

0001

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

\* \* \* \* \*

APRIL 14, 2008  
3:00 P.M.

\* \* \* \* \*

W. T. YOUNG LIBRARY  
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY CAMPUS  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

\* \* \* \* \*

AN/DOR REPORTING & VIDEO TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
179 EAST MAXWELL STREET  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40508  
(859) 254-0568

\* \* \* \* \*

KAVEH TAGAVI, CHAIR  
DAVID RANDALL, (ACTING SECRETARY)  
MARY DeMATTINA, COURT REPORTER

0002

01 CHAIR:

02 Good afternoon. As you can see, there  
03 are a number of things up there. In  
04 fact, I would like to offer you --  
05 Sheila, on the date of the last Senate  
06 meeting she went for a consultation to  
07 her surgeon. Her surgeon said we have  
08 done everything. Now should do a back  
09 surgery for you, and by the way I have a  
10 cancellation, tomorrow morning. She  
11 called me the day after and she said she  
12 was going to be out for several weeks,  
13 it could take. But, as I told you in my  
14 e-mail, keep me in your prayers.

15 On top of that, we still don't have  
16 a parliamentarian. I identified one  
17 person, couldn't get in touch with him  
18 last week. This morning he said he  
19 wants to think about it until tomorrow.  
20 And I said well, you could come today  
21 just as a trial. He's not here.

22 So on top of all this, Sheila is  
23 not here, the parliamentarian is not  
24 here and I received an e-mail from the  
25 President saying my raise is zero  
percent. (inaudible) So, but I'm going

0003

01

to brave it.

02

03 Let me go over a couple of  
04 housekeeping materials. First of all, I  
05 have an apology to you. I was supposed  
06 to send you things, agenda items to you,  
07 which by the way, we printed half of it.  
By the time I had to leave the office it

08 was only half of it. If you don't have  
09 an agenda, it is going to come before we  
10 progress, (inaudible), so just raise  
11 your hand when Michelle comes in, to  
12 give you a packet.

13 Anyway, we were supposed to send it  
14 to you by e-mail last Tuesday, we  
15 couldn't for obvious reasons, and we  
16 were one day late. So I need a motion  
17 from someone from the Senate to say, to  
18 waive the rule. I have the language --  
19 what's happening (referring to  
20 PowerPoint program).

21 Well, I need a motion that the  
22 Senate waive the six day rule so we  
23 could have the Senate meeting. Now  
24 don't have any ideas, if you want to go  
25 home, no one is moving. Yes. Please

0004

01 say your name for the court reporter.

02 I move that we waive the six day  
03 rule for posting the agenda for the  
04 business meeting for April 14.

05 CHAIR: Thank you for that elegant motion.

06 CHAIR: Second?

07 ANDERSON: Debra Anderson.

08 CHAIR: Debra Anderson. Any objections? No  
09 further discussion? Thank you. All  
10 those in favor of this motion please  
11 raise your hand. Any opposed? Any  
12 abstain? David, I forgot to ask you,  
13 all I need is for you to put the numbers  
14 with the motion. So no abstention, no  
15 opposition. Thank you very much for  
16 that.

17 Minutes. If you notice the absence  
18 of the Sheila, the minutes were really  
19 short. But to the best of our knowledge  
20 they are accurate. So let's start with  
21 minutes from February 11th. You  
22 received it last Wednesday. We have not  
23 received any corrections, to the best of  
24 my knowledge. Are there any questions  
25 or comments on the February 11 minutes?

0005

01 Then the minutes of the February 11  
02 stand approved.

03 How about March 17? Are there any  
04 questions for the March 17 minutes?  
05 Any objections? Okay, those minutes are  
06 also considered approved.

07 I have one short announcement  
08 regarding board election. David, will  
09 you please do the board election  
10 announcements? David Randall.  
11 RANDALL: Who will serve as our state  
12 representative on the Board of Trustees?  
13 Obviously it's a multi-stage process.  
14 Nominations are already open. They will  
15 be open until April 17th at noon.

16 In order to be nominated and in  
17 order to nominate the individual must be  
18 eligible to vote in the Senate. We have

19 a statement that the nominee is willing  
20 to serve, and a second to that  
21 nomination. That needs to be in by  
22 April 17th.

23 We will then have elections. If  
24 there are more than three nominees we  
25 may well have to have a second election.

0006

01 We will have elections opening on the  
02 21st. They will be conducted through  
03 the electronic balloting, that you are  
04 familiar with. And I think the full  
05 details of the process were submitted to  
06 the Senate by ENL last week. Are there  
07 questions on this? Yes.

08 GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Arts and Sciences. Do you  
09 have any nominees yet?

10 RANDALL: I'm not aware if we have nominees yet.

11 CHAIR: I'm not aware either.

12 RANDALL: That's not available. Please  
13 participate and urge those you know to  
14 participate.

15 CHAIR: If I could add one thing, David. The  
16 names of the individuals have been  
17 posted with your original notice. If  
18 there are any names missing, this is  
19 your chance to go in and make sure your  
20 name is there. If it's not, just call  
21 the Senate Council Office or Doug  
22 Michael, who is the chair of the Rules  
23 Committee and let him know about  
24 changes.

25 Now the State of Academic Affairs,

0007

01 of the University, by the Provost. He  
02 would like it to be an annual event. I  
03 thought I sent you the first the one but  
04 I think the second one I sent you.

05 UNIDENTIFIED: It's the first one in his memory, that  
06 he's forgotten the other.

07 SUBBASWAMY: Let me begin with one responsibility  
08 that it was assigned to me by Dr.  
09 Tagavi, that was to introduce to you, I  
10 think you've all already met him but for  
11 those of you who have not, let me  
12 formally introduce to the Senate our  
13 Vice-President for Research, Dr. James  
14 Stacey. His position has been in place  
15 since last November.

16 I think there has not been an  
17 occasion when he had been available for  
18 this event. So those of you who have  
19 not followed this or come after he  
20 arrived here, he came off of the  
21 national survey we conducted last year.  
22 He spent 25 -- 24 years at the  
23 University of Wisconsin, Madison as a  
24 faculty member and left there as the  
25 Associate Dean of the College of

0008

01 Veterinarian Medicine in Madison,  
02 (inaudible), with administration and all  
03 the issues that go along with it. And

04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0009  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0010  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

he had a solution to leave the cold, frozen tundra of Madison, Wisconsin and go to wealthy, rich Kentucky.

I also have a very pleasant responsibility assigned to me, both on behalf of the University and on behalf of the Senate to recognize the outgoing chair of the Senate Council, Dr. Kaveh Tagavi, who I think you will all agree that he carried out his responsibilities in an exemplary manner with distinction, with aplomb, with a great deal of wisdom. I think if you look at the number of things that have been passed by the Senate and I think his skills of managing, even without a parliamentarian.

On a personal note, he's also been an outstanding collaborator. I think he is an example, first he has set an example of what good collaborative government faculty government

administration can be and I look forward to continuing in the same vein.

And, in fact, as spokesman for the University's and the Senate's appreciation for your outstanding leadership of the Senate, I have the pleasure and honor of presenting to you the gavel that he always so carefully and so well wielded.

(Audience appl auds)  
CHAIR:  
SUBBASWAMY:

Thank you very much.  
Well, last year when I gave the state of -- I say the state of affairs of the University for those of you who still remember that memorable event. It was a very different song and it was, events of the past, you know, five months, roughly, have certainly been a major damper on our enthusiasm and excitement that was generated over the last two years over the business plan and the funding, such that there was, there appeared to be a true compact between the Commonwealth and the University in the sense of carrying out the House Bill

One, mandate to stop going public by 2020.

Certainly there are a great deal of complications and I'm going to give you the current state of affairs as we understand it.

I will try to follow the same outline as I did last time except that the circumstances are so different it will be difficult. A lot of things about the budget situation, I don't have all the answers, I don't have all of the numbers worked out, but I'll present to you my current state of understanding

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0011  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0012  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

and then I'll answer any questions.  
So I'll start with the two highlights for the last year, for the last two years, in fact. I think off campus has done a great deal of hard work, thanks to the faculty.  
In regard to budgetary considerations, I will present a little context and background. I'll talk about challenges and then finally comments about the particular accomplishments

that were made with Top 20 Vision Plan.

I should say this is just a broad-brush, a few highlights only. I hope you have not forgotten that the second installment of the Vision Plan, faculty salary catch-up was made, so basically there was approximately five and-a-half percent overall that was invested in improving salaries, July 2007. And the most recent in our staff was implemented in January 2008.

And I don't have the data to present here yet, but the assistant professor salaries, for example, have caught up to 94 percent of the benchmark median. We still have a ways to go in associate professor and full professor. But including the front end is so critical, we have made substantial progress.

There is a lot more to do. Even FY09 will cause a backsliding. The governor keeps talking we will not slide back. I'm sorry, Governor, we are backsliding with the budget requirements

in front of us.

We started the academic year with 20 new faculty lines in the business plans, those models added to the previous year's 54. We had already added 54 lines in. So there were lots of searches going on in General Fund. And if there is some success, that has already come from new hires, that will be to make a difference in leadership costs in certain critical areas.

The governor's budget announced, I guess, supposed to be the 30th of January, caused a total freeze to be invoked, as you know. We've made a few critical exceptions here and there.

And then the final for the FY09 budget, will certainly cause and we're still working out the details. We won't completely shut down for business because I mean, obviously we have to serve the students too. Still the question of how much hiring and where you will be able to do something we're still trying to figure out.

0013

01 We launched a war on student  
02 attrition. Last year I told you -- I'll  
03 show you additional figures in terms of  
04 our graduation dates at a little less  
05 than two percent. And compared to  
06 benchmark, I'll to show the comparison  
07 again.

08 And we re-invested in making  
09 improvements in advising and more  
10 interventions for our first year  
11 students' midterm grades and other  
12 things.

13 There were, unfortunately, some  
14 complications as well. Even though we  
15 were all ready to do different things,  
16 in terms of spending and graduation.  
17 The SAT data reporting and reliability  
18 really caused a lot of problems. We  
19 couldn't get enough information and, you  
20 know, it's slowly getting resolved but  
21 it's too slowly, in my opinion,  
22 certainly like everyone's off campus as  
23 well.

24 Interest in Administration, as I  
25 said we have new budget research. It is

0014

01 being made more PI, in department  
02 spending and a lot of conversations  
03 going on, what improvements and what you  
04 do to make it work better.

05 And budgeting being more  
06 transparent. This a critical piece.  
07 New faculty startup investment increased  
08 by over 50 percent. We are being very  
09 aggressive, the faculty will put forward  
10 especially the laboratory sciences will.

