

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

DECEMBER 13, 2010

3:00 P.M.

* * * *

* * * *

SENATE COUNCIL OFFICE
MAIN BUILDING
LEXMARK ROOM 209
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

* * * *

* * * *

HOLLIE SWANSON, CHAIR
DEBRA ANDERSON, VICE-CHAIR
KAVEH TAGAVI, ACTING PARLIAMENTARIAN
SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR
LISA E. HOINKE, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

* * * *♀

CHAIR:

It is after 3:00.

We have reached quorum. We are at 54 and over, and I'd like to turn it over to President Todd.

TODD:

Thank you.
I know you've got other business to go through and I appreciate having a chance to come and share some thoughts. I appreciate your all's coming to my building today.

It's a little warmer for me. I have been outside walking around and the wind is pretty cutting, but... I was telling someone on the elevator coming up, I'll never forget, I spoke at the University of Minnesota on January 16th two years ago. I remember that because it was 16 below zero and the lady taking me out to the airport, she said, we're glad you're here today. It was really cold yesterday. I haven't talked to Tubby recently, but there's definitely a shift in the temperature up there.

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt

I want to start by thanking Hollie for inviting me, giving me this chance to come and speak to you all. I don't know if this is my last time or my next to the last time, but I will still be around in June. I haven't made any plans yet after June the 30th but I'm -- our president will change but I will still be on the faculty here focusing in the areas that I have had a passion for for a number of years.

I want to thank you all for the work you do on this Senate. I know you've got other jobs and you have other things to do, but a lot of important stuff happens through your hands and I know you've got a couple of issues coming through today on the undergraduate program and (unintelligible) department, things of that nature, and it's important that we vet those things. I want to compliment Swamy on how he's worked with you all the last few years.

And I saw Ernie walk in a few moments ago, and we were talking just the other day about the process we've gone through with the undergraduate program and I appreciate the time and effort and thought that you all have put into that. It's a very important piece of what we do.

I'm going to look back a little bit over the last few years just to give you some -- some parameters and then talk some about some others but I want -- other subjects, but I'd like to quit in time to answer any questions that you all might have.

We're up to 28,000 students now, up from 24,000 in 2001. A lot of that increase I have to attribute to the faculty and the Provost's war on attrition because we have purposely kept the present class locked in around 4,000 the last three or four years because we haven't been able to add faculty. The last time we added faculty was when the legislature passed the business plan and gave us money. We had made a commitment in that plan to add faculty first, then increase student body.

Since we haven't been able to add faculty, we -- we tell the admissions folks -- we say publically we want to lock it at 4,000; we tell the admission folks not to come back with any less than 4100. We like that breathing room of those extra 100.

But this year our yield was up which means your product is better. It means -- means it's being viewed positively, and we have about 4300 present, and that's important. You might have seen that our ACT went up from 24.7, a full half point -- I always say a full half point, a half a point move in the ACT is a pretty good piece. It's 25.2 now, and we still haven't gotten 75 percent of our students are Kentucky natives. The average as you may know here in Kentucky

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt
is 19.1, and I do think that as a part of our land-grant mission, our purpose is to bring in Kentucky kids. I sit on the SSCT president's panel once a quarter and there are three SSCT schools in particular now who are well over 40 percent out of state students. One of them has ten recruiters in Texas and probably seven or eight in California where they go after the kids that can't into Berkeley or UT Austin or whatever. These parents have enough money to pay out-of-state tuition so they bring them in. It does give you a nice of revenue. They lop off the lower part of their population in their home state in order to get the ACT scores up. They look a lot better on US News and World Report than we do but that's not the way that I think a state university as a land-grant institution with a statewide mission should operate. You can argue with that but I -- but that's something that we're proud of.

The best way for us change our ranking and ACT scores is to change K-12 in Kentucky, and I think we have obligation to do that. We generate the teachers and I think we are doing that. And the STEM proposal you have in front of you for bringing in a STEM department is extremely important because no state in this union is doing it right, relative to STEM, and we have got a lot of stuff going on in this state.

And I couldn't say more about Mark Kornbluh and Tom Lester and Mary (Unintelligible), the work that they're doing in that area. And what impresses me -- and these numbers are somewhere in this packet of cards, but I know from memory that engineering three years ago had 380 freshman; this year they have 680 freshman. That's not happening anywhere else; 88 percent of those kids are Kentucky kids. Average math ACT is

29. That's a pretty good field.

I hope to find jobs for them when they finish. But they're coming here and -- and I believe when I asked Tom Lester the retention rate, it was comparable, freshman and sophomore retention, to what we have for the rest of the University or close, which is not unusual for engineering.

So there's a lot going on with this freshman class. I don't know how many years we've been able to say back-to-back that this has been the best freshman class we've ever had, but this is true again for this group.

We had 12,000 applications two years ago, which was a record. This past year we had 13,600, and I'm sworn by Don Whitt not to tell you what -- how far ahead we are in applications this year over last, so I won't do that because Swamy will tell him.

We're drawing a lot of attention,
Page 3

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt

as I mentioned, in the STEM area. Did I say engineering is up 44 percent in applications? Tom Lester told me that the other night in Washington, but -- I can tell you that one.

SWAMY: I'm going to tell Don you said that.

TODD: No, Tom Lester's of engineering. I didn't tell you about Don's number though.

So we are -- we're trying to change some of those parameters. I can't tell you how proud I am of the work that's gone on on this campus with respect to the war on attrition. When Swamy came and looked at one of our goals was to improve graduation rate, which I think is important for us, and the State. When you look at the graph, it showed us being around 60 percent and the 20th position is around 72. He said the only way we're going to move that is to declare war on attrition for freshmen and sophomore. We lose those freshman, and that really is never go to show up in that sixth year.

The -- at the time that we started that it was around 76 percent. Our retention rate was 82 percent this last semester, and that gives us a few hundred extra students going into that sophomore year and then juniors, and it will reflect in our graduate rate in a couple of years and so not only is that a good thing financially, but it's a good thing for the State, and it's a good link for us to the State about what we're doing. We're not softening, we're just paying more attention, I think, to those students.

This is by far the most diverse class we've ever had. It's been an issue we've had to deal with. We made a lot of changes back when we fell short of our African-American freshman population, the same time that the Michigan decision was made that you -- you couldn't use admission parameters that you had previously used. We changed everything a lot. We hired additional people in admissions to look at the total application for these children.

In 2001 we had 537 applications for African-American freshman. This last year we had 2,066. I think largely because we changed the -- the look of the classroom. We had 57 African-American faculty in 2001; today we have 89. Many of them, they're very strong. And so I'm pleased with that.

We look at research, and I've said many times I think a lot of people when we were challenged in '97 to become a top 20 public research university, that they felt that was all we were going to think about, but if it was the best category for us. We're looking -- you know, we measure ourselves for undergraduate quality, graduate quality, faculty quality and research.

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt

The hardest one for us to move has the undergraduate quality. What makes up that measure is three things. The ACT score, which we are gradually moving up, student-faculty ratio, we've been kind of frozen with that, and the graduation rate and we -- we will move that on up.

But in research we're now 27th in the country among public and private universities, which I think is a -- is a commendable position. We did 367 million last year in research expenditures.

If you look at non-federal research we're 21st; federal we're 33rd. One thing I think we should take pride in is that when that stimulus money became available -- and I had the pleasure last week of talking to both our Democrat and Republican representative congressmen in Washington about the earmarks, stimulus funds and so forth. You have to measure what room you're walking into as you start talking about these things, but the stimulus money once it's put on the table was open for any university, public or private, to go for it.

We ended up with about \$110,000 worth of that money, and Jim Gray could tell you we only got 30 million behind MIT and we beat several of our benchmarks. And one I do discuss is the CAER proposal that went in for -- and we're using it to build the new energy building out at Spindle Top. There were 167 proposals written for that pot of money. They only funded 12, and we had the second largest amount, and the lady who came down to announce that said that we had the best proposal in the group.

And so research wise we're -- we're hitting the mark. What impresses me is that we merge -- we're merging a lot of the research we do with work that we're doing here in the State to help solve some of the issues.

Some of you are involved in Commonwealth Collaboratives. We have about 40-some odd of those going right now, and they are making a difference in not only how we represent ourselves to our own State, where we make research real to the people of Kentucky where they see what we do and now understand why it's a top university.

But it's also one where we can garner extra funding from -- from broader sources. The two that I talk about quite a bit, one is the work done in Hopkins County through our clinic where our College of Dentistry worked with Public Health. They had a 16 percent pre-term birth rate and now it's down around 4 percent. When they introduced me at a conference, the president of Trover Clinic said that we have saved 37 pre-term births over that 18 month span of time at that point which would result in

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt
saving about 1.9 million dollars in Medicaid cost.

