had given us, and they couldn't fund us. If you look at the comprehenses (phonetically), that might be okay for them because their competitors don't have big endowments, don't have big annual giving, and so--and certainly community colleges didn't. So we had to change the conversation and get it to one where we tried to refocus back on higher education and particularly our Top 20 goal. All you heard going into that legislative session was how much money K-12 was going to take, especially for healthcare and how much money had to go into corrections, and how much money went in--was going to go into Medicaid, very little discussion about higher education. We did the dream tour. Some of you actually participated in that. We went to 22 cities around the state. We met with legislators in each community. We met with the radio stations. We met with newspaper editorial boards, a lot of prospective students, alumni, and all that. It was extremely well orchestrated. We formed a group called UKAN, University of Kentucky Advocacy Network. They were here on campus again last Friday. These are influencers in each of the counties around the State of Kentucky, people



September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

who carry some weight with those local politicians. As an example, we bring them together during each legislative session, and we educate them in the morning--this is very early in the session--on what we're going to be asking for. And then we ask them to invite their local legislators to come to a lunch that day. We had it at the Kentucky History Museum this past year. We had every member of leadership in the House and every member of leadership except for one in the Senate to attend, along with about 60 or 70 other legislative leaders. So it was a very powerful luncheon where we got a chance to pitch what we needed. And the beauty of this UKAN organization is that once we step away, somebody that they live with in their hometown is still sitting there carrying our case for us. We had them all to campus last week, so we told them again where we are this year, what we're going to be looking for to get a head start. If you wait until the legislature starts meeting and try to work on it, you'll never get anything done because they'll be overrun with the paid lobbyists who are there from the big companies, so we have to start early. But UKAN is something that Steve Byers and Rachel Webb oversee, and it's very helpful. I gave personal presentations to over 100 legislators, most of those in their home towns, to take them through a fairly thick plan, and what I found is that they didn't really know how to define what they meant with Top 20, and so we had to do that for them.

And so I got them to agree with the definitions that we laid out and asked them if there was anything else they could suggest, and they didn't know what it would take. And it was time extremely well spent and it showed we got--in the House, we called for a vote to support our Top 20 plan, and we got 98 out of 100. Those two were not in the chamber that day. That wasn't to authorize the spending; it was just to say we endorse the concept behind the way this has been put together. I'll tell you about the financing of it a little bit later. And then we met individually with every member of the House leadership. If you look at what happened as a result of those conversations, the Council on Post-Secondary Education's prime responsibility is putting

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT  
together a budget for the universities  
and to try to cut out all the  
regionalism and all that stuff.  
We worked with them and had to push  
them to even ask for us to get 13.7  
the first year and 13.6 the second  
year, and they were counseling us  
to not expect anything like that  
because it was going to be tough, and  
corrections was going to get money,  
and K-12 was going to get money, and  
so forth, but they at least submitted  
something at that level. The plan we  
had written said that we needed four  
million more than that the first year  
and five million more the second year,  
not a huge amount of money, but enough  
for us to begin to add faculty, to  
give some decent pay raises, and it  
was well calculated. And again, that  
was going to be with a nine percent  
tuition increase. The Governor called  
me to the office and asked me to get  
on the same page with the CPE, saying  
that we were going to cause a big  
fight among higher education if we  
didn't go with the CPE budget, and he  
told me that day what he was going to  
give the universities. Our share was  
going to be 4.6 million the first  
year--I reminded him that our coal  
bill went up 3.2 million that same  
year--and the second year 2.5 million.  
The House kept the first year, but  
I'll tell you what was impressive to  
me. I got a phone call late at night  
from Steve Byers out of Frankfort,  
and he said the Senate--the House just  
passed its budget, and it's putting in  
nine million additional dollars for  
UK's Top 20 plan. That's the first  
time that anybody had ever really,  
in a significant way, endorsed that  
concept. Then the Senate came along.  
Before this number came out, I was at  
the NCAA ball game up in Philadelphia,  
and the President of the Senate came  
up to that game and he told me I was  
going to like the Senate budget, and  
so I said, what's it going to say, and  
he said, I can't tell you. And I  
said, well, I'll be there Tuesday  
because they were going to roll  
it out, so they put 24 million in  
there. When I got to Frankfort that  
morning, they called me down to the  
Speaker's--or or the President's  
office and they said, would this be  
enough to fully--so that we can say  
that we fully funded the UK Top 20  
business plan in the second year?  
I said, that's fine. I didn't tell  
them we'd only asked for 18.7, so they

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

actually had a slight miscalculation. I know how they miscalculated, but I didn't tell them that either. The way it works, then, is the House had submitted a budget and the Senate submits a budget. If they don't agree, then they form a Conference Committee, and that's when they have a leadership team from each--from the House and the Senate that go in a room behind closed doors, no public press or anything, and they iron it out, and you have to watch that process very carefully. It lasts a few days. And they spread a little bit of this money out to the other institutions. All the other institutions got more money than they would have without the Governor's budget had we not gone through this process, but they pared us down to 20.9. They did put in something where we're going to have to spend a little money on some defined programs they want us to put in, but still, they clearly beat the 18.7 number. They beat it for the second year. The first year is still really low, and that's why--we were talking about a 5.5 percent increase for six years for salary raises for faculty. We were only able to do 3 1/2, and then we were able to--we're going to do 1 1/2 catch up in January. The--one thing I want to make clear to everybody, because I think there's some misconception, the promotion pool is separate from that 3 1/2 percent pool, so there's additional dollars for promotions. So that's what the budget ended up looking like. We had this--with this number, we had a table in the book that said that given how much money the State gives us, this is how much we'll have to raise tuition to stay on plan. Well, at 4.6 million the first year, our plan would have said we should raise tuition 17 percent. That was just too high. We don't need to inflict that much pain on the students, so we did go up 12 percent. It's the fourth year in a row we've had double-digit tuition increases, but it has not impacted our applications a great deal. They may be down a little bit, but not significantly, and that may be due to the high school population dwindling. But we were able to make some adjustments. The staff--we had a five million dollar pool in there for trying to improve staff conditions. We had to take that out, and in exchange, we took the staff to 3 1/2

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT  
percent as well, instead of 3 percent.  
But there are all kinds of rumors  
about why we did that, but that's  
the real answer. So that's what  
the budget ended up looking like.  
I called many legislators that evening  
and told them that it's important for  
us to get the money that second year  
because we need it if we got any shot  
at this, but more importantly, it was  
strategically important for us to  
differen--for them to differentiate  
us from the funding form that had  
been applied. We had gotten the  
lowest percentage increase in the  
last four years from CPE of any  
institution in the state, except  
one year KC--K--Kentucky State  
got less than we did, and so  
strategically, we broke from the  
pack. The real key now is to keep  
that mentality in place because,  
if you look at the plan, this is  
really the first year of several  
years where we need about a 5.8  
percent increase each year to do  
the things we want to do.  
I hope you saw the Chronicle on the  
higher education article. If you  
didn't, it's probably accessible on  
the website. I got some extra copies  
when it came out. It's a nice spread.  
Insi dehi ghereducati on. com are peopl e  
who rolled out of the Chronicle  
some--a couple of years ago because  
they di dn' t think the Chroni cle was as  
electronic savvy as it should be, and  
so they founded insi dehi ghered. com,  
and they had an article about it.  
I had two hours this summer with the  
New York Times in New York, an hour  
with Business Week in New York, an  
hour with Wall Street Journal in  
Boston. We're still in communications  
with them. They haven't written  
anything yet. They're waiting to kind  
of see what we do with this funding.  
The Herald-Leader did their feature  
article, which I was real pleased  
with. We have some interesting peers.  
I've given a speech at the University  
of Georgia, and I'm going up to Ohio  
State at Karen Holbrook's request to  
talk about this. I'm really proud  
that the University of Illinois' new  
president has asked a few other board  
members to come down and look at our  
turnaround in our Medical Center,  
because they have a hospital that's  
not doing as well, and to also look at  
our legislative approach because they,  
being a very top university, are not  
getting the respect that they need to

