

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

MAY 3, 2010

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

* * * *

* * * *

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

CHAIR: Of course this is our last Senate meeting of the year. As promised, we have a great deal of business to conduct today and I certainly would like to leave adequate time for the Provost as he gives his State of the University, Academic State of the University Address, so I'll probably put on my usual nasty of pressing everybody to go forward.

So, Sergeant at Arms, do you have a count for us, please?

SOHNER: Yeah, 51.

CHAIR: Fifty-one. So we have a quorum.

Thank you.

The minutes of the April Senate

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

Meeting are not prepared yet. We'll get them to you as we -- as we are able. I need to inform you that the Senate Council and waived a common examination -- or has waived the Senate Rule 5.2.4.8.1 to allow a common examination. This is an instance where normally two separate examinations for the same course would be given but it -- it makes it so much easier to control the exam if we allow this exam to be given as a common examination. And we have waived another exam that will be for a course that -- that takes place in the fall semester, I believe.

I also allowed the incorporation of a single individual on the graduation -- or Senate Council allowed the inclusion of a single individual on the graduation list. It turns out that that name was not added purely at the fault of an administrative error; not -- not anything that was the responsibility of the student.

The Senate Council has also -- as a part of that discussion, has also ruled that students names will be added to the list if there lack of inclusion is not due to their fault but is due exclusively to some administrative error; and under those circumstances their name -- their name will be added.

The Senate Council also moved that late additions, when there is no scheduled Senate Meeting, may be made by the Chair acting on behalf of the Senate Council if the -- if the matter that resulted in the lack of inclusion was -- inclusion was -- is not the student's doing, was an administrative problem. Those are the issues.

Recently, the Dean of the College of Health Sciences suspended admissions into the Master's and Ph.D. Program in Reproductive Sciences.

I guess candidly stated, there was some -- some concerns expressed by faculty members about this, and the Senate Council considered that issue fairly carefully at our April 26 meeting and moved that I inform you that the Dean has suspended admissions to this program for one year and that the reason was lack of resources and low enrollment.

It's not clear from Senate Rule 3.3.2 what constitutes a significant deduction to an academic program. Whether or not changes can be made are dependent upon whether or not there was significant changes and that issue came up in discussion.

So Senate Council explicitly stated that this action or this process whereby suspension of the admission, they did not -- we did not deem this to be a significant reduction; less than significant reduction. And so it does not set a precedent. We specifically note that the Deans suspending admission does not represent a precedent.

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

But it serves as an impetus to develop more formal language to address this possibility in the future. The Rules Committee will be working on that -- that matter.

The TurnItIn group will be reporting to Senate Council in our final meeting next week.

The -- in effect, the trial period has come to an end and we have statistics on the trial period, and effectually I'm informing you that we will very probably advise the provost to go ahead and purchase this -- this product.

Nonetheless, we still welcome anything final comments and if you would get them to Ruth Beattie, who's the chair of this committee, before Wednesday, we would very much appreciate it.

The winter intersession was a pilot project, and we have now, as a matter of fact, you'll recall, the last Senate Meeting we reported to you on the winter intersession statistics, and a formal proposal and a second reading/vote will be presented in September so that we will establish or we will -- we will recommend the establishment of a formal winter program and will take a second reading/vote on that in September.

Web transmittal is currently posted. You have from one -- one week from today to review and more transmittals will be coming. I believe there have been 50 issues sent now to the Senate office, and we're going to have to work through these as effectively as we can. So there will be transmittals coming and it's our responsibility to -- to look to those.

We are going to be holding a retreat toward the end of May. The considered issue: What can be done to improve Senate operations, performance, efficiency, effectiveness? And so, by all means, if you have continuing suggestions please do send them into the Senate office so we can consider them at our coming retreat.

There will be a webinar: The Role of Faculty Advisors in Student Success, on May 13th. If you would see Matthew Deffendall, if you're interested in this.

And, again, I think I reminded you last time that please you personally and urge your constituents if they would post their grades within 72 hours after the final examination. The people who have to deal with them at that point on would appreciate it.

You'll recall Deanna Sellnow and -- Deanna Sellnow and Diane Snow are here to tell us about the quality enhancement program. Apparently we haven't been overwhelmed with suggestions on that so, again, if you personally and if you would

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

remind your constituents to please, please send in suggestions so we can launch that program as it -- as it needs to go forward.

And so here are the emails to which that information or those suggestions should go.

So the first issue on your agenda is the Proposed New Center for Interprofessional Healthcare Education, Research and Practice. We have a number of guests: Anthony Hartsfield, Dean Perman, Andrea Pfeifle, Kelly Schuer and Kelly Smith, and I don't know who's taking the lead on this.

Please, come forward if you would.

This is a proposal to create a new educational entity to try and unite the programs of the health colleges.

PFEIFLE:

Thank you so much, and I appreciate the listing but I have to, first of all, gratefully acknowledge that several of my colleagues are here who are not listed and they're going to help me answer your questions about the proposal. And I'll have them raise their hands so you know who they are and you can address your questions to them.

I'm here with my colleagues to respectfully submit and answer your questions about a proposal to establish a Center for Interprofessional Education, Research and Practice.

The center's primary focus will be to support, evaluate and sustain an academic culture wherein students, faculty and staff work collaboratively to accomplish and report better outcomes than can be achieved independently.

According to the institute of medicine and others, in order to effectively work within the three models of healthcare our graduates must be able to become effective participants in a professional team.

Therefore, it has become imperative that we prepare our students using evidence-based curricular elements that teach them to value, learn from, respect and work with other professionals.

In healthcare the high stakes outcome of interprofessional education is improved safety and quality of care.

However in most of us in this room would agree that beyond healthcare it is imperative that our graduates -- all of our graduates from the University of Kentucky be equipped to work as effective collaborators and participants in teams regardless of their chosen careers.

Interprofessional education has become not only a national but an international concern and priority. So as educators and as scientist we must also

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

contribute to the larger body of knowledge around best practice and outcomes associated with interprofessional education and collaborative practice through rigorous and sound research. This would be another one of the key functions of the center.

You have the proposal, so I will not recite it to you word-for-word or even attempt to give you what would no doubt be an inadequate summary of the same.

Suffice it to say, however, that we have suggested what we think is a pretty good working model to start with for the center. We fully expect that this model would be revised over time in response to the outcomes of the center and the needs of the University.

I would like to add to what you have, however, that since the proposal was submitted in November and in response to Council's suggestions, we have modified the operational structure of the center so that it no longer would reside within the College of Medicine as originally proposed and, in fact, it would not reside at any college; rather, it would sit within the provost office and report through the provost's office for its outcomes.

It would continue to be governed by a board that consists of the deans of the participating colleges. At this point, we have eight active deans; health sciences as well as social -- social work, law and -- and communications has recently come on board as well, so that would make a total of nine.

The Director of the Center for Interprofessional Education would sit on the board with the deans, and they would work to establish priorities for the center that reflect the University's needs, with a working group of faculty representatives from each participating college.

So I'll conclude that summary of the proposal for you; ask my colleagues, who are in the room to help me answer your questions, to raise their hand so that you can see who they are.

This (unintelligible) is not my proposal by any stretch. I'm bringing this to you humbly on behalf of -- of many faculty and staff and students who have worked to bring it to this point.

So I'm going to open it up for questions at this point.

CHAIR: I'm going to show you the motions that we'll be voting on here, so questions please. Dr. Jones.

JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology.

Just to clarify: This is a center that's of the kind that's an educational unit research center or a multi-disciplinary, not an administrative center; is that correct?

PFEIFLE: It -- we actually have put it

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

forward as a research center because as an educational center it would need to be granting -- have its own courses and granting degrees. It is not going to function that way. As an educational center with a research -- a very strong research component.

JONES: So the answer was yes or no?

PFEIFLE: It's a research center.

JONES: But is it a kind of research center that's the kind called multi-disciplinary research center and institute, which is an educational unit?

UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah.

PFEIFLE: Yes. For all -- for all purposes.

This -- the answer to that question is bound by the regulations more so than --

JONES: I guess the reason I asked that was because if it's an educational unit, then this governing board of deans does not set the educational policy of the unit. It's the faculty associated with the unit who sets the educational policy.

PFEIFLE: Yes, but we would act under the advisement of the governing deans. It would not serve the center at all to operate independently.

CHAIR: Yes?

KIGHTLINGER: Mark Kightlinger from the College of Law.

As I was reading through this I noticed the College of Law was mentioned several places and since nobody in the faculty had heard of this, I asked the dean's office, and neither of the associate deans -- had heard of it, so I took it to the dean himself, and he said he was aware of it and had delegated it to somebody but as far as they know, we hadn't signed off on anything.

PFEIFLE: Yeah. Actually --

KIGHTLINGER: It's not a criticism, it's just suggesting that I think you may be -- you don't want to overplay the role of the College of Law in this.

PFEIFLE: Actually -- and that is why the College of Law letter is -- was removed from the proposal. When we took this to the College of Law, the active dean was --

KIGHTLINGER: Yeah.

PFEIFLE: And she was fully supportive. Dean Brennen also supported -- we met with him. He -- he did hook us up with several faculty, and we've had College of Law students participate in declaring the initiative recently, as well as contacted them about the leadership legacy. So I think it would be unfair not -- to say that the College of Law has not been actively involved. It's been in a transition of leadership. We did not want to hold Dean Brennen accountable for the -- an agenda that, you know, he hasn't had time to settle into and prioritize.

KIGHTLINGER: And yet the name is still listed on the --

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

PFEIFLY: And he gave me permission, yeah, to do that. I -- when I went and met with him I showed him the proposal and asked him if we could include the College of Law --

KIGHTLINGER: It must have slipped his mind when I asked him a few hours ago.

PFEIFLY: Can't speak to that.

CHAIR: John.

THELIN: John Thelin, Ed Policy Studies.

In Dean Perman's cover letter toward the bottom, he writes that: These important efforts must have a visible and permanent home, one which will position the University of Kentucky to be the national leader of education, research and practice of team-based patient care. We must seize the opportunity and so on.

Well, this kind of center has already been established at a number of other universities with medical and healthcare centers. My understanding is that you said that UK was not invited to a Carnegie foundation conference because they didn't have such a center, and a number of other university-based med and healthcare centers did.

So it seems to me it's a little presumptuous to say that we're going to be the national leader of anything. Well, almost everything. We're always behind. We're following. This is not original; it's not innovative. It's trying to catch up.

PFEIFLE: I'll speak to that part and the college can speak to that as well. We are not behind. We have been very actively engaged, as -- as an informal group of faculty and staff. I have been at the table in Washington with these same people. We do not have an organized center, which handicaps us when we make application to be part of a group of people who are competitively applying for participation in a conference such as this. I cannot speak to Dean Perman's statement, however. I didn't write that letter. He clearly wrote that letter, so... And I will ask if any -- yes?

BOTTO: My impression is --

BROTHERS: I'm sorry, name please?

BOTTO: I'm sorry. Oh, I'm sorry. Ron Botto, College of Dentistry.

My impression -- my impression is not that he was saying that we're going to be the leader, but the goal is to do the best we can and strive to become a leader. I read -- I know what you're saying, and I'm just saying my impression of the interpretation is not that we will be the leader, but our goal is to strive and work to be in that leadership role and to ultimately try to become a leader in the area.

But I don't think by joining in we would automatically be the leader, but I think that's the goal, to strive to -- to do

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

that and to be creative in -- in ways that are unique and can contribute; my impression. Please.

CHAIR:

WEBER:

BROTHERS:

WEBER:

I'll add to that comment in that --

I'm sorry, your name, please?

Donna Weber, College of Medicine and Pharmacology.

Just recently, and it was at UK -- on UK Now, the headline video last Friday was an interprofessional experience that I did with the College of Pharmacy and the College of Medicine students, and we are one of the first in the country to have a wider component of courses in the College of Medicine and in the College of Pharmacy where they did an interprofes -- all students were required to an interprofessional activity.

So I just point out that there is no point in striving to be the bottom rung of the ladder. Let's strive to be the top rung of the ladder, and I think we do -- are doing some things that would be benefitted by the center. Just in the project I did, it would greatly have been benefitted by having the center, so I think there's good things happening here because of the people that are adamant and passionate about this interprofessional experience and learning experience across many disciplines. I think we can truly gain benefit from having the center.

SWANSON:

Hollie Swanson College of Medicine.

Donna, could you follow-up on the how? How could a center benefit the course that you just did?