So those are the types of things that get people's attention because that changes people's lives for sure.

The other one is the houseboat project that Michael Speaks.... Now, Michael Speaks running around with those big glasses and came out of Southern California, and you would not think he's working on manufactured houses down around Kentucky River, doesn't seem to fit; but he loves it.

We had to sell the home. I hope some of you got to see it when it was parked out front. Only 20 universities were chosen to compete in that project, and we had to build it, we had to raise money to build it, we had to disassemble it, move it to Washington, reassemble it on (unintelligible) in a short period of time, and then have it measured in 10 different categories and we came ninth -- we came ninth in the world, which is pretty impressive.

When it came back, the folks in Ag and engineering and design and some of the other areas said, why don't we use what we've learned from this experience to translate it to other areas.

The houseboat -- the houseboat business down around the Kentucky River was hiring about 1200 people, down to about 100 right now. We know some people in the rural development area who have concerns for creating jobs in that area and we got a little bit of funding from them.

And the goal was to do a manufactured -- a manufactured home. I call it a trailer, but they call them manufactured homes that you can -- that you can heat for a \$1.30 a day or cool for \$1.30 a day. Now, heat there's a \$1.67 or something like that now. I didn't get all those numbers; they're close.

But in addition to that, they're taking on the responsibility of redesigning the factory floors where the previous boats were built so that they can actually assemble in some volume these particular manufactured homes.

They think there's a market in Department of Defense; they think there's a market in Katrina type episodes and they think it's a successful way to create good, sustainable jobs in that part of the country using Kentucky-based products.

And in addition to that, they're getting into the design of the neighborhood where these would go. They're putting in design rules but -- as an example, they're putting in a geothermal system that can serve multiple homes at one time, hot water systems and so forth. Now, General Electric has worked with them too on building the drain

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt

apparatuses on the inside of these. So those are some of the collaboratives.

There are, if you haven't heard, they are working on travels throughout the Appalachian in particular to take opera students, and that program has now been endowed by a couple out of Florida.

And, John Nardolillo is taking our orchestra throughout all of Kentucky to perform for students and for communities, and that program is supported by the funding we do with Makers Mark when we sell the bottles and we get the pro -- they sell the bottles and we get the profits from them.

So I'm really proud of the -- the outreach. I know for a fact that, you know, outreach and communications doesn't have any (unintelligible), they're warm fuzzy things in your local neighborhood, but there are 47 groups that have stepped up in doing just that, and I think the work that they're doing solving some of the problems that's very publishable and they've proven it's very fundable.

Another area I mentioned is economic development. You may not hear a lot about this, but for second consecutive year UK ranked first in creating startup companies per ten million dollars of research expenditures, and Joe Chappell's over in the corner and he's got one of those companies in that category.

We started a Venture Club a few years ago just to explain to the people of this region that had money, who'd made their money in real estate or coal or tobacco, or horses, whatever, that they had made their money in intellectual property and the types of jobs that are going to be sustainable, that have high-level motivation and education required.

But we had that for a couple years, and then we actually started an Angel fund for investors to put money up, and we've got two grants now Bluegrass Angels.

We track how much money -- how much new money goes into a start-up company, and this last year 47 million dollars went into 88 early stage companies just in the Fayette County region. And of those 88, 39 had UK intellectual property.

If you look at those 39, the average salary was \$58,000 for their employees; \$15,000 more than what the other companies, still in early stage, just shows you the difference in the intellectual property added value.

I'm pleased with healthcare. When I look down South Limestone, I can't help but be pleased with the progress that we see with the new hospital going up, which we get zero dollars from the State of Kentucky; a new pharmacy building which we sorely needed but

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt

we added some extra space at the top so we could do things like attract Dr. Mark Evers from Galveston to come here to our Markey Cancer Center.

Things you should know about what's happening in the hospital is that not only have their revenues increased substantially, I would say in a couple years they'll be a billion dollar operation, but the way they've done it is really what I'm most proud of and it -- it's a spoken goal and implemented goal to keep patients in their hospitals in their rural communities as long as possible.

Someone just said today in another meeting where I spoke that most of the time when there's someone in the hospital the whole family has to come in one car. No matter where that patient is, be it Lexington, be it Louisville, they'll drive to be there. And what is their hotel? Their hotel is the waiting room, and they also lose employment income while they're there.

We are allowing those patients to stay in their rural areas and then, though, when they have an acute problem that they cannot handle, instead of going to Cincinnati or Vanderbilt or Mayo, they're coming to UK.

The last time I really looked at the numbers, we were 30 percent up in our rural revenues and acuity for the patients that we treated was quite a bit higher than the previous years.

So those are the things that you should instead of just the physical structure going up, the operational block for that place is very positive.

We're coming up on a new legislative session. Somebody asked me the other day now that I'm -- after my retirement if I had a bucket list? I said, no, I've got an anti-bucket list. I've got things I don't want to do any more. Sitting through legislative sessions for 90 days and not getting a budget is one of those things that I will stick in there. Don't tell them that, though, but I'll tell them that in six months.

This is not a budget session. It's a short session. It's only suppose to be 26 days. And for the political science faculty in here, it will be an exciting time I'm sure with the present senate, fairly quiet shy fellow, run for Governor, at least a Governor who wants to stay Governor, and I'm sure every decision he's made will be questioned by every newspaper in the area.

We don't expect there will be any capital available, but we are going to have a meeting Wednesday with our local delegation and see if we can spread out further in bringing some of the leadership -- Greg Stumbo will be here, Bob Damron, Larry Clark from Louisville and we're going to kick off

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt

the meeting by showing them the video of the Reynold's Building.

We took two or three people through that from the legislative group last year to show them how horrible that space is. We actually got it in the house budget. If you recall, there was some discussion about having some capital to build -- to take care of dilapidated K-12 schools.

So Steve Bowers had the wisdom to think about why don't we (unintelligible)is building as an emergency need for education, and so we put it in here and we got it through the house with the whole capital but that whole capital bill died when it got to the Senate and we never go that.

So we are going to kick off that meeting with them. We've got 17 million in there to take care of it, but we're going to kick off that meeting with the video. We don't -- we know we can't get them all to go over there all the time that's the reason we've done a walk-through video with Bob Wiseman describing some of the -- the classroom shortcomings but -- some of the needs of that area. So it is high on our minds.

The one challenge we have that I know that we have problems with the elevators in the White classroom building right now. You know, maintenance and operations dollars have been few and far between. Even for -- something like a new building in pharmacy, typically you would get the M&O building to do their, you know, maintenance of that. We didn't get anything for that. So that's almost like a 3 million dollar cut in our budget because you've got to keep it going.

The community college doesn't even have buildings that they -- I don't know if they even opened them or not because they built new buildings but didn't have the maintenance and operation money.

We've been using our M&O to try to just improve what classes we can and keep things running, but those elevators are in sad shape over there. And I was on the phone with Bill -- Bob Wiseman a few minutes ago and we're replacing one, and trying to get the other running by tomorrow morning.

So capital at this time I think is going to be lean. It's -- there will be some areas we'd like to get some funding. You know, a lot of you hear about bonding authority. It would be nice if we had that authority but there are also still cash limits of what we could bond -- afford to bond our self.

But still my contention is when we -- when I came here in 2001, we got 303 million dollars from the State of Kentucky. This year we're getting 306 million. Three million dollar increase in nine years.

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt

Our revenues have gone from 1.2 billion to 2.4 billion. They ought to start treating us like adults somewhere along the way and let us make some decisions on our tuition; let us make our decisions on capital; let us make our decisions on expenditures. I don't know why they're not. It's a control issue, needless to say. And I'll be saying more about that probably after I step down from this position.

I'm going to -- you know, some of these legislators can't help you, but they can hurt you, so -- don't put that in there.

But you have to -- you have to -- you do a lot of tongue biting and cheek biting in this business, but I did tell them -- I called Greg Stumbo and Dave Williams the day I was going to announce my retirement, and I told both of them, I said one thing I'm going to say at this press conference is that had the State had a normal budget and revenue stream during this period of time would have continued to fund our top 20 plan, and they both said they would have.

And I really do think they want to. I think the challenge and the mentality in this country right now is that nobody wants to mention taxes; they all want to be elected next time, which they start worrying about immediately after they get elected. Right now we'll worry about next year's election, and they don't want to make any hard decisions that will make anybody mad and we can't solve those problems that way. We can't keep giving tax breaks to the rich and keep running your debt up unsustainable and find out some day we're going to go broke and have real problems.