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

get in order to continue to achieve what they've achieved in that state. And then I'm on the board in (inaudible) and ACE, and they've shown some interest in the way that we've gone about this. But what we're continuing to have to do here--and we'll give you the official numbers tomorrow, but they're above what we wanted to have, but that's okay. The reason that we're going to exceed our freshman target is because our yield rate went up five percentage points this year. And to describe to you that language, if you have a--you know, you get in your applications. We have between 10 and 11,000 applications--closer to 10, I think. We accepted around 8,000, and then you wait and you see how many accept you, and we had a five percent increase in that from 80 to 85 percent, which generated about 400 more students than we expected. So one thing you may have already seen in the paper is that we had intended to be able to hold around 3800 for the first two years of this--or the two years of this budget period. We're going to hire 27 faculty this year--or create 27 new faculty lines this year and 27 faculty lines next year. We've decided to go ahead and create the 54 faculty lines right now. The College of Medicine is going to have at least 30 new faculty lines that will be paid for out of their revenue. So we're going to be adding 80 new--over 80 new faculty lines this year, which is, I think, as Ernie said, might have happened in the 1968 time frame but hasn't happened certainly recently. The faculty--this I put in here just for interest sake, and I actually have used this at a couple of high schools where I spoke recently. When we had the reception for new faculty out at Spindletop a couple of weeks ago, we--I met professors who were coming in here from Harvard, Yale, Duke, Cornell, Penn, Johns Hopkins, Wash. U., go down the line. There were others there that I don't know where they were coming from. I did leave off University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, but we got one from there, too. I see our Dean back in there from dentistry who probably keeps her eyes on that. But we are--you know, we are really able now to hold our faculty and to bring in comparable faculty to really move us forward. The--we hired

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

eight African-American faculty. We did lose some this last year. I'm not sure what the net number is just yet. We put 4.2 million into classrooms. This is from extra funding. We've been pretty skimp about spending money around here in the last several years, and so there's some reserves built up and we've increased--improved some classrooms and some other spaces around campus.

This freshman class--I'm not sure that's in--I'll just say that it is the most diverse class that we've ever had, I'm led to believe. The numbers will be out tomorrow, but we had a substantial increase in our African-American freshman. After what happened last year, we changed a lot. I can't say enough for our folks who changed a lot of the processes we have in Phil Kraemer's shop and the Provost area, Don Whitt and Bill Turner, but we'll have a significant increase in African-American students, as well as Hispanics. It's a record for both of those.

If you look at research, we chose to break out earmarks. One of the things that UK, in my mind, wasn't really pushing very hard were federal earmarks, and when you have one senior senator who's getting close to a leadership role in the Senate and you have a congressman who's head of Homeland Security Appropriations and was head of Transportation Appropriations, you need to spend more time with those people. We did hire a lobbying firm to work with us to make sure we had a presence in Washington. Jim Duff, who's one of our graduates, is now the Chief Assistant to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. He had served Chief Justice Rehnquist in a capacity similar to that some years ago, and was one of the pallbearers at Rehnquist's funeral this last summer, but Jim Duff moved on, but we have a replacement for him. But if you look at what has happened, is we've gone from about 5.3 million in earmarks. We were at 27.2. They cut all earmarks out of the HHS budget this last year, and so that cost us about seven million dollars, but we're up to a level of reasonable respectability, and we work on that quite a bit.

If you look at our federal numbers, they've increased significantly. Just to be up this last year, with NIH and NSF going through what they've gone

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

through, I think is significant, and our total was up six percent. I do know we were going to recognize Dr. Mollaterno (phonetically) at the game, but it was almost a rain out, and we decided to do that at a later date. But the American Heart Association has got us in their Top 20 for funding for research in that category, which puts us in there with Duke, Johns Hopkins, and several other top schools. So this is moving up. I just am really pleased with the focus that we put--we're running out of space, though, and many of you know that because you're in those areas where you don't have the space. The focus I'm working on this year with our staff to go back to the legislature is something to deal with the acceleration of space because we've got good money out of the Bucks for Brains Program so that we were able to hire more people, but we are operating at capacity in many of your departments where you don't have the room to teach; you don't have the room to teach your laboratories; you don't have room to do the research. So we're on a push to get that accomplished. We did get the money for the pharmacy building which will free up the old pharmacy building for biology, but we've got to renovate that, and we've got the money that we can spend for the hospital complex, but we're in a real need, I know, for space. I'm fully aware of that. One thing that many of your associates are involved in are the Commonwealth Collaboratives. I don't think we really pushed that as much, and a lot, in fact, we don't even know about them, but these are 24 projects where faculty have assumed the responsibility of taking on an issue in education, the economy, or healthcare in Kentucky collaborating with people who are already working on that problem. And I have a demonstration that I didn't give. I gave it this morning down in Frankfort, because it's important. If you think about the legislative situation, our Lexington delegation isn't big enough to carry a vote, and so it's important, when we're doing work down in McCreary County, or Cumberland County, or over in Pulaski County, to let the legislators know. And we have projects in education, healthcare, economic development. We're teaching entrepreneurship in the

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

19 most tobacco-dependent counties. We're taking ash from the coal plant up in Carrollton with a nine million Department of Energy grant converting it into strong concrete-base products for resale and helping the environment at the same time. We've got a lot of things going on in healthcare. A methamphetamine program down in Western Kentucky is a model program for the whole state, possibly the nation. But we're going to make a bigger deal out of Commonwealth Collaboratives because I think it's an area I, too, think the Senate should get involved in to see how we could take the work that our faculty are doing to really apply our research to our population and let that help them advance through this system. In the healthcare area, one thing that we have done is we have three affiliates with our Markey Cancer Center in three counties in rural Kentucky. I'm extremely proud of the leadership in our Medical Center right now because they go out and very sincerely tell the people across Eastern Kentucky, in particular, that we want to keep your patients in your hospitals. We want you to send them to us when they need things that you can't do. And it's already paying benefits for us. Our rural referrals are up. Dr. Mollaterno, I mentioned previously, at the Gill Heart Institute, makes calls at Rockcastle County on Mondays and Fridays. He explained to me the reimbursement scheme. If there's a five dollar payment for that patient, four dollars goes for technical fees which stay with the hospital; the doctor gets one of those five. And that's important for some of these counties because, unfortunately, healthcare is their main economic driver. So--but having the Markey name out across the state is a very positive influence for us. This is the cardiology program I was mentioning. To help cure the pharmacy shortage in Louisville, in particular, Norton's Hospital has committed 1.15 million dollars to--and they built a classroom to allow us to send 20 to 25 of our last year pharmacy students to do their final program down in Louisville so that they can better serve that population, and it gives us some more capacity on campus, but also buys us a lot of goodwill in those counties where they have such a hard time