WEBER:

Well, first of all, as I just said, the project involved all the second year medical students and the third year pharmacy students. We originally intended for College of Nursing to be involved with this. And I think that that could have been realized if there had been a center that could help work with that component.

I had been trying and attempting to work on that for eight months, and the last week we were still scrambling and it didn't happen. So I think that can happen, as the center would -- would assist with that.

Also from the standpoint of -- I was working with some very good and experienced people in doing the standardized patients in simulation and able to use the College of Pharmacy facilities, which we could not have done this project in the College of Medicine and I -- again, I think the center would facilitate us using other facilities, accessing other staff, and so on.

As well as the fact that -- well, a lot of the assessment of this project that we did, we were looking -- it would have been helpful if we had interprofessional education best practices or some place to go with that expertise and assistance. I mean, it

definitely would have helped.

It was -- it -- these types of activities, as any of you can imagine, are tough enough in one college, much less across two or three, and I would love to see more of this involved in dental, health sciences, College of Dentistry as well as the social work and so on and so forth. There's just so much with medical education.

CHAIR:
ANDERSON:

Debra.

Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.

I have a question just to follow-up on what you were -- what you were saying. It seems to me that -- and I've just now come to this thought, so bear with me while I think it through.

But it seems to me that instead of interprofessional center for healthcare education, research and practice, that we need -- if we need anything at all, we need a center for interprofessional practice at the University of Kentucky, because I'm thinking as we're looking at this center we've got, what, nine colleges already that have signed on.

The College of Engineering is doing phenomenal things in healthcare right now. They need to be involved. Many of the colleges of Arts & Sciences do things with healthcare.

So why not make this University wide, and especially if it's coming out of the Provost's office, I mean, it seems to me this is going to be -- maybe it's bigger than what we...

WEBER:
PFEIFLE:

I agree with that.

It -- it is. Yeah, we -- we did start purely to not be presumptive on behalf of all the colleges. We started with the health science deans, and the health science deans didn't want to speak on behalf of the University.

Since that time, multiple folks in other colleges have come forward and are regularly participating in the work that we're doing, and we had broadened our perspective away from the Health Science Colleges to include broader University.

Saying that, we do acknowledge that healthcare quality and safety issues are one of our primary focuses in bringing these programs together, early on. But that doesn't -- that's not to -- doesn't cover all.

For example, we could not have done what we did in a course that I taught this year, deans honor colloquium, without the participation of social work; absolutely essential, their students and their faculty.

HART:

Kathryn Hart, College of Nursing.

Just to follow up on Dr. Anderson's comment, I think what this center does, and the College of Nursing fully supports the

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

proposal by vote of our faculty, and the dean of the College has a letter here, and it establishes a visible institutional presence that demonstrates our outward commitment to education practice, research at the interprofessional level and I think it opens the door to lots of these conversations that can happen and I think it also elevates the status so that we would be then competitive for grant opportunities.

Thank you.

CHAIR:

John.

THELIN:

Two hundred and sixty thousand dollars each year for compensation to break down institutional barriers that the administration itself have created at a time when faculty have voluntarily said, no, we don't want one percent salary increase; very expensive conversation.

CHAIR:

Further comments?

PFEIFLE:

Shall I respond?

CHAIR:

If you wish.

PFEIFLE:

Well, the \$260,000 are primarily allocated for activities that would come from salary supported folks that are currently involved in interprofessional education with no -- essentially with their individual colleges underwriting much of that.

Those funds have been -- that -- those activities are supported by the Provost and by Dr. Karpf. The funds that those -- that money comes from are not out there for general used. We cannot just decide what we want to do with them. It's not money that -- my understanding is that it's not up to us what Dr. Karpf is willing to support in this case with this money. This money is specifically for the purpose of interprofessional education.

So in a sen -- you are right, it is -- it is a lot of money, but as faculty salaries go and -- and salary support goes, it's a very modest office. It has a director, it has a full-time staff support and a project coordinator and the rest of the money goes to support programs that are already underway.

So, I mean, I can't defend the amount other than to tell you what it's for.

CHAIR:

Professor Jones.

JONES:

Davy Jones, Toxicology.

I was there when the provost -- I don't know if it's up there or not -- but when the provost was describing the money issue, he was directing it to the Senate Council, I didn't hear the language used that you just used. The provost used different language, and I -- John, I guess your comments, John were segueing into recommendation two here. I'd like some more information as to why the Senate Council -- it looks like, it likes the idea on its academic merit, but is saying, no, not right

now on a budgetary basis. Is that what your comment was -- was about, was the recommendation two?

GREISSMAN: Let me attempt to speak to that, Davy.

CHAIR: Richard, come to the mic, please.

GREISSMAN: What I heard Swamy say when he came last week to the Senate Council meeting is specifically language about the money principally coming from the fund, which is a healthcare endowment that is -- it derives its money from practice plan interest income and can only be spent on healthcare colleges.

And so I think the -- what -- what I take Andrea to be saying is a replay of what Swamy said last week, which is that the principal sum is coming from monies that are bracketed by healthcare initiatives.

So that's why a bunch of the money is coming out of (unintelligible), who oversees with Swamy, the -- the fund. That's not to say that Swamy isn't contributing a minority portion, he is, because he wants to see this thing, once established, go beyond the six healthcare colleges and his seed money, if you will, his venture capital, is to ensure that that's what happens.

So the answer to your question is specifically the money is coming initially and principally from the fund, the healthcare enterprise.

Does that help? Well, answer at least part of it?

JONES: Well, I -- I heard the provost talking about there -- there's noise in the budget, and 125,000 or whatever it is, and he -- he -- he can figure out how to massage money. I didn't hear him saying -- describing that pool of money in terms that you're using here right now.

GREISSMAN: Well, I think we were at the same meeting.

NADEL: Alan Nadel, Arts & Sciences.

Is there a way that we could independently verify what the provost says to us? Because I was here last Spring at the May meeting, and I heard him say, and I believe it's in the minutes, that no money would be spent on the Gen Ed until we voted on that budget.

I believe we have not voted on it, and I believe it has been spent. So I -- it's all well and good that the provost made statements, but does this body have any independent verification process?

CHAIR: I'll let you respond, then --

GREISSMAN: Alan, except on pilot projects, and specifically pilot projects, to ensure that when the provost comes in the Fall and Senate -- University Senate ask him to do two things that its' dictate; it ask that the provost demonstrate that the courses could be developed, taught and assessed, and it ask

that the provost provide a clear indication that the funding is sufficient to ensure the program succeeds.

So the principal sum, which has to be a recurring sum, have not been allocated and won't be allocated until the Senate votes on implementation.

What has been -- if I may?

CHAIR:

Sure.

GREISSMAN:

And I will be glad to answer more.

What has been allocated are non-recurring sums of money to fund first 60 pilot projects Summer 2009 so that faculty could develop courses that are being taught now. You know all this. So the only money that's been spent on Gen Ed, in terms of -- preparation has been non-recurring money and not recurring money.

So I think that's the distinction Swamy would make.

NADEL:

I'll tell you where my confusion lies. This is really where our -- like this body to have an independent verification so I will be unconfused, is that I believe or I was told that there were people hired on lines from Gen Ed money in English. Six, I believe, maybe a couple are an opportunity hire, so that's -- that's recurring lines there.

So I don't -- I don't -- this is what I heard. I don't have a document; I don't have an independent verification. I well could be wrong about this or I well could be -- we could be hearing a certain kind of double-talk where something is technically this, but it turns out to be that, and the reason I raised that question was to get assurances that Gen Ed would not be paid for out of the faculty's raise pool; I raised it again with the president in the Fall, and he said he didn't know; he'd have to speak to the provost.

I don't know what -- and -- and if you want to think -- I don't -- I don't believe that answer, I don't.

GREISSMAN:

Since this is about interprofessional education, since the provost will come at 4:00, and since I, in my best efforts, do a passive -- at best, passive imitation of my boss, and he's here to do the academic -- if I could respectfully ask that we hold the question on Gen Ed. In terms of interprofessional training, I'm sorry there's a misunderstanding on funding.

Let me simply say for the record, because I heard my boss say then and in subsequent conversations -- because I go back to him after a meeting and report, and I said here are the two salient issues that on the one hand got academic approval, on the other hand, non-academic disapproval and I said we're going to have to speak to the budget. Is it true that the majority of the funding

is going to come from the fund, a healthcare endowment? He said, absolutely. So I say that categorically.

I don't know if we have to get the same accounting firm that does the academic -- the academy awards, but I'm hoping we're not to that level of distrust.

But let me simply say that the seed money, the venture capital money to have this -- to launch the center, which we then hope will be supplemented by extramural funding is coming primarily from the fund, categorically. I hope that helps.

CHAIR: I am not going to cut off discussion on this because this is important, but we have a great deal of business to transact. Connie.

WOOD: Exactly what proportion of the budget is being provided by earmarked healthcare funds and what proportion is being provided by the provost?

CHAIR: I believe it's approximately a \$260,000 budget and at least in this initial period, I believe about half of that comes from the healthcare, from the hospital budget and about half from the -- no?

GREISSMAN: Well, I -- no, I simply don't -- I wouldn't want -- because I don't know the figures. The provost could be asked that another time.

CHAIR: The provost should be asked that, then, because we don't know the answer.

Dr. Nadel, with respect to your -- your question: No. The Senate -- Senate Council has no official report on how the provost spends his money. The day that we don't trust each other is the day that things really get messy around here.

NADEL: Well, they've gotten messy.

ZENTALL: Tom Zentall, Arts and Sciences.

Is someone going to speak to the difference between these two recommendations?

CHAIR: What I would like to do is vote on them separately, as separate issues, and address the second one in a second conversation like this one because the first involves what is unquestionably our responsibility. We approve this on the academic merits, and I think it's fair to say, although the vote was not unanimous in Senate Council, I think Senate Council endorsed or approved the academic issues here and we don't feel there's any question about the academic issues.

So if I may, I would like to keep the conversation clean on that respect, though anyone in Senate Council is welcome speak at this moment.

And, if I may -- John, please.

THELIN: Yeah. To put aside money, don't care what it cost; zero or whatever. What you have is an administrative solution to an administrative problem. (Unintelligible)

administration and we're rewarding practices that are less than appropriate.

Pete Perman in his opening remark said, you know, I've got to be frank with you, we on the healthcare campus, we don't cooperate well among ourselves.

So on one hand it's supposed to be a research unit, but we act on the academic merit. If you look at the budget, you're -- what you're doing is you're hiring a project director. You're not hiring faculty, and I don't know why the Dean of Pharmacy can't call over to the Dean of Medicine. Why do we need a go-between for that? There are a lot of opportunities at UK for faculty to interact and cooperate. Every masters committee, every doctoral committee, you have outside members, we have inter-disciplinary appointments abound, so why use an administrative solution to solve an administrative problem, (unintelligible) rewarding cooperation among units within the same healthcare center?

CHAIR: I would like -- Yes.

PFEIFLE: I just wanted to correct a couple of things that he said. The majority of budget does fund faculty activities and faculty lines. The director is a faculty -- is stated as a faculty member, and much of the budget is allocated to support educational activities that faculty wouldn't have.

So I did not want to leave you with the sense that this wasn't underwriting any faculty --

THELIN: I see very different numbers. Go -- go through the budget some more.

PFEIFLE: I wrote the budget --

THELIN: I see a project director at \$109,000.

UNIDENTIFIED: That is not correct.

PFEIFLE: That is the center director. It is a faculty person.

THELIN: Does it say faculty member?

PFEIFLE: It says that in your narrative, expressly as a member of the faculty.

THELIN: Well, you're taking a faculty number into an administrative role.

PFEIFLE: It does not to say that it an administrative role.

THELIN: Wait a minute. The dean's letter says that UK should try to be the first in the nation, but -- but then the college says, no, no, that's not what it says.

I see under personnel, I see director, program manager, coordinator, graduate assistant. Even if those are filled by a faculty member, you're taking a faculty member away from teaching and research and assigning probably to a DOE that's overwhelmingly administrative I would imagine.

PFEIFLE: I don't want to spend a lot of time

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

with the details unless -- unless you want to, but I have been filling that role at 30 percent FDE as a full-time faculty member. It is education, research, evaluation, strategic planning. It -- it's not mired down in the administrative of it at this point, and it would not be with appropriate staff support.

HART: Kathryn Hart, College of Nursing.
I just wanted to say this proposal supports the spirit of breaking down barriers you were referring to and, of course, the Dean of Nursing can call the Dean of Medicine and have a conversation about being more collaborative, but what I've seen happen with this group that's supported by the healthcare colleges, so it's healthcare colleges saying we want to do this so that we establish a concrete mechanism where we do work together.

