

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

SEPTEMBER 10, 2007

3:00 P. M.

* * * *

* * * *

LEXMARK PUBLIC ROOM
209 ADMINISTRATION DRIVE
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

* * * *

* * * *

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

* * * *

* * * *

KAVEH TAGAVI, CHAIR
DAVID RANDALL, VICE-CHAIR
BRAD CANON, PARLIAMENTARIAN
SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR
LISA E. HOINKE, CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER

CHAIR: Call the meeting to order. This is the first meeting of the academic year, and we have the privilege of and the tradition of having our President to talk to us about the State of the University Address. And later on we have some other minor housekeeping things to do, but I don't want to do that now. I'd just like to invite President Todd to please come up and give us your address. Please at the end of your address I need you to give me the authority to be the chair of the -- to be the presiding officer of the Senate after you're finished.

TODD:
CHAIR:

We'll wait and see.
Okay.

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

PRESIDENT: Well, thank you Kaveh, and I want to thank Kaveh for inviting me once again. He and I have met several times over the summer, and -- and it's been a pleasure. He's given me quite a few suggestions, which I think you'll see reflected in some of our ceremonial things, the Commencement and several other things that I believe I'll let you hear about those as we peel them out and put them in implementations.

But I want to thank you for being here. This is a cosier room than over at the Young Library.

If you haven't heard much about this room, it was -- when this building was new, this whole floor was a chapel where the whole University and -- but it had been chopped up over the years into smaller rooms and when we had the fire and started taking out all the drywall and everything, low and behold we found these two columns that had been embedded in walls and they -- if you ever see some of the old pictures with President Patterson standing at the podium and he's got an arch over the top with light bulbs in it, these were the two things holding it up. So we tried to bring back a few things that were historical. The pictures were all saved, fortunately, from the fire and we had them cleaned and put back up. So -- and you're certainly welcome to use. We try to have as many people use this as possible to make sure that it's a University room that is open to the public.

I want to spend some time in -- and I apologize for the PowerPoint, but I want to take you through some of analytics because we made a big pitch a couple of years ago to try to change the budgeting process for the University.

Previously, the CPE, which is the Counsel on Post-Secondary Education, the Oversight Board for higher education applied the same formula to all of higher education; Community Colleges, Comprehensive University and Research University.

We had gotten the lowest percentage increase except for one year since House Bill One was passed, and quite bothered me about the formula, and if you just hang with me and let me explain what they did.

They would look -- at each university we chose benchmarks, so we had 20 benchmarks which were easy to kind of categorize because they're the top twenty were trying to catch, public universities. And -- but all the other universities chose benchmarks. Ours were supposed to be aspirational; theirs was supposed to be peers so that they would be funded similar to the ones that were present in other states that looked like them.

They would calculate the amount of

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

state funds per pupil given to each of the benchmarks and they would calculate the tuition per student for each of the benchmarks and add those two numbers together, and then do the same for the comprehensive university, research universities, whatever and find a gap. And then they set the goal of closing that gap over a three-year period.

Well, the problem that I had with it was when you really look at it that way they don't take into consideration that the average of the top 20 universities we're trying to catch have a billion dollars more in endowment than we do, which kicks off in 50 to 100 million dollars more in cash.

They have a 100 million dollars on average more in annual giving than we do -- than we have. We're gradually moving up in both of those. But it's just a totally different economic model. They have a research complex that's been there for years with professors that are established and they're asking us to accelerate to that level.

So we were able to put together a new case, and this Top 20 Business Plan was able to break through. We made a commitment of some things that we were going to measure in order to do that, and I'll just remind you of those nine items.

We put the quality of the undergraduate program first. My concern was a lot of people would have felt that, since the language in the legislation said top 20 public research university, that people would feel that we're going to go straight out and just become a research university. You could do that and you could ignore several of the great colleges and departments that we have because they don't compete with those numbers. That wasn't my impression of what I thought they meant.

So we put undergraduate quality first, and we put in some tough parameters. This is not an high ACT state. The population of children with high ACTs is going to be hard to get. We are going to have to get our hands dirty, as I told the new Senators, with K through 12, in the way that we get those eight graders to take the tougher courses and become better prepared, get better ACTs if we're going to get the number of students we -- that we need to get.

Student/faculty ratio has been hammered since I've been here, as you know, because we cranked up the recruiting for the students in the anticipation we would have faculty, not in anticipation that we'd get budget cuts. But once we started drawing the recruiting, we kept on it thinking that the economics would get better and it didn't for about three or four years. We're now getting

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

back in front of that.

But that's a number we think is vitally important. One, it gives the professors more time with the students. Gives the students smaller classes and so that was a parameter we thought would be important.

And then finally the graduation rate. While we have the highest in the state, we're still lagging quite a bit behind in what we would want to have as a top university.

We put graduation education second, and you can see the parameters there. Faculty quality, and then finally research as the fourth item.

There are those four, and we have nine things we measure and I just want to give you an update on what happened this first year.

What you need to realize is that this -- coming into this year, starting this July 1, is the first time we've really been funded appropriately at this institution to attack some goal like this. We got an increase of 20.9 million dollars for this year.

Since we knew we had that coming, we were able to do some things last year to start accelerating some faculty hiring. The most critical thing the state could do for us is to kind of us gradual increases in our budget because the budget plan let's you figure what you want to do going forward.

This lines shows that -- if you look at the lower left-hand corner, we were 49th in undergraduate education and we slipped to 54th, and I won't go through all the analyse. Connie Ray over on the right is the expert of all these things, and she can go into gross detail with you.

But we slipped primarily because of the things that I mentioned before. If you look at the SAT/ACT scores, we kind of -- we've gone from 40th to 47th in that particular measure. We've been hanging in there kind of flat, if you will.

However, during that time period we've taken the freshman class of 3,000 to over 4,000 students, and so we've really picked up a larger sample of a population with low ACT scores and -- and I think we've done well in trying to hold our own in that regard.

If you look at student/faculty ratio, we've gone the wrong direction. We were at 17, where the point position with Michigan was 15, we're now at 18. That does include the new hires for this year, but we do think with the addition of 60 more faculty lines over last year that we'll begin to move that one down.

Freshman class is going to come in

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt
around 4,000, 200 less than last year. We didn't want to increase that. And so our goal had been to try to hold the freshman class size constant while we increase faculty, and we had such a large acceptance rate last year we accelerated our faculty hiring in order to try to get control of this problem.

The third parameter in that is graduation rate, which has gone up significantly since '97 but it's kind of leveled out. And that's why you -- you'll hear the Provost talking a lot about his war on undergraduate attrition because if we don't retain them the first or second year, we won't graduate them in four years or six years.

So we really have to get our attitudes and our economics straight so we can get that graduation rate where it should be.

You may not be familiar with the CPE's push to double the numbers. You'll be hearing that quite a bit. They contend that in order for us to really change the state, we need to have twice the number of Bachelor's candidates in the workforce that we had in 1997.

Kentucky ranks 47th in the nation right now in the number of Bachelor's candidates in the workforce, and there's a direct relationship to your economy and the education of your labor force. And so when you think about double the numbers, you're not going to do that purely by bringing in more students. You're going to have to get your throughput improved. So you're going to be hearing a lot about it.

The Provost chose this year, instead of hiring a certain number of faculty, he wanted to hire a few less faculty but add seen more advisors because those advisors can be ones that can help guide these students, especially the ones who run into trouble in mid semester the first year and try to keep them around.

Don't quote me totally on this, but I believe I heard the other day that if we could keep students to the point where they register as juniors that we would have an 84 percent graduation rate. So that shows you we lose quite a bit in those early years but they kind of hang in there with us once they get that far along.

So we've got a way to go on this one. You can see that the 20th position has actually gone up, you know, two and a half to three points just since we started our baseline. So these are moving targets, and I try to continue to tell the legislators and the leaders that we're shooting for some people who don't want to fall. You know, it's like I've many times said, I've not

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

gotten a single letter from a president of a top 20 saying, pardon me, I'm ready to come down, would you like to come up, you know, so they're pretty competitive folks, not just in that list.

If you look at the graduate domain, we were 34th and we moved up to 31st in this number, and the reason for that is that we have significantly increased the number of Ph.D.s but we've only moved up one position. That's a hard number to move, we don't give those out that readily. But -- and, again, this year is the year where we're beginning to get funding.

The research dollars have been going up so you could expect that number would rise, but the 20th position is moving up a bit as well. However, we have picked up one position.

Post-docs -- and we want to measure this one -- and a lot of people in Kentucky, I want to tell you, don't understand what a post-doc is. They don't relate to that. To me, it's really a measure of the quality of the research that our faculty does or people who have their degrees and want to come to our institution to study with our faculty. And you can see here we've had a remarkable increase, and I think it's directly related to our research results that we've had. And we're -- we're moving up. So we've moved up in both of those measures, and as a result we've moved up in the graduate quality.

If you look at faculty recognition, we were 37th and we moved down to 39th. One thing that I don't have with me but I hope you saw this on the web site, the Chronicle did a new way of looking at performance; they looked at a productivity study this last year. All the measures that are normally used in the Center Data that John Lombardi set up when he was in Florida or the U.S. News and World Report used, it's just a bulk number. It's not done on a per faculty basis.

But if you look on a productivity curve, then we were quite decent, you know, very decent. We had two or three departments that were in the top 10. The University overall was quite highly ranked. But the general way people measure is just on total dollars and total citations and so forth.

We moved back a little bit, but as we add faculty, just by the human -- by the nature of adding 60 more faculty, if they all publish one publication a year you're going to go up in that number.

One thing, our citations have gone up quite a bit, you know, a couple thousand during this period of time. Again, more faculty will give us more citations. But we dropped down one slot because of the rate of movement of the other people.

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

Citations, we are really looking at this number because we use the citations that are reported in the Center Data, and in such a small grouping that they choose, that we're looking at possibly broadening the definition of these citations so that we -- we'd still broaden them for our competition as well, but we think that this number is too easily swayed by one or two switches in numbers.

One thing I would ask of you is think about nominating some of your colleagues for some of these awards. I've asked the Provost to get me a list of how many nominations come from our Deans or come from our colleges because if we don't nominate, we don't get it. And I know how fast an academic year goes, and we have got people on this campus that I think should be in national academies; that should have national recognition.

And so we were -- we want you to help us to do that in your role as a faculty member to nominate some of your peers.

If you look at research, we could have put blinders on with that legislation and we could have said, okay, we're going to go for this number. We're going to be a top research university. We're going to get to number 20, and this is the highest ranking of the four that we have. We're 24th. We moved up from 26th. But, again, that would not have given us what I would call a whole university.

The way we did that is if you look at Federal dollars, we moved from 39th in '97 to 33rd, and we've gone up over double what we did previously in Federal dollars. This past year, if you followed the national picture, NIH and NSF have not been treated extremely well.

You know, NIH doubled their budget over a period of time but they've been taking back money from these five year grants they've given the last year or so. We were up about 17 percent in NIH funding this last year, and up in single digits in NSF funding. NSF is getting ready to get a budget increase pretty soon, and so I think that we have very high hopes adding to these numbers.

But the gap between where we were in '97 and the gap that we face now in getting that 20th position has widened because of the -- we know the people who are just in front of us and just behind us. It's a fairly flat slope, so we think we can catch some of those folks and move up. But the mountain gets a little high in the Federal dollars realm.

If we can't build space, and laboratory space in particular, we know that's a problem and in your areas you -- if you're in the wet lab research area you know it's a problem as well. We're trying to do

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

some things to create some more space within existing facilities, but -- we are going to be asking the legislature for another research building along with the College of Business, those are the two type of capital priorities for this coming session. And we were going to -- we are going to ask them to stick to our business plan, which calls for basically another 20 million dollar increase each of the next two years.

What happens -- what has happened I think, when you analyze the time since House Bill One, is that Bucks for Brains was a great program and they put forward 100 million dollars three times but that doesn't give you operating capital. That gives you endowments which you use 5 percent that you can operate from. But we just need operating capital to meet our bills and to hire additional faculty lines to educate the students we're bringing in.

The non-Federal research, which is industry research, State research and AG comes in here pretty heavily, and some institutional research funds that we provide, we're 21st. And so we've gone up both in Federal and non-Federal research and as a result that total number went up.

We did a C-score analysis that the business people can explain to you in their college of -- over at Gatton, so that we can roll all this up. All these nine parameters we count equally. We don't weight those. We had a big discussion whether we should or not but we count them equally and we roll them up and the bottom line is that this year we stayed 35th, and I think that's -- I'm okay with that given that we know student/faculty ratios -- some of those things that we were going to target were going to go down without the additional resources. We hope now that we've been able to get the budget going and we can get these next two years we could really have impact.

We do know the people who are five or six ahead of us and five or six behind us. We can provide -- we know where every dot on that map is. The dark dots are our benchmarks we're trying to catch. The other dots are ones that do at least 20 million dollars in Federal research funding that we're trying to compete against.

So that's the -- kind of the analytic update that I was wanting to provide to you on that score.

Let me see if I've got -- that's the end of that. I've got one note I wrote myself I want to backtrack on.

When I talk about the effort to get higher ACT scores, it is an area that I really think you could help us with. I know Joe Chappell and Brent -- their wives are in Jessamine County, and I went over -- Brent

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

Seales, I went over to Jessamine County to speak when they opened up one of their Project Lead the Way laboratories and their Testing facility, and it makes a difference when our faculty has a presence in schools.

And I think if you have something that you want to do for the school, Phil Kraemer is here, and we've got to look at ways that we can get out there and expose ourselves, especially to kids making decisions in the grade -- 7th and 8th grade, especially if they're -- if they're parents didn't go to college, because a few things that are happening now, their parents are seeing all the headlines on large tuition increases, they're making the assumption that they can't go to school, they can't afford it. They don't know all the resources that are available and we need to educate them on that.

But, secondly, if they don't make the right choices of what to take in high school, as a result, they start facing college and their ill-prepared.

Tom Lester told me he had a substantial increase in the number of engineering students. There are students who want to be in engineering but we had to put an awful lot of them into remedial courses so that they could catch up in that.

I do chair a 110 member committee, which is the only committee I've ever been on where people actually lobby to get on it; and they attend. We've even had a quite a few times on looking at the mass science arena, and I want you to -- you know, I will call out some of you to help provide me some resources with that.

Let me now go on -- and I will take some questions a moment, but if you look at some expenditures. We made some decisions in the first three years to cut some costs to do some outsourcing to make some of the auxiliary sit on their own bottom when they were not totally sitting there and were using some funds out of the general sources.

We've targeted some fund raising. What a lot of people don't know is that a lot of our scholarships are not endowed. Just because there's a name on a scholarship, it doesn't mean it's endowed. The Singletary Scholarships, the Wethington Scholarships come out of our general fund dollars.

And so as we go forward in our fund raising campaign, if we raise money to endow those scholarships, that money stays in the general fund and we can use that for salary increases in our budgets.

But some of the changes we made and we wrote an efficiency document that was just up -- just rewritten to update it, but some of those efficiencies are now showing up. The first three years we lost 70 million

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt
dollars to budget cuts, and so it kind of sucked them out of the system.

Last year we were able to put 6.2 million dollars into some classroom improvements. This year we put 8.7 million into other improvements, in wireless classrooms, smart classrooms.

Connie Woods is in here somewhere, I think. Connie, I got you a list of all the improvements we've made. She asked that question in Senate Council the other day.

So I think -- just the concrete around Patterson Office Plaza which was all cracked up, the State doesn't give you money for that stuff. You have to squeeze it out. That's called deferred maintenance, and too many universities have to defer that too much. But I do feel that we are making some headway with some expenditures there.

In the area of economic development, one of our responsibilities, I think, is to help the State in any way we can to create jobs so that we can retain these bright kids that we graduate.

I did form, this last year -- reorganized the Office of Economic Development, hired a gentleman named Lynn Heller, who was here some years ago, then went out and he was Secretary of Health & Human Resources under Brereton Jones, then he was out in some private companies. He knows how to make deals, and Lynn is now vice-president of that effort reporting directly to me.

At Coldstream I caught a little heck because we didn't grow it very much in the early days, but when you have 9-11, DOT.COM, Enron, not too many corporations are too happy about building new facilities or moving around too much.

We have in this last year had 16 new companies added to Coldstream, 181 employees. If you go by there now, we're building a new building for Extreme Software. They'll be putting about 150 engineers. That was founded by one of our alumni, so I'm really pleased to see that grow.

In the area of commercialization and intellectual property, we have five new UK startup companies that spun out of UK last year, and that is important. There's going to be a translational research conference held in Louisville coming up pretty soon, and several of you maybe involved in that and others.

But that's one of the areas where we can make, you know, research real to the people of the State. If they see us creating jobs and impacting the economy, it will help us in the legislature.

One of the major changes in this is in the area of intracapital. I'm pleased to say that we were influential in starting

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

what's called the Venture Club, and then an Angel Network. An Angel is somebody who has a whole lot of money that generally, in our case, in Kentucky, made it different ways than in technology, because I put off them to sleep when I was trying to raise money. They -- they didn't understand cathodochromic technology and I wasn't dealing with horses or coal, but -- but they have money and they will invest if you network them.

And last year we celebrated an investment of 35 million dollars into 54 companies in this region and 32 of those companies have UK connections. So I think that's something that you would want to hear about.

If you haven't seen all the chainlink fence on the south side of campus, then you probably don't realize that they health side of our campus growing. But it is doing quite well.

I would just say that one thing I'm very pleased with is the way that we're growing the business over here. We did add Samaritan Hospital, as you know, which has 13-1/2 acres right here on our campus, which was important. But we will keep that as a community hospital to serve community needs, and it will give us additional beds to add to our population of beds that we'll need once our hospital is finished.

But the income from rural Kentucky to our Medical Center has increased 30 percent in this last year, and that's because of the strategy that we've taken to keep the patients in their beds as long as we can, which is the best thing for those patients. It's the best income stream for those counties, with their county hospitals, and it's the best thing for families who don't have to travel to Lexington and it's quite an inconvenience. But we have really gained a lot of respectable input from there.

We have signed agreements with our Markey Cancer Center with Rockcastle County, Harrison County, with St. Clair's over in Morehead to enter into an affiliation of our cancer network with them, and we'll be doing more of that; where they use our protocols and in some cases we jointly buy equipment.

David Moliterno in Cardiology is making calls now in Danville and Rockcastle County, as well as some of our other cardiologists, and that's a significant move. When UK gets out of Lexington it is of benefit to us, especially when you think about the legislative delegations that sit on the important committees down in Frankfort.

The rankings at the hospital you've probably seen, but they were treated quite well and they are moving effectively. I appreciate that.

I would say, too, that the energy

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

bill that was passed in this last special session where everybody did meet together, was -- had 7 -- 9 million dollars in there for some of our mandated programs; 2 million for the Center for Applied Energy & Research, and 7 million for the Geological Survey Group. And there's a recognition in there that they realize that higher education is going to play a role in energy in the future. One, making it possible to be more efficient; two, keeping it environmentally protected, and three, creating the people who can work in those industries as they expand. So we have done a lot of work in that arena.

I was very pleased with the freshman class this year. We haven't gotten all the statistics. There is an IRIS issue. Should I say that? I'll say something about that in a moment.

But one marker for us, I think, that is significant is that the Singletary Scholarship is our best. It's full room board, tuition and a stipend. We had 417 applications, 80 from out of state. They break that down to 70, and then we have a great committee that calls them in and interviews them and they put the results of their essays, their test scores and interview together and they make offers. Typically -- and we only have 25 of those scholarships. We had 20 until two years ago when athletics shares the cost in 5 additional ones, so we have 25 now.

But we have to accept 50 people in order to 25 acceptances because these are children that are being recruited by the very best out there. So this year we accepted 50 and we got 38, and -- a problem, but it's a good problem.

We actually, I think, had 39 but one young lady went to Harvard instead, but there were two kids on the football field that have Singletaries, had full rides to Harvard, so...

So that is a real good indication of quality. All -- well, 37 of those 38 are Kentuckians. There's one young lady from Nashville, and they're -- you know, 30 of them were Governor Scholars, 7 were National Merit finalist, really a super profile. I felt very good about that.

I was in the software business before this job. Doing software releases is tough. This campus had to change its computing infrastructure. When I first came I was shocked when somebody came to me and said we need to upgrade one of our mainframes. Mainframes? I haven't heard that in a long time ago. Well, we rely on those.

As a result of the inability to have central computing facilities we've had a lot of shadow systems, which are great

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

because they do exactly what you want them to do, but when I ask for the numbers for the whole University, it's hard to roll them up.

My first six weeks or so I was asking for a whole lot of information, especially on community college transfers and all this stuff, and I would get them. But finally somebody as open as Jack Blanton walked in to me, and he said, you don't understand what you're putting us through. He said, you think that we can just go out and write a report, push a bottom and we get all this data. He said, we have to make phone calls, get yellow pieces of paper and put it together.

We're going to be out of that, pretty soon I hope. Maybe, you know, another month or so. But the reporting side of SAP is pretty tough to negotiate. I will tell you the team that's doing that work is a remarkable team. I don't know of anybody that's working any harder or tried more. The consultants we have from SAP are just -- they're -- they're one of us; they're trying to get things solved and they're trying to get the things that you need. But just be a little more patient because once we get that in place, we'll be able to know a whole more about ourselves, be able to get much more timely data and feel a lot more comfortable about the data that we do get; though we're not there yet.

I'm going to stop with that and -- and ask Kaveh to -- and I'm supposed to do something now or do I take questions first.

CHAIR: If you would be kind enough to take questions. Are there any questions for President Todd?

PRESIDENT: I know this isn't a shy group.

CHAIR: I've been here for 22 years, and given that the education and leadership of this University is under the hands of this body, I'd have to say that we have never been in better hands and I think actually President Todd and Provost Subbaswamy are not doing a bad job either, so...

There's a questions, yes.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Arts & Sciences.

Can you say a little bit more about plans for research facilities and not just at the hospital but across the rest of the campus?

PRESIDENT: Well, we're putting monies into redoing some labs over in your area now. We're moving -- you know, we're finishing up the top of the Lucille Little Library so we can move some things, and doing some things in M.L. King South so we can move some things in there to create some more space in there, both the classroom and laboratories. That's the best we can do in the short term.

Our request for a research building will be a broad research building. It won't

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

just be a medical center research building. It will be for the whole campus. I forget the size of that, but do you remember the budget request for that capital fund year so...

It's over a 100 million dollars and, again. And so what I was able to do with CPE last year -- two years ago, was to get them to split our capital list into two parts. One was where -- and the problem was that as long as we were being pushed to be doing research, and that's kind of the top marker in that legislation, we were at a disadvantage with educational buildings.

And so I got CPE to now have two lists. One is kind of research building list, so we have a priority for research building there, and the other is a -- is an education list so we can be treated like all the other universities with the educational facilities. College of Business is our top one, and we're also telling them we're raising about 25 million dollars for the College of Business because most universities don't raise money for their education buildings and we hope that will entice them to give us both of these. And we're also telling them it's a two-for-one deal because if we can build a new business complex, then we've got that space on campus where it can be used.

We are considering moving our Data Center out of McVey in order to create classroom space, but that building is not one that can be lending itself much to research space.

We're looking at -- that's one thing the hospital has done, is to look at individuals who are not patient-facing individuals and move them off campus so we can begin to have place internally. We may look at that -- I know we're looking at that on the academic side too; there are some areas that wouldn't be hurt by moving them off campus so we can create space.

But that's a real limit for us right now. If we can't get research space, we can't continue to grow. We're backed against the wall right now.

Biology, we've got some money to do a little bit of work, and I can give you the details on exactly what we're renovating. I've got a full list of all the renovations here today.

But that's where some of this money is going but we're having to capture ourselves because the only funded project -- when we built BBSRB we actually shelled out an extra floor, which we're finishing up.

On the pharmacy building, we're shelling out some extra space as well, a floor and a half I think. We're using our own money to do it and then we hope to get

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

grants and be able to secure other dollars to fit it out internally. So there will be some additional space over there which will not just be pharmacy space. But that's a place we need help.

North Carolina passed a 3 billion dollar referendum about four years ago in order to build capitol facilities for higher education in North Carolina. They've done that now across all of it, community colleges and all those. Now they're -- I think they're talking a 6 billion dollar referendum. They're going to leave other states in the dust, and we need to get that message out.

There was this past year, CPE hired a firm, the University paid for it, to go through and analyze our space needs, and it's huge. But it -- we've got things on the list, and that could be a good catapult for someone if they wanted to say our University's New Capitol. That's what we need.

I am arguing in favor of using some of the Bucks for Brains if we get another round for matching renovation dollars so that if you have a facility that you could renovate into laboratory or teaching classrooms, it's a great naming opportunity for somebody. If we could use some of that money for renovations and if we could get, you know, another 67 million dollars and match that with another 67, then you've got 130 million. I'd like to focus that on renovations, and then -- because I don't want that to be an excuse to not give us another building when we need it.

We won a bit of a victory that we didn't advertise much, but the BBSRB building, we were required by CB to pay 20 percent of the cost of that building. So we're paying two million every year for 20 years out of our indirect cost to help pay for that building.

The pharmacy building, we got the State to cover 100 percent of that, and then we've added our money in order to build the additional floor space.

CHAIR: One more question for President Todd?

RYAN: Buck Ryan in Journalism. This sensitive of course, but what conversations, if any, might you have had had with Steve Beshear in case he becomes the next Governor?

Now I know you have to be -- I know you've got to be neutral, but you've worked obviously with Governor Fletcher, is there anything you could say about what a relationship might be if there is a different Governor than the current Governor in terms of resources for UK?

PRESIDENT: Well, I have met with Candidate

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

Beshear to give him a view of what our needs are, took him through the top 20 plan. I have likewise met, either the same week or right after that, with the Governor and Brad Cowgill, when he was Budget Secretary, to give them the same presentation and answer any questions.

I made it a point each time I've been here during a gubernatorial election to meet with both candidates and be sure I'm available to them if they have any questions at all.

You know, I knew Governor Fletcher a little as a Congressman when he came in. I know Beshear a bit better because when he chaired as a Lieutenant Governor the Kentucky Tomorrow Commission, we had several committees he put together to look at the future of Kentucky and called me and asked me to be Chairman of the Math and Science Committee.

And when he did not get elected as Governor, that Kentucky Tomorrow report didn't go very far. But a fellow named Kris Kimel, who was his Chief of Staff, actually -- he staffed the Technology Committee that I chaired and he and I took that report and potentially what you hear now about the Kentucky Science and Technology Council that's sponsoring the Idea Festival which we lost in Lexington to Louisville this last year.

Kris and I started the Science Council. Its 20th anniversary is this Saturday, and -- but that came out of the Kentucky Tomorrow Project.

So I have known about every politician. I've worked -- when I was in private business and trying to push education, I worked with Governor Collins and Governor Wilkinson, Governor Jones, Governor Patton so we'll work with whoever is in the office, but I have been invited in to sit down with both and talk to them.

Thank you. I appreciate what you do here, and thank you very much for giving me a chance to come answer any questions. If you have any particular questions in detail about something you heard that you want more information, just send me an e-mail and I'll respond to you with that information. Thank you all very much.

Now, I hereby delegate all the power in this room to Kaveh.

CHAIR:

Thank you very much.

Okay. We have a full agenda so please help me to do this as expeditiously as possible. Those of you who are standing up, there is enough empty seats here. Please come and sit comfortably.

Okay. I have the first item. It is the minutes of May 7th. Some of you are new Senators, you might not have been here,

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

but nevertheless, you have the power approve these minutes.

There has been one revision on page 6 of the minutes, the same as page 7 of the handout.

Okay. Any comments?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Hearing no objections, then the minutes of May 7th stand approved.

I have a few announcements to make. Brad Canon is here. Brad, will you raise your hand so we can see you? Brad is our Parliamentarian for this semester, but he told me you better get yourself a permanent Parliamentarian by the end of the semester because he will not be in town or teaching a course, or have business at UK.

Many of you know that our Parliamentarian for 35 years is -- or was Gifford Blyton. I'm glad to report to you that I called him a couple hours ago, and he sounds younger and healthier than last year. It's amazing. He's going to be 99 September 18th. As I said, he was our Parliamentarian for 35 years, and he has some health issues. Please have him in your prayers. I appreciate that.

A couple of other announcements. Nick Phelps is not here. He's the SGA President. Of course, he's a member of this body. Where is Kenny Blair? Kenny Blair is the Staff Senate Chair. We appreciate you being here. He's also a member of this body, a liaison from the Staff Senate. Thank you, Kenny, for being here.

In October 2006 there was a question raised by a Senator, and I was directed to get the answer to the question from Rules Committee. The question was basically -- and I know the Senator who made that suggestion is here. I see Shelly Steiner; right?

You remember the question was regarding contrary opinion that all students are entitled to. So the question was asked: How far do we go? For example, could a student have a contrary opinion regarding evolution. And what are the limits of the students expressing those contrary opinions?

I have to report to you we took this to the Senate Rule Committee, and you see the answer. If you have a complaint about the answer or a comment send it to the Senate Rules Committee. Okay? So I just have to report that to you, and I'm doing it as we speak.

A couple of waivers, in fact, three of them --

GROSSMAN:

You said --

CHAIR:

Question?

GROSSMAN:

-- see the answer. Where is it?

UNKNOWN:

Where is the answer?

CHAIR:

Oh. Thank you. Here's the answer.

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

Is it not in your handout? I think that -- no, it's not. I'm sorry.

Basically, I have to accept some ownership of this answer because I am a part of this committee who gave this answer. We had difficulty to get the answer that we were asked to find from the Senate Rules, so this was the best that we could come up with.

All right. If there is no question on that, then we go to waivers.

As some of you might know, the Senate Council -- oh, yes. Okay. The Senate Council and the Senate Council Chair on your behalf could waive Senate Rules. It's an amazing power but we are careful with it, but the only condition is, other than being prudent, is to report to you and we can only do this when -- the decision has to be made before the next Senate meeting.

So here we are. Occasion number one, education and dietetics, comes recommended by Senate Council on May 14 meeting. Graduate student in the College of Education encountered certification or promotion problem needed September approval since we don't meet during summer, and the program was also cited by the academic agency and because of that the Senate Council moved on behalf of the Senate, approved these degrees in order for them to go to the Board of Trustees.

Any questions on that?

The next item was about

SR 5.1.8.5.A.2. This is about retroactive withdrawal. I'm sure you are familiar with this. There is a two-year window in which students have to request retroactive withdrawal.

There was a student who was injured in a car accident who didn't know about the retroactive withdrawal and advisor was unaware of the car accident. This student made appeal, a waiver to Senate Council, and the Senate Council voted to approve the waiver so the student's case could be heard by the retroactive withdrawal.

Any question on that?

Okay. Last waiver. On behalf of the Senate Council and Senate Council Chair, that would be me by the way, approved the granting of a -- not the granting. Approval of a degree for a student who according to the college had completed her degree requirements. Student was offered a job, couldn't accept it until officially licensed and the offer was in jeopardy, I acted on behalf of the Senate Council and approved that this name would be forwarded to the -- to the Board, and later on they forwarded this to the Senate Council.

Any question on that?

Okay. Then we have two items somewhat similar.

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

First item is UK September 2007 degree list. The next (inaudible) degree list is students apply for a degree, their department look at their credentials and determine if they pass everything that they're enrolled in, are they eligible to receive the degree. Upon approval of that they forward those names to the registrar, the registrar checks -- does some other checks, and then sends it to the Senate Council. The Senate Council approves it to be on the agenda, which is right in front of you. After you approve it, it would be sent to the Board.

The Board would then approve it. At that point, one more time the registrar would check everybody's credentials to make sure they eligible; that the grades that they receive are -- makes them eligible to receive their degree.

The degrees in front of you, the recommendation that we are asking you to make a motion about is that the elected faculty -- University Faculty Senators approve UK September 2007 degree list for submission to the President, to the Board of Trustees and recommend that the degrees to become (inaudible) by the Board.