September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

hiring pharmacists. So moving ahead, we've got to continue to push forward. You will be called upon in some of your cases to talk to legislative members. We're going to have them on campus to show them the progress we're making, because that's important to us. This year we only get 17 percent of our total budget from the State. Part of that is because we're driving that percentage down as our research numbers increase and as our hospital income increases, but that is a very important piece for us because that is recurring budget money that allows us to add full-time faculty positions and staff positions, and it's something that we need to continue to sell to those legislators, and we'd like to have your help. We are going to meet our obligation of covering 40 percent of the cost. We're cutting costs. We're going through cost avoidance in some cases that also counts toward this, because if we didn't avoid those increased costs, we'd have to charge more tuition. We are keeping track of these things so we can be explicit about where we're saving this money. We're about to wrap up our Bucks for Brains Program. We have 15 millions dollars left, and we've got 16 million dollars worth of commitments toward that. They've got to write their checks first and then--and won't release it until then, but I may have said we're at 950 million in our fundraising right now, and if we close that 15 Bucks for Brains money and bring in the State money, then that gives us--gets us up to 980, so we'll close a billion dollar campaign before the end of this fiscal year. We're then going to be looking at raising funds for scholarships, because the thing that people need to understand is an awful lot of our scholarships are not endowed. When I came here, I thought the Singletary Scholarships, which were around for a long time, were endowed, but they're not. They come right out of our general fund money and our tuition payments, along with a lot of our other scholarships. That's not unlike most other universities in the State. We need to endow those because for every dollar we can save on scholarships is money that stays in the general fund pool for campus improvements and salary raises. We haven't targeted scholarship

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

fundraising previously because we--the match money was sitting out there for endowed positions, and so we did kind of a right shift in that direction, but it's time to shift back towards scholarships.

The thing that we are really going to continue to push to in this next legislative session is bonding flexibility. If you don't understand the process, we can't build a dormitory. Even though we could go to a bank and say, we're going to build a dormitory over here; we'll fill it up with students; they'll pay; we'll use their proceeds in order to pay off our loan, we can't do that without State approval. We can't take out a bond without State approval. When you look at the hospital project, 450 million dollar expansion program, all of our--it's all our money, money generated from the hospital revenues, but we can't go out and bond that and then pay for it as we bring in additional revenue without the State's approval. We're trying to get that changed. Forty-eight states in the union allow you to bond yourself, what are called revenue-generating projects, like a Student Center. If the students say, all right, we'll pay an additional fee to have a brand new Student Center, we couldn't do that unless the legislature told us--gave us a go-ahead. So that was one that we are working on, because resident halls--you know, the Governor vetoed a few projects. We couldn't even air condition one of our unair-conditioned residents' halls this year because--you know, we got the money to do it, but we didn't have the authority. Kind of frustrating. So we're working on that. So that's where we are budgetarily. I think the thing that I find exciting about adding some new faculty lines is we have--and our goal--and I'm going to introduce Provost Swamy in just a second. Our goal is to relieve some of the pain that we have inflicted, and I take responsibility for inflicting that. We cranked up the recruiting machine. When I came in, we had 3,000 freshmen. We'll be over 4,000 this year. We were right up to that two years ago. We were around 3800 last year. But I felt we needed to grow, but I didn't foresee the cuts that were going to come. But once you make your investment and making the contacts with the high schools,

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

with the counselors, and start that process going, it's something you just don't want to cut back on because we need to continue to get not only the 6200 students, but they need to be students that will keep our quality up there. And so we are going to be adding some faculty to areas that have been overwhelmed, because one of our measures we're watching is the student/faculty ratio. If we were just focusing on research, we'd hire all research faculty and say to heck with the student/faculty ratio, but that's not going to happen. And so I think that will bring an energy level to the campus I hope that is appreciated, and I do seek your help as we go through this next session. I think this session was critical to us. If we had any hope at all of making a Top 20 push legitimate, I think this next session is equally important because it's going to show whether there's real commitment there or not. I will tell you there are other universities working hard against that right now that--you know, they want to go--they would much prefer to have the old formula, the old approach, and, you know, less peanut butter in Kentucky is the money around to guarantee the mediocrity we've always had. I was asked last year when we had the Joint Committee from Frankfort--the Joint Appropriations Committee met on our stage at the Singletary Center. That was the first place I'd given a pitch for this Top 20 formula, and one of the legislators said: Well, Dr. Todd, in your early slides, you show we're a high poverty state, but now you say you need this money in order to do what--you know, what you're saying. How can we do that? I said, how can we not? You know, do you want to always be a low income state, a high poverty state? You've got to make some choices. What's interesting to me is the money came from somewhere. Corrections still got some money. Healthcare and K-12 still got some money. So there's money there, but if you don't ask for it, you're not going to get it. And before I went in to meet with each legislature, I knew whether they had voted for House Bill 1 or not, and my question to them was: If you voted positively for House Bill 1 to take the community colleges away from UK and for us to become Top 20, did you really believe that that would

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

happen, and what made you believe it, because we got some plan to do it. It's all about the quality of the faculty and the students and staff that we put in this place and we've got to have their support. So we got it; we got it across the board. The leader of--the Minority Leader in the House, the Minority Leader in the Senate both spoke to the statewide Chamber of Commerce dinner on our behalf pushing this plan. It almost became a branded name down there. So we've got it, and now we've got to continue to show the progress. And if, given a few resources, we can just continue on the track that you established prior to getting the resources, I think we've got a real good shot at keeping their attention. So--but it will take work because there are other forces out there. So I'll be glad to take some questions for a few minutes, and then turn it over to our Provost. Any questions or any comments? Boy, I think I put them to sleep, Swamy. All right. Well, I appreciate what you do. I think that being a native Kentuckian, growing up in this state all my life, except for graduate days, I do feel when I say that--I think this job that I have here and the jobs you have are the best jobs in the State of Kentucky because we can touch education; we can touch healthcare; we can touch the economy, and we can touch it in ways in which it's moving, toward a higher need for learning and expectations in thinking, and if we don't do it, I don't think--we can pull the rest of them with us; we can work with them. We need to collaborate, but we're the ones that have to drive it, and that's a responsibility that I think causes some people who are joining us now to come here when you talk to them. So let's keep trying to improve things. We'll hopefully get the salaries where they need to be. That's where--you know, 80 percent of our money is in salaries, and so that's the push. Thank you for what you do. I want--I'm real pleased to welcome back to campus a gentleman that many of you know; some of you probably recommended for the Provost position. Dr. Subbaswamy has rejoined the University of Kentucky, having served at Miami down in Florida, having served as a Dean of Arts and Sciences in Indiana, having had other choices about where he could have

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

gone, but he chose to come back here, and I think that commitment is what excites me about his service here, and I've seen a high level of energy since he's come, an excitement. I want, as he comes forward, to also ask you to give a round of applause for Scott Smith. Scott did a tremendous job in a period that was very important to this University I think, looking back, this one--this year, this session we went through. And if you don't think the Ag people know how to do--deal with the legislature, they've been doing it for years, but I want to ask you to recognize Scott Smith in the audience for the tremendous job he did last year.

Swamy, it's all yours. I've got to go to the hospital board meeting, so thank you all. Thank you.

