

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
SENATE

\* \* \* \* \*

***Regular Session***

December 13, 2004

3:00 p.m.

W. T. Young Library  
First Floor Auditorium  
Lexington, Kentucky

***Dr. Ernie Yanarella, Chair***

An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.  
179 East Maxwell Street  
Lexington, Kentucky 40508  
(859)254-0568  
University of Kentucky Senate

\* \* \* \* \*

*ERNIE YANARELLA, CHAIR*

*GIFFORD BLYTON, PARLIAMENTARIAN*

*REBECCA SCOTT, SECRETARY TO SENATE COUNCIL*

*ROBYN BARRETT, COURT REPORTER*

\* \* \* \* \*

|

1

1

CHAIR YANARELLA: I will call the

2

December 13th meeting of the

3

University Senate to order and take

4

note of the fact that, at our last

5

meeting, I glimpsed through the

6

announcements without having taken

7

the time to get the minutes of the

8

October 11th Senate Meeting

9

approved. Are there any revisions

10

or emendations to the October 11th

11

minutes someone would like to bring

12

up? There being none, those minutes

13

stand as approved. I'd like to turn

14

to the minutes of the November 8th,

15

2004 University Senate, if folks

16

will close those doors. Thank you.

17

Are there any revisions, any

18

changes, any emendations that people

19

would like to bring to our

20

attention? If that's the case, then

21

those minutes are also -- also stand

22

as approved. At our last University

23

Senate meeting, part way through our

24

business, quorum -- the issue of

25

quorum was called, and it was

2

1                   determined that we did not have a  
2                   quorum. As a result, six name  
3                   changes that were about to be  
4                   brought up were not taken up for  
5                   Senate action. These are the six  
6                   that were up for Senate approval.  
7                   In light of the urgency of getting  
8                   these name changes approved, these  
9                   items were circulated by the Senate  
10                  Council Office to members of this  
11                  body via the Web site for a ten-day  
12                  circular time period, and this is  
13                  fairly routine for our consideration  
14                  of course and program changes.  
15                  There being no objection from any  
16                  senators, they were then sent on to  
17                  the board for approval at its  
18                  December meeting, so I am announcing  
19                  to you the action that was taken.  
20                  I'd also like to bring your  
21                  attention to another matter, and  
22                  this bears on the  
23                  Senate-Council-recommended and  
24                  Senate-approved action at the  
25                  September meeting regarding the

3

1 process for rotating the ACMC Chair  
2 position among various Health  
3 Science Deans. This action, in  
4 light of further information that we  
5 received, has proved unworkable.  
6 And as a consequence, the Senate  
7 Council will put forth -- will put  
8 forth some information regarding  
9 this circumstance at the next Senate  
10 meeting. I'd also like to bring to  
11 the attention of the Senate the work  
12 of the Ad Hoc Senate Committee to  
13 Review Academic Offenses Policy.  
14 This is being chaired by Bob  
15 Grossman, and you can see the --  
16 those members of the committee.  
17 This committee has been meeting over  
18 the last couple of months, and I  
19 thought I would bring you up to date  
20 on where they stand. Bob Grossman,  
21 who I believe is in the room, may  
22 want to say a word or two beyond  
23 this. The committee is currently  
24 doing the following things: It is  
25 examining the way in which other

4

1 institutions handle academic  
2 infractions; it is highlighting the  
3 problems of the current system; it  
4 is discussing the contours and  
5 details of an alternative new  
6 system, or at least revisions  
7 relating to the academic offenses  
8 policy at the University of  
9 Kentucky; and it is reviewing the  
10 strengths and weaknesses of a draft  
11 proposal that was largely crafted by  
12 its chair, Bob Grossman, earlier  
13 on. From the minutes of its  
14 November 29th meeting, it is clear  
15 that the committee has gotten into  
16 the nitty-gritty details of trying  
17 to answer these and perhaps other  
18 questions. While it recognizes the  
19 thorniness of some of the specifics  
20 it must tackle, it strikes me that  
21 it is proceeding in a manner that  
22 will provide the Senate Council and  
23 the University Senate with valuable  
24 drafts and recommendations that  
25 Senate Council members and senators

5

1 can react to and suggest  
2 recommendations. Bob, is there  
3 anything else you'd like to mention  
4 in regard to the committee's work up  
5 to date?

6 GROSSMAN: Well, just that when the  
7 committee has come to a consensus  
8 without a draft policy, we're going  
9 to post it on the Web site for  
10 everyone to look at, review, and  
11 send comments back to the committee  
12 for us to then rework the draft, and  
13 hopefully we'll be able to come to a  
14 campus-wide consensus on what's the  
15 best policy to have.

16 CHAIR YANARELLA: Great.

17 GROSSMAN: Before it then goes up to  
18 approval to the Senate Council and  
19 the Senate.

20 CHAIR YANARELLA: We'll be looking for  
21 that. A reminder relating to Senate  
22 Council elections: Last week we  
23 went through the nomination  
24 process. Six individuals won  
25 nomination for the Senate Council

6

1 elections. These elections began  
2 this morning at 10:00 a.m., and they  
3 will continue until Wednesday,  
4 December 15th, at 4:00 p.m. In  
5 order to vote, you need to simply go  
6 to the University Senate web page,  
7 which is indicated here, and there  
8 you will find a link to the voting  
9 page. This is certainly a very  
10 important task of the university  
11 senators. I would encourage those  
12 voting senators to please go to the  
13 University Senate web page and  
14 practice your franchise. The Senate  
15 Council held its election of  
16 officers at its regularly scheduled  
17 meeting on December 6th, and I'm  
18 calling upon Ernie Bailey, who is  
19 the present vice chair, to announce  
20 those results. Ernie, are you here?

21 BAILEY: Yeah.

22 CHAIR YANARELLA: Indeed.

23 BAILEY: The Senate Council holds its  
24 elections for its officers --  
25 sorry -- in December, and the



7

1 officers take office in December of  
2 the following year. So Ernie, for  
3 example, was elected last December  
4 and began serving his term this  
5 summer. So we held the elections.  
6 Ernie asked me to make the  
7 announcement. Because Ernie's done  
8 a good job, in the opinion of the  
9 Senate Council, he was nominated.  
10 He was the sole nominee and was  
11 elected to continue serving his  
12 second term starting this summer.  
13 And I guess the people that were  
14 eligible for that position are the  
15 nine voting members of the Senate  
16 Council. The Vice Chair position,  
17 the six members whose terms continue  
18 into the following year are eligible  
19 for that position. Kaveh Tagavi was  
20 nominated for that position. He's  
21 shown counsel leadership through his  
22 participation in the Senate Council  
23 and also through his service as the  
24 Chair of the Senate Rules and  
25 Elections Committee. And so there

8

1                   were no other nominations for that  
2                   position, and Kaveh was elected  
3                   unanimously by the Senate Council.