Could I have a motion?

CHAPPELL:

Motion.

CHAIR:

Name and college, please.

CHAPPELL:

Jerry Chappell, College of AG.

CHAIR:

Any second?

ANDERSON:

Second. Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.

CHAIR:

Are there any comments? Yes.

REMER:

Rory Remer, Education. I know we've been over this, and it's one of the issues that we discussed in -- at the end of last semester but if there are people who appear on these lists who aren't eligible to get degrees. And the question I have and have been asked to pose to the Senate is: Why do they keep appearing?

CHAIR:

Are these people that theoretically would not have been eligible? Of course, when you're dealing with hundreds sometimes thousands of names, there are going to be some names which are not eligible.

REMER:

This is a particular pattern. We have -- on the clinical area, and we have students who defend their dissertations and then go in internship and they're not eligible to get their degrees until they finish their internships.

So there have been recent (inaudible) in the past, people who are then not really eligible until they pass their internships.

CHAIR:

Well, think of it this way: If -- theoretically, if they finish their internship within the time between when they are recommended by the registrar and by us

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

and before -- or even after the Board approves them and then the registrar again checks their credentials, if they could theoretically be able to fulfill that requirement then their name should be there.

Just because your name is here doesn't mean automatically you will receive a degree. Quite the reverse. In this sense, if your name is not here then even if you finish your -- all of the requirements for the degree, you will not be awarded degree by the registrar because the Board of Trustees did not approve it.

This is the best systems as far as I know that we have, and you don't see some of these efforts but a lot of this work goes into this. We do several e-mails back and forth, we talk -- we send at least ahead of time to get input from Senators and here is the list in front of you.

Are there any other comments?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Do we have a second already on this motion?

Yes.

BROTHERS:

CHAIR:

Yes. We have -- by the way, we have -- this is one of another result of those efforts that I was mentioning to you. Today we were able to verify the credential of a senior student who was brought to our attention by their department. We checked everything and added the name, and you have this extra page for your recommendation.

So if you're ready, then, all those in favor of approving this list please indicate by raising your hand.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: Michelle, are you going to help me count this quickly?

Okay. I'm told we don't need the numbers, per se. Go ahead and finish this one, but the next time, just by observation it would be obvious that...

MICHELLE:

CHAIR:

Fifty-three
Fifty-three. That also tell us that we have quorum that actually vote. So all those opposed?

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR:

One. Abstain? Okay. So we have one opposed, one abstain and 53 in favor.

The next item is a similar item, but this one is for KCTCS. As far as I know, we are going to be doing this a few more years because of the memorandum of understanding that all those students, KCTCS students who were still a UK student at the time that this memorandum of understanding was approved will be eligible to receive a UK degree. Being a UK degree, then we have the prerogative to approve those and send it to our Board of Trustees.

You have the list. The recommendation is in front of you. May I

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

have a motion based on that recommendation?
CHAPPELL: I Motion.
CHAIR: Dave Chappell, AG College; correct?
I need a second.
ANDERSON: Second.
CHAIR: Same person, second. Any comments?
(NO RESPONSE)
CHAIR: All those in favor of this
recommendation raise your hand. I will not
count you. I just want to see your hand.
(MEMBERS VOTE)
CHAIR: Those opposed?
(NONE)
CHAIR: Abstain?
(NONE)
CHAIR: It was unanimous. Motion carries.
The next item is 2007 United Way
Campaign. Is my Dean Tom Lester here? I was
told that he might be involved in some
activity, so I'm going to use my prerogative
and --
WILSON: I'm here as backup in case he didn't
show up even though I'm sure that no one can
really be a backup for Tom Lester but... Do
you want me to take a few minutes and go
through it?
CHAIR: No, I would rather -- if there is
no objection from anyone on the floor, I will
go to the next item and by the end of today
if Tom is not here then I will ask you to go
ahead and do it.
WILSON: All right.
CHAIR: Unless you know for sure he
will not be here?
WILSON: No. I think he intends to be here.
CHAIR: Okay. So next item is the
University Joint Committee on Honorary
Degrees.

This is a quite unique -- in fact,
it's the only committee I know which is a
joint committee, jointly appointed by the
administration and by the Senate; more
specific, the Senate Council.

To give you a little bit of
background, you can see the rationale and the
history in -- in the handout you can see for
the background, very briefly, for years this
committee was appointed by the administration
and it was never clear whether this is an
administrative committee or a faculty
committee.

Two years ago there was a new GR
approved by the Board of Trustees, changed
the composition of this committee and more
specifically the committee now have -- half
of it is appointed by administration, the
President, and half of it by the Senate
Council.

However, inadvertently one
provision was skipped, and that provision is
we always had a member -- a voting member
from the Board on this committee.

This was inadvertently dropped and,

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt
however, the -- considering the rationale -- because, first of all, the Board of Trustees has the final authority and, second of all, they agreed in perspective which is very helpful to consider at the four main stages of this process.

So I brought this to the Senate Council, they directed me to bring back an amendment to the proposal and the proposal is in front of you.

Very briefly, there are a couple of editorial changes but the substantial change is that now we're going to have a member of the Board of Trustees as a liaison, non-voting selected by the Board Chairman to serve on this committee as a -- as a liaison and from the Board.

This is coming to you with a positive recommendation from the Senate Council. Does not require a motion or second. I'd like to open it up for discussion or questions.

Bob Grossman.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Arts & Sciences. I'm just wonder if in the past they were a voting member, what's the rationale for making them a non-voting member now?

CHAIR: The rationale was that -- there are other non-voting members too, by the way. So that's -- first of all, this is a new committee. The committee was formed mostly because of the KRS that says only the faculty of this University could recommend degrees. And, of course, the faculty has to be elected or chosen by other faculty in order to be the truly -- the decision of the faculty.

There are two other non-voting members, one of them the Senate Council chair, myself, for the time being, and Terry Mobley. I should know his title, but I don't know, he's in administration and he has an ex officio non-voting member. It's not that there's only one non-voting member, rather the philosophy was to keep this within the faculty.

Are there any other questions? After this is approved we're going to give this to -- convey this to the President's office, and it will become -- the AR will be changed.

THELIN: John Thelin. All right.
John Thelin, Education.
Isn't it unusual to have the Chair of that committee be a voting member? Doesn't usually the Chair not vote except in case of ties in -- on most university committees?

CHAIR: You are correct.

THELIN: Well, stop right there.

CHAIR: However, I am the Chair of this body, and technically I have a vote, but I do not vote under Robert's Rules of Order until there is a tie. So on one hand this Chair

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt
has a voting power; on the other hand,
because the University apparatus, the Senate
apparatus especially, works under Robert's
Rules of Order, under Robert's Rules of Order
and I hope I'm not mistaken, I will be
corrected definitely by many of you later on
if I'm mistaken, but under Robert's Rules of
Order the Chair will not vote unless there is
a tie or to break a tie.

Does that answer your question,
John?

THELIN: And that's applicable -- that --
that reading is applicable to this committee?

CHAIR: I will apply it, yes, because this
is a Senate Committee. It's a joint
committee; it's also a Senate Committee.

Brad, can you -- do you have any
opinion of that?

CANON: Well, there are plenty of
committees in this University where the Chair
is a voting member, the committees -- Senate
Committees among others. It sort of varies
by tradition or rule but there's certainly no
universal rule against this.

CHAIR: Okay. Any other question or
comment?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: All right. This does not require a
motion and a second, but it requires your
vote so if you're ready: All those in favor
of this amendment to the AR and sending it to
the President's office, please indicate so by
raising your hand.

(MEMBERS VOTE)

CHAIR: I don't think I need to count. I
won't anticipate. All those opposed?

(NONE)

CHAIR: Abstain?

(NONE)

CHAIR: It's unanimous. Motion carries.
Now I see my Dean Tom Lester is here, so if
you want to come to the podium or where ever
-- from where ever you're comfortable.

LESTER: Thank you, Kaveh.

CHAIR: Tom Lester is going to be talking
to us regarding 2007 United Way Campaign.

LESTER: Thank you very much, Kaveh. I
appreciate the opportunity to come before you
today to talk about this year's United Way
Campaign.

I've been asked to be the Co-Chair
for the University of Kentucky. It's an
honor to do this because this is an
organization and it's a drive that I believe
very strongly in.

The United Way of the Bluegrass
works not only for Lexington and Fayette
County, but also for the surrounding
counties. The estimate is that somehow,
through one of the hundreds of organizations
that we support through the United Way, we
impact over half a million people; just about
one out of every three citizens of the

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

Bluegrass in each year has some occasion to be benefitted by a United Way agency.

I'm here to ask your assistance; I'm here to ask you to give personally, and to -- also to encourage your colleagues throughout the University academic community to do so as well.

Frankly, in the past years the University has not done well. In the last two years we went to a web-based solicitation scheme, as others in other organizations throughout Fayette County and Urban -- the Urban area had found out, it does not work well.

This year we're going back to a direct solicitation, and I'm hopeful that we will respond in a much more generous fashion than we have previously.

This is a comparison of University of Kentucky with our counterparts in the Southeastern Conference. You'll see, first of all, there's been a dramatic falloff in our giving as a university from over 400,000 in 2004 to slightly over 300,000 last year. The average gift for the University of Kentucky's 13,000 employees is a little over \$24 per person.

Compare that, for instance, with the University of Florida, which gives over \$81 per person. The average for the schools for which we have complete data is around \$42 per person.

To put this in another context, my wife Frances is a Deputy County Clerk at the Fayette County Clerk's office. I will assure you that most of the individuals at the clerk's office, some -- numbering some 80 made less than 50,000 a year, their average gift last year was \$75 per person.

You can see for yourself through a quick -- through a quick multiplication what the impact would be were we at the University of Kentucky, even to give at the rate that the -- that the Fayette County Clerk's office gives.

Our hospital here, which will be treated differently because we know that to be the cultures of the various academic units and the auxiliary units such as the hospital are all different. Our hospital last year at the University of Kentucky gave less than Georgetown Community Hospital did to United Way of the Bluegrass.

We have, I think, a lot to give to this institution, and I believe that we can do much better than we have in the past.

This is another tabulation of what's going on at the University of Kentucky. Most dramatically in the last three years the number of donors has gone down by nearly 50 percent from approximately 2,800 to just over 1,500.

Of most importance is the fact that

however the average gift has gone up because leadership gifts are very important. Leadership gifts are those that provide more than \$1,000 a year to the United Way. There have been 77 of those leadership gifts at the University of Kentucky last year, and they've provided approximately one-third of the total amount of money that was collected at UK.

I will tell you that -- I'm sorry to tell you, actually, there are colleges that last year gave zero dollars to United Way. There are major organizational -- administrative organizational units at the University of Kentucky that gave little or nothing last year.

So, again, I am here to beg you, to implore you, to urge you to work with your colleagues to do better for the community of which we are a very important part, this year.

We also have pledge forms online, but I think -- Kim, do we have pledge forms here that everyone has?

WILSON: Yes. I believe they were handed out as they came in.

LESTER: And I would encourage you to fill those out while you're here today before you forget about it, and hand them in.

Kim, are you going to be collecting them -- Kim Wilson?

WILSON: Absolutely.

LESTER: Up here in the front?

Again, I encourage you to give. There are numerous reasons why you should give, and not very many others -- not very many, I think, as to the opposite of that. _____

So, again, I appreciate, Kaveh, the time that you've given me before the Senate Council. I know your schedule is busy, and I will end with my (inaudible).

Thank you very much.

CHAIR: We have one more item, but a very important item.

Okay. Very briefly, let me go to this most important next item, USP reform.

I'm sure many of you, if not all of you, are aware that this University has started an effort to reform USP. If I'm not mistaken, this probably started two, if not three, years ago. It started with ERC, External Review Committee, which was an external review of the USP program. A report was written, was presented to the Senate. As a result or partially as a result of that, then there was another committee appointed jointly by -- or the joint committee of the Senate and Senate Council and the Provost, GERA, General Education Reform. What is the "A" for?

UNKNOWN: Assessment.

CHAIR: Assessment. I've been thinking all day, couldn't come up with that. GERA has a recommendation, they talk to numerous faculty

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

forums, they made a trip all the way to D.C., if I'm not mistaken, for -- it was a week or so. They wrote a report and the report was presented to the Senate last year.

As a result of that then a steering committee was appointed, again jointly by the Senate Council and by the Provost Office, to come up with an implementation of this USP reform.

And to make a long story short, here we are, Phil is here. I'm sure he is going to -- if he has some ground rules he's going to discuss it with you. I don't think he necessarily wants to -- correct me if I'm wrong, Phil, to discuss the detailed merits of the proposal itself, although some of that has been released to the faculty. But rather he wants to discuss with you how to take the next steps.

If I'm correct, then come on over, Phil.

KRAEMER: First, I want to thank the President and Dean Lester for opening for me. Just checking to see if you're still there. What I really want to talk about is just the timeline, very brief, because Kaveh has well articulated the history.

Where we are now is that the steering committee had worked diligently over the spring and throughout the summer to develop a draft proposal.

We have a preliminary proposal, a draft proposal that we wanted to ship out and receive some initial feedback.

We presented that proposal to the deans, we have sent that proposal to each undergraduate college, hoping that the curriculum committee would review and provide feedback, but we also provided that proposal to the Senate Council.

The committee is hoping to get written feedback on that draft proposal by October 1. We will, if necessary, make revisions to the proposal, and then the plan is to present that proposal to the University campus, to faculty, students, advisors, staff; the entire campus.

And we then intend to hold open forums. I think we talked about at least two or three faculty forums at different times. We're going to have probably one or two student forums, and at these forums open to the public -- all can attend, we will listen and hear additional feedback, take written comments and, again, if necessary we'll make revisions to a formal proposal that we will bring to this body, the Senate, about the middle of November. I think it's the November 12th meeting.

CHAIR:
KRAEMER:

Yes.
And that will be -- and we've asked that it be put on the Senate docket for discussion only. We will discuss and again

hear, and if necessary make any final adjustments, amendments to that proposal that we hope to bring to in December for a decision.

I think Kaveh is absolutely correct. This one of the most important decisions this body will deal with this year, and we're hopeful that we get sufficient feedback from the college of committees, and particularly (inaudible). I think it's imperative that we talk about this very transparently and that we look at this in the ways in which this kind of proposal needs to be appreciated.

It's a very serious, great opportunity for us to make a major step forward in improving this institution and that, essentially, is the timeline.

Any questions?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR:

Just one -- one point. The reason -- by Senate Rule, any major item, and if any item is major, it's this item, has to come to the Senate for discussion alone in one session, and then in the next session, probably 30 days or a month later on, then it would be again discussed and then put up for a vote.

So that's the reason we have to have this discussion in November; that's what we are planning, and then on November, if need be, we could allocate an hour, even two hours of the Senate time.

This proposal needs by-in from every single faculty, otherwise it will not be successful.

So please be prepared, read the proposal, we'll have a discuss, hopefully a lively discussion in November and then it will come before you for a final vote in December.

Are there any questions for Phil regarding the time line; any suggestions; any discussion?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR:

Okay. Then -- yes, there is a question.

YANARELLA:

Phil, I'd like to thank the steering committee process for engaging in a very thoughtful process over the last year. As former co-chair with you of GERA, keeping many of the elements that -- that GERA and external review committee put forth as essential to us moving forward in the area of general education has been -- have been realized in this particular document.

I also think that it -- it's an open -- in some respects an open-ended document and will really profit from a serious examination by various faculty groups and faculty bodies.

I would, since your comments are basically confined to the issue of timeline,

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

I'd like to simply ask you a question with regard to that. Assuming that the proposal is accepted in December or a good part of it is accepted or some revision of it is accepted, do you have a sense or can you provide us with a notion of how the reform process will proceed after that? I think it's going to be a daunting task to engage in a serious revision of our general education framework. What is the -- what is the thinking of the Provost and what is the thinking of the steering committee with regard to this?

KRAEMER: As can be seen by all, the proposal has a number of elements to it and the plan would be, I'm not optimistic, but say it's approved in the December meeting, we would then want to have an implementation committee layout in detail what exactly has to occur and the steering committee has talked about this.

What would have to occur is reaching the elements. We're going to have to have faculty committees that are willing to work out in great detail the specific learning outcomes for example, the criteria for the various elements of this curriculum; and, also, discussion about the process by which we would be vetting future proposals for changes in this particular general education model we put forth. So there would be a lot of folks involved in just that part of it.

There's also going to be clearly the opportunity for faculty development because the proposal's a pretty provocative one, not just in terms of substance but in terms of curriculum but also it speaks to pedagogy and I think that's what makes it very exciting to me. But for that we're going to have to really plan to provide the kind of support that would help colleagues develop courses and also develop the techniques by which we could deliver these courses.

So it's going to be a process that invests quite a bit of our time, and a lot of individuals are going to have to be involved.

We had talked about targeting for implementation Fall 2009. And one of the things our steering committee is working on are some of the gritty details of this, you know, what is the feasibility, what has to be done in order to get there and we'll be going through that and including that in our recommendation that would come forth for the entire University Committee, that specific recommendation about implementation data, and by then there's a lot of work to do.

Relying on faculty committees indeed and certainly the current way with the curriculum structured the way it is -- and whatever other resources we have on campus.

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

So when we think about faculty committees, like the Teaching Academic Support Center. I think we're going to have to be deeply engaged in this and focused on this.

The Chellgren Center for Undergraduate Excellence as a role to play. Leadership, people like Ernie Yanarella, professor in the Chellgren Center. We're going to have to be deeply involved in this.

CHAIR: Could you remind the Senate who are on the steering committee?

KRAEMER: Yes. Let's see if my feeble memory works. It is Steve Hoch, Richard Greissman representing the Provost office, Professor Kim Anderson in Engineering, Professor Nancy Johnson in B&E, Professor Larry Graubau College of Agriculture. Am I leaving anyone out?

UNKNOWN: Student.

KRAEMER: We've had assistance, from Deb Moore with the Assessment Office, a very helpful graduate student assistant helped us collect a lot of data.

UNKNOWN: Phil Harling.

KRAEMER: Phil Harling has joined us as the endowed Chair of the Chellgren Center.

CHAIR: All right. Are there any other questions or suggestions, comments for Phil? (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIR: Okay. Then I can take credit for finishing up everything today. See you guys next month.

HALLMAN: Yes?

HALLMAN: Since the President suggested that we we're going to talk further about IRIS, and then really didn't; is that going to be addressed as to the state of IRIS?

CHAIR? IRIS has always asked us to give a presentation to us, so I am sure that if called the office and offered them to come to the Senate and --

HALLMAN: No, not from their point of view, from our point of view.

CHAIR: Oh, from our point of view.

HALLMAN: Because there's been so much difficulty on the departmental level and we teach staff and we teach staff and I'm wondering -- I just heard through the grapevine that the Provost made a declaration to the Dean that it was a total failure. So, I wonder if you know...

CHAIR: Okay. What I will do is maybe get someone from the Provost office to come and talk to the Senate Council and then I will update you what transpired regarding the comments that you make. Okay. Now this time is for real, you can go. See you later.

* * * * *

THEREUPON, the Senate Council Meeting of September 10, 2006 was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

* * * * *

* * * * *

STATE OF KENTUCKY)

COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

Xcript 9-10-07 Senate.txt

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 5th day of October, 2007.

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