PROVOST SUBBASWAMY: Seems like it was only yesterday that I was sitting in the back rows over there, the fellow Senator, and the most exciting thing we did during the two years or so that I was in the Senate was passing selective admissions. That would have been about the right time, and it was well attended because of that.

I just wanted to spend a little time with you talking about the context for the Strategic Plan that's been circulated, the Provisional Strategic Plan that's in your hands, and talk about the process and going forward where--how we--the--what the next steps are, and so forth.

The President has left, so I can say this. It's one of those things where you have to be careful what you ask for because you might get it, and so we have in our hands the acceptance of the Top 20 business plan and acceptance of the Top 20 mandates, so the compact is complete. The State told us you should become Top 20, and we said here is the bill, and they said, okay, and so now we have to deliver. So my job and the first step in this--the strategic planning process and the strategic provisional plan document that you have in hand is really the very first step in translating that Top 20 compact, that Top 20 aspiration, into reality. Now, the context for that is, there's both a short-term and a long-term activity involved in this.

The short-term comes from the fact that the 2003-06 plan expired on June 30th, and so we're operating on an expired driver's license--expired

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

Strategic Plan. An organization of this sort which talks about lofty goals certainly should not be operating with a Strategic Plan that has not been updated, and so as I signed on and as it became clear that the business plan was going to be accepted and--by the legislature and funded in the second year of the biennium--fully funded in the second year of the biennium, it became very clear that we needed to rush and get an '06-09 version of a plan put in place even as we're thinking about the longer term issues that arise from accepting the strategic--the business plan.

So between April and--well, March and the end of the academic year, a committee appointed by the President in consultation with the Faculty Senate Council called the University Committee for Academic Planning and Priorities, otherwise known as UCAPP, and I worked closely to develop--starting with the '03-06 plan as the starting point and then making some modifications in light of some larger, long-term goals, and drafted the document that is now in front of you as the provisional '06-09 plan that was presented to the Board of Trustees because they were really anxious to make sure that we were making progress and insisted at the June meeting they receive a progress report. They received a progress report. We told them that since the academic year had ended, we needed time in the early part of the fall semester to vet the document with the faculty and staff. And so as soon as August 16th hit, we got the document out there, and we've held so far three open forums, and now the Senate Council has had a copy of the document for more than a month now--a little bit longer, I think, and I hope that all the input that we have received and will continue to receive over the next couple of weeks we will fold that into the plan. The University Committee UCAPP will meet in two weeks from now--one week from now and collect all that information and produce the document that will then be presented to the Board of Trustees at the October meeting as the '06-09 Strategic Plan.

Basically what that constitutes, then, is the adoption of a set of university-wide goals and objectives. That's really what this is, and then

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

helps direct what happens at the colleges and the department and other administrative unit level. So that's really the process. The goals themselves derived as they are from the '03-06 plan. Because, obviously, this is a continuing process, you don't suddenly say, oh, by the way, forget about all of that and we start afresh. And also, those are quite generic. This is a flagship land grant university in the State, and we have certain missions, and the goals really are an articulation of those missions. And so if you looked at the Strategic Plans, the overall university-wide plans of any of our benchmark institutions, you'll pretty much see the same themes and the same sets of goals, similar goals, so just--none of this should come to you as a total shock or surprise.

Goal 1: Enhance the University's stature among its peers. That's a statement about House Bill 1 and the Top 20 mandate. Prepare students for leadership in the knowledge, economy, and global society. That is simply taking account of two major forces that help inform what happens in the academy in terms of the society, namely the knowledge, economy, and global society.

Goal 3: Enhance the intellectual and economic capital of Kentucky through growth and research, and that's, again, a statement about being a research university and being an economic engine for the State of Kentucky which forms the basis for House Bill 1. Embrace and nurture diversity in all its dimensions. In today's world, I don't think this requires much explanation. Our students will be participating in an increasingly diverse world, society, and they need to be prepared--fully prepared to play leadership roles in such a society, and therefore, we need to embrace and nurture diversity at the University itself.

Goal 5: Engage Kentuckians through partnerships to elevate quality of life is really a reexamination and a rededication to the land grant mission of the University, but defined in the 21st Century context; that is, in the 1860's and late 19th Century, a land grant university meant something very specific in terms of agriculture in particular, but in the 21st Century, the economy and the knowledge based economy, the universities are being

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

called upon to play a leadership role in quality of life in education and quality of life and healthcare, but also in economic development. And so that concept--developing that concept and making that a major part of what the University thinks about going forward is Goal 5.

And there are some cross-cutting or over-arching themes throughout this, and I'd like to call them because you need sound bites in this day and age, four E's and four I's. Excellency, that's--really speaks to the quality aspects of being a Top 20 university. Expansion, that refers to the fact that we are, in fact, going to be growing in size, both in terms of the student--number of students and faculty. Engagement, referring to the 21st Century version of the land grant mission. Entrepreneurship, referring both to really calling upon training more entrepreneurs, but also, more importantly, what the President referred to in terms of the funding for the Top 20 plan coming partly from the University's own resources through both growth, but also fundraising and increased grant activity and through reallocation.

Innovation: Clearly in this day and age, to be competitive, you need to be innovative.

Integration: That refers to taking advantage, full advantage, of the--probably one of the broadest spectrum of disciplinary coverage that any university has, ranging from fine arts at one end all the way to medicine and dentistry and the health professions at the other end, all on a single campus that--and in a land grant university. There are only six other universities that have this richness of academic offerings.

So the question is, in a world where problem solving requires interdisciplinary knowledge and professionals are being called upon to be trained as--you know, into professional training cross training, teamwork is really what is emphasized in--whether it's in medicine or other business, and so forth, in such an environment, how do you best take advantage of those cross linkages that can be formed? That's integration.

Inclusivity, referring to the diversity goals.

And internationalization: Again,



September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

no--I guess taking note of the fact that the University of Kentucky could be doing more to play a role as an international university and also exposure to our students of the international experience.

So those four E's and four I's, as a set of cross-cutting teams that go through goals one through five, sort of give you the general idea of the university-wide Strategic Plan.

Assuming that with minor corrections it's submitted to the Board of Trustees, the key indicators arising from the business plan are all the ones that at this stage we can submit to the Board, but there will be a lengthy discussion later on about an enhanced set of strategic indicators that truly get to the quality aspects of what a Top 20 university should be. But starting in October, we will go back to the colleges, to the different centers and institutes and administrative units and have them begin to align their Strategic Plans with the university-wide goals and objectives and the cross-cutting themes, which will be a fairly extended process. At least the first phase of it, we hope, will be completed by the end of the academic year. That's in April. And we will then have action plans and a set of priorities completely identified by that time to then help inform the budget allocation processes for the following year, as well as the budget construction process for the next biennium when we go before the legislature.

That's the scheme of things. I'd like to open this up for questions, or do you want to do it at the end? However you want to do it.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Is it okay right now?

PROVOST SUBBASWAMY: Sure.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Yeah. Just one interjection. You--some of you who are Senators for more than a year, you know we usually have somebody sitting there doing a transcript, and we are trying to do it a different way by sending the tape of the session to be transcribed. So I'd like to ask you to always mention your name and your college. That way, then, we will have a correct transcript. Having said that, any questions for Provost Swamy?

DR. JONES: Davy--Davy Jones, Toxicology. I'm curious. The goal here is to reach Top 20, and there'll be

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

indicators that are identified and approved, but my question is: I always like asking loaded questions, and you forgive me for doing that.

