

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

DECEMBER 12, 2016

* * * *

* * * *

KATHERINE MCCORMICK, CHAIR

ERNIE BAILEY, VICE-CHAIR

KATE SEAGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

LISA GRANT CRUMP, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

* * * *

MCCORMICK: Welcome. So I know that everyone has signed in, remember that the sign-in sheet is actually what the Senate Council Office uses to record your attendance, and so make sure that you sign as well as retrieve your handy dandy clicker.

As always, we'll try to follow Robert's Rules of Order as well as possible and Kate will help us with that. Your conversation should always be civil. We are the adults in the room, I hope, and be a good citizen to participate. One of the things that we really would like to hear is that sometimes we hear comments from a small number of senators rather than the full body, and so feel free to stand up and -- and voice your concerns and represent your colleges. And then don't forget to return the

clickers to the table. We need those; they're expensive.

And so we'll begin with the attendance slide. Remember that I'd like for you to vote after we've made the -- after the slide appears and after the question is read. So are you here today? Yes? No? Are you saying I had a choice? All right. Great. Most of us are here.

So we had only one editorial change to the minutes and so unless I hear objections from the floor, the minutes from November 14th will stand approved as amended by unanimous consent.

All right. Some announcements. Remember that tomorrow is the Connect Blue. It is our opportunity to interact with the Board of Trustees. It appears that the Board's schedule will be shorter than they anticipated, so the meeting -- our reception may begin as early as 2:00.

It's on the 18th floor of the Patterson Office Tower and it's not too late to RSVP to Brittany. So please do that, and we'd love to see you there.

One other announcement: when you leave today, you don't have to put the clickers in alphabetical order; we'll do that for you. So I don't want you to leave with it in hand simply because there's too many folks at the table and you feel that you don't have time to do that. So just put them somewhere near the box and we'll -- we'll get them and retrieve them, name side up, if you don't mind.

So as some of you know, we had some unexpected personnel changes in our office this fall and so we are hoping to get our trains back on track and move forward with the important work that we and you do together. But just bear in

mind that some of the actions that we normally move very quickly on, we did -- got delayed.

Some of you know and have already been using the new system called Curriculog. The President was very generous in helping us fund this and we think it's going to be well worth the dollars and the time and effort. Some tell me that's it's fairly intuitive at the beginning, but that the process to move it backwards is less so and, in fact, some say it doesn't have a reverse, and so hopefully we'll figure out how to make that work.

So the councils, the council coordinators are meeting weekly to troubleshoot this system and we hope to have it moving forward fairly quickly. And, again, right now we're just doing courses, but soon we hope to have

programs as part of the system.

We have been working hard to look at the ways in which we move curriculum forward in the -- in the Senate process. We started meetings with the council chairs, some officers from the Provost's Office, from our office, people who really had a stake in moving this forward, the Registrar, if you will. And so we're going to resume those meetings in January and we hope to be able to announce to you that we have changed that process in a way that will make it more efficient.

Certainly, we understand and we appreciate and honor the necessary changes or the reviews that we make at each level, but we'd like to determine and find a way to make that more efficient. So we're effective, but not so efficient right now.

And Roger Brown, who is the Elections Committee Chair, has an announcement for us.

BROWN: Well, you can see it on the board there. Last Thursday at 3:00, the elections to replace the three outgoing members of Senate Council was concluded. As a result of that election process, you see here the three members of the body, which will become the new Senate counselors starting in January, Al Cross from Communication, Jennifer Bird-Pollan from Law, and Joe McGillis from Medicine. (applause).

MCCORMICK: Now, we'd like to share our thanks to Roger, who's departing, and Todd Porter. If you guys could stand up, we'd also like to give you round of applause.

GROSSMAN: Katherine?

MCCORMICK: Yes, sir.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Trustee.

Can you explain why there were only two departing Senate Council members listed there even though we're replacing three?

MCCORMICK: Right. I am a -- my Senate Council Chair position overrides the fact that I, my Senate -- my election to Senate Council is also over at the same time that Roger's and Todd's is. So technically, that's why there are only -- there are three replacements, but only two departing. Thank you, Bob.

So, one of the things that I'd like for you to just keep in mind as you prepare items is that we had a recommendation, from the floor of the Senate, that we work to provide a rationale for why the change comes to you as a Senate. So what is the reason why we're voting on this? What is the reason why Roger is making changes or the chair

or the committee are making changes to the distance learning committee structure?

So we will work hard. We can't reach back to those proposals that have already been forwarded, but we are going to try to standardize that in a way that will make it reasonable to you as to why we're doing it, why something came to you as a body.

Finally, an update regarding the UK Core. As you know the UK Core, Eric Sanday, Chair -- I don't know if Eric is here -- he and his committee are working very hard to respond to issues of race and diversity. There are a group of at least -- we've had two now, groups of students who really feel strongly that the core, as it stands, is not sufficiently rich or robust in -- in the issues of power, privilege, race, that

this be an intersection of those.

So his work -- his committee is working hard and he hopes to have at least something to share with you probably in the spring.

Thank you so much, we had 30 plus nominations for our search committee nominees to share with the President, and his staff, for the Executive Vice President for Health Affairs. And so, we'll move through those. We have a number of faculty and senators who were nominated by more than one person and so they'll probably rise to the top. Yes, Davy.

JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology.

Is this a situation where the committee that's being appointed by the President has a position on it that the Senate Council is short-listing and the President is going to select somebody

from that short list for that position or the President might not select like anybody out of the nominees that come forward from Senate Council?

MCCORMICK: I think it is -- all I was asked was that they would like to have two to three nominees from the Senate. So -- so that's the way we're moving. I don't know how large the committee is. I don't know who's already on it or from what domain or population the President will staff that.

So the -- speaking of diversity, the -- I have served on that committee as your representative, and that search is almost finished, in the sense that the committee has four candidates to share with the President. I understand that he will have -- he will pick two of those and then he'll bring those to the campus community for -- for a

conversation.

And we're just beginning the search for the Associate Provost for Student and Academic Life. So that search has yielded a pool of applicants and we're working with a search firm to begin to review those. Ernie.

BAILEY: Nothing.

MCCORMICK: Okay. Kate?

SEAGO: Nothing.

MCCORMICK: All right. Bob and Lee.

GROSSMAN: All right. In case you don't recognize me, I'm one of your faculty trustees. We actually have a trustees meeting -- actually, it started earlier today and continues through tomorrow. So I'm going to be leaving a little bit early to head to the Health Care Committee meeting; Lee is already there.

We haven't had any Board meetings since our last Senate meeting,

so I really don't have much of anything to report. I guess the one thing I would say is performance-based funding is being discussed extensively in Frankfort. And our administrative team and our legislative relations team is discussing with a group from the other -- from the other universities in Kentucky, also from the from the Governor's office, representing the legislature, and trying to come up with something that will satisfy the desire of the legislators to try to include in the funding mechanism a little bit more motivation to meet the goals that they think are important for universities to meet.

And our weekly -- our leadership is trying to make sure that no harm is done; that the goals that are set are reasonable goals that we agree with and that we can achieve -- are reasonable for

us to achieve, and that won't harm us in terms of making the goal so stringent that we have no chance of achieving that at all, and then this -- just get a mass budget cut.

So, there's a lot of negotiating going on, but no decisions have been made yet. I'm sure as soon as decisions are made, it will hit the newspapers, and I will know just as soon as you do. Hopefully, I can find out a little bit more after that. Any questions, though, about anything? Okay. Thank you.

MCCORMICK: So those of you who were in attendance in November had the opportunity to chat -- to chat with Provost Tracy regarding initiatives that he has in place, as well as the new budget model on -- excuse me, Enrollment Management Model. And so I asked you over the week hopefully to review those

notes so that you come prepared with questions. He's here prepared to answer questions and we'll take about 20 minutes to do that and then he is also headed to the Board of Trustees meeting.

TRACY: Thank you, Chair McCormick.

It's good to be with you and happy holidays, as well. So I do want to take just a couple of quick minutes to tell you about something that we're going to do in the spring and enlist your help. One of the things that we want to do during the spring semester, prior to the January 20th inauguration, is begin a series of campus conversations, really, forums and panel discussions.

And what we're hoping to do is present both sides of key issues and really have a civil discourse and model that. But I'm also going to ask you that in your classrooms, if you'd be prepared

for those sometimes tougher discussions that may go on, but be sure again to present both sides of the issue and make sure both sides get heard.

So what we hope to do in the spring, prior to the inauguration, is to have some -- some kind of a kickoff of this and then a series of, I'll call them, forums or panel discussions throughout the semester around issues like immigration, trade, social media, traditional media, and the dissemination of information, discussions around the Affordable Care Act, and discussions of other key topics that have come out during this recent election season so that we can have open to our campus community, but also hopefully, the Lexington community, as well. So we can have discussions around these issues, and we'll be looking for faculty members to

serve as panelists, but also looking for ideas of, in some cases, key speakers that we could bring in to help kick off these kinds of initiatives.

So it really is -- we want to make sure that both sides are heard on each of those issues and that people have a chance to really discuss it in a true university institutional of higher learning civil discourse method.

So I simply want to kick that off with you and say that it will be coming back to you, Katherine and I have had a few discussions around this, and coming back to you for ideas of how to do this. And if there are other topics that need to be discussed during this time, we'd really like to have that as part of an ongoing proactive discussion throughout the spring.

So with that, I'll conclude my

very brief remarks and see if you have questions. We didn't get a lot of time to talk about UK (inaudible). Dr. Jones.

JONES: Yes, Doctor, recently, you were able to provide some more elaboration to the Senate Council on -- on the mechanisms to obtain some tuition return like Master's degrees. It was not just new Master's degrees, but also significantly expanded Master's degrees.

For those of us who are wrestling with what that expansion might look like, that's a sufficient expansion, who is the go-to contact person in your office to go to, do we have this right? Is this enough? Who would that be?

TRACY: Sure. So maybe just take a few moments and give them a little background about what you just alluded to, and then I'll introduce you to the contact person, who is sitting here in

the front of the room.

