

Xcript 9-14-09 Senate.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

SEPTEMBER 14, 2009

3:00 P.M.

* * * *

* * * *

MAIN BUILDING OFFICE OF THE CHAIR
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY CAMPUS
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

* * * *

* * * *

DAVID RANDALL, CHAIR
HOLLIE SWANSON, VICE-CHAIR
KATE SEAGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN
SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR
LISA E. HOINKE, COURT REPORTER

TODD: I do have the official responsibility of calling this group to order as Kaveh told me some years ago and Dave reminds me of frequently. So I've just been down with the new freshman Senators, some who have served previously, but some who are new to the campus. And, oh, I see some new deans out here and some old deans out here. It's good to have a chance to be here. I'm getting ready to get some --

VOICE: Mike is on?

TODD: It looks green here.
Testing, testing, again.

BROTHERS: Is that better?

TODD: Can you hear me.

TAGAVI: Yeah, it's better.

TODD: All right. I'm an engineer. I don't touch this electronic stuff. Well, I -- I want to thank Dave for the work that

Xcript 9-14-09 Senate.txt

he's done this past year. We've spent some time together talking about some issues. And I want to thank all of you for the service that you put into this. I was telling the freshmen a few moments ago that I served on this body for seven years and really felt it was one of the ways I stayed connected with what was happening at the University. And I know that you've got a lot going on right now and appreciate the time that you're putting into this. I'm going to give a State of the University address which will be prepared a little bit more detailed probably in a few weeks, actually September 24th I'm probably out here again, I think it is. You can watch the Web site and see, but it's something we try to do. We started a few years ago with the Student Government President. I was very pleased to hear the Student Government President speak last year when he started talking about how the students would endorse the Top 20 plan because when I was in school here, the last thing you would have heard was the students endorsing any administrative plan whatsoever. So it was a different day and different time, but we've got some really good student leaders, and I want to encourage you to come listen to that and participate in that.

The first thing I'll start with is just the budget issues. Unless you've been hiding under a rock, it's a difficult time right now. It seems to be something I repeat. The Governor has held us harmless the last couple of cuts, but in the last 18 months we've been cut 25 million dollars out of our base. And just to give you a feel for that, when I started in 2001, we had a 1.2 billion dollar overall budget. 303 million came from the state. So that's kind of the percentage that they were at. After eight years, our budget is 2.4 billion now, and we get 310 million from the state. So it's been a seven million dollar increase in this period of time. We hit a bump when they provided the extra 22 million for the business plan a few years ago, but then they've taken that back with these cuts. We continue to look at savings. If you are interested, there is a paper that we put out once a year that documents the cost-cutting processes that we've gone through. And the last one, we showed where we cut about 18 -- or 800 -- I'm sorry, 88 million dollars that we've been able to reinvest. But most of that growth in that 2.4 billion budget has come from tuition increases. And we feel that we're getting close to the limit on what we can do there. We're about up to the meeting of our benchmarks, but yet we're not really probably at the caliber of the

benchmarks we want to be because they're pretty aspirational. And we have felt this time for our enrollment, we had an increase in applications from out-of-state students, but we didn't get as many of those. And that's a national trend because so many of them are choosing to stay home now because that's the -- a large cost of their education. And so I try to explain to the legislators if they would just invest in us in order to get us to the point where we have the academic reputation that we want to achieve, then you can start charging an out-of-state tuition that's pretty lucrative. This is what happens in North Carolina, Michigan, and other places like that. It's like a spicket. They can kind of turn it on and bring in as many of those as they want, and it helps to subsidize the in-state tuition. We're not at that point yet. We're about a two-to-one ratio. Some are as much as four-to-one. And we're sitting around 22 percent out-of-state students. But the Governor has, to his credit, kept us whole the last couple of cuts, K through 12 as well as higher education. However, he's had a lot of help from the stimulus money that -- that's the only place I've seen any impact of that money. I hear a lot about this money everybody's got, but it doesn't seem to hit the ground. But they've plugged holes with it here in the state. The scary thing is that runs out in 2011, and so the second half of the next budget, if the economy doesn't pick up, then the state has got to start facing some hard decisions which they don't tend to seem to like to do. They've got to find some revenue someplace. They did pass some taxes with -- on alcohol and tobacco that helped out some. But they need to look at gaming issues. One that's been on the table and off the table and -- but if we don't get another revenue source, the tax revenues are just not there to give us the type of funding that we need. Our goal is to continue to grow and try to be as independent of the state as we can. But that 300 million dollars that we get from them is precious money. It's what I call in-the-class money. That's what puts professors in the classrooms. A lot of the other monies we get are through the hospital income, through research income, through tuition increases, but the state money is really what helps us give salary increases and -- and helps us improve our physical plant and things of that nature. We are trying to do everything we can. I was just in a meeting last week with Jeff Talbert, who's in our College of Pharmacy, who knows the Medicaid expenditures inside and out. I've tried now -- this will be my

fifth year in a row to offer the state help to manage their pharmaceutical drugs the way that we manage them here on campus. And a couple glaring examples that come out of the data just to give you an absurd example of where this state wastes money. There's one patient who had 27,000 pain pills prescribed in one year. My doctors or my pharmacy won't give you over 30 pills at a time, it seems like for what I need. I used to not take pills till I got this job, but that's a regular event nowadays. And there was another patient that went to the emergency room over 250 times in one year. And those kind of things can be, you know, it can be monitored. It can be dealt with and can be dealt with in a way that that patient hopefully gets better health care. And so those are the kind of things that we would like to be doing with the state. Professor Lawson in Law School has written at least one chapter out of a book recently on what goes on with prison costs here in this state. You look at prison costs and education costs, they're going the opposite directions. And health care costs is going right there with prison costs. So if the state can't face up to making decisions in order to create new revenue, they ought to spend the existing revenue in different ways. And so that's the argument that we have been making and will continue to make, and we have expertise on this campus that could help the state a lot if they would be willing to make some of the political decisions. The other agencies are being cut a lot. And when you hold education harmless, that's a big component of the budget. I'm fully aware that we have not had a salary increase for two years, and that hurts. You can brag on people for doing a good job, for keeping their heads up, and getting the grants and getting the teaching awards and all those things, but it doesn't pay the bills. We're doing everything we can do to look for money in order to have a pay increase next year. It's just fundamental. Some things that people might not be happy with, but when you look at vesting changes, five million dollar savings. When you look at vacation changes, several million dollars in savings there. I much prefer those to furloughs, to layoffs, to shutting down departments. And when you look around the country, those things are happening. So far we've been able to avoid those. We haven't had a hiring freeze because we felt that strategically right now is a good time to hire people if you can, you know, if you can find them, and you've got vacancies. And we try to be very judicious about that.

Xcript 9-14-09 Senate.txt

And I can't tell you how proud I am of the many people that we've added recently that have come here to help us in this, what I would call, a fight to pull this state forward and do what we can do for this country.

So I was a bit amused a year or so ago when a particular staff member was telling me how demoralized people were getting. And I said, well, think about sitting in the seat I sit in where I come here, you know, a new job, fired up, ready to go, Top 20 challenge, all this stuff, and then you have nine budget cuts in eight years. It's kind of demoralizing at this level too. I used to have an adage when I was in business: When in doubt, just work. You know, and that's what you all have been doing and the people across the campus because things are still happening in a very positive way. I'm having dinner with the Board of Trustees tonight. We have a Board meeting tomorrow. And I've asked Don Witt to come tell the Board members about the freshmen class that are coming in this year because we've got several records. We set several last year. We had 12,500 applications this year; 12,400, I think it was. We ran 11,003 last year. So applications were up. We held the freshmen class to a little over 4,000 again. This is the third year in a row. We had planned to grow the school. But we had said in the plan that we weren't going to grow it at the expense of the student faculty ratio. If we can't hire faculty, we're not going to let the student -- the freshman class grow. We can't cut it back because that's a revenue source that we need, and it's not being replenished. But we did move up with our ACT score. The top number moved from 27 to 28 when you look at the range. It's hard to move that number. This is not a record average ACT class because once before we had about a tenth of a point higher, but we have 1,400 more students in this freshman class than we had back then. And to be able to do that, to go from 2,600 to 4,000 and have about as high an ACT average that you've ever had, I think speaks extremely well of the students that we're drawing into this place. We're a low ACT state. You know, I often tell some of the folks who went to the private schools around the world that say that, you know, our rankings ought to go up. I said, well, they could go up, just cut our freshmen class to 2,500 and lop off the low ACT scores, and if the state would give us money to do that, we could be, you know, really highly ranked, but we'd do a disservice. As I told the new incoming Senators, a lot of the kids who score in

Xcript 9-14-09 Senate.txt

that low ACT range just take that test once. And they don't go to all these prep classes. They can't afford it. They do the best they can with what they've got. But we get them here, and we turn them into some pretty outstanding individuals. We still need to do that for this state. So we're going to keep going after it. If we -- the way that we should raise our entering ACT is get our hands in concert with K-12 to help the whole state lift that base number. Because if we lifted that base number for the state, then our numbers will go up, and the state will improve. But we have a record number of African-Americans this year. I think we were up about 22 percent in applications, not only for the freshmen class but for the entire University in total. We broke 1,000 for transfer students. We were down around the 600-and-some-odd range last year. And that's a significant improvement. We're still not back to the number of transfers we need. You know, we can bring transfers in at a pretty low marginal cost because they go into those upper classes and don't fill those freshmen roles. So we need transfers, and we're doing our best to increase those numbers, and we've done a good -- we had 10 percent increase from BCTC here in town, and we're doing some special things with them. But those numbers we need to continue to work on. You've probably already seen, we had a record number of African-American faculty. We have 84 African-American faculty. I think in 2001, we had 57. So -- and again, we're just bringing in outstanding candidates across the board.