PROVOST SUBBASWAMY: Absolutely.

DR. JONES: How do we know when we've reached Top 20? Who's going to decide that?

PROVOST SUBBASWAMY: Was it Justice Frankfurter who said: I know obscenity when I see it? I'm trying to remember. Anybody from the law school here? Something like that. I guess there are two different sets of measures here. One is very narrowly defined in terms of what the business plan used to compute the gap in the resources and, you know, marks--mark indica--key indicators, and then try to see how you close that gap, which is what the business plan gives you. And those are some of the really coarse, grained, easy measures, if you will. In reality, outside of the narrow, you know, CPE interpretation, our own Office of Institutional Research interpretation of something like that. Top 20 is when people routinely, when they're making various choices, whether faculty trying to decide which universities they're going to apply to, graduate students deciding to apply to various programs, undergraduate students considering their options, and granting agencies making decisions about centers and other such grants, awards being given, national academy members being chosen. If people are, in all of those contexts, thinking about the University of Kentucky among the universities that we think of as our benchmarks, especially the public universities, thinking about the Berkleys and the Michigans and the Wisconsin, and so forth, coming down. If, on that long list of 20 or so, the University of Kentucky keeps getting mentioned more often than not, then, to me that says we have achieved Top 20. But you don't set that goal through some particular measures because a lot of that is a reputational index which has to be really generated over a period of time. You move with the drivers that you start with, such as the grant activity and things like that. Some of those things will then begin to generate the buzz that then creates the--among peers, the respect, the

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

reputation, that then ultimately has to be sustained. So it's a long-term process. It is not something that you can achieve in the short term, but we are talking about a 15-year concerted effort to move the University significantly forward. And so I think that you start with the indi--key indicators that you currently have identified, but then ultimately achieve, hope to achieve, and work to achieve a reputational goal--I mean, a reputational identification as one of the top--topnotch public universities.

DR. JONES: What nomenclature will the Legislature be using? What language do you have to use to them to say, we're here, see?

PROVOST SUBBASWAMY: Yeah. I believe, again, this is--you know, this is a politically-loaded question as well, and so if Steve Byers or Jay Blanton or Tom Harris are here, they'll have to answer. But I guess my own view is: (a) 15 years is a long time; (b) The national indicators of how universities are ranked keep changing. To take--well, a trivial example, ACT and SAT scores are, you know, what we identify as one of the indicators of quality in the business--business plan, but more and more universities and university systems are beginning to either de-emphasize it or drop it, and my guess is that in five years time, there will be a discussion about why are we still using something that nobody else is using. And let's say there was a... (tape ends here) ...several kinds of child care and other issues that have come up. So I think you will begin to see all of that crystalize into some action over the next several months in terms of concrete action. You know, look, I'm politically naive, so I have to say that I really do trust those who succeeded in convincing the Kentucky Legislature to accept and give funding in the way that they did, that--to manage the political process in order to make sure that the best interests of the University overall come out while doing the right things, and so I'm trusting the University leadership's judgment in terms of the legislative relationship because this involves the legislature. But I think that you will begin to see over the next several months concrete action that addresses what the University really says it also means, I think.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Any other questions?

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

PROVOST SUBBASWAMY: Thank you.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Thank you very much. The Provost has asked specifically the Senate Council and the Senate for input. In your handout, I think there is a statement by the Senate Council that was issued as a result of that request. So now, I'd like to ask you to either send your comment and input to the Senate. You could reply to my e-mail and send it to me, and I would remove all the names and collate the information and send it to the Provost, or, of course, you could send it directly to the Provost, so please send your comments and your input. We have one more item before we start the regular business of minutes and other agenda items, and that is a memorial resolution by Dean Scott Smith, please.

DEAN SCOTT SMITH: I have an opportunity almost every day to be thankful that I'm not the Provost. I'm honored today to be invited to read a memorial resolution for Dr. Larry W. Turner. Dr. Larry Turner of Lexington, Kentucky, died August 27, 2006, from injuries sustained in the crash of Comair Flight 5191. He's survived by his wife of 30 years, Lois; daughters Molly and Amy; son, Clay; his mother, Martha Turner, of Rising Sun, Indiana; a sister, Marilyn Fox, and a brother, Wayne (Karen) Turner of Indianapolis. On behalf of the alumni, students, staff, faculty, and friends of the College of Agriculture, I humbly offer the following memorial to Larry Turner. Although Larry was raised on a farm in Rising Sun, he was a proud Kentuckian. Larry joined UK in 1978 as an Extension Agricultural Engineer and faculty member in energy management. In 1999, he was promoted to Chair of the Department of Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering, and in January 2002, he became Associate Dean of the college. Larry earned Bachelor's and Master's degrees in agricultural engineering from Purdue University. He earned a Ph.D. in agricultural engineering from UK in 1984. In addition to his Extension and applied research activities, Larry taught courses in the dynamics of biological systems and in the design of ventilation and environmental control. He led well-known multi-state, multidisciplinary efforts in development of an animal growth computer model now used in four

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

states. Larry's Extension program focused on cattle-forage systems, such as geo-textile pads, fencing, water supply, and paddock design, as well as cooling systems for animal housing. As a visiting scientist at Silsoe Institute in Great Britain, he conducted research on their quality effects on swine. Under Larry's leadership, the biosystems in the Agricultural Engineering Department increased external research and Extension grants from an annual level of 250,000 in 1999 to four million at the time he became Associate Dean. As Associate Dean, he spearheaded a statewide streamlining and enhancement effort called "Re-envisioning Extension" and led the successful effort to develop the County Enhancement Initiative which established a county agent career advancement track.

Larry will long be remembered for the passion he brought to the field of Cooperative Extension where he established himself as one of the nation's foremost leaders in innovative programming. Larry helped place the nation's first Fine Arts Extension County Agent in Pike County in 2005. He also sought partnerships to battle the State's drug epidemic and other partnerships like the Kentucky Entrepreneurial Coaches Institute that were designed to improve this State's economy.

Larry believed in the mission of Extension and its role in taking the University to the people. He was instrumental in creating programs in Kentucky's rural communities, including Health Education through Extension Leadership, also known as HEEL, the health, education, and empowerment program that would touch nearly 750,000 people in 2005 alone. His dedication to serving the people of Kentucky earned him a spot on the University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities where he served as Chair at the Engagement Subcommittee.

Larry's friend and colleague, Harold Benson, Director of Land Grant Programs of Kentucky State University, described Turner as a giant among men. "I will hold tight to the memories I have of him," Benson said. "He was able to bridge university to university and program to program in a gentle but effective way. The University is better for Larry walking

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

their way. He shall be missed. On behalf of Kentucky State University and myself, I say thank you, Larry, and for all the people he has helped serve, I say thank you."

I ask that this resolution be made a part of the minutes of the University Senate, and that a copy be sent to Dean Turner's family.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Dean Scott being a member of the Senate, I consider that a motion. We need a second for that. Name and college.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

CHAIR TAGAVI: All those in favor, please indicate by saying aye.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICES: Aye.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Opposed? Abstained?