A whole lot of people give a lot of talk to debt ceilings, but I don't think they understand that real debt there, we're -- we're really going to have problems trying to figure out how to sustain a lot of people that are depending on the monies that are available.

So the State's got to make some decisions. I do intend to spend some time in North Carolina and Wisconsin. I want to see, what did their leaders do fifty years ago this State didn't do? What decisions did they make? Was it re-allocation decisions; was it tax decisions; was it somebody gave them a whole bunch of money? What did they do to put their institutions where they are now that we haven't been willing to do?

It turns out both of those states have systems, for one thing. They don't have a corporation of independent entities out there that control them, with individual legislators that keep getting elected over and over again, (unintelligible) more to say about that. So I'm going to stop with that.

I -- I was standing here when I --

when I announced my retirement plans and -- and a reporter asked me: What are you most proud of? And I said: I can't go there. There's too many things. I think the way that most of us have kept our heads up and kept focused during this tight period of time with no salary increases and not a lot to work with we still made progress.

And so the thing I came back to say is I can't say anything in particular although I will say I really do appreciate the attitude that people have shown. I think that we are working; we're still keeping our focus; we're not whining a lot; I wouldn't say we're not totally whining, but we're not whining a lot, and I think it doesn't do a whole lot of good to whine because these folks have memories, and when the time comes they have to give money, they want to see that you're working. You can certainly make a much better argument if you're making progress in tough times than if you're just whining. And I haven't seen that on this campus, and I'm very proud of that. I'll take questions now for a few minutes, and then Hollie can tell me when to quit.

CHAIR:

Questions?

BLONDER:

Lee Blonder, College of Medicine.

TODD:

Yes.

BLONDER:

One of the things that came out -- we had some town hall meetings and one of the things that came out was the relationship between the University and the local area, the town/gown relation in terms of the new mayor going to be coming on board. I wonder if you could comment on that.

TODD:

You know, I've known Jimmy for a long time, and I think we've made a lot of efforts to have Lisa Higgins-Hord's office stay in contact with neighbor organizations. We've had issues we had to deal with, especially after some sporting events.

We've had some meetings with Jimmy Gray already. I've got a meeting with him coming up. We had a recess for him right after he got elected, and I would -- he's a Vanderbilt graduate; most of his family is Vanderbilt folks from Western Kentucky. He's not gone to UK, but he understands the importance of this institution to this city, and he is also one who really does, I think, appreciate the integration of the culture that we bring to the city.

And I don't know any agenda that he really talked about during the election cycle, if there was any implications here. He (unintelligible) jobs is what he wants to create, and he's probably much more interested in doing something downtown in the distillery district than he is out on Coldstream but he's not opposed Coldstream. But he'd like to see, you know, job creation with some -- Richard Florin

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt
(unintelligible) concept are, you know, more abundant there, and I know he's been very cooperative with that.

So we tend to have a good relationship with him. I doubt that he specifically people are asking about. There were other questions about alcohol being on campus and that throws these kids into the neighborhoods. I remember when I first came they (unintelligible) on campus (unintelligible). You need to let us drink on campus, because we can't drink on campus, we go out and drink other places and we get arrested coming back.

So I talked to Joe Burch who many of you know (unintelligible) here a long time ago. He said, well, when they can drink off campus, when they drink on campus the kids could come off -- out of their apartments, onto campus and drink, then get caught going home. But we didn't keep statistics as well back then so it didn't look as bad. But believe me they're going to drink, they're going to drive and they don't always go to one place and -- it's a college town.

I believe we've made some good strides in the whole prevention here. One thing that really, really bothers me with it, about three years in a row we lost a student the first -- first week of classes, and really tragic losses. And we lost two students in -- one of them was our student and one wasn't, at the end of one year. I think we've fortunately been able to avoid that. Those were due to alcohol but unfortunately we've lost some in car wrecks and other issues. We have done some things. The reformatting of K-Week I think has been good; keeps students involved more when they first come here to understand the campus, but I think, well, you always have some issues in a town and gown and periphery campus like this. (Unintelligible.....)

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Arts & Sciences. So you said you couldn't tell us what you're most proud of, but I'm just curious, what do you regret the most that was under your control?

TODD: Is there anything under my control?

GROSSMAN: You are (unintelligible) right?

TODD: Well, you know, it's -- you know, there are a lot of -- you can do something every hour on the hour and you can't do everything everybody wants and there's probably something there I regret. The thing -- you know, I do regret is the whole fiscal situation. We've had more than, I think, about 11 budget cuts in ten years and a lot of those come mid-year and they just wipe out any reserves you have, any worth you've saved.

I -- you know, I'd have to think about that, Bob. You've got me stumped. We

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt

-- we have -- I think I really love the student quality that we're getting now. The changes that are taking place in our undergraduate curriculum where a lot of people thought we weren't going to touch it, we were just going to go research. I can't think of anything there. The people we've hired and brought in, the ones we've retained, I'm proud of that. So I don't know. I'd have to -- I'm kind of an optimist. I think positive almost all the time regardless of what -- what really goes on.

There's (unintelligible) and what really bugs me is that there's some choices this State could make. We have -- you know, we have an incarceration right now, when you think about it, (unintelligible). And Bob Lawson, having read the first chapters of a book he just wrote recently in our College of Law, we can't put people in prison now, there's no room left. So we put them in county jails where they have no recreation, they have no healthcare, they have no food service. They don't get any kind of social realignment. They come out worse than they went in. You'll have a 20-year-old kid who stole a \$300 CD in for 15 years because we have the three strikes and you're out because we're not going to be soft on crime, so let's be soft on education.

So I regret that this State doesn't have the forward thinking leadership and sometimes may not have (unintelligible). But I think that's what I regret. We had an opportunity here to make a difference. I don't accept the fact when these people say, well, everybody is having trouble. Well, not everybody asked their State flagship university to move as (unintelligible) as they asked us to move.

And they just, you know, (unintelligible) moderate sum of money. They just haven't cut it, and they could have wrung out some money out of Medicaid where they don't really monitor it. We got a patient in Eastern Kentucky that got 29,000, 20,000 -- or 29,000 actually, pain pills that Medicaid paid for. We've got a patient in Eastern Kentucky that went to the emergency room 250 times in one year, and went to her private physician once.

We have a company that gets paid on a per transaction basis, but doesn't have to monitor necessarily why that money's being spent. We have sat down with legislators, tried offer to our pharmacy faculty to them to solve those issues. They won't take us up on it.

So that's probably what frustrated me that -- I thought I had a little bit more influence and control over it.

Dr. Singletary told me the first

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt

time he saw me, said, people will tell you that you have a powerful position but, in fact, you have an influential position; the power is still in Frankfort whether you like it or not.

Now, you'd think that 300 million out of 200 billion is not that much, but that's our teaching money; that's our recurring dollars; that's our money we use for our raises and the maintenance money is the money use to keep the buildings going, and that's stayed flat for nine years basically.

So that's -- so I don't -- not having a lot of control. I thought I could influence it more than I've been able to, so that may be my regret, Bob.

Yes.

BRI ON: Gail Bri on, College of Engineering.
Just wondering, if you had the next president in your office for five minutes, what would be three things that you see has to be done for us to continue to progress?

TODD: We -- this may be things they can do or may not be able to get done, but this State has got to make a decision on how it wants to fund higher education because you can't -- you can't get what they asked us -- I don't know if they know what they asked us for. I think it was more of a sound bite than a reality. I don't think some of the people know what a top university does for them. I think we're showing them some of those things.

But higher education funding has got to change. We can't continue to (unintelligible) money around when it's in short supply, and expect to get a whole lot out of it. You have to make investments where you've got a return. You've got to make -- I get tired of people complaining about the Golden Triangle, a big cobweb at best.

But you got to create wealth where you've got a shot at it, and we -- a lot of people create wealth in this part of the State, I bet you that many of them who come from Simpsonville or Madisonville or Pikeville, if they had ability to generate a company and generate wealth, they would give some of it back to their own areas. If we lose them to California and -- and New England, they're not going to do that.

So I think we've got to make up our minds about how to make investments that have some measurable payoff and not just try to keep everybody semi happy which is what we do.

The other thing I would say is I really still feel that we've got to pay attention to the needs of the State, and we fortunately have international students, we fortunately get some very good students from

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt

out of state. But I really think that -- and I was at the chronicle on higher education on Thursday speaking to the editorial board.

I think the land grant mission has disappeared for a lot of the State, and it's not just an AG mission. I think if you conceptually go back and think about what was going on then, it was an AG country. That was our primary income source, and the deal was we're going to create these land grant universities to help stimulate the economy in the State and create jobs.