But what we've done is try to incentivize the colleges to expand Master's offerings, in particular. We've put forth the following, and that is, if you develop a new online Master's program, new online Master's program, we'll share 60 percent of the tuition with the college. The 40 percent stays with this central. That doesn't come into my office; it comes into the overall University coffers. But we share 60 percent.

If it's a traditional Master's, one that is here on campus, we'll share 40 percent of that tuition with the college or the unit, and 60 percent comes into the University, Central Administration.

We also say that if you do a -- a bump in current Master's programs, and

remember these are tuition paying
Master's programs, for Master's programs
where we're already covering the tuition
for a tuition scholarship, we can't spend
the money twice, right, so we're already
putting that student's tuition, but these
where students are paying tuition. In
that case then, we will also look at
significant increases.

Now, what that significant
increase means will vary by program and
how -- what is the possible enrollment?
One student, probably not. Two students,
probably not. But if you're going up by
10 or 20 students, could result in a
couple hundred thousand more tuition
revenue, we'll also look at sharing
incremental increases in the size of that
-- that share.

So the contact, Lisa, you
don't mind standing up, Lisa Wilson,

Associate Provost for Finance and Administration, is your contact on that. And she'll help any college work through those, the college and their faculty, work through what the business plan would be for that, because we will want a business plan. We'll want to know what's the potential enrollment.

We share that money for the first few years, probably three years or so on a non-recurring basis until the enrollment is stabilized. In other words, you put the recurring money, and we want to make sure it's going to stay at those kinds of enrollments. So if you had a non-recurring for the first roughly three years or so, and then once those enrollments stabilize, then it would be a recurring kind of a share. Does that help?

JONES: Yes, thank you.

TRACY: Yes.

MAZUR: Joan Mazur, College of Ed. So this related question, is there an actual budget model that speaks to these kind of dimensions in how we should be incentivizing our enrollments and the kinds of things that we discussed at our last meeting?

We've seen many different things. You know, non-metrics on this, increases in that. You know, undergraduate increases and so forth. Is there a model, as there was, you know, before the famous new budget model that had us all scurrying in -- in a non direction, it appeared now. So is there an actual budget model that has things as Dr. Jones was asking about that we can really -- I mean, it's very hard to develop business plans when we really don't know where we're heading and what

-- what the, you know, what the end game and what will ultimately be incentivized.

TRACY: So let me talk about two pieces. And so what we have done is we've retained your incremental budgets for the colleges. So those incremental budgets, the ones from the budget last year with any changes or adjustments by the state. Let me reiterate that with the budget reductions of the past spring, only two colleges had their budget reduced. All other colleges budgets were maintained the same even though we had a 4 and a half percent budget reduction at the University, or about \$12 million.

 So there were only two colleges, and in those cases, one of them was a 1 percent reduction and one was a 2 percent reduction. We did that through some reallocations in my office. We took a million dollars in cuts in my office and

some reallocations throughout the University, efficiencies and so forth.

With that said now, a couple of things. One, so your budgets are continuing in incremental model, but over the past two years, we've put \$5 million new monies each year into the colleges, based on roughly enrollments and enrollment growth, a little bit in student credit hours, but mostly enrollment growth at the undergraduate level, and some parameters around retention and graduation and under-represented minorities.

So that is new money. Not what your budgets are dependent on, but in other words, it adds to that base for the incremental that carries over from year to year. So it is a new -- new monies added onto that.

Then we have -- to try to

incentivize on the graduate side, remember that if we're paying the tuition through our tuition scholarships, we're already paying that out of university money so we're creating a new incentive for paying Master's programs so the colleges have an opportunity to be entrepreneurial and gain some additional funds. And that's what I just described for Dr. Jones's question.

So all of your colleges have those -- those particulars on both of those programs and I would encourage you to have your deans present those to you. They -- they have all the specifics on that. It's not a here's what you have to do to keep your budget model. It is a here's the way to get additional monies model. And so there are no losers. There's only the chance to get additional funds through that, and we split it

between the health care colleges or, I'm sorry, the professional colleges and the undergraduate because they're pretty different in terms of how they -- they operate. Most of the professional colleges are totally tuition driven and so they -- they are -- depend on their tuition.

We also, as per the deans, we keep about a million dollars to five million that I get to allocate based on where I see pressure points because I -- I can see areas where we need to put additional funding, and so out of that five million, I have roughly a million dollars that I allocate through that.

So there is no model -- you have to keep your budget, but there's a model to gain additional monies, and we hope next year to have an additional set of monies. It depends on whether we make

our targets for our finances for the University or not, to where we can put new monies in. So it's not a -- it's a model to keep growing, but again dependent on being able to generate new revenues. That's why, again, retention becomes so important. You know, every -- let's see if I can get this right. Every 100 students is going to be about \$1.5 million. So if we retain another 100 students, that's \$1.5 million of revenue, net revenue.

But I'm not -- please don't take it I'm putting everything in financial terms, but retention is a moral imperative to the student. It's a financial imperative for the student, but it also has a benefit to the university. So if you think about it, every 100 students is roughly \$1.5 million, and so if we retain at 2 percentage points of

retention, we're \$1.5 million additional -- additional monies for the University. So that's why we're -- that's another reason why we're working so hard.

MAZUR: So a quick -- quick follow up. So if you have an existing master's program that meets these requirements for the 60/40, then -- I mean, are existing programs in that pool too? You mentioned new and ones that were offsite. What if you have an online?

TRACY: Existing or if they are a substantial increase in the number of students. If you -- you know, normal fluctuations of 1, 2, 3 students, but if you say, we believe there's a market to increase by 10 or 15 or 20 students in this particular master's program, we will share that additional revenue with you based on whether it's online or traditional.

MAZUR: Thank you.

TRACY: We're trying to get as much money out to the colleges as we can, but incentivize good things, hopefully, in terms of growth where there is a real need.

MCCORMICK: I'd like to ask a question --

TRACY: Sure.

MCCORMICK: -- people have asked me. How does the new enrollment management plan impact retention? So in what ways -- how would you explain that at a cocktail party or (inaudible)?

TRACY: So Bob can do it at the Trustees dinner tonight; that's a cocktail party. No, let -- let me walk you through that again. It's part of what I got to touch on it a bit and not really go into last week because we were kind of in a hurry or last time we were here.

So a couple of things. When you look at our student population, and let's just take the freshman class, first to second year retention. When it gets to \$5,000 of what we call unmet need, that is the difference between all in on their scholarships, their grants, and their subsidized loans, and the actual bill. The total cost of attendance, so the room and board, books, that kind of thing. When you get to \$5,000 of unmet need, that student retention drops off by 8 absolute percentage points compared to students with less than \$5,000 unmet need.

When you then go to \$10,000 of unmet need, it is an additional 10 percentage points drop in retention. So a student with \$10,000 unmet financial need, on average, has an 18 percentage point lower retention rate. Think about

that. Our average retention rate is about 82 percent. For those students, it's about 64 percent. That's a -- I hope you agree, that's a substantial drop.

We then took those numbers and said, well, of those students who don't come back, what are some of their academic characteristics or at least their performance? That's what really matters, is how they did after one year. At the end of spring semester and not coming back this fall, we had -- we had a class of about 5100, 900 students did not come back this fall. Nine hundred students did not come back. Of those 900, 300 of them had a GPA between 3.0 and 4.0. One-third of the students had a GPA between 3.0 and 4.0, but did not return. Now, not in every case, but we then compared those, that block of 300

students -- by the way, there were 500 plus students who had a GPA above 2.0 and did not return. Fifty-six percent of our students who did not return, had a GPA of above 2.0.

But let's just take the 3.0 students. Of the students who did come back with a 3.0 and above, their unmet financial need was negative \$900. Meaning they had \$900 extra. Of the students who did not come back, their unmet financial need was \$6100. Remember I said 5,000 is the break point. So you had 900 students with a 3.0 GPA at the end of spring semester. This is not their high school GPA, this is at the end of two terms, who did not come back. And the difference between those two was roughly \$7,000, but they had \$6100 of unmet need.

We believe that if we can reduce

that below the \$5,000 mark and get more of those students, our modeling of past classes, remember modeling is never predictive of the future, but it suggests that our retention would move 4 to 5 percentage points just on that alone.

Our multi-variant linear regression suggests that unmet financial need tops out every single time. If not as the most significant, not close to the most significant factor in student retention. Now, that's not going to get us all the way to 90 percent, which is where we want to be. It's going to take us part of the way there or put us in the 86 to 87 percent range.

We believe that other activities through great engagement of all of you, through student support, tutoring, those kinds of things, can get us up to 90, but it'll take us a good bit

of the way. So this is really a -- a scholarship program around retention. And that's one of the things we want to do, is make sure that the students we bring in, you know, folks say, well, you're not bringing in the right students. Well, I would argue if we have 300 students with a GPA over 3.0 and they didn't come back, that we did bring in the right students. Five hundred of them, above a 2.0. But how can we help those students succeed? And it only takes, you know, 100 students is a 2 percentage point difference. Two hundred students is a 4 percent increase in retention and that's where we want to get to.

So this scholarship program is about that. It will eventually move the total amount of need based aid to about two-thirds for the freshman class or

about \$17 million, still leaving \$8 million for merit. So this is not totally moving away from merit-based aid. We'll still be recruiting outstanding students, as well, but now shifting because right now, we're 90 percent merit and 10 percent need, shifting more to roughly 65 percent need and 35 percent merit.

So it is a very significant shift in strategy. It's one, though, that we believe is the right thing for Kentucky and will do the right thing for Kentucky's students, as well as students from out of state as well.

VISONA: I'm really impressed with --

BROTHERS: Name, please.

VISONA: Monica Visona, Fine Arts.

I'm really impressed with the way that you've been able to marshal financial data to support a

position that I think many of us believe is -- is, in fact, a moral imperative to provide more education for the student citizens of Kentucky, whether or not they are in that upper 100 percent, 10 percent of the population, in terms of income. Is there a way that you could perhaps tie this kind of accessibility to the population to perhaps some of our (inaudible) schools?