Thank you very much, Dean Scott. Okay. Let's start regular business by--we have the minutes from April 10, 2006. They have been distributed to you. Some of you made some corrections. Those corrections are under light strike through. Are there any other corrections? Hearing none, I assume they stand approved. So the minutes of April 10th are approved. I'll have to get--please bear with me. I have to make a couple of announcements, but before I get to that one, I have one quick announcement. As you--some of you might know by Senate Rule, the Chair of the Staff Senate is an ex officio member of our body, so I'd like to recognize Kyle. I have seen you, Kyle, over there. Kyle was recently reelected as the Chair of the Staff Senate, and thank you for being here. Okay. We had--again, by Senate Rule, we have to report to you when we make rule waivers, and Senate Council made two rule waivers, one on Monday, 20--August 21, 2006. This was regarding waiving the rule of retroactive withdrawal that cannot be considered after two years of the semester that the request is being made, and there are compelling reasons and we have represented it from the Dean's Office and from the retroactive withdrawal. They came to our Senate Council and presented the case, and we approved the rule waiver, and I'm reporting them to you at this point. The other rule waiver was regarding--some of our colleges for a variety of reasons did not conduct elections on time, and we waived the rule so that their Senators would continue remaining a Senator, and we also waived the rule so they could

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

conduct their elections early in September, and pretty soon you're going to have the result of those. So I'm just reporting those to you for your information. Are there any questions or discussion regarding those? Okay. We have a couple of other agenda items. The first agenda item is UK degree list, and I'm going to ask for my colleague on the Senate Council, Professor Jones, to give us an explanation for why, at this point, we're considering this agenda item.

DR. JONES: Okay. This relates to the status of the University faculty under State law. The State law delegates directly to the faculty of the University the responsibility to determine which students have completed the course of studies--or have graduated the course of studies that leads to the degree and then to make the recommendation to the Board of Trustees that the degrees be awarded. The intent here by the legislature is that the faculty, the academics here, are the last point before the Board of Trustees in getting the names that should be on this list. Back in the early days, it was literally--the entire University faculty would be sitting here. Now, the elected faculty Senators who are here have been--a circle has been drawn around them by the Board of Trustees. You are entitled to act on behalf of the faculty of the University in your vote on these degree lists to affirm that the Board of Trustees is acting on the list that contains the people who should be on it and all of the people who should be on it. Now, toward that end, you received an e-mail about this. There was a draft list, and we're very appreciative of those of you who cross-checked back on that because there were a number of students who were entitled to be on this list, to get their degree in hand and go look for a job with their degree in hand that were not on the draft. Colleges of Nursing, Law, Pharmacy, Medicine, Health Sciences all pointed out some students who were entitled to be on there. The Registrar agreed they should have been on there, and those names are there. So with that amended correct list now, the vote by the elected faculty Senators is due to approve this list for its presentation to the Board of Trustees. Tomorrow we will

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

make the final vote on the award of degrees.

CHAIR TAGAVI: This coming from Senate Council does not require a second. Are there any questions or discussions? If not, all those in favor, will you please raise your hands. Go ahead and count, please.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

CHAIR TAGAVI: We don't need counting. Okay. Those opposed? Okay. Abstained? It's approved.

And part of my job is, I was told by Sheila--which by the way, I didn't mention, on my first day here, Sheila Brothers is attending an LDI two weeks intensive program, so I'm all by myself, and I was reminded I have to let certain people know about this list as being approved.

The next item is somewhat similar. It's the list of degree--the degree list for KCTC--well, actually, it's specifically BCTC. Will you please do the same thing, Dr. Jones?

DR. JONES: Yes. This relates to the students at LCC, and the separation of LCC from UK a few years ago. Students who had enrolled at LCC prior to June 2004 are entitled--as long as they graduate by sometime in 2010, I think they're entitled to have their degree awarded by the University--the University of Kentucky degree, not a KCTCS degree. So that requires, then, the Board of Trustees approval because the Board of Trustees makes the final decision on degrees that have the UK's name on it, and again, they want the faculty to be informing them what is the list that should be acted upon. We have worked very closely with the LCC faculty about the kind of questions that you were asked about the list that we just did a moment ago. Are all the students on here who need to be? Are there any that should be removed? Also, for these LCC students, their degree honors--although they're under KCTCS now, if they enrolled before June of 2004, their degree honors criteria are those that this body has established for degree honors under a UK logo. And we've also confirmed with them that the Registrar and others over there are using the correct degree honors list. It's not the KCTCS criteria; it's our criteria. And so we've confirmed, then, that the degree honors and the degree list are correct, and we're ready for the elected faculty Senators, again to



September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

vote on that, to present the list to the Board of Trustees tomorrow.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Again, this being from Senate Council, it does not require a second. Are there any discussions or comments regarding this item? If not, all those in favor of approving this motion please indicate so by raising your hand. Opposed? None. Okay. Abstained? Okay.

The next item, I'd like to make a small introduction to that. This is a change to the Administrative Regulation regarding Chief Academic Officer Merit Review. If my memory is correct on this, this started in the previous year, and the Senate Council had an opportunity to iterate with then Provost Smith regarding this AR, and we gave our input, and it was incorporated. Later on--and I'd like to explain that that recession doesn't look at this CAO review and the 65 Rule, which you have some handouts regarding that, to be connected.

But we on the Senate Council had anticipated that--and we thought there was a connection, and we wanted to reiterate and revisit the AR, and Professor--Provost Subbaswamy was kind enough to allow us to engage him and his office one more time, considering the fact that there was a desire on the part of the administration to drop the 65 Rule. And I'm going to momentarily show you the part of the 65 Rule, and in fact, why don't I do that right now. You have it in your handout, but here is the part of the rule that, it's my understanding, will be eventually dropped. But let me again separate this mainly--and I'm going to ask Provost Subbaswamy to come, please, to the podium if there are any questions and if he wants to make any remark. The AR is available to you. The underlined--of course, the AR is this one, if I could go ahead and find it here. There are some underlined and--some underlined and strike-throughs. Those are the ones that were included after the last (inaudible) with the Senate Council.

So just one more explanation. We don't--this is not in front of us to approve or disapprove, so there is not going to be any motion, per se, for approval or disapproval, except that there's a tradition that when the Senate Council is asked for input on ARs, we have made this a process that we would bring it to the Senate for input, and I'm going to be asking your

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

input regarding that right now by--in terms of maybe questions and even later on by writing to the Senate Council, and I will then correlate those input and send it to the Provost.

PROVOST SUBBASWAMY: Sure. On the Chief Academic Officer Review process, I guess the main thing I will say is that it's been a really good collaborative process where the Senate Council and my office and the Deans basically have sort of gone back and forth round-robin making sure that all concerns have been addressed. The upshot of this is--this is something that I think is a very valuable one, is that under the previous version, whichever version that was--I'm not sure that was an adopted version or just a draft version. I came into this in the middle of it all. But certainly there was a version in which there would certainly be input from the faculty and/or staff of the academic unit as a part of the Academic Officer Review. This is the review that--periodic review done of Deans and Vice Presidents, and so forth. But then there really was not a feedback to the--those whose opinions were sought in terms of here is what happened; here is what was found in some general sense, and that's a very sensitive thing for a couple of reasons. One is it is a personnel matter. I mean, you know, personnel matters are, in fact, things that are supposed to be private, on the one hand, but on the other hand, this is, in fact, a position of authority, and so if there were improvement plans and things like that developed, I think the faculty and the staff have a right to know what was the outcome of such an elaborate process. So the summative review now has been cast in a form where the opinions--I mean, the surveys that are done and the summary that resulted thereof will then be made available to the faculty and staff as relevant to that particular unit. And that--that's really, from my perspective, the major change that came as a result of this iteration among the Senate Council, the Council of Deans, and my office, and I think it's a healthy thing, so this way there is, in fact, feedback to those affected in terms of a summary form that is--you know, obviously does not violate privacy considerations for the

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

employee, in this case the CAO, but that's really the major change.