Well, I think we're still doing a land grant mission when we have start-up companies. I think we're doing a land grant mission when we educate these children and make them competitive in the world.

And I -- I think the -- the first day I was on the job I was walking off the Patterson Plaza after having spoken and a -- and a person asked me, this is your first day on the job, what would you like to be said the last day? And I said, if it could be said that the University of Kentucky, as a land grant University, did more for its home State than any other land grant university, I could live with that. And I -- I think we've done a good job at that. So, keeping focused on that is important.

And third, I would say talent. You've got to have the best people you can get. You've got to hire the best people, you've got to find the resources, and that's where I'm -- I'm most disappointed. We've brought a lot of people here. Your provost -- could have been other places in this country, he chose to come here because he had that Business Plan funded and we pulled the rug right out from under him as soon as he got here. He's never complained about that.

Some of the deans that we got to come here, I've said, I'm kind of embarrassed I got you to come here. Now, I can't give you a raise and you can't give your people a raise. And they say, it's our job to help you find money.

So -- but you got to have strong people. The students, you've got to keep pounding on these kids in Kentucky that don't understand what they need to do because they're parents and their teachers don't know what they're capable of doing, what their opportunities are. You got to be able to go out around the country and get the best people that you can get to come here and you've got to keep your best people here. So, people, money and outreach are the three.

I better quit or you won't get to the other things you've got to do.

SWANSON:

I just thought of another. You are on the Research Committee that's looking at what the National Academy that's looking into the future of public universities. Could you

just comment on that?

TODD:

Well, this is a National Academy meeting. I'll give you a little background as long (unintelligible) taking your time.

I knew I'd been nominated for it because I was head of the APLU or (unintelligible) that year, and the night before they were going to announce this -- this committee, the group of presidents that APLU were meeting, and we had Chad Holliday, who was the past CEO of Dupont who was going to chair that committee, address us, and he's a (unintelligible) he's from Tennessee and we talked the whole night but not about the committee at all, so I thought well, my chances of getting on it is pretty nil, and the list came out on Friday, the next day, and I wasn't on it, so that's just the way it goes.

Sunday night Peter McPherson, who is head of APLU called me and said, I was so irate when I looked at the list of people. There were 21 people initially put on that committee. There was nobody from a land grant university; there was nobody from the south or mid west. It's Stanford, Berkley, Cornell, MIT, and so forth.

And he ended up saying he couldn't take it so he called Chuck Vest, former President of MIT, he's head of National Engineering Academy now, and told him, I think you all are opening yourselves up to a lot of complaints from land grant universities because we create 80 percent of the graduates in this country, and already Bob Rigel of AAU has written an editorial saying that future research money ought to be invested in those big universities that already have a lot of money. Peter McPherson chastised him the next day and he withdrew a little bit of that.

But I got a call from Chuck Vest on Sunday night saying, would you serve on this committee. So I'm on it for that reason. If I mention things like Episcor to these people they choke and it's the ugliest word they've ever heard.

If you go back to the Vannevar Bush Committee, which was appointed by President Roosevelt to try to figure out how can we use technology, because that's what we used in the Manhattan project, but use it for peaceful means to make this country have a long-term competitive future. And then he wrote the report and gave it to Truman, he had six committees, 20 members on each committee and he had one person from the south and it was Vanderbilt.

So we haven't been in the research game, so this is supposed to be looking at the future of American research universities. One thing we our focused on is the F&A rating because we don't -- on our research grant,

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt

you know, we can't charge out what it really cost us to do research.

One of our picking points is the fact that the Federal Government allows industry to recover their full overhead rate, plus put in a profit margin and yet they won't allow us to have the full advantage. So that's one thing that we're going to come out with.

If you remember the Gathering Storm, this is the committee to really look back at the Gathering Storm. There was an intermediate release just recently called Approaching Category Five. You read that report it basically says nothing in the Gathering Storm has been done. This country has sat flat and not paying attention. So we're going to respond to those. We're going to pick off the higher education pieces in Gathering Storm and say, this is what we propose.

There are two members on there that -- there are several, but there's two, past CEO of Eli Lilly and past CEO of DuPont are on there and both of them say we don't do basic research any more. We need universities to do it. So here they're telling us that they need us to do it, but we can't get our overhead rate. That's ridiculous.

The other thing I'm trying to propose, if I can get through the -- is I think that from the State, as well as Federal, we need to get our research buildings paid for out of economic development funds, and so that would allow us to take our academic buildings and bid against these other universities for academic buildings in the State.

And I think the Federal Government ought to put up some new stimulus money to invest in research facilities that the State has to match, and a State doesn't have enough sense to put up a match, then they ought to become a third world country. But -- so my proposal survives into the Federal Government, put up some kind of a peer review process where you have to make a case for your research buildings.

You got to show it's going to have some return. You've got to be able to show you really need the square footage. Your state's going to have to step up and put some money in, and then we could build a research capacity.

One thing this country has is a network of research facility that the other -- China and India haven't built yet; not that they won't. I think the peer review is very strong in this nation, and we have proven -- and I told McConnell and Chandler, we are not afraid of the peer review process. Take the earmarked money and put it out there for peer review. Don't let this go somewhere

else and be squandered; and let us go for it because we got 110 million last time that happened.

So I -- if we're serious about doing research, then that endowment is -- the State's got to step up to it. How many states are cutting budgets worse than ours? A lot of them are. And so they will put money in their check when they've got state (unintelligible) teachers that live next door, where they got -- they don't have the guts to tell state employees that they can't get full medical benefits after 26 years, so I need another job and all (unintelligible). It's just not realistic how we do business in this state for people right now. They don't have the guts to go out and cut cost in prisons and Medicaid, they're not going to put money in research universities. They got to get over those three, four stumbling blocks before they get to us. In fact, the Federal Government is going to have to get serious about it, and so that's an area we're looking at.

But there is enough concern that Congress asked the National Academy to put together something to look into the future of the American research universities. So that's a good step. So, Gathering Storm went K through 12, all the way through, you know, the economy and everything. This is just going to be focused on higher education.

Every state has got to have a research university. Bob Rigel and I argue about this a little bit; because that's the future, I think, that's where your new ideas are going to come from.

And one thing I want to say about, you know, I'm an engineer and you'll think I'm pretty techy, but every engineer in Silicon Valley has created ten more jobs that aren't an engineering job, and that's -- that's where they come from. We need people in other capacities that aren't engineers. And in this world you need foreign language. You need world history and you need a lot more than what you needed, I think, when I grew up, and you could still live in the vacuum of the United States.

And so it's vitally important we do what we do, and I'm glad to be on it. It's a struggle because I'm on another committee, Business Higher Education Forum where you have 30 CEOs of Boeing, Raytheon and Pfizer and all those folks, then you have 30 university presidents, mostly from the big-shot schools and the vocabularies just don't match; you know, the people have come here say some of these companies have such disdain for higher education and they never think we'll ever do anything useful whatsoever.

And then the higher education people stand there, and especially if they're

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt

from some of these -- these AAU, and they say, we don't have a problem, maybe with, you know, applications, so what's the real issue. And they don't look at everybody. They don't look at the country. They're doing fine. They're doing too good for the rest of the country's good. So we're going to have to call that to task, I think, so I'm kind of enjoying to do some of that. (Unintelligible) making progress or not, but...

Thank you very much. Thank you all for what you do. I am proud of you.

SWANSON: Thank you. We'll get on with our meeting now, and we have minutes from the November 8, they're not ready.

BROTHERS: Right.

SWANSON: We have returning with us today, but today acting as Parliamentarian, we have Kaveh Tagavi, former Senate Council Chair. Thank you, Kaveh.

TAGAVI: Sure.

SWANSON: We have a reminder with finals week, please submit our final grades within 72 hours of the end of the final exam; not on the Monday at the end of finals week.

On your behalf, I approved the inclusion of four students to UK December 2010 degree list and on behalf of Senate Council, these were omitted due to a college clerical errors. We have two ED students, two BE students, two SW student, and two Arts & Science students.

We also have an update with respect to proposed changes to the Administrative Regulations. That happened at the Board of Trustees meeting. Joe Peek is here. Do you want to say anything about this, Joe.

PEEK: Well, other than it's going to be changed over to a GR from an AR, and so -- and with a GR you have to have two readings for that, means it takes a little bit longer. But I think, you know, we're making progress and Sheila is among several people who have spent a lot of time trying to get this going. So it's not going to be perfect but it's going to be better, I think, than what we have.

SWANSON: I assume it's been -- it was received very favorably at the --

PEEK: Yeah.

SWANSON: -- (unintelligible) --

PEEK: I was on there -- I was wearing jeans. I had to go. I was on the next committee that overlapped, and I had to leave so I wasn't there for that.