4                   CHAIR YANARELLA: Thank you. I think,  
5                   finally, in terms of the  
6                   announcements, the Board and  
7                   Senate's Holiday Reception will take  
8                   place tomorrow afternoon, December  
9                   14th, from 3:00 until 5:00 p.m. in  
10                  the public room of the main  
11                  building. We have an opportunity  
12                  to -- for the University Senators,  
13                  for Senate Council members to  
14                  interact with members of the  
15                  Administration and the Board of  
16                  Trustees, and we look forward to  
17                  having an opportunity for all of us  
18                  to share in the holiday cheer to  
19                  come. So please, if at all  
20                  possible, we urge you to attend and  
21                  enjoy the festivities. Our next  
22                  agenda item is the Board and Senate  
23                  Degree List. There are actually two  
24                  lists that we will be considering at  
25                  this meeting. One is the Western

9

1 Kentucky University - UK joint  
2 program in engineering, and the  
3 other is the approval of the degree  
4 list for the -- for LCC. Although  
5 this may seem to many people simply  
6 ceremonial, it is an important  
7 action, both from the general  
8 perspective of the faculty statutory  
9 governance role and specifically  
10 because of the substantive amendment  
11 that I believe will be offered, at  
12 least in one of these lists.  
13 Regarding the specifics of today's  
14 particular action, let me first  
15 point out the state law that  
16 demonstrates the role of the  
17 University Senate in the granting of  
18 degrees. KRS 164.240 states that  
19 the Board of Trustees may grant  
20 degrees to graduates of the  
21 university, prescribe conditions  
22 upon which postgraduate honors may  
23 be obtained, and confer such  
24 honorary degrees, upon the  
25 recommendation of the faculty of the

10

1

university, as it thinks proper.

2

Let me give you some background on

3

the Western Kentucky - University of

4

Kentucky joint program. This past

5

spring, the University Board of

6

Trustees approved the joint

7

undergraduate degree program between

8

Western Kentucky University and the

9

University of Kentucky, with Western

10

Kentucky University serving as the

11

primary home institution of that

12

program. Under such a joint

13

program, the names of both WKU and

14

UK go onto the diploma, which

15

requires that the board of trustees

16

of both universities approve the

17

degree list. That requires, then,

18

that the Western Kentucky program

19

faculty submit their faculty

20

Senate -- pardon me, submit through

21

their faculty Senate to their board

22

the names for the degrees list and

23

that the University of Kentucky

24

program faculty submit through its

25

Senate to the board those names as

11

1 well. While the WKU side utilizes  
2 its registrar to assist in  
3 ascertaining the degree candidates,  
4 that they are properly on the list,  
5 on the UK side, the registrar has  
6 not clearly been in the loop, at  
7 least as of this time. Therefore,  
8 the UK Board of Trustees is  
9 dependent upon the University Senate  
10 to properly and, in a timely  
11 fashion, vet the names on that  
12 degree list. In the present case,  
13 it turns out that the UK College of  
14 Engineering did not get to the  
15 Senate Council the names of three  
16 students in the joint Civil  
17 Engineering program in time for  
18 inclusion on the degree list for  
19 today's action. As a result, it is  
20 my understanding that there is going  
21 to be a motion from the floor to  
22 amend the degree list you have  
23 received to add the names of the  
24 three candidates to the joint Civil  
25 Engineering program. In order for

12

1                   these students in the joint program  
2                   to obtain their degrees in this  
3                   fall's graduation, the action of  
4                   this body today to add these three  
5                   names is necessary. Both degree  
6                   lists are submitted to the Senate by  
7                   the Senate Council with a positive  
8                   recommendation for approval. I  
9                   would like to take these in serial  
10                  order, and so let us consider first  
11                  the Western Kentucky University - UK  
12                  joint program. We have a motion on  
13                  the floor to approve that degree  
14                  program from the Senate Council.  
15                  Are there any comments or additional  
16                  actions that need to be taken? Yes,  
17                  Kaveh. Please indicate --

18                  TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. I  
19                  have three names. I think you also  
20                  have those three names that are in  
21                  the agenda. I'd like to add these  
22                  names that for one reason or the  
23                  other did not get in the master  
24                  list, and I would like to add that  
25                  at this point. They are: [Jerrod

13

1 Nicks, Travis Spiden, John Suell].  
2 And I'm not going to go into the  
3 spelling; you have those names; is  
4 that correct?

5 CHAIR YANARELLA: We do, indeed.

6 TAGAVI: There is an asterisk on all  
7 these three and a comment: Pending  
8 UK receiving from WKU the  
9 information UK has requested.

10 CHAIR YANARELLA: Do we have an  
11 amendment to the motion or --

12 GROSSMAN: Second.

13 CHAIR YANARELLA: Second from Bob  
14 Grossman. Is there any discussion  
15 on the amendment? There being none,  
16 I'd like to call for a vote on the  
17 amendment to the degree list. All  
18 those in favor, please indicate by  
19 raising your hands. Any opposed?  
20 Being none, any abstentions? The  
21 motion is carried. Okay. We'd like  
22 to take up, then, the motion to  
23 approve the degree list with the  
24 amendment that has just been  
25 passed. Is there any discussion on

14

1                   that action? There being none, I  
2                   will call for a vote. All those in  
3                   favor of the motion to approve the  
4                   degree list as amended, please  
5                   indicate by raising your hands. Any  
6                   opposed? Any abstentions? The  
7                   motion is passed. Thank you. Our  
8                   third item on the agenda are  
9                   proposed changes to Senate rules.

10                  SCOTT: Ernie, you forgot LCC.

11                  CHAIR YANARELLA: Excuse me. Thank  
12                   you. We have a motion on the floor  
13                   coming from the Senate with a  
14                   positive recommendation to approve  
15                   the degree list for LCC. Is there  
16                   any discussion regarding that  
17                   particular list? Davy?

18                  JONES: In the Senate Council, we had  
19                   some discussion of the context for  
20                   the LCC list coming through us.  
21                   Could you maybe enlighten the Senate  
22                   on what our role in that is, as you  
23                   understand it so far?

24                  CHAIR YANARELLA: It's my understanding  
25                   that, given the fact that until --



15

1                   until all students who have been in  
2                   the program when LCC was part of the  
3                   University of Kentucky have  
4                   graduated, those LCC students will  
5                   continue to have on their degree a  
6                   University of Kentucky symbol as  
7                   well; and therefore, until that --  
8                   until that has taken place, we will  
9                   continue to be responsible for  
10                  approving that list. Any other  
11                  comments? Any other questions  
12                  regarding the LCC degree list?  
13                  There being none, all those in favor  
14                  of approving the LCC list, please  
15                  indicate by raising your hands. Any  
16                  opposed? Any abstentions? That  
17                  motion has been approved. Let's  
18                  move, then, on to the third item:  
19                  Proposed changes to Senate Rules --  
20                  pardon me.

21                  CIBULL: I'm sorry. I just have a  
22                  question, Ernie. We also approved a  
23                  list for just the university at the  
24                  Senate Council. Has that already  
25                  gone through?

16

1 CHAIR YANARELLA: That went through  
2 already, yes.

3 CIBULL: Okay. Sorry.

4 CHAIR YANARELLA: Okay. The third item  
5 on our agenda: Proposed changes to  
6 Senate Rules relating to the Board  
7 of Trustee Faculty Representative  
8 Elections. You will find in your  
9 packet both the rationale and the  
10 proposal itself. That proposal  
11 was -- it was being brought to the  
12 Senate with a positive  
13 recommendation by the Senate  
14 Council. The rationale is quite  
15 simple and, I think, quite clear.  
16 The proposed changes make the  
17 language regarding electronic  
18 balloting conform to the fact that  
19 we have already been using such  
20 balloting for the past several  
21 years. Secondly, it allows  
22 elections in the spring rather than  
23 in the fall, as typically occurred.  
24 And thirdly, it takes care of tie  
25 situations; and finally, it cleans

17

1 up the existing language and makes  
2 it in better conformity to -- to  
3 standing -- or towards standing  
4 practice. Kaveh, are there any  
5 particulars relating to the proposal  
6 itself that you would like to  
7 underline for the -- or highlight  
8 for the Senate members?

9 TAGAVI: No. I think you mentioned --  
10 well, the main three changes are  
11 from fall to spring and from paper  
12 ballot to electronic. And in case  
13 of emergencies, if we don't have the  
14 technology, we go back to the paper  
15 ballot. The nomination part remains  
16 paper versus fax, the way that we  
17 have been doing in the past, but the  
18 voting itself is now going to be  
19 electronic. And the last one: We  
20 were to say, in case of tie in every  
21 other aspect, we tried to break the  
22 tie in a meaningful fashion, but if  
23 it's a tie in every other aspect,  
24 then we're going to do that by a  
25 random draw.

18

1 CHAIR YANARELLA: Are there any  
2 questions regarding the proposed  
3 changes to Senate rules concerning  
4 the Board of Trustee Faculty  
5 Representative Elections? I'll  
6 assume that the committee has done  
7 its work well, in that case. All  
8 those in favor of the changes as  
9 indicated, please indicate by  
10 raising your hands. All those  
11 opposed? Any abstentions? The  
12 action -- the motion carries. Our  
13 next two items involve presentations  
14 by two individuals. The first  
15 person is David Royse, who is  
16 presently filling his second term as  
17 Academic Ombud. It has been the  
18 standard practice to ask David to  
19 come to the University Senate and to  
20 give an address to this body in  
21 order to clarify how -- how the  
22 business of the Ombud is going. He  
23 will be followed, after perhaps a  
24 Q and A period, by our Provost, Mike  
25 Nietzel, who will offer us some

19

1                   important perspectives on the  
2                   university, graduate education, and  
3                   some other matters.

4                   ROYSE: I'd like to start my remarks by  
5                   thanking Michelle Sohner for her  
6                   invaluable assistance. In the past  
7                   year and a half, she has invaluable,  
8                   a tremendous asset to me in terms of  
9                   knowing the policies and the people  
10                  within this vast educational  
11                  machine. I've relied upon her a  
12                  great deal, both for her insight and  
13                  sound judgment and her editorial eye  
14                  when we have to write a letter or  
15                  e-mail to a disgruntled faculty  
16                  member or parent or student. She  
17                  fields a lot of problems before they  
18                  come to me. She answers the phones  
19                  when I'm not there, or even when I  
20                  am there, and is able to answer a  
21                  lot of questions that people have,  
22                  which is a very sort of slick  
23                  solution to people who have an  
24                  immediate need for -- and e-mails --  
25                  have an immediate need for

20

1 information. I also want to thank  
2 Cleo Price, in the Registrar's  
3 Office, and Mike Healy and Joe Fink  
4 for being chairs of the Appeals  
5 Board, as well as all the individual  
6 faculty and students who did their  
7 best to render Solomonian wisdom on  
8 behalf of the board. I'd like to  
9 acknowledge also the cooperation and  
10 assistance I've almost always  
11 received from the staff and faculty  
12 whenever I've had to call or  
13 e-mail. I'm sure that on many  
14 occasions it felt like a rude slap  
15 in the face when I had to tell them  
16 about some complaint that came in  
17 out of the blue. I've always been  
18 amazed that the faculty don't hang  
19 up on me and that I've never been  
20 threatened with bodily harm.  
21 Sometimes there has been a shouter  
22 or two, but they've been remarkably  
23 few. A few people thought that they  
24 could stonewall me long enough that  
25 I would go away, but sometimes that

21

1

doesn't work out that way, either.

2

Now, for the statistical report.

3

Last year we had 307 cases, which

4

was the highest number in ten

5

years. Now, that's about an eight

6

percent increase over the year

7

before. Now, when a member of the

8

academic community approaches us,

9

and it doesn't matter how they

10

approach us; sometimes it's a

11

walk-in, sometimes they've called to

12

schedule an appointment. If we can

13

resolve it over the phone or by

14

e-mail, we try to do that.

15

Sometimes there are simple questions

16

like, "Can I give a quiz during dead

17

week?" You know, it depends, if

18

you're waiting on that. Sometimes a

19

student might want to know, "Who do

20

I complain to? There's an adjunct

21

that always late for class,"

22

something like that. If it is a

23

more -- an appropriate sense that

24

someone needs a little bit more

25

information or we need to gather a

22

1                   little bit more information, then  
2                   Michelle schedules an appointment.  
3                   And when I meet face-to-face with  
4                   that student or faculty member, then  
5                   that becomes a case so. Last year  
6                   we had 831 single phone calls,  
7                   e-mails, walk-ins, that kind of  
8                   thing, and that's just about the  
9                   average for the last three years.  
10                  Now, when something can't be handled  
11                  over the phone, and this is a -- for  
12                  instance, a student called one time  
13                  and said that a TA was hovering  
14                  around her during class and it  
15                  wasn't clear what hovering meant  
16                  exactly. So, again, that becomes  
17                  the case when a student comes in and  
18                  begins talking about it. Sometimes  
19                  the complaint is an instructor has  
20                  shown a film that's inoffensive or  
21                  inappropriate, somebody wants to  
22                  talk about some violent scenes or  
23                  something that was in the visual  
24                  media and whether or not they have a  
25                  right to complain about that; it may



23

1 not involve a grade. So by and  
2 large, a lot of these things, we  
3 just need to sort of investigate a  
4 little bit more. A student who  
5 complains about an essay being  
6 graded unfairly because of his or  
7 her political beliefs, you know, we  
8 need to hear more information about  
9 that. So the stickier situations  
10 generally mean that they come in and  
11 usually they schedule those for  
12 about an hour appointment. As you  
13 can see from your handout, we  
14 handled 15 cases of academic  
15 integrity, either cheating or  
16 plagiarism. That means I met with  
17 15 students, or generally students,  
18 who came to discuss their situation  
19 of whether or not they felt there  
20 might be grounds for an appeal.  
21 Most did not go on to the Appeals  
22 Board. Now, there's another -- I  
23 mean, that is not to say that all  
24 the academic integrity cases are  
25 summarized in those 15. There were

24

1 another 47 letters that we received  
2 from deans of colleges, which means  
3 that formal charges had been made.  
4 Oftentimes, those students -- well,  
5 15 of those probably are the ones  
6 that came to meet me, so the vast  
7 majority of those 47 do not contact  
8 the Ombud. That means that they  
9 took their punishment and it went no  
10 further. The punishment generally  
11 is an E for the first-time offense  
12 of academic integrity. If it  
13 happens a second time, and there has  
14 been one of those, then the student  
15 can be suspended. So of these 47  
16 letters, 11 were for cheating and 36  
17 for plagiarism. It's abundantly  
18 clear to me that there's -- this is  
19 probably the tip of the iceberg. We  
20 know the ease with which students  
21 can go to the Internet and pull  
22 materials or whole papers off, so I  
23 believe a lot of faculty are  
24 handling these problems informally  
25 and I never know about them. Now, I

25

1 do get some phone calls from faculty  
2 saying, "Can I do it this way? Can  
3 I give this student a zero for the  
4 assignment, or can I do something  
5 else? I don't think the student  
6 understood." Or maybe they take  
7 some blame and say, "Maybe my  
8 instructions weren't clear." So  
9 besides that sort of intuition or  
10 gut feeling, I found an article in  
11 the Chronicle of Education in 2002,  
12 which is a survey of 700  
13 undergraduates in nine different  
14 colleges and universities. 16.5  
15 percent of the undergraduates  
16 reported sometimes cutting and  
17 pasting text into a paper without  
18 citation. Eight percent reported  
19 doing it frequently, very  
20 frequently, or often. So in other  
21 words, about a quarter of all  
22 undergraduates in that study admit  
23 to having plagiarized. So if you  
24 think about it that way, we're not  
25 seeing very many cases of plagiarism

26

1                   come through the Ombud Office. I'm  
2                   not sure what we should do about  
3                   that. Maybe that's why this  
4                   committee is meeting. On the other  
5                   hand, perhaps something like trying  
6                   to bring an honor code to the  
7                   university might help students take  
8                   their writing assignments a little  
9                   bit more seriously. Our office  
10                  handled very few cases of  
11                  discrimination. There were nine  
12                  last year. Most of the time these  
13                  were not, in my opinion, very  
14                  serious in that situation. By that  
15                  I mean that maybe the student felt  
16                  it was serious, but there didn't  
17                  seem to be any real evidence. It  
18                  might be a male student in a class  
19                  of primarily female students feeling  
20                  that their remarks weren't valued as  
21                  highly or something of that nature.  
22                  So we talk about strategies or  
23                  options the student might have. I  
24                  think we made only one or two  
25                  referrals to Terry Allen's office.

27

1 About a third of all the cases that  
2 come to us have to do with grades  
3 and grade complaints. As a rule, we  
4 do not try to intervene during the  
5 course of the semester and would  
6 only do so if it's apparent that  
7 that activity or problem would make  
8 a whole letter grade difference.  
9 You know, when a student comes in  
10 and says, you know, "I got 25 points  
11 out of a 30 point quiz," well, I  
12 mean, normally there's not a lot we  
13 can do about that except let the  
14 students ventilate. That's a  
15 closely-guarded secret, however.  
16 About a fifth of all complaints have  
17 to do with instructional issues, and  
18 these are the kinds of things where  
19 an instructor departed from the  
20 syllabus or there was some kind --  
21 the student feels an unreasonable  
22 demand was made. And students are  
23 pretty savvy in that they compare  
24 against other sections, and so it's  
25 not uncommon for students to say,

28

1 "My section is doing more reading  
2 than the other section," or, "We're  
3 having more quizzes than the other  
4 section," and that kind of thing.  
5 Sometimes the complaint is the  
6 faculty member is not returning  
7 homework soon enough or not grading  
8 them in time for the mid-term report  
9 and that sort of thing. Another 20  
10 percent of complaints have to do  
11 with what we call progress and  
12 promotion. These are generally  
13 obstacles within the college when a  
14 student can't take upper division  
15 classes or they're not offered or  
16 the student doesn't have the GPA and  
17 they want to appeal that, the fact  
18 that there's some kind of, they  
19 feel, unfair prerequisite that  
20 prevents them from going forward or  
21 delaying their graduation and they  
22 might have another semester or so.  
23 Sometimes students realize they're  
24 in trouble; they want to withdraw  
25 after the mid-term or they're denied

29

1 admission to a program. And the  
2 saddest of those situations is when  
3 graduate students come in and they  
4 feel that their chairs or advisors  
5 are purposely frustrating them or  
6 holding them back in order to crank  
7 out more research or to further  
8 their own goals. You can see that  
9 most of the complaints arise from  
10 the College of Arts and Sciences,  
11 but that's also the largest college  
12 by far, so that's not unusual. You  
13 can also see that juniors and  
14 seniors may be more likely to make a  
15 complaint than first-year students.  
16 Finally, I was asked to report on a  
17 situation that I sort of became  
18 aware of this summer and early in  
19 August about the University Health  
20 Services policy of not issuing  
21 something like a report or an  
22 official-looking document to explain  
23 whenever students had been -- had  
24 contacted them to -- students have  
25 claimed an excused absence. Earlier

30

1 in the summer, we were concerned  
2 that the faculty would not be  
3 comfortable with this existing  
4 policy of having the student go back  
5 to signing the release of  
6 information so that the faculty  
7 member could contact the nurse or  
8 someone there at Health Services to  
9 verify that the student had been  
10 seen by a professional, but it seems  
11 to have been working reasonably  
12 well. As far as I know, we've only  
13 received one complaint about this  
14 not working well, but that is a  
15 major one, and it comes from  
16 Chemistry. And I don't know whether  
17 Bob would want to talk about this or  
18 not, but in the spring there are 700  
19 students in chemistry labs. And  
20 what that means is it is a major  
21 problem whenever a makeup lab has to  
22 be scheduled or a student wants to  
23 claim an absence; they couldn't do  
24 their experiment, and the lab  
25 supervisor does not have enough time



31

1 to arrange a different experiment or  
2 a lab makeup whenever a student  
3 needs that. So I think that what  
4 they've been doing is to allow one  
5 student -- allow one makeup lab.  
6 There's no penalty for missing one.  
7 I'm not sure exactly what happens  
8 when they have to miss more than one  
9 lab, however. In conclusion, I  
10 would say that our faculty and  
11 students seem to be remarkably  
12 well-informed that the syllabus is a  
13 contract, a binding educational  
14 document. It's surprising to me  
15 occasionally to find that a tenured  
16 professor who's been here a long  
17 time has a one or two-page  
18 syllabus. I mean, most of our TVA's  
19 do a lot better than that. Carolyn  
20 Carter has done a really wonderful  
21 job with providing TA's with  
22 orientation and preparing them to  
23 teach. We do get some complaints  
24 about TA's, but sometimes it's  
25 almost -- not because they're not

32

1                   doing their job, but maybe they're  
2                   doing it too well. You know, you  
3                   find someone in the department  
4                   that's not English, and they're  
5                   grading the grammar so harshly that  
6                   the students are saying, "but this  
7                   isn't," you know, whatever. Those  
8                   who miss out, though, are the new  
9                   faculty who don't get the same  
10                  quality or kind of orientation and  
11                  our adjuncts, part-time  
12                  instructors. I sometimes see  
13                  problems, I think just because the  
14                  adjuncts aren't aware of the  
15                  policies that maybe the rest of us  
16                  know about. So although my office  
17                  sometimes sees an unflattering and  
18                  blemished side of a few educators --  
19                  these are educators who treat  
20                  students maybe in an unfair or  
21                  cavalier fashion -- I want to report  
22                  to you that the vast, vast majority  
23                  of our faculty are dedicated to  
24                  treating students fairly and  
25                  respectfully. And I'm often

33

1                   impressed at the thoughtfulness that  
2                   goes into making a decision, as well  
3                   as the sacrifices and accommodations  
4                   that have been made for students.  
5                   Thank you. I can handle a couple of  
6                   questions if they're easy.

7                   YATES: Steve Yates, Chemistry. I'm  
8                   just curious: How many cases  
9                   actually make it to the Appeals  
10                  Board?

11                  ROYSE: Not very many. I'd say about a  
12                  dozen in a particular year. Am I  
13                  right, Michelle?

14                  SOHNER: Something like 15.

15                  ROYSE: Thank you.

16                  (APPLAUSE.)

17                  CHAIR YANARELLA: David, you were so  
18                  quick that I wasn't able to put my  
19                  hand up. I wonder if I could ask  
20                  you one quick question. Since  
21                  plagiarism seems to be far and away  
22                  the most frequently considered  
23                  academic offense, can you say  
24                  something approximate what your  
25                  office is doing to sensitize the

34

1                   faculty and students in regard to  
2                   what the meaning of plagiarism is  
3                   and what constitutes that act?

4                   ROYSE: The one thing we did do recently  
5                   this fall was, if you go to the  
6                   Ombud Web site and go to the site  
7                   index and choose Ombud, there is a  
8                   link that will pull up a couple of  
9                   examples of, you know, ways to  
10                  paraphrase what is plagiarism, you  
11                  know, what it is not, sort of good  
12                  and bad examples. That's the major  
13                  thing we've done. I speak to the  
14                  TA's. I give them sort of a -- you  
15                  know, a little instruction about  
16                  what to look for and things, a way  
17                  to talk about that. Whenever I get  
18                  encouraged by -- say, when I speak  
19                  to faculty, College of Nursing or  
20                  something like that, I try to tell  
21                  them to talk about what they want  
22                  when they're -- whenever there's a  
23                  written assignment. Make sure  
24                  students know because we have, you  
25                  know, transfer students who may not

35

1 have gone through our writing  
2 program who may not have the same  
3 understanding and international  
4 students who may not have the same  
5 understanding of what plagiarism is  
6 as we hold our students to. But  
7 other than that, it's kind of hard  
8 to communicate a lot of concern  
9 about that.

10 CHAIR YANARELLA: Thank you. Any other  
11 last questions? Thank you again.  
12 We'll now turn to our Provost, Mike  
13 Nietzel, who will provide us with an  
14 address on issues bearing on  
15 university, the faculty, and  
16 undergraduate enrollment and  
17 teaching. He may have a few other  
18 issues that he may want to fold into  
19 this but, Mike, let's call you to  
20 the podium and welcome you.

21 NIETZEL: Okay. Thank you, Ernie, and I  
22 appreciate the opportunity to  
23 address the Senate again this year,  
24 as I have in prior years, about  
25 matters that I think are of

36

1 particular importance for our  
2 consideration and discussion.  
3 Before I start, I want to  
4 acknowledge the help of Richard  
5 Greissman in putting the slides  
6 together today for this presentation  
7 and to [Mark Enemy] for the  
8 technology support, but certainly to  
9 Connie Ray. You'll see that there  
10 are quite a bit of data about the  
11 impact of the increasing entering  
12 freshman cohorts from 2001 through  
13 2004 that we're going to discuss  
14 today so that we can have some data  
15 about how the university has coped  
16 with that particular issue. And it  
17 would not have been possible to do  
18 this without Connie's wonderful work  
19 in support of it, and you should  
20 recognize that she did that and her  
21 team did that, also at the time when  
22 she was responsible for bringing  
23 together the university self-study  
24 on the NCAA report, which for any of  
25 you that have seen it, know that

37

1                   that was also an enormous  
2                   undertaking. So Connie, as always,  
3                   has been very busy but very  
4                   important to an institution learning  
5                   about itself and providing an  
6                   opportunity for us to have this kind  
7                   of discussion. My theme or  
8                   organizing principle today is the  
9                   concept of necessity. I want to  
10                  talk a little bit about what  
11                  necessity imposes on the  
12                  institution, how we've responded to  
13                  necessity, and maybe some ideas  
14                  about what we should discuss with  
15                  respect to the future and how we  
16                  respond to it. And the first  
17                  introduction of the necessity theme,  
18                  I turn to King Lear. Lear had a  
19                  lament about necessity's sharp  
20                  pinch, and for those of you know  
21                  that know about the kind of familial  
22                  conflict and personal distress that  
23                  was tormenting Lear, I don't want to  
24                  pretend that we can elevate to quite  
25                  that level of drama at the

38

1 university, but we have practical  
2 and high stakes that the university  
3 needs to consider from the specific  
4 context of being the lead  
5 institution in this state. So we  
6 feel a sharp pinch here as well, and  
7 I want to talk a little bit about  
8 that context and a little bit about  
9 how I understand that sharp pinch,  
10 and you'll see the theme of  
11 necessity returning a bit in some  
12 different formats and quotes later  
13 on. We do have a set of really  
14 compelling needs in this state, so  
15 on the one hand, necessity, in terms  
16 of those compelling needs, forces  
17 itself upon the university. And we  
18 also have some powerful hopes for  
19 the institution. Those are ones  
20 that I think we share or we should  
21 share with respect to the role of  
22 UK. I want to talk about, first of  
23 all, the kind of factors that we  
24 must confront as an institution. We  
25 live in a state, obviously, where a



39

1 great deal is needed. So if we  
2 think about necessity just from the  
3 point of view of the State of  
4 Kentucky, I want to talk about four  
5 factors that help define that  
6 particular kind of need. And  
7 certainly we believe that UK should  
8 be one of, if not the primary  
9 institution that's going to give the  
10 state some hope. It's clear that we  
11 can't do that by ourselves. I think  
12 it's equally clear that without UK  
13 taking the role, it isn't going to  
14 happen with respect to the role  
15 higher education needs to play for  
16 moving the State of Kentucky  
17 forward. We operate at a time when  
18 less is being provided to higher  
19 education than is necessary, so  
20 necessity addresses this discussion  
21 from the point of view of  
22 resources. And I'm not going to  
23 spend a lot of time complaining  
24 about our lack of resources. You're  
25 well aware of what that is, with

40

1                   respect to the situation we're in  
2                   with the state. And so the other  
3                   response and one that there's been a  
4                   lot of discussion on, clearly,  
5                   within the university is: We don't  
6                   want to recede in quality with  
7                   respect to the education that we  
8                   provide here. There's a concern  
9                   about a turning back on quality. We  
10                  also don't want to retreat from some  
11                  pretty lofty ambitions that have  
12                  been sent our way and that I think  
13                  most of us want to maintain. So  
14                  that's the sharp pinch with respect  
15                  to the fate that the university  
16                  confronts at this point. Let's look  
17                  at this as the first factor: This  
18                  is a state that continues to have  
19                  very low educational attainment.  
20                  This shows the percent of adults  
21                  with a bachelor's degree or higher  
22                  by states. The national average  
23                  here is 24. You see Kentucky is  
24                  47th out of 50 at 17 percent. The  
25                  low end down here is 15 percent. I

41

1                   showed you a figure like that last  
2                   year. It hasn't changed a great  
3                   deal. These slides, by the way,  
4                   come from the Council on  
5                   Postsecondary Education; in most  
6                   cases, the primary source is the  
7                   U.S. Census. I'm going to show you  
8                   something that is some good news, I  
9                   think, and something that the state  
10                  should begin to see the benefits  
11                  from, and that's the percent of high  
12                  school graduates who are attending  
13                  college anywhere in the U.S. in the  
14                  following fall semester. This is  
15                  ten years ago, 1994. 55 percent was  
16                  the national average; in Kentucky we  
17                  were at 52.4 percent. Eight years  
18                  later the national average has  
19                  moved. Very little UK is now -- or  
20                  excuse me, Kentucky is now above  
21                  that. The enrollment increase that  
22                  the Commonwealth has experienced,  
23                  the great majority of that being in  
24                  KCTCS and the comprehensive  
25                  universities, actually moved us

42

1 beyond the national average in the  
2 fall of 2002. The tie between  
3 education and employment rates and  
4 between education and salaries,  
5 you'll see in a minute as to why  
6 this is so important in a state in  
7 which clearly the revenue, the tax  
8 base, is not sufficient for us to  
9 participate in a way that we must in  
10 a knowledge-based economy. Here's  
11 another not-so-happy slide on the  
12 educational pipeline. We're going  
13 to start with 100 ninth grade, and  
14 we're going to follow the attrition  
15 of those 100 students through the  
16 educational pipeline. And we're  
17 going to have a set of top states:  
18 For the most part, it's New Jersey,  
19 by the way, until we get down here  
20 to the last one, which is  
21 Massachusetts. The purple bar here  
22 is the U.S., and here's Kentucky.  
23 Now, you see the erosion that  
24 occurs: Of those 100 ninth graders,  
25 65 graduate from high school in

43

1 Kentucky as opposed to our  
2 top-performing state, New Jersey,  
3 90. There's the U.S. average. How  
4 many enter college? We're down to  
5 39; top-performing state, 60; the  
6 U.S. average, 40. How many are  
7 still enrolled? Up here's another  
8 measure of first-year retention: 44  
9 in our top performing state, 27,  
10 26. And then we get down to  
11 graduating college: 15 percent of  
12 those Kentucky ninth graders end up  
13 graduating from college, half of  
14 what is present in the  
15 top-performing state, and three  
16 percent is a sizeable difference  
17 when you multiply that times the  
18 number of students that we're  
19 talking about in the population. So  
20 we're losing a lot of students along  
21 the way. It does not seem to me  
22 that a 15-percent graduation rate  
23 starting with the -- or up here is a  
24 very good performance, another  
25 indication of why this access to

44

1 high-quality higher education is so  
2 important. This is from the United  
3 Health Foundation. This shows you  
4 an index made up of 15 different  
5 measures, the overall health of a  
6 state. Kentucky is here. It's one  
7 of the poorest states in terms of  
8 the overall level of health. This  
9 has a variety of measures having to  
10 do with healthy behaviors, as well  
11 as incidence of different kinds of  
12 health conditions. We remain a  
13 state, again, where the productivity  
14 and the economy suffer because of a  
15 relatively poor standing for our  
16 citizens' health status. Here's  
17 median household income by state.  
18 Now, you begin to think about the  
19 link between what's provided by  
20 higher education, what's provided to  
21 the state in terms of a tax base,  
22 and what our role can be in terms of  
23 empowering that. You see the  
24 average median household income,  
25 1999, was \$42,000. Our high end out

45

1 here, not surprisingly, New Jersey,  
2 which you remember did a very good  
3 job with its pipeline, educational  
4 pipeline, at 55,000. Here's  
5 Kentucky; I believe that's 45th out  
6 of 50 at about 33,600, the low end  
7 down there at 29,700, and I believe  
8 that's West Virginia. This is a  
9 wonderful figure that shows the  
10 step-wise progression between higher  
11 levels of education and declining  
12 unemployment rates, as well as  
13 increasing median earnings. These  
14 are in 2002 dollars. A high school  
15 graduate, 29,900; a college  
16 graduate, 40,000, almost 49,000.  
17 That essentially \$20,000 difference,  
18 multiplied across a lifetime of  
19 employment, is about a million bucks  
20 per person in terms of the  
21 difference in the state's economy  
22 between someone who has a college  
23 education and someone who only has a  
24 high school education. The step up  
25 is, of course, as we would want it

46

1 to be and as you would expect, much  
2 more dramatic as you get advanced  
3 education. This is why access and  
4 success in educating our students  
5 remains so important in terms of  
6 being able to feed back to the base  
7 which can support higher education  
8 at higher levels. Federal research  
9 and development expenditures per  
10 capita: We've had made progress  
11 here, but it's still not a real good  
12 story. Here's the national average  
13 in terms of R & D, federal R & D.  
14 Here's Kentucky at 37. Here's the  
15 low end down here at 20. If you  
16 look at just competitor states,  
17 these are ones that are close to us  
18 geographically, those that we think  
19 about as being sort of in our  
20 region. You can see, still, a  
21 dramatic level of advantage with  
22 those competitor states over  
23 Kentucky. You take that together,  
24 and you see that this state has a  
25 great deal that is needed, upon



47

1                   which it must depend on higher  
2                   education to help advance. And my  
3                   thesis remains that this institution  
4                   must be the leader in that, so we  
5                   need to look at how we do. We need  
6                   to look at what our role is in  
7                   educating students; how we've been  
8                   doing it; how can we think about  
9                   doing it better in the future. The  
10                  second theme with respect to  
11                  necessity comes from Robert Burton:  
12                  Make a virtue of necessity. And I  
13                  would like to suggest to you that I  
14                  believe that's what the university  
15                  has done with respect to the  
16                  enrollment growth that you have  
17                  seen. I'm going to only talk about  
18                  undergraduate education at this  
19                  point between 2001 and 2004. I will  
20                  give you my conclusions first so you  
21                  can be thinking about them as I go  
22                  through these slides. One is the  
23                  faculty has done a marvelous job in  
24                  absorbing and educating the 20 to 30  
25                  percent increase in undergraduates

48

1                   that this institution has  
2                   experienced since 2001. I'm going  
3                   to go through six different kinds of  
4                   measures with respect to these  
5                   cohorts between 2001 and 2004.  
6                   We're going to look at students'  
7                   ratings of advising. We're going to  
8                   look at a national survey, which is  
9                   the []NESSI: How engaged do our  
10                  students feel at the university?  
11                  We're going to look at the freshman  
12                  ratings of the quality of  
13                  instruction and classes that they  
14                  have. We're going to look at formal  
15                  teacher and class evaluations.  
16                  We're going to look at grades.  
17                  We're going to look at different  
18                  kinds of learning outcomes: How  
19                  well do they write and how well do  
20                  they think they speak? And we're  
21                  going to look at retention as  
22                  different ways to evaluate: How  
23                  have we been doing with this  
24                  enrollment increase that we've  
25                  experienced? Now, I want to present

49

1                   this for a couple of reasons. One  
2                   is we have had a large number of  
3                   stories making some suggestions  
4                   about the dire consequences of the  
5                   enrollment growth at the university  
6                   since 2001. This compels us, I  
7                   think, to study the issue and begin  
8                   to assess, in fact, how are we  
9                   doing? Second, I present this so  
10                  that you can begin to think about  
11                  what other kind of data would you  
12                  like to have that would help us  
13                  evaluate the enrollment growth and  
14                  how it's being managed at the  
15                  university. I think this is a  
16                  fairly comprehensive start on it,  
17                  and I'm doing it at a fairly high  
18                  level of abstraction. If you want  
19                  this broken down at a college level,  
20                  we can do it. If you want it broken  
21                  down at a department level, we can  
22                  do it. I'm trying to do it at a  
23                  level that appeals to an audience  
24                  with this kind of breadth. But more  
25                  importantly, I think, is I wanted to