11 So it is needed to be quite  
12 aggressive in trying to go after the  
13 best possible candidates. And so that  
14 investment went from 8 million to 12  
15 million. Downside the prospect for the  
16 FY09 UTRS budget looked bleak for a  
17 number of reasons, including a slowdown  
18 in federal contracts, as I'll show you,  
19 and also people are not spending at the  
20 same rate, which is most costly as well.

21 Here's new faculty startup  
22 expenses. I showed this graph and  
23 updated it with higher and higher  
24 investments and making sure that we do  
25 what is necessary to find the best

0015

01 possible people and some senior hires  
02 with the (inaudible) million dollar  
03 faculty to add to the numbers as well.

04 The 2007 and 2008 progress report,  
05 successful conclusions to vice-president  
06 for the diversity research when she  
07 takes office on July 1, I hope the  
08 Senate will have occasion to hear from  
09 her, because she's been really  
10 outstanding at MIT for a considerable

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0016  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0017  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

amount of time and then has been at Vassar for the past four years. And in student affairs in general (inaudible) diversity too.

You are certainly aware that there were several racial incidents in the student body and I really am proud of the way our students, both the majority and minority handled it. They handled it extremely well, with a great deal of control and created energy including the performance issue in the student leadership group called Effective Vote, will try to keep a dialogue going on at that constructive pace throughout the

year, rather than just as incidents occur.

Also, I want to tell you that the African American student retention fall -- this fall to spring, at an all time high and it's higher overall -- the overall student population. We have the safety net working and and mentoring working, seems to be working quite well.

Several major renovation projects were started and completed as well. The MIT, the other library that's to accommodate library information in the school, as well as some additional "musical chairs" to make additional space available in the Chem/Physics building.

Teaching in the research lab and this is only the tip of the iceberg, to have -- this is only -- if I've insulted somebody by not including one of your buildings but there's lots of buildings that need a lot of love and tender care.

The DBS RB4 floor setup was completed and the Bio/Pharmacy building

is going up, as you can see going down on Limestone.

Unfortunately the downside here is that there's no capital funding that was provided by the Legislature for the next (inaudible) and that really is going to hurt our ability to do research with the research laboratories.

Essentially we are still trying to figure out what we can do, the design to buy the pharmacy building and we will be using the space in terms of the best impact rather than the space we particularly, I own all space, (inaudible).

The Gary and USB farm effort in general education is continuing and at the last meeting you were kind enough to approve the design principle. A steering committee has been appointed, I think you have already sent out an

22  
23 CHAIR:  
24 SUBBASWAMY:  
25  
0018

announcement about that.  
Yes.  
They have already started working and they will be working through the summer.

01  
02  
03

Some groups will be working through the summer and we'll keep you updated as progress is made.

04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13

In the strategic plans, the strategic plans we're in, I talked about several overall teams, four "E"s and four "I"s. They rely upon a business plan. Some of them expansion, engagement, entrepreneurship, international integration, included in this expansion. I want to take a couple of them and show that we still think in these terms, you may not but I do.

14  
15  
16  
17

Integration, what that is, defines, what it's really talking about is interdisciplinary and professional activities.

18  
19  
20  
21  
22

I don't have a complete list here but these highlights. The Deans and I met and received after the college planning process was completed and last summer we met.

23  
24  
25  
0019

And there were several broad emphasis that are campus wide and emphasis emerged, clinical science,

01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10

poverty, disparity in education is one thing, energy, environment and sustainability, world studies and health policy management and communications. These were some of the things that kept emerging from different colleges and it made sense to have them sort of broad teamed. So some of these investments we made of factors on the team along these lines.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

For example, the Center for Clinical Science involving multiple colleges on campus has opened its portal and will be opening its doors shortly. Dr. Perman, do you know when that will actually happen?

17 PERMAN:  
18  
19 SUBBASWAMY:

I don't know a specific date but I would think it would be done in a few months. Thank you. The NIS proposal for

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Clinical Path and Science award, including four, and will be resubmitted for submission for the June cycle. And investments are being made by, (inaudible).

0020

01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06

Internationalization is a -- last year I told you one fact that I hope you remember, if you remember. This is the number of undergraduates, international students, enrolled at UK from 1997 up until now.  
What happened folks? The world's



Xcript 4-14-08 Senate.txt

07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0021  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0022  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

shut down its doors or did we shut down our doors? This is very troubling. Forget population, forget anything. In this day and age this is bad. Western Kentucky does better, some of our students are (inaudible).

Certainly 2001 was doing okay. 2002 and 2003 there were complications for some of the students with visas and so forth.

But we can't blame this entire trend on what happened in 2001. This desperately needs to be addressed. This is not good for the majority of our students, this is not good for anything. With things being global these days, and we are simply not doing well, so this got my attention.

Another thing that is related to

that, that got your attention, you know, if you look at the US average of graduate and undergraduate international student percentages, they're about even. UK, we have -- 80 percent of our international students are graduate students and professional students and only about 10 percent are in that. So we have much more to do in that regard.

So we have been putting a lot of -- one is I don't think we paid enough attention, frankly. That has got to change. So the campus wide International Task Force, I'm sure many of you are members, they are developing a strategic plan and that is expected very soon.

UK is participating in the American Council on International Education Laboratory program to bring that practice nationally. So what is it the others are doing that we are not doing? And we are trying to learn and implement them here.

Provided faculty level leadership

that's been added for the students as, compared to national, about a 50 percent basis have been working since about last fall, late last fall.

International and graduate students, a recruiter has been hired. We need to be recruiting these days. We can't just open the doors and expect students to walk in. And finally, invested in the national student who happened to have graduate international student affairs and all kinds of things, along with using, basically using our student population to see if we can open doors to undergraduate students from their towns and so forth.

The admissions process has seen

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0023  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0024  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0025  
01  
02

many complications between the Office of International Affairs and Admissions. Support was effected for the Asian Center because they have been very successful and in fact UK wasn't known as center. We recently were fortunate to get an endowment gift for media studies when we also hope will go along

with the Asian Center success.

Okay, turning to the budget, this is a site from last year. I told you that the business plan was really good because it introduced a new way of thinking about a budget request. Basically the revenue request was set equal to the mandated expenses plus the salaries that we wanted to get, to catch up to them, and then whatever program enhancement was calculated for improving progress goals. And then we requested something that was constructed by what we need, what is required in order to achieve certain goals.

The prior approach, before the last millennium, was basically whatever revenue was given to us and we subtracted out the mandated expenses and that was what was available for salary, school and programming enhancement, if any.

Well, the General Assembly took us entirely back to the old approach. Well, they said, basically well, we

really care about our expenses, so we'll cut you only six percent. Then don't raise tuition too much.

And so one simple answer for why the salary, there's no salary increase in spite of the nine percent student increase, the revenue available and certainly the state portion declined by 20 million dollars, then you take a mandated expense of the facilities, health care costs and various other mandated programs.

Including, for example, now there's a new one on development through education and there's a lot of things thrown in our direction. You subtract all of that and that's basically the reason for it.

But also looking at the prospects. The prospects over the next couple of years, nationally don't look really good and we have to plan for that. So the good news in all of this is the problems that we are having, in fact we are ahead of the rest of the country.

They are all going to be in this same situation next year if they're not

03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0026  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0027  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13

already this year. The bad news is we got there first. Usually they say everything comes to Kentucky ten years later, but this one, unfortunately, didn't.

The problem for FY09 is a multiple. First we talked about the perfect score. And some of it -- well first of all, the revenue change stuff and the state appropriation is down by 20 million, you add student revenue, and at 9 percent increase, still you only produce about 6 million gross and financial aid to be given out of that -- actually subtract the financial aid.

It's reduced because of what we talked about. Last fall we experienced a serious enrollment shortfall and that translates into dollars.

So the next change is a negative 14 million dollars when you offset the 6 million dollar increase. And so if we were to -- I mean that 14 million will

absorb that cut -- as the President explained, so that will absorb the economic factors.

The salary increase of one percent will require about 3.5 million dollars, which roughly would add an addition of (inaudible).

And that -- that I'll show you that. Apart from public policy, the pay increase may be already be lost. And it's not clear that we will get a net revenue increase, if -- maybe not have, out of the affordability.

I don't expect you to see all the numbers. What I wanted to do here was draw your attention to the fact that all of our budget information is available to you on the web site.

You can go to the Office of Budgetary Planning and look in there, the Expedia, (sic), format, the entire budget document is there. There are no secrets. And if there is something there you don't understand, you can ask.

The main factors here are that at

one level the bottom line that you see there says that a 2 billion dollar budget, you see the numbers.

But in terms of undesignated and designated funds, that is if you take out designated expenditures and some like the University hospital's research grants and contracts and all of those, what you are left with is about 640 million dollars, in terms of the two undesignated budgets that's the General Fund project.

And even there, actually, there are

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

revenue pieces that as a matter of course, it's profit and gains revenue, that revenue is left there because it's needed to continue that operation. So to take that part out, it's about 485 million dollars. That is really the state's allocation and, plus the tuition.

That is really the budget that we operate under. And so when you take 20 million dollars out of that, that's that problem.

0028

01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08

Okay, this just gives you an idea of how that 485 million dollars, actually this is a 600 million dollar budget divided up. The giant portion, as you would expect is in the academic sector, where it says provost, that's where we've got the most, including students, of course.

09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

And then the Vice President of Finance -- for Fiscal Affairs. And then the President's things, budget that includes things like government relations, alumni relations, development, all of that is included in that.

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

And the executive vice-president for financial affairs is also really, primarily the physical plant, the biggest piece of it, it's physical plant. And the university wide, looks like a big pie. It's misleading. The biggest chunk of it is what is called operating capital, basically all the cash balances including your cash balances and things are carried forward.

0029

01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07

That's a big chunk of that money, if you take that slice out.

I looked very closely at how the budget is allocated. And when you take out the revenue pieces, about 82 percent of the two undesignated general fund budgets is in academics.

08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

All right. I pointed out that I'm not expecting you to read it, but it's all in the budget document in terms of what are the pieces that go into the -- the several factors that I pointed out. And those of you who are interested can certainly go and look at it.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19

Well, the goose that laid the golden egg, I showed you last year's as well, the undergraduate enrollment, this has been updated. The graph on the left side, I don't know, do I have a pointer? Yes.

20 CHAIR:  
21 SUBBASWAMY:

22  
23  
24

Yes, there it is. This graph shows the number of undergraduates enrolled from 2001 and 2002 to the fall of 2007. And the enrollment kept going or was going,

Xcript 4-14-08 Senate.txt  
however you want to look at it. And

then we really wanted to stop that growth but not quite by that much. We wanted it to remain flat and we ended up with a significant drop.

And then what I've shown here is the Revenue Plan. This is institution revenue total and this is the state allocation, state appropriation. So from 2001 and 2002 to 2007, 2008 state appropriation has either remained flat or, in fact, part of the time it was cut. It was negative, in fact, the total cut.