SWANSON: We rescinded one degree and subsequently approved the conferral of a different degree for one student in the College of Design.

We had our elected officers last week, and you have me for one more year and we also have Robert Grossman as our incoming

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt
vice-chair. Thank you, Robert.
Many thanks to Joe Chappell. Joe
will be leaving the Senate Council and his
term on the Senate and -- and look at his
smile. This is his last Senate meeting.
Thank you.

Professor Shelly Steiner, would you
like to update us on the Presidential Search
Committee meeting?

STEINER: Well, there hasn't been a meeting
since the last -- I updated you. I have a
description of the president if you want --
of the -- a description of the president, if
you want to put it on the overhead and I can
show it. There are a couple -- just a couple
of points. The meeting's running late and I
don't want to take time...

Well, you know, most of this -- it
-- it came up that there was some -- a little
bit of discussion as to what should actually
be in it. I think it came out okay. I think
the main important thing I have in red, which
is -- I'll -- I'll put this up so you can
look at the whole thing. I'll put it up on
the Senate website.

There is strategic and visionary
leadership as evidenced by achievement in
education, research and service. And a
record of scholarly achievement and
understanding of the importance of
corroboration and shared governance.

The rest of it is -- you'll see,
but these are very important issues. There
was some question as to whether these should
-- the question of scholarly should be put in
there, and I think that the -- I think the
Search Committee -- it -- it bodes well in my
opinion. I think overwhelmingly people
thought it should be in there and that we
should be searching for a scholar.

So, that's about it.

Any questions? We didn't meet --
we haven't met since the last time.

DEBSKI: Could I ask a question?

STEINER: Yeah. Of course.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, Biology.

There's been some discussion about
a change in process from what we had last
time; that is, the top candidates not
interviewing with faculty and --

STEINER: I think it depends on how -- how
late in the process. I don't know -- yeah,
not early on they didn't last time.

DEBSKI: Well, no, I'm actually referring to
an interview that a member of the Board of
Trustees did on the radio, and he basically
said that the Board was going to choose based
-- there would be no interviews and would be
(inaudible)... in terms of, you know, the
staff and the faculty as having done in the
past.

STEINER: Well, it hasn't gone through the
Search Committee, so I don't know -- I don't

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt

know what you're referring to. I can find out and come back. I know there's several stages we've had --

DEBSKI : -- (unintelligible) --

STEINER: -- you know, the stage you're (unintelligible) you know, the executive search firm that did the last search is doing this search, so -- and I thought by March that the procedure was going to be the same, but I don't --

DEBSKI : I (inaudible) --

STEINER: I will check on it and get back to you.

SWANSON: Joe, can you clarify?

PEEK: Yeah. Just -- just real quickly. I don't think a decision has been made, but there has been voiced by the Search Committee very strongly that it is very dangerous to identify candidates because they can lose jobs or they can be punished in some way. And so you get a much better group of applicants, but then there's also the conflict about, but if you're a state university, open records, open meetings there's a bit of a conflict.

So to my knowledge no decision has been made that you're not going to see anyone but the final candidate but there is some strong sentiment on the Board and certainly with the search firm to go that way and so -- so the suggestion is they -- my -- my suggestion is they get a heck of a lot of input before you make -- get under that last lap, rather than just springing it on people.

I don't know which way it's going to go but I know there's a lot of sentiment that we need to get the best, you know, group of candidates we can and the only way to do that is keep it secret. Makes me a little nervous, but I had 1 of 20 votes.

SWANSON: Thank you. We still need faculty volunteers for a number of committees. Committees performing summative evaluations of the Graduate School and Engineering deans; for the periodic program reviews for the Communications and Information Studies, for the College of -- for the Graduate School, the College of Medicine, for the College of Pharmacy and College of Social Work.

Please contact Sheila Brothers so we can get those committees completed.

I'd also like to update you on the following activities. One of the things that happened during our retreat this summer was we discussed the possibility of forming a Grievance Committee, and the possibility of forming a Joint Enterprise with the Staff Senate.

What we have done, and the Staff Senate really took the lead on this because we were a little slow on getting our committee on committees formed.

But the committee on committees met

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt

with the staff senate, and what we are charging a new committee, so we've got three staff senators headed by Terry Olson, as a co-chair, so we'll be looking for faculty co-chairs and what was our charge was to formulate a recommendation for creating an employment Ombud office here at UK.

And the rationale for that is that this will provide a mechanism for addressing faculty/staff work disputes. Many of our benchmarks have that. They have a lovely report that they generated that I can share with you if you're interested. So, for example, at the University of Iowa, last year they had around 267 folks, that'd be faculty, staff and students visited their office.

And it's consistent also with the actions and policies of most top 20 institutions and our benchmarks, and it's consistent with UK's Strategic Plan, in particular Objective 3.3: "Create a workplace culture that articulates values and initiatives to engage employees as stakeholders."

So, please, we need at least three more faculty members on that committee. Contact Sheila to volunteer.

All right. So the next section then, we have our committee reports. Our first committee report will be the Senate's Admissions & Academic Standards Committee. We have Chair Alison Davis. Alison.

DAVIS: All right. We have four proposals that came to our Committee. The first one is a proposed change to the Bachelor in Health Science Clinical Leadership and Management. Essentially they are looking to get rid of the requirement that each student that comes in needs to have one year of work experience after their Associate's degree, and they're asking for that to be removed. The rationale is it gives students the opportunity to transfer smoothly and directly to UK's Bachelor in Health Science program and Clinical Leadership and Management.

There's a motion to approve this that came from the Committee with a positive recommendation. It was unanimous, and...

SWANSON: So we have a motion from the Committee. What we need now is a discussion of the motion? Any discussion?

All right. Let's go ahead and favor -- let's go ahead and vote then. All in favor, please raise your hand? All right. Opposed? Abstained?

DAVIS: Motion carries. Thank you. The last three motions all are dealing with the Art Department. This one is a proposed change to progression requirements for a Bachelor's in Art Studio, and essentially they have changed one of the pre-major requirements. It went from at least a 2.8 grade point average to a letter

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt
grade of C in each of the pre-major
foundation courses, and they've restructured
a little bit their -- their major
requirements just to make it a little bit
more clear; and their rationale for doing
that is it aligns with their peer
institutions and it is a greater rigor and
that it professionalizes students at an
earlier stage in their undergraduate career.

So there was a motion to approve
this -- this change that to the Bachelor's in
Art Studio. It comes from the committee with
a positive recommendation. Again, this was
an unanimous vote.

SWANSON: Discussion?
All in favor? Opposed? Abstained?
Motion carries. Thank you.

DAVIS: The next one is very, very similar.
This one is for the Bachelor's in Fine Arts,
the Art Studio. Again, it's the same changes
and, to make things short and sweet, both
carry a motion that -- to approve these
changes and with a positive recommendation
and, again, the vote was unanimous at the
committee level.

SWANSON: Any discussion? All in favor?
CHAPPELL: Wait, wait. I'm not sure I
understand what the motion -- what is the
proposed change?

DAVIS: It's the same change as the
Bachelor's in Art Studio where there is a --

CHAPPELL: A grade change.

DAVIS: There's a grade change and there's
also a little bit of a reformatting of their
major just to make it a little bit clearer,
and it's trying to get more education at the
earlier stages of their undergraduate year.

CHAPPELL: Thank you.

SWANSON: Further discussion?
All in favor? Opposed? Abstain?
Motion carries. Thank you.

DAVIS: Okay. The last one is proposed
change to the progression requirements for a
Bachelor's in Art Education. This one before
did not -- did not have any pre-major
requirements.

They are now including a set of
pre-major requirements that are very similar
to the ones that are in the other two
programs we just mentioned. The idea is that
the Art Education program is built on a
distance (unintelligible) approach,
therefore, the requirements and expectations
of those students should be aligned with
those other two majors.

I don't think there's anything else
that's very different. It's just putting in
a pre-major requirement with a GPA of 2.5 to
progress in the pre-major and major status.

Again, there's a motion to approve
this. It comes from the committee with
positive recommendation, and there was a
unanimous vote in favor of this.

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt
SWANSON: Discussion?
All right. Let's go for a vote.
All in favor? Opposed? Abstain?
Motion carries. Thank you.
Our next committee report is the
Senate Academic Program Committee. Dan
Wermeling cannot be with us today. He is
attending sick children, so, Tom, would you
mind describing the program, please? This is
a proposed new PhD in Clinical and
Translational Sciences.