TRACY: So, yeah. Let -- let's talk about that a minute. And I also want to say that one of the things I did at the Board of Trustees meeting, and to Mike Ritchie, as you know he's the Vice President for Philanthropy, is I also challenged him to find us \$250 million of new money for scholarships. And I think this plays very well with our donors. And many of them brought themselves up by their bootstraps and it plays well with

them.

So we're also trying to generate -- that would spin off \$10 million a year in scholarship money. That would allow us to maybe use less institutional funds, but also to meet those needs.

As far as the performance-based funding, I think, you know, that those - - as Dr. Grossman said, those conversations are still ongoing. We believe that retention and graduation is -- is key. And the degrees conferred. If we're going to -- if we're going to help Kentucky continue to improve as a state, we've got to have more people educated, more people with -- with college degrees. So that's what we advocate in those discussions, is that it's degrees that matter. Because ultimately retention and graduation rates

lead to degrees.

So we have that in our funding that I described for the undergraduate colleges to get additional money, does include things like, not only enrollment, but degrees conferred. Particularly, retention gaps with under represented minorities, low-income students, you know, those first generation students which cut across all demographic categories are -- are so important and they're the ones that are most at risk. So we've tried to provide incentives for the colleges to close those gaps.

Our teaching plan certainly says that we're going to focus on those things, and we think they're the right things, and so we've also tried to tie it to that strategic plan.

GROSSMAN: Can you talk a little bit about the Graduate School and some of the

conversations around the Graduate School and how those are going to move forward?

TRACY: Sure. So one of the things that I -- as I spoke to you last time, a little bit, was one of the three things we talked about was graduate education and renewing the focus on graduate education here at the University of Kentucky. And one of the pieces that goes with that is the Graduate School. And as you know, we've been looking at the structure of the Graduate School and trying to decide what's in the right structure and how much of those functions should be centralized? How much should be decentralized? What things are best done in colleges?

Many of you would probably argue, justifiably so, that the recruitment of graduate students probably happens most at the college level and

even at the department level. But you would also maybe say to me, there's some things that are more central like reaching out to under represented groups through large conferences and so forth.

There's a data reporting and -- and sort of big acquisition of reporting function that maybe is best done centrally through some kind of mechanism because we have to, you know, record many of those things for CPE, as well as SACS, and that probably has to be coordinated some way.

But what I don't know is how best to support graduate education until we have the discussion around graduate education. I want the two to be aligned together. I'd prefer not to realign the graduate school and then say, well, that was great except it really doesn't fit with how we want to (inaudible)

undergraduate education, and so I'm hoping that's a broader campus like conversation.

We had a long and good discussion with Senate Council a week or two ago about how to carry out that process, and I think that we've come up with a good process to do that that engages the campus community, but also has a group leading that. I really -- I don't want to be the only person leading this charge and I think there's -- that they've put together a blue ribbon panel to do that.

But I would hope that as a consequence of that, we would have a way to best align the graduate school or whatever entity that comes out to be. What I -- what I am passionate about, I guess maybe I'm giving sort of my prejudices. And I'll state -- if I say

I'm biased up front, it's a conscious bias, right, I guess. What I really want is for the Graduate School and the -- the -- whatever that is and that leader to be the champion of graduate education on campus and really serve as a person that champions it across campus and works in what I call a triangular function with the Provost and Vice President for Research, because I think the graduate -- graduate education has such a close linkage with the educational mission of the University, but also with the research mission of the University. So those three really have to be in -- in a coordinated fashion, and I would hope that that position would move beyond record keeping and data reporting, but to be a true champion and help facilitate graduate education across campus. In that way, it's my bias.

We'll see how that turns out, but that's my own personal bias, is to really elevate the distinction of graduate education on campus and align that unit to best do that. (Inaudible).

CHENG: Yang-Tse Cheng, Chemical and Materials Engineering.

When I asked a question about retention, I heard a lot about -- the case about how we improve retention, but one factor is not discussed is the rule of family and friend. I know there are a lot of privacy concerns of getting -- reporting to parents or...?

TRACY: Yeah, so you ask a good question and let me -- let me comment on that. You're right. And so let's take that from several levels. Let's take first the first generation who may have a very supportive and passionate family,

but has not had the experiences that maybe we have and could really help our students (inaudible). So how do we give them a support system here that helps complement their family in that way?

But we're also working to reach out more through the parents association, but also to communicate more prior to their joining the University so that they know what resources they have available so they can call us and say, you know, my student seems to be having problems.

Now, obviously a student doesn't have to sign the FERPA release and we can't tell the parent a whole lot beyond that, but what we can do is proactively give them tools and give them resource contacts so that they can help us through that process. So we're also working through the parents association and trying to expand that quite a bit, so

that they parents have an opportunity to participate and for those who may have parents who did not have the opportunity to come to college, that they know that we have resources here to help those students here with that transition.

That's why in Washington last week when I was meeting with congressmen and senators, I -- I lobbied for year-round PELL. You know the PELL program right now is an important program. It's sitting on a \$6 billion surplus and a lot of legislators would like to use that for something else, and I understand the attractiveness of that. But what I argued for was to go to a year-round PELL, because right now we're only (inaudible) during the academic year. And without that, students who maybe want to come in for a summer transition program into college, they can't use PELL

money for that. Or if they want to catch up at the end of the first year, they can't use PELL money for that and so it creates a tremendous financial burden on those students.

So we will continue to advocate and we've gotten good contacts through -- we used seven different legislators last week and every one of them was receptive to that and we've offered to work with them as we go into the higher education re-authorization process to argue for PELL at least going year round. And I would love to have it expanded, but I'll settle for year round right now. But it also fits many of the things you're talking about, is making sure that our students have the greatest flexibility in the use of that money.

We have 5475 students on PELL here at the University of Kentucky.

Twenty-eight percent of our Kentuckians entering into freshman class are PELL eligible and that total bill for those 5475 students is \$23 million annually. So PELL is a very important program for us.

REGARD: Michael Regard, College of Public Health.

(Inaudible) talking about retention in general as sort of a broad basis for students, but as he said when we move away from the merit-based aid to need-based aid, will of course sort of be cuts in that area. I know this year alone, the Singletary scholarship program was cut with the amount of funding students get, as well as the number of scholarships given out, while also increasing the requirements to get the scholarships. And after discussing with the people (inaudible) advisor, they've

had an issue with at least retaining those students as well as getting the sort of students they would like to come to UK. A lot of the students who are alternates.

I was wondering if there's any conversation in your office on how to retain those students while there are less scholarships, so they're more competitive, while also diminishing their value? How the university is going to address getting those high achieving, high caliber students at the University?

TRACY: So the entering class of this fall, we did reduce the number of Singletarys by 20. We did not reduce the award size. The award size stayed the same. We did reduce the number by about 20 students. So that was not changed. I can't say that that won't happen eventually in the future, but this year

we did not change that.

A couple of other things I believe, but maybe I'm idealistic, but I'll say that I think the Lewis Honors College and the tremendous opportunities it has provides an opportunity to attract those very high performing students as well. But I also -- from my experience in enrollment management, sense that those high-end students also want to go to places with 90 percent first and second year retention rates and 70 percent graduation rates.

There's also a factor in there that says this is a -- at least a surrogate measure of quality. And so we will continue to recruit those students very hard, but we also know that we have not been as successful in the students with the 26 to 32 ACT range as we would like to be and there are a lot of

students in that range that we believe we can attract as well. So all of our modeling suggests that the ACT will go up and that the GPA will go up of the entering class.

We will (inaudible) we have fewer merit finalists because those students, they're looking for that full ride where -- where they can get it, and so we will probably have fewer of those. But we believe that the overall quality of the class will look up.

VISONA: This is actually -- I'm saying this because we've (inaudible) conversation. This is Monica Visona, Fine Arts.

Just a question about the upcoming discussions on issues that were raised by the elections. I'm -- in the College of Fine Arts, I'm in the Humanities, so I really worry about

having two points of view, or both sides. I would really like to have panels of experts with many different approaches to solving the problems (inaudible) face our University, face our community and face our world.

I think one of the really upsetting aspects of the election was that there was a polarization according to personality rather than to solution based discussions.

TRACY: I think that -- I think that should have been -- thank you for that reminder. Multiple points of view, just not one point of view. I think we agree on that, yes. I would -- if we get a panel with four different points of view and it represents the range, I'm happy, very happy.

Katherine has asked me to speak a little bit more about my -- our time in

Washington. Tom Harris is here. Tom Harris was with us in Washington. We spent -- Monday and Tuesday, we interviewed with the Inside Higher Ed and the Chronicle of Higher Education. You may have seen the President's video on the Chronicle's website. There hopefully will be an article coming out of Inside Higher Ed sometime. We're providing them with more information. They were very interested in the UK LEAD scholarship program, so is the Chronicle as well. And we saw that mentioned in -- in the video as well. So that was Monday.

On Tuesday, then, we had the great fortune of being in the Senate chamber when Senator McConnell gave his speech about the 21st Century Cures Act. If you know about that, it has primarily three -- four components. We'll say four. One is precision medicine. One is

a cancer moon shot called the Beau Biden Cancer Initiative after Vice President Biden's son, who died of brain cancer. A piece of it is reforming -- reforming legislation around the FDA and getting drugs approved faster.

And the fourth part is very pertinent to us and that is on opioid abuse and the tremendous problem in the country. And I would say -- we -- we certainly said to our legislators and we didn't have to convince them that we were at the epicenter. And there will be \$500 million a year for two years for opioid abuse. We, at the university, want to position ourselves for that money.

We got to hear Senator McConnell's speech, which you know that it later went on to pass, we -- we advocated all the way up to 2:00 when the vote was. We were -- we were actually

with Senator Paul and he had to leave us, and the last thing we said to him was vote for it and he did, luckily. And so all of our legislators did vote for that piece of legislation. It's quite significant for I think the country, but also for the Commonwealth of Kentucky and the University of Kentucky.

So our two primary points that we made during that effort were the PELL grants that I just described and the 21st Century Cures Act, which again, should have some significant research dollars. That's a big plus NIH and biomedical research.

So when you go to Washington, you have to pick your spots. You have to be very, very strategic and you can't have 50 topics that you discuss with legislators. But I -- I think it was a successful visit and we do that every

year, and periodically throughout the year, as well.

Okay. Well thank you all. I'm going to head out to the Board meeting. So thank you and, again, have a happy holiday.

MCCORMICK: All right. So we have old business. It was fun, right? And we apologize to Scott and (inaudible). We had this on our agenda last time and we didn't --

YOST: It happens. It's not a problem from our standpoint. I appreciate you having us back.

Real quick, we had a proposal that was -- came before the Senate last November, which was November, last month. I'm sorry I couldn't be here (inaudible). I appreciate Kevin doing that for the committee.

This proposal is basically a

change in the College of Health Sciences Clinical and Leadership Management major. They basically -- they have two tracts. A -- that is a tract in associate's degree to entry to the degree and then the entry level for degree, and they made some changes in those two tracts and then they added a third tract. And the third tract and basically the long-term care administration specifically with the health services executive dealing with long-term care issues.

So besides the changes that dealt with a couple of courses in the pre-major, a capstone rework, a capstone course, some issues, and then this new tract dealing with the anticipated need as the population ages, and specifically in Kentucky as our populations age and having people to be able to work in that area as administrators and help lead the

effort as, again, the demographic shifts going on.

And then the -- it went before the committee, went before the Senate Council. The Senate Council actually asked for a modification of this prior to coming here. So you have the current proposal. And that was that the major, I guess, challenge was they wanted to also raise the admission requirements. The Senate Council specifically voted that down and sent it back to committee.

And so the one change, if you happened to see this, some of you had happened (inaudible) from before. The one, I guess, significant change to the proposal before it came here, and that was instead of a change in the admissions requirements, they basically made it the -- added an ongoing requirement for student performance as they matriculate

through the program. Am I correct in saying all those things?

And so with that, it comes before you and regards this program change. Again, the structure of the courses and then adding this new tract. And that new tract actually has three or four specific courses that are going to be tied to that particular health services executive for long-term care. Anything else you want to add to that?

UNIDENTIFIED: No, I think you've covered it well. Be happy to answer questions.

YOST: And so with that, the proposal comes from the committee so it doesn't need a second, but any questions or any comments before we go to vote?

MCCORMICK: The motion from the committee is that the Senate approve the proposed changes to the BHS in Clinical Leadership and Management. You have this

information as a part of your packet.

Any discussion? Again, the Senate approve proposed changes in the Bachelor of Health Science in Clinical Leadership and Management. Please vote. It passes.

YOST: Thank you.

MCCORMICK: Margaret.

SCHROEDER: This is a motion from the committee that the Senate approve the submission -- suspension of admission into the BS in International Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences.

This one is kind of a cleanup thing. They modified the BA program with the intent of deleting the BS tract. It didn't get deleted. Now, it's finally getting deleted. The BA tract does still exist. It's the best route for the students. There's no students in the BS tract. Is there any questions?

MCCORMICK: The motion from the committee is

that the Senate approve the suspension of admission into the BS in International Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences. No questions? There again is the motion to approve the suspension of admission into the Bachelor of Science in International Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences. Please vote. Motion passes.

We have a number of In Memoriam recipients or at least nominations to you and we'll begin with the College of Education. Dr. Crystal is here to share the College's nomination.

CRYSTAL: Ralph Crystal (inaudible),

Special Education and Rehabilitation Council. I am here to present Barbara Slevin, who is deceased. She died November 9th, 2015. She was in the doctoral program in special education. She had started that program in 2003, had

been attending on a part-time basis because she was working, employed full time.

She had previously completed a specialist degree in I think it was 1997 -- or 1989 and established a rehabilitation program in this community, which was very successful and thriving, and decided to return to doctoral work, which was in 2003 and was going -- attending part-time, and was just at the point of taking qualifying exams when she became ill at the last of classes in the spring of 2013, as I said, died a year ago, November 2015. I am presenting and recommending that she be -- I'm not certain what the wording is, but awarded an in memoriam doctoral degree.

MCCORMICK: So the motion from the Senate Council is that the elected faculty senators approve this College of

Education student as the recipient of an In Memorial Honorary Degree for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Questions? It is so motioned. Let's vote.

College of Nursing has three.

(Inaudible).

HEATH: So this one is Courtney Meyers. She died in the fall, 2014. Courtney was just beginning her nursing career as a first semester nursing student when she lost her life in an automobile accident. Her friends described her as thoughtful and quiet.

She was finding her way into nursing's role and was already showing the kindness, competence, and compassion that are important as her academic ability was as well. Courtney leaves behind her parents and a brother and a sister.

MCCORMICK: So the motion from the Senate Council is that the elected faculty senators approve this College of Nursing student as the recipient of an In Memorial Honorary Degree for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Any questions? Please vote. This is approved.

HEATH: The second student is Ross McCoy. He died in March of this year. Ross was also in his first semester of nursing when he died from health complications. It had been his dream to come to the University of Kentucky from Pikeville since he was a little boy and he was excited about becoming a nurse. In fact, he turned down a full ride scholarship for football at Georgetown to earn a University of Kentucky nursing degree.

 He is a product of the coal

community of Eastern Kentucky. Ross understood loyalty to family and friends. The consensus of his friends, his faculty, his classmates, was he was there for you. Ross was an only child, and in addition to his parents, is survived by his beloved grandfather (inaudible).

MCCORMICK: It's the motion from the Senate Council that the elected faculty senators approve this College of Nursing student as the recipient of an In Memorial Honorary Degree for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. This is the motion. You will vote please. Thanks. Motion passes.

HEATH: And finally the third student is Shawn Alexander. Shawn died in May of this year. He was a second degree student that was pursuing nursing following a significant military service as a medic and also as a career in

teaching with a Master's degree in Education. He lost his life in a motorcycle accident during finals week.

It didn't take much time with Shawn to see that he was passionate about people. He noticed who did what and was quick to show appreciation. He engineered recognition for the custodians of our building who clean our building every day. He presented them with flowers and cards signed by many students at the end of the semester. Faculty and classmates were also recipient to this kindness and care. The movie title, *Band of Brothers*, comes to mind with the description of how Shawn related to his classmates, in particular, our veteran students. Shawn is survived by his mother, two siblings, his wife and two daughters.

MCCORMICK: The motion for the Senate is

that the elected faculty senators approve this College of Nursing student as the recipient of an In Memorial Honorary Degree for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Please vote. Motion passes. This is a request from the College of Arts and Science. (Inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED: The College of Arts and Sciences is requesting the awarding of an In Memoriam degree to Seth Mulcahy. Seth was a veteran in his military service in the US Army, including a tour in Afghanistan.

On completion of his military service, Seth entered UK as an English major with the goal of becoming a journalist. At the time of his death last July, he was a registered student in good standing and so meets the criteria for an In Memoriam degree.

MCCORMICK: The motion is that the elected faculty senators approve this College of Arts and Science student as the recipient of an In Memorial Honorary Degree for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. Here you see that motion again. Please vote. Motion passes.

 Now we have the larger vote which is our motion that the elected faculty senators approve the December 2016 list of candidates for credentials for submission to the Senate and then through the President to the Board of Trustees. Submitting this to you where you see our motion and ask you to vote. Thank you. All right. Margaret.

SCHROEDER: So a couple of these are older. They don't have the rationales that you all requested, but the others have rationales. So just bear with me while I

read the rationale for the first couple.

This motion is a recommendation that the Senate approve the establishment of a new undergraduate certificate, International Film Studies in the Department of Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures, and Cultures in the College of Arts and Sciences. The purpose of the certificate is to enter students in a systematic way to the history and theoretical vocabulary of cinema to provide a comparative approach through which students may reflect upon the nature problematic concept of national film styles and their relation to each other in an increasingly globalized world and to foster expertise in film analysis and its expression.

It's a highly interdisciplinary program that will allow students to bring the knowledge they have gathered in home

departments to bear on their work in film studies. It will appeal to students in numerous programs including English, NCLLC, Hispanic Studies, History, Philosophy, Social Theory, Fine Arts, Design Communications, and so forth.

It emphasizes (inaudible) but context how the language of film and intersects with closely related movements and other artistic media in philosophy and history and different cultural traditions. They anticipate adding 10 students each year to the program. Are there any questions? Yes.

FARRELL: I do have a question. Herman Farrell, College of Fine Arts.

I haven't really heard about this proposal. I know the folks involved and it seems like a great proposal. But I guess I would ask, how would this in the future relate to perhaps a film

making, film production or film producing program here in the university, as well as film writing?

PETERS: Jeff Peters, Arts and Sciences, author of this proposal.

 That's an excellent question; something we've talked about, the people who were involved in -- faculty members were involved in this. This proposed certificate are not specialists in the area of production. So it's something that we've talked about that could be crossed over with the College of Communication, for example, where there are courses in production there.

 There's a little bit of overlap with some of the people in word writing rhetoric (inaudible) who do a little bit of documentary film production, as I understand it. But for the moment, this is a -- a purely scholarly proposal. But

it's the kind of thing that would be --
that -- that would absolutely work
perfectly well in conjunction with such a
future program.

SCHROEDER: Are there any other questions?

Yes.

VISONA: Monica Visona, Fine Arts.

What -- why was the decision or
could you perhaps just explain really
briefly why a certificate rather than a
minor?

PETERS: Yes. Excellent question.

That's also something we talked about.

It had to do mainly with not being
required to ask for new resources. This
is a program that allows us to combine
the existing film courses into an
undergraduate certificate.

I think one of the things that
we say in the proposal that was not read
just now, is that we're the only

university among our 19 benchmarks who has currently no program whatsoever in film. Most of our 19 benchmarks have at least minors. Most of them have majors and at least half of them have Ph.D. programs, and, you know, devoted faculty in those departments. So we thought that it was a good idea to start, as well, basically, and not have to ask for faculty hires, for example. That's the thing.

CHENG: Yang-Tse Cheng, Chemical and Materials Engineering.

A family friend, their daughter got a film degree in another university which has a program already, but it's very difficult to find a job. What is the likelihood these 10 students with this certificate will -- will find a job?

PETERS: Well, first of all, it's not 10 students. It's 10 students each year,

right?

CHENG: (Inaudible).

PETERS: I'm sorry?

CHENG: So they are larger than
some engineering programs.

PETERS: Perhaps. Perhaps, yeah. I mean
-- right. This is a -- this is a
Humanities major. This is a -- the --
the student with a certificate,
undergraduate certificate in
International Film Studies first of all,
doesn't have a degree, but that's a
certificate that gets added to whatever
degree they're in. But this is a
Humanities degree, so they have the same
kind of skills that students in other
humanities majors develop over the course
of four years, having to do with critical
thinking, articulate self-expression in
writing and speaking, and all together
qualities that we pick so importantly in

humanities and throughout all majors at the University of Kentucky.

SCHROEDER: Undergraduate certificates just kind of add the feather to the cap, a little bit more knowledge and background in your -- in addition to your major.

PETERS: It did actually occur to me that we could probably pretty quickly move to a proposal for a minor, but given what it took to get this through, I don't see that happening.

VISONA: Monica Visona, again.
I'm actually the outgoing director of the certificate, undergraduate Certificate for Global Studies, and we have had significant problems in terms of support, in that I was taking over the directorship essentially as an overload. And it is -- there's been quite a lot of discussion about who administered undergraduate

certificates. And the person who was currently my administrative assistant is now doing so only as a result of like groveling on my part. I'm not really sure that the undergraduate certificate is that much more viable than a minor or that it will require any fewer resources.

PETERS: Yeah, that -- that may be. I don't think we're going to have any trouble -- I personally don't think we're going to have any trouble overseeing this and supervising this program. I'm going to be the first director for it if it gets past today, first two years. And, you know, the faculty that I've been in touch with as we've put this proposal forward all seem to be very willing to serve in this position in the future.

MCCORMICK: Any other questions? The motion from the --

SACHS: Leon Sachs, Arts and Sciences.

One thing that sometimes gets lost in these conversations that I think it might be worth adding, since I know a little bit of the history of this, is this is really coming from students who want some coherence to what they are doing anyway. Students have been clamoring for this for a long, long time and finally have a way to acknowledge the -- the coherence. Like I said, the integrity of what they have been pursuing on their own.

PETERS: Yeah, what they actually want is a major. But, you know, as I said we're starting small.

MCCORMICK: Yes.

ALLAIRE: Just a comment. Gloria Allaire in Arts and Sciences, coincidentally NCCLC, as well.

 The idea of studying film takes me back to the '70s when I was an undergrad at Madison, Wisconsin, which

was a major film studies school, and I do recall my own undergraduate response when a roommate announced she was going to take a film studies course and we all mocked her for thinking lame.

But film studies discussion in this day and age is extremely vital. It goes beyond simple literature. It's using language. It's using culture. It engages students in ways that reading on page doesn't, and with all the visuals out there in their lives, this is no better time to be learning to analyze and think critically about the images they're seeing.

Film studies teaches you structure, philosophy, theory, as well as international cultures and using language, if you are listening to and watching films in a foreign language with subtitles admittedly. But it exposes

students to the greater world like
nothing else. Thank you.

MCCORMICK: Thank you. The motion from the
committee is that the Senate approve the
establishment of a new undergraduate
Certificate in International Film Studies
in the Department of Modern and Classical
Languages, Literature, and Culture within
the College of Arts and Sciences. We've
had discussion. Here's the motion again
if you need to read it. And I'll ask for
your vote. Thank you. The motion
passes.

SCHROEDER: The next one is a motion that
the Senate approve for submission to the
Board of Trustees the establishment of
the new -- of a new Ph.D. in Radiation
and Radiological Sciences in the
Department of Radiation Medicine within
the College of Medicine.

The rationale for the program is

on the front page of the packet, so hopefully you've read it. The only thing that I would point to you here that's a little bit different than our previous Ph.D. programs is that there's three routes to admission. The first is the traditional route of having obtained a master's and going into the Ph.D. program. The second is you enter the program to earn your BS, earn your master's (inaudible). And then the third, and it has been approved by Brian Jackson, is they currently have an MS degree that if a student decides before the end of their first year, before the end of their spring semester of their first year that they wish to switch to the Ph.D. program, they are allowed to switch to the Ph.D. program taking that program course work with them and finishing up in the Ph.D. program earning

the master's (inaudible) along the way.

Are there any questions? Okay. Great.

MCCORMICK: Hearing no questions. The motion from the committee is that the Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees the establishment of the new Ph.D. in Radiation and Radiological Sciences in the Department of Radiation Medicine within the College of Medicine. Now having heard this twice, you can see it, and we'll ask you to vote. The motion passes.

SCHROEDER: So this is for the undergraduate certificate in Social Sciences Research. It's an undergraduate certificate. It will be housed within the College of Arts and Sciences. It's interdisciplinary and involves a lot of other colleges, as well.

 If you're wanting to see how specifically it might play out because

they're so many different options, in the first appendices in the proposal, there is different majors or different student options on how it may play out in their program. It's very flexible for the student and they hope that it helps to encourage more students to do social science research. Are there any questions?

MCCORMICK: I thought these proposers did a great job of reaching out to almost anyone it seemed on campus. It's very collaborative, and I don't know how long it took. That would be another question.

UNIDENTIFIED: Much too long.

MCCORMICK: Much too long. The motion from Margaret's committee is that the University Senate approve the establishment of the new undergraduate certificate in Social Science Research in the College of Arts and Sciences, and

again it enjoys broad support and collaboration. Here's the motion. Please vote. The motion passes. All right.

SCHROEDER: Our final one is the Graduate Certificate in High Performance Coaching from the Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotion within the College of Education. It's a pretty traditional graduate certificate. There is nothing funky here or anything like that. It's a very high and popular field, if you've read the rationale on the front of the page, and it's also a collaborative in College of Health Sciences. There was no noted overlap and all (inaudible) supported the program. Are there any questions?

MCCORMICK: So the motion from the committee is that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate

Certificate in High Performance Coaching
in the Department of Kinesiology and
Health Promotion within the College of
Education. And you see the motion here.
I ask for you to vote. Thank you. The
motion passes.

All right. Our next item comes
from Roger Brown and the Committee on
Distance Learning and eLearning.

BROWN: So the lion's share of the work
around here is done by 18 standing
committees. Those are the Senate
committees and that's who gets up here
and does reports, and the Senate Rules
articulate and describe these committees
strangely in two different sections. And
depending on which section your committee
is described in, that determines the
criteria of who can be the chair and what
percent of the members must be elected
faculty senators, namely, whether it's a

majority or not.

So three years ago, the Senate created the most recent Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning, and I've been the chair of that committee for a couple of years now. And it turns out that whenever we have work to do in this committee -- I know this is similar in other committees, it takes a long time, and so we've run into some situations where it would be nice if the chair of that committee could be a more stable person rather than have to switch up with the needs of the elected senate -- senator stats.

And so what we have is a proposal today simply to move the language from the section that requires the chair to be an elected faculty senator and a majority of the members to be elected faculty senators to the

section that does away with that requirement.

And there's one other change, which is just to clarify, this particular committee, it looks like, could have had one member from every college that has a distance learning program, and if you know of anything that's happened in the last little bit, is that that's become something that a lot of colleges have done. So, therefore, the committee membership gets really big, and so we just ask that we clarify that, like all the other committees, there are membership recommendations from that committee to Senate Council and then Senate Council decides who is going to be chair and who the members are. And so they could decide that they want a majority to be faculty -- I mean, elected faculty senators. They could decide that

they want the chair to be that. It just does away with that as a requirement.

MCCORMICK: Any questions for Roger? So, again, this is I think really a move to recognize the more inclusive nature of this work. This committee began as ad hoc and now we really would like for it to be a -- a group that could be broader than senators only.

So the motion is that the University Senate approve the proposed changes to Senate Rule 1.4.2.13 and Senate Rule 1.4.3. Roger has described the action. We do have the motion again. You can read it. And I ask you to vote. Motion passes. Thank you, Roger.

So you remember last year we charged a group of faculty as when we approved the -- the Honors College, to begin the work of this -- what it might

look like, what the structure might be.

At that time, if you remember, the proposal was fairly loose because the proposers wanted a broader body to have a time to really think carefully about the organization and about the curriculum and about the way the -- the student should look in terms of their initiative, as well as their matriculation and graduation.

And so we're very appreciative of Phil Harling to take -- take this task. He's the chair of that transition committee and he has some things to talk with us today. We'd like for you to think about it, think about it over the holiday, I'm sure. As you're trimming the tree, think a little bit about Honors College and -- or engage in other holiday celebrations and then we'll come back to this at -- in the spring. Thanks, Phil.

HARLING: Thank you so much, Katherine.

Thank you, senators, for the opportunity to begin sharing with you the work of the Honors Transition Committee.

We've been at it all semester.

We started meeting in July. So how do I advance this thing?

BROTHERS: Clicker to the right.

HARLING: Thank you. We were dealing with a nine point charge initially from the Senate Academic -- the Senate Committee on Academic Structure and Organization. We added one sort of broader ballistic charge point to that. We were charged by Provost Tracy back in July. We've been meeting actually weekly pretty much since then. I'm pleased to say that we delivered our report to -- to Katherine and to Ernie last Friday. So a big shout out to the 18 members of our committee from 10 colleges. I think some of them

are here in the room. Could you guys stand and just allow yourself to be acknowledged? This is a huge task and thank you all for being here with us this afternoon. So the report is in full and ready for you to -- to review at your leisure.

As Katherine indicated, we started out as a committee by sort of asking ourselves what we want honor students to be and to become as a result of their experience in the Lewis Honors College, and several things came to mind, broad intellectual curiosity beyond their major course of study. People who are interdisciplinary by way of -- of approach in thinking, but certainly by the time they graduate, able to appreciate (inaudible) on the world quite different from what they might typically get, again, within their major. Skilled researchers within their majors,

obviously, is something we found very important. And by no means last or least, interest in cultivated young people who possess a common moral imagination and a commitment to lifelong learning. So these were some of the guiding principles we took as we were dealing with the Senate's charge to kind of map a curricular blueprint, as it were, for how the Lewis Honors College should move forward.

And I would also like us to envision what we'd like to see the Lewis Honors College look more like in five or ten years, hopefully, as a result of some of the curricular changes that we are proposing.

One is considerably broader faculty participation across the breadth of UK's wide campus. Now, historically the Honors Program at UK was -- was relatively very small compared to

the broader size of the institution.
That was true for probably a good 40 plus
years of its existence. It recently
celebrated its 50th birthday.

(Inaudible) over the last ten years
(inaudible) you've seen a great
(inaudible) enlargement of the college.
Now, plus the 10 percent of undergraduate
student body are students within the
Honors College, getting close to 2000
students at -- at this point.

Over the last ten years, there
has been this enormous growth in the
student population. What's lagged
behind, I think, a little bit is faculty
participation in instruction, and there
are all sorts of compelling reasons for
why that is so. Many of them -- many of
them we hope we've addressed as part of
our report. But we would like to see
broader participation among the faculty
broadly. Particularly, in the larger

undergraduate colleges, which at the moment, are relatively under represented in the rank -- in the typical ranks of honors and structures as you count from semester to semester.

We would also like to see the Lewis Honors College become a place that is seen as an incubator from the teaching ideas. In other words, a place where perhaps one can experiment with a new course idea which then can be retrofitted fairly readily back into one's regular departmental (inaudible). I think that has been kind of a perception in the recent past that you go off to teach in honors, you do something special there. It doesn't necessarily add any value to the departmental curriculum. That's something that as a former associate dean, a former interim dean in the College of Arts and Sciences, I appreciate that as a critique. I

certainly would like to see the Lewis Honors College become a place where good ideas come to thrive and to go back to -- and to be imbedded within the broader curriculum of the University.

The committee also would like to see a richer variety of honor seminars and of dedicated honors sections of established departmental course offerings. If you look at honors colleges that we aspire to be more like, they typically have a great many more of both than -- than you see within the current Honors College at UK. So, again, this is kind of partly to do with growing pains over -- over the past dozen years or so.

There's a particular (inaudible) of honor sections have established departmental courses at the 100, 200 levels. I've been busy trying to gradually build that up and that's

something that requires revisiting when you build up a teaching schedule every years. So this is very much a work in progress. This is something that I hope my successor, the permanent dean, will -- will continue to undertake, but we identified this as a value that we want to underline as a committee.

So the meat of our charge was to suggest a blueprint, a roadmap as it were, for building the current 21 credit honors curriculum up to a 30 credit honors curriculum, and our goal here was to add an element of common curricular experience, which the current honors program does not have, while maintaining the flexibility which is a hallmark of our honors curriculum. And I think that's one reason why it's been fairly attractive to (inaudible) students who make up the majority of our honor students.

So you can take -- you can be a major in a relatively credit intensive area, such as engineering, and readily meet the 21 hour requirement. We are trying to build that to 30 hours in a way that upholds the spirit of flexibility, while adding a degree of curricular rigor and something that we think has been noticeable by its absence, and that is a common experience and better within the -- the honors curriculum.

So there you see the current curriculum, which is a fairly broad smorgasbord, of -- of -- of six credits of lower level honors courses that meet core requirements. A mirror twin of six credits of upper level honors courses. Six credits of honors experiences that can be met in a variety of different ways so there's imbedded flexibility in that. And then finally three credits of honors capstone, which is typically addressed

within the student's major. We're not looking to change any of that. We're simply looking to -- to add to that core, that flexible core.

And what the transition committee is recommending is that first of all to build up to 24 credits, we take the WRD/CIS 112, that is a combined communications and composition course, which is an accelerated version of the -- the comp and (inaudible) course that other UK students have to take to meet their graduation requirements. It would make this an obligation and make this a requirement among all honors students.

Now, this is something that is relatively easy to -- to undertake in the sense that the vast majority of honors students already take either a -- either CIS 112 or WRD 112. In fact, no additional staffing resources would be needed to make this a mandatory

requirement for all of our honor students. So that builds us up to 24 credits.

Next, we thought that we wanted to sort of encourage breadth, intellectual breadth among our honor students. And so to that end, to get us up to 27 credits, the transition committee is recommending a -- what we call a directed elective, which is to say a course either a special topics honor student (inaudible) or departmental honors course, which the student would take outside their major area of study. So, in other words, the intent here is that if you're a Social Science major, to meet the directive elective, you would take this additional three credits above, over and above the core, probably either in the Humanities or the Natural Sciences.

And the idea is that honors

advisors would meet with students. We have a great deal of advising muscle in the Honors College and we have resources from the (inaudible) to add to that advising staff, to be able to steer students in directions that are going to broaden them intellectually while they continue to meet their requirements within their major. So that takes us up to 27 credit hours with the directive elective.

Finally, we thought it very important that we recommend a common curricular experience for all honor students within the Lewis Honors College. This is something which is quite typical across honors colleges that we aspire to be more like, which is to say, most of them that account for more than 21 credit hours. It's very typical for there to be one, or in some cases, a two-course honor seminar. Often this is something that

the students will take in their freshman year.

What we are recommending in order to maintain a necessary modicum of flexibility for students in relatively described majors, is that they meet this foundational seminar, three credits only, sometime before the end of their second year of matriculating within the honors program so that engineering students, biology students, wouldn't necessarily have to take that course right out of the starting gate.

What we envision for the honors seminar is, again, kind of a variation on something which is fairly common in honors colleges and that is a course that really looks at the deliberately very broad theme of the relationship between the individual and society, and we would do that through a series of guided readings, close reading, a lot of

writing. Probably a 20 page minimum with -- with a rewrite requirement imbedded within it, because we want to make sure that our honors students are terrific writers by the time they pass on to upper classman status here at UK.

The idea is that we would examine this broad theme through the traditional divisions of knowledge; the humanistic component, the social scientific component, and the natural sciences component. So sort of a tri-partheid dimension of the -- of the curriculum.

There would be a common reading list as we envision it. Maybe 60 to 75 percent of the readings assigned would be common readings arrived at as a result of the faculty committee work, with the individual instructors having some autonomy to add readings up to maybe on the order of 25 to 30 percent of the

overall total for the course.

We thought it would be terrific if we could introduce each of these three broad units in this examination of the relationship between the individual and society by having a UK faculty member give an evening lecture to the entire student body of the Honors College, really kind of driving home how within their disciplinary frame of reference they envision this relationship as a way of kicking out this broad unit and making it a sort of co-curricular dimension (inaudible) intellectual. Something that -- that, you know, we're not, in my opinion, we don't really have enough of in the current manifestation of the honors program here at UK.

Obviously, in looking at curricular changes, we were also tasked with the notion of envisioning what instructional staff and what

instructional support would look like. And also the issue -- the very important issue of the fact that governance within the college in which nobody according to UK's governing regulations will hold a tenured appointment. That -- that isn't -- we don't envision that changing. That hasn't been the way it's worked in honors for sometime now and that wasn't part of our (inaudible).

So what does faculty governance look like in the college that doesn't have -- that -- that isn't a tenure (inaudible) for any of the instructors who work within the college? That was kind of an interesting challenge that we needed to discuss, and also how best to staff this required foundational seminar in an environment where it -- where it's been a bit of a challenge to broaden faculty participation in honors instruction. That's an ongoing

challenge.

So our goal was to ensure that moving forward the regular faculty at UK own the honors curriculum while we still get the instructional muscle to offer this common seminar experience that we think as a committee is pretty crucial to the intellectual development of honor students.

So what we're envisioning is a situation where the foundational honors seminar would certainly be taught by any of the regular faculty members who would wish to participate in that, but we certainly envision a scenario where, in all likelihood, we would need to retain the services of a modest cohort of lecturers who would be tasked with providing the meat of instruction for this foundational seminar. There are a number of models for this (inaudible) other honors colleges.

Our challenge there is to make sure that if we go in this direction, those lectures are closely tied to the core disciplines within other colleges at UK. This is going to be critically important. What we're not looking for is a passel of -- of honors instructors who are cut out from the -- from the broader college. So what we are recommending in the report is that to the extent we need to hire a small number of lecturers to staff the foundational honors seminar, that they be connected closely to their core disciplines.

What does that mean in practice? Well, a number of things. First, it's going to be critically important the core discipline departments participate on the hiring committees of any such lecturers so that if we're looking to hire a philosopher, we'll get faculty members within the Department of Philosophy

participating actively within the hiring committee. We envision a scenario where -- I think there's a buyer's market for young, exceptional talent out there across many different sectors of the University, we're very aware of that. We get good people to fill these positions to the extent we need to fill them, but it's going to be critically important to have departmental buy-in and for the Honors College to consult closely with core disciplines to make sure we are hiring the right people to the extent we need to do that.

We're also mandating that there would need to be regular instructional time within the core discipline for any lecturers that we hire. Do you want me to take a question now?

BUTLER: It's up to you.

HARLING: What do you think Katherine? I don't -- yeah, please.

BUTLER: J. S. Butler, Graduate School.

Instead of lecturers, how about advanced graduate students?

HARLING: Well, that's something that we could -- that's something that we could talk about. Part of the -- part of the difficulty here is making sure we have somebody who can give us enough instructional time to enable us to teach the many sections of this course that will need to be taught.