Connie Ray, who's sitting here and is our data master and knows all the details behind these, sent me a note even before this freshmen class came in saying that we should call last year a year of records. And if we get involved and don't think about some of the accomplishments, we do need to be reminded every so often. I used to say, you need to visualize your success every now and then, you know, take time to breathe deep and say, wow, you know, we were able to do some things that made this place move forward. Last year was a record freshmen applications which we just broke. Last year was a record number of Governor's Scholars & Governor's School for the Arts, 389. This year we have 404. Those kids used to be going out of state. They used to go to the private schools in Kentucky. Those are kind of the cream of the crop. If you look at our Singletary Scholars which is our full-ride, top scholarship, we have 27 of those this year. We usually budget for 25. We had 27, all

Xcript 9-14-09 Senate.txt

from Kentucky. Twenty-four of those were Governor's Scholars, and the other three were Governor's School for the Arts. So these are students, if you're not familiar with that program, they're chosen if they go into their senior year, between junior and senior year, they spend the summer together on a college campus and get enriched. And they spend quite a bit of time together. And they are ones who are maybe not the top ACT scorers in their school, but they're the ones that the teachers say they're going to be successful. They're going to be good ones. And so we now get a significant number of those. Four hundred and four is by far the largest of any one.

Last year, something I'm really proud of, is that the Provost declared war on attrition. If you're going to get your graduation rate up which is what we desperately need to do. We're about 60, 61 percent. We need to be 72 or a little bit higher than that to be where we want to be. But if you don't keep them from freshmen to sophomore year, you're never going to get there. And our retention last year was 81 percent. And we held that close to 81. We'll see which way the rounding goes this time. It will be 80 or 81. But we've held it now two years in a row which means it wasn't a fluke last year. It wasn't a fluke because I think there are several things we put into place to keep the students aware of the fact that they might be sliding backwards in a class with the academic alert system. We've gone back to the midterm grades. We've done some things you can point to to say this is why that went up four-and-a-half percentage points. We've held it now, but what the Provost reminds me is that for us to then get those next four points, you know, we got the low hanging fruit, we're going to have to do some other things now to really focus on how to keep them even longer than that and get that rate up even higher. But it was a record last year. Last year we had 347 African-American freshmen. That was a record number. This year we have, what, 404. So we're up, you know, about 50 in that category. That's a substantial increase. We had a record number of doctoral students, 2,400 last year. And we've gone up again in that number. We had degrees awarded, 312, which was a record. Record high first professional enrollment of 1,558. Record high number of full-time faculty, 296, not where we need to be, but it's higher than we have been. I've already mentioned the African-American faculty. A record number and percent of women in executive, administrative and

managerial positions, 234, which is 48.4 percent of our talent in those positions. And then a record high in research expenses of 337 million. When I mention that number to most people in Kentucky, they have no concept. They don't have a company within driving range of their home that does 300 million dollars in business, and yet they think we play basketball up here, and that's, you know, it's a tough sell to get across to some of these people what we do at this place. We've got to get better at that. We try to tell them; we try to retell them, but try to get them to ingest it is a harder thing. And that's something that we -- we started a group that is really a result of the fact that we don't have the community colleges spread out there selling for us anymore. But we started this group that we bring onto campus now once a year, and it's called UKAN, the University of Kentucky Advocacy Network. And we really inform them of everything going on to try to get that in their minds. And then the first day of the legislative session, we have those people invite their legislators to come to a lunch down at the -- in Frankfort. And last year we had them the same day that they had the Chamber of Commerce annual dinner, and we had more legislators at lunch than they had at dinner that night. And we get students to speak to them. And that sticks; that gets their attention. But that Advocacy Network does help. When we did our Dream Tour a few years ago, and each time I go to a city on a visit right now, I'll have breakfast with our Advocacy members that morning and ask them to invite their legislator. And then after I leave, they hammer on them a little bit more. But we almost have to get in hand-to-hand combat throughout the state because our local legislation can't carry many votes. And when it gets right down to budgets and holding your own, you've got to be able to talk to all of those people. So anything you can do to help us there, I would certainly encourage you to do. We have a process we deal with Frankfort, and Steve Byars heads that. I think the best thing that -- that you could help us do or some of your peers could help us do is go into a classroom sometimes. Go out to some programs in the schools to give out book awards at the end of the year. Be seen. There's a hunger around this state for Kentucky, UK, in particular. And it's not just for sports. I mean, people want to be touched. I've gone to all of the places where we had community colleges before, and they all say, come back more often. And we are trying to rebuild that. I met with the

president of the national alumni association the other day. And I said, one thing that our alumni members spread throughout Kentucky could do is spend some time at the community college talking about why they should transfer to UK because those numbers are good ones that we need to have, and we're not getting those. So we're trying to get them engaged. One thing I will announce in a few weeks, I guess, is that we're going to begin a presidential scholarship campaign, probably 150 million dollars. We haven't settled on the number yet. But right now we spend about 50 million dollars out of our general fund for academic support. And you know, the Singletary Scholars, I thought when I got here, hey, this thing must be endowed; they're named after somebody. Not quite. They come right out of the general fund. And an awful lot of our scholarships do. A lot of them are dedicated, especially in the College of Ag, they do a great job and other colleges. But if we could raise a larger endowment for scholarships and all -- any million dollars we can save out of general funds for scholarships can go into pay increases and so forth. And so we are going to start that campaign. And I do feel that what happened in '97 or '98 when Bucks for Brains passed, our development officers and everybody started heading for those donors that could give you a minimum of \$50,000 because that money would be matched by the state. But we kind of didn't spend time cultivating those people who could give you a couple thousand a year for 10 years or who would take on a student and pay for their way through college over a period of time. But we're going to do that. And I think that that will -- there are a lot of people who want to do that. And if you get that base of a couple thousand dollar a year donors built up, then some of those people do grow up. I heard a comment the other day; I won't tell you who told me this, but they said that -- you know, we now go after estate gifts and deferred gifts and help get people to write it in their will. And this person said, do you know what the deferred gift handshake is? I said, no. This is (indicating). If you didn't see it, it's that, anyway. They do extend their lives when they give us a deferred gift, I have no doubt, but sometimes.... We are recognizing \$833,000 worth of gifts this week in three estate gifts. And many of those people start with those who want to give you just a little bit and give you what they can. But when they -- when they are deceased, they leave us the residual.

So those are some of the things

Xcript 9-14-09 Senate.txt

we're trying to do to, you know, we're going to work on the legislature to get whatever we can get. We don't take political positions on -- I did take a political position on this tobacco tax. I just think it was high time, and they didn't do enough. I don't take a political position on gaming. I don't particularly like to base our economy on gambling or lotteries or those types of things, but we need revenue, so that's kind of my bottom line. I want revenue. So we're trying that, but we're also saying, try to save money in prisons and health care. That will get a little controversial sooner or later, but we are going to be active in that discussion. And then we're going to have this other -- our next big campaign will be for our 200th anniversary. But we're going to have the scholarship campaign starting off pretty soon, and the whole goal of that is to put money into the general fund with the offset expenditures from that.

If you talk about capital, we are doing some construction on campus now as you see. We were able to get the Bucks for Brains changed this last time so that they would allow us to match capital donations. And as a result, we're building additional buildings that we would not have built otherwise. Davis Markbury, who you may know who sold Exstream Software to Hewlett Packard gave us six million. We were able to match that. Jim Hardyman, who's retired from our Board now but was the chairman of our Board, has given us several grants or gifts before, but he had us in his will for two million, but when he heard he could match it for that building, he went ahead and pulled that and gave that to us. And then we had another donor for a half a million we matched. But we need space. We need academic space, and we need research space to continue to grow. And another ploy I'm trying to employ is to tell the state that they should give us the education funding for educational buildings, and they should use economic development funds to build our research buildings. BBSRB, sitting over here on the corner, first year it's fully operating, generated 22 million dollars. We spend tax incentives. We spend road money. We spend training money to attract companies to come here that generate a lot less than that in earning revenues. And so we're trying to make some headway in that because Economic Development does have money. The trouble you have to do is to convince them that they need to, you know, they -- they don't want to spend it in the golden triangle, as they say. My contention, it's copper, at

best in this state. We're not golden in any part of our economy. But we do have the ability to take this economy and grow it throughout the state. And that's the pitch that I try to make to them. If you go out to California, you know, either Hewlett or Packard had a garage, and they started Hewlett-Packard in Palo Alto, but over the years, Northern California, Southern California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, they changed because of that. People didn't want to live in Palo Alto. I know how thorough Kentuckians believe in place, and if we bring students from across the state into this place, we allow them to generate some wealth, many of them would want to go back to their home counties. And with electronics the way it is now, they could do that. So the pitch is, economic development should build us buildings, and we should look at how to create jobs throughout the State of Kentucky, not just here in Lexington. And they're listening a little bit, but we've got to try to pry some existing money. We do need -- one thing we were going to do that we couldn't do is we had planned to move our Data Center out of McVey and out of the Medical Center over to Coldstream and then use McVey right in the middle part of campus for education space. Those are the kinds of things we're looking at doing in order to, you know, create some more academic space. We've got a research building that we've been asking for. We've got a College of Business, College of Law we've been asking for. But buildings cost about 80 million bucks now, and there are no cheap buildings out there. The Digital Village was -- it's a fairly small building. It's going to be one of four when we finally finish that group. But we need to be able to -- to not only maintain what we have, but be pretty inventive about what space we can generate. You probably have noticed, and especially on the medical side of campus, the nonpatient-facing positions are moved out toward Alumni Drive, and we're looking at moving other functions that we can off campus so we can free up space for academic facilities right here.

Worry about the Top 20 plan. We did a recalibration. I have to thank Kaveh and Angie Martin who put a lot of work into this and their staffs. The bottom line is right now with the uncertainty in the financial conditions, it's really hard to go out and say, yeah, we need what we asked you for before, but we need more because we're not going to get it. So why beat on a drum when there's nobody there to listen and respond except

maybe negatively, like, well, just forget it. I don't want to give them that option. I think we've got to continue to keep this Top 20 plan in front of the state. It's a differentiator for us versus the other institutions. We are making some headway. They finally have got some leadership at CP, I think, that understands what House Bill 1 really said. And we were able this last year, just as an example, they allowed us to raise tuition higher than the comprehensives, only by one percentage point, but that's a -- that's dollars. We need to be able to make an argument that we are different than the comprehensive universities and the community colleges. And I think this plan helps us do that. We are changing some measures that didn't change our ranking. We're still 35th, the way we calculate it. I do like the way we calculate things. I know about Forbes. I know U.S. News and World Report. You know, they have measures that some people do pay attention to. I asked Don Witt today if the U.S. News and World Report hurt his recruiting? And he says, no. We're getting the students we're going after, that aren't questioning those things. But that report looks so much at selectivity. And we're not a selective institution. You know, and we don't need to be, I don't think, in order to serve the state and to drive ourselves to push those numbers. So we won't be talking a lot about the Top 20 plan, but I will tell you when I went around to the legislators the year that we came up with that, you heard me say before, CP didn't back it; the Governor didn't back it. But we went straight to the individual legislators and met with, I guess, 100 was the last count and took them through this, you know. You asked us to do this; were you there when you voted for this plan? Yes, I was. What did you mean? Well -- well, we, you know, they didn't know what they meant. Several did. Well, here's what we plan to do. We're going to measure this, this, this, and this. This is how much we need. Will you support that? Yeah. And they did. Now, they haven't had the money to support it, but we have been in the conversation all the way through the conference committees. The way budgets work, the CP puts together a budget. They give it to the Governor. The Governor considers it or doesn't consider it. They then send it to the House, and the House looks at it. And then they do something; they send it to the Senate; the Senate sends it back to the House. The bottom line is they end up in a conference committee where they appoint leaders of each group, close the doors, and work it

out. Well, we started with the Governor's speech a couple of years ago being cut 12 percent potentially. We went in to the conference committee potentially being cut six percent. We came out of conference committee only cut two percent. And so those -- being in the conversation late in the game like that is important. K-12 is really important to these legislators. They understand it better. They live with it every day. It's a bigger voting population that they pay attention to, and we've at least connected ourselves on the last couple of discussions with K-12 so that we can be protected as education in general. In the past, I think they've assumed that we could just kind of go through the tuition door and jack it up. We've done about as much of that as -- that we need to do. But if we have to have a higher tuition to give a salary increase, then I'm going to be pushing hard for that because that's -- if that's the only option they give us, then we're going to have to see what happens. So you'll be hearing more about the -- I think the Top 20 plan is doing a good job, and I'm not going to predict what year that's going to come in. I'm not going to do anything to take it off the table. As I said downstairs a few minutes ago, there are some people that say, man, that's ridiculous. If they don't give you the money, let's just rip the thing in shreds, call a press conference, burn it. Too many people say, that's all right; we don't need it anyway, you know. Where you ranked in basketball? So, you know, that's an attitude we're fighting. And we are getting it across to some people in this state that this is important. I think what the legislature was saying in '97 was this world is changing. We're losing jobs. We're not sure where our economy is going to be. We think education might be a choice to help us. And that's when they started writing House Bill 1, increase the per capita income for the state. We can have an impact on that, and I think we will. I'm going to take questions now about whatever you would like to ask me. I was here when presidents came and spoke and left and wouldn't take questions, so I decided I wouldn't do it that way. I may not answer them, but I'll take them so... Yes. Not you, Bob. Go ahead.

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, A&S. There are several states, including some in our neighborhood where the institution is state-supported, not state. And of course, there are pros and cons to that, but is that something that's been talked about at all in -- in your administration, and have

you had those kind of conversations at all with the legislature?

TODD: Wait, say it again, they're state --

GROSSMAN: State supported but not -- they're not state institutions; they're state-supported. Pennsylvania, Indiana, they're -- they're quite a few in our neighborhood.

TODD: You know, I think it would be difficult. We haven't gone that route. I've looked at different models, but you know, privatization, I mean, you -- if we privatize certain schools, we could probably go out and charge higher tuition and bring in our money and do something like that. But I think there's a danger if you're the state university, that you lose a lot of political support. And like it or not, you're going to need it sooner or later because that 300 million dollars is not as big as I'd like, but I'm not going to turn it down. And I believe we're positioned -- nobody's getting money in this state right now. I think we are positioned that when money comes available, that this University will get its fair share. And I'll take that and go seek other money. But going through the battle for that, I think we'd get a lot of stripes, but I'm not sure we'd be able to generate enough resources. We've pushed tuition about as high as we can right now. We've got research numbers about where they, you know, awfully good compared to the federal budgets. We've got hospital revenues up there. So things we can -- you all can leverage, we've done that. The state is the missing link. And I think, though, the state -- we'll get it, when they get it.

GROSSMAN: One thing becoming state supported does is it -- is it frees you up legally for being a state agency.

TODD: Yeah. And see, I'm not sure I know of any big ones that have really totally freed themselves or gotten enough money out of it to make it worth it. But the thing that we argue for, bonding is an argument that, you know, it still bothers me that, you know, we're a 2.4-billion-dollar company, but if we want to do anything over 600,000, we've got to go ask mom and dad if we can do it. And I spent 30 minutes at the last CP meeting in Berea arguing -- not arguing because I knew they were going to vote for it, but talking to them about spending \$300,000 that a donor had given us to build a children's garden in the Arboretum. You know, why are we taking CP's time to discuss stuff like that, when, you know, it's money in the bank? Those are the kind of things that I

think we can fight individually and eventually get those changed. We've gotten it through the House, the bonding issue. We got the levels raised up for equipment and for capital. But we die in the Senate all the time. So we're still pushing on that one. One thing that's holding this University back was that a lot of other institutions were using third parties to building capital projects for them, like dormitories at Western and other places. We had an odd situation in that when they built those dorms and the complex in 1967, they entered into a debt covenant which said that they could not invest in or partner with any entity that would build competitive housing near the University. As we built other things, we kept tacking ourselves on to those same bonds. And therefore we couldn't do third-party deals. We bought those out about three years ago. And so now if we can find a third party -- and we were doing some of those discussions for academic buildings as well as for dormitories until this economy fell flat, and now it's just hard to find the money. We have that flexibility now. The state, you know, if we find somebody that can build a building for us, and we'll lease it. There is a state law that says we can't enter into a lease over two years. That's arcane. We have ways around that, but those are the kind of things that are on the books that I think we can fight those, and we're getting some leadership down there that may understand it but -- Yes?

NADEL: Alan Nadel, A&S. Last spring when we had a presentation on funding for the GenEd, the Provost indicated that one of the options for paying for it would be part of the raise pool -- is on the board. I said, is that -- he said, no, that is one of the options. In light of what you said about our doing without raises for the last few years and how that hurts this institution, are you willing now to remove that as an option, that is to say GenEd will not go forward if it comes out of the raise pool of this faculty and staff?

TODD: I haven't heard that from the Provost --

NADEL: It's --

TODD: -- I'll talk to him about that, but I know that he and I have found monies to try to get that process moving because GenEd hasn't been changed for 20 years.

NADEL: I understand the problems --

TODD: And it's --

NADEL: -- with GenEd. This is not a discussion about GenEd. It's a discussion about raises. But, it's in the minutes. Four options were presented -- or three.

He was asked directly, are you saying this will come out of the raise pool? He said, well, that is one of the options.

TODD: I'm sure it's not his top option, but I'll --

NADEL: I didn't --

TODD: -- I'll talk to him about that.

NADEL: Top or bottom, if it comes out of someone's raise, it still comes out of their pocketbook. Or if not, will you commit yourself to a faculty-wide and staff-wide referendum about whether they want to go forward with GenEd if it means reducing their raises?

TODD: Off the top of my head, I'm not in favor of doing that. I think GenEd hasn't been changed in 20 years. There are some nonrecurring funds we can put into that change. But I will tell you the highest priority we have is faculty raises. And there may be some tradeoffs in how much or whatever, but I'll talk to Swamy about that, but I'm not looking for -- I think the GenEd has come so far, and this body has been so helpful in getting it there, we need to keep it alive, and we may have decisions we need to make about how we slosh money around because there's not much there, and we're looking to, you know, do everything we can do to keep both of those options alive. But I doubt that's his top priority for that particular issue.

NADEL: Well, again, top or bottom, when you have to pay the bill in the middle --

TODD: I understand. Yes?

ANDERSON: One of the things -- Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. One of the things you talked about earlier in your presentation was how we haven't necessarily spoke out pro or con to policies on a political --

TODD: Right.

ANDERSON: -- level. There's one organization that I'm not sure if we're involved with, but the Kentucky Youth Advocacy Group where I think the things that they are promoting are the same types of things that we need to attach our name to because they're looking at K through 12 education; they're looking at graduation rates for kids across Kentucky. And I think it's real important that we are right there on the front line with working with that type of organization.

TODD: You know, and I don't disagree. I don't know who's heading that now. I know the gentleman who used to head it, who did it for years, and I used to be on podiums with him a lot. Again, my only challenge with supporting one organization is where do you stop? You know, if -- I think we can argue for graduation; we can argue for investment in education. And

that's what bothers me about some of the cuts is they're headed toward some of the social programs that really are under water, way under water. Yeah, go ahead.

ANDERSON: This is -- one of the really positive things, I think about this particular organization is that it's a coalition. So it's not just one organization but it's a coalition.

TODD: I'm not familiar with it. You can send me some information it. I mean, I'm --

ANDERSON: Okay, I will.

TODD: -- I'm out there with a lot of folks speaking, you know, in -- we carry our positions and others carry their positions, but you know --

ANDERSON: One of the things they're really working on now is graduation from high school and to -- to change the dropout age from 16 to 17 or 18.

TODD: Yeah, yeah. And we can certainly support some of the legislation that they have. It's just a question of when we start -- you know, I do get a requests a lot of times, you know, we do payroll deduction for United Way here at the University, and I get requests all the time for every organization there is to, why don't you put us on your payroll deduction plan? We have to be a little careful with some of those, but I'll -- do you know Steve Byars? Steve is our liaison with Frankfurt, but if they are pushing for some changes that will affect dropout rates and so forth, there are certain ones we can certainly support. We've got political connections to do that kind of stuff.

ANDERSON: I'll send it to you.

TODD: I admire that organization, in particular, though. What was the fellow's name that headed it? He left about three years ago, but... You all can support anybody you want to, you know.

ANDERSON: Right.

TODD: I have to be a little more judicious sometimes about where I put us. Yes.

WERMELING: Dan Wermeling in Pharmacy. Would you comment on the publicity related to Col dstream?

TODD: Yeah. It's -- it's the -- and I found it interesting. One thing we have been able to do, and it's in the paper today. It's in a paragraph about that big (INDICATING) on some page back in the back. We got up state to put up five million dollars so we could put redundant power out there. What that means is that if you're going to build a company that's going to do a lot of data processing or you're going to move our data processing center out there or you're going to keep Hewlett-Packard out

there? They can't just have one power wire running to the place. They got to have a redundant source of power to keep them up and running all the time. It's a requirement by the Googles and the Yahoos and all those kind of folks as well. And they knew about that the other day because they published it in the paper today. But they don't choose to put some of those things in there that have been accomplished. I think it's probably time for a Coldstream article. They haven't had one for a while. There's been a lot of publicity about one of the developers in South Carolina. That's drawn a lot of attention. And we've had our challenges there, but that developer owns the IBM building that IBM has been leasing for a long time, owns the Hewlett -- I guess built the Hewlett-Packard building, may own that building too. So when you get involved in development deals, you can have some rubs. We feel pretty good about where we are right now. We only have one out of two buildings, and there are three occupants moving into that building now. And we just lease the land to them. So we would like for it to fill up. But you know, that -- I would expect that -- there are several activities, and I will probably put a Website piece up on the number of jobs going on out there, and there are several things going, that Len's got going, but that's probably their -- their -- they're requesting a lot of other open record stuff now about that too. So they'll have some more articles about that development in particular. We feel -- we feel we're all right with that. The -- I wish when they filed all their open records -- I mean, we have one person full time, that's all they do is respond to open records request from the Herald and the Courier, but -- and they're more than that, but -- so there's a lot of that. And when they don't find something, you always wish they'd just put a little white flag in there saying, we didn't find anything here, but they never have. Other questions? Yes.

SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, College of Medicine. Do you think the way we envision ourselves as an institution is appropriate in meeting the needs of the Commonwealth in today's economy?

TODD: The question Hollie asked was, do we -- the way we envision ourselves -- is it proper the way that we envision ourselves to meet the needs of the state? I think we've re-envisioned ourselves quite a bit in the last several years. The College of Agriculture has been doing it for years. If you look at what medicine is

doing in rural Kentucky now, I think that it's a spectacular example of how we help the rural communities keep their patients where they are until they have acute needs, and then they're coming here for care. And last year, I know our rural revenues were up 30 percent. But when I see the legislators or the Board chairs or the hospital in Rockcastle and others, they can't say enough good things about what we're doing for health care. In addition, I know Everett McCorvey, I was at an opera function last night, and he went to 100 middle and elementary schools with his opera program, and they're getting ready to do a Lincoln portrayal with three or four opera students, by going around the state. John Nardolillo is getting ready to take orchestra members out across the state to the middle and elementary schools. And, you know, these Commonwealth collaboratives, we probably -- and Ernie's told me several times, we haven't publicized them enough, but what Ellen Hahn is doing in smoking cessation, she had a conference, there were about 150 people there. Two or three counties shortly thereafter adopted smoking laws. We have the low birth rate baby situation down in Hopkins County that Dentistry has been involved in in particular, probably others, but they had something like a 16 percent, maybe higher, pre-term birth rate that's down to below six percent now because of our involvement. So I think that -- my concern when I interviewed for the job was that this Top 20 focus could be a very outwardly focused mandate. We could be saying, we just want to go after the dollars. We want to get the research articles, not everybody understands, but we can count them, and we want to be seen out there as a Top 20 university. My view is it's got to be an inward focus, and that we got to change the state. A lot of you aren't from this state, but if we can change this state, we can change a lot of places. And I think it is proper, and I do think that we increase substantially the amount of activity going on. We had the community colleges before. And just to be candid about it, a lot of these collaborative areas are political. If we're out there doing algae studies in Henderson, which we are, we're doing low birth rate studies in Hopkins County, if we're doing math-science in Bell County, that's beneficial to us. But it's also good work. So I'm very proud of the stuff that we've done. I was asked right out here on this plaza the day I gave my opening remarks by a writer, this is the first day of your administration, what

Xcript 9-14-09 Senate.txt

would you like to be said the last day? I said if it could be said that this university did more for its home state as a land grant institution than any other land grant in the country, I could live with that. I think we're doing a lot. We may not be preaching as much, but we do send out mailers to each congressional district right now that -- we ought to put them on our Website, if we don't. We just publish enough of them to send them to each congressional district, but it shows what we're doing in that district. You know, the Somerset area has the Markey cancer work going on, College of Medicine is doing. There's entrepreneurship work going up in the 19 counties in the northeast. So we're doing it pragmatically, but we're also doing it -- because I think the last time Phil Greasley gave the number of those collaboratives, which were kicked off at just \$10,000 each, they've raised 6.3 million dollars, something like that. So they're finding money from other sources to solve local problems.... So I don't think I'd feel comfortable if we were just trying to envision ourselves as an elite Top 20 university, highly selective. We're not there yet. Don't want to be so.... Yes?

HAYES:

Jane Hayes, College of Engineering. I've been thinking a lot lately about Kentucky Proud, and I don't really know how much the University buys, but could it be the case that without too much impact to the budget, we could look and maybe try to buy locally and then that could be something we could share with the representatives, and they would see that we're actually giving some revenues to their county, and then maybe in turn they would feel a little more inclined to look --

TODD:

Yeah, buy them off a little bit. I'm all for it. Scott, you're nodding your head. I mean, our food service is Kentucky Proud. They buy that a lot.

SMITH:

They're very participatory in Kentucky Proud. They -- they buy from a Kentucky, a unique Kentucky dairy. They -- the Green River Cattle Company supplies all the hamburgers at the cafeteria, and -- and they're very interested in this.

TODD:

But to your point, the fact that you asked the question and didn't know the answer, and how many of you knew that we were doing that? That speaks to the issue that we need to get that out there. And and the other thing I'll tell you about the hospital is that the bricks are made in Winchester. We have 500 construction workers, and I think 85 percent of them are Kentucky people. And so, you know, those are the kind of -- I'm getting -- I'm

Xcript 9-14-09 Senate.txt

getting a writeup on that right now. But those are the kind of things that, you know, Kentucky can talk about. I mean, health care and the economy hit people right where they'll pay attention and education. So thank you, we would -- we do need to get that word out. Anything else? I'm sure you probably have other business. Yes?

ALLEN: David Allen, Arts and Sciences. A quick question about when the intellectual property office is going to catch up to our Top 20 vision?

TODD: Good question. I, you know, I was going to say I got six patents at MIT in about two years, but when I was here at UK, I was here nine years, and I never got one through the system. So you'd think I would have changed it by now, but we're working on that. I can get more specific with you, but Len Heller is under some mandates to figure out how to move faster to get other input. We are looking at getting venture input into what deals we should put forward, not put forward. We're trying to coagulate our legal services. We've been using a lot of legal services throughout the country that probably don't have allegiance to us. And we can't beat on them because they're not doing enough deals of ours. So we're looking at how we can consolidate those into a couple shots that will be for us. We're sending a lot of our patent applications to a law firm in Pennsylvania that's Penn State's law firm, and we do nanotechnology; they do nanotechnology. Who gets the front burner up there? I'm not sure it was us. I'm in some detail with that, but it's got to improve. And we have changed some of the regulations where we now take stock in startup companies. We have money in our endowment that is invested into venture funds, and, you know, so we've moved some in that direction. One piece of information that we track, and this is back to the Herald-Leader's comment on Coldstream, they never cover this -- we've had it for three years in a row now. The Mayor is there; the head of Chamber is there; we had probably 200 people there this last year we had the announcement, but we tracked how much new capital goes into early stage companies in the Fayette County area. Last year there was 68 million dollars invested in 69 early stage companies, 39 of which had UK intellectual property. Of that 68 million dollars, 39 million of it was new -- was what I call East Coast-West Coast venture money. And three years ago, it was zero. And we now have an angel network here in town. We have a venture, you know, network. And so

we're making some moves in that direction, but IP is still in process. Yes.

ROHR: Jurgen Rohr, College of Pharmacy.
If you think about it, while this discussion is going on on public health care (unintelligible) obviously UKHMO has a possibility to expand and go into public health care.

TODD: I'm probably not educated enough to answer that question, but doesn't mean I won't, but you know, I -- this may not be getting to the heart of what you're asking, but I think the way that we've held our health care costs down on this campus, respect to the management, and we've got a diabetes management program, a cardiovascular management program. We've done some things in prescription drugs to reduce our costs a lot. We could probably sell that capability to some companies that are getting eaten alive with health care costs. But I'm not sure I -- I understand your point about where our HMO would fit in. You may want to reask it.

ROHR: Isn't it semi-public or (inaudible)....

TODD: It's managed by Humana. They do the -- they do the claims management for it, but -- but you got any answers over there, anybody? Well, I'll have to -- send me an e-mail, and I'll get you more of a thought on that one.

Now, that I did such a good job of that one, anybody else want to ask something else?

I'm going to let you get to your business now. I do appreciate your service. I do appreciate what's happening despite the (unintelligible) of circumstances. I get notes from people who are just continuing to move -- advance forward in their area of expertise, and I'm extremely proud of this place. And let's just keep -- keep the fight going because it's important to not just us. It's important to a whole lot of people. Thank you a lot.

CHAIR: I'm going to go forward. We're trying to wake up these screens. We'll get their eventually. I'm Dave Randall from the Department of Physiology. I am Chair of Senate Council this year. Hollie Swanson is sitting right down here is the new Vice Chair. She's from Molecular Environmental Pharmacology at our College of Medicine. Sheila Brothers over there is the gal who runs the Senate Council office. When you call our phone, you'll either get Sheila or Adrea LaRoche who will help you answer questions from Senate Council. Michelle Sohner is our Sergeant at Arms over here. You'll see her every time you

Xcript 9-14-09 Senate.txt
come in. Please be sure and sign in with her when you come in. Kate Seago is our Parliamentarian. Her word is law here when we have an issue dealing with procedure. Lisa Hoinke is our reporter, got fingers that move at the speed of light there. Lisa, thank you. The faculty representatives to the Board of Trustees are Ernie. Are you around? Ernie Yarnarella over here. And Everett McCorvey is, I think, has class this hour. So he's not able to be here. Our Student Government Association representatives, Ryan Smith. Ryan here? And Kyle Kirk who works with us. Kyle over there. Thank you. We have a new Associate Provost for undergraduate education, Mike Mullen, over here. Will be working closely with Senate Council and with us. New Senators, when I call your name, would you stand briefly, please? Lee Blonder. Thank you. Todd Cheever, Nathan DeWall. Thank you. Joshua Ederington, Christopher Feddock, Bob Grossman. Bob is new/old. Beverly Hilton, Steve Isaacs, Reinette Jones, Paul Karan, Lee Carl -- or Carl Lee. I'm sorry. Edward Morris, Roxanne Mountford, Brian Murphy, Yanira Paz, Dave Pienkowski, Armando Prats, Gary Shannon, Diane Snow, Richard Sutphen, Greg Wasilkowski, Mark Williams and Scott Yost. Thank you. Folks, welcome. It's a pleasure to have you here. Look forward to spending the -- the year with you.

When you speak, please give your name and your affiliation. And one of the issues that I think is so very important for us is please keep your constituents informed. When we do things here at the Senate, it's important that our colleagues know what it is that -- that we've been doing.

So minutes and announcements, the minutes were distributed Tuesday, September 1st, and we have the minutes from April 14, 2008. No changes were received, and we have the minutes from May 5th, 2008. No changes were received. So I need a motion that the minutes from April 14th be approved as distributed. They're in your packet if you have a packet or on the Web. I need a motion that the minutes from April 14th be approved.

PAZ: (I n a u d i b l e)
CHAIR: And a second?
HARDESTY: David Hardesty, Business.
CHAIR: Discussion? All in favor, aye?
AUDIENCE: Aye.
CHAIR: And the minutes from May 5, 2008.
SPEAKER: Is it May 4th?
BROTHERS: May 4th.
CHAIR: A second?
ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of

Nursing.
CHAIR: Discussion?
BROTHERS: I'm sorry, who -- who made the
motion?
CHAIR: I heard it but I -- who -- who
moved that they be approved?
BLACKWELL: Okay. I will. So moved.
CHAIR: Bless your heart. Thank you.
Okay. Discussion? All in favor, aye?
AUDIENCE: Aye.
CHAIR: Thank you. All right. I'm going

to be reading a lot of announcements. Senate Council over the summer will typically have some business to conduct, but this last summer we had more business than I recall since having been involved in it. And so we are obligated when we do something on behalf of the Senate, we're obligated to inform you what we've done. We did more business, and so I've got a lot of things to tell you about, and I have to tell them to you verbally so they can be read into the minutes. And the minutes, of course, are the official record of what we do. So we had -- we had three two-year waivers for retroactive withdrawal that were delegated to the retroactive withdrawal committee. Bachelor of Education for Middle School Education and Science. The Chair, I approved that for listing purposes. The clarification was that there were two content courses are required, not one content course plus a lab. So the department was asked to complete the program change process in the fall of 2009.

There was a waiver of Senate Rule 6.2.3 for an abbreviated ombud search. We felt it was very important that we have an ombud on board for the summer students. And so we couldn't go through the normal ombud nomination-election process. So we abbreviated that search and Lee Edgerton was appointed to that position.

We approved the use of a repeat option for a graduate student. There was a waiver of Senate Rule 1.2.2.1.B and 1.2.2.1.C that allowed Fine Arts and Social Work to conduct fall Senate elections. Normally, those elections are done in the spring, but we authorized those two schools to do them in the fall.

A-E 680 is a new course which was approved by the Senate Council on behalf of the Senate. The Bachelor of Science in Gender and Women's Studies, when that program was proposed a Bachelor of Arts was proposed, but the course corresponding Bachelor of Science degree was overlooked. Senate Council determined that after it was -- the Bachelor of Science option was approved by the college faculty, the only approval that we would require or that was

Xcript 9-14-09 Senate.txt

-- that is required is by the Undergraduate Council and the Senate Council chairs. So we took that action.

The Bachelor of Arts for Interior Design, the chair approved official inclusion of required Communication courses. Again, these are the kinds of things that the Senate does. Normally the full Senate would do it. But the situation was such that I approved that on behalf of the full Senate.

We approved degree for a student on behalf of the Senate Council and Senate for a engineering job in Japan. That degree needed to be exercised very -- approved very rapidly so he could take that degree.

Master of Science Epidemiology was not posted for the CPE prior to the Senate approval; thus, the Ph.D. degree for that degree went forward to the Board of Trustees, but the Master of Science was delayed until the CPE posting could be completed. In other words, when a new degree program comes up, it has to be posted with the council for Post Secondary Education for a period of time.

The Board of Trustees normally or prior had reviewed President's performance in the spring. It's now being reviewed in the fall. We just completed that. You saw e-mails and so forth respect to -- requesting your input for that. We had twice the number of respondents than we did from last year. So we had a total of 24 of you respond to our request for input. And let me sure assure you, those responses and that information was used by Senate Council. In fact, in writing the letter that went to the chair of the Board of Trustees, I quoted from two of those. So those are valuable to us, very valuable to us.

Changes to the spring of '09 calendar. We clarified that Senate Rule 5.1.8.2.A.1 states the withdrawal period is the end of the eleventh week for fall and spring semesters. The Rules Committee clarified that the eleventh week referred to is the eleventh academic week. It does not count spring break.

There is the issue of substantive change. The SACS people require that we notify them when there is a substantive change in what we do here at the University. And an issue arose where we did not inform them for something they thought they needed to be informed of. So over the summer, we've been working to satisfy the SACS reporting requirement on that. When I say we, lots of other people besides me, but if you're a Senate Council member and have not voted on that AR

Xcript 9-14-09 Senate.txt
revision, please do so before you leave the meeting today. So that request was received by the President on June 16th, and we need to respond by October 1st. This is often what happens in an issue like this. Something comes in over the summer, and we're required to respond to that on behalf of the faculty. And so Senate Council in this case is going to be responding to that. Called a meeting on Friday. We will be responding to that on your behalf, and it was because of this timing issue and the necessity for getting to SACS in a timely manner.

Jurgen Rohr is our newest Senate Council member. He replaces Peggy Piascik who's gone on sabbatical leave. Her term, and hence his term end December of 2009, but he has been appointed to Senate Council.

There's a new University Senate web page, and so when you go to the University Senate, this is the address that you'll now use for that, and we had a large number of openings come up for our various councils and committees. So you will be getting a letter from Sheila here or e-mail this week asking if you're willing to serve on these committees. Folks, please respond to that query. Shared governance means nothing unless we're willing to stand up and fill in those slots on these committees and councils and so forth.

So the next order of business is the ombud report. Lee Edgerton would have made this report. I understand he's not feeling well. And so the former ombud, Professor Kaveh Tagavi, will be giving this report.

TAGAVI: Welcome new friends. I will be giving you the ombud report. This is a standard format report. It's very short, but it's occasioned so that there would be some interaction, usually between the new ombud. Unfortunately, Lee doesn't feel good today. And hopefully, it's not the actual real flu. But Lee actually is not a new ombud here. He has been ombud in the past. So I'm going to give the report. These are the numbers that happened actually under the time that I was the ombud. So here we go.

BROTHERS: Oh, sorry, I didn't put the numbers in the PowerPoint.

TAGAVI: Oh, they are not there, okay. I have to go back. It's in your handout.

BROTHERS: Page 30.

TAGAVI: Page 30. I apologize for that. I assumed that it would be up here, but that reminds me not to assume.

The first breakout is the total number of academic offenses. Total number of cases handled by the Office of Academic

Ombud was 316 and total number of academic offenses 106. There is a breakout as you can see. The next category is the nature of complaints. You have the numbers in your handout. Still grades are the highest as you could predict. And exam and class requirements are good number of complaints about those. Colleges where complaint originated. We have always been giving this information to Senators so you could give it to your constituents, if interested. The highest is Arts and Sciences, well, of course, it's not a surprise because that's the biggest college. Classification of student complaints are given to you. They are for first year, sophomore, junior, and senior. And that basically is the short report of the ombud. One thing that I wanted to mention is we did receive while I was the ombud a little bit more than usual complaint regarding Dead Week. And of course, that's also understandable because we just changed the dead week the previous year. We used to be able to have short quizzes or quizzes during the spring break -- sorry, during Dead Week. And no longer we can do that, and it takes time until this information goes to all the levels of faculty. Of course, the ombud office sends messages, and I'm sure you talked these things to your colleagues, but we did receive a little bit more complaints than usual regarding Dead Week. There is not going to be -- there should not be any quizzes or any evaluated work during class, whatever you want to call it, quiz or anything else, cannot be done. So I thought I would mention that to you, and if there is anything that you want to discuss, I'm here to discuss it with you. Any questions?

SPEAKER: Wasn't --

BROTHERS: Name, please?

PAZ: Yanira Paz, College of Arts and Sciences. Wasn't that a caveat?

TAGAVI: That?

PAZ: From the -- for evaluations on Dead Week?

TAGAVI: No. That was changed. That was a caveat, as we mentioned several years ago that you could -- in fact we changed the rule regarding quizzes and Dead Week twice in the, let's say, last 10 years. First, we limited it to -- it used to be that quizzes was allowed. Then we -- Senate changed the rule limited it to quizzes that were announced in the syllabus. And there were about every other week, so therefore none of them could have been more than five percent -- I'm just speaking from memory. Students initiated a change to the rule a couple of years ago, and now no --

absolutely no quizzes are allowed. Yes, sir.

PRATS: I'm Armando Prats, English. Of the -- of the 101 complaints about grades, do you have any figures on the outcome of these complaints or how --

TAGAVI: No. I do not have. And maybe that's an interesting thing to -- to add for future. There are -- of the ones that was officially submitted to us, which was 106, there is a breakout, but there is not a breakout on the grades. But I think that's an interesting question. Michelle is there (indicating) hearing this; maybe this is something that we should add: of the complaints that students have, how many of them, they are correct? How many of them, they are not correct? I can make a guess, but that would be merely a guess.

PRATS: Do you want to try to hazard a guess?

TAGAVI: You would be surprised. I was surprised how often, more than I thought, students are actually -- were right. I'm not saying more than 50 percent. But that was one thing that I was surprised myself as an ombud. But beyond that, I really -- it would be a really wide guess. Yes.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A&S. So these -- first of all, these academic offenses, they don't include any grade appeals? These --

TAGAVI: No.

GROSSMAN: -- are purely academic offenses?

TAGAVI: Correct.

GROSSMAN: So I'm -- I'm curious about -- do you have an idea how many of these are second offenses? Are these more than we've seen in the past come through the ombud's office? Fewer than in the past?

TAGAVI: Michelle, let me first make sure, these 106 does not include grade appeals?

SOHNER: No. They're academic offenses.

TAGAVI: And the question that Bob has, again, another good question, is how many of these are second offenses, right?

GROSSMAN: Right.

SOHNER: Yeah, we don't have any listed here. We can do that next time, but...

TAGAVI: Of course, the reason Bob is asking has a very -- you have a very good reason to ask because when it's the second time, then it would result into an XE. Is that -- am I reading your mind correctly?

GROSSMAN: No. Results in an E, but I was -- but one of the purposes of the reform three years ago is to make sure -- was to try to get all the additional offenses into the system --

TAGAVI: I see.

GROSSMAN: -- so that when a student committed a second offense, we would know that it was the second offense.

TAGAVI: I understand your point, but your

point was -- is that before the reform, some of the offenses would never get to the ombud level or the University level. And the purpose of the reform was to -- for those to get to the ombud level. I'm just thinking that if you look at the number 106 compared to last year, which I cannot compare for you, if that's higher, it can show that there are more reported, but I, of course, I don't have that number. I think, Michelle, that's a good thing to consider. Yes.

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. Another number I was thinking would be nice is if you have that 162 Arts & Science and different numbers from each of the different colleges, instead of the number, although you can include the number, but a rate, you know, like is that one per 100 students; it's one per 1,000 students. Do you know what I'm saying?

TAGAVI: Should we do it per student or per faculty?

ANDERSON: That's a good point. Maybe both.

TAGAVI: Maybe both.

ANDERSON: Yeah.

TAGAVI: Okay, Michelle.

GROSSMAN: Or FTE.

TAGAVI: Since whatever I commit would then me doing it. But easy to agree to everything that you say so --

ANDERSON: You have the numbers, so that would be easy.

TAGAVI: Yes. It's -- it's -- it's very easy. You're correct. Anything else? Yes.

STEINER: Just one point, makeup exams is still allowed?

BROTHERS: I'm sorry, name, please.

STEINER: Shelly Steiner, Biology.

TAGAVI: Makeup exams --

STEINER: Makeup exams are still allowed during Dead Week?

TAGAVI: Yes. But what it was also in the past, it has to be with the agreement of both sides, the student -- so make -- makeup cannot be forced, but neither can it be forced perhaps in any other week. So there should be some level of mutual agreement to make a makeup exam. But you are correct, makeup exam is allowed during Dead Week.

Thank you very much. Nice to see you all again.

CHAIR: My fault that that wasn't in the PowerPoint, Kaveh. But the former chair taught me everything I know. So it's his fault.

TAGAVI: Absolutely. I'll take all the credit and the blame.

CHAIR: All right. Again, one of our absolute responsibilities is to send forward to the Board of Trustees the names

Xcript 9-14-09 Senate.txt

of individuals who will be receiving degrees. So the June 2009 KCTS candidates for credentials are listed in your handout. The motion needs to be worded precisely as this. So if someone would so move, please.

JONES:

So moved.

CHAIR:

Dr. Jones. Second? Second.

BROTHERS:

Name?

CHAIR:

Dr. Wood. Any discussion.

All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE:

Aye.

CHAIR:

Thank you. Carries. The UK 2009 degree list. The list is on page 42 of your handout. And again, a motion, if someone would so move, please? Dr. Jones. Second? Second? Dr. Grossman.

Discussion?

All in favor, aye?

AUDIENCE:

Aye.

CHAIR:

Motion carries.

Work Plus Life Connections. Ann Bassoni. Ann, thank you. And is Terri here as well? Yes.

BASSONI:

Hi, everybody. My name is Ann Bassoni. I'm a licensed clinical social worker. And in February I was brought -- hired by UK to start the Work Plus Life Connections' program which is a free counseling and referral service to all employees, faculty, and staff that work .5 or more. What we so far -- I got here in February. We started seeing people in May. And so far we've seen children, couples, individuals and done some family work from issues for marital counseling, grief, stress, a lot of stress. We've had some -- to make some referrals to the community for financial assistance for rent, things like that. So it is a counseling service, but we also work to find concrete services for people which might include housing, food, clothing. We've had some fires; people needed clothing, so we would access resources for those. We also are beginning to do some group work. In the packet I sent, there are some descriptions of the groups we're doing. We have a working mothers' group. We have a parenting teen and tween group because it's such a fun age. And we also have a child-free women's networking group for women that have elected not to have children. And we also have an elder care group that we do. We -- in next month, we'll be starting an empty nesters' group. So one of our -- our focuses is if we know that there's an issue that people would like to share with other people who are going through the same thing, if you let us know, we'll see about getting a group going. Most of those groups happen during lunch. We're trying to figure out some times to do after work schedules for people that don't get 45

minutes for lunch. The other thing we are doing is helping supervisors that might not -- might be concerned about one of their employees and don't know what to do, we can offer you some advice on that. We are starting a how to recognize alcohol and drug abuse in the workplace. We'll start that in the hospital probably next month for supervisors. And that -- we're doing that in conjunction with employee relations. So it's a pretty good service, and it's free. What we do is it's brief counseling. If there are services that you might need longer or for a longer term, we -- we will refer you, and we'll try and find something that works with your insurance, is affordable or free. Let's see what else do we do? We can do seminars and workshop. We have a reframing for stress workshop right now that we offered a couple of times. And if there's something that your department or something would like, you feel like it's affecting a lot of people, and you'd like a workshop on that, we can do that. We can put it together if you give us some notice and kind of tell us what you're looking for. So I'm really excited to be here. I come from the mental health background. I worked for Comp Care and for the Chrysalis House for the past 15 years. So I come with a great deal of experience, substance abuse, family matters, children. And I do want to emphasize that this is for -- not only for people employed here, but your family, your children, retirees. So we offer a really broad array of services, and right now it's just me, and we do have Terri Kanatzer from Elder Care that does some grief work. So if you all can let everybody know that we're here, we've just moved over to the Seaton Center in what we like to call the cave, that's also used to be the men's locker room, I guess. Some people are pretty excited about that. But we -- we like to work with other people. So far we've worked with Employee Relations; we've worked with Wellness. We're getting a lot of referrals through Healthtrac Rewards. And I don't know, do you all have any questions about what we do or what we can offer? All right. We were brief. Thank you.

CHAIR:

This is exactly the kind of thing we need to keep our people informed of, providing new service. And if nobody knows it's there, it won't be of much good.

All right, folks, I think this is I think probably one of the more issues of the day. You'll recall we spent a lot of time last semester dealing with GenEd reform. And we got to the point last semester, the very last meeting, the May

Xcript 9-14-09 Senate.txt

4th meeting, where we had approved a number of -- it was the culmination of a great deal of effort that had been put in to developing guidelines and criteria for these new GenEd courses. As President Todd said, GenEd hadn't been looked at for 20 years. And so this was an initiative that people have put a lot of work into. And so the challenge over the summer was to begin to develop courses and to begin to develop ways to vet these courses to make certain that they met the guidelines. And so a call was put out for development of courses. I think the expectation was about 30 courses would be developed. It turns out that there were 66 applications for development of new courses. And the Office of Provost found a way to fund 60 of these. And so 60 of our fellow faculty spent a significant amount of time over the past summer in developing course outlines. Now, the goal is to implement this new program in 2011, but we wanted to run some trial runs starting next semester in 2010. So I think you can see that that puts some constraints on the system. These courses, if they're going to be offered, have to be listed, and students have to be informed of their availability and issues like will they satisfy USP, present USP requirements, and so forth. Students need to have assurance of those kinds of things. And so there's some important issues. And Senate Council struggled with this several times during the summer. And in particular, we -- we talked in detail at our retreat in August 17th as to how we wanted to go forward with this. And we felt the wisest thing to do would be to develop some experimental approaches so that ultimately we can actually present some data to the Senate. So before we ask for any final approval of anything, we'd like to try some things to see how they work, gather some data on how that went, and then present it to Senate. So there's two pages in your handout that are from the minutes of the Senate Council meeting where we dealt with this. We wanted you to see exactly what we did. And so we're going to try some experimental or some initial vetting groups so that we can see how this works and then report back to you and present that. So the expectation is that we'll form these vetting groups over the next several weeks based upon nominations for individuals to be a member of it, for an exploratory trial at vetting the various courses. And then we'll report to the Senate at our December meeting and ask for what I'm now envisioning is that we'll ask for your approval for provisional one-time presentation of the classes that are

Xcript 9-14-09 Senate.txt
appropriate for spring of 2010. So, that's what we're looking forward to. So here's the motions that Senate Council approved. This is extracted from the minutes that are on -- and I'm going to read it.

The motion is that the Senate Council will solicit nominations for service on seven faculty vetting teams. So there will be four for learning outcome number 1, and one team for each of the remaining learning outcomes. You'll remember there are 10, and these will be from full-time faculty employees. Three members and the chair will be appointed for each team by the Senate Council, and the remaining three will be selected by ballot at the October Senate meeting. Members of the vetting teams composed in the fall of 2009 will serve through May of 2010. A quorum of five is required for each of the vetting teams. Vetting team meetings will be publicized, open meetings. And the Senate Council recommends that future elections by ballot will involve the entire faculty. Now, here was the problem there, and you'll see it reflected in the way that's worded. We had actually, for much of that meeting, we'd actually envisioned an honest-to-God election from the entire faculty as a whole. People have expressed strongly that they want these teams to be elected so that they're representative of the faculty. But as we sat down and thought about how we could do that, there was just no way. There was no way that we could organize and carry out an election from the open entire faculty. So what we're proposing to you is that we will solicit nominations for members of these teams. Senate Council will pick three of those members, and the purpose there is to make certain that members of appropriate knowledge and background and so forth for a given vetting team will be on that vetting team. Senate Council will take that responsibility to make certain that happens. And then we'll solicit nominations from the faculty. And you will vote by paper ballot at the October meeting for the remaining members of each vetting team. That's how the vetting teams will be comprised. They will then look at, as is appropriate, Natural Science courses will go to the Natural Science vetting team, and so forth. They will then look at these courses, see if they meet the learning outcomes, and through this process, we'll get them listed with the Registrar, put on the Web so that students will know that they're being offered. And then my expectation is that we'll come back in December with these lists of courses that the vetting teams and Senate Council thinks

Xcript 9-14-09 Senate.txt
will be appropriate to try in the spring.
Now, there's some obvious
problems here in that we're going to need
to work very hard to make certain that
we're communicating with each other so we
don't come up with a situation where in
December someone stands up and says, this
is a terrible idea to offer this course
when it's been listed and students have
registered. So there's some -- there's
some issues that we're going to have to
deal with with each other. But it's our
job as Senate Council to make sure you're
apprised of how the process is going about.
We will keep you informed as fully as we
can as the semester marches on as to how
this goes. But what we'll be asking in
December is for one trial so that we can
find out how the process works, and then
we'll report back and we'll come up with
ways then of giving full, fully-approved
vetting teams as we march on from that
point. Questions on that motion or on how
that process will go forward? Any member
of Senate Council want to clarify anything
I said? Any questions? Yes, ma'am.

MOUNTFORD: Roxanne Mountford, Arts &
Sciences. So is the -- the understanding
here that the vetting teams will be looking
to approve new courses, or will they be
looking at transformation of existing
courses or both?

CHAIR: I imagine both. I don't know, of
the 60, are there any that are
transformations of old courses? I assume
there are.

BLACKWELL: Yes. Yes, there are.

GREISSMAN: Yes. (Unintelligible).

CHAIR: Yeah, so it will be both. It
will be both. Connie.

WOOD: With your permission, sir, may
-- may I respond to that?

CHAIR: Please.

WOOD: It was Senate Council's intention
that these -- that this vetting process be
viewed as experimental, not only from the
point of view of -- of the courses that are
going to be offered in spring and could
potentially carry GenEd credit, or if GenEd
does not fly, would also carry USP credit.
We do not want students to, you know, be
ill served in either case. But also the
intent of this process is to explore the
appropriate process for getting these
courses actually vetted which is the new
buzz word for getting these courses to
approve for GenEd credit. So what our
intent was is to have -- is to propose a
structure which is half-appointed,
half-elected. We will have a chair,
hopefully, that will be an unbiased party
who will actually also be able to assess
the workings of the committee. And then we

Xcript 9-14-09 Senate.txt
will be able to bring those types of evaluations along with the courses that have been approved for spring 2010 back to the Senate at the December meeting. There is nothing here written in -- which is it, I always forget, is it the cement that makes the concrete stick or the concrete that makes the cement stick? I can never remember. But there's nothing written in stone here. This is an exploratory process whereby courses will be offered, 15 to 20 in the spring semester. It is an exploratory process on exactly how the process of getting these courses approved. And what we're doing here, only applies to spring 2010. Based on what information we gain, then we will come back to the full Senate, or you all can suggest to us or to whomever what process should be used for actually getting these courses approved for GenEd credit; you know, was the -- did we have the committee right? Is the numbers right? Is the proportion right? How did they do the vetting? What is the appropriate way to do it? Things of that nature. But we felt we couldn't come up with a beautiful proposal starting from nothing. So we had to run, in the words of research parlance, a pilot study.

CHAIR:
PRATS:

Yes.
Armando Prats, from English Department. If -- if the process runs into December, how do students find out what the courses are and -- and whether they can register for this stuff since the schedule will already be in place?

CHAIR:

So the question is, if the process runs into December, how do we get things so the student can sign up for them for next semester? And you're right, that absolutely is the issue. And so the vetting teams are going to have to be appointed very quickly. They're going to have to do their reviews very quickly. And what is the date? We need it by the end of October, we need a list to put on the Registrar's --

GREISSMAN:

No, we don't. No. We're -- we're obviously taking a leap of faith. All right. We're -- we're -- we're taking a leap of faith that we can post the courses at the beginning of October and faculty advising for advanced registration courses at the beginning part of October. And then the idea is that given the trust we have in -- in the faculty to do good work, and the fail-safe -- and the worst case scenario, the outlier, that goes through the vetting process, revises and resubmits and still doesn't get approved, that course, I mean, but you know, through a vetting process, we revise and resubmit and approve.

Xcript 9-14-09 Senate.txt

CHAIR:

Dr. Mullen, would you care to speak to this as well?

MULLEN:

Sure.

CHAIR:

Stand up so that --

MULLEN:

Essentially, in terms of the process, if advising starts on October 1st, 2nd, 3rd, in Arts & Sciences and undergraduate studies which is likely to be the primary group of students that we're really talking about that are going to probably going to be in these, we've been working behind the scenes with the colleges, with the advising network, to -- to look at how we can do this. And so we already know out of those 60 courses that were approved, some 20 of those, and I -- I've so far have identified right at about 20 from Arts & Sciences, from Fine Arts, they're going to be piloting some of their Arts & Creativity courses to see how those work. And Agriculture has a couple, so I'm really happy to see that. And so what our plans are is to have those courses inserted into the fall time table, the electronic schedule by the end of this month. There will be a hard copy piece of paper that we'll get out to all of the -- all of the advisors throughout the University, simply listing here are the courses, and these three courses if your students are in them would be Natural Science courses, Social Science courses, Humanities' courses and so on. There's a couple that are in the local citizenship. There's a stats reasoning course that is actually going to be piloted. So that would be there. We're already in consultations with Mike Shanks in terms of APEX. So we would -- assuming that those courses fly, those courses will be inserted into APEX, so when a student looks at APEX or when an advisor looks at APEX, that course will actually show up in the appropriate USP category so that they've got the opportunity to see, yes, indeed, it's counting for something. We are, of course, going to be relying on the advising network very heavily to make sure that advisers know that these classes are out there for students. And it is important if we expect this to happen, it is important for those students to have full confidence that if we say they're going to be taking A&S 100, section 3, or USP 112, section 1, that that indeed is going to count for something other than just an experiment with which they are a part. So that's our goal at this point. As Richard says, the process is compressed. And so the vetting teams are going to have to look at those courses, and we've already been looking at these courses. They're going to have to look at courses, and what the syllabi say, and what are the -- the --

the outcomes for those courses, what are the assessments that are built into those courses, how well does it run true to the learning outcomes that you all have approved? And if the vetting teams say, well, this one simply doesn't make it yet, we've got to get that back into the hopper, get the faculty members to work on it more, bring it up to where the vetting team says, yes, this one will -- this will be a suitable course for a pilot in Natural Science foundation of inquiry or local dynamics or whatever the case may be. So that's where we're at. And so we're giving this process the opportunity to unfold and then come down to the December Senate meeting where the whole process will be looked at, and hopefully, we can say that this has gotten us to a point where we can have some data for you all next fall to make an informed decision on whether to move forward with GenEd in the fall of 2011. Does that help?

CHAIR: Questions for Dr. Wood, Dr. Mullen, or me? The answer is, there is a fair degree of faith in the whole faculty here. Faith is the essence of things hoped for, the substance of things not seen.

BLACKWELL: Jeannine Blackwell, Graduate School. I just -- for those of you who haven't been around for 25 years like I have, I just want to say that there was a precedent for this kind of activity. When we started with the USP, there was a Ford Foundation grant for putting together paired courses. And the same kind of process had to be gone through at that time too to ensure that those students would get credit, General Education credit as well as that it could be used for the new system which was not yet in place. So I think we -- these birthing pains happen about every 20 years or so.

CHAIR: Questions? Okay. I'm sorry.

GRABAU: Larry Grabau, College of Agriculture. Number of vetting teams, I thought I heard you say ten. Is it ten or is it seven?

CHAIR: Seven.

GRABAU: Should be seven, right?

CHAIR: Well, there's a (unintelligible) courses that will be one and then the (unintelligible) course so forth and so forth, don't need one for each course. Each of the courses in the first slot. And after Science, Social Science will have a single team.

All right. So here's the next motion. As part of the experimental vetting process, the chair of each vetting team will be responsible for the assessment of the efficacy of their team's interactions and processes, and that

Xcript 9-14-09 Senate.txt
recommendations for further vetting
processes be developed by the seven chairs
as a group for the Senate's review. And so
this is how we're going to try and
integrate things and bring them together
for our December meeting. As Professor
Woods said, just trying to get some pilot
data. You've got to -- rather than
pontificate how we think this should go,
and say, this is it; vote on it, we're
going to try and consume data together, but
we're doing it on good faith that our
fellow faculty are working hard. A lot of
effort has been going into this.

JENSEN: I think we've -- Jane Jensen,
College of Education. One of the things
that Senate Council felt very strongly
about is that even though we may be having
lots of faith, we also don't have to take
it sight unseen. All of these meetings
will be totally open for people to come,
even if you're not one of the Senate
members of the committee. We want these
committee -- these meetings to be open so
that there's no sense of -- if you have any
questions or concerns in any area of the
curriculum, your department can send people
to go and participate and observe.

CHAIR: I think that there's one thing
about this whole process from beginning to
of end that we've learned is that the
transparency is what works. So when the
call goes out for nominations, absolutely
please prod your people to nominate the
best of their faculty, the best of your
colleagues so these teams will have the
people on them that have the judgment to
look at these things and when they make a
recommendation, we as a Senate will have
confidence in the teams that put this
together. They're our colleagues. Any
other questions? Frankly, I'm taking the
lack of any shouts and screams as an
affirmation that we're heading in the right
direction. All right.

SWANSON: Do I have a motion to adjourn?
So moved to adjourn.

CHAIR: So moved. All right. We don't
need a second.

* * * * *

THEREUPON, the University of Kentucky
Senate Council meeting for September 14, 2009 was
adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

* * * * *

COUNTY OF FAYETTE) STATE OF KENTUCKY)

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

Xcript 9-14-09 Senate.txt
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 1st day of
November, 2009.

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