I'm happy to answer any questions.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Would you please give us a timetable regarding when this would be presented or become effective, or also maybe about the 65 if you have any input on that?

PROVOST SUBBASWAMY: This has been going on, from what I gather, since--as you said, this came up what, a year ago or something like that?

CHAIR TAGAVI: Yes.

PROVOST SUBBASWAMY: So it's time to bring this to a closure, so this--I--the final version, I think, has been in with the Senate Council for what--it's about a month now...

CHAIR TAGAVI: Yes.

PROVOST SUBBASWAMY: ...or something of that sort. So I guess my prefer--I mean, right now all that needs to happen is that--for this particular AR, the President has to adopt it. And my--unless there are serious concerns expressed, you know, within the next week or so based on what you've brought to the Senate, my inclination is to take it to the President next week. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) just a brief question. Assuming the President does adopt and promulgate this, does this apply to the existing Deans, or is there some grandfather clause regarding new Deans?

PROVOST SUBBASWAMY: No, that's--that is, in fact, the way it'll be implemented, and in fact, the first guinea pig Dean is going through this even as we speak. I won't say who it is.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Any other questions for the Provost?

PROVOST SUBBASWAMY: The age 65 thing, does that need any type of comment?

CHAIR TAGAVI: If you have a question regarding the age 65, this is also the time to bring that up if there are any questions. Otherwise, it's my understanding that--it's my understanding, of course, that this would be probably just deleted, this part regarding the 65.

PROVOST SUBBASWAMY: It's vestigial. It goes back to the days when there were mandatory retirements. Faculty mandatory retirement went to 70 and then disappeared, and at that point, the 65 Rule was kept, and it's topatently (phonetically) discriminatory because it's based solely on age. There's absolutely nothing else, other than you reach

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

a certain age and suddenly your abilities have gone away. So I think it is inconsistent with where the law is, where the federal laws are, and where our own thinking in terms of age discrimination has evolved. So the--there is a review process. Every person reports to their supervisor at their discretion. The President can fire me tomorrow if he so chooses. I hope not. And so in that sense, really, it's a totally--a total vestige of something that I don't think applies any longer.

CHAIR TAGAVI: The Senate Council also asked the Provost for a statement on the provision regarding the 65 Rule, and we received one, and this is exactly what I received from the Provost's office. Dr. Jones.

DR. JONES: Yes. Again, just a little procedural aspect. This one does require Board of Trustees' action?

PROVOST SUBBASWAMY: That's correct.

DR. JONES: And that will happen at tomorrow's Board meeting?

PROVOST SUBBASWAMY: No. The October meeting.

DR. JONES: The October meeting?

PROVOST SUBBASWAMY: Yeah. The plan was--because I believe this came before the Senate Council at the May--at its May meeting, I think, sometime in May, and then it was--it had been brought back now with CAO review as well, redone, and so my understanding is that at this stage, our intention, I mean, is to bring it to the Board of Trustees at their October meeting, not September meeting, which means that there are about two weeks here in between before it--the material has to go to the Board in its final form.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Any other questions? Name and college.

(Inaudible): (Inaudible) biology. I may be the only representative here to present the position on women, so I just wanted to make sure that everyone read this last part of the statement that--we discussed this at one of these meetings, and this was a paragraph that was drafted--

PROVOST SUBBASWAMY: (Interrupting) Yeah. I drew that from--

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Interrupting) Right. I just wanted to bring that--

PROVOST SUBBASWAMY: (Interrupting) --the discussion.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: --to full attention. Thank you.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Any other questions? Thank

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT  
very much. Similarly, if you have any input on this, as I said, you could send it to Provost Subbaswamy directly or send it to Senate Council and we will collate it and provide it. I thought there is no way we are going to finish this agenda item, but--this whole agenda list, but perhaps we could do it with your help. The next item is extension of--here, let me get this--Oral Communication Suspension extension, the requirement for oral communication. Is Associate Provost, Phil Kraemer here? Would you like to come and present this?

ASSOCIATE PROVOST KRAEMER: Do you want me to say something about it?

CHAIR TAGAVI: Yes, please, say some--

ASSOCIATE PROVOST KRAEMER: (Interrupting) It's pretty straightforward. I think many of you may recall that we had voted to suspend the oral communications requirement of USP two years ago. The hope was that we would come up with some solution of how we can administer an effective oral communication program or requirement, and we aren't quite there yet. I think we're in the process now of beginning to seriously examine USP reform, and we're also facing some very serious enrollment challenges. So the Department of Communications requested an extension of this hiatus. It was supported by the College of Communication and Information Studies. The USP Committee voted unanimously to support this. I think it makes sense at this time, but I think the one rider that's important is that we did request that we be held accountable and come forth with some particular progress report on how we are going to manage this important issue; that it doesn't, quite honestly, look good for a university to be saying--I don't think we're quite saying that, but it looks that way, that our oral communication skills are not that important in the year 2006, and we're not saying that. We have to seriously work on this. The Provost has asked that I form a committee working with Dean Johnson and the Chair of Communications Department, Nancy Herrington, to get a group to really think about what some alternatives may be.

CHAIR TAGAVI: This, again, is a proposal coming from Senate Council with positive recommendation. It doesn't require a second, but it does require

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

a vote. So before entertaining a vote, I would like to ask if anybody has a question or comment? I ask you to help, but not this much help. You could ask some questions.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Chief Tagavi, you're usually back here (inaudible).

CHAIR TAGAVI: I know that. Okay, then, all who are in favor of this proposal please indicate so by raising your hand. Is--that means you got up because you want to count?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

CHAIR TAGAVI: Okay. (Inaudible).

CHAIR TAGAVI: I hear that--Michelle, I hear that nobody wants this to be counted. I think--yeah, I think it's obvious. Those against, please?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: One

CHAIR TAGAVI: One person. Abstained? Okay. So for the record, we have one against and no abstain, and everybody else in favor of. Okay. Thank you very much. I cannot believe--the next item--if I could have--by way of introduction, I prepared a brief introduction. We had a review of USP which was initiated by the Office of the VP for Institutional Research Planning and Effectiveness in 2004. Two committees were formed as a result of this. One was Self-Study Internal Committee and the other one was External Review Committee, referred to as ERC. At the same time, the general education initiative was initiated by then Senate Council Chair (unintelligible). Later, therefore, it was formalized into a new committee charged by Senate Council and Provost's Office. Hence, GERA, which stands General Education Reform and Assessment Committee. GERA will present its final report to the Senate Council and perhaps later to the Senate in late September and to the Senate in the October meeting. But for now, this is all about ERC, and I would like to ask Bill Rayens to come over and present this report for your input. Is this the one?

BILL RAYENS: (Inaudible) some changes (inaudible).

CHAIR TAGAVI: Oh, you want to use that one?

BILL RAYENS: (Inaudible) I corrected (inaudible).

CHAIR TAGAVI: Oh, well, that's--then that's going to take some time. Go ahead and put it in there and let me see if I can get it for you. There has been a change, so I have

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

to use a more recent version, so  
please bear with me. Where is it;  
do you know?