Here -- what happened here was that we got a 20 million bump and then we had 10 million taken away and next year we'll probably have another 10 million taken away. So then, I can say this, Indian givers, they took the money back.

This tuition is what has really allowed us to give salary increases and run the University, in terms of academic revenue. Student revenue was increased by 108 million dollars from FY02 where state appropriation has been slashed all

over.

So the increase in undergraduate enrollment -- I didn't correct it. I'm sorry -- has kept the entire University including the hospital and everybody afloat, I mean prices, also, out. This really, basically the entire University's operations have been cut. 80 percent of our student revenue is undergraduate revenue. That's why I focus on that. 20 percent is work incentives and professional and non professional students. This is something to keep in mind as we serve our students and say where do we make the cuts and what do we do. This is, in fact, the goose that laid the golden egg and there's very few people say that.

So the enrollment, is fine. I wanted to talk a little bit about that. Total enrollment was down by more than 600. And I'll be honest with you, the SAB nightmare, the numbers are hard to pin down. And because it's comparing numbers across two different systems,

before SAB was implemented and after SAB was implemented. And every enterprise system changed like that. Something is going wrong.

Growth of the shortfall was over six million dollars. I'm giving you round numbers. This has not been hit by the University office. If it's wrong it's my fault, not theirs.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0033  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0034  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

So there is really, obviously, a great deal of concern about having, one of the reasons we have the enrollment downturn is because the tuition was so high. And I certainly, the out of state markets, you have to really watch, like the real estate market, because I think there's intense competition from Western, Eastern and others as you'll see. And there's other factors there. The largest decline was in transfer students. And that's a major concern that you will see when I show you some data on that.

And this is a matter for the Senate in that there were some policy changes

that we need to adopt in order to fix it and we want to fix it.

Another concern was pipeline. The high school graduating senior numbers, throughout the country actually, the baby boom, echo and so forth has piqued and it's actually going to start declining and you'd better go international -- international students not only because it's good for us but it's also good for our revenue.

It's certainly not prudent to raise tuition higher, in my opinion. This is why we are recommending that we go no higher than nine, and even that is... The undergraduate transfer student enrollment and impact, I want to -- this, again, is a telling graph, I think.

From '96/'97, when we owned the community colleges, to 2006 and 2007 was to show, the new transfer, that's the light blue, is then the continuing transfer student was already in the system.

And so we went from a total of about 6,800 down to about 5,100. So it was a steady decline. And there's, obviously, a steady decline here up to '06/'07, in terms of new transfer students coming into UK, about 2,000 down to 1,800 or so.

But it got worse, for some reason. This is new transfers. The last date on there is 2007, the fall 2007, 864 from 1,175.

It went down from 1,175 to 864. That again is, you know, why is that? We are trying to understand that. That's it.

So let's look at where are the students coming and where is -- really all over the place. This is KCTCS students, this is Bluegrass Community Technical Institute students and then

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0035  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0036  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0037  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05

the other transfers from elsewhere.  
And, certainly, this decline here has been steady but this will jump down as well. That fall time -- I'll skip this one. No point.

Okay, enrollment. In itself in the Kentucky Community College system in that from 2000 to 2006, you know, enrollment has supposedly grown.

But I want you to pay attention to the ones who are likely to transfer to four year institutions. And those are the light blue liberal arts piece, that bottom piece there. That bottom piece has not only not grown, it has shrunk.

So when KCTCS talks about increasing enrollment, it's missing it from the perspective of transfer students, potential transfer students.

This is also telling -- this compares in the general region where we compete for transfer students, generally speaking.

This shows '96/'97 transfer students, ECU, from LCTC to Stanford to UK. In '96/'97, 105, 446. And ECU in 2006, got 277 and we had 507. So UK increased by 14 percent, ECU jumped by 160 percent.

We have been passive in international students as well as transfer students here again. Passive by, significant percent of our revenue has depended on these students.

The market place has changed and unfortunately we need the market place. We talk about college education, so to really understand -- one of the factors that I haven't mentioned, I really don't have enough data on this focus group or otherwise, is that when they changed the policy to not include the community college transfer GPA into our GPA.

This was action that was taken about a year ago, which is reasonable action, that is what the norm is nationally, that you receive a credit but not a GPA.

The GPA is reported separately. All the other institutions except for the the University of Louisville are accepting the GPA. The transfer students are being told oh, don't go to UK because they don't accept the the GPA.

These are the kinds of things that affect, ultimately, enrollment. Anyway, again this shows the cost factor aptitude. The red line shows the percent yield of pre-bachelorette

06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0038  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0039  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

students transferring in and this shows the differential between the cost increase in BCCC and BCCC versus the cost increase at UK. As the differential between UK and BCCC students has gone up, our bachelorette yield has gone down. It was suggested the scholastics would differ.

Just a few national comparisons. This comes from what is known as "Icehead", which is a government public education data collection. What I really wanted to point out here, this is really comparing, the crosshatch bars are for 18 or 19 of our benchmark institutions, the ones that are listed in the House Bill 1 as it relates to the Top 20. And then the solid blue is UK.

This shows the percentage of revenue that comes from various sources.

Tuition, ours against -- this is misleading because this is really showing it as a part of that whole 2 billion dollar budget and I don't think it's a fair comparison. But anyway it's compared to about -- I think the hospitals -- but I think the Kentucky Clinic revenues are so strong in there.

The government grants and contracts, which we, you know, the percentage of budget, total budget, is comparable to the benchmark and other programs that are comparable.

The institution is -- as a percentage is lower. And part of it is because we don't really target much out of state. Part of the problem is we can't. At 14,000 we have a hard enough time getting good students.

So we have to really improve our marketing education before we can charge what, let's say even in our region, what Indiana or Ohio State might be charging.

We need to have the US News and World Report and other rankings improve

before our market position will reflect that and we can charge higher fees. And that is part of the issue.

Basically I also want to point out -- what the previous one was looking at -- the tuition rate and graduation rate compared side by side, and the accountability question comes up. The tuition gap has been the benchmark median, this is the same group of 19 institutions I talked about, is really close. And this only goes to 2006/07.

I think if you look at 2007/08 and perhaps '08/'09, we will have been at the median, if not across the median, on the one hand.



Xcript 4-14-08 Senate.txt

On the other hand, our graduation rate, and this is benchmark median of the 77 year at 69, so somebody can ask the -- charging the same institution as the median, as the benchmark but the graduation date is almost lower, so where is the value for the dollar?

I think that's something that's an accountability issue, is just difficult

to do.

The easiest way to boost the graduation rate would be to take only ACT scores of 28 and over. This shows graduation percentage as the range of entering ACT.

But in order to do this you have to give politics, mostly by the students, which means we don't generate any revenue. If we didn't have students in this range we would not have that goose that laid the golden egg. It's a huge balancing act to try to make all of this work. My hair has turned white. Conclusion. We'll come back to one other topic and talk a little bit about it.

Undergraduate revenue is a significant part of the academic budget, if you take all the other distractions out. We may have reached the elastic limits on student enrollment. We have to really manage that carefully. Undergraduate enrollment fell significantly, particularly because of

the transfer students. We need to try to recoup some of that, policy changes for transfer students. And this is something that we will be bringing to the Senate, perhaps, in the fall, and including dual admission and other strategies.

The concern is that we invest more to include the second standing, boosting that reputation and show students that there really is value to the \$8,000 or whatever they are paying when all is said and done.

And we should re-examine the Top 20 business plan or something that was made under various assumptions of adding 25 percent more to the normal. And a lot of people have changed and I think we need to look at that reality. And this summer we will have a new version of this, start asking some of these questions and begin to see and look at alternative strategies to achieve reputational goals. That was the one path.

So really, it's something that I

02 think could be done and be part of the  
03 strategy. Some have talked about we can  
04 get smaller and better. But you can  
05 actually do that if you have some  
06 financial flexibility and being able to  
07 do that. I think all of this should be  
08 opened up for discussion. With that,  
09 I'm happy to take questions at this  
10 time.

11 CHAIR: Following the Provost if you would  
12 answer some questions.

13 SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, Medicine. I know that a  
14 number of universities are considering  
15 satellite. Where is UK on that?

16 SUBBASWAMY: On a satellite somewhere. But the reason  
17 we have a UK eye on satellite is very  
18 important. The answer is we have a few  
19 business programs, engineering programs  
20 that have been there for a long time.  
21 But in terms of actually setting up a  
22 satellite campus and looking at the  
23 feasibility, there are a couple of  
24 issues that we need to take into  
25 account.

0043

01 There was a highly publicized,  
02 three major university undertaking. I  
03 don't know if it was in the New York  
04 Times Thursday or Friday. I think it  
05 was Dave Preston or somebody like him.

06 The point is that the operating  
07 model, you basically -- offshoring works  
08 because it's cheaper over there. But if  
09 you have our faculty or faculty  
10 re-certified to go teach there or  
11 something like that, the cost is going  
12 to be the same as it is over here.

13 So to maintain that quality and  
14 that certification is not as easy it  
15 might seem, especially in the generic  
16 offering -- specialized offerings, where  
17 there's a market operating.

18 In exploring it -- but I think we  
19 will probably learn from the other  
20 people's mistakes before we make our own  
21 mistakes because we can't afford to.

22 CI BULL: Mike Cibull, College of Medicine. You  
23 presented some data about the community  
24 colleges and things. Do you have data  
25 about the percentage of those students

0044

01 that have graduated from here? Is it  
02 better than --

03 SUBBASWAMY: Yeah. One of the -- part of what we did  
04 with that study was to look at the  
05 success of those who transferred. They  
06 succeeded at about the same rate as our  
07 native population.