BUTLER: There are a number of departments in which graduate students teach. You could be very selective and pick those with the -- their teaching evaluations. So that would connect with emphasizing graduate study on campus and will allow you and graduate study to work together.

HARLING: Well, it's certainly an idea to -- it's certainly an idea that we haven't really discussed as a committee up until

this point, but I think your point is well taken. Thank you for that.

Another really important factor here would be the core discipline departments would need to be involved in merit and promotional reviews of any lecturers hired within the honors college.

And finally, and quite importantly, we want to build up a faculty governance situation within the Honors College where any lecturers who were hired would be mentored and really protected from the dean, in a sense, by the honors faculty of record that will be broader governing responsibilities within the Lewis Honors College than they currently enjoy.

And so I want to sort of address that fact, the governance piece now in the next slide. We have a faculty of record within the Honors College already.

These are -- these are eleven faculty members from across the breadth of the University who are excellent resources in terms of the vetting of course proposals within honors. What we envision is a much more authoritative role for the honors faculty of record moving forward, such that they would function in a manner akin to a departmental faculty on a number of governance issues. And for this to be the case, I think reasonably they would need some (inaudible) DOE, assign a task to the Honors College, perhaps on the order of 5 percent. That's something that we can discuss at greater length.

Several roles are envisioned for this honors -- this -- this -- this sort of beefed up version of the existing honors faculty of record. One would be to provide the kind of insulation from any lecturers that might be hired to

teach the foundational seminar from the dean in a way that the senior -- a senior departmental faculty acts as a kind of protection for junior faculty members within their units.

We also see a need for the permanent dean of the Honors College to have a body that she or he can consult on a regular basis to provide good counsel on a wide variety of -- of issues. This is something that obviously is common across other colleges at UK. We need to find a way to embed that into the honors structure as we move forward. So that, you know, with (inaudible), we're envisioning the fact that (inaudible) would advise the Dean of Honors on budgetary personnel matters very much the way that council chairs might do in a bigger college.

We also think it critically important that the faculty of record

preside over annual merit review for any lecturers that might be hired within honors to -- to teach this foundational seminar that we envision. Also to adjudicate the question of promotion to senior lecturer in -- in such cases. So we envision a formalization of the role of the faculty of record through a set of rules at the college that I think would look very similar to established departmental rules or finding good models to draw from within the (inaudible) of UK universe here, but that role is going to need to be beefed up and formalized in a way that gives the faculty of record a real kind of power and authority within -- within the Lewis Honors College.

Now, in terms of the rest of the curriculum, I've been focusing on this foundational seminar because the challenge of staffing is a significant one. But, of course, here we're talking

about three credits of a proposed 30 credit curriculum. As far as the rest of the curriculum is concerned, and to the extent we can encourage regular faculty participation in the core seminar and -- in those three credits as well, what we're wanting to do is to both broaden and deepen the involvement of the regular UK faculty within the Lewis Honors College. We'd like to see a wider variety of honors seminars and more honor sections, the 100 and 200 level courses, than we do at present.

Now, we understand that in order to make that happen, the Honors College is going to have to be able to control some significant incentive funding, which it doesn't really do at the moment. Right now, I have about \$175,000 a year that I can use to support the

instructional mission of the Honors College. It's very difficult to persuade deans and department chairs, who are rightly skeptical, that lending one of their star instructors to honors for a semester to teach (inaudible) for, in many cases than the PTI rate, is -- is going to be any kind of a good deal for them. So I'm out there (inaudible) riding on a prayer and a shoeshine, and I do the best I can and I do better than I would have anticipated when I -- when I took on this interim position. But the permanent dean realistically is going to need to have much more significant recurring funds to be able to do constructive deals with -- with deans, with department chairs, so that we can free up the time of our best teachers to stand in front or in some cases behind, because I usually lead my honors courses

from the rear, in front or behind our best undergraduate students. I wish that that were more true than it currently is. But we're envisioning a university in which this becomes much more the norm. It's going to -- it's going to require some money to do that and we're -- so we're certainly asking the -- the Provost for beefed up incentive funding. We're recommending that this money be permitted to be spent in flexible ways.

One size does not fit all when it comes to the needs of the departments. One department might want to take this incentive funding and in terms -- in the form of in-house travel money for the regular faculty. Others might want to put it right back into instruction. We think flexibility is probably the order of the day here. Up until now, really the honors programs and now the honors

colleges had one hand tied behind its back in terms of being able to recruit more robustly among the regular faculty. We would like to see that situation rectified.

As a way to do this, we're also recommending, and this is embedded in some detail in the report, what we're calling a faculty fellows program as one way to capitalize and anchor broader faculty participation within the Lewis Honors College, and obviously this is just an idea that we have so far. It's modeled on several different faculty fellows programs that we see in honors colleges that we aspire to be more like. There's a very well developed faculty fellows program, for example, at the University of South Carolina, which is nationally recognized as one of the

outstanding honors colleges out there. What we envision here is a situation where perhaps something on the order of nine faculty members, deliberately brought in from across the university, would commit to being faculty fellows within honors for staggered terms up to -- up to three years. One at one for three years. And what we envision is an idea where something on the order of half their DOE during that period would be assigned to honors. In other words, enough that would enable them to teach probably a course in honors per semester during their service, while also providing meaningful additional service to the Honors College. As the college has grown, that service necessities become stronger and we -- right now we lack faculty muscle to meet the service obligations that attend a college of

fairly substantial size at this point.
Order -- one case in point is application
review. We get -- we get in excess of
3500 applications to the Honors College
every year.

Right now, we're reviewing all

these applications with a small staff and
-- and the good services of a handful of
really faculty volunteers and myself.
That's what I'm going to do when I leave
this meeting is to go read more
applications because it is the season,
right? This is a place where a faculty
fellow could make a really positive
difference. Also to -- to get involved
in co-curricular events, and quite
importantly, we would envision a faculty
fellows as adding strength during their
term of service to the honors faculty of
record by serving as ex-officio members

of that -- of that body. And so if you do the math, you take the 11 current members of the faculty of record, you add maybe something on the order of 9 faculty fellows. You have 20 -- you have a council of 20 faculty members who can provide counsel to the honors (inaudible), who can adjudicate merit evaluation and promotional questions to the extent those arise, who can help shape the curriculum, and who, importantly, will contribute directly to the teaching of honor students. We think that something along these lines might have the potential over time to be a bit of a game changer here in terms of a seed bedding, broader and deeper faculty involvement within the Lewis Honors College.

So that's who we are, and I want to once again thank my fellow committee

members. I look forward to coming back probably early in the spring to discuss several of our proposals at greater length after you all have had a chance to digest our document. I apologize, it extends beyond 10 pages. I was hoping to be able to keep it at 10, but that was a bit unrealistic. I hope you find it a relatively readable report, however. We spent a good deal of time on wordsmithing. And with that, I'm happy to take any additional questions. Yeah, Matthew.

GIANCARLO: Matthew Giancarlo, Arts and Sciences.

Phil, are you -- are you interested in having feedback on this as it's presented?

HARLING: Sure. Yeah.

GIANCARLO: Because the one thing that really stands out to me is that of all

the proposals for curriculum and all the possibilities for courses, there's only one program and one course that's given the privilege of now being required. And in the proposal, I haven't seen anything that's either dispositive or even evidentiary as to why WRD/CIS 112 should be required for this. Now, it says that many students take it anyway. But in an honors curriculum when we're trying to develop something new, I think we need a bit more background and a bit more justification for why three credits of required course work for a particular program and department should be set in place.

And I would ask you if there's going to be guarantees that at this 100 level they aren't going to be taught by graduate students or PCAI's who currently teach the lion's share of these kinds of

courses for WRD/CIS or if there's going to be some kind of justification for one of you, as opposed to the regular curriculum of that class, which is not an honors course. It might be an advanced course, but it by no means has a designation of a specific honors disposition.

And three, because, you know, Phil, I can think of courses in History and Philosophy and English, in International Studies or Political Science that might serve these functions just as well as this particular course. So I would ask you and I would ask the committee what the decision making process was for picking out one course out of our entire core for this kind of particular distinction and whether that's really something that's justified given the overall flexibility in the rest of

(inaudible)?

HARLING: Right. Well, you know, what largely did drive it is the fact that a large majority of students are currently taking that course and there seems to be a sense that --

GIANCARLO: Did anybody poll them to ask what they think of it?

HARLING: Well, I'm certainly happy to solicit more feedback from -- from current honor students. I'm certainly open to the notion of a situation that would -- that would sort of guarantee that a certain kind of facility in writing and verbal communication, you know, there are -- there are a variety of ways of meeting that. This is simply the -- the path that honor students have been taking to a very large degree thus far. It could be that we could think more flexibly about it. I don't know if any

of my fellow committee members want to offer any feedback on that particular question.

SACHS: Well, I think Matt makes a good point. And I -- I would really want to know what is the status of our document and how much can be revisited. I'm asking about what the committee's charge is beyond submitting the (inaudible).

HARLING: Well, at the end of the day, it's a question of -- of the shricing and curricular proposals, our -- our recommendations. So nothing within the document is -- is binding at this point. It -- you know, it isn't subject to an up or down vote. We were simply wanting to chart out a road map for how we get to the 30 credits. It could be that this is one that -- I -- I mean, I'm certainly open to continued discussion.

GIANCARLO: Giancarlo. Given the size or

the hope for increase in the size of the Honors College, I do think that this is something that ought to be maybe deliberated on a little bit, a little bit more, instead of just doing what we've been doing to think about if this is, in fact, the best way to deliver that introductory skill set or whatever it is. I mean, I do know that on your faculty of record and the other committee members, there's nobody from WRD, and I'm not even sure -- I guess we have one member from CI.

HARLING: Uh-huh. And we did consult -- we did consult the, you know, the Directors of WRD on -- on what we had -- what we envisioned here. We had a good discussion with them. They were not only amenable to it, they were enthusiastic to it as an idea.

GIANCARLO: I'm sure they were.