What I'm excited about is that it brought all the colleges together, the healthcare colleges, to brainstorm and then it also brought other colleges that have an interest, and we're already talking about couldn't we have interprofessional electives where we can -- each profession can be part of it.

We're talking about the possibility at the hospital of having an interprofessional unit. Wouldn't that be a novel idea, where we actually do work side-by-side instead of just talking about it.

So with all due respect, this proposal begins to break down those barriers and centralizes the initiative in one spot so that we have a mechanism to work together to move it forward to reality instead of just talking about it, which we -- which we've done for awhile.

CHAIR: We have got to move forward. I'm sorry. We have got to move forward, unless you think what you have to say is --

NOVAK: I'm sorry, but I do. I'm Karen Novak from the College of Dentistry.

We're talking a lot about faculty and support. This brought students together in one of pilot projects, which was the interprofessional honors colloquium, and the benefit -- I wish we had students sitting in this room today to tell you how much that experience benefitted them educationally, research and in their practice.

So I just want to make sure that student benefit isn't lost in the conversation.

CHAIR: Thank you. Yes, quickly, please.

KUPERSTEIN: Janice Kuperstein, College of Health Sciences.

I just want to add that these silos were not created at the University of Kentucky. The silos between various healthcare professions have existed for decades. In 2001 the Institute of Medicine

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt
called for breaking them down, and this is one effort to try to catalyze that change that has been called for nationally.

CHAIR: All right. We don't really even have a motion on the table, so if I could have a motion, please.

Davy.

JONES: Move that the recommendation one, that the Senate approve, on its academic merits, the programs in this newly proposed educational unit.

CHAIR: Have a second, please.

KELLY: Second.

CHAIR: Tom. Thank you. Further discussion of the motion.

NADEL: Point of information. What's the consequence of passing the first one before the debate of the second one?

CHAIR: I don't believe this session can go for -- this proposal can -- this can be created for an academic -- no?

GREISSMAN: Great question. Let me try to answer knowing that Davy will be quick to correct me, and I -- and I say that with fondness and not with malice.

This is a -- the center begins as a center that cannot sponsor academic activities like proposing courses, proposing a degree program or appointing faculty, that -- that kind of thing.

What it -- it's meant to do initially is fund what multi-disciplinary research centers do, research and related activity.

The provost can establish the center on his or her own authority. Must seek input of the Senate. If at some future time, if at some future iteration of governing regulations when perhaps there is the authority given to a center to, for instance, offer courses -- right now it can't, but that -- that's next Falls discussion, it -- the center could not that without University Senate authority, so it's being started as an administrative unit doing educational activity; but activity that stops at the boundary of what the Senate has sole authority to approve, which is offering courses, offering degree programs.

Davy, how (unintelligible) that?

JONES: I -- that's not my understanding. You just said -- you said this is an administrative unit, and I asked specifically at the beginning is this an educational unit. If this is an educational unit, it was told -- said this is an educational unit of the kind that's the one that doesn't have a degree program but as the -- the faculty member here explained, there's all kinds of other educational policy and environment that the Senate control that's not degree program; post-doctoral environment, prime student interactions.

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

The difference between these two proposals here is the -- the component of this that's the educational environment and educational program that's been described, we control yes, no or up, down on the academic merits of that -- that educational policy.

Number two, we're commenting and giving opinion to the administration on its budgeted infrastructure that's -- that would support that educational program. We control the first in Senate, educational policy, the administration controls the second, the infrastructure, and we only comment on that. That's recommendation two.

GREISSMAN: Clearly David is going to give me the hook, and this is in its first instance, in its first infancy. What do we mean by educational policy in the center. We've had lots of centers approved where we've agreed that the center can be established but that certain things cannot happen without the University Senate approval.

JONES: We establish the broad academic policy of the University. The subset of that are degree programs. Things that are not going to be (unintelligible) are certificates, post-doctoral training, summer high school research experience. Those are all educational policy that's under the Senate's jurisdiction.

And, again, I point to what she described right here, the students who benefitted from the educational environment that was created by this activity. It's the Senate that controls what that environment is going to be, what its parameters are.

Do we like what we heard? If we do, then we vote for recommendation number one. We -- we establish that educational policy. We comment on number two to the administration, we don't think you're putting up enough money to make it go or we do think you're putting up enough money to make it go.

GREISSMAN: So, two points. First, if you think about what the Senate Council said last week when it gave a near unanimous approval to the academic merits, have they not -- what would that mean? What could the center not do? Anything?

JONES: Well, they would recommend to the Senate. You're -- you're saying what would happen I was to disapprove of their recommendation one?

GREISSMAN: Right.

JONES: The Senate would say this -- this educational environment here is a no go, and if council on postsecondary education comes in and SACS comes in and wants to know what is the policy of the university about this, the Senate established the policy. The provost and the president must speak for whatever the Senate says on recommendation one.

GREISSMAN: Let's cut to the chase. I can -- let me remind the good Senators that the Senate Council voted near -- near unanimous on the first part of this, that doing the activities encompassed in a center like this, interprofessional training was a common good.

NADEL: I still have a question, and I honestly ask it as a point of information because I don't know how to vote. I want to know what I'm voting on on those items. If I understand Davy's explanation correctly, recommendation one has teeth; recommendation two is advisory. Therefore, if recommendation one is passed, however we vote on recommendation two is simply a suggestion which may or may not be taken. Is that correct, Davy?

JONES: That's my understanding.

CHAIR: I agree.

NADEL: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED: May I ask what the Senate Council's vote was as far as recommendation number 1?

CHAIR: My recollection was 7-1-0 --

JONES: Right. I remember one abstention.

BROTHER: I'm sorry, I don't have those notes with me. They're on the notes that you gave me and they're on my desk.

CHAIR: All right. We're going to vote by show of hands. Michelle, we're going to count. All in favor, hold your hand up, please, and keep it up.
(MEMBERS VOTE)

SOHNER: I got 39.

CHAIR: 39.

SOHNER: Yes.

CHAIR: Exactly. All opposed?
(MEMBERS VOTE)

SOHNER: I think it was 14. I -- I didn't get --

CHAIR: Let's count -- I got 17, so please, let's try it again.
(MEMBERS VOTE)

SOHNER: I got 16 that time.

CHAIR: 17 is the total. All right. Motion carries.

UNIDENTIFIED: Abstentions?

CHAIR: I'm sorry. Abstentions. Absolutely. I'm sorry.
(ABSTENTIONS ARE COUNTED)

CHAIR: 4. Okay. The second recommendation is stated in the negative, exactly as Senate Council is sending it to you. It is advisory in the sense that we do not have authority in this area. Vote was 4-4-0, so as you can imagine, there was a great deal of discussion. John, would you care to summarize that discussion?

THELIN: My recollection was that there was concern about the sources and direction, the uses of the funding as a vote to your budget

material.

Also, a colleague raised serious questions about the quality and validity of the evaluation and assessment criteria that were included in the proposal. I think there was -- was a reasonable agreement that the way of assessing the center would -- would probably not pass a rudimentary course in program evaluation.

CHAIR: Any other member of Senate Council want to add anything? Jane?

JENSEN: Jane Jensen, College of Medicine. I think to clarify on the budget, there was a general sense of how do we pay for -- if you're -- if you're establishing a new center, how will it be paid for? The provost has arrived so he can clarify, but in the -- in the discussions --

PROVOST: (Unintelligible) I just want to --

JENSEN: In the discussion with the Senate Council, and I understand that this might have been clarified for -- for Richard Greissman later, but in the discussion with the Council was, the practice fund was mentioned, but it was not clear that the money for the center would be coming from the revenue that the health colleges produce for the purpose of health college interdisciplinary education.

So there was a sense on the budget piece of the infrastructure, it was unclear as to where the money would come from and I think the general sense was that people were uncomfortable with an unfunded center.

PROVOST: Would you like for me to answer that question?

CHAIR: Please.

PROVOST: I only heard half of it, but...

JENSEN: It was unclear where -- whether --

PROVOST: Well, I think it's important to recognize, Jane, that we are a single university. We really do not operate with the notion that the College of Medicine or any of the colleges are -- works on their own (unintelligible) because that's a (unintelligible) and risky model.

And the minute I take the position that anything having to do with the -- either the healthcare colleges, pick any number of colleges you want, have to be funded by themselves in some boundary, I have lost all influence over that -- that particular set of institution. So I will not take that attitude, and I don't think that's my charge that I -- as the job is described.

Having said that, you know, we really do take account of the fact that many of the colleges we deal with have ancillary and other funding sources and -- and we really do, therefore, deal with it in judicious manners.

So if you really want to know, I truly look for those instances where some

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

initiative crosses college boundaries, to step in and say, okay, the provost has a role in this. If it were entirely within the College of Medicine, it's far easier for me to argue that that's something that the college itself through its various sources and the various fundings are....

This one really covers multiple colleges, and I felt that it was a good thing symbolically and especially, you know, following the suggestion on the Senate Council that it would housed or work -- work out of the provost office rather than be embedded within the College of Medicine. In order to justify that as well, I think that it made sense for me to put some symbolic amount of money in there.

And it's symbolic in the sense that, you know, we can argue about what is substantive, what is symbolic, but UK Healthcare and the provost office will split the cost.

But there, again, I think I explained to you and Senate Council that there are some pots of money that -- that are private or inherited from the days when the two college campuses were separate, which really by statute, by -- by the bylaws, have to be spent within the healthcare colleges, and I use those funds in that particular matter; keeps them happy, keeps me happy and keeps the whole world smiling.

CHAIR:
PFEIFLE:

Yes, please.

I wanted -- just wanted to speak to the comment about the evaluation plan for the center, if I might. The evaluation plan that was included with the proposal was based upon strategic planning that the working group, an informal group of faculty and the deans and staff from across the colleges established at the conception of the working group three years ago.

It was shared and stated as such in the proposal as evidence that we intended to follow the best practices and set up an evaluation plan based on objectives and goals that would be set up for the center.

What we said to the Council when -- when we came here was we would follow the administrative regs for the evaluation protocol for assessment. And we -- assessment evaluation is something we take very seriously. There's not a person involved in that group that would walk away happy if we did not have a rigorous evaluation plan that was operational.

So I just didn't want to let that -- that comment go without addressing it.

CHAIR:

If we could have a motion, we can spend a moment or two specifically discussing the motion. So this is the motion that Senate Council is bringing to you.

Do I have a motion? Davy?

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

JONES: I recommend the Senate adopt
 recommendation two, which is not endorsing
 the proposed new center based upon the non-
 academic merit considerations.

CHAIR: Second? Connie.
 Now, a discussion of the motion.
 Again, we'll do a vote.

ANDERSON: Can -- can we do the financial
 piece just one more time? It has -- what I
 just heard isn't what I heard at the Senate
 Council meeting, which doesn't mean, you
 know, temporarily when we're at meetings, our
 mind leaves us for a moment then comes back.
 So if I could just hear one more
 time that the financing is coming from the
 hospital and from a fund in the provost's
 office that's strictly for healthcare
 colleges; is that correct?

SUBBASWAMY: Yes. That is correct.

CHAIR: That is correct. The provost
 informs me that is correct.
 We'll vote by a show of hands, so
 if you're voting yes to this you're voting
 against, all right? And then if it fails we
 -- we vote to the contrary.
 So all in favor of this motion,
 raise your hands, please.
 (MEMBERS VOTE)

SOHNER: 32.

CHAIR: 35.
 (VOTES ARE RECOUNTED)

CHAIR: 33.
 Opposed?
 (MEMBERS VOTE)

SOHNER: 16.

CHAIR: 15.
 Abstain.
 (MEMBERS VOTE)

SOHNER: 9.

CHAIR: 10.
 Motion carries.
 The August 2010 degree list is in a
 separate attachment, and I would like a
 motion to this affect, please. Jane.

JENSEN: Jane Jensen, College of Education.
 So move that the elected faculty
 senators approve the UK list of candidates
 for credentials.

CHAIR: And second?

WERMELING: Wermeling, Pharmacy.

CHAIR: Discussion?
 All in favor aye?
 (MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Opposed nay. Motion carries.
 Same thing with respect to the May.
 Motion, please?

ZENTALL: So moved.

CHAIR: So moved. Second?

ZENTALL: Tom Zentall, Arts and Sciences.

ENGLISH: English, Health Sciences, second.

CHAIR: Discussion? Davy?

JONES: Is there actually a typo here?
 This -- this -- the language about

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

BROTHERS: credentials is BCTC language. _____
 Yeah. It was addendum, and then
 cross out candidates for credentials.
 Candidates for credentials is not necessary.

JONES: Okay.

CHAIR: All in favor aye?

 (MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Opposed nay? Motion carries.
 Proposal for relocation of the
 Graduate Center for Biomedical Engineering.
 Dean Blackwell.

BLACKWELL: Hi, there. I'm going to keep this
 very brief if possible. What we are
 proposing, the College of Engineering and
 graduate school are proposing to relocate the
 Graduate Center for Biomedical Engineering
 and its degree programs and its budget to --
 from the egis of the Graduate School to the
 College of Engineering.

 This has been under discussion for
 several years, since the futures report, and
 we're finally grinding the wheels to get it
 actually moving.

CHAIR: Dr. Puleo, do you have any
 comments?

PULEO: No.

BLACKWELL: It has been unanimously approved by
 the graduate faculty in biomedical
 engineering, the affiliated faculty, the core
 faculty, the faculty under the egis of the
 graduate school, the College of Engineering
 bodies, including the faculty, graduate
 council and anybody else who voted on it.

CHAIR: Any questions for Dr. Blackwell?

SAATMAN: Kathy Saatman, College of Medicine.
 Does this have any impact on
 accreditation of the colleges, I guess on the
 merit?

BLACKWELL: No, it doesn't. The accrediting
 body for the College of Engineering is
 undergraduate; is that correct, Eric?

GRULKE: Correct, yes.

BLACKWELL: So that's -- the level of
 accreditation is undergraduate only and
 biomedical engineering does not have a
 undergraduate degree program.

SAATMAN: And -- and this doesn't
 incorporate any plan to in the future?

BLACKWELL: Not at this time. No, there's no
 plan for an undergraduate degree.

CHAIR: Dan.

WERMELING: Wermeling, Pharmacy.
 What do the students think of this
 proposal? How does it affect their
 participation?

BLACKWELL: Dave, could you speak to that?

PULEO: It doesn't affect their -- their
 academic or research components at all. They
 are completely aware of it, and those who
 have given their opinion have been in support
 with it.

BLACKWELL: And there are no changes to the
 curriculum associated with this move.

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

ANDERSON: Does this affect graduate assistantships?

BLACKWELL: No.

ANDERSON: Okay. Or funding for research conferences or anything like that?

BLACKWELL: No.

ANDERSON: Okay. Thank you.

BLACKWELL: The funding that is already located internally with the graduate center, goes -- moves with them.

CHAIR: Thank you. I need a motion, please.

ANDERSON: -- Anderson, College of Nursing, moves the recommendation that Senate approve the proposed relocation.

CHAIR: A second?

WASILKOWSKI: Second. Greg Wasilkowski, College of Engineering.

CHAIR: Discussion of the motion?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: All in favor aye?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Opposed nay? Motion carries. Proposal for a new Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science in Japanese Language and Literature, Dr. Slaymaker.

SLAYMAKER: Hi, I'm Doug Slaymaker, Advance Studies Program. Just a quick summary of what you have in your handouts about why advance studies program -- a major in the Japanese language literature, why now?

A number of reasons. One, state flagship university (unintelligible) a place where Kentucky ties are so strong, we need to have a major. We haven't had one for a long time. We've never had one, and we need to have one; the interest strong; the -- the growth area remains strong among students. Chinese not overtaking Japanese at all and Chinese is one of the major you all will be dealing with at some time in the near future partly because of the historical tradition between this state and Japan.

Second, student demand has been pent up for this for a long time. There's been lots of ways that students can sort of major in Japan and Japanese studies sometime -- for a long time, and I -- I list them as a point to give you a history as well to give you a sense of the numbers and what those numbers of students really are and it also speaks to resources, I think.

Topical majors has been one way that students have been doing Japanese studies for a long time; five, six majors has been the usual number of students we have during any given time for a number of years.

Joint major foreign languages, international economics, there's a major in economics (unintelligible) A&S. There -- there were about 40 to 45 students in that two years ago doing Japan and a lot of those

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

students really wanted to do a major in Japan. That's the focus they were interested in. With the recent international studies major, also a very strong major -- and that's kind of -- these are hard given the way our (unintelligible) major is structured, but we counted 40 who were doing Asia as their area of focus. To my sense, that accounts for about 30 doing Japanese (unintelligible) as well as student interest there.

All of these options, I think are -- it's quite clear you have this stopgap as far as students are concerned. I expect we're going to have 30 to 35 majors at any one time doing Japanese language and literature when this comes into play. So that's student demand.

Third, has to do with certification of teachers. Kentucky Regulations require that in order for a university to regulate, to say that individuals are competent in language until they become teachers, that the university at least have had a major.

No university in the state had a major, we were therefore unable to certify or recommend for certification (unintelligible) studies, (unintelligible) Japanese.

I need to make one amendment on this point too. Murray State has just put in place, about a month ago, a major in Japanese language. It's a little different, not -- not nearly as robust as what we are proposing here. But there is another one. But we will -- this will now place us to go direct -- to recommend teachers for certification, and the obvious ramifications. I think the obvious ramifications is (unintelligible) more teachers in the state which it also will need -- a need for teachers certified throughout the state and that, of course, gets more students doing these languages in high school (unintelligible) here, et cetera, et cetera.

Student need. Also, we have the resources. Like I said, we've been doing this for a very long time, for 10 to 12 years at this point, offering Japanese (unintelligible) of one sort of another. Last year two new Japan faculty were hired, seed money with a Japan foundation, so there's now four faculty on campus whose research and teaching load is -- is committed to Japan and Japanese studies. There are another five six in colleges across the University who are also doing Japanese-related courses and research; that all of these work together for the major core program that we are proposing here.

So there's a strong number of faculty, strong demand from the students. I'm very excited and I hope that you will

support.
CHAIR:

Questions?

Questions?

KIGHTLINGER: Mark Kightlinger, the College of Law.
I'm a little confused about the numbers because you say on what is page 60 of our agenda, you only expect four to five completions per year. That's below what we consider ideal, and that's -- I don't know what the ideal would be but if this is going to small we probably ought to recognize that it is going to be small.

SLAYMAKER: Yeah. That -- that was being as conservative as possible, and in time -- in the meantime with the two new faculty have come on and more the -- the -- the critical mass energy is coming around, it's like -- I think, that 40 -- 35, 40 or 45 is a reasonable number.

KIGHTLINGER: So that would work out to ten a year, nine a year? Completions, I guess, is what --

SLAYMAKER: Right. Right.

KIGHTLINGER: okay. Would that be ideal?

SLAYMAKER: I'd --

KIGHTLINGER: What's the norm? Norm would be -- I don't know what a small major is or --

SLAYMAKER: Actually, yeah, I don't know what ideal is either. I think those are strong numbers for A&S majors, especially for language, language and literature. I'm very comfortable at this point.

CHAIR: Further questions?

SLAYMAKER: Thank you very much.

CHAIR: Motion, please.

SELLNOW: So moved. Tim Sellnow, Communications and Information Studies.

CHAIR: Second?

NADEL: Alan Nadel, Arts and Science.

CHAIR: Second.

CHAIR: Discussion on the motion?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: All in favor ayes?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Opposed nay? Motion carries. Proposed suspension of the Dance Minor, and you'll see that there's yet another related issue here. We will vote on them separately.

Melody, please.

NOLAND: Hi. I'm Melody Noland, Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotion. These programs are -- basically, there's two things, the dance certification program and the dance minor, and our KHP faculty voted unanimously to suspend these programs. One of the primary reasons is low enrollment. We had eleven dance minors and three dance certification students. The dance certification program had been in existence -- has been in existence for six years, and we've graduated seven students in six years.

It's taking us a lot of resources

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

to operate these programs. We offer about 17 dance classes a year, and now a few of those are for our KHP majors who are taking dance for teaching purposes to increase physical activity in the schools, but it is requiring us a lot of -- lot of resources to run this and mostly through -- all of it now through part-time instruction since our -- our dance teacher retired.

Also another for reason for this is the performance dance courses don't really meet our strategic plan. With our physical education majors, they're going to be teachers or -- you know, they want to promote dance as supporting physical activity in classes, but among the classes that are in the minor are like -- things like jazz dance one, choreography, jazz dance two, modern dance, those kind of things, and our -- our majors don't need those classes.

Those are considered more performing arts classes, and so those classes don't really -- aren't in line with our strategic plan.

Also the dance market is -- the dance -- excuse me, the market for teachers with a dance certification is really low because schools don't just hire a teacher with a dance certification.

The only place that does that would be schools of performing arts, like SCPA or private dance studios but that's it, because regular in-the-classroom teacher, they don't have dance certification.

Now, we will still offer a few dance classes for our majors, but the plan is after this -- after the program is suspended, after a period of time, after we finish all the students then we won't be offering a lot of the performing dance classes that are required for the dance certification and the -- and the dance minor.

And also I want to say that our enrollment in our department, undergraduate enrollment has gone up 33 percent in the last two years and so this was something our faculty felt was really necessary for us to take that position that was our dance line and convert it to another position that would support that 467 majors that we have in our department.

Questions? Yes, sir?

ESTUS:

Steve Estus, Physiology.

So the current students will be allowed to finish out the program?

NOLAND:

Yes, sir. We're still teaching all the classes until they all finish and they were all sent a letter and told to meet with our undergraduate advisor to plan out their program so we can make sure they get their course work in.

KWON:

I have two questions. One is how are --

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

CHAIR:
KWON:

Your name, please?
Fine Arts, Donna Kwon.

One question is: How are enrollments just in the classes themselves and compared to the people who are actually majors and minors, or get a certification?

Two, is this -- it's my understanding that this is the only place you can take dance classes on -- in the -- in the campus, so if you get rid of this position, this is a pretty big impact.

And I don't -- I came here after -- I've only been here for two years, so I -- it seems like this probably should be in Fine Arts. But, anyways...

NOLAND:

Yeah, it's been quite a unique history, but let me answer the question first about the enrollment.

The enrollment for the dance certification classes, that are only for those, are really, really low. Okay. So sometimes we just have one or two people enrolled when the (unintelligible) was taught.

For the performing arts types of classes like jazz dance we do have pretty good enrollments and I don't have exact numbers. But they vary anywhere from 10 up to 25. Let me say that.

So they are pretty good. So there are some students that might be taking those classes that aren't enrolled in the dance minor, just to take it.

And then what was your second question?

KWON:

The question was: This is pretty much the only place students on campus can take dance classes, and so I'm just wondering if these classes go away, is there any plan, I don't know, maybe another school can take, you know, this over or something?

NOLAND:

Well, yeah, it --

KWON:

It just seems very sad to me.

NOLAND:

-- it is -- that's -- you're right, that -- that's the only place that dance classes are offered, are our department. And we will still teaching some dance classes, but they won't be organized around performing arts, like choreography and some of those, we won't be teaching those anymore.

And so it would be -- the history of it has been that we started with dance education for teachers and somehow it's just sort of gotten away and evolved because the dance teachers wanted to do other things, and they've done more Fine Arts things. And so some of that's should have probably gone to Fine Arts.

It's a resource issue though, because there's no dance minor -- a dance major, and now we have a dance minor with low enrollment so it -- it really is a resource

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

issue, and that's all I can say about that.

CHAIR: Further questions? I need a motion, please.

ESTUS: Steve Estus.
Move to recommend approve the motion.

CHAIR: Second, please?

ANDERSON: Second.

CHAIR: Any further discussion?
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: All in favor aye?
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Opposed Nay?

UNIDENTIFIED: Nay.

CHAIR: This is a recommendation that we approve the proposed suspension of the dance teacher certification associated with that degree.

So if there are any questions, Dr. Noland is here to answer them.
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: I need a motion, please

COSTICH: Move. Costich, Public Health.

CHAIR: And your name, please?

COSTICH: Costich.

CHAIR: A second?

MEYER: Meyer, Agriculture.

CHAIR: Discussion of the motion?
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: All in favor aye?
(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Opposed nay?
Motion carries. Thank you.

Professor Jones. Proposed change to Senate Rule 5.1.1.

JONES: Actually, this is -- this is Robert Grossman's baby, but he is pumping water out of his basement or something. And so I'll -- I'll wing it the best I can.

While back a new grade was created in the grading system for those courses that stretch more than one semester; maybe there's an undergraduate research project, it's going from fall into spring, more maybe research hours.

There needs to be -- so we would agreed, and we approved a course that was like an interim grade. There was a -- so the new grade in -- on our rules that we're already using, satisfactory I, or IS. I can't remember which one is which. But the I next to the S means this is an interim grade on route to the -- the real grade that's going to happen at the end of the second semester or however long it goes.

Bob Grossman encountered a situation and he brought it to Senate Council's attention, and they agreed that what was missing there was a way to indicate unsatisfactory interim progress at the end of that first semester. Okay?

And so that's what this proposal is right here, is to create the counterpart

unsatisfactory grade for the interim grade set.

CHAIR: Questions?
YOST: Scott Yost, College of Engineering.
If I understand correctly, this just goes on until the person graduates or they go through a qualifying exam. Okay, if I understand, as far as reading the rules. But what happens if a person just leaves the University, does this stay on their transcript for 50 years, the I, SI or UI?
JONES: I -- I don't know. Bob?
YOST: I mean, I'm just wondering why it is that -- why don't they have like a regular incomplete grade has like one-year time period, automatically to an E? Why don't they have a sunset clause in these as well? Why is it graduation? And why don't they make it in here so it just doesn't linger on for part-time students? It lingers on for years and years potentially.
JONES: You can offer an amendment from the floor as to when it'll end, or you could ask the Rules Committee to come up with some more language that would solve that problem.
YOST: I guess I would like to -- before I could vote positive I would like to know the reason why you just have this lingering out till graduation when we have part-time students, it could go on for years. (Unintelligible) one year issue.
JONES: Oversight in the language.
You -- you can send this back. We -- we do -- I think Bob wanted something on the books for this fall, and this is the last meeting. If we do it in September, then the syllabus (unintelligible), you know, what day (unintelligible) semester. I think he wanted -- he wanted to be able to use this grade this fall, so...
I think the situation you're worried about won't happen by the end of December of this year.
YOST: That is true.
JONES: We -- we can fix it this fall with some more language, but get this on the books right now.
YOST: I'll move that we approve it subject to they promise to clarify --
JONES: It's in the transcript. I promise. Okay?
NADEL: Move to approve subject -- move to amend -- point of order, can't move that we approve subject to. He has to move the motion or amend it.
JONES: Yeah.
YOST: Then I'll propose to make an amendment that we give more guidance on a sunset clause of some type to be voted on in the future.
Does that make sense? I'm not exactly sure what that amendment should look like.

CHAIR: Why don't we send it back?
YOST: I mean, I have no problem with what they're trying to do temporarily, but I just want to make sure it's a temporary fix; not a permanent fix because I know how temporary turns into permanent.

JONES: If it's the sense of the Senate that you want it to come back to the Rules Committee (unintelligible), we -- we can do that. But it's gotta be done via motions and votes here.

SAATMAN: But there's already the SI grade on the books --
JONES: Yeah. See it's unbalanced --
SAATMAN: -- so that's going to create problems --
JONES: -- right now.
SAATMAN: -- so not approving this is sort of (unintelligible) --
YOST: No, exactly. I'm -- I'm inclined to approve it, I just want -- I'm not sure -- I want to make an amendment that we have to give some type of guidance for both of those.

CHAIR: If you would move this -- if someone would move this?
NADEL: Yeah, let me as part of the discussion make the suggestion that we vote on this, and then you introduce a new amendment -- a new motion which can be tabled until the fall. In other words, there's those two separate things, then we can --
CHAIR: Right.
NADEL: -- conclude our business. So I would like to move that we accept the recommendation.

CHAIR: Second?
MOUNTFORD: Second. Mountford, A&S.
CHAIR: All right. Now, a discussion of the motion.
PRATS: I'm not seeing what is wrong with just an incomplete. You know, eventually the grade comes up before the faculty member again, so what exactly is gained by having this fairly byzantine kind of -- this kind of incomplete as opposed to that kind of incomplete? I'm not getting it.

CHAIR: Richard.
GREISSMAN: I think I can answer just that part, and it's about a course that -- that intentionally does not complete in one semester. The I grade is bounded by simply a semester. So what the SI attempts to address, and I think what Professor Grossman's proposal is an attempting to address, those courses where the I grade is inappropriate because the course intentionally crosses semesters. Does that help?
It doesn't help. Sorry. Best I can do.

CHAIR: Further discussion?
(NO RESPONSE)
CHAIR: All in favor aye.

(MEMBERS VOTE)
CHAIR: Opposed nay?
(MEMBERS VOTE)
CHAIR: Motion carries.
YOST: So -- Scott Yost, College of Engineering, again. So do I have to make a motion for the committee to revisit this topic, or can I just say can you give them instruction to revisit this topic?
CHAIR: You can float a motion for Senate Council to further pursue the issue.
YOST: Then I make a motion that Senate Council further pursue this -- this issue with the notion of some type of sunset clause or some type of definitive, not just graduation, time frame?
CHAIR: Do you have that?
BROTHERS: Just a second. Now, is this for the Senate Council to further pursue this issue or for the Rules Committee?
CHAIR: Let's leave it at the Senate Council for now.
BROTHERS: Okay. So I motion for the Senate Council to further pursue this issue with some sort of sunset clause or definitive time frame, not just graduation.
YOST: That sounds good to me.
BROTHERS: It'll look cleaner in the minutes.
CHAIR: Do I have a second?
WASILKOWSKI: Second. Wasilkowski, Engineering.
CHAIR: Discussion? All in favor aye.
(MEMBERS VOTE)
CHAIR: Opposed nay.
(NONE OPPOSED)
CHAIR: We'll come back to you with this.
Motion carries.
I had a conversation with the provost last semester which subsequently ended up in a conversation in January between Dr. Swanson and myself and Richard about the possibility of going to a winter commencement.
Subsequently, in March we had a rather full committee review this issue, and it's come to Senate Council, so that's the history and -- and I asked Richard if he would fill us in a little bit more about this proposed three-year pilot program for December commencement.
Richard, please.
GREISSMAN: Let me try to be real brief and then your questions, of course, I'll answer any and all of them as I can.
There's an AR that establishes a commencement committee. It's a faculty lead committee with faculty, students and staff. They work really hard to produce a highly choreographed spring commencement, but the reality is twofold. First, only about one in ten graduates in a given year show up in May. And secondly, and perhaps the correlate to number one, partly because 40 percent of our students don't graduate in May. They

graduate in August or December.

So the provost asked some deans to form an informal task force, do some homework and make a recommendation. The recommendation is to do a three-year pilot where we have a December graduation to capture, admittedly, mostly undergraduates, but any student who doesn't graduate in May.

The discussions to come that will be richly driven by faculty and faculty governance body sentiment is how to make it work. We don't want to interfere with pinning, hooding or coating ceremonies, but we do want to have ceremonies in which students are recognized by walking across the stage and having their name announced. It is their five-second Andy Warhol moment of fame.

And so if the starting point is to do that, we have to figure out what doesn't become part of a December commencement. It's a three-year project to get it right or come back and say it didn't work.

But it seems peculiar that we have 40 percent of our students who are told, come back in a year and we'll announce your name. And, in fact, if they're undergraduates they don't get their name announced at the -- at the big ceremony anyway.

So this is an attempt to recognize students who have worked hard, whose parents have paid a lot of money.

We will not ask the Senate in the first year to think about honorary degrees but, just for the record, we think it's appropriate that if a commencement is piloted, it makes sense to also have honorary degrees as part of it, but let's put that aside for now and have that discussions in the fall.

There's not enough time to have a legitimate call and get faculty enough time by this December to come with honorary degrees, but we will come back to that.

So the first year, with this being winter commencement at the end of December, three-year pilot total and come back at the end of the three years, like we did in the winter intercession and say, here's what we've learned, what do you think and either propose we end it or make it permanent.

Questions, please.

JONES:

Reinette Jones, Libraries.

The calling of the names for the undergraduates will only take place in the summer --

GREISSMAN:

No.

JONES:

Am I --

GREISSMAN:

You've -- good question. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to cut you off, but I anticipated and I am watching the time; forgive me.

We would -- the attempt would be to have both May and December be calling all

graduates. And how to do that is that the fall project. But the attempt is to obviate the need for many of the college recognition ceremonies, like Arts and Science, which was a deliberate attempt -- attempt to recognize students individually.

We want to have two ceremonies in which at least all the undergraduates are recognized, and then figure out we do the rest, because we do professional ceremony separately over there, so the attempt is to have this commencement -- have a pair of commencement activity for all graduates. How -- how we do that will be in discussion as well.

SMITH: Scott Smith, Agriculture.

The -- Richard, the version I saw had very soft language, something like if feasible with regard to recognizing students by name. If you don't do that, you're still going to get the same pathetic turnout. Is the language still "if feasible"?

GREISSMAN: I've been told by the provost, who is within earshot so he can correct me, that the starting point is to assume that we're going to announce every student's name because it's the only way to make this work. If we don't, we're back to where we were.

So I expect the first year pilot will be undertaken as if we're going to recognize every student. Yes, that -- that's the intent.

PROVOST: That -- that's a learning process simply -- every one here will tell me that it's impossible to do, so we want to try it out in December and prove it's possible and then try again in May and show it's possible.

CHAIR: Further questions for Richard?

ENGLISH: If we vote for this -- Tony English from the College of Health Sciences.

If we vote for this, what will that do to individual college ceremonies that currently exist in the springtime? If we vote for this we'll have one in December and we'll have one -- the main one in May. Will those other individual college events be --

GREISSMAN: I think -- here's the safe answer. The safe answer is that we attempt -- if we attempt to announce all the students' names, which includes the undergraduates, we think it'll probably obviate the need for any separate undergraduate ceremonies notwithstanding pinning and other kind of specialized ceremonies.

So I think the safe ground here is that what we want to do, and it goes back to Dean Smith's point, what we want to attempt to do is recognize every undergraduate and obviate the need for other undergraduate recognition ceremonies.

All right? That said, we want to, of course, also honor professional and graduate students but that's -- really it's a

separate question.

Connie.

CHAIR:

Connie.

GREISSMAN:

I'm sorry. Excuse me.

CHAIR:

That's all right.

WOOD:

As a followup, does this mean that after the main commencement in 2010 that, for example, the College of Arts & Sciences or the College of Agriculture would not be allowed to have a recognition ceremony, after 2010?

GREISSMAN:

I'll answer it rhetorically, in that, if that the May ceremony recognizes the students, you could ask the question, why have a separate college recognition? I think the safer answer, Connie, is we know now that too many students, even the ones who are -- graduated in May elect to not come to the main ceremony because they know the college ceremony will be more rewarding.

So the ques -- so the conundrum, the (unintelligible) for the fall is: How can we have a main ceremony that attracts enough students? If we can do that and have college recognition ceremonies, I suspect the provost would be (unintelligible). The problem is that the proof right now is that students, I'll pick on Arts and Science, don't come to the main ceremony because they know the college recognition ceremony is the real deal.

So, you know, I can leave open the question of -- as to the college recognition ceremony, but the starting point here is how can we make the main ceremony, May and now December pilot, more participatory than it -- than it currently is.

WOOD:

Having served as the Chair of the Commencement Committee for eight and a half years, I'm well aware of what you're saying and I think your point is very well taken.

However, I think it should be clear to this body as to what the ramifications are going to be for a positive note on this issue.

I mean, if -- if what we are saying is, is that the intent is to completely change the commencement process, I think that should be clear and -- and -- and for everyone to realize that it -- that they are, in essence, voting against the college recognition.

And I completely agree with what you said and -- and was not in favor of those to start with.

But we have --

GREISSMAN:

Well, I guess this is why the Senate insisted it be a pilot, and I think -- I wish I was clever enough to answer that question.

If the college recognition ceremony -- if the continuation of a college recognition ceremony insures or likely

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

insures that the May commencement will be as poorly attended, then it begs this question.

You know, what's -- what's the -- there are lots of universities that have rich university ceremonies and that's what people come to. I would say carefully, because we have at least one dean here and, you know, others within earshot, no doubt, who would -- who might disagree with this.

But at least in Arts & Science, not the epicenter of the universe, but the universe I know, at least in Arts & Science the recognition ceremony was in reaction to what didn't take place.

So if we make it happen at the May ceremony, it would seem to make since at least for Arts & Science that it could forego that ceremony.

That -- that said, that's the discussion this fall. I don't know how to -- you know, answer it, Connie, because if -- if at the end of the day the college recognition ceremony means we continue to have less than stellar attendance, then it does beg these questions.

I'm sorry I can't be more definitive, except to say it's a three-year pilot and if we want to start with December and see what happens in December.

CHAIR:

All right. Please.

KORNBLUH:

Mark Kornbluh, Arts & Sciences.

GREISSMAN:

Oh, here we go.

KORNBLUH:

The dean's office and the chairs are very supportive of having a -- in Arts & Sciences, of having a December commencement. There is much more questions about giving up our May commencement. I believe we are going to see a proposal about that in the future from a committee that Dean Blackwell is suppose to chair. And this recommendation is only about the December commencement.

CHAIR:

Debra.

ANDERSON:

Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.

I just want to follow-up on that. That was my understanding at the Senate Council meeting, is that this was about having a December commencement, and not necessarily that it was going to supercede anything else. That will come with everything else that follows with our committees and different commencement activities will come later.

But this is a recommendation that we have a December commencement because, as you said, 40 percent of students graduate in August or December, and this seems to make so much more sense for those students.

GREISSMAN:

But I go this far. It says, experiment with a December commencement and there will be no college recognition ceremonies in December. That's the point, you know, and so we'll be agnostic on the other. The point is to see how we can get

students and their parents to come a commencement ceremony. We start with December.

CHAIR: Quickly if we can, Dan.
WERMELING: Well, it seems like the students are voting with their feet, aren't they? I mean, they're telling you what they want. They're -- they're the -- they're the decider.

What does the student member or student -- or Senate Council speak to this? What -- what do the student representatives think about this, because it their day; not our day?

GREISSMAN: They -- they have. The committee was really thorough. They say they want a ceremony in which they get real recognition. That's the start of it all. They want to have moms and dads, grandmothers see the student cross the stage and have the student's announced, and that -- that's why the December commencement will (inaudible).

CHAIR: Professor Steiner.
STEINER: Have you run the numbers? Have you run the numbers on the potential number of students that would graduate in May compared to (unintelligible).

GREISSMAN: I like the idea of leaving this as a December experiment, in that, right now what we're talking about is a proposition that students will come -- that 40 percent of our students who don't come at all will come in large numbers to a December commencement under the terms that they're recognized by person, crossing the stage, and that acclamation from that aspect. That -- that's really what we're talking about here. I think the rest is to come.

WASILKOWSKI: It is my understanding that nothing's being taken away from students because those who want to participate whether in college or whether this is done university wide, they still will have the same choice, but this proposal, which I like very much, gives chance to those students who would not attend.

GREISSMAN: That's right. That's right. And let me make one definitive comment: It'll be a December commencement without college recognition ceremonies like there is today. That -- that's the one thing I think I can say.

CHAIR: Yes.
BADGER: Karen Badger from the College of Social Work.

So that actually will mean that three colleges -- students from three colleges will (unintelligible) because there are -- there are currently three colleges that have their own December recognition. So faculty -- I've not had a chance to really discuss this or -- or discuss this with students who have a tradition of having their

own college --
PROVOST: Let me make one point.
GREISSMAN: Yes, sir.
PROVOST: I believe, in fact, Dr. Jones you can correct me on this, it's the president who confers the degree. Yes?
JONES: As the Chair of the Senate.
PROVOST: As the Chair of the Senate. Thank you. And so we have a peculiar system in which one -- one person out of a 100 maybe, sometimes no representative even of the college shows up at the central ceremony and the degree is never conferred upon the ones who go through college ceremonies.
Folks, we're trying to have this work the way it's suppose to work, and let's give it a shot in December and if it doesn't work, fine, you know, I've been a fool before. I will be again. This for the students. It is to have the pomp and circumstance like lots of larger universities have succeeded in having non-anemic central commendations. Let's have a robust commendation. Try it out in December and if it's a failure, it's a failure; then we don't have to change a thing. We'll come back and discuss it.
GREISSMAN: And -- and it's not to say that the College of Social Work couldn't have some function -- to have a reception. What we're trying not to do is have parallel functions. So, there could be a robust reception. There could be lots of things that happen. We just think that in the current -- it's -- it's reasonable to assume -- the current trend (unintelligible) that a college recognition ceremony trumps the main ceremony.
BADGER: I'm not -- I'm not opposed to the idea. It's more of a process issue because I've not had time to vet this with faculty and we've just had a -- we've just had a tradition. That's -- that was more my point.
CHAIR: Folks, this is a proposed trial. We're not committing until the end of the world. I think we can go forward, but if I see a hand up I'll recognize it.
YOST: Scott Yost, College of Engineering. I just want to clarify because we do have a College of Engineering December recognition, and I just want to understand, if we have this trial in the fall, in December, does that mean the College of Engineering cannot have its recognition this fall? That's what I want to know.
PROVOST: That -- that's certainly not the intent and, in fact, you know, Dean Lester was the chair of the committee that looked at -- looked at what other universities, both within the Commonwealth and elsewhere, are doing.
I think that if you look at the timing of when the finals end and when, in fact, it's likely possibility that we could

even hold a commencement, there's very little time between -- in December before people go off for the holidays. It is very unlikely that we could do both, and that's why Dean Lester himself, in fact, thought that there was not nece -- that the -- the trial would, in fact, be one more where we will just have a University ceremony in December and not a college ceremony, for logistical reasons.

CHAIR: I'd like to call for a motion. Do I have a motion, please? Steve.

ESTUS: Steve Estus. Move that the Senate approve the three-year pilot.

CHAIR: And a second?

SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, second.

CHAIR: Discussion on the motion.

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: All in favor aye.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Opposed nay? Motion carries.

Mike, I think the next is the Establishment of Interim General Education Oversight Committee.

MULLEN: We too will make this quick.

Senators, as you know, through process we started gen ed reform with a steering committee that helped us come to the design template or the design principles and the learning outcomes, and then we had template committees that helped put the course templates together.

And then this past fall we authorized vetting teams to look at proposals that were already coming through the system. Those vetting teams are to sunset this May, Scott, so we do have a sunset clause.

And we are moving into a phase where we're going to be ramping up. There will be quite a few proposals, is my understanding, coming through for evaluation in the next few months.

And I felt and Senate Council felt that it was very important for us to have a group of faculty who are essentially helping then to oversee the final, really might -- there might be two years of implementation.

So what we're asking for, what we discussed in Senate Council, was the General Education Oversight Committee, Interim General Education Oversight Committee to be appointed for a period of two years by Senate Council, with input from the associate provost's office, from May 15th until May 14th,

We'll be meeting this summer to iron out how we're going to do our work for the next year or two. The charge is in the materials that you've got here. But to provide input and recommendation on issues, review proposed general education proposals.

And this summer that could take the form of actually looking at some proposals, but the -- the goal is to have ten

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

subcommittees and we'll have ten members on each committee, one representing each of the ten course content areas and then those individuals would oversee a smaller group of folks to be determined by this group at some point and brought in to be finally approved by Senate Council in August, for making sure that we have a very efficient, very effective review process in conjunction with reviewing proposals through undergraduate council. And we actually want three of those -- those numbers to actually be appointed to undergraduate council as well so that we've got a curricular framework so we know what's going on at all -- in all parts of the community.

So there was some question in the original document that we had used last week for discussion purposes that got posted, and then I sent out an addendum which you have in your -- in your packet that simply says that there's one faculty member from each of ten areas.

We've already been talking to colleges and individuals about people who might be interested, and then we'll work with Senate Council to make the appointments this week.

CHAIR: Questions for Mike?
(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: I need a motion, please. Connie?

WOOD: So moved.

CHAIR: Second?

UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

ANDERSON: Second.

CHAIR: Discussion on the motion? Connie.

WOOD: Mike, I just heard you say that the appointment mechanism would be by Senate Council with advice from the associate provost for undergraduate education; is that correct?

MULLEN: That's correct.

WOOD: Would you accept a friendly amendment to include that phraseology in the draft circulated on April 22nd, the first line?

MULLEN: Yes.

WOOD: Committee will be appointed by Senate Council with advice from the associate provost for undergraduate education --

MULLEN: Will do.

WOOD: -- do you accept that?

MULLEN: I read that on my draft as well.

WOOD: Okay.

MULLEN: I accept your friendly amendment.

CHAIR: Yes, please. Jane.

JENSEN: Just a point of clarification, and I said this before at Senate Council, but the -- when we talk about one faculty in each of ten areas, that that refers to the faculty member's disciplinary background and experience, not to their college or the name of their department.

CHAIR: Connie.
WOOD: Would you accept another friendly amendment? Your -- well, in -- in the draft of April 22nd it's not as specific as what you just said, Mike, with respect to the composition of the committee.

MULLEN: Right.
WOOD: Would you accept a friendly amendment which deletes from the April 22nd amendment structure all the way through others, question mark, and replace that with -- on page 12 of current handout, committee structure all the way through others as identified by IGEOC during the summer of 2010.

MULLEN: That's fine with me. That was my intent when I rewrote that last page, was to remove the end --

WOOD: I'm just trying to --
MULLEN: -- and (unintelligible) --
WOOD: -- get it in the document.
MULLEN: Yes.
CHAIR: I think we're working with the revised --

MULLEN: Yes.
CHAIR: -- draft. These are not amendments to the motion as such. They're understandings --

WOOD: Yes.
CHAIR: -- as to what things are. Yes.
WOOD: Point of information. I'm trying to clarify, that says as outlined in the proposal. I believe the proposal on the floor is this one which was sent -- which was circulated on April 22nd.

CHAIR: Okay.
WOOD: I am trying to clarify that proposal.

CHAIR: Would you like to respond?
MULLEN: If I can simply add that the -- it was my intent, Connie, when I sent this second addendum through e-mail to all the Senators, my feeling on that was is that when you received the draft document it did not represent what we ultimately agreed on. That's why I added this verbiage, so that it was clear what we were intending.
So, yes, what you're talking about is this last page.

WOOD: Right. I just wanted it to --
MULLEN: It places everything --
WOOD: -- it to reflect it in the --
MULLEN: -- in that --
WOOD: -- the document.
MULLEN: -- in the previous structure.
CHAIR: Understood. Thank you. Further discussion.

LEE: Carl Lee, Arts and Sciences.
Just a quick question. It's not really with respect to the composition of this committee but the document refers to ten subcommittees, but currently there are not ten subcommittees. There are, for example,

with quantitative -- just one? Just one committee? I don't know if any of the others are mine or not.

MULLEN: What -- what -- what the intent was is that we would ten faculty making up this standing committee for the next two years. Each one of those faculty would represent one of the ten content areas in general education.

So rather than having four from inquiry and one from competent communication and one from quantitative reasoning and one from citizenship, we -- we went back and said let's have one for each of the individuals in ten areas and then the idea was is that each of those ten members would be responsible for working with a small group of faculty in the review process.

LEE: So my --

MULLEN: And those -- and those reviewers wouldn't be technical members of that committee. They would be...

LEE: So there might be fewer than the official subcommittees --

MULLEN: No. You can envision ten official subcommittees, one for each of the ten --

LEE: Unlike what we have now?

MULLEN: -- course committee. Right.

LEE: Unlike --

MULLEN: So instead of having one committee for quantitative foundations that looks at the quantitative reasoning and statistical inferential reasoning, we would have one committee for each of quantitative and statistical. Does that make sense?

LEE: I understand it, yeah, although I think it's functioning all right as a single unit.

MULLEN: Well, just -- and the other part of this proposal is that -- this -- when we (unintelligible) together this summer and they will actually -- I'm going to ask them: lets think about what the most effective and efficient way to do this is, and they can report to the Senate Council in August for final -- for you all to see again in September.

CHAIR: Further discussion?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: All in favor aye?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Opposed nay?

(NONE OPPOSED)

CHAIR: Motion carries.

Dr. Jackson was to have spoken to us now, but she's -- she's gone home ill, so we will try and sneak this in in the fall.

And so that brings us -- I'm sorry, I skipped -- I apologize. Marcy Deaton, of Heidelberg. Is Marcy here?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Okay. This is a motion with respect to the Heidelberg scholarship, the

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

wording of that has been changed. We voted on some previous amendments to the ARs last meeting. We saw that this one needed some further work. We sent it back to the committee that did that work. The text of this document is in your handout.

Are there any questions on how it's changed? This has been through Senate Council. It's been through the AR regulation committee, and I think it's fixed up as it should be now.

So do I have a motion?

BLACKWELL: So moved. Jeannine Blackwell.

CHAIR: Second?

ESTUS: Estus, Physiology.

CHAIR: Discussion? Either I can answer questions on this or Richard could answer the questions, if there's any.

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: All in favor aye?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Opposed nay?

(NONE OPPOSED)

CHAIR: Motion carries.

And then J.J.'s gone home ill. And so we'll ask the provost to get...

We don't have any further voting issues, so a quorum isn't essential, but I would ask, if you would, please -- I think this is a very important report, and we're delighted to have you here. Thank you.

PROVOST: The academic state of the university is rushed. I will skip some of this slides because, you know, I'd really like to leave at least a few minutes for question and answer.

So, let's start. The outline -- we'll post the slides at the Senate web site. I need to write some corrections. I found some errors, so we'll do that and then certainly make it available for everybody.

I wanted to talk about who the team is because this is really obviously all done as a team, and certainly the Senate is the most prominent component of it. I've enjoyed a cordial relationship with the Senate Council, and I truly appreciate that and look forward to working with Hollie next year.

For those of you have served on this body for long enough, you will remember the way I conceptualize our strategic plan and Top 20 plan is in terms of four E's and four I's, expansion, excellence, engagement, integration, innovation, inclusion, entrepreneurship and internationalization. Try to sort of follow those notions and see how we're doing.

One of the parts -- and for those, again, who remember what the various metrics are in the business plan, we certainly are interested in seeing an improvement in our student body. That's, you know, certainly --

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

it's clear that at least some 20 percent of our student body, quite -- not quite ready for taking classes here. And I'm, you know, pleased to report -- you'll -- you'll notice a general theme in pattern recognition that starting with 2006 -- 2006 everything looks up in terms of growth. I don't know why, but...

Our number of applications is going up, our acceptance rate is going down and we're holding the enrollments at a constant, and indeed, as the site bar here tells you, that already we can see that the mid-50 range of the ACT curve has moved from 21/26. That is mid-50 falls within 21/26 in to 22/28. Our goal is to keep pushing that gradually, while working with the school systems and so forth.

I'm, in fact, very pleased that already in week 32 for this next fall, the number of applications has really moved up even further 13,225 and acceptances lower correspondingly, and we're keeping, again, enrollment constant, but this is only week 32. Whether that's the Calipari effect or the Swamy effect, I don't know.

Academic state. The enrollment progress, again, I want to talk about the importance of transfer numbers and as you will notice we've had a huge drop off and, again, we're beginning to pick back up and that's important both because we lose students in the first two years and also because public policy in terms of the number of graduates -- increasing the number of graduates.

Internationalization. Again, unfortunately our undergraduate numbers in international students have been -- have been dropping, and I'm glad to report that through concerted effort of various folks, it's picking up and that's important for internationalization on campus. I also want to point out that our number of study-abroad students -- those who are studying abroad, is also increasing and we have some particular, really ambitious goals for that as well.

Various things have gone on. I hope you've been paying attention to the fact that we've had some high-visibility events, such as Prime Minister Ehud Olmert, and India's president Abdul Kalam and Hanan Ashrawi visiting campus, lots of things associated with the Haitian earthquake and the Confucius Institute is, again, a major victory for (unintelligible) and for folks who worked so hard to make this happen and the German program that you'll hear about. So overall I think, both in terms of impact and in terms of the amount of activity, we're increasing internationalization. It's a critical part of being a highly ranked university which is what we aspire to become.

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

War on Attrition. We've had sustained year-to-year retention, first year to second year retention above 80 and, again, our projection is that for this fall we will see about 84 or else Mike will lose his job. And actually, our projections really do suggest that, that we'll see another big bump. This, of course -- the six-year graduation rate is a lagging indicator. It will take a few more years before the effect of these bumps will be felt but, again, I think all the hard work that you folks are putting and the focus on undergraduate education I think is really beginning to pay off and we'll be a much improved product.

General Education Reform, you've heard much about it. A few more things, 160 new or revised courses in development for Fall 2010 and Spring pilot offering, so lots of excitement, I think, on campus.

Research has, again, continued to improve and drive as at least measured here by research dollars. That's -- keep -- keeps increasing.

The UKRF budget for 2011 for the first time will exceed 50 million dollars. We've been hovering around 40 for the most part. A lot of it having to do with stimulus funding but nonetheless it pushes that in helping hopefully remain high.

Various other important things such as a -- let's see, well, I think -- I think this is something to brag about, really, for the University. It's a compliment to the faculty here. A 125 competitive stimulus funding or -- it's totaling 71.4 million, which really if you just can kind of take as a percentage of the base, puts us at -- among the elite universities. The people have been extremely competitive in -- over these.

This number, in fact, I don't believe but I'll put it out there anyway. Now, depends on how you define contact. This is a measurement of engagement. This certainly is true for our agricultural extension services, patient contact and every pill that's counted by the College of Pharmacy -- not College of Pharmacy, the pharmacy.

But this is the number I was given, and I like it. So we are engaged with the state. There's no question about it.

Some concrete things. The math and science program continues to really make news frequently and nationally. The Toyota Foundation grant was a highly competitive grant that we received. Pharmacy, again, was selected to receive one of the four inaugural American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy, Student Community Engaged Service Awards. And the University as a whole I think is really beginning to be to be recognized as a highly engaged University that gives back to

the state.

Inclusion is critically important. When I first got here, you'll remember, we had a pretty tense atmosphere on the campus, our student diversity has increased significantly. The total number of African American faculty has, again, improved continuously due to the hard work that all of you have put in. We really now -- really do begin to look like the composition of, you know, Top 20 universities and our benchmarks. For example, if you look at the big ten universities, places like Michigan, and look at the percentage of African American faculty, it's in that range rather than the 1.7 range that we started out with ten years ago. So I think that's something for all of us to be really proud of.

Women, percentage has increased on the faculty from 22.3 in to 36 percent and obviously continues to increase just given the demographics.

Let me skip that part.

Space, the Final Frontier. We have major projects, such as the new Bio-Pharm building, although I know it as the College of Pharmacy building. The Vocal Arts Center, renovation; Hunt Morgan teaching and research lab renovation have been completed and some major projects that currently are underway: the Digital Village Building #2, the Marksbury, the Equine Reproductive Facility, and Main Chance Farm. CAER has a big expansion going on. Sanders Brown has new animal quarters being built with federal grants. College of Nursing has renovation going on due to federal grants. Chemistry-Physics research labs are being renovated, et cetera, et cetera.

So we're trying to make an optimal use of existing space given that new buildings are hard to come by and the state has not given any new capital.

Thanks to your wisdom and Senate Council's wisdom, we've passed some substantive changes in tenure policies and practices trying to get them to best practices.

Just in terms of Top 20, where do we stand in terms of the projections and how things look, again, for those of you who have been following the Top 20 these are the projections from the Top 20 business plan and this is for undergraduate enrollment growth, we have deliberately not wanted to admit more students. This slight increase you see is due to better retention and more transfers, not because we are admitting more students at the first-year level. And that was a conscious decision because until we can build up the capacity and quality, we don't want to do that.

Graduate student numbers are, in

fact, not growing anywhere near that rate. We just don't have the money. I mean, that -- we have to be honest and say, no fellowship money, no research assistance or (unintelligible) assistance money, no higher faculty capacity so that's been a...

Again, with research growth some of -- in the sciences certainly will see some RA numbers grow but not in terms of (unintelligible) intentional growth.

Research expenditure, you already saw, but the (unintelligible) still compared to where we want it to be by way of business plan, we're not there but the space -- we're really space limited, limited more than anything else as well as faculty size. So until we add more faculty and more space, we're not likely to see that.

Full-time faculty, this is something that, you know, again, you'll see the numbers. Our numbers have grown higher than projected but that's primarily coming from clinical faculty and the medical center, and shown here, I'm sure you'll be curious to see, tenured track and ten -- tenured and tenured track numbers are pretty flat and the actual growth in the -- for the other faculty is where sort of the substantial growth has been, clinical faculty in particular.

Salaries. This is again a part of our whole scheme of things. Our salaries -- salaries everywhere are stagnant. Again, all you have to do is make a few phone calls to your colleagues and you'll see that they're frozen salaries abound.

Compared to the SEC, we really remain at the median, slight -- slight loss of ground, but compared to the top 20 in the list, we are lagging behind, but I want to submit one thing for your consideration. The Chronicle has a great deal of assessment over the past year or two about cost-of-living adjustments because if you look at the Top 20 institutions, Berkley's one of them in their area. You have Rutgers showing up there, you've got San Diego showing up there. So there are lots of places, UCLA, they're all -- the cost-of-living is significantly higher so if you, in fact, as some of the arguments in the Chronicle have suggested, were to adjust that to cost-of-living, then in fact our averaged compared to the Top 20 is -- percent of the average is at the 95-96 range. It's something to think about in terms of what makes sense in terms of comparison. In other words, do you want to have all those high cost-of-living cities in the list or do you want to make the adjustment? I just simply put it out there.

The state has been, you know, in a state of decline and this graph you've seen before. Basically this is a budget that's actually set 01-02, in mid-year it was

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

reduced. Again, the Senate (unintelligible) with the reduction. That's been the pattern.

And then there were two years when the actual budget and the set budget were the same, and then this was the year I came, I was lured into coming back to Kentucky with that money and lo and behold after that, we went, you know, back to that history.

And, in fact, we're looking at other reduction here for the coming year, as you know.

So this being the history, no wonder there, and also there was some enrollment growth associated with here. Tuition has exceeded as the bigger part of our academic budget compared to the state allocation; that crossing already took place somewhere like 2007, and then this is going to keep -- this gap will keep widening. No question about it.

I also want to point out that can't keep increasing tuition, this is something that you need to be aware of. This is from (IPEDS) data. It's a national database. What's shown here is our tuition for 2008-09 compared with the benchmark, that is Top 20 benchmark average, we're right at the -- right at the median there.

We have really don't have quality of product, frankly, of the Top 20 and yet we're charging the same fee. This is why you've seen me just constantly harp about trying to our undergraduate performance to be at the nationally competitive levels.

So really we're limited in terms of what we can do there, in my opinion. These numbers I tried to compress to show you, but in the process they don't all add up and so forth. I'll correct them and give them to you, but to give you a flavor of where the budget stands, I think, Angie Martin, our vice-president for fiscal affairs is here and if there are any questions, she can answer.

But let me just kind of take you through very quickly what -- what the (unintelligible) system revenue changes are, and then the expenditures and what the problems are.

The state appropriation is being reduced as much as the state can get away without losing stimulus funding from the federal government, so that's about another additional 1.35 percent and that's what's shown here.

And then tuition, as you heard, the CP is at a maximum of 6 percent and if you figure that in and projections of retentions and all those kinds of things, you have an increase about 14 million, and then by the time all that is said and done what you're left with is 10. I know there are some other adjustments that I got -- I left out here. It's really a little bit less than that that

you have as new revenue by the time you figure those things out.

Then in terms of fixed cost, there are two components to this. One is personnel. We've always respected faculty promotions. In other words, if you happen to get promoted from assistant to associate or associate to full in a year when the salaries are frozen, you should not suffer as a result and, therefore, that money has always been set aside. Again, we're doing that.

And then the faculty fighting fund, a small amount we hang on to so that counter offers can be made and hang onto the best faculty that we have.

So those two pieces are there in the budget, and then things like this -- this particular one is -- what's showing. The miscellaneous benefits increased by 5.2 million, that's the result of changes in the federal rules on Medicare laws such that this is for retiring -- our retiree health benefits only. This is coming as a result of the changes and what we all -- due to the retiree health benefits agreement we have, which says that retirees don't pay any more than 10 percent of the total cost of insurance. But that's where that's coming from, that increase. It's a huge piece there. So those are fixed costs, and related to personnel.

And then if you look at other program operating expenses you have utilities, including maintenance for the new bio/pharm building. The state does not give us any money, and all of that with high efficiency and everything else and chilling you out in your offices, it's still going to cost another million dollars.

Scholarships. Every time we increase the tuition our scholarship budget has to be -- including, obviously, the TA tuition waivers and so forth have to be incremented. So take that off from your total.

And then SACS compliance is an example. We did our five-year review and found that we were out of compliance in terms of the number of part-time instructors in our Spanish classes and so we needed to fix that. That's going to cost some money; just the cost of doing business. And summer school expenditure was a small piece. But then implementation of Gen Ed, the rest of -- one -- one additional installment is being put in there as well. That's fixed cost.

When you do all of that, you end up a net balance of minus 8 million. In other words, the revenue increased by about ten, the expenditure increased by even more, and by the time you're all said and done, it's -- we start out with an approximately 8 million

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

dollars shortfall, which means that that has to be really reduced from our budget expenditures, and that's what's going to happen between now and when the budget is submitted to the Board in the June meeting, at the June meeting, we have to figure out how we allocate out the reductions and it's going to come back to the colleges and departments. There's no way to avoid it. Up until now, we avoided pushing it down all the way to the colleges as much as possible. This time we won't be able to.

And note that in doing this, none -- nowhere was the general (unintelligible) included. That's -- so even without that, we're talking about about an 8 million dollar total.

So that's the state of affairs and, again, this is not uncommon across the country right now unfortunately.

I was at the University of Colorado Boulder the last several days as an external reviewer and they have had frozen salaries for two years as well and they are even more dependent on tuition than we are.

So I just want to talk about prospects or lack thereof for FY12 and beyond. Seventeen million of the FY11, this coming up budget that I just showed you, is coming from one-time federal stimulus funding and that's going to end and unless the state does something else, they haven't even figured out the FY11 so what they'll do for the FY12 budget is certainly going to be after the election, so that will mean another six percent reduction, which is why we're reluctant to add on to the base salary -- the salary base as we move forward not knowing anything over there.

Fixed costs will further increase. That's a guarantee. Utilities, benefits, instructional costs perhaps. Even if the legislature doesn't intervene, there are both market and public policy limitations on the amount of tuition we can increase. In the professional schools already we're out -- we've costed ourselves out of the market, for all the -- all the state. Law and medicine are the highest in the nation or our rates are highest in the nation. We can't really increase those much further.

We need to look at -- look for serious cost reductions and increasing efficiencies and productivity to be in a position to increase compensation going forward.

And, again, please remember that our situation is not unique; these conversations are going on nationwide.

So I want to remind you that some of the -- again, some of the challenges coming up are having to do with our re-accreditation, our license to operate and

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

that will happen in 2012-13. This will be the first time that we will do this under new rules.

It has compliance review followed by a quality enhancement project. The QEP, hopefully, you've heard enough about it already, is required to be the result of campus-wide deliberation resulting in improvement of student learning outcomes.

And vice-president Connie Ray is leading the overall effort; and then QEP planning is being lead by Professors Deanna Sellnow and Diane Snow. You've probably already heard from them trying to talk to you about this time and again.

Conclusion. University of Kentucky has continued to make, thanks to all of your hard work, substantial improvements in its teaching, research, and engagement missions.

Applications for admission and success in research funding are increasing steadily. Thanks again to your hard work, indicating these improvements are being noticed. I think our reputation is on the upswing.

It is inevitable that UK like all public flagship universities will need to behave more and more like a private institution. We need to look for serious cost reductions and productivity increases in order to remain competitive. And our situation is not unique. These conversations are going on nationwide.

Thank you for listening. I'll be glad to answer any questions, and we'll post all this with some more details on the web site.

Do I just take questions?

CHAIR:

Please.

UNIDENTIFIED:

Would it be possible to come up with a way of measuring the research out because so far it was in -- which is important, it was grants, but to productivity level, journal publications --

PROVOST:

As you know, in the business plan certainly we have a measure that is related to publications, both publications and citations. And, yes, we -- we do track that and we have that information.

Connie... Yes. We annually report where we are on that, and certainly we're following that. Some questions about should you use American Analytics that just, you know, came out with a new set of measures for that on terms of productivity. So, we're trying multiple things, but, yes, that's certainly being tracked and that's, you know, fairer to the humanities and other areas where grant funding is not, of course, (unintelligible).

NADEL:

Alan Nadel.

Your numbers made a great deal of sense for not adding to the recurring costs

by giving raises. But you have been adding to recurring cost by doing hirings, and I -- so I'm wondering why you decided that that would be a priority over the hiring -- over raises? But more significantly, in all the discussions both here and from the President, I've never seen any explanation of why one year bonuses at least for people making below -- at or below the average salary, are also off the table and if they're off the table for those people, has the administration ruled bonuses off the table for all employees of UK?

PROVOST: First of all, the pay -- I'm not calling (unintelligible) -- a one-time payment for those making below professional level is not off the table. I think the only reason for hedging that a little bit is we don't -- I mean, that's basically a cash issue inside all the colleges and the central administration have been, you know, trying to save up as much cash possible for that purpose.

That'll cost about 2.7 million dollars, by the way. But we don't know whether there may be mid-year -- further budget -- may be a budget recession. Until the legislature does its thing and goes home I think it would be risky to sort of commit to it firmly but that's certainly -- the thinking is that once we know for sure what's going to go on for next year, that that will be done for people below 50 thousand.

And certainly in -- you know, I know what you're referring to. I do want to come back and say that the compensation structure for some people, including the College of Medicine for that matter, is built around a so-called bonus that a direct result of various things. It's a part of a contract.

And so for those, I'm confident that it will be discussed in the same way, but there is no other out -- other than contract kinds of bonuses anywhere.

NADEL: Well, the non-contractual bonuses across the --

PROVOST: Yes.

NADEL: Would -- would you rule out --

PROVOST: Yes, I -- I absolutely --

NADEL: -- working --

PROVOST: -- rule out --

NADEL: -- bonuses --

(INTERRUPTING)

PROVOST: The -- the -- we will scrupulously rule out non-contractual bonuses and there's no question about it.

KOVASH: Mike Kovash, Arts and Sciences.

As you know, one of the contingencies for final approval for generated from this body was that the provost's office come up with the funds to support it adequately.

The 2.6 million is part of that 8 million dollars --

PROVOST: No, it's not 8. Please go back and review your notes from two years ago. It was 4.6 million.

KOVASH: No, I'm sorry, the 2.6 --

PROVOST: Well, that --

KOVASH: -- (inaudible)--

PROVOST: Yeah, that --

KOVASH: -- is the --

PROVOST: Okay. Go ahead.

KOVASH: -- the state (inaudible) --

PROVOST: That's correct.

KOVASH: So, but it's part of the 8 million dollars that's missing, I guess, shall we say. So does this put general education in jeopardy?

PROVOST: No. It -- but it puts everything else in jeopardy. No, I mean, I think it's -- it's in the allocation. Basically what it is, it's a reallocation because that 8 million then gets distributed out as reductions and, therefore, we have reallocated within the University, the University's full 560 million general education project, reallocated that much.

And, in fact, I already did that once and that's why we are pretty much at full funding, which is why we can forward confidently for 2011 -- 2011 implementation. And remember that some of the hiring associates would -- will have to be done this fall. So if we didn't have that money -- guarantee of that money, we couldn't do it.

STEINER: I don't see in the plans -- or I don't sense in the plans, an attempt to expand the capacity to increase the student population, which would be one way to raise revenue by getting -- and you're -- you're pointing out that there's greater applications, and the -- the ACT is going up. A lot of universities -- big ten universities, a lot of them use that approach to help their budgetary situations? And I don't see any -- I don't sense that at all.

PROVOST: No. I mean, I think there is really a good reason, Shelly. The reason is you need -- I mean, you are absolutely right, we need to fill up to capacity, and that means several things, you know, to be a factor to students and go out nationally and compete, you need really good classrooms and laboratories, and I can show you -- build -- I mean, classrooms and -- not as far as you could see them, until we renovated some of yours, that are really not very competitive.

We need badly, in my opinion, a brand new classroom building. The one that we have now is 40 years old and not that -- as serviceable as it needs to be, and things of that nature.

But then a lot of universities are acting like sort of -- private universities are doing this with their own bonds and --

and, you know, student tuition scheme.

We're not even allowed to do that. Our legislature does not -- our state government does not allow universities to issue their own debt.

And so even though we can have revenue streams that we feel confident about and -- and our bond rating would allow us to do that, we cannot do that, and Senator Williams has actually made it sure that we won't have that authority.

So it's a double whammy, so I -- and one thing we should not do is to admit more students than we can handle. That -- that's going to be so negative, as already once has happened. We don't want to do that, so we're holding steady, we're going to improve the quality, be ready at the moment when we can increase capacity and already -- in fact, some day you might want to have others come and talk, I mean, you know, this is for professional education as well, we got about 2400 applications for our College of Medicine for approximately 107 slots.

We're -- you know, we're heading up towards -- like to see 20,000 applications for our 4,000 seats and we had a -- a great reception in the New York area. We went as a group and so we're really building the ground -- the groundwork for being very competitive and being able to recruit, and I think, again, gen ed and other things that are being done here, are also part of having a very competitive program that allow us to...

Also, not only that, right now our hook is that we're a low -- low price bargain for out of state. As soon as we get our student numbers -- I mean, our performance numbers to look like the top universities, we can start cranking that up as well, and move up to capacity.

CHAIR:

Yes.

PROVOST:

Armando.

PRATS:

So what is this thing of faculty/student ratio?

PROVOST:

In fact, in the way -- I mean, you know, I'm going to be very clear and say that in the way that IPEDS, which is the federal government reporting structure does, we will -- once our gen ed things get going -- gets going with the smaller classes and so on, it is going to improve noticeably substantially towards our goals. It will, in fact, develop the small class, small group break-out sessions and other (inaudible/unintelligible) and also the fact that we held our enrollment constant.

ANDERSON:

Do you want to pick --

I just -- no, I just need to know what his question was. I'm trying to take --

PROVOST:

Oh, I'm sorry --

ANDERSON:

I'm taking notes for Sheila, so if you could give me --

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

PROVOST: Armando Prats asked about whether
-- what did you ask?
PRATS: The student to faculty ratio --
PROVOST: The student to faculty ratio.
Okay. Sorry.
ANDERSON: Thank you.
PROVOST: Hollie?
SWANSON: Hollie Swanson.
I was wondering whether there'd be
competitive need for different configurations
of the masters programs that would be tuition
paying masters programs.
PROVOST: It is an interesting question. The
question is about -- because if we have a
particular set of configurations of master
program that will be producing. And, you
know, our starting point has always been to
think in terms of the conventional Top 20
metrics and masters don't count in that.
Right. So it's been sort of -- the focus is
on doctoral education, doctoral education
which, of course, doesn't generate revenue
other than unless you have grants and
research assistance support.
I think that there are, you know,
statistics, accounting, there are different
kinds of things that actually can have that
effect, and, again, the more we start
thinking about -- thinking like a private
university, the more we'll have to think
about. And probably Arts and Sciences has
taken its entire summer offering -- not
entire, Mark, is it; most of them?
MARK: They're in addition.
PROVOST: In addition. Okay. There are lots
of summer offerings online with the idea of
growing that market; it's an interesting
experiment. You know, that's the kind of
thing -- the E for entrepreneurialship, under
my four E's and four I's, really has to come
into play. I think biology is doing the same
thing; isn't that -- isn't that right,
Shelly?
STEINER: Yes.
PROVOST: Psychology not so, I think. So,
yeah. I mean, I think, you know, we really
have to think in those terms in order to stay
competitive. And, you know, look, this place
belongs to all of us and we got to think
about a raise as iffy in the fall.
CHAIR: Further questions?
PROVOST: Yes, Professor Kovash.
KOVASH: So what are the factors -- the
dominant factors which limit the growth of
the graduate student population?
PROVOST: There are two things. Because one
-- one in -- in the SACS world you have the
18-credit rule which means that for TAs you
first have to bring them and pay them to do
nothing. I'm sorry, I was at the not-central
where they didn't have this rule, they don't
have this rule, and so people start -- and
soon start teaching right away and so you

could make that happen.

Or alternatively you have something to do with endowment, called a Stanford, that -- you have lots of fellowship money and you bring people in and, you know, grow it that way.

Alternatively, if you had so much in (unintelligible) flowing and you didn't use it for other important things that (unintelligible).... you could set up a pool of funds that could be used for improvement and (unintelligible).... Yeah, Jeannie.

BLACKWELL: Can I -- can I just brag just a moment here --

PROVOST: Please.

BLACKWELL: Because we had -- keeping those numbers steady, we have increased masters productivity and doctoral productivity because people have been working very, very hard at keeping students full-time, if possible, and getting them graduated.

So we -- the whole University should pat themselves on the back --

PROVOST: I agree. The number of -- the number -- the graduation rates and the number of graduates is increasing while the total enrollment is flat. In other words, there is more productivity coming out; that is correct. (Unintelligible/inaudible)....

CHAIR: Any other questions? Thank you very much.

PROVOST: Thank you for staying. I appreciate that, and we'll put all of this on the web site so you can take a closer look and find (unintelligible)....

CHAIR: All right. The last order of business here is to turn over the gavel. So Hollie Swanson will become Chair here and, Hollie, welcome.

SWANSON: Thank you very much.

CHAIR: This is your --

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIR: Becoming Chair by acclamation --

(APPLAUSE)

* * * * *

THEREUPON, the University of Kentucky Senate Council Meeting for May 2010 was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

* * * * *

STATE OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

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

My commission expires: January 26, 2011.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 8th day of

July, 2010.

MayUKSenateCouncil.txt

LISA E. HOINKE
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE
K E N T U C K Y