08 CI BULL: Based on ACTs?

09 SUBBASWAMY: No, I'm saying overall. That was what  
10 I'm saying. I'm saying that our overall  
11 graduation rate, success rate and  
12 compare that to the transfer student, it

13 is about the same. But I don't have  
14 technical data because generally I don't  
15 think we look at the ACTs off the  
16 transcript.  
17 CIBULL: My guess is that there would be  
18 different -- better per ACT than the  
19 students who are admitted --  
20 SUBBASWAMY: I think it's possible, but it's a good  
21 question. I'll see our --  
22 CIBULL: Based on --  
23 SUBBASWAMY: I'll ask them.  
24 SOTTILE: In followup to our Department of  
25 Engineering, my graduation rate of  
0045  
01 transfer is quite a bit higher than the  
02 people who come here first term  
03 semester. I know it's a small program  
04 but I think that it's worth looking  
05 into. It would do very well.  
06 UNIDENTIFIED: Is there a mirror image retention rate,  
07 in fact, of any colleges, for students?  
08 Is their population increasing or is it  
09 just a sign of the times?  
10 SUBBASWAMY: I think it's a sign of the times.  
11 CHAIR: Any other questions. Thank you very  
12 much. Bob?  
13 COOK: Bob Cook. I have a question that is on  
14 a completely different subject. Bob  
15 Cook in Arts and Sciences. And it has  
16 to do with the new work life policies  
17 that were proposed that were inaugurated  
18 last summer.  
19 There was a great fanfare in saying  
20 that we would now be able to transfer  
21 our tuition benefits for taking classes  
22 at UK to family members.  
23 And yet when the actual rules were  
24 promulgated it actually turned out that  
25 those tuition benefits would not apply  
0046  
01 to any graduate classes, it would only  
02 apply to undergraduate classes.  
03 Where that decision was made is  
04 still somewhat murky. It certainly  
05 wasn't in the original recommendations.  
06 But it seems to me and to most of  
07 the other people that I have talked to  
08 about this, that this decision has  
09 particularly -- has made it particularly  
10 difficult for faculty, in particular, to  
11 take advantage of the new benefits,  
12 simply because we all have terminal  
13 degrees already, so we're not going to  
14 be getting classes.  
15 And most of us who have spouses, I  
16 wager, would already have bachelor  
17 degrees, at least.  
18 So unless we happen to have  
19 children who happen to attend UK, you  
20 can't take advantage of those benefits  
21 at all. And none of those things are  
22 true in general -- in general terms of  
23 the staff.

24  
25  
0047  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0048  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0049  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08

And so when I start my inquiry about why this decision was made, it's simply oh, it's money. But it seems to me that it's extremely unlikely that there's going to be this mad rush of faculty spouses and children to take graduate courses at UK.

And so it's going to cost a whole lot of money to the University. Again, an example of the way the University structured the policy, faculty were put in a position where it would be extremely unlikely they could benefit from it.

So I wondered if you'd comment on this and maybe make a commitment to look into this.

SUBBASWAMY: I'll first make a comment on it and whether I'll make a commitment or not, we'll see. In the sense that when you speak of the faculty, in a sense that's true. Remember that we have approximately 14,000 staff --

COOK: It's a great benefit for staff. I agree.

SUBBASWAMY: -- so what I'm saying is, I don't know that there would not be a mad stampede for the MBA classes or for the pharmacy classes or even, heaven forbid, the MD program --

UNIDENTIFIED: Bring them on.

SUBBASWAMY: Yeah, bring them on.

COOK: Those are not graduate school programs, those are professional programs. And so one could easily say that the benefits --

SUBBASWAMY: The department -- the philosophy degree -- the PhD philosophy --

COOK: Bingo. Exactly what I'm talking about.

SUBBASWAMY: I'm not talking about getting an MBA -- I will make a commitment to look into it.

COOK: Thank you.

CHAIR: We are going to go to the last question. I think Provost has to be somewhere. Is that true?

SUBBASWAMY: Yes, in fact, I do.

CIBULL: My question is synchronic in graduate education. My question is how much do you think that is feeding into this? I mean not just this but it's really a standing problem, in terms of the physical plant and (inaudible).

How much do you think that feeds into the problem at the University, the sign of other things here?

SUBBASWAMY: My honest opinion is that's why I used the term the goose that laid the golden egg. I think that in terms of how the

09 financing of public education has  
10 changed over the last couple of decades,  
11 I don't think -- it would not allow,  
12 certainly allow these pieces in the  
13 hour, just have got out of, yeah, you  
14 are paying the price now.  
15 Because there is aggressive  
16 competition, doubly there. The  
17 University of Iowa took -- because they  
18 came to this problem way back when.  
19 They don't have enough room there at the  
20 University. And you invest in this  
21 group and you can't transfer the  
22 students unless you have the program,  
23 the facilities. But yes, that is a  
24 problem. And I think it's better to  
25 deal with it now than never.

0050

01 CHAIR: Before the Provost leaves, I just want  
02 to make a comment on my own stating,  
03 serving you guys, the faculty, has been  
04 a great honor but what I would like to  
05 add is I couldn't have asked for, even  
06 dream of a better relationship and a  
07 better system by the Provost and the  
08 President. And that has made my job  
09 much more enjoyable. Thank you very  
10 much.

11 SUBBASWAMY:

12 CHAIR: Thank you.  
13 Now I got a gift from the Provost. A  
14 gift from you guys would be nice.  
15 Okay. Moving along, and I'm going to go  
16 a little bit faster than usual.  
17 There are agenda items out there.  
18 Please raise your hand and she will  
19 give it to you as she passes you. Okay.  
20 The next item is the revision of  
21 AR11-1.7-2, access to and use of the  
22 university technology resources. I just  
23 want to tell you guys that this is not  
24 just an approval, slash, disapproval  
25 item, per se.

0051

01 Although we could express approval  
02 or disapproval, we could possibly  
03 endorse this or just give our input but  
04 we have mostly different and penny cuts  
05 to give any, if you have any questions  
06 or if you need background information.  
07 Let me ask if you would like to add  
08 anything? Everybody has this proposal  
09 and the handout, I believe. Would you  
10 like to add anything?

11 Okay, then we are ready for  
12 questions. I don't want to confuse you.  
13 Are there any questions regarding the  
14 computer and technology policies? Right  
15 there. Please state your name for the  
16 court reporter.

16 DI EDRI CHS:

17 Carol Diedrichs from the Library. In  
18 Section 6, Part B there is -- it's about  
19 administrative responsibilities. It  
seems you have just missed the role they

20 have in the leading accounts after  
21 employees leave and the fact because  
22 it's not there, it sort of seems to say  
23 they can't do -- I think -- do you think  
24 it's just an oversight?  
25 There are three sections 6B,  
0052  
01 talking about the things they are  
02 prohibited from doing  
03 CHAIR: What page is it?  
04 DI EDRI CHS: Page 6.  
05 COX: I'm Penny Cox. And in Section 6, Item  
06 C3, Carol?  
07 DI EDRI CHS: No. It's D.  
08 COX: It's D. But that's where it would go.  
09 (i naudi bl e)  
10 CHAIR: I think we have given you two versions,  
11 the track version and the final version.  
12 But I can give -- is it this version?  
13 On this version or the clean version?  
14 CI BULL: We don't have that in here.  
15 (i naudi bl e)  
16 COX: I will take that, because we have to  
17 sort that out.  
18 DI EDRI CHS: Right. We did get the same feedback  
19 from the Senate Council and we inserted  
20 language, which I'm sorry is not in this  
21 version that you have up here. But we  
22 did actually get that incorporated and  
23 gave them permission to do that when it  
24 was terminated or it was transferred.  
25 Thank you.  
0053  
01 CHAIR: Are there any other questions? Yes.  
02 Okay, well, to tell you the truth, I  
03 don't know exactly what is in your  
04 handout. Because I told Andrea, one of  
05 our assistants, that -- don't make it  
06 200 pages times 95 of these Senators.  
07 But I have brought everything that  
08 is supposed to be, now this particular  
09 phrase, I don't know why it is not here.  
10 But I have everything else on my drive.  
11 I could show it to you.  
12 DI EDRI CHS: Since this isn't something you're going  
13 to approve, the fact that they know  
14 about it and --  
15 CHAIR: This is for interest only or FYI. But  
16 we could give our input. But then  
17 again, it doesn't mean we can, if there  
18 is an AR in the future, that we could  
19 still disapprove it, knowing that we  
20 don't have disapproval power.  
21 So at this point I would pause, if  
22 anyone wants to endorse this, on behalf  
23 of the faculty, if the faculty wants to  
24 do it. If not, are there any other  
25 inputs?  
0054  
01 STEI NER: Just summarize what it is. We don't  
02 have it.  
03 CHAIR: We -- no, this was in your e-mail as  
04 agenda items but it is not yet --

05 STEINER:  
06 UNIDENTIFIED:

Can you summarize it?  
Let me give you just a little bit of history. The University of Administrative Regulations are under review by AR Committee, which Marcy Deaton chairs. And every AR comes through a committee process. This happens to be one of those administrative breaks.

This particular policy is on governing access and use of computing resources. There were definitions included on what a computer resource was.

Believe it or not, it has changed a lot since this policy was written in 1993. So 15 years later we have networks, we have spam, we have phishing, we have all sorts of camps attacking the University. And probably most important thing that occurred was

0055

in December '06, which was the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which applied to public institutions, but anyone receiving federal grants.

And so that federal law required us to adopt a policy on E-discovery and privacy and confidentiality. This committee has spent, I would say a year and a half, researching other institutions, particularly Cornell, some of the groups that we considered to be out on the forefront in terms of compliance with the federal laws and also in education in higher ed.

And we also had issues about copyright, which the previous document did not adequately address on when you can copy electronic licenses and materials.

And so we tried to incorporate in this one document, a translation, so that everyone knew what is private, what's not private, the fact that we are a public institution and what we can do as an employees.

0056

And we also wanted to say that everyone has an incidental use license. So we are not saying that a University computer, a University network can no longer be used to send e-mail to your colleagues inviting them to lunch or whatever. There is an incidental use.

We believe that management should have the responsibility, if there is a performance issue, to address that at the employee level rather than mandating that the public computer is not for personal use.

So that's sort of the background on it. We also talk about, as I said, the

16 privacy issues and confidentiality. And  
17 we did present twice to the Senate.  
18 CHAIR: I see the sheet you are talking about  
19 but I make a decision not to put this in  
20 your handout and I said I'm going to  
21 read it. I assume that you -- I never  
22 read this beforehand. I used to read it  
23 while the Senate was going on. So I  
24 made a mistake.  
25 What I can offer to you, please  
0057  
01 send me your inputs. Okay? As you know  
02 it's in your e-mail, you could go click  
03 on it.  
04 It's not accrual matter and if I  
05 receive another complaint from you I  
06 will let the two of them know and maybe  
07 we ask them to delay the approval of  
08 this.  
09 But please, this is going to affect  
10 your life, to some degree, because it's  
11 technology and we do a lot of it  
12 nowadays. So please in the next two or  
13 three days. How about that? Two days.  
14 By Wednesday noon.  
15 If you have any comments or  
16 suggestions or complaints let me know  
17 and I will let them know. Mike Cibull.  
18 CIBULL: You say the percentage will affect our  
19 life greatly, not just a little. What  
20 is the rush to do this and why is that  
21 period of time so short?  
22 CHAIR: You mean Wednesday?  
23 CIBULL: Yeah.  
24 CHAIR: Well, because I've just come up with it.  
25 We are supposed to approve or disapprove  
0058  
01 this today, but I make --  
02 CIBULL: A lot of this is sort of written, from  
03 what I see flashing by as you scroll  
04 down, a low of it is written in  
05 legalese --  
06 CHAIR: Right.  
07 CIBULL: -- that many of us, necessarily, are not  
08 going to be able to grasp the full  
09 meaning of on an individual basis. Why  
10 can't this be discussed further in an  
11 open forum at a scheduled time, rather  
12 than rush? I don't think -- I realize  
13 this is -- is this the last meeting?  
14 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.  
15 CHAIR: Probably. There is the potential of a  
16 May meeting, you know. If it's  
17 possible, I want to have it done right.  
18 CIBULL: Does this have to be done by the start  
19 of the next academic year? Is that  
20 right?  
21 UNIDENTIFIED: That is our objective. As I said, we  
22 have some issues with the e-discovery  
23 compliance, to be prepared prior --  
24 CIBULL: Clearly the devil -- the devil is in the  
25 details of this document.  
0059



01 UNIDENTIFIED: The devil is in the detail. As I said,  
02 we've got to the Staff Senate, we've  
03 gone to the --  
04 CHAIR: They have come to us twice and we had a  
05 lot of corrections. And as much as I  
06 feel this is towards my two colleagues  
07 here and they have, the same thing as I.  
08 But this is your Senate. Please  
09 make a motion and that the sense of the  
10 Senate is to please not process this  
11 until we have an open forum. Now they  
12 could ignore this because it's just a  
13 recommendation. But that doesn't mean  
14 you can't make a recommendation.  
15 CIBULL: That would be my recommendation, that it  
16 be brought to the next Senate meeting,  
17 whenever that is.  
18 CHAIR: Is that a personal recommendation or is  
19 that a motion?  
20 CIBULL: That's a motion.  
21 CHAIR: Do we have a second on that motion?  
22 YATES: Second.  
23 CHAIR: David, if you could write down the  
24 essence of the motion, that would be  
25 nice. Okay, let's discuss this, to some  
0060  
01 degree, if you want to discuss it. Or  
02 is it a clear cut motion?  
03 KINKEL: Kinkel, College of Engineering. It  
04 seems to me that this document, being an  
05 administrative regulation, is one that  
06 is, in some sense, outside the purview  
07 of the Faculty Senate. Certainly it's  
08 within our right to make comments on it,  
09 to object to it, to vehemently agree  
10 with it. But we have no say in the  
11 matter. Therefore I'm not sure we need  
12 to have a full discussion of this.  
13 CHAIR: Okay, and as I said, one alternative --  
14 whether or not this motion is approved  
15 would be that as a senator you could  
16 give maybe two days of, out of the week,  
17 to give us your comment and I will  
18 forward it to Legal. Somebody's hand  
19 was up. Steiner, yes.  
20 STEINER: Steiner. I think that would be -- that  
21 would be -- it's not very good. The  
22 argument that we don't have any right.  
23 I think the Senate is very important to  
24 the University. Is it that top heavy  
25 that we must march in line to whatever  
0061  
01 is told to us without any comments at  
02 all? To me that's absurd.  
03 The fact that the Senate is very  
04 important to Administration.  
05 (inaudible) It can't be a top heavy  
06 thing. I don't -- I'm confused as to  
07 what's in there in terms of have you  
08 eliminated any groups of people, have  
09 you added any groups of people.  
10 UNIDENTIFIED: Actually we did add the retirees. We  
11 added a group of the retirees to be able

12 to continue with e-mail. As a result of  
13 eliminating the U-connect account, the  
14 retirees previously had U-connect.  
15 And so we now have licenses for  
16 them to have, keep an exchange e-mail  
17 account. I had offered -- we were  
18 scheduled to come to the last meeting,  
19 and we didn't get on the agenda.  
20 So could we consider a ten day  
21 period for you all to provide written --  
22 I mean we're in absolutely no hurry.  
23 And I think it's very critical to have  
24 your inputs and to have a ten day period  
25 for comments to come back and then

0062

01 perhaps have Kaveh decide whether we  
02 need to have another public discussion  
03 or --

04 CHAIR: I actually --  
05 UNIDENTIFIED: -- have another public discussion. We  
06 are flexible.

07 CHAIR: -- tell me -- Monday there will be a  
08 Senate Council meeting and the Senate  
09 Council is going to make the decision  
10 based on the input from the faculty,  
11 whether to request this to be delayed  
12 until we have a larger quorum. I  
13 apologize because this was my mistake.

14 If you have not read this  
15 beforehand, I admit it. I don't think  
16 you can vote on this or speak on it if  
17 you haven't seen it before. This is not  
18 enough. I brought it in case somebody  
19 wants to say hey, page 8, this word  
20 should be changed. Name.

21 MITCHELL: Mitchell, Dentistry. I think you have a  
22 motion on the floor.

23 CHAIR: We have a motion on the floor. So we  
24 are discussing the motion, actually. So  
25 let's discuss the motion.

0063

01 ELDRERD: Janet Eldred, Arts and Sciences. I  
02 wanted to second Mike's idea, that I  
03 really would like a discussion, as  
04 opposed to a reading, and it's not  
05 because I'm fearful that there may be  
06 something in there that is going to be  
07 done to me.

08 But it does seem like the kind of  
09 document, where we have someone explain  
10 and to provide background. It's  
11 something you've done a lot of work,  
12 you've collected a lot of information.  
13 And it's probably just easier to discuss  
14 than try to provide a document with  
15 little notes everywhere or footnotes or  
16 whatever.

17 I prefer to have a discussion  
18 rather than a reading in ten days, give  
19 us your comments. I feel like I'm only  
20 getting a part of the story.

21 CHAIR: Anybody else wants to discuss the  
22 motion? As I said there may be,

23  
24  
25  
0064

perhaps, a May meeting. If that's the case then maybe it could be done during May.

01  
02  
03  
04

But we have a motion and I want you to know a yes or no on this motion does not obligate the administration. It's only advisory.

05 PHELPS:  
06  
07  
08  
09

Nick Phelps, College of Ag. I have a technical question. I didn't quite understand a previous answer. Do we have to have something in place by fall? Is there a mandate to do that?

10 DEATON:  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

Yes. The mandate is because of the new E-discovery rule that the federal government has accommodated. Our old version is not working for us in the legal office when we have to put litigation holds on people's computers and copy their hard drives and store that. So we've been working on this a long time.

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0065

And what I've learned from this discussion today is that we need to bring those two lead singers because they affect the whole group. We thought by going to the Senate Council -- and we did get a lot of good feedback and we made those changes.

01  
02  
03  
04

And I can see now we need to do that a little bit differently in the future when we have this kind of a big change.

05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12

As you can see, this is -- it's almost so rewritten that you can't really track the old version. But what we do have is a totally clean version of the new draft and we can send that out. We would like to have -- we wanted to get this one done and approved before the end of the academic year.

13  
14  
15

So if there are any other ways that we can get that done, we'll work with you

16 CHAIR:  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0066

Marcy, this is really my fault. The only other way would be we set a date, we will give you a week, you read this, give us your most serious concern and Senate Council will review that concern and would basically make the same motion that you want to make now, make that motion and say the Senate is not ready to -- we are asking you to delay, if that could be the case.

01  
02  
03  
04

That's the only other way I can see. otherwise at a May meeting or we have a motion right now, we have to work on that motion. Connie Wood.

05 WOOD:  
06  
07

Connie Wood, Arts and Sciences. I don't understand your last comment.

The motion on the floor basically

08 asks to have you put it on the May  
09 agenda when the faculty has had an  
10 opportunity to read this document that  
11 is -- I'm on the Senate Council and it  
12 is very well put together but it is a  
13 very extensive document and it contains  
14 quite a bit of information, which you  
15 implied that. I don't understand your  
16 comment --  
17 CHAIR: Which comment?  
18 WOOD: Would it hurt your timeline if we just  
19 moved this agenda item to the --  
20 CHAIR: No.  
21 WOOD: -- May meeting?  
22 DEATON: No. I think I was under the impression  
23 there is not always a May meeting.  
24 CHAIR: Actually here is an interesting  
25 suggestion to you. Why don't you amend  
0067  
01 the motion and include a May meeting in  
02 the motion and let the Senators work on  
03 that right now? That would be a very  
04 interesting matter. So I ask someone to  
05 amend the motion. Bob Cook.  
06 COOK: Yes. Just to keep everything  
07 parliamentary, I would like to offer to  
08 amend the motion which says that in  
09 place of having -- discussing -- having  
10 a mandated discussion, to allow the  
11 Senate Council to decide next Monday  
12 whether to recommend this be put on the  
13 agenda.  
14 That will allow-- the purpose of my  
15 motion is to allow for the procedure you  
16 suggested a moment ago, so the faculty  
17 as a whole can vote whether they want to  
18 go through that procedure of having  
19 posted comments and then the Senate  
20 Council decides does it seem so in the  
21 meeting --  
22 CHAIR: Based on input --  
23 COOK: -- based on input from the faculty, the  
24 amendment that I'm offering to the  
25 motion. And obviously it changes the  
0068  
01 sense of the motion but I think everyone  
02 should vote on it. And if they don't  
03 like it, it will go back --  
04 CHAIR: But it's not necessarily a friendly  
05 amendment.  
06 COOK: No.  
07 CHAIR: Any second to that amendment?  
08 STEINER: Second.  
09 CHAIR: Steiner seconded it. Okay, let's not  
10 only talk to the amendment. We have to  
11 speed this up or something.  
12 CIBULL: Number one, that amendment changes the  
13 kind of motion. It's not an amendment,  
14 it's a new motion. It's senseless.  
15 Number two, the longer we talk about  
16 this the more it guarantees us there  
17 will be a May meeting. So, you know,  
18 whether you want a May meeting or not,

19 there will be a May meeting. So, so I'm  
20 speaking against the amendment.  
21 CHAIR: So if this amendment is approved you  
22 could see it amended to include a May  
23 meeting. By the way, technically  
24 speaking --  
25 CIBULL: There are two different issues. One is  
0069  
01 whether the Senate thinks it is  
02 necessary to have a general discussion  
03 of what, without reading this, appears  
04 to me to be an important policy that  
05 affects the lives of all faculty, not  
06 just the Senate but everybody on the  
07 faculty.  
08 That's -- that's what I think we  
09 are dealing with here. Whether it's in  
10 May or it's next fall, that's what we're  
11 dealing with. So I don't think we  
12 should cloud the issue by saying, well,  
13 you know, throw the May thing in there  
14 just to see if we just can't push it  
15 over -- to not discuss it.  
16 CHAIR: Just to make sure everyone understands,  
17 Mike Cibull is correct. The amendment  
18 changes the favor. But, in fact, there  
19 are things called substitute amendments  
20 which totally change it. So it's a  
21 varied and -- it's a varied amendment,  
22 but maybe you should work against it or  
23 for it.  
24 Any discussion on the amendment?  
25 Let's vote on the amendment. The  
0070  
01 amended one will find that you need --  
02 this decision, whether or not to ask the  
03 Administration to delay this to the  
04 Senate Council, based on input from  
05 Senators in the next week. Correct?  
06 CIBULL: Yes.  
07 CHAIR: All those in favor of the amendment  
08 please indicate so by raising your hand.  
09 Can you please count?  
10 MICHELLE: Eight.  
11 CHAIR: All those opposed? Okay. We don't have  
12 to count. Obviously -- abstain? So  
13 eight in favor, zero abstain. The  
14 amendment stays. Let's not talk or vote  
15 or discuss the original motion  
16 unamended. Any discussion? Yes.  
17 UNIDENTIFIED: I'd like to add an amendment to that to  
18 allow for the May meeting. I don't know  
19 how to phrase that, but I think what is  
20 here that they voted on is that they  
21 would like to discuss it. Hence we need  
22 to have this scheduled for a May  
23 discussion, in order to meet their time  
24 lines. It has to be -- it can't be  
25 delayed, so --  
0071  
01 CHAIR: So the essence of the amendment is to  
02 hear it in a May -- special meeting of  
03 the Senate -- meeting in May. Do we