KELLY: This is a PhD program,
interdisciplinary PhD Program. This is
directed to the individuals that have
professional training in medicine, dentistry,
pharmacy who are interested in doing
supplemental training, research training to
able to participate in clinical translation
research as part of their professional
careers.
The program is a -- the PhD program
is interdisciplinary -- interdisciplinary in the
sense that advisory committee membership is
multi-departmental. There's a requirement
for one -- the program will be housed in the
Department of Behavioral Science. There will
be requirement for one faculty member for the
Department of Behavioral Science to
participate on the advisory committee, but
other committee membership is eligible to all
faculty with appointments at the graduate
school.

The individuals coming in to the
PhD with professional degrees or they're in
current professional program, dual degree
program, will be given the academic
equivalent of a Master's Degree coming into
the program so that the course requirements
will be able to move forward from that, be
able to maximize the amount of time that
they're able to spend on research.

SWANSON: Okay. This came through the Senate
Council with a positive recommendation. The
motion is from the committee, it's a
recommendation that the Senate approve the
proposal of new PhD in Clinical and
Translational Sciences effective Fall 2011.

CONNORS: Discussion?
Terry Connors, College of Ag.
I understand your philosophy and
what this (unintelligible), but I don't
understand what translational sciences means.
Could you explain that?

KELLY: Well, the definition that -- we're
using the definition that's coming forward
from the National Institute of Health. It's
actually a bit of a complicated definition
and includes multiple parts. Translation
could be either from basic laboratory
research to the bedside, trying to improve
basic research to improve care of individual
clinics. It could also mean translation of
evidence-based research that's generated at

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt

an academic medical center, translating that knowledge into the community and then having communication from the community back to the academic medical centers and back to the basic scientist.

CONNORS: Thank you.

SWANSON: Further questions?

All right. Let's go ahead vote

then. All in favor? Opposed? Abstain?

Motion carries. Thank you.

All right. Our next committee report is from the Senate's Academic Organization & Structure Committee. Dwight Denison, chair.

DENISON: There is widespread discussion regarding the need for better education -- educated children in the STEM discipline. Meeting this objective requires better trained teachers in the STEM discipline, so the faculty of the College of Education proposed the creation of a new department that would facilitate training in technology and research (unintelligible) STEM education. The new Department in the College of Education (unintelligible) -- currently in the Department of Curriculum Development.

The proposed STEM Education Department will also provide institutional coordination for various faculty members in the STEM disciplines across campus who are affiliated with STEM education.

The new department will become the home for the current undergraduate mathematic and science secondary education program, the advanced Master's of Science and STEM Education program, the Master's of Arts and Education with initial certification in mathematic and science programs.

Future plans will include creation of new Bachelors and Doctoral programs in science, technology and engineering and/or mathematic education.

The proposed STEM department would focus greater attention on marketing and recruitment of students to help to alleviate the shortage of STEM certified teachers and researches.

The proposal comes with the support of the dean of the College of Education, dean of College of Arts & Sciences, dean of College of Engineering, chair of the Department of Curriculum Development, chair of Mathematics, chair of Chemistry, chair of Biology, chair of physics and astronomy, and chair of Earth & Environmental Sciences.

The Senate Academic Organization & Structure Committee has reviewed the proposal twice, and sends it to the Senate Council and Senate faculty with a recommendation to be approved.

SWANSON: So, we'll be voting on two motions. The first motion is that the Senate endorse

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt
the proposed new Department of Science,
Technology, Engineering and Math Education
based on its academic merit.

The second motion is recommendation
that the Senate endorse a proposed new
Department of Science, Technology,
Engineering and Math Education based on its
non-academic merits.

DEBSKI : Discussion?
 Liz Debski, Biology.
SWANSON: Where did the motions come from --
 The motion comes from the
 committee.
DEBSKI : (Inaudible) --
SWANSON: Yeah, on the SAOSC. Are you on the
 (Unintelligible) Okay.
DENISON: The two motions that are here, are
 those that are more (unintelligible) --
SWANSON: That's right.
DENISON: And then most of these are for --
 for the academic merits and (inaudible) have
 comments for the second motion, which will
 get into some (unintelligible) -----.
SWANSON: Kaveh, would you like to clarify?
TAGAVI : I'm thinking if you -- if we
 approve the first motion, how could you not
 approve the second one?
SWANSON: We did last year.
TAGAVI : Okay.
SWANSON: Bill, didn't we? Yeah, yeah.
 Bob Grossman?
GROSSMAN: One could decide that the proposal
 has merit, but the resources are not
 sufficient to allow the creation of a
 separate department or -- so in that case the
 Senate might -- might endorse the proposal on
 its academic merits but -- but decline to
 endorse it on its non-academic merits.
 Conversely, one could decide that -- well,
 probably if one decides the academic merits
 weren't there, they're probably would also
 (unintelligible) non-academic merits as well.
BRION: Gail Brion, Engineering.
 I was just trying to figure, again,
 what a non-academic merit would be, and I
 think we've just had that clarified.
SWANSON: Further discussions? Questions?
FERRIER: Walter Ferrier, College of
 Business.
 The senate will endorse or is that
 kind of an implicit approval?
UNIDENTIFIED: Exactly.
SWANSON: It's an approval.
FERRIER: Approval.
UNIDENTIFIED: On the academic.
SWANSON: On the academic. That we should
 have that approved?
BROTHERS: Yeah. Motion made should be
 approve on academic merits and then
 endorsement on --
SWANSON: And then endorse on the non-
 academic.
NADEL: Point of information.

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt

SWANSON:

Yes.

NADEL:

Does this mean that the second one is simply advisory and has no statutory status?

SWANSON:

Yes. That's right. According to the school of Davy Jones.

MILLER:

Joe Miller, Communications.

So if I understand this, the new department will not displace the Department of Curriculum & Instruction and so there is still going to a remaining department after these faculty have been moved?

SWANSON:

Could I have somebody from the college answer that?

WILHELM:

Yes. Jennifer Wilhelm, Department of Curriculum & Instruction, College of Education.

You know, basically it's the reorganization of the current Department of Curriculum & Instruction, which Parker Fosson is the current chair. And so the STEM people that are in that department will now, we're hoping, form their own STEM Education Department. Would you like to elaborate, Parker?

FOSSON:

Parker Fosson, Curriculum & Instruction.

It will still be Curriculum & Instruction Department, but we'll just have the STEM faculty forming a new department.

PRATS:

Armando Prats, English.

Can somebody give me an idea on how creating a different department will make education better?

WILHELM:

Well --

PRATS:

I mean like an example of what the difference would be?

WILHELM:

Yes. Well, for one thing what we're going to do is we're going to create innovative undergraduate programs, so currently, for example, our -- our teachers are -- are the teachers that are in our program that are undergraduate math and science programs, cannot get certified to teach in four years. So they're in our program and the only way that we can get them certified to teach is to go into our Master's initial certification program, and right now only 60 percent of them -- oh, sorry, 60 percent do not go into that Master's initial certification program (unintelligible) ----- universities like Eastern Kentucky, so we're losing them.

So one of the things that we want to do with (unintelligible) is to create a new undergraduate program where they can get certified in four years to teach in the STEM area.

PRATS:

So if I can just follow-up with you: But does the certification really -- you know, do they thereby gain greater ability to teach, to know more about science, engineering, you know, wouldn't want this to

be a kind of Wizard of Oz thing that you just say, well, they have a certificate now and, therefore, they can -- they are better trained or something? Is there going to be a difference in what --

WILHELM: Yes. Absolutely. And, in fact, (unintelligible) ---- been developing this program for the last four years, so she (unintelligible) to become new undergraduate program.

MOORE-SCHRODER: Margaret Moore-Schroder, College of Education.

Currently (unintelligible) in our undergraduate certification program, they have not been revamped or revised for over 15 years. And many of the course have been outdated and worn out by the content areas that come to the department with a new undergraduate's program not only addresses the attrition rates that we're experiencing right now but it also updates the contents of new standards of United States that's coming out with and then making higher standards for our undergraduate students. And, in fact, all the content departments are really excited about it, and they're endorsing it and the standards in the courses they are taking are better than the ones we offer now.

PRATS: Thank you.

SWANSON: Other questions? Okay. We're ready to vote.

NADEL: Point of order.

SWANSON: Okay.

NADEL: You have to have an (unintelligible) debate the motion before you vote on it.

SWANSON: All right. Let's stop discussing and start debating then.

BRI ON: Can this new -- Gail Bri on, College of Engineering. Sorry.

And there's no way under the current structure that we can create this new degree with departmental structure?

MOORE-SCHRODER: No. Not right now, it's not -- no.

BRI ON: Can you say why?

