

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE

* * * * *

Regular Session

September 12, 2005
3:00 p.m.
W. T. Young Library
First Floor Auditorium
Lexington, Kentucky

Dr. Ernie Yanarella, Chair

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

* * * * *

ERNIE YANARELLA, CHAIR

GIFFORD BLYTON, PARLIAMENTARIAN

REBECCA SCOTT, SECRETARY TO SENATE COUNCIL

ROBYN BARRETT, COURT REPORTER

* * * * *

3

1 CHAIR YANARELLA: At the risk of setting
2 a bad precedent and starting on
3 time, I'd like us to start our
4 September 12th, 2005 Senate
5 Meeting. First of all, the first
6 item of business is approval of the
7 minutes of the May 9th, 2005 Senate
8 Meeting. Are there any additions,
9 corrections, deletions that people
10 would like to make? Hearing none,
11 the minutes are approved. I'd like
12 to welcome our new Senators. For
13 those of you who are not new
14 Senators, at 1:30 we had a new
15 Senator orientation and about a
16 dozen new Senators attended. And I
17 was very pleased with the attendance
18 and hope that what had been conveyed
19 to the Senators will provide them
20 with some semblance of an
21 orientation to our activities here
22 in the Senate this year. Could we
23 please recognize all those who are
24 new incoming Senators. Could you
25 please rise.

4

1

(APPLAUSE.)

2

CHAIR YANARELLA: I've also eyeballed

3

those of you who didn't come to the

4

orientation, and you're going to be

5

put on terrible committees with

6

crushing burdens. Thank you very

7

much for coming to the Senate

8

meeting. That's of crucial

9

importance. In addition to

10

welcoming new Senators, I'd also

11

like to acknowledge at least one

12

ex-officio member here, Kyle

13

Dippery, who is the Staff Senate

14

Chair. Kyle, are you here?

15

DIPPERY: Yes.

16

CHAIR YANARELLA: Welcome. I hope this

17

will be the first of many meetings

18

that you will attend. I'd also like

19

to acknowledge Robyn Barrett, who is

20

serving as our transcriptionist. I

21

would also like to -- to her left --

22

to her right, pardon me, is Rebecca

23

Scott, my Administrative

24

Coordinator. Rebecca announced at

25

the last Senate meeting that she is

5

1 expanding her family and has chosen
2 a due date that approximates the
3 time when we'll be totally crushed
4 with last-minute obligations and
5 responsibilities. As a result, I'm
6 assuming the role of the Senate
7 Council Chair and urge all
8 Department Chairs, Deans, Associate
9 Provosts and Provost to make sure,
10 if there are any items that need to
11 go through our Senate processes,
12 that they be done early and often.
13 So let's please bear that in mind,
14 and let's congratulate Rebecca on
15 her pregnancy.

16 (APPLAUSE.)

17 CHAIR YANARELLA: I'd also like to
18 welcome back James Sparks, who does
19 the yeoman job at these meetings,
20 helping out with the sound, the
21 sound system, and with the taping of
22 our Senate meetings. Welcome back,
23 James. Thank you. And I have a
24 word or two to say about our
25 returning Parliamentarian, Gifford

6

1 Blyton, in just a few minutes, so
2 let me reserve my comments for just
3 a minute more -- for a few more
4 minutes from now. I'd like to
5 report to the Senate that the Senate
6 Council, at a summer meeting, acted
7 on behalf of the Senate to approve
8 the August 2005 degree candidate
9 list. This is a responsibility that
10 exists and is available for the
11 Senate Council on those occasions
12 when the Senate is not meeting. In
13 addition, I'd like to take note of
14 the fact that last week, John
15 Thelin -- John, would you stand
16 up -- who is a member of the Senate
17 and also the Senate Council, Kaveh
18 Tagavi -- Kaveh, where are you?

19 TAGAVI: Right here.

20 CHAIR YANARELLA: Why don't you stand
21 up. Kaveh is a member of the
22 Senate, the Senate Council, and is
23 also serving as Ombud, among other
24 notable responsibilities, including
25 chair of the Senate Rules and

7

1 Elections Committee and is also the
2 Vice Chair of the Senate. John
3 Thelin and Kaveh Tagavi and I sat
4 down with two representatives of
5 Corn/Ferry, the executive search
6 firm that is handling the
7 preliminaries for the Provost
8 search, assisting the Provost Search
9 Committee in trying to generate
10 interest in the Provost position. I
11 think I speak for the other two
12 members at this meeting in saying
13 that we had a very lively
14 discussion, emphasizing/underlining
15 what I believe are the consensus
16 feelings among university faculty in
17 the need for a -- the generation of
18 a list of potential candidates who
19 show strong scholarly ability, who
20 have important administrative
21 experience, who will work
22 cooperatively in a university
23 structure and a governing system
24 that involves both an administration
25 and a strong faculty, a University

8

1 Senate. And I think we touched on a
2 number of other bases as well
3 relating to undergraduate
4 initiatives that are coming down the
5 pike this year. Apropos to that
6 last comment, I would like to take
7 note of the imminent formation of a
8 Senate/Provost Task Force on
9 Undergraduate Education and
10 Assessment that will involve a very
11 serious and significant effort at
12 energizing the general education
13 core of this university and of
14 advancing means of assessment. We
15 will have more about that in
16 succeeding meetings, and perhaps
17 Phil Kraemer will say a word or two
18 about this in his presentation. I
19 would like to turn very briefly to
20 Bob Grossman, who is Chair of the
21 Academic Offenses Review Committee
22 for a quick update.

23 GROSSMAN: Let's see, where to begin.

24 During -- I guess during last
25 spring, you may remember that a

9

1 proposal from the Academic Offenses
2 Committee was brought to the Senate
3 for discussion. Subsequent to that
4 meeting, an objection to the
5 proposal was raised that the
6 university -- that the Senate did
7 not have the authority given to it
8 by the Board of Trustees to change
9 matters relating to how university
10 appeals were handled. And this
11 derived from the Code of Student
12 Conduct, or this objection derived
13 from the Code of Student Conduct.
14 Well, the Code of Student Conduct
15 was completely revised over the
16 summer and passed by the Board of
17 Trustees, and the new Code of
18 Student Conduct no longer has in it
19 the phrase that made many people
20 think that perhaps the Senate did
21 not have the authority to change how
22 appeals of academic offenses were
23 handled. So the proposal came
24 forward to the Senate Council again
25 a few weeks ago, and what the Senate

10

1 Council decided is they would like
2 to have one more round of
3 solicitation of opinions on this
4 proposal and have the committee
5 consider those opinions once more
6 before the Senate Council finally
7 decides whether to vote -- or
8 whether to pass the proposal on to
9 the Senate for a full vote. So very
10 soon you will be -- you and everyone
11 at the university, or at least the
12 faculty and the students at the
13 university, will be receiving e-mail
14 that gives you a Web URL where you
15 can post your thoughts on the
16 proposal. And it's -- I guess it's
17 going to be done as part of the Big
18 Blue Board, which I had never heard
19 of before last week. But in any
20 case, you will get that URL. The
21 proposal itself and also a document
22 describing its rationale are still
23 posted in the place they've always
24 been posted, which is accessible
25 from the University Senate Web

11

1

Page. So you can go to the

2

University Senate Web Page and

3

follow through to where the proposal

4

and a document describing its

5

rationale are kept. So the

6

solicitation of opinions will last

7

through the end of September.

8

During October, our committee will

9

meet again, discuss the opinions

10

that are expressed, see if they're

11

good, constructive suggestions

12

regarding maybe ways the proposal

13

should be changed, make those

14

changes, and then present to Senate

15

Council in time for a discussion at

16

the November Senate meeting and then

17

hopefully a final vote at the

18

December meeting. Okay?

19

CHAIR YANARELLA: Thank you, Bob. Just

20

a few more announcements. Senate

21

Council elections are upcoming in

22

October, and I hope that you would

23

be mindful of that and be thinking

24

of individuals that might be

25

considered for those elections.

12

1 Just a couple more things. We will
2 need to waive the six-day rule TO
3 act on the LCC or BCTC degree
4 candidates, and I will be calling
5 for a motion to do so later in the
6 meeting. Next to last, I will
7 remind you that there will be a
8 special October 3rd meeting that
9 will be in the Lexmark Public Room;
10 that is 209 of the Main Building, on
11 the second floor of the Main
12 Building. This will be specifically
13 for an address by President Todd on
14 the State of the University. He was
15 not able to attend this meeting, and
16 as we began to look at future dates
17 when the Senate is scheduled to
18 meet, we discovered that he had
19 binding commitments on all of those
20 dates and so it was felt that, as a
21 result, we would try to accommodate
22 his schedule. And the earliest that
23 we were able to set up was an
24 October 3rd meeting, so please take
25 special note of that. I will be

13

1 conferring with the Senate Council
2 about the regularly scheduled
3 October 10th meeting, which would or
4 will be here. Please stay tuned for
5 further information about that.
6 Finally, in regard to another
7 returning member, we have Gifford
8 Blyton, who is returning as our
9 Parliamentarian. He is returning
10 for his 34th year as
11 Parliamentarian. He took note of
12 the fact that he has been serving
13 this university in one capacity or
14 another for 57 years. He has
15 outlasted seven presidents, and I
16 sometimes think there's enough spit
17 and vinegar in him that -- in his
18 blood that he may outlast one or two
19 more. I'm not sure. I will say,
20 however, concerned as I am about my
21 successors, that someday Gifford may
22 decide to retire and we may be in
23 need of a new Parliamentarian. I
24 take note of this for no other
25 particular reason than on Sunday,

14

1 this coming Sunday, he will be
2 celebrating his 97th birthday, and
3 for that I think you should --
4 (APPLAUSE.) I now would like to
5 welcome our Interim Provost, Scott
6 Smith, and invite him to offer his
7 own welcome to the University Senate
8 on its first meeting and to give him
9 an opportunity, as I understand it,
10 not so much for a formal
11 presentation, because fairly
12 routinely we ask the Provost to give
13 a formal presentation at the
14 December meeting, but rather a kind
15 of informal outline of academic year
16 issues and initiatives. Scott?

17 SMITH: Thanks, Ernie, and I'm quite
18 confident that Gifford will at least
19 outlast another Provost. As Ernie
20 said, I am not here to substitute
21 for the President or to give
22 anything approaching a comprehensive
23 State of the University with regard
24 to academic affairs. I'm simply
25 going to hurry through three or four

15

1 items that I've previously discussed
2 with the Senate Council that I
3 anticipate or that I've already seen
4 verified will be critical issues and
5 important agenda items during the
6 interim term that I trust will end
7 within a few months. Some of these
8 have already come to the light of
9 day, and a few others we are
10 anticipating, and I can give you
11 kind of a heads-up on a few of
12 those. I do want to talk primarily
13 about issues that relate to
14 education and instructional
15 programs. I'll touch briefly on
16 education, the issues of diversity
17 that were publicly raised last week,
18 provide a little bit of a buildup of
19 drama for Phil Kraemer's
20 presentation -- he needs that kind
21 of support -- and then talk about a
22 couple of other issues that are
23 interrelated, but not maybe directly
24 so, to undergraduate education. You
25 are, I hope, reasonably familiar

16

1 with the trends in enrollment at the
2 University of Kentucky and perhaps
3 saw the news last week that we have
4 officially enrolled 3,844 freshmen
5 in the entering class. The budgeted
6 target was 3,800; the Registrar's
7 target was about 3,900; so we split
8 the difference. This results in a
9 total undergraduate population of
10 just under 19,000. Of some interest
11 and relevance, I think, is that the
12 increase in undergraduate enrollment
13 that we will realize this year is
14 about 150, still a significant
15 increase, but nothing like the
16 increases that we have seen in past
17 years of 350 to 550 students in the
18 undergraduate population. Some of
19 this is, of course, deliberate, and
20 we will continue to hold on
21 increasing undergraduate enrollment
22 goals. There were recommendations
23 from some quarters, including
24 Faculty Committee, that we decline,
25 that we deliberately reduce the size

17

1 of the entering freshman class, and
2 President Todd and others were not
3 in agreement with that objective for
4 some reasons that I'll give you in a
5 few minutes. Certain colleges,
6 certain elements of the university
7 bear the vast burden, the vast --
8 the largest fraction of the
9 responsibility for dealing with
10 these enrollment increases. Arts
11 & Sciences is projected to be up
12 about another 370 students. My own
13 College of Agriculture is up about
14 150, Education up very slightly, and
15 several colleges have in fact
16 declined in enrollment for one
17 reason or another. Statistically,
18 at least, the quality of the
19 incoming class was at least
20 sustained and, in some very marginal
21 measures, enhanced. Further, the
22 top end of the ACT midpoint scale
23 went up half a point or so. It was
24 the largest fraction of admissions
25 in the selective admissions

18

1 category; that is, those who
2 automatically qualified -- more or
3 less automatically qualified by ACT
4 and GPA. This has led to some
5 supports that it is the most
6 selective class that we have
7 enrolled, and that's true in that
8 sense at least. Graduate
9 enrollment, Dean Blackwell reports,
10 is down 250 or so, most of that due
11 to declines in a small number of
12 master's programs. Doctoral
13 enrollment as a whole remains
14 strong, and I think (inaudible) and
15 doctoral degree productivity
16 continues to go up, maybe indicating
17 a faster turnover or a higher
18 completion rate of some of those
19 doctoral students. So a mixture of
20 news there, but I think most of it
21 reasonably positive in terms of the
22 ability of the university to sustain
23 a high quality programming in light
24 of the growth that we've undergone.
25 I have no doubt that most of you

19

1 read about the issue of diversity in
2 the entering freshman class, and we
3 were -- we unfortunately had to
4 report that 151 African Americans
5 enrolled in the freshman class in
6 contrast to 256 last year, which is
7 a very dramatic percentage decline
8 and not entirely a surprise, but it
9 is something that we have been
10 anticipating since I came into the
11 Provost Office in the spring. It
12 is -- it bears very complex
13 analysis. It is a difficult
14 question. I can report that both
15 the acceptance rate of African
16 Americans that applied to the
17 university was down and the yield of
18 those accepted who actually enrolled
19 was down. The number of
20 applications was very -- only very
21 slightly reduced. The media, in its
22 way of making things very simple,
23 linked this directly to a change in
24 the ACT standards, and we feel it's
25 considerably more complicated than

20

1 that. But I do want to say that I
2 think it leads us to a very careful
3 examination of the way ACT is used
4 as a measure of potential success at
5 this university, and it will lead us
6 to some changes, perhaps. As I
7 said, we've been anticipating this
8 development since May or so, and we
9 are reasonably prepared to move
10 forward. Vice President Bill Turner
11 and I will be recommending several
12 measures to President Todd, and
13 among these will be review and
14 consideration of some very
15 substantial changes in admissions
16 and recruiting and in scholarship
17 management. These are areas that
18 are under pressure, not just to
19 honor our commitment to diversity
20 but also to bring us into compliance
21 with some recent Supreme Court
22 decisions. Again, very complex
23 issues that will require very
24 careful analysis and deliberation.
25 We expect to ask President Todd in

21

1 the very near future, perhaps this
2 week, to designate a working group
3 of representative faculty and key
4 administrators, for example, those
5 in the Registrar/Scholarship
6 Management Office, to further
7 analyze and then begin rapid
8 implementation of some of these
9 measures that we believe will be
10 necessary to reverse this
11 unfortunate trend in the upcoming
12 class. Bill Turner and I also
13 expect to present the President with
14 a recommendation or two in the very
15 near future on the Commission or the
16 future of the Commission on
17 Diversity. Phil Kraemer gets to
18 talk about most of the good stuff on
19 undergraduate education. There are
20 a couple of things I do want to say
21 to frame his comments. I want to
22 begin by saying that we, in the
23 Provost's Office and I think
24 throughout the administration, are
25 aware of what has been asked of our

22

1 faculty at the university over the
2 last few years. We have pulled off
3 in many ways a small miracle, and
4 the only reason that that happened
5 was because faculty stepped forward
6 and accepted the challenge of a
7 larger number of students -- very
8 substantially larger number of
9 students in some program areas --
10 without, unfortunately, anything
11 close to a comparable investment in
12 building the capacity to deliver
13 instructional programs. We are
14 aware of this. I think you'll see
15 it reflected in some of the future
16 plans for enrollment growth and for
17 building capacity for faculty to
18 teach. And I'll talk again -- I'll
19 come back to that issue again in a
20 second. So I want to express my
21 gratitude and appreciation for what
22 has happened here, and I know very
23 well who's responsible for it, and
24 that is those of you who work in the
25 classroom and advise students.

23

1 There really are some exceptionally
2 positive things that have happened
3 or are about to happen in
4 undergraduate education, and I want
5 Phil to talk about those in great
6 detail, but things like expanded and
7 broadened living-learning
8 communities expansion. The new
9 dorms are really much more than an
10 amenity; it's a different way of
11 interacting with students. The
12 expansion of successful tutorial
13 programs, these are all really
14 important developments. Again, to
15 compliment the faculty, I'll just
16 pick out one example of the energy
17 that's been invested in teaching
18 introductory math classes. And I
19 don't know if there's anybody here
20 from the Math Department, but they
21 have tackled head-on the
22 unacceptable problem of very high,
23 much higher than our benchmarks,
24 D/F/W rates from the introductory
25 math classes, drop, fail, withdraw,

24

1 which is way above the norms. And
2 it's largely inexplicable, and early
3 results indicate that they have made
4 very substantial progress with some
5 new and innovative tools that will
6 be applied. As a goal, I do not
7 intend as Interim Provost to make a
8 lot of recurring commitments and
9 lock up the budget for the next
10 person, but I do intend -- I have
11 the goal of identifying at least one
12 million dollars on recurring funding
13 over the next academic year to
14 invest in a larger classroom
15 improvement fund and for renovation
16 of undergraduate-related space. And
17 I know that that is only a fraction
18 of what is needed to deal with the
19 expanded capacity -- the expanded
20 enrollment that we have, but I think
21 it may make a significant
22 difference. We have critical issues
23 on this campus with regard to how we
24 handle enrollment growth in
25 budgeting and management, and you

25

1 can talk to any one of your Deans
2 about the inequities that have been
3 created by some of our strange
4 incentive systems, of the
5 specialized fees that some colleges
6 have been able to institute and
7 others have not, the selective
8 admission standards for upper
9 classmen. All of these things have
10 created some unintended consequences
11 which lead to a patchwork which
12 really, frankly, doesn't make any
13 sense. Most of our benchmarks --
14 most of the universities do realize,
15 by some formalized method, an
16 increased budget response to an
17 increased enrollment in a particular
18 college or a program. And we don't
19 do that at all, and in some ways we
20 do the reverse of that. And I hope,
21 over the next academic year, to at
22 least develop some options or tools
23 that will allow the next Provost to
24 deal with what has become an
25 unmanageable problem. I'm not going

26

1 to say much about engagement; but,
2 again, at this October 3rd
3 meeting -- I think, Ernie, I believe
4 it's going to be the same
5 occasion -- President Todd will
6 introduce the Commonwealth
7 Collaboratives. This is his idea,
8 but the Provost Office has
9 implemented it, with Bill Turner and
10 Phil Greasley. These are projects
11 that highlight and document the
12 emerging commitment to engagement
13 and I think will provide the
14 President with a very useful talking
15 point, but it will also invent a
16 structure for some modest investment
17 in promoting and enhancing
18 engagement and outreach. Research
19 issues, again, I won't go into any
20 great detail. I think that many
21 people on campus feel that the
22 research management and leadership
23 issues will be part and maybe a
24 foremost part of the questions that
25 a provost candidate will ask as they

27

1 come to campus. And I would be the
2 first to say that we have not had a
3 unified and well-coordinated system
4 of leadership investment on this
5 campus in the past for a variety of
6 reasons. And I hope to work with
7 Vice President Baldwin to iron out
8 some of those wrinkles and make
9 it -- make the investment more
10 strategic and less redundant and
11 more open and transparent; again,
12 something that you may see later
13 this year. The final thing that I
14 want to mention, just a heads-up on
15 the Top 20 Business Plan. Again,
16 this is something that President
17 Todd will announce very soon.
18 Everybody in the Administration
19 Building knows that I was a profound
20 skeptic about the Top 20 Business
21 Plan when it was started, but I am
22 now a convert. I think that they
23 will offer us a very valuable tool
24 for strategic planning as the
25 university attempts to move

28

1 forward. And I'll give you a sneak
2 peek at a couple of factors that I
3 think you'll see when the President
4 unveils that plan. One of those is
5 the realization that we must build
6 capacity before we grow, and so the
7 plan will call for a significant
8 expansion of the faculty numbers and
9 a very modest expansion of
10 undergraduate students in the period
11 between now and 2010. Now,
12 ultimately the plan draws out to
13 2020, but I certainly won't be
14 Provost at that time, so we'll see
15 how that works out. But the first
16 steps will be building the
17 capacity: Increased research space,
18 increased instructional space, but
19 particular attention to the faculty;
20 not just greater numbers, but I
21 believe that this report will
22 highlight the absurdity of
23 attempting to be a top-20
24 institution with a faculty that's
25 compensated like it's in the top

29

1 100. And it may result -- I think
2 very likely will result in our
3 raising our sights even beyond our
4 current goal of 90 percent of the
5 benchmark average. So I want you --
6 I hope you'll pay attention to
7 that. I think it will be important
8 to the future of the university, and
9 I think you'll find some things in
10 there that are very rational and
11 very helpful to our strategic
12 planning on campus. So my general
13 goal as Interim Provost is
14 multifunctional. I think that there
15 are many things that we can just
16 conclude and move forward with and
17 Chellgren Center was an excellent
18 example of things that somebody else
19 did and I got to be present at the
20 ceremony. There are other examples
21 of situations where we're just
22 attempting to clear the table or set
23 the table for the next provost, and
24 there are two or three really
25 critical issues that we will have to

30

1 face. But I hope that you see,
2 during the next year or so, a
3 continuing sense of progress and
4 advancement and a commitment to
5 excellence at the institution that
6 you saw under Mike Nietzel and I
7 hope you will see in the future,
8 beyond my term as interim. Do you
9 want to do questions, Ernie, or are
10 we too short on time?

11 CHAIR YANARELLA: We have maybe an
12 opportunity for one or two
13 questions. Would anyone like to
14 address any issue to the Provost in
15 terms of the agenda which he has set
16 out for this year or any other
17 matters?

18 SMITH: Cool.

19 CHAIR YANARELLA: Scott, you're off the
20 hook.

21 SMITH: Thank you.

22 CHAIR YANARELLA: Phil Kraemer and I go
23 back quite a number of years in
24 various capacities, and I must say
25 that in all of those capacities that

31

1 he has performed in, he has done so
2 with both a commitment to excellence
3 and a concern for faculty, as well
4 as a fundamental interest in the
5 quality of undergraduate education.
6 In a number of respects, our work
7 relating to certain innovations in
8 the past, certain experiments, we
9 cut our teeth on some of the same
10 things. Phil presently is Associate
11 Provost for Undergraduate Education,
12 and he will be giving us an
13 opportunity to explore some
14 perspectives on the University
15 Undergraduate Program, including new
16 developments and initiatives. I've
17 had the pleasure of working with him
18 this summer on at least one of those
19 initiatives that will be carried
20 forward over this next year, and I
21 couldn't think of a more delightful
22 person to be working with. Phil,
23 please come forward.

24 KRAEMER: Okay. Bear with me. Thank
25 you, Ernie, for this extra support.

32

1 SCOTT: It's the slide show at the top.

2 (INAUDIBLE DISCUSSION.)

3 KRAEMER: We're going to be working well
4 together as a team. It's always a
5 pleasure to come to the Senate and
6 see colleagues back for a new
7 academic year. I want to thank
8 Ernie for those kind introductory
9 comments, but I want to say a word
10 about my new boss, here, Scott
11 Smith. We didn't know much about
12 this guy. We were very worried, but
13 I can tell you it's really a
14 pleasure to work with Scott, and the
15 more I work with him, the more I
16 recognize that he's another one of
17 these venerable scholars that we
18 have who have been here a long time
19 and are clearly invested in this
20 institution, and I think we're in
21 very good stead with this important
22 position in his hands. It's a
23 pleasure to work with Scott and
24 learn more of how he thinks, and
25 it's going to be, I think, a good

1 year. I want to begin my comments
2 by highlighting my incompetence, or
3 at least a small portion of it.
4 Some of you are thinking, "It's
5 about time." When I first became
6 Dean six years ago, in that first
7 year I offered a report and sent it
8 around describing some of the
9 progress we had made in
10 undergraduate education. And I did
11 that the second year and the third
12 year, but I haven't done that for
13 the last three years, and I could
14 offer up a number of very good
15 reasons why I haven't done that, but
16 suffice it to say that I think it's
17 important that I do that. I think
18 it's important that we really
19 communicate more of what is going on
20 in this very dynamic complex and
21 large institution. Because I agree
22 with Scott: The story is a very
23 good one, and the compliments are to
24 the faculty. As I began to just
25 prepare for a part of the

34

1 presentation that focuses on what
2 we've accomplished, it was clear to
3 me that we have a lot of folks doing
4 a lot of good things and there are
5 many good stories out there. And we
6 need to find better ways of
7 communicating just what progress
8 we've made. And it is impressive,
9 because these haven't been the best
10 of times. But despite that, in
11 addition to some of the examples
12 I'll highlight here, there are good
13 things going on in each college and
14 departments and programs, things
15 that don't even get to the surface.
16 And I think, again, it's a sense of
17 pride I have to work with my
18 colleagues here, to be included on
19 this faculty. This is a very good
20 institution. So now that I've
21 softened you up a bit, hopefully,
22 what I really want to talk about is
23 leading into reform, because I think
24 this can be an exciting year for the
25 institution. We're concentrating on

35

1 the USP reform number, but there are
2 a number of other reforms. But I
3 want to set a bit of the context for
4 this and talk a little bit about the
5 history. There has been a national
6 imperative to look at improving
7 undergraduate education at research
8 universities for a long time, and
9 it's exemplified by a number of
10 reports over the last 15 to 20
11 years. The Kellogg Commission
12 Reports -- there have been multiple
13 reports; this is just an example of
14 the kind of theme that they've dealt
15 with. They've looked at a variety
16 of issues, a variety of concerns,
17 and offered a variety of
18 recommendations for how we can
19 improve undergraduate education at
20 research universities. My favorite
21 is still the Boyer Report, and I
22 would encourage us as a faculty to
23 embrace this report, to read it,
24 because I think it gives us license
25 to experiment. And I think we need

36

1 to take advantage of what this
2 report is telling us, and it's not
3 telling us that you want to have
4 research scholars simply doing more
5 for undergraduates. We want to have
6 our teachers teach differently, to
7 do it differently. And I think this
8 is a report that, if we really
9 studied it, would catalyze some
10 creativity and that we'd find
11 enriches all of our missions. I
12 don't think it's necessary to invest
13 more in one mission to the cost of
14 another. So we don't necessarily
15 have to improve undergraduate
16 education by detracting from our
17 research mission. That would be
18 deadly for this institution. This
19 is a report that gives us some
20 examples of how we can do that. A
21 more recent report by Greater
22 Expectations -- called Greater
23 Expectations by AAC&U, this is a
24 reform movement that's been around
25 two or three years focusing on the

37

1 more general question of: What Is
2 the nature of undergraduate
3 education? What should it be in
4 2005 and, more importantly, in 2010
5 and 2020? And the main theme here
6 is that we really need to
7 recognize -- maybe it's
8 reaffirmation -- that we are here
9 and preparing future citizens, that
10 the goal is to educate well our
11 undergraduates for the world that
12 they will occupy. And I'd offer one
13 other national imperative. I don't
14 know how many have read this book.
15 I have. I think you could probably
16 take issue with some of the
17 hyperbole, you might challenge some
18 of the assumptions, but I think the
19 very basic core message, the very
20 core meaning of what Friedman has to
21 say is something that's hard to
22 deny, and basically it's that the
23 world is very different today, by
24 virtue of technological change,
25 especially over the last 10 to 15

38

1 years, and it has changed the nature
2 of work. It will continue to do
3 that. It will change the nature in
4 which societies interact, and it
5 really is the thrust for
6 globalization. And this is going to
7 have implications for higher
8 education, and I think we all need
9 to be concerned about that, both in
10 terms of opportunities and in very
11 serious challenges that we're going
12 to face as a country. And I think
13 it's something that we need to
14 invest more time in. And I think
15 bodies like this, we need to
16 encourage each other to talk about
17 these kinds of issues, to begin
18 conversations about these kinds of
19 national pressing issues. There has
20 been a local imperative for
21 improving education here at UK for
22 as long as, at least, since we began
23 our lofty aspiration. When the
24 top-20 ambition was announced, I
25 think many adopted the rhetoric that

39

1 we would only succeed if we were
2 able to express excellence in each
3 of our missions. And I think the
4 initial investments were in research
5 and in graduate education, and I
6 think that was wise to do that. I
7 think one might argue that we
8 haven't invested enough in the
9 undergraduate mission and invested
10 not necessarily financially, but in
11 our time and attention. But if we
12 are going to be among the very best
13 public research universities, then
14 we're going to have to address our
15 undergraduate education, and we're
16 going to have to strive for
17 excellence. And I think, again, the
18 creativity of this faculty is such
19 that I'm confident that we can get
20 there. There has been quiet,
21 sometimes not so quiet, discontent
22 with our existing General Education
23 Program, USP, and there are
24 enrollment pressures. Many of these
25 are recent. We have seen a rather

40

1 dramatic increase in the number of
2 students coming into the
3 institution, during the same time
4 we've seen rather serious budget
5 cuts. So resources were going down,
6 and yet the demand was going up.
7 Just a few comments about the reform
8 dynamics. CPE has certain
9 expectations for what this
10 institution should do, what we need
11 to do. Many of those are linked to
12 the general goal of really improving
13 the state economy and the society of
14 Kentucky, and it's hard to argue
15 with claims that we are ranked way
16 too low in the number of college
17 graduates. At the same time, we
18 have to resist the idea that that
19 problem can be solved at UK alone.
20 We have to look at all the public
21 institutions we have, the community
22 college system as well. But it is a
23 very serious challenge. When you
24 begin to look at where UK ranks,
25 there are too many lists -- rather,

41

1 the State of Kentucky. There are
2 too many lists on which we're too
3 far to the bottom, and that is
4 something we must address as well.
5 There has been enrollment growth.
6 There has been increased quality of
7 our student body, at least on some
8 measures, and that should be very
9 encouraging to us. We've suffered
10 serious budget cuts. There has been
11 a strategic goal, in going back to
12 President Wethington's Strategic
13 Indicator Number 37: Simplify and
14 improve USP. It is still on the
15 agenda, simplify and improve USP,
16 and I would emphasize the "improve"
17 part of that. I mentioned the SACS
18 liberation. I think our accrediting
19 body has relinquished some of the
20 micromanagement expectations that we
21 often accuse them of. I think that
22 SACS is now less concerned with seat
23 time, credit hours in courses; and
24 that, again, is a license to
25 experiment. We need to think about

42

1 the pedagogy: How do we teach? Is
2 there anything rational or necessary
3 about having courses go 16 weeks,
4 three hours a week. I think there
5 are ways in which we can perhaps
6 teach better in compressed formats,
7 but certainly we can teach
8 differently. And I think, again, we
9 want to take advantage of what may
10 be a temporary liberation, and I'll
11 come back to that idea of a
12 temporary liberation. At UK when we
13 began the top-20 initiative, there
14 was a call to look at improving the
15 undergraduate mission. And I think
16 you remember we had committees of
17 faculty. I think there were three
18 committees that each looked at
19 different topics and made
20 recommendations, then, to a steering
21 committee. And those
22 recommendations were distilled down
23 into a final report that became the
24 Swift Report, and that was sent to
25 President Wethington. And he

43

1 adopted the spirit of those
2 recommendations, and I'll go through
3 a few of those recommendations in a
4 moment and show you where we have
5 made progress. We have had other
6 experiments, and Ernie and I worked
7 together -- he's already alluded to
8 this -- on something called the
9 Modern Studies curriculum in the
10 College of Arts & Sciences. I think
11 there have been examples of the kind
12 of reform that we can think about,
13 and I think we're capable of doing
14 even more. When we look at USP,
15 though, and we ask the question,
16 "Have we done much in reforming
17 USP?" If the answer is no -- we've
18 eliminated the cross-disciplinary
19 requirement. This was a requirement
20 that, when you read the rationale,
21 you thought, "This is a very good
22 thing. We want to have students
23 taking courses that are linked in
24 some conceptual way and learning how
25 to look at similar problems from

44

1 different perspectives." But the
2 reality was that those courses were
3 never taught in a way that we could
4 bring out that advantage. We
5 detached the science courses, a
6 rather modest improvement. Students
7 at one point were required to take
8 sciences in tandem, and now they can
9 take one science in this area and
10 another in another field. That's a
11 fairly modest change. Running
12 across the curriculum, I think, is
13 one positive source of pride. I
14 think the Committee or the Senate
15 last year approved this writing
16 initiative that allows us to expand
17 writing instruction in a very
18 positive way, so that we have
19 writing that should be in the upper
20 level. It should be writing that
21 occurs within programs. I think
22 that is a very strong change, and I
23 think we can be proud of that, but
24 at the same time, when we talk about
25 oral communications, we've embargoed

45

1 that requirement. The shortage of
2 resources makes it very difficult
3 for us to have oral communication
4 courses for our students. We're
5 going to have to find a way to have
6 confidence that our students are
7 getting the kind of instruction they
8 need in oral communication, that
9 when they leave this institution,
10 they are able to communicate better
11 than when they arrived. And that's
12 a challenge for us: How do we do
13 that? Remember, the Senate put a
14 three-year hiatus on the oral
15 communications requirement in USP,
16 and I think one year is up. So
17 we're going to need to be prepared
18 to deal with that in some way. The
19 Swift Report had two sets of
20 recommendations. The first set were
21 foundational recommendations, and
22 I've listed here in red, for those
23 of you who can see red, these are
24 areas where I would say we have made
25 some progress. I'm going to put

46

1 together a pretty detailed report
2 and make that available to the
3 faculty, available to the entire
4 university, where I will go into
5 more detail in terms of what each of
6 these areas is about, what progress
7 we've made, so I'll not speak about
8 all of them but just highlight a few
9 of them. The Institutional Research
10 Capacity, I think, is indeed much
11 stronger today than ever before.
12 And Leadership here, Connie Ray,
13 we've hired some very excellent
14 individuals. Roger Sugarman is a
15 tremendous asset. We now hand out a
16 freshman survey each year. We've
17 collected more data than we've ever
18 seen before, and we're using those
19 data more effectively. Deb Moore is
20 a tremendous asset with respect to
21 expertise in student learning
22 outcome assessment, so I think we're
23 much stronger there. Class
24 Availability, I think we have done a
25 better job of managing classroom

47

1 space, managing it in terms of the
2 calendar, the clock, the day of the
3 week. Faculty Resources really
4 shouldn't be totally in red. As I
5 looked at this recommendation, it
6 was that we should increase the
7 number of faculty. We haven't done
8 that, so that needs to be in black.
9 But getting better students, I think
10 we have done that. But I think
11 clearly, going back to the Swift
12 Report, it was obvious that if we're
13 going to be better and better able
14 to deal with undergraduates, we're
15 going to have to increase the size
16 of the faculty. We need more
17 faculty. Classroom Space and
18 Efficient Scheduling, I think we've
19 done a pretty good job, again, of
20 trying to manage this more in a
21 central way. We've garnered more
22 spaces for instruction, but we're
23 still challenged. We're at a very
24 difficult point. There are some
25 large classes that we have, but

48

1 we're constrained in terms of
2 facilities. There are very few
3 places where you can have very large
4 classes. Now, there may be
5 philosophical reasons why you don't
6 want to have large classes, but when
7 I look at the 19 benchmarks, the
8 Penn States, the Michigans, the
9 Wisconsin, they have large
10 classes. If you look carefully at
11 the U.S. News & World Report
12 rankings, we scored pretty high on
13 having few classes over 50. So
14 these other institutions are finding
15 ways to teach undergraduates well,
16 in some cases in very large
17 settings. We're constrained with
18 how far we can go with that. We've
19 done very little with Simplifying
20 and Improving USP. Challenging
21 Courses, I would reiterate what
22 Scott has said: Congratulations to
23 colleagues in the Math Department.
24 I think we've really begun to tackle
25 this problem. Also, credit goes to

1 Dean Hoch in the College of Arts &
2 Sciences. In addition to changing
3 instruction, one very seemingly
4 simple but important change we made
5 this year is we have students now
6 placed where they should be placed.
7 We began to enforce this year the
8 ACT recommendations that we had
9 ignored before. We let students
10 self-place, and they were putting
11 themselves in courses for which they
12 weren't well-prepared. In addition,
13 we implemented a math placement
14 exam, and the results of that
15 determined which course these
16 students would be in. It did cause
17 some shifting of enrollments. Not
18 many students in the calculus
19 course. Some of those fell back to
20 the Math 109 course. Some fell back
21 to the remedial course in math, but
22 there's no greater mistake than to
23 have a student at the wrong level.
24 They aren't going to succeed. I
25 think we've also made progress in

50

1

some other challenging courses.

2

There was discussion at the time of,

3

"What do you call these courses?"

4

Road Blocks was one. Students would

5

have their own names, I think, for

6

these courses. We've chosen the

7

pleasant "Challenging Course" label,

8

but we've made some progress.

9

Chemistry, there is an individual,

10

(inaudible), who does a marvelous

11

job, very creative, innovative. And

12

I think, again, when there's the

13

will to do it, there certainly is

14

the creativity; we can make some

15

progress. The Honors Program has

16

this year begun to change, and that

17

recommendation goes back to the

18

Swift Report process. We've

19

expanded the scope of Honors. We've

20

added some new tracks. That does a

21

couple of things: It offers the

22

students more alternatives. More

23

importantly, it gets more faculty

24

involved and faculty from outside of

25

the College of Arts & Sciences. It

51

1 is good to have an Honors Program in
2 which there is a broader spectrum of
3 faculty who participate and it's the
4 responsibility of more colleges than
5 just one. We have not done much
6 with intellectual and cultural
7 diversity, and I come back to what
8 Scott mentioned. This institution
9 will not deserve to be among the
10 very best public research
11 universities unless we do a better
12 job with diversity on our campus.
13 These are very disappointing numbers
14 this year, the undergraduate
15 enrollment numbers. But we need to
16 do a better job with respect to
17 faculty hiring; we need to have more
18 conversations about what are some of
19 the obstacles here. But when we
20 compare ourselves to places like the
21 University of Maryland, you walk
22 across that Maryland campus, you
23 know you're in a very diverse
24 environment. We must address these
25 issues here. The other set of

52

1 recommendations were for progress.
2 We've made some real progress here.
3 The Freshman Discovery Seminar
4 Program began with more seminars
5 under Bill Freehling's guidance and
6 his passion. This year we celebrate
7 the tenth anniversary of that
8 program. And we have increased the
9 number of seminars, but clearly what
10 we should be doing is increasing the
11 seminars by a greater number. I
12 taught a discovery seminar a couple
13 of years ago. For me it was a
14 developmental experience. It was
15 very enriching. It challenged me as
16 a teacher. I gained, perhaps, more
17 from that experience than my
18 students did, and I think that's the
19 kind of teaching opportunities we
20 need to make pervasive on our
21 campus. Communication skills is in
22 pink, not red, because we have
23 increased the writing instruction;
24 we have improved it, but we haven't
25 improved oral communications

1 instruction. The Student Resource
2 Center, the idea that was originally
3 described is now being implemented
4 to some degree. We have this
5 marvelous facility on the fifth
6 floor of this building. We call it
7 "The Study." We've combined the
8 Writing Center and Academic
9 Enhancement Programs. Those involve
10 a variety of programs that are meant
11 to assist students. It's tutoring;
12 it's working with faculty to help
13 students develop skills that are
14 undeveloped, and I think that
15 facility serves us well. If you
16 haven't been there, I encourage you
17 to drop in. It's a very different
18 level of activity, if you drop in,
19 in the afternoon versus the
20 evening. We have some very talented
21 people. Karen Lewis, who directs
22 the Academic Enhancement Programs,
23 is a learning specialist, and she's
24 outstanding. Meant to be a faculty
25 resource. Living/Learning

1 Communities, Richard Greissman has
2 shown real leadership the last year
3 in helping us to move on what,
4 again, is a very smart strategy for
5 changing where students live in the
6 residence halls, for expanding the
7 academic world into their daily
8 lives. With the new facilities that
9 we have, there is even greater
10 potential to do more with
11 Living/Learning Communities in the
12 future. I'll mention just two
13 things, two additional points: The
14 teaching assistants, I think we did
15 the right thing by moving
16 Dr. Carolyn Carter into the Graduate
17 School to work with Jeannine. She
18 does a marvelous job in helping with
19 the TA orientation. And by putting
20 that in the graduate school, the
21 Dean can bring that hammer that she
22 has and likes to exercise and work
23 with the departments so that we can
24 be sure that our graduate students
25 take seriously their teaching

1 assignments but also give them the
2 kind of support and development that
3 they need. Most of our graduate
4 students will not go on to research
5 universities. They will go to other
6 institutions where teaching is going
7 to be at a premium, and we don't
8 serve them well if we do not help
9 them learn what it is to be a
10 teacher. And some of these teaching
11 assistants that we have are a credit
12 to the teaching profession, just
13 outstanding individuals. They care
14 about it, and they do it well. And
15 finally, Undergraduate Research and
16 Creativity: We're going to open a
17 new office, and that has no meaning
18 other than conceptually. We're
19 going to call it the Office of
20 Undergraduate Research. Bob
21 Tannenbaum and Bessie Guerrant are
22 going to jointly manage that
23 operation. It's a collaboration
24 between my office and Vice President
25 Baldwin. It is meant to be an

1 opportunity for students to find one
2 path to getting engaged in
3 undergraduate research, for us to
4 work with faculty who are willing to
5 offer opportunities for students.
6 And this is something that, again,
7 we're ahead of the curve on. There
8 are only a few of our 19 benchmarks
9 that have this kind of an office, so
10 I can feel good about that. And
11 you'll learn more about that in the
12 near future. The Chellgren Center
13 is something really to be excited
14 about. We feel very good about
15 this. We were able to have a public
16 announcement opening the Chellgren
17 Center. It is, at this point, a
18 federation of our excellent
19 programs, programs listed here. And
20 "federation" is meant to be a word
21 that captures what this is and
22 avoids miscommunicating what it is
23 not. Each of these programs
24 maintains their autonomy, but they
25 come together in a new level of

57

1 collaboration. And hopefully, by
2 virtue of that collaboration, they
3 provide some added value. We needed
4 to do a better job of grooming those
5 students to prepare them for
6 external scholarships. That's one
7 of the functions of the Center. But
8 what I hope the Center really
9 becomes is an incubator for
10 innovation. We will be able to
11 hire, through the generosity of Paul
12 Chellgren, an endowed professor who
13 will spend time in the Center and
14 help guide that Center in its
15 innovation mission. There will also
16 be, I think, six -- five to six,
17 Richard?

18 GREISSMAN: Five.

19 KRAEMER: Five chaired positions. These
20 would most likely be faculty who are
21 in the departments here already.
22 We'd ask them to spend some of the
23 time in the Chellgren Center working
24 with the unit directors for the
25 units listed here and working with

58

1 students. We need to have a way to
2 make more visible the excellence
3 that we do deliver to our students
4 and to allow faculty a better
5 opportunity to see the connections
6 across programs. Enrollment
7 Management, I think, is another area
8 that has improved considerably. Don
9 Witt, the Assistant Provost for
10 Enrollment Management -- that's a
11 new buzz word out there, but it does
12 mean that we're trying to help
13 students through a complicated
14 process. And rather than sending
15 them around to different units that
16 function autonomously, we're trying
17 to create an integrated strategy,
18 more holistic, a seamless operation,
19 so that we bring together
20 individuals from Financial Aid, the
21 Registrar, Admissions, and then
22 working with the colleges to provide
23 something that isn't as scattered as
24 it can be in a large institution
25 like this. There's still a ways to

59

1 go, but we have made considerable
2 progress. The college contacts
3 alone are invaluable to us,
4 especially in managing the increased
5 enrollments that we've seen. The
6 Future: I want to spend just a few
7 moments on this. How am I doing for
8 time?

9 CHAIR YANARELLA: You're about two
10 minutes over, but that's okay.

11 KRAEMER: Two minutes over? Are you
12 teasing me?

13 CHAIR YANARELLA: Yes. Go ahead.

14 KRAEMER: Wow. Well, I only have
15 another hour and a half. All right,
16 then. I'm going to spare you a
17 lot. You're fortunate that Ernie's
18 clock is faster than mine. I think
19 this is where we want to focus this
20 year. Ernie has alluded to this.
21 This is a chance for us to look at
22 USP and really begin to ask some
23 deep questions: Is this the kind of
24 curriculum that we want our students
25 to have? Does it serve us well?

60

1 Can we do it differently? It's also
2 linked, however, to more general
3 concerns about reform. We need to
4 look at our programs. We need to
5 ask whether we have been driven to
6 increase the quantity of our courses
7 rather than the quality of the
8 courses and the curriculum. But
9 we're going to try to launch an
10 effort that gets the conversation
11 going. This is the responsibility
12 of all the faculty of the
13 institution. The faculty own the
14 curriculum. This is an important
15 part of the curriculum, but it's a
16 very easy part of the curriculum to
17 ignore. It can't just be the
18 responsibility of the College of
19 Arts & Sciences. I think they will
20 naturally be a leader in this, but
21 this is about all of our colleges.
22 And we need to step up and examine
23 what it is that we can do. It needs
24 to be linked as well to pedagogical
25 reform. I was going to show you

61

1 this, but I assume you already know
2 what it is (indicating). I think we
3 have to ask: What are the general
4 goals that we want to have for this
5 program? And when you look at other
6 institutions, you see differences.
7 You tend to see the same kind of
8 distribution approach, but they are
9 beginning to include in their
10 curricula more general goals than we
11 have with USP. It addresses the
12 idea of trying to better educate
13 citizens, to better prepare them for
14 a complicated world. So it's a
15 question of what should be taught,
16 who is going to be responsible for
17 this, and what are the resources
18 that are required. And I think we
19 have to look at this in a way that,
20 if we're going to be top-20, then we
21 need to express the kind of
22 undergraduate general education
23 program that we'll be proud of and
24 not begin by, "Oh, we can't afford
25 to do that." Let's see how

62

1 inventive we can be, how creative we
2 can be, and then let's see what the
3 cost might be. And no doubt the
4 Interim Provost and the next Provost
5 will find resources to get that
6 done. Let me end with this -- am I
7 really out of time, Ernie?

8 CHAIR YANARELLA: No, go back. Go back
9 to the last one. I said I was
10 joking. Go ahead, come on.

11 KRAEMER: No, that's all right. Here's
12 what I want to try to emphasize.
13 This is some odd symbolism, and I
14 have to give credit to Gordon Davies
15 for this. Remember Gordon Davies,
16 may he rest in peace? He came to a
17 College of Arts & Sciences
18 presentation a few years ago, and he
19 used this symbolism. The actual
20 source of the symbolism is the
21 Lawrence, Massachusetts textile mill
22 strike, and they had at one point
23 workers in the streets, and at one
24 point there was a banner shown:
25 "Give us bread and give us roses."

1 And applied to striking mill
2 workers, I'll let you work through
3 that symbolism. But the way Gordon
4 used this symbolism was to argue
5 about what it is that we should be
6 doing with respect to undergraduate
7 education. What should a student
8 expect to get? And they are going
9 to expect the bread, and they should
10 get the bread. Our students are
11 looking to get a college degree to
12 help them get a job that they enjoy
13 that will have some material
14 well-being associated with it. That
15 is natural, that they should strive
16 for that. But at the same time,
17 many of us recognize that they've
18 got to have the roses, that they've
19 got to be educated, not just
20 trained. This is not a vocational
21 school. So that when they leave
22 here, if they're engineers, they
23 should be trained well, but they
24 should be educated, because they
25 should be serving as the leaders in

1 our society. It's the old argument
2 about what is the purpose of public
3 research universities or public
4 universities, and it really is the
5 public good. We are trying to
6 improve society through education.
7 So we do need to get our students
8 to, as my former colleague Mike
9 Nietzel would say, look at their
10 interiors, begin to value knowledge,
11 begin to develop humility in knowing
12 what they don't know, having immense
13 respect for the kind of inquiry that
14 we all engage in, the kind of
15 scholarship that we pursue. So we
16 do have to find a way to have a
17 general education program that has
18 practical benefits for students but
19 never lets them off the hook, that
20 does get them to confront
21 themselves. They should know more
22 about themselves, more about the
23 world, more about other people,
24 whether or not that is directly
25 applicable to their future work. A

65

1 huge number of our students are
2 going to work in professions outside
3 of their major. So they need to
4 come out of this institution with
5 the ability to learn, the ability to
6 change jobs in the future, the
7 ability to contribute as good
8 citizens, and that's the
9 responsibility that we have. We
10 structure the faculty, structure the
11 curriculum, so we need to think of
12 it in that kind of seriousness.
13 Now, if I do have any more time -- I
14 can't tell if Ernie's pulling my leg
15 or not.

16 CHAIR YANARELLA: Go back, please.

17 KRAEMER: No, I'm going ahead. I'll
18 never go back. The eyes are in the
19 front of the head for a reason. I
20 realize there are obstacles to
21 reform. I realize that you can't
22 come before a group of faculty at a
23 research university and say, "Yes,
24 it's all about the undergraduates."
25 We have multiple missions. I

1 respect that. Each of those is a
2 filament in a cable, though, and I
3 think we have to use the cable
4 metaphor. You have to find ways to
5 get the undergraduate mission cabled
6 up with the research mission and the
7 service mission. When you invest in
8 one to the detriment of some other
9 mission, we're making a mistake, and
10 I think we can pursue that. I think
11 we can find ways to invigorate the
12 undergraduate experience that don't
13 force us to do less research or less
14 service, but it will take some
15 concentrated effort on our parts.
16 We have to look at this and not
17 simply come at it in a knee-jerk
18 way. I encourage you, to be able to
19 look at this, to get a better sense
20 of the context, the history. My
21 colleague John Thelin is over here.
22 I'm going to push your book. John
23 has a wonderful History of Higher
24 Education. I think books like that
25 for me have helped frame the issues

1 that we face, and I think that's an
2 important part of really getting on
3 to reform. Now you've got me going
4 forward and backward, and I'll end
5 with one other big obstacle. I had
6 heard about this book for a long
7 time, and I finally read it this
8 last summer. Clark Kerr was the
9 former President of the University
10 of California Carnegie Foundation.
11 He wrote a series of essays in 1963,
12 and he was describing what he saw at
13 the research university, and it
14 wasn't as pessimistic as I would
15 have thought. He supplemented these
16 essays in '63 with additional essays
17 every ten years or so. But what is
18 a common lament, if you read the '63
19 essay, you think he's talking about
20 the research university of 2005.
21 But the common lament was that we
22 haven't been serving the
23 undergraduates well, and much of it
24 has to do with the unusual nature of
25 this marvelous organization. This

1 is not an intended organization. We
2 have evolved, and I find his
3 description of what a research
4 university is useful. It's really a
5 combination of several different
6 concepts. The idea of a university
7 he attributes to Cardinal Newman.
8 It tends to be well-respected by the
9 humanists; it serves the
10 undergraduates. It's British in
11 origin. Its intellectual forebear
12 is Plato. Its administrative
13 forebear is President Lowell of
14 Massachusetts. We're also what
15 Abraham Flexner described, the idea
16 of (inaudible). It tends to be for
17 the scientists; it's about graduate
18 students and researchers, German in
19 origin, goes back to Pythagoras, and
20 embraced by President Elliott. Then
21 there is the "Multiversity." This
22 is a term that I don't think Clark
23 Kerr invented but he certainly
24 popularized. It's really for the
25 administrators, about the faculty,

1 American in origin. It traces its
2 history back to the Sophists, and
3 James Bryant Conant is the Harvard
4 President that embraced that
5 notion. But I find this useful:
6 "Be as British as possible for the
7 sake of the undergraduates, as
8 German as possible for the sake of
9 the graduates and research
10 personnel, as American as possible
11 for the sake of the public at large,
12 and as confused as possible for the
13 sake of the preservation of the
14 whole uneasy balance." And I think
15 what Kerr is pointing to is that we
16 really do have an unusual
17 organization and that many of our
18 obstacles have to do with that
19 inherent set of characteristics that
20 define what a research university
21 is. But even if it wasn't intended,
22 if it was a kind of natural
23 selection that got us here, the
24 research university is still a
25 pretty darn good institution, and we

70

1 still do things pretty darn well.
2 We're still the envy of the world,
3 but I think it is time for us all to
4 begin to look at: Where are we?
5 Where could we be? And my last
6 point, not of alarm but just of
7 concern: I mentioned that we've
8 experienced a certain liberation
9 from SACS. I don't think we're
10 seeing the same kind of liberation
11 from other forces out there. I
12 detect a bit more interest at CPE to
13 help micromanage the institutions,
14 not just provide guidance, not just
15 provide accountability, but actually
16 get us to do things, and I think we
17 need to look at that carefully.
18 We're certainly seeing, I think, a
19 new wave of intervention from the
20 federal government. On the 17th of
21 September all institutions that
22 garner federal funds will now
23 celebrate Constitution Day,
24 including this institution, and that
25 is federal law. Now, they aren't

71

1 necessarily going to enforce that.
2 They are not going to come to campus
3 and see what we're doing to
4 celebrate the Constitution, but I
5 find it odd that the federal
6 government is going to tell us what
7 to teach and tell us when to teach
8 it. And they have the usual federal
9 rules of "What happens if the 17th
10 is a Saturday?" It's all worked out
11 in advance. This is Senator Byrd's
12 doing, let's say. This may be a
13 good thing. Maybe our students
14 don't really appreciate the
15 Constitution. But there is a bill
16 being debated now to come out, the
17 Reauthorization Bill, and it has an
18 awful lot of language in there about
19 what we can and can't do with
20 respect to transfer credit. This
21 institution has typically not
22 accepted, for credit, students who
23 have gone to institutions not
24 accredited via SACS. The federal
25 legislation is beginning to push us

1 in a different direction. So I ask
2 you as colleagues to begin to
3 consider these issues, to begin to
4 recognize that we're a dynamic
5 institution and the world does
6 change. And we ought to be either
7 ahead of this curve, or else it's
8 going to begin to cover us in ways
9 that we don't want. We need to be
10 able to talk about these kinds of
11 issues, and I think a body like the
12 Senate needs to find some time for
13 those kinds of discussions. We have
14 a lot of actual work to do.
15 Governance is important, but I don't
16 see any other venue on our campus to
17 engage in these kinds of national
18 issues, and they're fairly serious.
19 Federal government gives us lots of
20 money, not just for research, but a
21 lot of money for student aid. And
22 they're beginning to hold us
23 accountable now, and that's a
24 concern. But otherwise, I do want
25 to report that things really do look

73

1 to be better now than two years ago,
2 with budget cuts. I think there's
3 room for optimism. Again, I
4 congratulate the faculty. You've
5 done a marvelous job. I do intend
6 to write up, in a very detailed way,
7 all that we're doing and communicate
8 that and look forward to working
9 with you. This should be the year
10 we once and for all get on to
11 improving USP. I'm hoping we can.
12 So I will now answer any questions
13 that I can.

14 CHAIR YANARELLA: Please, questions from
15 the floor. Bob?

16 GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Chemistry. How
17 do you envision overcoming some of
18 the barriers to teaching innovation
19 that there are in the retainer and
20 promotion process, which
21 traditionally rewards research
22 excellence, whereas teaching is
23 usually secondary?

24 KRAEMER: That has to be a faculty
25 conversation. The faculty have to

1 talk about that, and we have to ask
2 that question of "How is it that we
3 get to the point of rewarding
4 individuals for what they should be
5 rewarded to do?" That's a difficult
6 one, Bob. I don't think you're
7 going to find any administration
8 that is going to solve that
9 question. The review committees are
10 faculty based, and one of the
11 observations -- or at least it may
12 not be accurate, but it's said often
13 enough that despite the fact that we
14 talk about the importance of
15 teaching for tenure and promotion,
16 that when it comes crunch time at
17 the Faculty Committees, it doesn't
18 carry that kind of weight. But the
19 conversation has to be richer than
20 that. You know, what is it that
21 we're doing with tenure and
22 promotion? What does this mean? Is
23 it different now than it was? What
24 should it be? And I think in that
25 context we need to then look at,

75

1 "What is it that we are valuing
2 here?" Because it clearly expresses
3 the institutional values that we
4 have, and I think in some cases it
5 is tough to see why we do some of
6 these things. The contribution that
7 some of our colleagues make in the
8 classroom working with students and
9 advising is clearly as much in the
10 institution's best interest as some
11 of the contributions that are made
12 by some of our outstanding
13 scholars. And it's unfortunate that
14 sometimes we have to measure each
15 against the other, but this is where
16 I think the faculty need to engage
17 that debate.

18 CHAIR YANARELLA: One more question.

19 Liz Debski.

20 DEBSKI: Biology. Do you foresee the
21 USP putting forward any
22 recommendations as to reform in
23 front of the Senate this year?

24 KRAEMER: I think the timetable that
25 we're looking for is to have a group

76

1 that will, as we say, catalyze the
2 conversation. This may be fora that
3 are held across campus and really
4 get faculty talking about this.
5 There will be a report released soon
6 from an external review team. We
7 had a self-study written for USP
8 that an external review team -- much
9 like the process we use for
10 departmental college review. Those
11 recommendations will be made public,
12 and hopefully they will point in
13 some possible directions. We can
14 then get the campus to react to
15 that, so hopefully by spring we may
16 have some directions to pursue. We
17 can't rush this. We have to do
18 this, you know, carefully, but we
19 can't also wait too long. So it's
20 hard to say, Liz. I don't know that
21 by spring USP would have
22 recommendations. Thanks.

23 CHAIR YANARELLA: Phil, thanks so much.

24 I'd like to turn to our next agenda
25 item. That involves a report from

77

1 Linda Siebert-Rappaport, who is our
2 Work-Life Director. Upcoming in the
3 next month or two will be an
4 important survey, and we look
5 forward to hearing more about the
6 results of that after it's been
7 completed. But for now, let's get
8 ourselves a preview from Linda.

9 SIEBERT-RAPPAPORT: Thank you very
10 much. Thank you. Ernie, I wish I
11 were as tall as you to stand up
12 here. So can everybody see me, in
13 the back? Good afternoon and thank
14 you so much for the opportunity to
15 come and speak with you today. As
16 Ernie said, I'm the Director of
17 Work-Life, and that means that I am
18 here to help look at the work and
19 life balance issues here in the
20 university and support all the
21 wonderful work that you are doing
22 and many other members in this
23 organization to help us really be a
24 competitive university and have an
25 even more compelling reason why

78

1 people want to come here and stay
2 here, so it's really about the
3 employee experience. Leading up to
4 my talk about the survey that is
5 coming up, I just want to talk a
6 little bit in more detail about what
7 are some things that have been
8 accomplished in Work-Life. And, you
9 know, admittedly we really haven't
10 looked at a lot of faculty issues
11 yet, and so we really want to be
12 sure that we are assessing those
13 issues very carefully and very
14 diligently before we go off on what
15 seems like a good idea but really
16 get solid data to see what the
17 faculty needs really are in this
18 university. So the Office of
19 Work-Life actually was founded a
20 year ago, and this was after a task
21 force had been formed a couple of
22 years ago and there was a
23 recommendation that the office would
24 ensue. Scott Smith was a part of
25 that advisory council, and many of

79

1 you were participants in that, and I
2 thank you for that, because it
3 culminated in having an official
4 Office of Work-Life. By the way,
5 out of our benchmarks, and if you
6 look nationally at public
7 universities and even private
8 universities, we're one of the few
9 that now have an Office of Work-Life
10 to look at the employee experience,
11 whether you're teaching, whether
12 you're serving, or whether you're
13 healing patients. And so we are
14 already putting ourselves in the
15 forefront by having an office and
16 having a survey of this magnitude
17 that is going to be issued in
18 October and then in February. Some
19 of the things that we have already
20 accomplished in Work-Life, through
21 the recommendations of our task
22 force that formed our office, was
23 that we broadened the definitions of
24 the family household so that more
25 individuals are eligible to partake

80

1 of some of our existing policies.
2 That has happened. This may not
3 affect you directly, but because we
4 want to look at faculty as well as
5 staff and some of the issues that
6 help individuals either come to work
7 or remove some of those barriers,
8 we're even now working with LexTran
9 to try to help increase the kind of
10 scheduling and outreach that is
11 available through public
12 transportation so that we can get
13 employees here to work. We found,
14 amazingly, that 75 percent of our
15 candidates for some of our very
16 hard-to-fill jobs were being turned
17 down even though they were qualified
18 because they just simply could not
19 get to work. So that gives you an
20 idea of some of the scope and the
21 range of what we're tackling from
22 the Office of Work-Life. And again,
23 Work-Life is about: Individuals
24 bring in their own life cycle issues
25 and their own needs, which may

81

1 transform and change over time, plus
2 we have, of course, a more
3 dramatically changing work force
4 than we did 20 years ago. So we
5 look at those issues and look at:
6 How we can have a very supportive
7 university environment that helps
8 tap into the unique needs of each
9 and every individual here? That
10 brings me to the survey that we are
11 about to issue and launch. We have
12 a wonderful partnership between the
13 Office of Work-Life and, I heard
14 mentioned previously, Connie Ray's
15 shop and Roger Sugarman and Deb
16 Moore. They are our partners so we
17 can be sure that the survey that we
18 are issuing has the highest
19 integrity and the ability to be
20 analyzed in a very, very fine way,
21 so they are our partners. We're
22 also partnering with an external
23 firm that is one of the premier
24 organizations in the industry of
25 work-life, who have worked with,

82

1 actually, OSU and Ohio State
2 University. They're one of the few
3 of our benchmarks that have embarked
4 upon surveys of this kind for each
5 and every employee, and typically
6 they would work with companies like
7 IBM. The research shows that when
8 we address work-life issues, we can
9 ultimately look at ways to increase
10 the positive work experience that
11 employees have across the board.
12 And so it's really looking at how
13 we're communicating, issues such as
14 that, and how we are really able to
15 attract and retain, because we can't
16 always do it by money. It's also
17 the experience of what someone has
18 here. Certainly we want to pay a
19 competitive salary and have
20 wonderful benefits. And also then,
21 at the end of the day, often the way
22 people select to maintain at an
23 institution is their experience on a
24 everyday basis. Do they have the
25 ability to learn and thrive and grow

1 in their profession, for example.
2 So what I'm here today to ask you
3 about is if you could please, first
4 of all, in October support the staff
5 that works with you. We are going
6 to issue the staff survey first, so
7 to the staff and to the health care
8 will be in October. So I'm here to
9 ask if you would help us on that,
10 encourage them to take it. We'd
11 really appreciate that because we
12 want a really dramatic outturn. We
13 want to have everybody's voice
14 heard, if at all possible. It is
15 voluntary. It is confidential. It
16 is anonymous. There's no way we
17 will ever be able to link back to
18 who said what about whom or anything
19 else. So that is in October. Then
20 in January, probably about the third
21 week of January into early February,
22 we will then issue a separate survey
23 that is customized for faculty along
24 very similar lines, but perhaps with
25 some different topics to address and

1 focus on the needs of faculty. So
2 that will be in January/February, so
3 on that, we really ask for your help
4 to make sure that -- not only we ask
5 for you to fill it out but also to
6 confer to colleagues and those
7 around you that this is something
8 that we would really encourage in
9 the university. Dr. Todd is looking
10 forward to the results. He has also
11 been involved with how we are
12 posting things from the study. We
13 have talked with Scott Smith. We
14 have talked with a cross-section of
15 some of the deans and with -- spoken
16 with Wendy Baldwin and Michael Karpf
17 to make sure that everyone's on
18 board. We also have Frank Butler as
19 one of our main sponsors of the
20 survey as well, and we are investing
21 in special outreach efforts to areas
22 that are often hard to reach, such
23 as PPD, to make sure that everyone
24 has the opportunity to have a
25 voice. So the month is October for

1 the staff survey, and we ask for
2 your help. I'm going to just put
3 out a handout that will give you
4 some talking points as you may begin
5 to speak to staff about their
6 involvement. We also have asked the
7 deans to issue a memorandum to all
8 faculty, which should have gone out
9 over the past couple of days, to ask
10 for faculty to in fact participate
11 in volunteer roundtables where we
12 will ask for their specific input to
13 make sure that we are putting
14 together a very, very well-formed
15 survey that is in fact based on
16 reality of what UK faculty is
17 talking about. So we would ask,
18 when you see that, that you would
19 please consider participating or
20 encourage others, again, because you
21 are influencers in your area. And
22 so that's why I'm here today,
23 because you are knowledge brokers
24 and you are influencers, so I really
25 would appreciate your help around

86

1 that. Are there any questions that
2 I may address at this time? Okay.
3 Thank you very much. I really
4 appreciate it.

5 CHAIR YANARELLA: Linda, let me assure
6 you there are certain disabilities
7 in being as tall as I am. Thank
8 you.

9 SIEBERT-RAPPAPORT: Thank you very much.

10 CHAIR YANARELLA: Okay. Our next agenda
11 item relates to the changes that
12 have taken place in the governing
13 regulations. This summer the Board
14 of Trustees reviewed and passed
15 positively upon those changes.
16 Those changes took many months of
17 work and collaboration between the
18 administration and various faculty,
19 faculty bodies. I am pleased to
20 bring back to the podium Davy Jones,
21 Professor of Toxicology, who will
22 give us a quick overview on those
23 changes and discuss the implications
24 and import of those for Senate
25 processes.

87

1 GROSSMAN: Ernie, before you start, can
2 you tell us which one's Gifford?

3 CHAIR YANARELLA: Gifford, I don't know.

4 GROSSMAN: Which one's Ernie?

5 JONES: Yes, this is the -- your
6 predecessor. This is the faculty
7 body of the newly separated A & M
8 College from Transylvania
9 University. This is out at the
10 Ashland area, stationed out there
11 before the Main Building was built
12 here a few years later. There is
13 President Patterson and the other
14 professors, all of which constituted
15 the faculty of the university at
16 that time. As Ernie has mentioned,
17 there have been some updates to the
18 board's governing regulations that
19 were adopted in June of this year
20 that clarify, bring into greater
21 focus, the relationships among the
22 decision-making entities in the
23 university. And I'll be talking
24 today with most emphasis on those
25 entities that deal with educational

1 policy-making, since that's the
2 purview of the Senate here. Now,
3 there are some faculty who may think
4 that we operate under a system like
5 this (indicating). This is not the
6 system that we have, and it is
7 certainly not what has been
8 codified. There are probably some
9 unit administrators who may think
10 that we're operating this way as
11 well, and this is also not what is
12 codified. This is not the system
13 that we have. What the board has
14 clarified that we have is
15 illustrated here. The board, of
16 course, under the state law, is the
17 ultimate body for policy-making and
18 decision-making in the university.
19 The board has entrusted two major
20 branches of the university for
21 decision-making: One branch, the
22 administrative branch that makes
23 management policy, and I've got it
24 indicated here, chairperson, dean,
25 president. I'm not meaning to

1 maliciously omit provost here, but
2 this is to make them parallel with
3 the educational units, and there's
4 no educational unit which provost is
5 a chair over, but that's the only
6 reason on this slide the provost is
7 not here. Okay. So you see the
8 chair and the dean and the
9 president, I've got two colors
10 here. The black is the management
11 hat that they wear. They are the
12 managers and make all management
13 policy. The board's governing
14 regulations have clarified some
15 areas that were not completely
16 understood to be the management
17 jurisdiction and that they are the
18 management jurisdiction; for
19 example, distribution of effort
20 assignment. That's not educational
21 policy; that's the management that
22 makes those decisions. So some
23 things like that have been
24 clarified. Educational
25 policy-making is done by faculty

90

1 bodies, the department faculties
2 nested within the college faculties,
3 nested within the University
4 Senate. Now, the board has also
5 clarified what constitutes
6 educational policy. There have been
7 some places there where they were
8 able to make some clarifications.
9 There are some areas that we'll get
10 to in just a moment, as an example,
11 that impinge on both in that you
12 can't make a clean cut between the
13 two. Now, an important thing as far
14 as the Senate that the board has
15 done is -- and the people who were
16 here for the orientation earlier
17 heard me talk in more detail about
18 it -- there is a small set of
19 functions out there in state law
20 that the state law says are to be
21 performed by the faculty of the
22 university. The most obvious
23 example would be the degree list
24 that we submit from the Senate to
25 the Board of Trustees. This is to

91

1 be done by the faculty. And what
2 the board has done is, in order to
3 make the state law manifest the way
4 it should be, one thing we could do
5 is we could hold a meeting of all
6 2,000 faculty. And up until 1940,
7 that's what was done; literally, all
8 professorial faculty met in Memorial
9 Hall and were the Senate and
10 performed all the statutory
11 functions of the educational
12 policy-making. In 1943 we got the
13 elective subset of faculty, like we
14 have today. And so what the Board
15 of Trustees has said is, for those
16 small set of Senate functions that
17 state law says are to be done by the
18 faculty of the university, beginning
19 this fall or beginning this meeting,
20 it's going to be the elected faculty
21 Senators of the Senate. In other
22 words, draw a circle around the
23 Senate membership that's the elected
24 faculty Senators; being elected,
25 they're representative of this

1 larger body of the full-time faculty
2 of the university and it would be
3 their vote on this floor that sends
4 the degree list forward, rather than
5 the total membership. Now, there
6 are -- if you go to the board's
7 governing regulations, there are a
8 lot of duties the Senate has. It's
9 only a small subset that state law
10 gets into, so most things that come
11 before the Senate will be the full
12 Senate, but there will be a few that
13 it's the elected faculty Senators
14 acting as the quorum of the faculty
15 body performing those actions. Let
16 me talk for a minute, again, about
17 those -- the statutory functions.
18 One thing is that the state law,
19 when it refers to the faculty of the
20 university, doesn't define what is
21 the faculty of the university. It
22 assigns the Board of Trustees to
23 define: Well, what is the body, the
24 faculty of the university? And they
25 don't want to get into: Well, do

1 you consider part-time faculty as
2 part of your decision-making
3 bodies? How about temporary? There
4 are a lot of things like that. So
5 in your department, probably the
6 part-time faculty probably are not
7 part of the voting faculty that
8 determines educational policy in the
9 departments. A clarification like
10 that was needed: What about the
11 level of the university? What is
12 this body, the university faculty,
13 that you are the elected
14 representatives of? So they defined
15 it this way: If we take each of the
16 college faculty bodies, and they
17 define those, collectively, the
18 college faculty bodies constitute
19 the statutory body, the university
20 faculty. Now, the functions that
21 the state law assigns to this body,
22 for example, one of the functions is
23 to elect faculty trustees. This is
24 done directly by all the members of
25 this body. We could meet as a body

1 and do it, but we don't. We do it
2 by ballot off of a Web site, but
3 it's this total body that's
4 performing that statutory function.
5 But the other functions that are
6 done are going to be done through
7 representatives, and that's where
8 each of the colleges has
9 respectively elected you, their
10 faculty Senator, into the elected
11 faculty representatives that acts
12 for the university faculty body, for
13 example, to recommend to the board
14 the degree list. Now, what have the
15 governing regulations been modified
16 on with respect to the college
17 faculty? The definition of the
18 college faculty body, and again, I'm
19 distinguishing faculty employees who
20 are employed in a college is not the
21 same thing as the governing college
22 faculty body of the college. So
23 we're talking here: What's the
24 governing body of the faculty of the
25 college? The automatic members of

1 that are the tenured and tenure
2 track faculty at or above the level
3 of Assistant Professor. This body
4 can confer membership with or
5 without voting privileges to other
6 members. For example, if you have
7 Instructors, they're below the level
8 of Assistant Professor. If you want
9 to afford them membership without
10 voting privileges in the college
11 faculty body, you can do that. You
12 can even go so far as to say: Okay,
13 the chair of the student body of the
14 college, we'll afford membership
15 without voting privileges. You can
16 confer, at the college level, these
17 privileged memberships. Now, the --
18 this decision-making body, the
19 governing regulations clarify that
20 the college faculty determines the
21 educational policies of the
22 college. But up until this past
23 June, the governing regulations
24 didn't elaborate on: Well, what
25 does educational policy mean? You

1 know, what's within that circle?
2 And so they've defined that now.
3 This includes what I'll call
4 curricular policy-making, academic
5 requirements, curricular course
6 offerings, but also programmatic
7 aspects of research, professional
8 programs, service functions.
9 Insofar as these are relating to
10 educational policy matters, it's the
11 college faculty body that's
12 determining those policies. The
13 faculty at each college are expected
14 to establish a document that defines
15 its structure on how it's going to
16 perform these decision-making roles,
17 and copies of those will be filed
18 with the Senate Council. And the
19 Senate Council's radar will be high
20 to make sure that the faculty of the
21 college actually adopted the
22 document and that the rules enable
23 the faculty to perform the duties
24 that are assigned to them. And
25 finally, at the department level,

1 again, the automatic members of the
2 decision-making body that is the
3 department faculty body are going to
4 be the tenured and tenured track
5 faculty who are Assistant Professor
6 or higher. Again, at the department
7 level, you can confer voting
8 membership or nonvoting membership
9 to lecturers or instructors or other
10 persons who are assigned to the
11 unit. The educational policies are
12 made, you know, within the framework
13 of the Senate. The department has
14 jurisdiction over its internal
15 educational policies. And again,
16 there's elaboration here. It's all
17 three mission areas: The
18 instruction, research, and service.
19 And, again, the faculty of each
20 department are to establish rules
21 and a committee structure on how
22 they're going to perform these
23 functions, and copies of those will
24 be filed with the Senate Council.
25 And again, Senate Council's radar

1 will be high that the faculty
2 actually approved this document
3 that's sent forward and enables them
4 to perform those functions. There
5 was an actual case that came up that
6 a chair wrote a document and sent it
7 off and the faculty never saw it.
8 That's not going to happen. Senate
9 Council will be alert that that
10 doesn't happen. Okay. So that is
11 just a little bit on how each of
12 these bodies has been elaborated on
13 in the governing regulations we have
14 now. I just want to close in one
15 moment with shared governance. This
16 is a term that has been used a lot,
17 was never defined, meant different
18 things to different people, and the
19 board has now made a definition of:
20 What is shared governance? What
21 does it expect us to do in a shared
22 governance atmosphere in the
23 university? And basically the way
24 it defined it operationally was, as
25 each level of final decision-making

1 is making a decision, it is to
2 solicit and obtain the advice and
3 input of the other branch. So as a
4 dean is making college policy, the
5 faculty advised the dean on that.
6 As the University Senate makes
7 educational policy, the President
8 inputs to the Senate. So the board
9 does not expect that the
10 decision-makers in each branch are
11 making decisions in a vacuum. It's
12 expecting that there's going to be
13 communication and interaction and
14 sharing of expertise in both
15 directions. That's what shared
16 governance now means, in terms of
17 the University of Kentucky. I would
18 note that the -- with these changes,
19 the board has vested a great deal of
20 confidence and anticipation that
21 both of these branches are going to
22 step up to the plate and perform
23 very well the authorities with which
24 they've been entrusted, and I would
25 urge our body here and the other

100

1 bodies, levels that are involved
2 here, that we need to put our
3 energies and quality of performance
4 into this so that the board does see
5 that it has well-placed its -- it
6 has well-placed confidence in the
7 faculty and the administrators as
8 they perform their delegated
9 functions under the new governing
10 regulations. That's, in a nutshell,
11 our new regs that we have in
12 operation today. Ernie.

13 CHAIR YANARELLA: Any questions you'd
14 like to address to Davy before we
15 turn to our last agenda item? Davy,
16 thank you. The last agenda item
17 relates to the disposition of the
18 LCC or the Bluegrass College &
19 Technical -- pardon me, Bluegrass
20 Community & Technical College degree
21 candidate list. We're focusing
22 specifically on the -- on just that
23 portion of the degree candidate list
24 that has been sent forward to us. I
25 need, first of all, a motion from

101

1 the floor to waive the six-day rule
2 to act on these degree candidates.

3 CIBULL: Move.

4 CHAIR YANARELLA: Motion has been moved
5 by Mike Cibull.

6 TAGAVI: Second.

7 CHAIR YANARELLA: Second from Kaveh
8 Tagavi. Is there any discussion on
9 this motion? There being none, all
10 in favor, please indicate by raising
11 your hands. All opposed? Any
12 abstentions? The motion carries.
13 Okay. This last item, then, on the
14 agenda relates to another special
15 status rising from state law
16 concerning the awarded degrees. The
17 legislation in this case is the
18 House Joint Resolution 214 from the
19 Spring of 2004 concerning the
20 transfer of Lexington Community
21 College from the management of the
22 University of Kentucky to the
23 management of KCTCS. Under that
24 legislative resolution, as the
25 faculty body of the LCC approves a

1 list of its graduates who are
2 candidates for UK degrees, those
3 recommended degree candidates are
4 then to be submitted through the
5 University of Kentucky apparatus for
6 the award of UK degrees. As a brief
7 note of information, these are
8 students who matriculated under the
9 UK registrar system into LCC during
10 the time that LCC was managed by the
11 University of Kentucky and whose
12 academic records UK has agreed to
13 continue managing until June of
14 2006. These students who have
15 remained subject to the graduation
16 requirements of their associate
17 degree programs, as those graduation
18 requirements were prescribed as of
19 July 1, 2004, in the UK Senate Rules
20 and approved by the UK Board of
21 Trustees. If those students
22 complete those degree programs by
23 August 31st of 2010, then they are
24 still eligible for a UK degree.
25 Now, in accordance with the state

1 laws and board regulations that Davy
2 Jones just summarized, the final two
3 approvals at the university level
4 for UK degrees are the body of
5 elected faculty Senators, as
6 gathered in this meeting today, and
7 the UK Board of Trustees. A number
8 of us have rechecked during the last
9 several days that the process of
10 transfer of LCC to the management of
11 KCTCS apparently did not result in
12 any error or omission of graduates
13 from this May graduation list who
14 otherwise would need to be here on
15 the floor today. So we are ready
16 for a motion and a vote from the
17 elected faculty Senators for
18 approval of submission of the LCC
19 degree list to the University of
20 Kentucky Board of Trustees for its
21 final action at next week's board
22 meeting. I'm prepared to entertain
23 a motion, then, from any of the
24 elected Senators for approval of
25 this degree list.

104

1 JONES: So moved.

2 CHAIR YANARELLA: Davy Jones has so
3 moved. Is there a second?

4 BAILEY: Second, Ernie Bailey.

5 CHAIR YANARELLA: Ernie Bailey. Is
6 there any discussion on this
7 motion? There being none, may I
8 call for a vote? All those in favor
9 of approving the LCC or BCTC
10 candidate degree list, please
11 indicate by saying "aye."

12 SENATORS: Aye.

13 CHAIR YANARELLA: All those opposed say
14 "nay."

15 (NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE.)

16 CHAIR YANARELLA: Anyone else want to
17 get into the fray? Any
18 abstentions? The motion is
19 carried. This concludes our
20 agenda. If there are no other
21 issues to be brought before the
22 Senate, this meeting is adjourned,
23 and I thank you very much.

24

25

1 STATE OF KENTUCKY)

2 COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

3

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

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

17 My Commission Expires: November 24, 2007.

18 IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
19 hand and seal of office on this the 28th day of
20 September, 2005.

21

22

23

24 _____
25 ROBYN BARRETT, CERTIFIED SHORTHAND
REPORTER, NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE AT
LARGE, KENTUCKY