HARLING: And the other issue is it something that -- that actually could be delivered without -- with -- with -- at current staffing levels, which is one reason why we thought it an attractive option. And the -- you know, and at this point, the honors population is about reached what it's going to reach. We're about 10 percent of the undergraduate student body.

So we'll continue to grow, but at this point going forward, I think more or less (inaudible) with overall enrollment going up at the University. There is -- there is an idea that it will continued to expand aggressively as a program as it's done over the past half dozen years or so. Just to make that point. Yeah.

SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, College of Medicine.

This reminds me of two conversations. One is, I don't know, a decade long conversation that we've had about writing across curriculum. That conversation versus having it, you know, in a school, of course. And also the -- the conversation that I had with my own honors course, which has mostly engineers, and so in the course, honors course I've been teaching for the last two years, we have them write about a page and a half every week about the topic and then they go into debate. So they're getting written and oral. And so, you know, so the students were telling, you know, workload, but my argument was, well, that's your writing requirement.

So in my own opinion, I sort of like the idea that you're writing for a purpose rather than writing.

HARLING: Right. Exactly. Thank you for
that. Bob.

SANDMEYER: Bob Sandmeyer, Arts and
Sciences.

First of all, I want to commend
you all, the entire committee. I think
this is very impressive. My question
goes back to the lecturers and the role
of the lecturers. I was a lecturer for a
year so I'm -- so it's kind of informed
from my -- from my experience as a
lecturer. One of the concerns I have
immediately when you were -- I mean, I --
I feel you for the requirements you have
and the constraints to fulfill those
requirements without hiring tenure track,
but one of the -- one of the restrictions
of a lecturer is that they're, you know,
you're restricted to teaching 100 to 300
level classes, which in the long run
leads to possibly a bifurcation of the

faculty where you have lecturers teaching at the lower level course work and then the faculty working from the University working in a higher level, which means that students who take -- and I'm just wondering if you all thought about this -- this was part of your discussions about how the ramifications of this. Because what this -- (inaudible) on the one hand students taking lecturers they really like, but then forced to move beyond them, not being able to work with them.

But also, and this is my real concern, that you have in honors, faculty members who have a status below regular faculty members, you know, RTR -- I mean regular or STS faculty members who are teaching the guts of the course. So I'm just wondering if you all -- and that's the sense on which I mean kind of

bifurcated. So I'm just wondering if you all had thought about that and if and what -- what -- if you had, what you -- what conclusions you have come to?

HARLING: Yeah. Well, the one conclusion is that we want regular faculty to continue to teach lower division honors. That's critically important. We just didn't think it was realistic to suppose that there would be a lot of faculty, a demand to teach this particular seminar. And so realistically we're looking at the need for some extra instructional support on that issue.

But having said all that, core honors to a very significant extent would continue to be the broader property of the UK faculty. We wanted also to create a mechanism where these lecturers would occasionally be able to teach within

their core discipline in a way that is done to that core discipline and that also, ideally, creates an opportunity for regular faculty within that home department, that core department to come over and teach (inaudible) honors if we're getting a, you know, an honors lecturer to teach -- to teach three credits over there. So we're trying to build on a situation where there is a degree of cross pollination to keep these interesting for the lecturers, for the core departments to feel like they're getting something of value from the lecturers and to hopefully prevent the lecturers from getting burnt out from having to teach the same course time after time. Even though we do envision mechanisms for revitalizing that course and revisiting its content, probably on an annual basis, in which the lecturers

who would do the lion's share of the instruction would take a very active role in shaping it as it -- as it moves forward. Yeah.

CHENG: It seems the Honor College should offer something that's unavailable at UK. (Inaudible) inviting guest lecturers, leaders of industry, (inaudible), scientific field, a different field. I remember there is a New York Time commentator who did the Freshman seminar for us at Princeton and wrote about it in a book. That would also solve our shortened faculty member (inaudible).

HARLING: Yeah, we have, you know, we have mechanisms for doing that and I'm not -- I'm certain we remain open to the idea of bringing in people who are properly qualified to -- to teach within honors and so there are mechanisms for enabling

that kind of a -- a teaching experience within the college. I don't -- I don't envision that disappearing. But we did, as a committee, feel that the main objective here was to make sure that honors was, you know, was property owned by the faculty of the -- of the University, okay. Yeah.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S. So in the past, I've been asked for just like regular courses by particular students who've enrolled in them to turn them into honors courses with honors assignments just for those in particular students. Is that going to be necessary in the future or are you going to --

HARLING: Yeah, I think the -- the idea is that there would be -- what we want to see is the development of -- if we feel that there's significant demand within the honors population of undergraduates,

the addition of honor sections of established departmental courses, and this is a discussion we have on a semester-by-semester basis --

DEBSKI: Yeah, but this is out -- this is outside of honors sections. This is just for individual students in a particular class, a regular class in my department.

HARLING: Right. Yeah. Depending on the nature of what -- of what you're having them do, it could qualify as a so-called honors experience.

DEBSKI: It doesn't, though. And so -- and so, in fact, I've had to talk about additional assignments for just those students, and I'm just wondering, again, is that something that you're going to anticipate will no longer be necessary or will students still be approaching you to take, again, a regular class, add assignments just for them and --

HARLING: Yeah. I'm hoping that the need for that is going to diminish quite substantially over -- over time as we build up our offerings within honors because that -- that provides, you know, that's a bigger onus on the instructor. I totally see that. It's not a way that we want to go. I think it's a way that out of necessity, we've had to go in the recent past.

What I'd like to see is honors evolving in a way where those sorts of ad hoc relationships are going to be a lot less necessary. But that's, you know, that -- that will only come as a result of -- of a beefed up honors curriculum and sort of broader and deeper faculty participation. So kick starting that is going to be the big and important challenge that we face moving forward. So then we can relieve the folks like you

that -- Liz, of that -- of that need,
right? Yeah.

YOST: Scott Yost, Engineering. Just
one comment to take back, I guess. All
the stuff I think it's good, but from a
student prospective, looking at this
program, you're going from 21 to 30
hours. Now, that may be fine for Arts
and Sciences or Fine Arts would have a
quarter of the curriculum as electables.
But from an Engineering prospective,
which are very descriptive, the 21 hours
has been integrated pretty heavily which
has allowed engineering students to
participate in this, but now you're
adding 9 hours.

 So the first comment is, in the
112, is there going to be something for
students who come in that may get credit
-- transfer credit for that or is that
going to be required no matter what the

background is in stuff like the 101 or what about the 112, 110, 111? And then the other thing is, you know, why not potentially maybe make it a tiered structure to -- to meet both avenues? In other words, students who want this broader prospective, but not have the burden of 9 additional hours in an already full curriculum, then maybe they get a high level of honors and the students meet the existing (inaudible) which seems to be very good, and they get regular honors.

HARLING: That's the one reason why -- another reason why -- what I should have added earlier in my response to -- to Matt is that because so many of our students already take the 112. That includes many engineering students who meet the requirement that way and we felt that this was one way of maintaining the

kind of flexibility that we want to see while adding additional credit requirements elsewhere. We did have a number of standing faculty members on the committee. This issue of flexibility is one that came up and (inaudible) is here in the room. John, you want to speak to that issue.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, we absolutely talked about that. It is an issue. We also have changes in Engineering. We're going to be reducing our curricular to 128 credit hours. In a sense, that opens up a swatch when I think about it that way, but yeah, we definitely talked about this and felt this was a reasonable compromise in terms of a college like Engineering, which is pretty prescriptive and incorporating that with the -- with the honor students.

And as was noted in the report,

a lot of the honor students come in with so many credits that we felt there was enough -- enough flexibility there with the students we're considering that they'd be able to accommodate these -- these additional credits in terms of real courses. A couple -- a couple of additional courses they'd have to take during their time at UK.

HARLING: They come in on an average of 29 credit hours, which kind of amazed me when -- when I saw that -- that figure. So we're hoping that, again, we know there's been a lot of discussion about the balance and the need to retain the kind of flexibility that a lot of (inaudible) majors need with a way to -- to bind the curricular experience with the purpose of either finding some -- some common ground. Because right now all we have is a radical ala carte menu

essentially. And that works with respect to the flexibility, but I don't think it really works very well and I don't think that anything works very well with respect to some modicum of intellectual coherence in the experience. So it's a balancing act. I take the point for sure. It's after 5:00.

MCCORMICK: Yeah. Thank you so much.

Thanks to Phil and the committee. Just to give you a reminder that many of the committee members also on the search committee -- I don't think that Phil is on that.

HARLING: No.

MCCORMICK: Do you want to give them
(inaudible) of where we are.

HARLING: Yeah. Well, the committee has been appointed and as Katherine -- as Katherine says, most of the members were members of the transition committee so

they're very well versed (inaudible) in all things honors at this point. God love them. It is being chaired by Claire Renzetti, who is the Chair of the Department of Sociology, and Dean Dave Blackwell at Gatton College of Business and Economics. There's been a draft kind of position description. There was an open forum dedicated to that position description on December 1. I -- I believe the committee felt they got really good feedback from the forum. So I suspect that the ad is set to go out quite soon, and I'm picking on Leon because I know he's a member of the committee. What's the timeline? Because I don't know.

SACHS: The ad goes out -- there's an outside search committee -- search (inaudible), right, that's involved in guiding us through the schedule.

Applications will come in and start to be reviewed in February. There will be interviews in early March and a recommendation of, I think, three or four unranked finalists will be submitted to the Provost in March and he will make that decision (inaudible).

HARLING: So they seem to be very much on schedule for a July 1 transfer of power which I eagerly await. That means I remain your humble servant.

Thank you very much.

MCCORMICK: Do I hear a motion to adjourn?

WHITAKER: Motion to adjourn.

MCCORMICK: Mark Whitaker.

UNIDENTIFIED: Seconded.

The meeting adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

C E R T I F I C A T E O F S E

R V I C E

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 3rd day of January, 2016.

LISA GRANT CRUMP
NOTARY PUBLIC,
STATE-AT-LARGE
K E N T U C K Y