04 have a second on that amendment?  
05 MITCHELL: Mitchell.  
06 CHAIR: Mitchell seconded it. Okay, let's  
07 discuss this amendment only, please.  
08 BLAIR: Blair with Staff Senate. Are we taking  
09 into consideration these individuals and  
10 whether or not they can attend the May  
11 meeting to discuss this?  
12 (INAUDIBLE)  
13 DIEDRICH: What is the date? 5th? 12th?  
14 CHAIR: Actually. Well, it's May 12th? We  
15 might actually meet in May -- we have  
16 already discussed this. I anticipated  
17 for other reasons there may be a May  
18 meeting and if we have a May meeting we  
19 would do it on the 5th. That's my  
20 guess.  
21 We don't have to always have it on  
22 the second week of the month and the 5th  
23 is a day of grace for you. I think you  
24 would agree that the 5th is a better  
25 date than the 12th. Let's only discuss  
0072  
01 the amendment, please. Connie Wood.  
02 WOOD: Could we set a May meeting on May 5th?  
03 I believe that is a Monday.  
04 CHAIR: Yes.  
05 UNIDENTIFIED: I second.  
06 CHAIR: So the amendment is to add and to have a  
07 May 15 special meeting of the Senate.  
08 UNIDENTIFIED: May 5th.  
09 UNIDENTIFIED: May 5th.  
10 CHAIR: May 5th. May 5th. Any discussion on  
11 the amendment only? Okay, let's vote.  
12 Michelle? David, we have to count it.  
13 All in favor of the amendment please  
14 indicate by raising your hand. Opposed.  
15 One opposed. Abstained? One, two  
16 three. Did you get that, David?  
17 MR. RANDALL: Yes.  
18 CHAIR: Thank you. So the amendment passes. We  
19 don't have to worry. Now we have an  
20 amendment which is two parts. One part  
21 is to ask the Administration not to  
22 process these AR until the Senate has  
23 the opportunity to hear this in a live  
24 meeting. And two, there would be a May  
25 5th special meeting of the Senate. Are  
0073  
01 we ready to vote on that? Any  
02 discussion? All those in favor of this  
03 amendment motion please indicate by  
04 raising your hand. Any opposed? I  
05 don't see any hands, Michelle.  
06 UNIDENTIFIED: Wait --  
07 CHAIR: One opposed?  
08 UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah.  
09 CHAIR: Who is the person who -- well, I don't,  
10 I just want to make sure it's correct.  
11 One opposed. Abstained? One abstained.  
12 PIERCE: I'm opposed mainly because I can't  
13 attend. Connie Pierce. College of  
14 Medicine.

15 CHAIR: It's done, the motion carried. Yes.  
16 DEATON: If you don't mind, we can send out the  
17 current, final version. It would be  
18 very helpful before the May 5th  
19 discussion if you did send comments to  
20 us so we can organize this and the  
21 meeting will go much smoother.  
22 CIBULL: May I make a suggestion?  
23 PIERCE: Yes.  
24 CIBULL: Since you're going to send it out  
25 anyway, could you send it in bulk point  
0074  
01 what you feel are the major points of  
02 this --  
03 PIERCE: Yes.  
04 CHAIR: Executed summary of the changes.  
05 DEATON: They already have that.  
06 CHAIR: And this time I will bring you a  
07 physical copy of it, I promise. Okay,  
08 my apologies to you.  
09 HOUSE: I have a question.  
10 CHAIR: Yes.  
11 HOUSE: Are the -- Lou House from the College of  
12 Design. Is the E-discovery available  
13 online as well? The document, program  
14 that you were referring to.  
15 DEATON: Yeah. It's a big federal law.  
16 CHAIR: Okay, thank you very much. Okay, we are  
17 done with this one. Winter Intercession  
18 Calendar. We often give you calendars.  
19 Last time, the previous meeting, we  
20 approved about a dozen or so other  
21 calendars.  
22 Now you have the calendar for the  
23 Intercession, 2008/2009. I believe that  
24 one is in your handout, because it's not  
25 a very long document.  
0075  
01 It has been approved by the Senate  
02 Council with a positive submission to  
03 you and the submission should be we  
04 don't need a motion on this because it  
05 comes from Senate Council, that the  
06 Senate approves the 2008/2009 winter  
07 intercession calendar.  
08 So basically this motion is in  
09 front of you. I would like to open it  
10 up for discussion. Okay.  
11 Hearing no discussion, and nobody  
12 would like to speak, let's vote on the  
13 approval of this. Let's vote on this.  
14 All those in favor of this proposal or  
15 this motion please indicate so by  
16 raising your hand. Opposed? Abstained?  
17 It is unanimous, David. The motion  
18 carries. Thank you.  
19 I'm being told by my wife to go to  
20 Items 9, 10 and 11. And I don't know --  
21 I know exactly why it is. She is making  
22 that suggestion, because we are going to  
23 have a May meeting, these items could  
24 be done at that time. So I'm going to  
25 go to Item 9.

0076

01

02

03

04

05

06

07

08

09

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

0077

01

02

03

04

05

06

07

08

09

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

0078

01

02

03

04

05

06

07

08

09

10

But before that -- oh, wait a second. No, I cannot do that. Jackie, thank you, I heard you, although you were not very loud. We cannot do that. We have to do the degrees. The degrees. I'm going to go -- skip Number 5. If you have an objection please let me know, because once these items are up, I cannot take back a change. It is subject to the vote of the Senate. So I'm going to skip Number 5. I'm going to skip Number 6. I'm going to skip Number 7. I'm going to skip Number 8. And I apologize to those who came here for those items.

Let us go to Item 9. These are our students, we cannot wait. It will be approved by the Board of Trustees a week from tomorrow.

Senate Council, this a KCTCS degree list -- well, that is Item 9. You are correct. Jackie, what is wrong with Number 9? /

I'm sorry?  
Why don't we just do it?

JACKIE:

CIBULL:

CHAIR:

We're going to do it. Senate Council has approved this list with a positive recommendation and a commendation, which is in front of you. This is a list of students who would be receiving probation if they have completed all the requirements, which they are taking in the first semester. Is there a problem? These are on page -- on page 24. The name of the students, KCTCS students. Pardon me.

(INAUDI BLE)

Jackie, do you have a comment on that, why they only have one student? Well, remember we are in the down-phasing -- they had to have started at KCTCS by a certain date in order to have theirs at UK and we are now in the down -- the downside of that. Most of the kids have long graduated.

JACKIE:

CHAIR:

We are no longer doing every phase of KCTCS. Imagine a lot of people were in it to graduate. Eventually at the end there will only be one person to graduate and this is the situation.

So we have a motion -- this is from the Senate Council, we don't need a motion. It is in front of if you. All those in the favor of the motion please indicate by raising your hand. Opposed? Abstained?

That one is unanimous. Motion carried. Let's go to Number 10. Okay, we were going to keep the other curricular items. We will go to Number



11 11. You can see, UK is not in its  
12 regular blue color, it's red, because  
13 I'm thinking that we sent you out, by  
14 mistake it said KCTCS.  
15 It was the, I think the agenda you  
16 received today but I wanted to bring it  
17 to your attention, that it was a  
18 mistake, these are UK students. Same  
19 thing every year, federal funds.  
20 Jackie, are there any names to be added  
21 or are they already added in the  
22 handouts?  
23 JACKIE: I have heard from a couple of folks and  
24 I have added in things that we needed to  
25 add.  
0079  
01 CHAIR: Are those the handouts? Do you have a  
02 copy of the handouts?  
03 JACKIE: I don't think anybody has a copy of the  
04 handouts.  
05 CHAIR: Oh, okay. There is a partial list on  
06 page 277.  
07 (INAUDIBLE)  
08 CHAIR: We had a couple of additions that the  
09 faculty wrote for and said this person's  
10 name should be added before it goes to  
11 the registrar. The registrar did the  
12 investigation and on some of those they  
13 added -- and it's already added, to the  
14 best of my knowledge, the list. And  
15 that is until a -- a question comes up.  
16 Are you ready to vote on that? All  
17 those in favor of this raise your right  
18 hand. I notice I fixed it here but I  
19 did not fix it here. So this would be  
20 also UK. For some reason I cannot do  
21 it. I thought I got all of it. Yes. I  
22 fixed the other one, I'll fix this one.  
23 All those in favor of this indicate  
24 by raising your hands. Opposed.  
25 Abstained. It is unanimous. Thank you.  
0080  
01 Motion carried.  
02 Okay. Let's go to -- I'm assuming  
03 that we are going to 12. Yes, we are.  
04 Okay. Unless I hear any objection from  
05 you, because, again, I cannot  
06 unilaterally -- unilaterally do that.  
07 CIBULL: These people just from the proposal --  
08 CHAIR: Correct. That's why I stated the  
09 objection.  
10 COOK: I object. Let's go back to Number 5.  
11 CIBULL: Yeah. I think we should go back to  
12 Number 5, since we had submitted them to  
13 the previous discussion.  
14 CHAIR: That's fine. This body works by  
15 motion --  
16 CIBULL: I move that we --  
17 CHAIR: No, you don't have to move to do what  
18 you are supposed to do. Because if  
19 nobody says anything, we are going to do  
20 what we are supposed to do. But if  
21 anybody wants to make a suggestion, that

22 would be a motion. So accordingly, if  
23 there are no objections I'm going to go  
24 to Number 5.

25 Okay. A new center for

0081

01 microbiology has been approved by the  
02 Senate Council with the following  
03 recommendation. Let me see, this one,  
04 the proposal, at least four pages of it,  
05 I told Andrea less than four page, five  
06 page, please. More than that I would  
07 show it on the screen. But this one is  
08 there for you.

09 So, let me ask Michael Beel. Is  
10 Michael Beel here? I have seen you.  
11 Yes. At this time do you want to add  
12 anything or do you want to respond to  
13 questions?

14 BEEL: I appreciate the offer or the  
15 opportunity to have our proposal  
16 considered by the Senate. Given the  
17 lengthy deliberations up to this point,  
18 I won't belabor this by giving you a  
19 summary or overview but I would be  
20 delighted to answer any questions you  
21 might have.

22 CHAIR: Are there any questions? Mike Cibull.

23 CIBULL: Budgetary impact. What is the budgetary  
24 impact of this?

25 BEEL: The budget for the Center, as outlined

0082

01 in the proposal comes from two sources.  
02 Basically the one source represents  
03 start-up funds and a good faith  
04 investment on the part of the College of  
05 Medicine. The first few years will be  
06 \$75,000 per year.

07 From that point forward, years  
08 three and four will be \$25,000 a year.  
09 That's from the College. We anticipate  
10 that if this were to go forward, the  
11 budgetary proposal, we have we would  
12 receive indirect cost rates, 10 percent  
13 of the indirect cost of regular members  
14 of the Center.

15 So we would get money back from the  
16 grants that our Center investigators  
17 bring in to the University. It would be  
18 a portion of the indirect costs that  
19 would come from the budget of the vice  
20 president for research.

21 CHAIR: Bob Grossman.

22 GROSSMAN: What does the Center do that can't be  
23 done by faculty working together, like  
24 we usually do?

25 BEEL: Good question. What this lets us do is

0083

01 it creates the opportunity for us to  
02 establish programs or research programs  
03 and educational programs that could not  
04 be logically -- well, it would be  
05 difficult to coordinate this across the  
06 four colleges and one graduate school

07 center that are participating. As it  
08 is, this is a broadly interdisciplinary  
09 program.

10 The idea is that the University  
11 basically has already recruited and  
12 invested in a number of Sandwell  
13 investigators. But these investigators  
14 are scattered across campus. So there  
15 is no mechanism for them to interact,  
16 there is no mechanism for them to  
17 function as a cohesive group. And the  
18 Center would provide that, in so far as  
19 the investigators are bringing in,  
20 adequately search.

21 DEAN: If I may, it also projects an image. It  
22 also projects an image to proper  
23 foundations, it projects an image to  
24 central zoners that we have a cadre of  
25 individuals who are focused on specific

0084  
01 things and can move forward. College  
02 of Ag.

03 UNIDENTIFIED: I think, as you presented in the Senate  
04 Council meeting, it also positions you  
05 for Center grants, which is a very  
06 important source of -- you've got to be  
07 -- you've got to be a cohesive unit to  
08 be competitive, you know. So you made  
09 that argument at the Senate Council but  
10 I think it's important, you know, it's  
11 different than just collaborative. It  
12 shows really bonafied integration and  
13 movement forward in a particular area.

14 DEAN: Thank you for that reminder. You're  
15 right.

16 CHAIR: Are we ready to vote on this? All those  
17 in this creation of this new Center for  
18 Microbiology indicate so by raising your  
19 hand. Any opposition? Abstain?  
20 it's also unanimous, based on my  
21 eyesight.

22 Let's go to the next item.  
23 Proposal to expand transfer credit to  
24 PhDs. Some of you might know that  
25 transfer credits are allowed for only

0085  
01 master students and they are not  
02 applicable to PhD students.

03 I think Dean Blaxer couldn't be  
04 here. We have Dean Jackson here. So  
05 let me give you the opportunity, if you  
06 want, to somewhat summarize. I think  
07 this is in your handout, let me make  
08 sure. Yes, it is your handout, pages 12  
09 to 14. Is there any, Dean Jackson, do  
10 you want to add anything?

11 JACKSON: To summarize it, we've come across a lot  
12 of students that are in the doctoral  
13 program question why a limited number of  
14 courses cannot be transferred for the 36  
15 hours required for pre-qualifying.

16 It isn't a student decision. The  
17 courses selected must fulfill the

18 criteria presented in your handouts and  
19 also must be approved by the director of  
20 Graduate Studies. And in the case of  
21 most doctoral students, it would need  
22 approval by the student advisory  
23 committee. Not just -- they would be  
24 pretty specifically, (inaudible).  
25 CHAIR: Approval by Senate Council --  
0086  
01 STEINER: This isn't a question. My impression is  
02 that the PhD didn't require courses --  
03 the PhD graduate student isn't required  
04 the courses you do for a master's. I  
05 don't see why the program couldn't just  
06 accept or not accept.  
07 JACKSON: Because you would need to show 36 hours,  
08 a minimum of 36 hours of course work to  
09 be eligible to sit for the qualifying  
10 examination.  
11 CHAIR: We all know that is a requirement.  
12 Right? It's maybe the 36 hours you are,  
13 in your mind, is what is residency  
14 hours. Connie Wood in the back.  
15 WOOD: I also share a silly concern about this.  
16 First thing in reading this, maybe could  
17 come under a point of information, it  
18 says that one (inaudible) who greatly  
19 benefits from this are students who have  
20 to pay UK tuition for credit by  
21 examination.  
22 I've never known a student,  
23 undergraduate or graduate, to who have  
24 to pay for hours of paying for credit by  
25 examination. So that's one. Jackie  
0087  
01 Hager, I checked that with Jackie before  
02 she left.  
03 The other thing is that even though  
04 I do agree that somehow, some degree of  
05 flexibility to prepare the students who  
06 have to leave campus to do work, course  
07 work. I'm also very concerned, because  
08 the PhD is a residency based degree, not  
09 an hourly degree. And residency can  
10 always be waived by the dean of the  
11 graduate school.  
12 I think that we are are taking an  
13 extreme step by allowing transfer of  
14 credit. And we have never allowed that  
15 in the past because of the fact that we  
16 did not want to allow students to obtain  
17 a doctoral degree without at least some  
18 training here at UK.  
19 CHAIR: Okay. Dean Jackson?  
20 JACKSON: To respond to the comment, the issue is  
21 that the rules as they stand, are such  
22 that if a student had a prior master's  
23 degree from an accredited institution,  
24 that would be equivalent to 18 hours of  
25 those 36. So for those individuals that  
0088  
01 are only requiring 18 additional hours  
02 of residency at UK, this proposal is

03 simply going to allow them nine. So  
04 it's still within 27 hours.  
05 So the rule in place allows a  
06 considerable amount of leeway.  
07 WOOD: For information, Brian, it says that a  
08 student that has a master's and  
09 therefore only has one year of  
10 pre-qualifying residency to satisfy,  
11 since this would not be matriculated.  
12 JACKSON: Correct. Because (inaudible) if you  
13 allow to take both of those credits, if  
14 you will, mean nine hours of course  
15 work. That would agree -- so at least  
16 this way the 18 hours are in.  
17 WOOD: But then how does that help the student  
18 who comes here ready to sit qual?  
19 JACKSON: In exceptional circumstances, as you  
20 correctly pointed out, an appeal can be  
21 made. But for most students if the  
22 committee under the admitted program  
23 feels that there's still coursework to  
24 be completed, under the circumstances  
25 it's going to be a minimum of 18 hours  
0089  
01 of course work at UK prior to the  
02 qualifying examination.  
03 It gives one other option for  
04 someone who does not have a master's  
05 degree could, with the approval of the  
06 program, transfer nine hours. You  
07 cannot do both.  
08 CHAIR: Let me go to Bob Grossman.  
09 GROSSMAN: Yeah. I guess I have a question. Where  
10 are the actual words of this proposal?  
11 I see a rationale, I see on page 12  
12 there's a rationale. On page 13 there  
13 is kind of an explanation.  
14 I didn't see the actual proposal.  
15 The words go with the rules -- the words  
16 that go with the rules. The words that  
17 go with the rules --  
18 CHAIR: Bob, I probably the same speech that I  
19 made before but let me see if I could --  
20 (Inaudible, several talking simultaneously.)  
21 CHAIR: -- would you tell me -- (inaudible) --  
22 to that --  
23 GROSSMAN: I was asking, are the actual words that  
24 go in the rules are going to begin: We  
25 propose? Is that what you're saying?  
0090  
01 CHAIR: Dean Jackson, where is the actual  
02 wording of what you want to --  
03 JACKSON: Paragraph 2, the proposal.  
04 CHAIR: Paragraph 2, the proposal.  
05 GROSSMAN: All right, I also have a question about  
06 the procedure for this. In the  
07 rationale it says, the very last clause  
08 of the last sentence is: If the course  
09 work is approved by the graduate faculty  
10 and the program and recommended for  
11 transfer by the BGS. I don't see those  
12 words in the rule, paragraph two, for  
13 one thing.

14 For another, is this going to  
15 require a vote of the graduate program  
16 committee and the department or the  
17 faculty every time a student -- on the  
18 faculty of the program -- every time a  
19 student wants to be transferred, is this  
20 going to be left up to the program?  
21 Left up to the BGS?

22 I think these things need to be  
23 spelled out. If it's approval by the  
24 BGS, then it's approval by the BGS. If  
25 it's approval by the program then that

0091  
01 should be spelled out. But I don't see  
02 any of that here so I have no guidance.  
03 JACKSON: I would entirely agree with that. I  
04 think reinterpretation of that  
05 statement. But I think we are  
06 fundamentally saying the same rules  
07 would apply in terms of approving that  
08 sort of credit, as for a master's  
09 program. The additional oversight  
10 would be built in, for -- if the advisor  
11 would (inaudible) would be involved in  
12 any instance, but not  
13 incomplete, (inaudible).

14 CHAIR: But we have a motion in front of us. We  
15 either have to amend it or dispose of it  
16 or approve of it or not approve of it.  
17 Either way we have a motion.

18 CHAIR: Yes, Yates.

19 YATES: I think what Bob is saying basically is  
20 most of the time we agree specifically  
21 on wording when you go into the  
22 administrative regulations about these  
23 policies and this isn't it. I mean,  
24 this appears to be the concept and we  
25 might agree on concept. But this isn't

0092  
01 what would appear in the graduate  
02 catalog, is kind of what he's saying.  
03 Right?

04 GROSSMAN: Yeah.

05 YATES: So it appears to me that we need  
06 specific wording going into the graduate  
07 catalog, because that's often when we  
08 make wording suggestions to try to  
09 clarify, so I think that's,

10 CHAIR: But we work with the motion. So --  
11 amendment to the motion --

12 GROSSMAN: I move --

13 CHAIR: Before that, Dean Jackson, do you have  
14 any suggestions to remedy the request or  
15 the concern that was mentioned that the  
16 actual wording of the rule is not  
17 available?

18 JACKSON: From the incorporating concern, that's  
19 absolutely correct. We can either do it  
20 by amendment here or if you prefer to  
21 return it, that would be fine too.

22 CHAIR: Yes. Bob Grossman.

23 GROSSMAN: I move that we table this until the May  
24 meeting so that we can see, in the

25 meantime, the exact rule -- wording of  
0093  
01 the rule that goes into whatever --  
02 wherever these rules go, the graduate  
03 handbook, the University Senate rules,  
04 whatever to be formulated.  
05 CHAIR: Both of the rules -- but we have it  
06 presented by Yates. Anybody wants to  
07 discuss --  
08 CIBULL: You can't discuss a motion that is  
09 tabled. We cannot. Parliamentarian?  
10 RANDALL: That works for me.  
11 CHAIR: That sounds good to me and I don't think  
12 there is a desire on the part of anyone  
13 to discuss it. So let's just -- if you  
14 don't want it we will vote against it.  
15 Let's vote on the motion to table until  
16 May. All those in favor so indicate by  
17 raising your hands. Any opposed? Any  
18 Abstained? The motion to table is  
19 unanimous.  
20 We just did this one. Okay, this  
21 one is actually also the person who  
22 presented or who answered your  
23 questions. Mike, do we need to finish  
24 this one? It would be nice if Mike  
25 doesn't have to come back during May,  
0094  
01 because we did the Microbiology.  
02 UNIDENTIFIED: About Number 7 --  
03 CHAIR: I thought we just did Number 7. No, it  
04 was not. Let's do 7. I didn't mean to  
05 skip that. If the precursor is prior to  
06 the requirement it have been approved by  
07 the Senate Council with the  
08 recommendation, the same situation. The  
09 Associate Dean is here to answer any  
10 questions. Do you want to add anything  
11 to that?  
12 JACKSON: Well, I'd be happy to try to answer any  
13 questions.  
14 CHAIR: Okay, let's go to questions. Are there  
15 any questions? The proposal or at least  
16 a form of it. At this point I really  
17 don't know if all of the proposal, if  
18 you have it or what portions were  
19 omitted, which I deeply regret it  
20 because of the -- because -- pages 16  
21 and 17.  
22 This -- from memory I remember we  
23 used to have only one type of the  
24 proceeding requirement and then we  
25 changed it to three ways, but now we are  
0095  
01 defining further. All right?  
02 JACKSON: I'm sorry, if you wanted me to go  
03 through the description, yes, correct.  
04 It would require a pre-qualifying  
05 residency requirement, being  
06 fundamentally a minimum of 36 hours of  
07 course work. But those 36 hours have to  
08 be structured in a particular timeframe,  
09 if you will.

10 And, for example, Model 1 would be  
11 to take -- to require to take two  
12 fulltime semesters of course work, at  
13 least nine hours in each of those  
14 semesters and then make up the other 18  
15 hours in other ways, either credit for a  
16 master's degree or 18 hours over an  
17 indeterminate period of time would be  
18 okay.

19 And in essence Models 2 and 3 were  
20 on similar lines. Called it -- over a  
21 year or two years ago a proposal came  
22 from Senate and was approved. So by now  
23 students have a maximum of five years to  
24 complete the pre-qualifying residency  
25 requirement, from the time of their

0096

01 enrollment. And I move therefore that  
02 the models no longer really apply. That  
03 fundamentally the proposal would be to  
04 do away with Models 1, 2 and 3. And  
05 simply the requirement would be that 36  
06 hours of course work be completed within  
07 the five year timeframe.

08 CHAIR: Are there any questions, or concerns  
09 regarding this proposal? Back there.  
10 Name?

11 UNIDENTIFIED: I think the exact wording, Brian, is  
12 page 16 and it's in quotations. Right?

13 (inaudible)

14 CHAIR: It seems that -- yes.

15 HOLTON: David Holton, College of Economics. So  
16 that the language says: The course work  
17 should be completed in five years. Why  
18 should it be five?

19 Is the fear that it shall be  
20 completed or that it should be?  
21 JACKSON: The wording was such, because a program  
22 has an opportunity to request a time  
23 extension in the five years. You have  
24 through Graduate School, through  
25 Graduate Council in reality to go up to

0097

01 a maximum of eight years.

02 The converse is that it's also  
03 built into the structure of the program  
04 to submit to Graduate Council the  
05 requirement to reduce that timeframe to  
06 below five years.

07 In essence with the five years, in  
08 reality there are opportunities to  
09 change it all along the, if that were  
10 approved, then it would be applied to  
11 that.

12 SOTTILE: Joe Sottile, College of Engineering.  
13 We had a similar question. We just  
14 suggested the last paragraph on page 15:  
15 Pre-qualifying residency requirements,  
16 completion of 36 hours of course work or  
17 a master's degree and 18 hours of  
18 coursework within five years of  
19 enrollment.

20 And that was obtained from our



21 committee and then maintained the intent  
22 of the proposal. And I think that this  
23 was what Bob had brought up in the last  
24 item, is an appropriate wording for a  
25 motion.

0098

01 And you're certainly welcome to  
02 change it if you think it needs to be  
03 changed. We tried to put it into words  
04 so that people would be able to vote on  
05 something that looked like a motion.

06 CHAIR: Are you ready to vote on that?  
07 UNIDENTIFIED: I'm not sure what we're voting on. The  
08 wording that's in quotations or the  
09 wording that was just referred to?

10 CHAIR: Why don't we ask Dean Jackson, which one  
11 are we voting on?

12 JACKSON: Well, the motion to the last one, there,  
13 to the last comment there, would imply  
14 that every student had nothing but five  
15 years.

16 CHAIR: But would you tell us which version?  
17 Which one are you requesting that we  
18 vote for -- on?

19 JACKSON: I would suggest that the wording in  
20 there -- to assure that folks recognize  
21 that upon approval by Graduate Council  
22 the following qualifying examination  
23 could be modified, that would affect  
24 this requirement.

25 YATES: Yates, College of Education. We have to  
0099

01 vote on what's in quotations because  
02 that's what was presented to Senate  
03 Council. And unless somebody wants to  
04 make a motion to modify it, we have to  
05 vote on what came from the Senate  
06 Council. Right?

07 CHAIR: All right, we are voting on what is in  
08 quotations, Yates?

09 YATES: But I mean, I'm not saying that that's  
10 what it should be. I'm saying that if  
11 we want to change it we have to have a  
12 motion to change it. We can't just,  
13 like, which one are we voting on.

14 CHAIR: Okay. So just that everybody knows when  
15 they are voting, if you are voting, it  
16 would be on the one in quotations. Back  
17 there. Janet Eldred.

18 ELDRED: Yes. The committee voted to approve the  
19 change of pre-qualifying residency  
20 requirements and suggest the following  
21 language, which to me is, I thought was  
22 the Academic Standards Committee. So I  
23 thought the recommendation from the  
24 Senate Council was the bottom.

25 UNIDENTIFIED: We suggested that wording so it would be

0100

01 clear, because of the wording of should,  
02 we suggested that wording. Then it went  
03 to the Senate Council.

04 GROSSMAN: What did the Senate Council forward to  
05 us?

06 CHAIR: Somebody help me.  
07 UNIDENTIFIED: I think we forwarded what was in  
08 quotations.  
09 CHAIR: Okay, folks, we are voting on the one in  
10 quotations. You could vote it down, you  
11 could amend it. We are voting on the  
12 one in quotations. Mike Cibull.  
13 CIBULL: Yeah. I move that we amend should to  
14 shall.  
15 CHAIR: You have an amendment. Is there a  
16 second on that amendment?  
17 GROSSMAN: I'll second it.  
18 CHAIR: Okay, the word should to be changed  
19 shall. David, please make a note on  
20 that. Let's vote on that. I don't  
21 think we need to discuss it. All in  
22 favor of that amendment indicate by  
23 raising your hand. Any opposed? One,  
24 two, three opposed. Any abstained?  
25 One, two, three, four, five. In my  
0101  
01 opinion the yes, carries over, unless  
02 someone objects. So otherwise, three  
03 opposed and five abstained. David.  
04 The amendment is passed.  
05 Let's now talk about the amended  
06 motion. Are we ready to vote on that?  
07 Rocky.  
08 GILFINKLE: I fear that the current wording of the  
09 motion is so tight that it disallows  
10 programs from restricting amounts of  
11 time less than five years and it  
12 disallows, by petition, having the five  
13 years extended. I do not believe those  
14 are good ideas. Ray Gilfinkle, College  
15 of Engineering.  
16 GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Arts and Sciences. So the  
17 question is whether the five years here  
18 is modified elsewhere in the rules and  
19 that's an open question because only  
20 this one little paragraph was put in  
21 front of us to vote on. I move that we  
22 table this until May so that these  
23 matters are qualified or clarified for  
24 us.  
25 CHAIR: So we have another motion to table,  
0102  
01 apparently --  
02 OVERHOLTS: Second. Ray Overholts.  
03 (INAUDIBLE)  
04 CHAIR: It's very difficult that it's not --  
05 (INAUDIBLE)  
06 UNIDENTIFIED: We have a quorum?  
07 CIBULL: We don't have a quorum until somebody  
08 calls for a quorum.  
09 (INAUDIBLE)  
10 CIBULL: She didn't ask for a quorum. She asked  
11 a question. Are you calling for a  
12 quorum?  
13 CHAIR: Quorum. We had a quorum at the  
14 beginning. (inaudible) -- until  
15 somebody asks for a quorum. So let's  
16 vote on tabling the motion. All those

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0103  
01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
0104

in favor of tabling this proposal,  
 please identify by raising your hands.  
 Any opposed? Two opposed. Abstained?  
 Three abstained. Two opposed, three  
 abstained.

CHAIR: Okay, folks it is like two minutes after  
 five. Can we do Item Number 8?  
 (UNIDENTIFIED) Could I ask for a clarification first?  
 CHAIR: Yes.

(UNIDENTIFIED) Is the requirement for Number 8 made  
 clearer in this proposal, (inaudible),  
 or that there is flexibility built in,  
 that the time limit can be longer or  
 shorter, that was approved by Senate?  
 CHAIR: Could somebody who initiated tabling  
 answer that?  
 GROSSMAN: I would -- my suggestion is that the  
 wording of this rule make it clear that  
 the five years can be modified by the  
 program pursuant to some other section  
 of the rules. That's my suggestion.  
 CHAIR: Okay. At this point I am going to make  
 a decision to stop. It's after five  
 o'clock and we have a May meeting. I  
 hope that you all come back and have a  
 quorum at the May meeting.

THEREUPON, the University of  
 Kentucky Senate Council meeting for  
 April 14, 2008 was adjourned at 5:05  
 p.m.

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

STATE OF KENTUCKY)  
COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

I, MARY R. DEMATTINA, 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: August 30, 2008.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand  
and seal of office on this the \_\_\_ day of May, 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_  
MARY R. DEMATTINA  
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE AT LARGE  
KENTUCKY

Xcript 4-14-08 Senate.txt