BILL RAYENS: Yeah. (Inaudible).

CHIEF TAGAVI: That's fine. There you are.

BILL RAYENS: Thank you.

CHIEF TAGAVI: Go ahead.

BILL RAYENS: Thank you very much.

As Kaveh mentioned, my name is Bill Rayens, and I've been asked to give you a very brief overview of the External Review Committee's final report. The committee itself, the composition is there on the screen, and I think most everyone is here. At least I see several of the members here. You know, I was asked to keep the presentation to maybe ten minutes, twelve minutes at most, and I really had to make some choices about what I would say. This has been going on a long time for us, and I decided, well, I really needed to be very intentional with respect to what I talk to you about, and I decided what I would do is try to summarize, I think, what the committee would say should be the take-home point from our deliberations over the course of a little over a year. So there are lots of details that are interesting to discuss. They've been discussed in other sorts of venues as well, but I'm going to try to stick to a couple of main points, and you'll see that as we go through.

We were charged originally in February of 2005. That charge had to evolve over our first couple of meetings. We sought to understand our charge a little better. Ultimately, our charge was clearly articulated as seen up here, to generate a series of guidelines in an attenuated document that would serve as an intellectual springboard, something that would continue the discussion for general education reform and act as a catalyst. So we met many times, and we filed an original report in 2005. Now, our understanding was that this report was going to go to a small committee of four or five people, and they would have--Tony is laughing in the back there, one of the members of the committee--and that this committee would have a look at this and it would sort of maybe stir their primordial soup and help them think about what they could do next in order to continue with this issue of general education reform. GERA had a better idea. GERA came along and said, well,

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

we would really like to take this little report and we would like to expose it to 14 or 15 university forums and that's, in fact, what they did. So the original report--Alan Santas was the Chair of the committee at that time and was a tremendous leader in putting this report together, and that report was circulated among these different forums and debated. We were asked--we weren't recharged, but we were asked if--the ERC was asked if we would attend these forums, listen to what was going on, read the transcripts, and be informed by the opinions of the faculty and submit a revised report, and that's, in fact, what we agreed to do. So a substantially revised report was submitted in May of this year, and that is now on the--it's been on the GERA website for some time. I think all the Senators received a copy. The ERC was officially discharged early in the summer of 2006, but what I wanted to do was to talk to you a little bit about what the substance--what's the substance of the report, but I think--and other members of the committee please correct me if I'm not doing justice to the report. In a way, we could boil down this report into the bullets that are on this page. If we were to agree on what might be two or three take-home points from the report, I think at least two of them would be on this page. We started meeting, and we tried to think about what might we do in order to catalyze this discussion on general education reform, and we started doing, I think, what I've seen other committees do that were similarly charged in the past, and I've been here 19 years. We started to think about witty curricular models, and we started thinking about, well, gee, wouldn't it be fun if we did this, or this sort of program is long overdue. But the more we talked, honestly the more we realized we didn't know what we were talking about, and I think the reason we realized we didn't know what we were talking about is we--there wasn't a clear set of objectives for the program or the courses in the program. So we started to back pedal, and we decided--a couple of quotes from the report, "that a coherent framework for describing shared outcomes must be conceptualized before implementation



September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

issues can be sensibly debated." It may be more clearly said on page eight: "The position of the ERC was simply that the value of a General Studies Program should not be judged solely on how widely it's distributed across various intellectual disciplines, but rather on how effectively it addresses fundamental curriculum objectives." So what we ended up doing was not coming up with any type of curricular model or set of models, but rather focusing on this point and trying to make this point in the forums and also in the--of course, in the revised document, that we needed some sense of curriculum objectives for the entire program before we could talk about--sensibly talk about revisions.

Now, Ernie, with apologies, I have to say this one more time. I think early on, what we were saying in the original report, the first draft, generated a lot of talk that the ERC was proposing an outcomes-based approach to general education, as opposed to a distribution approach, and I think that was a source of perhaps some confusion. I think members of the committee would say that we weren't thinking this way at all because an outcomes-based approach isn't in any sense at odds with a distribution approach. In order to make that point--and I have to thank my Chair who is here, Connie Wood, from Statistics, for having this document and being able to produce it very quickly for me one day when I asked if it was still around. This is from a statement to the Senate, I believe, in 1985 when the original University studies program was in--you know, in the process of being created and coming on line, and it was built around seven intellectual skills. And what I think I found interesting about this, once I dug this out, was how few people actually realized that our current program that's sometimes viewed as just a distribution program was originally based on seven intellectual skills. And there's, of course, some discussion that can be had as to whether we've just gotten away from the foundations of the program. So in a sense, what the ERC report was trying to do was to ask for and vie for a return to some focus on clearly stated curriculum objectives and attending learning outcomes. Now, there's a lot of

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT

detail in the report, a lot of detail about, you know, particular learning outcomes that you may or may not be interested in as faculty, but I would say certainly the overriding point in the report is for a principled approach to curriculum reform, to gen. ed. reform. Now, the way the report is structured, we have an over-arching principle. And under that over-arching principle, we have four curriculum objectives, and under each curriculum objective, we have a series of learning outcomes. That's the basic structure of the report.

And all I'd intended to show you today was the over-arching principle and the four curriculum objectives. I have more detail prepared if you want to see it, but I thought this would probably be about all I could do in ten minutes.

The over-arching principles, the University of Kentucky prepares its undergraduates to be life-long learners actively engaged in the global community of the 21st Century. And then we have four curriculum objectives. Let's just go ahead and put them all up there. The first one addresses, what we call in the report, essential skills. The new General Studies Program should provide students with essential skills. The second bullet--and I think some of these map pretty nicely to what the Provost was talking about a few minutes ago--the new General Studies Program should enable all students to think from multidisciplinary perspectives. The new General Studies Program should engage students in processes of inquiry, analysis, and reflection, and the new General Studies Program should empower students to engage as participatory students in a dynamic multicultural world.

So these were the four curriculum objectives, and under each--and you can see in the report that you have, there's a list of specific learning outcomes. And I believe my job today was to bring this as an item of information so you could see and understand what was in the report and maybe respond to questions.

CHAIR TAGAVI: Yes. Let me make clear that this is not an agenda item that we are voting on it yes or no. It was just informational submitted to us. Any questions? Okay. I'd just like to add that this is a major effort,

September 11, 2006 cript.TXT  
this and the GERA, and it's once--and  
if adopted in any form, it would touch  
the lives of every student and  
probably every professor on the  
campus. So I would like to encourage  
you to read and to engage, and next  
time, when we have the GERA report,  
to have questions and to participate  
in forming this policy. One more  
time, are there any questions for  
Professor Rayens? Okay. Thank you  
very much.

BILL RAYENS: Thank you.

CHAIR TAGAVI: And I am amazed I can let  
you guys go home ten minutes early.  
The meeting is adjourned, and see you  
next month. Thank you.

\* \* \* \* \*

STATE OF KENTUCKY )

COUNTY OF FAYETTE )

I, BARBARA ANN LeROY, 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 the foregoing transcript was prepared  
from audiotapes; that I was not present  
during the aforementioned action; that the  
transcript was prepared under my direction  
and supervision and to the best of my  
ability to hear said tapes.

My commission expires: March 9, 2007.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto  
set my hand and seal of office on this the  
day of , 2006.

BARBARA ANN LeROY, FAPR, RPR, CLVS  
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE