UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE MEETING

* * * *   * * * *

NOVEMBER 14, 2016

* * * *   * * * *

KATHERINE MCCORMICK, CHAIR

ERNIE BAILEY, VICE-CHAIR

KATE SEAGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

LISA GRANT CRUMP, COURT REPORTER

* * * *   * * * *

MCCORMICK: I'd like to welcome you to the November Senate meeting. So make sure you sign in and pick up your clicker. Remember to follow Robert's Rules of Order. I request that you are civil, you're a good citizen in the sense that you listen to others, and again, allow other people to make a statement, rather than going for your second or third.
               Participate is one of the things that senators tell me that they don't feel comfortable participating, and so if you can give me ways to make participation more congenial, please let me know and I will (inaudible).
TAGAVI: Can you use your microphone?
MCCORMICK: Yes.
TAGAVI: Or I do not hear you.
MCCORMICK: And then finally, make sure to return the clicker to the table before you leave. So we'll get started.
               As you remember, I had some difficulty with the slide regarding tallying the vote and so when the slide appears and you hear the question read,

then is the time to vote. So are you
here today? Say yes, no, or it can't be
November already. I'm going to give you
a few minutes, a few seconds. Five,
four, three, two, one. And here's the
tabulation. Yes, most of us are here and
some of us can't quite decide.

Senate Rules 1.2.3 require that
your minutes from your meeting, the
agenda and each supporting documents are
sent to you six days in advance. Kaveh,
just yell at me or give me a hint if I'm
moving away from the microphone. But
items were not sent on Tuesday, certainly
because hopefully everybody was home
voting. So we need to ask that we waive
Senate Rules 1.2.3 to allow the Senate to
consider the agenda because the entire
agenda was not sent out six days in
advance.

However, we also would like for
you to consider in this portion that
there was a mistake made in terms of the
pdfs that were the supporting documents
for two of those motions, for 3.1.2,
3.1.0 and 3.1.1. Those were just
reversed, and so that's a condition that
-- consideration here as well.

So I need a motion and second
that the Senate waive 1.2.3 to allow
consideration of the agenda for November
14th.

BLONDER: So moved. Lee Blonder.
MCCORMICK: Lee Blonder. Do I have a
        second?
BAILEY: Second.
MCCORMICK: Thanks, Ernie. All right.
TAGAVI: Question.
MCCORMICK: Yes, sir.
TAGAVI: I got this (inaudible) so I
        didn't hear everything you said.
        Can we add to the motion the agenda as
        amended? Because the agenda was amended,
        there were some strike throughs, so...?
MCCORMICK: Yes. Thank you.
BROTHERS: That's on the next --
MCCORMICK: Here we go.
TAGAVI: Oh, you're going to have another
        motion?
BROTHERS: Yes.
TAGAVI: Okay. I thought you would
        combine the two.
MCCORMICK: The next one.
BROTHERS: They're voting now.
MCCORMICK: All right. Can we make a note
        that that's the Senate agenda as amended?
BROTHERS: Yes. Hold on just a second.
MCCORMICK: All right. Can we vote again?
        Will -- will it allow us to vote again?
BROTHERS: I think so, yes.
MCCORMICK: All right. So -- and Lee and
        -- Okay. Thank you. Now, let's
        try again. Does everyone agree that

```
                     that's -- are you -- would you still --
                     would you vote any differently?
GROSSMAN:            Call for a show of hands.
UNIDENTIFIED:        Show of hands.
MCCORMICK:           Yes.  Can I have a show of hands
                     for support for the agenda as amended?
                     Thank you.  Opposed?  Okay.
                     The second issue, as Kaveh just
                     mentioned, we had some changes in the
                     agenda and so I have two other kind of
                     cross-speaking items that are in
                     reference to the agenda.
                     The first is that the committee
                     that proposed the items regarding
                     distance learning and -- E-learning and
                     distance learning would like to remove
                     those so that they could have a chance to
                     work on those a little bit more.  So I
                     would need a motion to remove those items
                     from the agenda to waive 1.2. --
BROTHERS:            No.  It's like two slides in
                     (inaudible).
MCCORMICK:           To remove the five proposals
                     from Senate's Committee on distance and
                     E-learning.  Yes, Mark.
WHITAKER:            I vote that we do that.
MCCORMICK:           Mark.  And the second?
BONDADA: Second.
MCCORMICK:           A second.  Thank you sir.
BROTHERS:            I'm sorry.  Who's the second?
MCCORMICK:           Very back.
BROTHERS:            Name, please.
BONDADA: Subbarao Bondada.
MCCORMICK:           Thank you.  All right.  So we're
                     going to revise the agenda again to
                     remove the five proposals from Senate
                     Committee on distance education and E-
                     learning.  All right.  Vote, time to
                     vote.  Five, four, three, two, one.  And
                     it looks like we're in good shape there.
                     Then my second request is that
                     the Senate move to return the graduate
                     certificate in Engineering and Healthcare
                     to the SAPC for further review.  You've
                     received, I think, some comments from
                     senators regarding this proposal, and the
                     proposer has requested that he take this
                     back to his college for further review
                     and amendments.
                     So what I would like is for you
                     to move to allow us to return the
                     graduate certificate in Engineering and
                     Healthcare back to the committee for
                     further review.
WOOD:                So moved.
SCHROEDER:           Second.
BROTHERS:            Name, please.
SCHROEDER:           Margaret Schroeder.
WOOD:                Connie Wood, A and S.
BROTHERS:            Thank you.
MCCORMICK:           Any discussion?  So our
                     recommendation is to return the graduate
                     certificate in Engineering and Healthcare
```

to the SAPC for further review. We can vote now. Five, four, three, two, one. Votes are closed and it looks as if you're amenable to that change.

All right. I received a number of editorial changes and we responded to those. Unless I hear objections now, the minutes from October the 10th will stand approved as amended by unanimous consent.

All right. Some brief announcements. The University Senate and Staff Senate will host the annual December reception with members of both Senates and the Board of Trustees. That is being rebranded as Connect Blue. It's going to be Tuesday, December 13th. We encourage you to attend and RSVP to Brittany Begley in the Staff Senate.

Our UK Core Committee, headed by Eric Sanday, has been working really hard and they met last week to respond to student concerns regarding the CORE component in community, culture and citizenship.

And so I anticipate that they will work more closely with this -- on this issue, and in collaboration with the VP for Institutional Diversity. So we'll keep you apprised of their -- their work. And they are also working with Tara Rose and Chris Thuringer regarding how we intend to assess our CORE. As you know, that's going to be a critical component of the SACS review when it comes along. So, again, I really appreciate the work of Dr. Sanday and his committee.

We approved the ad hoc committee on technology and that is -- it's kind of a shared agenda, I guess. And so Roger's committee, as well as Mark and Beth Kraemer who chairs the committee for the Provost -- for the President, they really see some areas where they might -- their work might intersect and so they're going to do kind of this ad hoc committee. We (inaudible) to share that with you and we hope that we'll see really great things from that committee as well.

Remember that elections for Senate Council members will start in the near future and be on the look out. Roger, if you'd like to make a comment here.

BROWN: Just a quick announcement. There are two elections regarding the Senate that are going on now. Both have a nomination round that's followed usually by a voting round. So the first one that you probably received -- this is all from the Senate Council website. I mean, the e-mail address.

The first one is to elect a new Senate Council chair. The nomination

UK11-14-16.txt

round for that ended this morning at noon and so we're assessing those senate councilors that are willing to serve as a new Senate Council chair.

The other election begins about 3:00 today -- 2:00 today, and that is to elect, among the elected faculty representatives, three new representatives to be senate councilors. So that's, again, starting with the nomination round.

And so you have about one -- about two weeks to nominate others from your -- in our group to be the new senate councilors and then we'll follow that with a voting round.

So take a look at your e-mails so that you catch that and make sure you participate, and I'll be sending out reminders as well. Thank you.

MCCORMICK: I neglected to introduce Sonja Feist-Price, who is here, also, from the Office of Institutional Diversity as well as faculty development is one of the key members in the discussion that Eric is having regarding the CORE, and so we appreciate her presence.

Dr. Bailey, do you have the report as the VP? Kate? All right.

Bob and Lee, you're up.

BLONDER: I hope you can hear us okay. So we're the two faculty trustees. We had a retreat, annual trustees retreat that we attended in October. It's a day and a half long retreat.

The first day we toured the Academic Science Building, which is beautiful, and we had a PowerPoint presentation, some of which the Provost will describe in the afternoon.

We also had these very interesting diversity breakout groups, where we broke out into small groups and we met diverse students, and had discussions with students about diversity and their experience at UK. There were three or four trustees per group. That was very interesting.

The next day we had an interesting talk by the Provost, and he'll discuss that today, I believe. And we also had the Board meeting. And we -- we approved athletic facilities at the Board meeting, and we voted on the Schnatter Institute, as you may know.

We differed in our views of that since I voted against it and Bob voted for it, which I think reflects the vote in the Senate. It was a narrow margin that -- that voted to not endorse. So we represented the two various views here.

So that's a summary of the
Page 5

retreat. Our next meeting is in
December. The slides for the retreat are
all posted on the Board's website if you
want to see the actual PowerPoints.
Davy?

JONES: I know there's some new members
on the Board of Trustees and this was
your first retreat as well. Did you get
any impressions as to what it is about
the academic side of the University and
the faculty that the Board most doesn't
get?

GROSSMAN: Tenure. They don't understand
the purpose or value of tenure. That's
the biggest thing I've had in my
discussions with the -- with Board
members. They don't -- they don't just
get why -- well, they get why we think
it's important, but they think it's just
because we want job security.
          They don't understand why it's
so important to what we do. So, you
know, I've been trying to explain it when
I get the chance, but, you know, most --
the vast majority of Board members do not
come from academia. They come from the
world of business and/or government,
where, you know, in government, of
course, you can regularly get turned out
by the voters. And in business, you can
easily lose your job or your business can
go under.
          So they -- they live without
tenure. They don't -- they don't really
get why it's so important for the
University to have it. That doesn't mean
that they are eager to abolish it. It
doesn't mean that, but.... That's my
sense of things.

BLONDER: And I think there is also a
varying degree of in depth understanding
of the concept of academic freedom.
There's some Board members, one or two,
that really understand it and really
respect it and will fight for it. And
then there's, as Bob said, there's, you
know, people from various backgrounds on
the Board, many in business, and the
concept of academic freedom. You know,
it -- it's a very interesting deep
concept, and I'm not sure that it's fully
appreciated or perhaps acted upon as a
value that's really important.

GROSSMAN: But I think to kind of temper
what we just said, all the Board members
that I've spoken to about things -- you
know, I haven't spoken that much to the
new board members, but certainly the ones
who've been around a little bit longer,
all of them have an enormous respect for
the faculty of this University and the
jobs that we do. And some -- many are --
you know, say we have to -- we have to
                    Page 6

make sure we have the best faculty. They just say that over and over again. We have to make sure because without an excellent faculty, nothing else at the University will be excellent.

So they do appreciate what we do. Again, it's just that the world of academia is just something that's -- that they don't -- many of them don't understand. Ernie?

BAILEY: With respect to the Schnatter Institute, there's -- could you describe to what extent the Board understands and respects the concerns that the faculty had about academic freedom? That it wasn't just a political issue.

BLONDER: I gave a mini speech about it and I hope that I explained that. Dean Blackwell gave an introduction to the Board and he talked about the Senate vote and he gave a little bit of background on that. And I tried, in my remarks that I made before the vote was taken, to explain exactly those concerns. Kaveh?

TAGAVI: Regarding Bob's comment about tenure in academia versus business and government, federal employees, they don't have tenure, but they have almost tenure. There is a huge protection regarding losing their job. I don't know about State of Kentucky employees, maybe you do.

GROSSMAN: Well, there's merit and non-merit employees, but the -- the Board members who have experienced government had that experience in non-merit positions.

TAGAVI: So when you discuss this with the Board members, you could remind them that in -- in our government, the vast majority of the employees have very rigorous protection. They don't have tenure, admittedly, but they have a lot of protection.

GROSSMAN: One other thing that we've been doing, along with Katherine, is attending, as many as possible, forums that Provost Tracy and President Capilouto have been having with the faculties of different colleges.

So I'm sure many of you have attended your own college's forum. And so these forums have been really diverse in terms of the -- the types of questions raised, the amount of the concern versus -- versus expressing how great we're doing. And so it's been really interesting to see, you know, all the different discussions that are occurring across campus.

One thing that does come up repeatedly, is, and this is probably because the President has brought it up

in many of the forums, is the business
about performance funding, performance-
based funding that the state put into
last year's law regarding our
appropriation, in which the Council on
Post-Secondary Education is currently
working on implementing a plan for. And,
of course, no one knows whether that plan
will be accepted by the governor or by
the legislature, especially now that
there are so many new members of the
legislature.

        So there's a huge amount of
uncertainty there, but there's, you know,
we just have to live with that
uncertainty until things have resolved.
And hopefully in a way that we can --
that won't -- won't hurt our ability to
(inaudible).

VISONA: Monica Visona, College of Fine
Arts.

        I am curious to know in your
discussions with the other trustees,
whether or not there has been some
discussion about humanities, given the
fact that our governor and vice-governor
publicly said that they believe that
humanities degrees are not oriented
towards proper careers?

GROSSMAN: Well, I can tell you last year's
trustees, this came up several times, and
what's the best way to put this
diplomatically? The views of the
president, of the governor, and the
lieutenant governor were not shared in
the slightest by the Board members, that
I have spoken to.

        As far as I can tell, and again,
I don't know the new Board members very
well, but all the Board members that I
have spoken to understand that there is
value in the sciences, engineering, and
math, and there's also value in the
humanities and arts. There's also value
with the healthcare enterprise.

        They understand that we do a lot
of different things and that all of those
things are valuable. So I wouldn't -- I
wouldn't worry about -- I haven't seen
anyone, except the lieutenant governor
and the governor, make comment -- express
those kinds of sentiments.

        I'm positive that Dr. Capilouto
and Dr. Tracy and Dr. Cassis and all the
-- the leadership of the University and
-- I don't know for sure, but I would bet
even the Council on Post-secondary
Education, they all understand that
science and arts are complementary and
both important in their own ways.

MCCORMICK: Thank you. We move to old
business and ask Dr. Bailey to come
forward.

BAILEY: So our committee looked at a proposal from the Department of Anatomy and Neurobiology and they asked to -- for consideration to change their name to the Department of Neuroscience in the College of Medicine and -- and it seemed fairly straightforward.

The impetus for the change is that the activity of most of the faculty in the program has to do with -- with the neurosciences. They believe that that would be beneficial to their -- their status and recruitment to identify that way. The program continues to have the responsibility for teaching Anatomy.

One of the other issues that came up was that there are lots of other programs at the university that are involved in neurosciences and to what extent would this encroach on the other -- other programs. We had some consultation with different programs and no one had a strong objection to it.

There's an undergraduate program in Neurosciences that is operated in Biology, and they collaborate closely with the faculty in this department and they're offering a degree, and we have a letter from Dean Kornbluh expressing support for this proposal.

So we recommended that approval of this -- this particular name change.

MCCORMICK: So the motion comes from committee. It doesn't need a second. The motion is that the University Senate endorse the proposed name change from the Department of Anatomy and Neurobiology to the Department of Neuroscience. Repeating that again, proposed name change from the Department of Anatomy and Neurobiology to the Department of Neuroscience. And so I would ask that you --

BAILEY: Is there any discussion?

MCCORMICK: All right. Thank you. Yes. Any discussion? All right. So hopefully -- no discussion?

BAILEY: Brian MacPherson is over here from Neuroscience to answer your questions. Okay.

MCCORMICK: So now you can vote. Five, four, three, two, one. These are the votes. All right.

Also under old business is Joan Mazur, who is the Co-Chair of the Senate Rules and Elections Committee.

MAZUR: This is a recommendation from Senate Rules and Elections Committee to approve revisions to Senate Rule 3.1.2, blocks of numbers for certain courses contained within University Senate Rule Section 3, Course Numbering System and Curriculum Procedures.

A little background, the Senate
Council had previously tasked SREC with
examining some draft definitions of
various types of experiential learning
that had been prepared by the University
Senate Committee, or excuse me, a
University committee, and initially by
the Senate Admissions and Academic
Standards Committee.

Katherine asked, in May, if SREC
could please draft for the Senate Council
what the senate rule would look like to
codify those definitions. The SREC
prepared the following draft codification
for review and action by the Senate.
Could I have that pdf up there?

So you can see this is to
Section A 395 that adds definitions on
community engagement and other
experiential learning courses as noted up
there: community engagement, service
learning, outreach and civic engagement.
Any questions, comments? Yes.

TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi.

Just to be sure, could you
put up that large paragraph between no. 3
and B is not part of the rule, am I
correct? It looks like -- because 3 is
part of the rule, A 395 is part of the
rule.

Is that paragraph part of the
rule or that's just tagged on for
mentioning?

MAZUR: Is what part of the rule?
GROSSMAN: What you just highlighted. What
        you just highlighted, is it part of
        the --
TAGAVI: That's not part of the rule that
        you want to approve and it's not going to
        go in the rule in the Senate?
MAZUR: No.   Right.
TAGAVI: The rest is?
MAZUR: Yes.   Correct.
MCCORMICK: Other questions for Dr. Mazur?
FIEDLER: Yeah, what's the purpose of --
        of -- why can't we have 395 section
        001, section 002, section 003? Why --
        why complicate matters?
MAZUR: Davy?
JONES: This is meant to connote that
        although experiential learning can happen
        at the -- in the undergraduate context,
        these definitions also apply to the
        extent needed in other educational
        context. So it's not restricted just to
        395 experiential.
FIEDLER: I still don't get it. I mean, I
        have to speak for my department and I'm
        sure this is true of the (inaudible). We
        take on independent study students
        because they can't find something that
        they want or they need an extra course,
        so we offer them our time, et cetera.

                But why would one want to change
the implicit evaluation of that course by
using lower course numbers? It -- I just
don't get it.
MAZUR: We're not using lower course
numbers.
FIEDLER: Well, what do I see? If a
department offers more than one such
course, numbers lower --
MAZUR: Oh, yes. Right.
FIEDLER: -- than 395 shall be used. What
numbers?
JONES: That -- that's old language.
That's not actually relating to the
experiential learning aspect. That's old
language.
FIEDLER: Well, it's old language that
ought to be gotten rid of.
MAZUR: We can certainly consider that,
but it's not related to the experiential
new language. Connie?
WOOD: As it reads now, A, it does not
prohibit the use of section numbers, so
-- and I concur with Davy, that's
existing rules.
MAZUR: And as far as making these --
these definitions more explicit, I think
-- I think looking ahead, regardless of
whether they're course for zero credit
hours and so forth, I think we also have
to be thinking ahead to the strategic
plan, and -- that community engagement,
engagement are specifically pieces of
that, that we'll be tracking and
certainly want to make some clear
connections to get credit for those. So
that's part of the discussion I remember
from way back in May as well.
                Any other comments or questions?
Yes, sir.
BROTHERS: Name, please.
WHITAKER: Oh, Mark Whitaker, A and S.
                Just a question for
clarification. So this rule change won't
require existing courses with already
existing course numbers to change their
designation?
MAZUR: No. No. It -- it's adding to
the -- the compendium of ways we could
describe these kinds of courses.
MCCORMICK: Any other questions? Bob?
GROSSMAN: Yeah. Just a -- just a quick
comment. Can you go back to the pdf?
Then scroll down to the next -- so you
see where it's crossed out in red, they
define 396 and 399. You go to the next
page, keep scrolling down, it defines 396
and 399.
                So really all this is doing is
providing a definition of the
experiential education, and part of this
is so that everyone on the campus uses
the same definition of B 1 through B 4,

B 1.1 through B 1.4 across the campus.
It's just simply adding some definitions of the different kinds of experiential merit. It's not changing anything about any of these course numbers.

MCCORMICK: So this will help us with strategic planning. It will also help in terms of accrediting documents, so there are a number of uses. There's a lot of utility for having these definitions more explicit and publicized. Any other questions for now for Dr. Mazur? Thank you for that presentation.

All right. So our motion is that the University Senate approve the revisions to 3.l.2, which the title is blocks of numbers for certain courses, but the contents is what we just discussed. Five, four, three, two, one. And you voted in favor.

Scott Yost is not with us today, but he sent a representative. Dr. -- what is your name, sir?

DONOHUE: Yes, I'm Kevin Donohue from the College of Engineering. Scott is traveling today and asked me to do the presentation for this particular item.

Our committee was tasked with looking at Senate Rules 3.1.0 and 3.1.1 on the course numbering system, which they felt was outdated or (inaudible) as stated. Essentially, it's stated that in order to take a 300 level course, you'd have to be of junior standing. You couldn't be a sophomore and take that -- that level.

That's currently not what's being practiced. The only place where this comes into practice is at 600 level courses and above that undergraduates cannot take graduate level courses without special permission.

So Scott Yost worked with the Registrar just to confirm what's currently being practiced and if you -- we can see what the pdf says. Propose the following changes just to say that 100 level courses are freshman level courses. 200 level courses are sophomore level courses, without making a prerequisite that you have to be of sophomore standing to take the 200 level courses.

So all it is, is just labeling the course numbers. However, when we get to the 600 level course, then -- then the restriction remains, which is currently being practiced. That in order for an undergraduate to take the 600 level courses, they have to get special permission, which then brings us to 3.1.1, which -- can you scroll down just

a little bit -- we eliminated the
exceptions that require special
permission for, let's say a sophomore to
take a 300 level course, those have been
removed.

And the only one that remained
is the requirement that if an
undergraduate wants to take a 600 level
course or 700 level course, they need
special permission, which is what the
Registrar's office currently practice.

MCCORMICK: Discussion?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

I'm sorry, I didn't catch this
when it went through Senate Council, but
under 800 and 999 where it says
professional programs course, it says
open only to students -- students in
professional colleges. We don't have --
yeah, we don't have professional
colleges. We have colleges, some of
which offer professional programs, and
some of those colleges offer both
professional programs and undergraduate
programs, and some even offer
undergraduate programs.

So this phrasing suggests that a
freshman could take an 800 level course,
which I don't think is the intent. Now,
what I don't know, and maybe some of our
colleagues from Pharmacy or Medicine can
share it with us, if a Ph.D. student in
Medicine or Pharmacy or Dentistry, is
taking a -- is a regular graduate
student, are they encouraged or permitted
to take classes 800 to 999?

I don't know the answer to that
question, because how -- how we amend
this could make a different -- would make
-- probably make a difference.

DONOHUE: Right. As stated, it's only
open to -- and that -- that's a good
catch. It should be people in the
professional programs.

GROSSMAN: If that's what the intent is,
and that's what -- what the -- what is
the current practice.

But again, in the College of
Pharmacy, it may be that a Ph.D. student
in pharmaceutical sciences may be allowed
to take an 800 level course. I don't
know. Is that the case in Pharmacy or
Medicine or Dentistry?

JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology.

I think a specific example of
what you're talking about might be
nursing. I remember they contacted me
one time, they got coordination between
their professional doctoral degree and
their graduate doctoral degree.

So I don't know that it's true,
but that might be an example of what
you're talking about right there.

Page 13

MCCORMICK: Connie?
WOOD: There are also some law degree
          -- law courses, 900 level law courses
          that are approved both for graduate
          credit and for professional credit.
                    So perhaps a wording -- I mean,
          you've got to say professional programs
          and to -- I don't know, something.
MCCORMICK: Dr. Schroeder.
SCHROEDER: This -- the Senate Council has
          this very same professional degree
          programs and their definitions and
          classes, et cetera, at SAPC right now.
                    So I would recommend to the
          Senate that we withhold changing anything
          with regard to that and wait until SAPC
          recommends the changes for that, because
          that line is under consideration as well.
DONOHUE: I'm sorry, I didn't quite
          understand that. Are you talking about
          the fact that the graduate students
          taking the 800 --
SCHROEDER: On the professional programs
          course, the 800 to 900 level, we agree
          that there is -- there's somewhat --
          problems, wrong with the language there,
          and we're working with Brian Jackson and
          other colleges to clean up professional
          programs, and that would include the
          courses.
MCCORMICK: So what you're suggesting is
          that we table this?
SCHROEDER: I wouldn't make -- I would just
          leave it as is right now.
TAGAVI: The whole thing or just the 800
          - 999?
SCHROEDER: My comment pertains specifically
          to the 800 to 999.
DONOHUE: Okay. As I understand the
          comment, just for clarification, is that
          there are problems with the 800 and 900
          level courses because we haven't
          addressed the crossover between graduate
          students taking them. But you're saying
          that there's already activity looking at
          that, in particular?
SCHROEDER: Yes.
DONOHUE: But the other ones, you're not
          commenting on one way or another?
SCHROEDER: No.
MCCORMICK: Kaveh?
TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering.
                    When I read this on my own
          without and I wasn't in the rules
          committee -- I wasn't in this committee,
          I thought this is basically fixing
          editorial language.
                    I really did not understand the
          enormity of this proposal, which brings
          me to -- I'd like to ask, there was some
          distance passed, that every proposal
          coming to Senate had the rationale. It
          could be one page, it could be either one

sentence, it could be a couple of
sentences. I would like to request to
have that.

But my specific comment, I
came to this meeting to say, this is so
huge that it need -- requires two
readings, in my opinion, according to
Senate Rules.

Now, I was schooled a little bit
by my colleague, Connie Wood, but let me
remind everybody, for decades we have had
these prerequisites. In one swipe of
hand, you're changing this, so as a
result a freshman student in their very
first semester, they could take a 500
level course. Now, if I'm wrong, correct
me if I'm wrong.

And then, we come to mid-term
and they are -- cannot handle the course.
They're going to come and say, nobody
told me this was a prerequisite of the
program.

So what we could do to achieve
this, instead of dropping all these
prerequisites, which we don't
prerequisite because by the way hollow.
If 500 has no prerequisite verses 100,
then what is the distinction?

What we could do is to add one
asterisk saying instructors could waive
these junior and senior level. If you're
not willing to do that, at the very
least, I request to delay the
implementation of this by let's say two
years, maybe six months, to give
professors the opportunity to go back and
put in their own course prerequisite to
add senior level, junior level, if they
wish to do that. Because if you're just
change it immediately, they won't have
time to do this for spring.

MCCORMICK: Bob and then Davy.
GROSSMAN: I disagree with my colleague
in Engineering. First of all, the
practicehas been for years and years not
to say oh, you're a freshman, you can't
take a 300 level course. There -- all
these courses still have prerequisites.
You know, they -- you can't take Chem
232, Organic Chemistry until you've taken
General Chemistry. So -- and the same is
true of all the 400 and all the 500 level
courses. So there is not an issue at all
with students not being prepared.

What this does do, though, is
say if a Freshman comes in with a huge
amount of college credit, so, you know,
they can still -- they can go ahead and
take courses that are commensurate with
their level of knowledge.

On the 800 to 999 question, what
I would suggest is we just go ahead and
approve all this as it is currently and

-- with the knowledge that someone is going to come back with a proposal to -- to better handle 800 - 999. If you look at the proposal, the proposed change for 899, it's just putting a title in there, so it doesn't hurt to go ahead and pass that really.

MCCORMICK: Davy.

JONES: I agree with everything that Dr. Grossman has said, but I promise I didn't know he was going to say.

MCCORMICK: Connie.

WOOD: Same here.

FIEDLER: Ted Fiedler, Arts and Sciences.

I need a clarification as to why -- I don't fully understand what we're now doing.

It seems to me that if I look at this on the surface of things, a freshman, who comes with a significant command of French, isn't going to be allowed to take a 500 level French course even though linguistically, and probably intellectually, he can do it or she can do it. So aren't we getting rid of that possibility here? Or am I totally misunderstanding what you're doing?

DONOHUE: We're allowing the possibility on paper, if it's currently practiced. I mean, that would happen, right?

FIEDLER: Right.

DONOHUE: So what we're doing is trying to make the language agree with what we're currently doing. Because this, this language, the old language would have precluded that. For example, it says, you know, in order to take the 500 level course, they would have to have hours that required them to be a junior. That was the old language.

FIEDLER: Exceptions allowed.

DONOHUE: What's that?

FIEDLER: Under exceptions, they were allowed to do it if the instructor and the dean approved.

DONOHUE: Yes.

FIEDLER: So all of -- this is no longer necessary because they can now just take it if they are up to it without --

DONOHUE: If they have the prerequisites that the course lists, yes.

FIEDLER: I see. But the prerequisites will probably not be in the form of courses, but in the form of their proficiency?

DONOHUE: Right. The prerequisite is not in -- in the form of their standing either as freshman, sophomore or junior.

FIEDLER: Okay. All right.

TAGAVI: So -- Tagavi, Engineering.

I am -- I am not prepared for this, but I think there are some 500 level, 400 level courses with no

Page 16

prerequisite, as of now, assuming that
the prerequisite was the standard.
                  But beyond that, senior,
sophomore, junior, they all have Senate
Rule definition. I just want to let you
guys know, there is no justification
called advanced junior.
                  It's a little bit not in a good
practice of rule writing. There is no
such thing unless you add into the -- the
definition of what is advanced junior.
GROSSMAN: And that's going to be described
in course. Advanced would be described
in course there, not the junior and
senior level.
TAGAVI: What is it? Where does it say
advanced? On 400 - 499.
GROSSMAN: Yeah, advanced level is
describing the course.
TAGAVI: Yeah, advanced junior and senior
level course.
GROSSMAN: Junior and senior level --
advanced junior and senior level course,
is how you (inaudible).
MCCORMICK: All right. Any other
discussion?
DONOHUE: Make a motion to vote on
accepting the proposed changes to 3.1.0
and 3.1.1.
MCCORMICK: He's brought the motion. We
don't need a second. It comes from your
committee.
                  Approve the revision to Senate
Rules 3.1.0 and 3.1.1. (Inaudible) All
right. Ready for a vote. All in favor,
opposed, abstaining? Five, four, three,
two, one. Motion passes.
                  Dr. Healy. We appreciate Dr.
Healy's patience. If you remember, he
was on our October agenda and has come
back for this meeting.
HEALY: Hi. My name is Michael Healy.
This is my third year as acting Ombud
at the University and I'm honored to
serve in this role, which has been very
interesting and has allowed me to get to
know a number of you across campus.
                  First, I wanted to thank Laura
Anschel, who is the assistant in the
office. She does a lot of the work of
the day-to-day work at the office. If
faculty members have questions about
different issues in terms of syllabi or
excused absences, things like that, Laura
is often the person who takes those
questions and answers those questions.
                  And she resolves a lot of the
issues before they -- they get to me, and
we're always talking about different
issues and -- and how they might be
resolved. So Laura really has been
critical to the workings of that office
and I appreciate her help greatly.

UK11-14-16.txt
I also want to thank the Senate
and Scott Yost and the Academic Standards
Committee for their work last year on
taking a look again at the absence
policies at the University and -- and
also burden of proof issues on academic
offenses that we had talked to them about
and that were enacted last year by the
University Senate. So I appreciate that.
If you look at the report that
we prepared for the Senate Council and
the University Senate, you will note that
the numbers show a lot of increase,
especially for matters that take less
than an hour of the time for either Laura
or myself at the -- at the Ombud's
office.
I think a lot of that just
reflects better record keeping, better --
keeping better course of -- of issues
that are brought to the office. Other
than that, I'd say in general, the -- the
work at the office has probably increased
somewhat, especially for Laura. But I'd
say generally, in terms of issues that
find their way to the University Appeals
Board, we're broadly similar in the level
of activity from year to year.
With that, I just wanted to
summarize that. The report is there for
anyone to see. If anyone has any
questions, I'm happy to answer any
questions. Thank you.
MCCORMICK: Thank you. Next item is
a conversation with Provost Tracy. Some
of you know that he has formed, I think,
a significant agenda and we'll hear a
little bit more about that. His
interest, I think, is to have the
opportunity to hear your feedback
regarding issues around especially
graduate education interdisciplinary
education.
TRACY: Thank you, Katherine. Mics on.
Thank you. Good afternoon. Today, I'd
really like to use this time to begin,
and I use the word, begin, an ongoing and
sustained dialogue with you, the faculty,
about the University's academic mission
and how best to move this University
forward across several academic
opportunities and initiatives.
I need your expertise, your
thoughtful knowledge, your ideas, and
your perspectives. With that in mind, I
really want to spend our time today,
talking about my vision for the Provost's
office. I see today as a starting point
to a longer conversation that I'd like to
facilitate with the faculty and campus
leadership over the course of the
academic year.
If you're willing to go there

with me, I'll start with looking at where
we are as an institution. As you are
aware, we are in the middle of an
enormous physical transformation.

This year alone, we opened a
beautifully renovated Gatton college, a
brand new Jacobs Academic Science
Building, and a set of residents' halls.

Recently, we acquired the
Lexington Theological Seminary and are
pushing the boundaries of our campus in
all four directions. In fact, our entire
housing stock has now been updated and a
new Student Center will open in just 18
months. At the same time, less than a
year ago, the University community signed
off an aggressive five year Strategic
Plan.

Now I've been a faculty member,
a department chair, a dean, and a
provost. I've been in meetings talking
about vision, plans, and future
investment. I know, both from experience
and conversation, how faculty feel about
the words synergy, cutting edge, game
changer, et cetera.

But this is a good plan. It
provides us an overarching direction that
we can all get behind; higher student
success rates, a strengthening of
graduate education, a deepened commitment
to supporting research and scholarship, a
more inclusive and diverse university and
increased community engagement. This
plan rings true to those of us in this
room, who as faculty, chose to make our
mark as academics at a research
university.

Our challenge, then, is how to
move that plan into a reality. How do we
take the vision forward? I view our
campus physical transformation and
aggressive strategic plan as building
blocks to enable us to transform and
elevate academics at UK. Taken together,
they help elevate our intellectual
aspirations and symbolize what we can
accomplish if we work together.

And so it is with all of that in
mind, that I want to start our discussion
today on three main areas; graduate
education, undergraduate education, and
interdisciplinary initiatives.

I want to begin with graduate
education purposefully. In many ways,
graduate education is a lynchpin of any
research university. It spans across
almost all missions and plays an integral
role in the success of undergraduate --
undergraduate education, research, and
departmental success.

Graduate students occupy
multiple roles, each serving muliple

purposes. As our graduate students move into their professional careers, they carry the flag for UK and extend and perpetuate the University's reach, influence, and reputation. However, it is no secret that we are at a defining moment for graduate education, not only here, but nationally.

On our own campus, we are in a moment of transition with graduate education. And although transitions can be challenging, they also provide us opportunities to rethink what we do and move in different directions.

Last year, a group of faculty came together to put forth a set of ideas concerning the graduate school. The deans took those ideas and further refined them. I want to build on that work and, in fact, add to it. At the same time, however, nationally there have been many discussions about the role of graduate education at the universities and for students.

The changing labor market is often front and center in those discussions. Graduate education is no longer solely a preparatory program to replicate the faculty ranks. We must prepare students for an array of careers now. We must prepare students for an interdisciplinary world, even if they are headed to faculty. And we must prepare students to lead with technical, as well as soft skills.

In short, despite the multiple goals and purposes of graduate education, I think we must start any discussion based on creating an excellent student experience. And as we make administrative shifts, for example, to graduate school, they should be driven by an intellectual vision.

So first, help me, along with your colleagues, envision the student experience of graduate education for the future. Faculty know students need to aim for a wider array of jobs, but how do we help faculty prepare their students for those careers?

Let's talk through how we engage in those conversations at the department level and the college level so all faculty and departments envision graduate education in their discipline for the future. What should the educational experience look like? How do we best meet the needs of the students in preparing them for the future? What should the philosophical framework be? What is the intersection between students and their experience and faculty members and their research? How do we prepare

Page 20

students for an ever changing work
environment? And finally, what do you
need from the Provost's office or the
Graduate School in terms of concrete
initiatives, support systems, and
cultural shifts to best support graduate
students?

In addition to re-envisioning
the student experience, I've also heard
from you about how best to think about
our current portfolio of graduate
programs. Collectively, I want us to
think about how to evaluate that
portfolio. In that vein, help me, along
with your colleagues, develop a rigorous
faculty led program review process.

I've been thinking about forming
a working group to pick up the ball from
where last year's committees left off. I
don't, though, want this to be yet
another committee. I'd like to single
its importance, single its importance and
its charge would include developing
criteria for starting new graduate
programs based on need, and for
sunsetting programs, develop criteria for
assessing the effectiveness, impact, and
viability of graduate programs.

In my mind, this work will lay
the foundation for graduate education at
UK for the next decade to fifteen years.
We may see some changes in the next two
to five years, but really this is about
long-term stewardship. It is one of the
reasons I've been hesitant to search for
a permanent dean for the Graduate School.

I think graduate education is
too important to the overall academic
mission of a research university, and at
this particular one, that I want to make
sure that we get it right. We set
ourselves on a long-term path toward
excellence, and we do right by the
students who come here.

We have issues we need to
address. We need a permanent
administrative structure. We need to
invest in support services and
infrastructure, among other issues.

But I think first, we must agree
on the central goals of graduate
education, putting the student experience
first, have a collective view of the
future, realizing a very varied job
market, and a faculty governed process
for the developing, strengthening, and if
need be, sunsetting programs.

To be honest, I started with
graduate education purposefully because I
know that there has been a concentrated
sustained focus on campus on
undergraduate education for at least ten
years. They are equally important and I

don't want either of them to overshadow
the other. In many ways, they overlap,
particularly, when we consider the
teaching mission of our teaching
assistants.
        And while we've made strides in
undergraduate education with that
concentrated attention, there is still
more work to do. Faculty, departments,
and colleges continue to work
deliberately to transform the
undergraduate curricular experience on
campus. As that important work
continues, it's my responsibility to
organize the Provost's office and its
units to help enable, provide value, and
support the undergraduate education
mission.
        As a result, last spring we
commenced a dramatic overhaul of the
Provost's Office Academic Excellence
Units and began with the merging of
Student Affairs and Undergraduate
Education into a new unit called Student
and Academic Life, with the express
purpose to marry the extra- and co-
curricular activities with the formal
undergraduate curriculum.
        We also realigned the allocation
of resources to support programs, units,
and initiatives that show impact on
student success. And we are pushing more
resources to the college. As a former
dean, I believe students should be
advised in the colleges and have closer
interaction with faculty.
        Many of these changes are still
underway, as it takes a while to move a
University as large as we are. The
Strategic Plan sets forth three main
areas to focus on with regard to
undergraduate education. And along with
the deans, we have tried to structure our
work around them.
        These three initiatives include
impactful support for students to insure
their success. Advising, critical to the
function of the University and their
students. We're hiring almost thirty new
advisor positions in the colleges, an
increase in almost 60 percent in advisors
at the University of Kentucky.
Counseling, we've added four counselors
and have ads out for four more
counselors, a total of eight, to bring
our numbers to twenty-one counselors, and
maybe more to come.
        The community of concern is
adding case managers, and we've changed
the academic work process, try to develop
a feedback system so you now get a result
back that you've submitted an academic or
behavioral alert. But also I'm asking

you to be diligent in submitting those alerts, particularly in that first six to eight weeks.

It's so critical that you, as faculty, engage with the students and when they're having trouble, let us know. And I would also ask you to have meaningful assessments in those first six to eight weeks. And if you will permit us, if you would put those grades in Canvas, we can actually automatically pull and we can do the academic alerts for you. We're not looking to get on -- into your grades and see who's giving what grades, but how can we help the students more automatically so that we can reach out to them proactively and help them to succeed here at UK.

It's important to note, however, that the changes that I've just mentioned are not with new resources, but rather with internal reallocations of existing resources. In fact, about -- between $4 million and $5 million of reallocation of resources to effect these changes. Thus, more central money is being pushed out to the colleges in the form of advisors, and we are growing an increased front line student support through internal reallocation.

Also, through the Provost's Office restructuring, we absorbed the bulk of the budget reduction. In fact, over $1 million, so as not to have to pass that on to the colleges.

The second strategic initiative of the Strategic Plan related to undergraduate education is Fostering Innovative Teaching and Learning. We want to expand the training in and attraction of innovative pedagogical methods across the campus, to coordinate tutoring across campus for students to enhance their learning, and assist students in identifying their learning style and provide multimodal delivery of knowledge to meet their learning styles.

My hope is that colleges and departments will work with the Center for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching to further build out and redefine how we teach and help students to learn.

And finally, the third initiative related to undergraduate education, is providing students with opportunities to participate in transformational experiences.

As you know, we just started the Lewis Honors College with a plan to build that out to reach a 2,000 student goal and develop an integrated relationship with the colleges. We're working very closely with Phil Harling, the Interim

Dean to make that college a realty, and
the transition committee, Honors
Transition Committee that you helped form
in that process. But we also want to
increase the internationalization of the
campus.

I've asked Associate Provost Sue
Roberts to develop a plan to hopefully,
over time, double the international
student population at the University of
Kentucky, with appropriate support
systems for those students.

So I won't lie to you, there's
much work to be done in undergraduate
education. Our graduation rates are up
almost 63 and a half percent this year
for six year graduation rate. But
unfortunately, our retention rate, first
or second year retention was down
slightly this year.

I firmly believe that that
restructuring of academic excellence will
get us part of the way there, but there
is no magic bullet. The colleges and the
departments will continue to help us, and
it's one of the reasons why we have
repositioned the former Student Affairs
and Undergraduate Education into Student
Academic Life towards the colleges.

The Student Academic Life's new
mission is to be of service to the
colleges and their students so that the
formal curriculum and the academic
experience drives the co-curricular and
extra-curricular activities. But this is
a cultural change, and as a result, it's
going to take some time and probably some
trial and error.

The colleges have been pushing
for a stronger academic presence in
events like Cawood, See Blue You, first
semester programming. And we are moving
administratively to enable that, but it
also means that you, the faculty, will
need to engage, in a different way, with
students around those critical times. I
need your help in thinking through how to
enable that engagement.

Finally, I'd like to take some
time to talk about interdisciplinary
initiatives, and I need your help in
thinking through those interdisciplinary
initiatives and how they, in particular,
work together in concert with graduate
education and undergraduate education, as
well as research.

Often UK is highlighted as one
of only eight institutions, nationally,
with a full complement of disciplines on
one continuous campus. And although I
appreciate that sentiment, I'm a little
at a loss at how best to promote that.
In many ways, it can be just confusing

and suggests we don't know who we are because we are everything. But in a different light, it also provides enormous opportunity if we harness it correctly.

It means we are at a place of divergent thought and action, and that it is -- that it is in that interaction and introspection between the different disciplinary transitions where we can marshal our resources. Given our full complement, we must think deeply about how we allow for, promote, support, and develop interdisciplinary programs, research centers, agendas, et cetera.

I won't pretend this isn't a perennial conversation on university campuses or even this one. Academics have been talking about interdisciplinary work for many years. And some universities do it better than others. Frankly, we have danced around this issue here with some success, and other times, not. But if you look at where the world is, if you look at the problems we confront, if you look at how research is being conducted, and if you look at what our students, both graduate and undergraduate, are facing in terms of job placement, market, and life, if you look at our disciplines, we can't ignore the role of interdisciplinary understanding and workplace.

We also can't ignore that our campus is particularly well-positioned to do this kind of work. We have the ingredients here. We need to make it administratively and bureaucratically attractive, place a focus on it, and support it collectively. It also offers itself as an umbrella to moving many of our over-arching goals; research, community engagement, graduate, and undergraduate education.

I've been framing it this way, which has led me to the following questions that I ask you to think through and help me explore over the course of the next year. First, if we all agree that we want to be student-centered, placing the student experience in a central position, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels, then how do we overlay our campus strength and disciplines? I'll call it our competitive interdisciplinary.

To my mind, if we need to look into the future for jobs and skills needed to have longevity, for instance, informatics, and neuroscience, since we discussed neuroscience earlier today, and see where we have the capabilities to create degree programs.

Page 25

I also think we need to foster and facilitate avenues for faculty to come together to create and brainstorm the program. Secondly, given the inherent strength that we have with regards to the number of disciplines on campus, what is the best way to leverage them into our strategic research directions?

Again, I believe they must be aligned with our strategic research initiatives, as well as aligned with our graduate programs. But the Vice President for Research and I need your help in how best to assess, evaluate, and prioritize this.

Finally, how best should they be aligned also with new educational initiatives and professional master's programs? Again, we must work in concert with educational growth opportunities.

So today I've covered several different topics; graduate education, undergraduate education, and interdisciplinary. It's been a purposeful mix of what's on my mind, while trying to provide you some updated information, for example, the academic excellence restructuring, but also to pose some questions to you for your thoughts and for further discussions.

I want us, as an academy, to explore how best to move these initiatives forward collectively. I also want to create space and time that can be set aside where we can wrestle with concepts, pose questions, and explore answers. I hope that you will take this conversation with you when you leave and continue to think through these issues. In fact, you got a handout as part of your materials for today with questions that I posed already. And I welcome feedback when we meet next or any time in between.

The handout, I've given to you with the hope that you will take this back to your departments and your colleges, and discuss these ideas with your colleagues and bring forth their thoughts, concerns, and perspectives. In short, I'm looking for real academic dialogue on these issues. Thank you.

MCCORMICK: We have time for some questions. Roger Brown.

BROWN: Roger Brown, College of Ag. I just was wondering, you said about the graduate program, you mentioned assessing the need for or possible sunsetting of programs. We often mention reviewing those. Those are both things that the senate already has in place, apparatuses for doing that.

                And I just wondered what pros
and cons do you see in utilizing that
existing structure for that versus do you
have plans for a parallel structure that
-- I mean, how would those work together
(inaudible)?

TRACY: Yeah, I don't want to create a
parallel structure, but I hope that we
can develop a process that also has a
diversity of input into it so that we can
-- again, it's part of a conversation as
how do we best structure ourselves to do
that in a way that's most effective.
                That's why, again, I'm here
today to engage you in what that looks
like: Is our processes the right ones?
Do they engage enough people? Do they
engage the right people to fully assess
it, but also make sure we have a clear
process for doing that.
                Again, I would hope that we're
developing new programs, but we also
should ask those hardened questions as
well as to are there programs that may be
we need to take a different look at?
First Kaveh, then Lee.

TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering.
                I sent your presentation to my
faculty yesterday and by noon, I see half
a dozen responses, some of them of varied
types. For example, one person said
attention to graduate programs are really
good, not just for graduate students, but
also for retention of the new faculty
that are hired, because if they don't
have good support, they would leave.
Another person said, this is all very
good, but it's going to add to the number
of administrators.
                By the way, being Senator is
really, really a good thing because you
could ask any questions from the Provost
and attribute to your faculty. Take
notice.
                But truly, I would like if you
would like to answer is one -- one, is
VPR constantly cutting support for multi-
college research facilities and having
central administration take over TA, RA
salary stipends is very good, but will
you consider differentiating per college?
Because some colleges, to become
(inaudible), you have to have higher
stipends.

TRACY: So the first question about the
VPR, I'd prefer that she answer that
question. First of all, I know she has a
number of initiatives to look at
equipment and interdisciplinary kinds of
work that will be coming out soon. So
I'll just simply say that and try not to
answer for her.
                On the second one about graduate

UK11-14-16.txt
student stipends and so forth, one of the
things we've been trying to do, we did a
pilot and we're getting ready to expand
that out to all the colleges (inaudible)
block grants. Block grants, rather than
having you apply, and 400 students apply
for one fellowship, is the ones that we
can, pull those together into a block of
money and allocate it to the colleges so
you can make those decisions at the local
level. So you can choose whether you
have five graduate students at X salary
or ten at Y salary. Based on what their
discipline is, it gives you more local
control.

        So we're getting ready to again
spread that throughout all the colleges.
The trick is what's the right amount of
money to each college and we started with
history, but we'll work to continually
refine that. But we believe that the
best way to do it is to get it to the
local level to meet your local needs,
because there's certainly difference
among the disciplines in terms of whether
you want fewer students at a higher
stipend, more students at lower, what is
the market, and allow that at the local
level.

TAGAVI: Thank you.
TRACY: Great feedback. I'll try not to
increase the number of administrators.
I'd like to have fewer direct reports.
BLONDER: Lee Blonder, Medicine.

        I just want to follow up on
Roger's question because it's just a
little puzzling to me. Senate Rule
3.4.0, Procedures for Consolidation,
Transfer, Discontinuation, or Significant
Reduction of Academic Programs or
Educational Units is very detailed. So I
think that we already have a process in
place, and we also have the -- the
creation of programs coming from the
faculty.

        So I -- part of me is a little
bit concerned about this approach that's
a little top down and doesn't recognize
the power of the senate and the authority
of the senate.
TRACY: We'll certainly be cognizant of
that. I -- I, again, would like to ask
you to look at it. And is it the right
process, and is it accomplishing what it
should accomplish? And do we have the
right people engaged in, and are you
engaging folks across campus, for
instance, a blue ribbon panel that looks
at that. And should we have external
people saying what are the disciplines
where we're missing opportunities? Are
we -- are we engaging in those
conversations to say, hey, there's a
Page 28

really hot discipline here that you haven't strengthened and you haven't developed yet, or interdisciplinary programs.

So I hope we're having those conversations and we constantly ask ourselves do we have the right processes in place? Are we asking the right questions, and are we carrying it out most effectively? I'm not trying to subvert the senate, but simply saying let's have a campus conversation, and let's make sure that we all understand all the pieces and that we carry them out effectively.

SANDMEYER: Bob Sandmeyer, Arts and Sciences.

I'm in Philosophy, so we have a graduate program that's narrowly focused in Philosophy, but I'm also in Environmental and Sustainability Space Program, which is an interdisciplinary in nature, it's an undergraduate program. We have aspirations to be a graduate program.

So I -- well, the first thing I want to say is I -- I applaud this entire initiative that you're talking about here, and I have a lot of questions, great interest in it. So rather than ask all those questions, I -- my question is centered on how do you -- what do mean, facilitate a dialogue and facilitate a conversation? What are you doing to -- because I have concerns about the top down approach too.

So how is it that -- that you're going to facilitate so that I can hear what my colleagues are advancing so that I can bounce ideas off of them and that kind of thing?

TRACY: A good question. And that's part of what we're -- what I hope comes out of today is, what would be the best way to engage? And Katherine and I've had some earlier conversations about that: How do we get a campus conversation, just in terms of -- I'm trying to say let's get from the bottom up and get everybody involved.

And so that's where we need to reach out into the colleges. You will help with that as representatives of your colleges, but I would hope we also include department chairs and deans who are part of the colleges and get that conversation.

Is it town hall? I don't know. Maybe it's part of it. Maybe it's focus groups to work on problems, ways that we can facilitate faculty having exactly the conversations you're talking about.

I don't know all the answers,
Page 29

and I'll readily admit that. But I would like for all of us, collectively, to come together in some way to ask ourselves those questions and (inaudible).

SANDMEYER: If I could just follow up with one quick recommendation, which is that there should be some means to maintain a history of this that people have access to. That's the thing that I see that is one of the great flaws in these processes, is that we move forward and we forget what we said in the past.

TRACY: Great idea and thank you. That's great feedback and that's what I hope to get through this, is the ways that we can best move forward. But I really hope that we, again, have this campus-wide conversation. That you all take this back with your colleagues in some organized fashion, but informal and formal so we have that.

I think it's a great idea to find a way to collect that information so that we don't reinvent the wheel, reinvent the wheel, and reinvent the wheel. So that we also can learn from each other in this process. Again, I don't want to -- I want to facilitate, not drive the process. But I just felt like we were not -- we had done a lot of work on undergraduate education.

We have not really talked about graduate education yet. It's many of the same questions. I would argue that it -- we're exactly the same point we were with undergraduate 10 years ago. We need to have a conversation about what is the graduate education? What does it mean to us and how do we best facilitate it here at the University of Kentucky? I want it to grow, prosper and be strong. Let's give it the kind of focus we did the undergraduate education and tie it in with interdisciplinary initiatives, which I -- I believe are -- hopefully we agree are inter-related to that.

And we're going to do everything we can to have those conversations across campus through the Senate, through the leadership, and get those all going together so that we truly have a conversation.

TRUSZCZYNSKI: Truszczynski, Engineering.

I have two questions. One is based on the discussion that just took place. It's as you say, a beginning, the beginning of a dialogue.

I think it would be useful to know when the dialogue will conclude in your mind, and with what -- what should be the outcome? If it is to be useful, it has to end with something usable, implementable, and something that we all

buy into or there is consensus for, and
-- so that needs to be specified, I
think.

    And second question is, with the
undergraduate education, we knew, we
looked at other programs. Our retention
numbers were low. Our six year
graduation rate is low. So we had a
sense that things have -- have to
improve.

    What is the -- in your mind,
indicates a problem with graduate
education? What sort of a measure do you
have in mind, or had in mind thinking,
no, this cannot be like that anymore?

TRACY: Sure. So the first part of your
question is what are the outcomes that I
expect?

TRUSZCZYNSKI: And when.

TRACY: And when. So I would like to
think we could do it by May, that's
probably a little ambitious. But
certainly by the end of the next calendar
year, I'd like for us to come out with a
clear set of -- a clear vision and
philosophical framework for graduate
education for the future.

    Secondly, I'd like to use that
as a framework for how to best align the
graduate school or what that is to
support that vision, and that we would
have, again, an identification of what
opportunities that we may want to take
forward in terms of interdisciplinary
programs that relate to graduate
education. So that would be my goal.

    I'd love to get May. I'm an
optimist; the glass is always half full.
But if it has to be fall 2017, I'm okay
with that. But we're going to continue
the dialogue until we get there, and
again, (inaudible).

    Now, the question is what do you
see as -- as the problem, maybe is the
other way to put it. So what is
interesting is I hear from a lot of
employers, not universal, but what I hear
is, you gave them the prerequisites, but
you didn't really teach them how to do
the job. And they -- your students are
incredibly trained in depth in a fairly
narrow field and we are using them across
a variety of parts in the field.

    So I asked -- that's why I asked
the question about philosophical
framework. What's the balance between
breadth and depth? What are the other --
so let's call that the foundational
knowledge, we can call it foundational
knowledge, and what's the balance between
breadth and depth.

    One of the questions I used to
love to ask for in a thesis defense was,

tell me everything you know about
somebody else's project in another
laboratory. I was a lab-based person.
And the student would first look at me
completely puzzled and then I would just
sit there and wait, and it told me how
much they paid attention in departmental
seminars or other things, how much they
paid attention to the world around them
and not just their field.

You know, I started out working
on drugs for pre-term labor and I ended
up in Pharmacogenetics, a big discipline
but pretty far apart. And I think that's
true of most of our students. So how do
we help them prepare for that?

The second piece is what's the
tool kit? What are the things that
students need to perform in the future?
Things like maybe informatics. Data
plays a large role in most of your
disciplines. Things like statistics.
What's the tool kit that they need?

And the third piece is what are
the -- some people call them transitional
skills, soft skills, whatever? How are
-- how to work in teams. How to
communicate effectively through all
modes. In some cases -- personal
management, you walk in with a Ph.D. and
suddenly you're in charge of three people
who have master's and been there for
twenty years and probably know more about
that job than you do and now you're in
charge of them.

So what are those things they
need to learn to perform in the
workplace? I'm not saying we're
universal, but can we give them
experiences that help them do that?
That's just my idea and it's not
universal. That's what I want the group
to wrestle with, is what's that
philosophical framework? And how do we
best prepare those students?

You know, the Bureau of Labor
Statistics says that for undergraduates
graduating today, they predict they will
have on average fifteen different jobs by
the time they're 37 years old. If you do
the math pretty quickly, that's one a
year. I've got a 28 year old son and
he's on his sixth. He's tracking right
with the Bureau of Labor Statistics. But
I think that's more the norm than the
exception. Many of us have been at
multiple institutions.

So what does that look like?
So is there a -- I know there's a
problem, but are we -- are we thinking
about what the student experience needs
to be and what it needs to be for the
next fifteen, twenty years? If it's

perfect, that's great, but I think it
could be healthy to have that
conversation. Bob Grossman.
GROSSMAN: Yes. Bob Grossman, Trustee.
                   Very, very briefly. I forgot to
mention this during my trustee report, so
I want you to describe it a little bit,
the initiative on financial aid and
changing balance of financial aid.
MCCORMICK: Perfect.
TRACY: Thank you for that setup.
GROSSMAN: And specifically the statistic
about grades, GPA versus drop outs.
TRACY: We'll get into that, absolutely.
It's going to be the second part of the
presentation.
MCCORMICK: We had one more question.
CHENG: Yang-Tse Cheng, Engineering.
                   I'd like to -- I like
philosophical discussion about graduate
program, but most of our graduate
research here is driven by funding,
(inaudible) we cannot disconnect the
philosophical discussion with available
funding, or federal funding. So how do
we balance this?
TRACY: So I would say that you're
asking that important question of
what does the intersection between the
students' experience and the faculty
members' research look like? I won't
pretend to know the answer, but how do we
bring those two together?
                   You are exactly right. That
drives the style of research, but are
there ways that we can enhance that
experience through that.
                   I'll just give you a couple of
quick examples. Are there industry
internships? I think you and I talked
about that the other day, but are there
industry internships to give them
(inaudible). Is there an opportunity for
them to supervise undergraduate students,
with your mentorship, to learn pieces of
that?
                   One of the things that I used to
do is every week we had group meeting.
Everybody had to bring a flash drive with
their five best slides, and their first
slide is what's your progress in your
project today? The second slide was what
are you going to tell me today?
                   You had three of your best data
slides for the week and then the last
slide, I guess, of the six was, what did
you just tell me and what do you need our
input on to help you move forward next
week?
                   And then one person every week
was randomly selected oh, I'm sorry, we
don't have enough time, two slides,
because that happens all the time, right?
                   Page 33

You don't have -- you would get cut off
and now you've got to make your case real
quick. We did that every single week.

So when the students went to
national meetings, they're like, this is
no big deal. It's not any worse than
weekly group meeting. This is those --
those are things you can add into it. So
what does that look like? What are we --
what are the outcomes we hope to get?

It's not the universal answer to
it, because it differs by fields, but can
we think of ways that we enhance that
experience.

MCCORMICK: Thank you. So another
initiative that the Provost has begun is
an issue that (inaudible) in terms of
financing. How do we support our
students? And so he is willing to talk
through those slides, and I think we --
we welcome that conversation.

TRACY: Thank you. Shift gears just
a little bit. This -- this is the
downside of things dropping off of your
agenda, is you're stuck with me a little
bit longer.

But I want to take a few moments
and tell you about a new initiative we've
taken here at the University of Kentucky,
and as Dr. Grossman said, the reasons
behind it. I told you a lot just a few
minutes ago about student support
services. I talked about the role of
faculty, but I want to give you another
piece. It's not -- again, there is no
magic bullet, but I want to give you
another piece of what -- of some things
that we believe are related to student
success.

So you remember from my -- you
may or may not remember from my talk, but
I mentioned three initiatives around
undergraduate education. The first was
enhanced student success through their
support services. The second is teaching
and learning innovations. And the third
is enrichment opportunities like the
Lewis Honors College.

As part of this reorganization
of academic excellence, we built it on
what we call the four pillars of student
success. For our work, we believe there
are four fundamental factors that
influence student success.

The first on is academic
success. You say, well, that's obvious.
But that's how we have the right tutoring
programs, advising clear pathways to
degrees. All those components that go
into academic success.

But there are three more that we
believe are critically important. The
second being financial stability.
Page 34

Financial stability meaning do they have
the resources to continue their education
here at the University of Kentucky. And
I'm going to spend a good deal of time on
that throughout the rest of the
presentation, so I'll come back to that
one.

The third is belonging and
engagement. If students do not believe
or feel that they belong here at the
University of Kentucky, that they're not
welcome, and if they don't engage,
they're much less likely to stay here at
the University of Kentucky.

And fourthly is wellness,
both physical wellness and emotional
wellness. If you read the Wall Street
Journal about three weeks ago, you saw an
article on student mental health centers
and rates of mental illness among
students.

Today, seventeen percent of
freshman entering universities suffer
from either depression, anxiety, or a
psychiatric illness, clinically
diagnosed. So how do we provide
outstanding support services? That's why
we're adding eight additional counselors,
four already in place, and adding four
more to support our students in that
arena as well.

Let me give you a quick example
of how these are all inter-related.
Let's imagine that something happens in a
student's family. For instance, one of
the parents loses their job during the
course of the semester. What's the first
thing the student going to do? They're
going to start worrying. So now they
have potential financial instability and
they begin to worry. So now we've begun
to impact wellness, particularly,
emotional wellness.

What's the second thing that
they do? They have to go find a job. So
when they go find a job, are they as
likely to belong and engage? Probably
not. They're probably going to spend
time away from their fellow students at
their place of employment, and they're
probably not going to participate in co-
curricular or extracurricular activities
(inaudible).

And so, the third thing
that they do is they maybe don't study as
much or they don't go to class as often,
and so it impacts their academic success.
So one single event can impact all four
areas of student success.

So we try to structure our
offices so that these folks work as a
team. In fact, every Friday morning at
8:00 a.m., that's when what we call the

SWAT team gets together, and we go
through all the issues across campus, all
the data on behavior alerts, academic
alerts, number of withdrawals, incidents
that have happened.

And we take it every single
week, how do we best serve our students?
And how do we provide them with the best
support to make sure that they are
academically successful, have financial
stability, feel like they belong and
engage and they have wellness?

So as I said earlier, we merged
the offices under -- offices of
Undergraduate Education and Student
Affairs. I'd like to tell you we're the
first university in the country to do
that, but that would be incorrect.

Many universities are going to
this model of trying to bring together
the curricular, the formal curriculum
with co-curricular activities, into
common reading experience. How do we
bring that together with our composition
and communication courses throughout the
first year? Right now, they are
independent of each other. Is there a
way we can bring that together into a
richer experience? That's marrying the
curricular with the co-curricular to
thirdly, the extracurricular.

I get concerned when I drive by
the Pieratt Fields, and it's 12:00 at
night, and they're having intramurals.
Now, I know students love to stay up late
at night, but if it's our call, that's a
different matter.

So how do we bring that program
together, but how do we think about the
Johnson Center a different way? Is the
Johnson Center just a place to work out?
It's good, but can it be also a resource
for access to programs? Are there things
we can do there that marry together with
the curricular aspects or at least
(inaudible)?

So this is some of the
investments I talked about earlier.
Eight additional licensed clinicians in
the counseling center. So we're up to
fifteen licensed clinicians and four
(inaudible) interns, which is equal to
two -- two full (inaudible). Sixteen
doctoral practice students. I would say
that based on best practices, we probably
need to go to about thirty. So we'll
continue to hire counselors, but if you
look at the best practices ratios, we
probably still have a ways to go.

We are adding, we've already
posted nineteen. We'll be posting eleven
more positions for professional academic
advisors. That's building on the fifty-

four that already exist. So a
significant increase in advisors. Also
additional personnel in the Violence
Intervention and Prevention Center and
additional career counselors, adding
three new centralized career counselors
and eight -- to complement eight college
based career counselors. Ways to help
our students succeed again, all through
internal re-allocations of resources.

We asked ourselves, we went
through all 420 positions in those -- all
the offices of academic excellence and
said, which of those positions is
addressing one of those four pillars of
student success, and if it doesn't, is it
something that we should continue doing?
And yes, we did make some reductions in
force, but we also re-allocated resources
as well, in addition, to making the
budget reduction.

So enrollment management, this
is really getting to the heart of what
Katherine has asked me to talk about.
And you say, well, what is enrollment
management? What is that term?

We believe that enrollment
management is the well-planned strategies
and tactics that shape the enrollment of
an institution to reflect established
goals and values. Goals can be the
number of students, for instance.

The values are also things like
diversity, is an example of values. So
how do we use enrollment management to
meet both our goals and our values?

I will tell you that in today's
environment, it's also critical and
directly tied to the health of our
organization.

We get about $267 million from
the State of Kentucky. We're very
grateful for that money. About $80
million of that passes directly out to
mandated programs. It goes in the door
and right back out to mandated programs,
which leaves us about $180 million. It's
a lot of money, but I can assure you that
won't cover the salaries of all the
faculty on campus, and staff.

So about $600 million comes from
tuition. So over three times as much of
our operating budget comes from tuition,
as does from state allocation. So it is
directly tied to the health of our
organization. That's why we fret so much
about enrollment each year.

So I want to give you a few
definitions so you understand some terms
I'm going to use here in just a moment.
The first is net tuition revenue. Sorry
to use business terms, but we've got to
get down to some money and finance here.

The net tuition revenue is the gross tuition less institutional aid, both need and merit based.

So that $600 million, subtract out what we give in institutional aid, and that gives you the net tuition revenue. So from $600 million, this year we gave out about $115 million in institutional aid, so that makes it $485 million for the net tuition revenue. Okay, so we're not counting scholarships from gifts and philanthropy. This is direct institutional aid from our general funds.

The second set are the total cost of attendance and the expected family contributions. Cost of attendance is the room, board, tuition, mandatory fees, and what the government calls incidentals, but things like books and other things a student needs to get over the course of a year. It's not incidental, so we're using the government's term, it's not my term. But that is a cost, the total cost of attendance, and I'll talk through that a little bit more in just a moment.

But also the expected family contribution, the government determines that based on a family's income and assets, but also the number of children they have. So it's a formula the government uses to say, here is your expected family contribution.

So two families with $80,000 a year of income could have different expected family contributions, for instance, based on their assets or the number of children in their family.

Then finally, something that I think many of you are familiar with, we call the High School Readiness Index, something that we created. And it's a formula that uses the GPA and the ACT score to predict a student's capability for entering college. It's the GPA times 10, plus the ACT, ACT divided by 2. So roughly two-thirds of it is weighted on the GPA and roughly a third of it based on the ACT.

For us, it's a much better predictor of retention than is either alone. Much better predictor. And it does a couple of things that are really significant. One is it predicts much better for students who did not have the opportunity to go through Kaplan Test Prep and take the ACT test multiple times because it weighs more than GPA. The second is that students who aren't good takers of standardized tests, again, it's not as weighted toward the ACT. And thirdly, by using the GPA, we believe

that's a bit of a surrogate for
persistence and grit.
          You take that student who didn't
-- who walked into a high school
gymnasium on a Saturday morning, sat
down, took the ACT with no prep, had not
seen any books, anything, and not gone
through Kaplan, gets a 26. Has a 3.8 GPA
at their high school. I'd argue that's a
pretty doggone good student if they can
walk in and get that score with actually
no studying. The fact that they're a 3.8
at any high school in Kentucky is --
probably has some measure of certainly
persistence and grit. So it does a much
better job of predicting student success,
and we'll show you in a bit how we use
that in a moment.
          So we need to first talk about
where we've been to talk about where
we're going to. Between 2011 and 2016,
last five years, we've been using a
growth model. It's a growth model to
increase quality, to maximize net tuition
revenue, and to promote diversity. Those
were our three goals.
          The way we did that was by
increasing first time, first year
students. That's a 20 percent increase
in the size of the freshman class. So we
were effective in that.
          We made a change to the
residency mix to achieve a higher number
of non-resident students while remaining
the first choice of qualifying
Kentuckians. We continue to accept every
qualified Kentuckian. Our doors are open
widest for Kentuckians, but we have gone
from about 20 percent non-resident to now
about 38 percent non-resident students.
          And then significant
institutional aid to yield high quality
resident and non-resident students, and
increase the well -- and increase the
well-rounded incoming class.
          So we've doubled our
scholarships over the past five years
from about $57 million, $58 million to
$115 million. So how did we do? First
year class is up 20 percent. It's
primarily non-residents. Our under-
represented minority students, as a
percentage of the overall class, grew two
percentage points from 16 to 18 percent,
and our African American enrollment has
grown by 40 percent in that time period.
The number of national merit finalists
was 29 in 2011. It was 105 in 2015. And
as I said, our institutional aid has
increased, almost doubling. That's been
primarily directed toward higher ACT
students and non-resident students. But
however, retention has remained basically

flat. The question you asked just a few moments ago; we're slowly getting to the punch line here.

So this fall, we have a quality class. The ACT is 25.6. Our 75th percentile actually went up to 29 from 28. We had 808 students with an ACT of 31 or higher. That's a pretty sizeable portion of the class. Fifteen students with a perfect ACT. That would not have been me. Full disclosure. Average weighted high school GPA was 3.69, and I've already told you about the 105 national merit finalists. A good class.

The diversity, 18.6 -- under-represented minorities 18.6 percent. Twelve percent of the population, African American students. Kentuckians, 7.5 percent. Significantly higher than the State of Kentucky. Five percent Hispanics. That's the largest growing segment, fastest growing segment of our population has been Hispanic students, and international is at one percent. So hopefully, you see now why I said I'd like to increase the number of international students. I think that number should be higher.

So a couple of things to put into context. There are only two public flagship universities in the south that have an African American undergraduate student enrollment that is equal to or higher than the population of their state. Only two. They are Kentucky and West Virginia. West Virginia has a significantly lower African American population than we do, but we're the only two in the south that have an undergraduate enrollment higher than their state average. And for those states, it is half or less. We'll pick one, Alabama since that's the President's home state, I'll pick on Alabama at the moment. It's about 27 percent African American. Their enrollment at the University of Alabama is about a little over a third of that. So it's a -- it's a demographic that I'm going to put in context. So you can see the institutions there, and at all of them, it is a half or less. So we're delivering on a commitment to diversity as part of our strategy.

We said we were going to increase the size of the population at the University of Kentucky. There you see it. It's about 30,800, roughly, this fall. So an increase in total enrollment, and yes, we do measure undergraduate, graduate, professional, and (inaudible) as total enrollment. That's a nationally -- national way to do

that. It's a standard way to measure.
But that, again, is how we -- it's the
result of that strategy. So we
accomplished the strategy there. But we
must plan for the future.

So what's the strategy for the
next five years? Well, let's look a
little bit about our -- at our competitor
-- not compare, competitor institutions.
From the ACT, we can tell where students
went to if they selected the University
of Kentucky as one of their top choices.
So this is where students were most
likely to go to. We're not saying
they're equal institutions, but where
students go to if they don't come here.
So Indiana, Miami of Ohio, Purdue, Ohio
State, Alabama, Cincinnati, Georgia,
Louisville, Missouri, UT Knoxville and
Western Kentucky. That's where students
go to if they've marked us and someone
else. Those are the most common
institutions. So we use those as our
competitors. Then we said what's
different about those competitors? Well,
they have an average retention rate of 87
percent and I'm betting you could guess
that several of those are above 90
percent. Remember our goal is 90 percent
first to second year retention. And
their six year graduation rate is 69
percent. Ours was 60 using the same
comparison. This past year it was 63.4.
So we've made some movement on the six
year graduation rate, but I will tell you
that's already (inaudible) in because you
could tell from the four year graduation
rate what the six is going to be. We've
got about one year -- one more year to
increase this, but if we don't increase
retention, we're not going to see anymore
increases in graduation rate. They're
interrelated, right? If they don't stay,
they're not going to graduate.

This is a slide I want you to --
one of two slides I want you to pay
attention to, the most important slide of
the whole presentation. I'll just be
honest with you. Our challenge is unmet
need. The difference between what the
student can't pay and what the deal is.
It's a simple (inaudible). Along the
vertical axis is the second fall
retention rate. That's the first to
second year retention. And along the
horizontal axis, is their unmet financial
need. So a negative number means that
they have excess money according to the
government. For instance, if the bill is
$20,000 and their unmet financial need is
minus $20,000, that means that the family
income suggests that they could pay
$40,000. Not that they have to, but

that's -- it's saying that there are
significant financial needs and could pay
more than the bill. And it walks its way
across to where you see the zero to 5K
and then a positive $30,000. Okay. Does
that make sense? So students on the left
are more financially capable. Students
on the right are not in terms of being
able to pay the bill.

So let's look at the retention
rates and you can see that it's well
(inaudible). So we have about 20 percent
don't fill out the FAFSA, so we don't
have data on them. But of those that
fill out the FAFSA, for those with minus
20, their retention rate, either in state
or out of state is well above 90 percent.
In some cases, it's pretty close to 100
percent. We know that socio-economic
status matters, right? Students who are
more from higher socio-economic status
are generally more academically prepared.
And it remains really pretty high. A
little bit lower for out of state.
Remember they have higher bills. Until
you get to this point right here, about
80 percent. Look what happens when you
get -- you cross that 5,000, where it
says 5K to 10K. You cross that threshold
and look at the drop in retention. It's
about an 8 absolute percentage point drop
in retention from 5,000 to 10,000, and
from 10,000 to 15,000, it's another 10
percentage points. And if you get up to
20,000, your retention rate is about 20
percent. This does not matter how
academically prepared you are. Okay? So
unmet financial need is -- is a
significant factor.

IOCONO: What's the total budget of a UK
undergraduate a year?
BROTHERS: Name please.
IOCONO: Iocono.
What's the total budget for a UK
undergraduate for the year?
TRACY: For a resident, Kentucky
resident is about $22,000. That's room
and board and tuition. I'm leaving out
the incidentals in that. For a non-
resident, it's about $33,000.

So let's take, for example, a
family with an income of $50,000. With
Pell grants and other aid, our students,
in the lowest income quartile, pay on
average, about $300 per semester in
tuition. But that still leaves $10,000
to pay room and board, and that's not
including incidentals.

So a family of $50,000 before
taxes, needs to come up with $10,000 or
20 percent of the family's income. Okay.
Does that sort of put it in a better
perspective as to where it gets -- where
Page 42

these issues come to light very quickly.
And I'll go through some Kentucky
demographics as far as income
(inaudible). So it is a significant
retention risk factor.

        What's the market research say?
In Kentucky, the average household income
is about 20 percent lower or $10,000
lower than the US median. $43,000 a year
is the median income in Kentucky. In
fact, it's the second lowest of the
neighboring states. Yes, sir.

BUTLER: J. S. Butler, Graduate School.

        I would much rather see the
regression adjusted to the fact of unmet
need rather than just the overall because
that unmet need is correlated with a lot
of other things. And so I have no idea
whether the unmet need is or is not a
risk because it needs to be regression
adjusted.

TRACY: We did. We did run the multi,
multi (inaudible) regression and it pops
out as the top thing. Others are like a
1.2 or .8. For instance, being in a
fraternity or sorority (inaudible) --

BUTLER: (Inaudible) display a regression
co-efficient or --

TRACY: I don't have it in here, but we
have it back in our models. So we've run
multi-grade regression on all the
factors, a whole bunch of factors.

BUTLER: (Inaudible).

TRACY: Diversity, the low percentage of
under-represented minority students
within Kentucky and neighboring states,
suggest we need to recruit out of state
to continue our diversity goals. US has
an average under-represented minority of
35 percent. Kentucky is at 14 percent.
So we're four percentage points above the
national -- above Kentucky's under-
represented minority percentage.

        Here's the one that I also want
you to think about, is projected high
school graduates. Kentucky will continue
to decline in the number of high school
graduates for the next five years.
That's not because of lower percentage
are graduating. It's because of birth
rate. There are fewer students entering
the educational system and so it will go
down about five percent. It says two
there. Other -- other data suggests
five. It's somewhere in that two to five
percent range. And it's the third lowest
of neighboring states in terms of growth.
In fact, we're negative. Several are
positive. So we've got to take these
factors into account.

        So what we've developed is a
strategy. Well, first, let's consider
the factors. One, we got to be flexible.

How do we -- how do we impact unmet need and re-balance our financial aid portfolio? And how do we reduce that unmet need to positively impact retention rates? And I'll show you some data that suggested it will. But we need to keep those demographics and some of the higher education policy changes. When I'm in Washington in a couple of weeks, I'll be arguing for expansion of Pell, and to make it so it covers summers, as well as just the academic year. So those are the kinds of things we lobby for, as well, in -- in Washington.

So we are calling our initiative UK Leads, Leveraging Economic Affordability for Developing Success. And yes, we hope we're leading, but it has three components. The first is class composition. We are setting an enrollment threshold and, in fact, we are raising the threshold for admission to the University of Kentucky slightly. We're raising it based on high school readiness index.

How do we maintain our net tuition revenue? Every 200 students, for example, is $3 million of net tuition revenue. Every 200 students is $3 million in net tuition revenue. If we admit fewer students, we have less net tuition revenue. Are there ways we can make that up through transfer students, potentially international students and better capture our first time freshman? And lastly, how do we award financial aid based on unmet need and it's predicted to have its affect on student success?

So the first part is class composition. Based on last year's data, if we were to use a 37.7, you can tell the one that I'm going to call that we're using, 37.7 high school readiness index, we would decrease the class size by about 200. That's why I gave you the number of 200 students is $3 million. That would increase the ACT by a couple tenths of a point, increase the GPA by 500ths of a point. Basically, the same in residency. The number, percentage of URMs is essentially the same, first gen the same, number receiving Pell is the same. The big difference is -- two differences. One is, we would be $3 million less in net tuition revenue with 200 fewer students, but we would also increase our retention by about a percentage point, is the prediction. That would be about a percentage -- percent higher retention, or about 50 students. That's part one.

The second part is net tuition revenue. How do we overcome that loss?

Page 44

Well, we can do it either by increasing
the number of first time freshman
captured. Those students who hoped to
come here that didn't. Find some better
methods of capturing them. But also
transfers and international, or we can do
a balance of those. So I won't go into
details, but fundamentally, those are the
three levers you can pull to try to
recapture that lost tuition revenue.

But the big one is this: this
aid. Again, our break suggested it's at
5- to 10,000. Based on last year's data,
we believe that would be about a four to
five percentage point increase in
retention. That still doesn't get us all
the way to 90, which is where we want to
get to, but I sure would like to get 86
or 87, and use our other methods to get
all the way to 90.

The data that Dr. Grossman was
talking about are pretty fascinating.
And that is that of our 900 freshman that
did not return this fall, of the 900 that
did not return this fall, 300 of them had
a 3.0 or higher GPA. Five hundred of
them had a 2.0 or higher GPA.

But let me give you one more
piece of data around that. Of those
students with a 3.0 or greater GPA, the
ones who came back, their unmet financial
need was actually a negative $900,
meaning their estimated family
contribution was 900 more than what the
bill was.

For the students, those 300
who didn't come back, their unmet
financial need was $6100. These are
students, who after the first year,
performed equally well. They all had a
3.0 or higher. The difference, a
difference, a key difference was $7,000
(inaudible) and ability to pay. And the
numbers get worse from there.

As you go to lower GPAs and you
look at it, the numbers get higher to
where they reach about 10,500 average
unmet financial need for students who
don't come back.

GIANCARLO: Matt Giancarlo, A and S.
I'm just curious if you also
perhaps did any survey data asking them
to confirm, or not, the correlation of
unmet financial need with their decision
not to enroll (inaudible)?

TRACY: We try. I will tell you that
students who leave are not real good
about filling out exit surveys. So it's
hard. We try to ask them. I can tell
you that our request for money, like the
Provost Persistence Grants, continue to
go up. Our number of students in
(inaudible) the financial wellness

continues to rise. I'm not saying this is the magic bullet, but it is -- we believe it's a significant component.

TRUSZCZYNSKI: So do you have numbers on how many of those good students that don't come back are out of state versus they are resident students.

TRACY: Not a whole lot of difference, slightly more out of state, but there's not a lot of difference in the percentages. Good question. Because you'd think with the double, the higher tuitions, it would more out of state, and it's really not that much different. They're pretty much equal.

So this is two graphs. This is how -- on the left is how we allocate our money now. This is before merit aid and does not include Pell. Before merit aid and doesn't include Pell. You can see this is the estimated family contribution. So this is 42,000 plus. That means for that student, the government says they could pay a tuition bill of $42,000 plus.

This is students who the government says can only pay a bill somewhere between zero and $2,000, and you see that we've pretty much allocated already (inaudible) across those. (Inaudible) 90 percent merit. Ninety percent of our aid has gone to merit case and 10 percent need based. So out of $25 million given to freshman, about $2 and a half million has gone for need and about $22 and a half million based on merit.

This model, if we put it in place, and we're going to, uses an unmet need cap and now you can see that it is greatly shifted on the need-based side to the students with the greatness need. However, it still leaves about $8 million of that $25 million for merit. So we're not saying that merit does not matter, and many of the students with need are also meritorious, but we're shifting more of our need or our aid to need-based aid.

And so we believe it will help and make a positive impact, but I want to remind you it's a three part strategy. One is working on the class composition. Two is the mix of the class, to try to maintain net tuition revenue. I assume that your departments don't want to give back $3 million. Nobody has offered yet when I've asked them. I thought I'd ask. So we've got to find a way to make that up, but also using that need-based aid as a way to help our students succeed. We believe we'll be graduating more students from the University of Kentucky. In the end, that's what I think it's about.

We're also going to seriously go

after the 26 to 32 ACT students because
we have not been capturing them at
particularly high rates because we give
them $1500. And that's why Western
Kentucky is listed on there, because they
give $4,000 to students with a 26 to 32,
and we give them $1500. But we've been
giving full room and board and tuition to
students with a 34, 35 and 36.

So we're shifting and we think
we can capture a lot more of those 26 to
32 students. I hope you'll agree with me
that those are still very fine students,
and students that can definitely succeed
here at UK, and will help elevate the
Commonwealth of Kentucky itself.

IOCONO: Iocono.
Does the University of Kentucky
have any university-based loan programs?
I mean, I was one of those students when
I was an undergrad, but my university had
loans, that supplement after everything
else, that I paid until I was 45, and I
was more than happy to pay them, because
it allowed me to stay in school.

TRACY: So we do not have a loan
program. That has gotten much trickier
over time to be a lender, both with
government regulations, financial
regulations, and that is much more
difficult. There are universities that
are, for instance, if you finish in four
years, remitting the last semester of
tuition. There are some things that we
-- we've looked at. We'd like to think
if we get this going, we will end up with
fewer loans.

I will tell you that our
students, half of our students graduate
without loans, and that's well above the
national average of 36 percent. And we
have half the national rate of defaults
on loans at 4 percent. In fact, we're
way below than anybody else in Kentucky.
But we want -- we would like to get to
where students need fewer loans by
addressing need-base, but it -- it's a
very complicated issue because again
getting into the lending.

IOCONO: It's not bad to have a loan to
go to school. (Inaudible) you own it
more and they're more likely to come back
if they have an investment.

TRACY: Yes. I -- I had a loan. I
guess many of you had a loan for your
college education. It's not -- we're not
eliminating them. We're trying to reduce
it so that it's something that they can
stay in. Again, that family with $40,000
of income who has a great student, how
can we help them finish. So it's a way
to address that.

MCCORMICK: So the Provost is willing to

come -- to first share his slides with
you. There's a lot of information in
these slides and they are currently on
the Board of Trustee website, but we'll
link to those. Sheila has a wonderful
skill in making that -- that kind of data
visible to you. So they'll soon be on
the Senate website.

He's also willing to come back
in December and answer other questions,
and so, you know, as you review those
slides, as you think about and reflect on
the things that we shared in terms of his
initiative, then we could also look
forward to come back to them in December.
But it's 10 after --

TRACY: And thank you for your patience.
I do appreciate it. I'm passionate about
this, so I'm sorry. It's something I'm
very passionate about.

MCCORMICK: I extend my apologies to
Margaret. And -- she and Riley stayed
until the end, but we will move forward
on hers, as well as on the other agenda
items that we were unable to get to.
Thank you. Do I hear a motion to
adjourn?

UNIDENTIFIED: Motion to adjourn.

MCCORMICK: A second?

UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

* * * * * * * *

The meeting adjourned at 5:11 p.m.

* * * * * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF FAYETTE   )

        I, LISA GRANT CRUMP, the undersigned
Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky at
Large, certify that the facts stated in the
caption hereto are true; that I was not present
at said proceedings; that said proceedings were
transcribed from the digital file(s) in this
matter by me or under my direction; and that the
foregoing is a true record of the proceedings to
the best of our ability to hear and transcribe
same from the digital file(s).
        My commission expires: April 6, 2019.
        IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
my hand and seal of office on this the 19th day

of January, 2016.
_____
LISA GRANT CRUMP
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE
K E N T U C K Y