MOORE-SCHRODER: There's a lot of different reasons why, but the main is structural within the department. Within the department there is six different program areas, Literacy, Social Studies, Science, Mathematics, (unintelligible), and there's over thirteen different degree programs right now. If we were to form an undergraduate program within math and sciences in the department structure, it would actually affect three other program areas and we would have to do it all jointly in one big program and we wouldn't be able to specialize in the science and mathematic areas that we want to. It would be more of a general secondary education degree, which is what we're trying to avoid.

DENI SON: Dwight Deni son, Graduate School.

One of -- that was one of the things that the looked at is, you know, (unintelligible) an existing structure. Otherwise, what are the -- what (unintelligible) means we get the faculty involved in this coming from these other colleges and it provides (unintelligible) coordination which will (unintelligible) the curriculum couldn't really be handled under the current structure; provide this infrastructure to other faculty to provide formalized input into the curriculum.

SWANSON: Are there other points you would like to make?
All right. I'd like to call a vote please. I'd like to call a vote on the motion?

TAGAVI: Go ahead.
SWANSON: Okay. All in favor?
UNIDENTIFIED: Motion one?
SWANSON: Motion one, please. Opposed? Abstain? Motion carries. Thank you.
Vote on the second, please. All in favor? Opposed? Abstain?

Motion carries. Thank you.
All right. Our next order of business is approval of the Academic Calendars. They are in your packet and one of the reasons why they are so thick is you have the (unintelligible). We have a motion on the table, a recommendation that the Senate approve the academic calendars as submitted. Actually, I need a -- I need a motion to that effect; is that correct, Kaveh?

TAGAVI: Is it coming from Senate Council?
SWANSON: Yes.
TAGAVI: No, you don't need any motion.
SWANSON: Okay. We need a vote, then?
TAGAVI: Yes.
SWANSON: Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstain? Motion carries. Thank you.

All right. No. 6, Implementation of General Education Curriculum. If you'll recall this is our second reading. It was first introduced last Senate meeting, and was introduced by Associate Provost for Undergraduate education, Mike Mullen, and let me just remind you what's happened in the mean time is that we've had discussions, we've had questions coming forth and -- where is Mike? Mike, would you like to come forward and talk to us about it please?

MULLEN: Thank you, Hollie. Again, it's great to be here with you today and I'm glad to have a quorum on this cold blustery day.
It's a pleasure to be here to once again to present on behalf of undergraduate education. I was just want to remind you that we did, indeed, have that first reading on November 3rd, and at that time the motion was to approve implementation of the new general education curriculum for Fall 2011.

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt

And if you remember, there were two requirements that needed to be satisfied in order to move forward with that as per the Senate, and that was to ensure that we had adequate resources in place and that processes were in place to oversee the program; approval, processes and oversight of the program.

We discussed those particular issues at the last meeting, and the fact that the Provost here has allocated 5.3 million dollars over this year and next year to the core list curriculum; that we have adequate seats or classroom resources, if you will, enough space for students.

That's already lined up this coming fall across all ten course areas or course template areas, and we also provided an overview of the interim general education oversight committee; its structure, how its functioning, the -- the courses that they have been handling. I think you recall they have at least -- have received and are handling, as of last month, 79 courses this -- just since this past summer. That is now over 87 with more coming in almost daily so there's been a lot of work going on with your faculty committee that is charged with overseeing the process.

And we talked about -- had a short discussion on assessment issues as well at that meeting.

During that discussion a couple of key questions arose, and the first of those two questions was what was the source of that particular funding and the Provost has -- has provided this breakout. If you remember, we had the 5.3 million dollars for a cost of two years. Again, this is recurring money. This is permanently -- permanent money that is there to provide for the hiring of lecturers, full-time lecturers, of tenured-lined faculty and of well placed TAs across the curriculum, that will allow us to move not only the smaller classrooms in some cases but also to provide for those breakout sessions in courses so that all of our students are having a period in each class, in these general education classes, where they're in a small class environment and truly having a world class education with respect to their general education program; one where they're interacting with those -- those lecturers, in many cases with faculty and certainly with excellent TAs.

So that's -- that was the way I applied (unintelligible) 5.3 million is being allocated, to which of that 4.089 million is being allocated from tuition revenue increases. That comes not only from the fact that we are -- that we have had tuition increases, 6 percent this year, and we will see another tuition increase next year. But

we've also had, as was pointed by President Todd earlier in the meeting, increase of retention rates, almost a 6 -- or 5-1/2 percent retention increase in the last four years. Those represent real dollars that are coming back after the first year the student is here and so as we continue to work on increasing our retention, those dollars will be in place for that and the Provost has also then re -- reallocated 1.2 million dollars internally towards general education for a total investment -- new investment in undergraduate education at this University of 5.3 million dollars.

So that's what our -- that was where -- the answer to that question. Now, are there any comments on that before I move on?

NADEL: Yes. Alan Nadel, A&S.
In September Frank Butler gave us a report on the finances of this school that indicated including tuition increases and including a reallocated funds, that we had a 7 million dollar deficit, so this would indicate that he falsified data if this is true.

Could you please tell me which data is correct and how would -- how do we judge that?

MULLEN: I'll let Subbaswamy answer that one.

SUBBASWAMY: You are welcome to call Crit Mullen to come and take a look at the books immediately --

NADEL: That's totally (unintelligible) --

SUBBASWAMY: I apologize, I apologize. But no one's falsifying anything.

When -- in the budget-making process, which begins sometime in January, we start out by having budget (unintelligible) package where you put all the known projected expenditures and then you pay (unintelligible) and that number will be 10 million dollars (unintelligible).

By the time we finally present the budget to the Board for package, that's already (unintelligible) taking out the deductions off the top, so we know how much we have to reduce and that's then sent to all the charges by way of reduction.

And what I did was -- and not only did I reduce however much they need to get reduced by allocating to all the colleges, I -- they reduce a little bit more, and that's what the allocation money comes from and by, what, 1.5 percent. Instead I 2 percent and that order, available for the allocation towards that.

NADEL: Well, I would, with all due respect, refer you to the minutes of the September meeting when Mr. Butler was rather vigorously questioned about this data and he indicated none of these possibilities. The

re-allocations were already figured in, whether it was to "A" or "B" and it's still shows a 7 million deficit --

SUBBASWAMY: I beg your --

NADEL: -- and even with a 5 million here, that would still represent the a two million dollar deficit and he was quite emphatic about that and he indicated that it was recurring funds and, again, I would refer you to the minutes because I'm not challenging what you're saying in the least. I'm simply saying that it is not consistent with he told us at the September meeting.

SUBBASWAMY: If I may, I think -- Well, that is in regard to the FY '11 budget and FY '12 budget (Unintelligible)

NADEL: He projected for the -- I'm sorry, (unintelligible)

SUBBASWAMY: Right. But the (unintelligible)

NADEL: He was using your number -- he's also projecting in the future saying it was going to get worse because of certain short-term funds --

SUBBASWAMY: (Unintelligible)

NADEL: -- (unintelligible) he was projecting out several years --

SUBBASWAMY: We -- we --

NADEL: -- indicating that this was a projected --

SUBBASWAMY: For example, we haven't balanced the budget it and we will be drafting today for a budget or that start out by knowing how much of a shortfall there will be, which will make it -- you know, the Board -- Board members will do that we're obligated to present a balanced budget.

And so by July -- June 30 -- June 30, (unintelligible) submit this to the Board for approval, it will have (unintelligible) by the -- we have to do. So when there has not been any actual (unintelligible). They ask me, you know, if there is an deficit, how much deficit would there be. It would be some -- somewhere around (unintelligible) you put in a dollar you pick up all -- planning to put 1 (unintelligible) budget 10 million dollar deficit. That's not to say one way or another by the (unintelligible)

NADEL: Well, again, I don't want to debate that or -- but, again, it means that that was not the explanation or the kind of explanation we received in that report. And whether or not there was an intention to deceive this body or whether it was simply a question of, well, competence, I don't know. But I do know --

SUBBASWAMY: It was communications, perhaps.

NADEL: Well, competent communications then. Yeah, I do -- I do know this, and this is where the real (unintelligible) it about accountability. People make statements here that we as representatives of the faculty take to be reliable. And it turns out that the impression we get and the information we

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt

get creates an impression that has turned out not to be one we could rely on, whether technically there was rhetorical gesture here, then there seems to be no accountability when giving this body a false impression.

You or me or anybody else in any administration are bonus or they are (unintelligible) of a continued employment here? And this is the body of the faculty, and one can say anything and never be accountable for the impressions they give or the things they say then they're essentially saying the faculty here is embellishment to the running of this University. Is that an appropriate thing for them to do?

SUBBASWAMY: If that is indeed that transpired, no, it is not appropriate.

NADEL: So what is the mechanism for accountability?

SUBBASWAMY: Should I let the --

NADEL: Why don't you tell me the mechanism for accountability. That's all I want to know.

SUBBASWAMY: I think that (unintelligible) do you want me to go and look into what was actually said and what's in the minutes, and then --

NADEL: The mechanism across the board for accountability, does it affect raises or continued employment or censure or anything?

SUBBASWAMY: Well, what we know from the (unintelligible) is that we have (unintelligible) procedures for (unintelligible) all administrators, and that involves (unintelligible) and so forth. They were mechanism and a good mechanism followed by another --

NADEL: So part of that mechanism is what

--

SWANSON: Can we please --

NADEL: -- (unintelligible) --

SWANSON: -- restrict the discussion to Gen Ed, please?

MULLEN: So the second issue that was put on the -- on the table at that particular time was a question from -- from one of the Senators on the long-term oversight of General Education, and as you know we put in place this past summer, the Senate Council, actually the Senate (unintelligible) put in place the General Education Oversight Committee, and this past summer we put in place the mechanisms for review, and that review process was to continue for a year.

Part of the question that came about at the last meeting had to do with long-term oversight and processes for faculty representation, and what has transpired from that is that the General Education Oversight Committee will formulate a policy that will be presented no later than September 2011 for a permanent structure -- a permanent

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt
structure to include processes for how
faculty are using those committees to include
elections, much of whom the Undergraduate
Council, Graduate Council, ACPC, their
Council, and so forth.

I believe that was part of the crux
of the question at that particular time and
so the council will -- will put that -- that
proposal together for this coming year.

And then -- there we go. Finally,
I just want to mention that Senate Council
did vote unanimously to recommend
implementation of -- of General Education,
and so I'd like to turn it back over to Holly
at this point for discussion and -- and vote.

SWANSON: Okay. All right. So now most
(unintelligible) the University have approved
the implementation of the General Education
curriculum for Fall 2011 for all incoming
undergraduates.

KOVASH: Any discussion?
Art Kovash, Arts & Sciences.
Wonder what the (inaudible). How
do you see the transition being done for the
next three years?

MULLEN: Again, the colleges are all working
behind the scenes right now to change their
program, number one, the programs to become
involved in what the 30-hour General
Education and that (inaudible) is ongoing.
(inaudible) without those programs
(inaudible) the implementation approval for
that program.

You know, obviously we're going to
have to have what (inaudible) in terms of
handling current students that are the USP in
terms of overseeing the courses that they're
taking, there will be many of the courses
available in the transitioning to make sure
that (inaudible) students can catch up in the
course work they need (inaudible) we'll have
to look at these courses and -- and maybe
(inaudible) or -- or a current --

So there will be in any of the
(inaudible) changes in (inaudible) from times
one of two years of transition where you're
giving current students through and while
taking the UN. And so it will be a
collaborative effort between my office, the
General Education Oversight Committee, and so
forth, to make sure what your (inaudible)
cutoff will be during that time. And, of
course, the student (inaudible) that came in
this year can choose to graduate under this
year's calendar.

SWANSON: Any other questions?

CARL: Lee Carl in Arts & Sciences.

For clarification, those students
who come with courses from other
institutions, are transferring, first, is
there a process for approving individual
courses for Gen Ed, that individual staying
for finals or there's a whole body of Gen Ed

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt
for a student (unintelligible) or students
AP credit for history, (unintelligible) for
what there have not explicit learning
outcomes that are matching on a (inaudible).
What kind of (unintelligible) do you all
have?

MULLEN: There are discussions going on at
the State level that are put on by House Bill
160, where instate transfers -- and we are
building an infrastructure right now that
allows for mapping of General Education
courses if they (unintelligible) community
college against the (unintelligible) common
learning outcomes, but the State is working
on valid (unintelligible).

And so if -- if -- if a -- if
Western maps this particular course as the
being a learning outcome from Humanity, then
that course would transfer and it'd meet
(unintelligible). That's a statewide kind
of a transfer mechanism that is being put
into place.

The out of state issue will -- of
course, we'll have to start looking at those,
and we know from the General Education
Oversight Committee that this is an issue
that we have tackle and the discussions are
ongoing with it.

But as much as we've done in the
past, if we have courses that come to us and
we've not seen them, we would have to have
some way of having faculty members look at
those and say, does this meet as a learning
outcome for a course in U.S. Citizenship or
in Social (unintelligible). So we'll have to
have that process in place, and of course
we'll make sure that that process is there.

So the block transfer, if a student
goes to a community college and finishes all
of their general education, they would be
able to come straight in and they would done.
But their -- their freshman during --
especially General Education, be very much
different than ours.

(Unintelligible) decision are --
are basically decisions of the faculty, and
we're working on a process where
undergraduate studies will start to look at
what the AT looks like and so we'll be
working with faculty to make sure that those
(unintelligible) are made right as well --

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Arts & Sciences.

Just a follow-up to that, just so I
understand, are you saying that regardless of
what the curriculum is from these acceptable
colleges, if they say a student completed Gen
Ed requirements by the of their two years we
are obliged to accept that as being general
orientation so that --

MULLEN: Yes, Bob. All -- if they leave
their community college with an Associate of
Arts & Science and has complete all the
General Education, then, yes, they get to do

a block transfer.

GROSSMAN: General Education of the community college --

MULLEN: The community college, and we have that in place now, so that's nothing different than we have --

GROSSMAN: So there's going to be discussions with the community college to strive to encourage them to align their General Education Program to more of what we are doing here?

MULLEN: Well, of course, there are exceptions going on in each of the areas of General Education as defined by the State right now. (Unintelligible) faulty to faculty from the university as to what does a set of -- what do the outcomes look like that we can all agree, and we -- and we will have -- be sharing those with you, too, as they become (unintelligible).

The reason we are charged by the State for coming with the mechanism that allows students to easily transfer General Education from one university to another in order to facilitate

KORNBLUH: Mark Kornbluh, Dean of Arts & Sciences.

Our faculty members participating in each of these committees and united in (unintelligible) personal time to (unintelligible). The faculty members --

MULLEN: And their voices are being heard.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski.

I'm wondering if you have any thoughts about the implementation of this having impact of students in their actual on the education of the students' interaction --

MULLEN: My personal feeling? We haven't got the program in place yet. But if we are spending more money on more faculty/lecturers and PA and we're providing more opportunities for our students to interact with us, then I don't -- I don't see how that can do anything but improve the education experience of our students.

SUBBASWAMY: I believe Ms. Debski was asking a slightly different question; which is, are you talking money from upper division for lower division.

The answer is: are taking money from the professionals schools to undergraduate, and -- enough amount (unintelligible). Because to me, look at coming in and, you know, there's no (unintelligible). We might as well take their (unintelligible). I believe it's investment in being able to build the (unintelligible) that will -- that's what everybody is doing. And the fact is, if (unintelligible) itself through retention and students arriving at the university and part of the --_ and it's directly coming from the fact that we have.

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt
But when you say generated,
primarily from undergraduate students.
There's -- there's a (unintelligible) in
that.

SWANSON: Any other questions? Points to
debate? Are we ready to vote?

So we have a motion on the table
that the University Senate approve the
implementation of the General Education
curriculum for Fall 2011 for all incoming
undergraduate students.

All in favor? Opposed? Abstain?
Motion carried. Thank you.

SUBBASWAMY: May I just make one comment? I
just want to take a moment to thank this
faculty and congratulate this faculty for
what the faculty has done over the last five
years. That's approximately how long it has
taken; it's been a -- because it is a process
that has been led by the faculty and, in
fact, from the -- and the results have been ,
I'm very excited things are coming out and I
think that as we vote for some implementation
and I would finally congratulate you a lot of
our time paying attention and I think once we
start talking about the actual implementation
it will be much more attention.

So, again, I just wanted to take a
moment to elaborate on all the hundreds of
faculty who have been involved in this.
There are lot of universities that never even
have been able to get a General Education
(unintelligible).

I congratulate you and I thank you.
SWANSON: Thank you. Do we have a motion to
adjourn?

JENSEN: So moved.

SWANSON: Second?

STEINER: Second.

SWANSON: All right. Thank you very much.

Our next is Valentine's Day.
* * * * *

WHEREUPON, the University of Kentucky Senate
Council Meeting on December 13, 2010 was adjourned.
* * * * * STATE OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

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

My commission expires: January 27, 2015.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
hand and seal of office on this the 15th day of
April, 2011.

Xcript 12-13-10 Senate.txt
NOTARY PUBLIC, ID NO. 435798
STATE-AT-LARGE, KENTUCKY