50

1 start a discussion, a debate that  
2 will certainly begin here, about:  
3 Are there other things we should be  
4 looking at when we evaluate the  
5 impact of what has been a very large  
6 increase in terms of the  
7 university's enrollment of  
8 undergraduates? Now, let's take a  
9 look at that in terms of the -- a  
10 first look, and I really want to  
11 emphasize the "first look," at  
12 possible effects. From fall 2001 to  
13 fall 2004, the university's head  
14 count undergraduate has had a seven  
15 percent increase, about 1,200  
16 students. The freshman class in  
17 2001 was about 3,000 students. This  
18 fall it was 3,900 students and a 30  
19 percent increase. In the fall of  
20 '02 and '03, the increases were at  
21 least 20 percent. So we haven't  
22 admitted a freshman class since 2001  
23 that's been any less than 20 percent  
24 greater than that 2001 class. So  
25 that gives you an idea about the

51

1 magnitude of the enrollment  
2 increase. I do want to mention here  
3 the second reason I think these  
4 results are going to be as you will  
5 see them, and that is the high  
6 quality -- the higher quality of  
7 student that's been admitted in  
8 these cohorts. Having talked to  
9 many faculty, I think there is a  
10 recognition that you see this in the  
11 classroom in terms of some improved  
12 capability of students, and I think  
13 that that quality of student, where  
14 we've basically increased the  
15 selective admissions yield by about  
16 eight to ten percent from where it  
17 was back in 2001, coupled with  
18 excellent work by the faculty, is  
19 the best explanation I can make for  
20 the results that you will -- that  
21 I'd like to summarize here this  
22 afternoon. First, let's start with  
23 average class size by 100, 200, 300,  
24 400 and 500 level, across the four  
25 fall semesters. At the 100 level at

52

1                   2001, we were at 45; this fall,  
2                   we're at 48. At the 2000 level, we  
3                   were at 38; this fall, we're at 42.  
4                   34 at the 300 level; 45 this fall.  
5                   27/26 at the 400 level; 18 and 19 at  
6                   the 500 level. Make two comments  
7                   about this: One is that's the  
8                   direction it ought to go. Obviously  
9                   it's nice to see, in fact, that the  
10                  class sizes are getting smaller. If  
11                  you want to know what the overall  
12                  class size has done between '01 and  
13                  '04, it's gone from 35.5 to 38.2, an  
14                  overall change of less than three  
15                  students. Now, these data here  
16                  represent the arithmetic mean of all  
17                  sections. If you have last week's  
18                  Kernel, you'll see some different  
19                  numbers here, and that's because at  
20                  that time we were reporting the  
21                  average of averages at -- with  
22                  different, of course, prefixes. So  
23                  if we had ten courses that were  
24                  psychology courses at the 100 level,  
25                  we averaged those together and used

1                   that average to go into the overall  
2                   average. You get some different  
3                   results with it. I think -- my view  
4                   is, this is the most accurate, is  
5                   simply to not do an average of  
6                   averages, but Connie and I are  
7                   having an interesting debate back  
8                   and forth about that, which we'll  
9                   probably continue. And I'm happy to  
10                  show you the data the other way.  
11                  What you'll see is that these  
12                  numbers hardly change at all; these  
13                  numbers are slightly larger when we  
14                  do that. But that gives you, across  
15                  the four semesters, an indication of  
16                  what has happened in the average  
17                  class size. I suspect most of you  
18                  think that those aren't very  
19                  traumatic in terms of average  
20                  increases, and I would agree. Now  
21                  what I want to do is look at the  
22                  student experience in terms of  
23                  whether they have a diet of small or  
24                  medium or large classes and also how  
25                  that has changed across the four

54

1 years. So what we did is, we  
2 divided our classes into three  
3 categories. A small class, we said,  
4 was 30 or fewer students; medium, 31  
5 to 99; and a large class was more  
6 than 100. And then we looked at the  
7 fall 2001 and the fall 2004  
8 schedules to see what had happened  
9 in terms of student experiences.  
10 We're going to only look at  
11 full-time freshmen in this  
12 analysis. Now, let's start here.  
13 Richard's exhausted the rainbow on  
14 this one for me in terms of colors.  
15 We're going to start with this gray  
16 oval, which compares 2001 to 2004 in  
17 terms of the percentage of freshman  
18 who have at least one class, 30 or  
19 less, one medium class, and one  
20 class of 100 or more. So really,  
21 the comparison is this way. And  
22 what I would -- the conclusion I  
23 would draw from that is that there  
24 has not been very much change in the  
25 likelihood of a full-time freshman



55

1 in '04 versus a full-time freshman  
2 in '01 experiencing at least one of  
3 these classes, class sizes. Now  
4 we're going to go over to our  
5 full-time freshmen and we're going  
6 to say: What percentage are  
7 enrolled in at least two classes of  
8 this size, this size, and this  
9 size? This bears some watching.  
10 There's a 15 percent; you may find  
11 that to be a large increase or not.  
12 I think that one's kind of on the  
13 edge of how a person would interpret  
14 that, but there has been a 15  
15 percent increase in the percentage  
16 of freshmen in '04, in at least --  
17 taking two classes of 100 or more  
18 versus those that were doing that in  
19 2001. Now let's go and look at, at  
20 least three classes. Over half of  
21 our freshman continue to have at  
22 least three classes in their fall  
23 semester of their freshman year with  
24 30 or fewer students in it. That is  
25 about four times more likely than

1 freshmen who have at least three  
2 classes with 100 or more in it.  
3 This has increased, just as we saw  
4 there, and the yet if you think  
5 about the balance in terms of a  
6 freshman's experience, I think we  
7 can still feel as if that's a pretty  
8 good ratio. And then finally, we'll  
9 go out here to what really is the  
10 diet, which is: What percentage of  
11 our freshmen have four or more  
12 classes -- we're probably, in most  
13 cases, talking now about their full  
14 load -- that are either small,  
15 medium or large? Nine times more  
16 likely to have a class -- four  
17 classes of 30 or fewer than you have  
18 100 or more. Only three percent of  
19 our students, in their fall freshman  
20 semester, have four classes of 100  
21 or more. Over a quarter have four  
22 classes of 30 or fewer. These five  
23 bullets are the summaries I just  
24 gave you. I would hope by the end  
25 of the week we'll have this

57

1                    PowerPoint presentation posted at  
2                    the Provost Web site and so you can  
3                    look at those. I've just given you  
4                    those five conclusions as I showed  
5                    you that slide and had them there  
6                    for you to evaluate when you have a  
7                    little more time to look at the  
8                    table that preceded it. Now we have  
9                    an opportunity to look at -- can you  
10                   see the orange in the back okay, the  
11                   numbers? Okay. We had an  
12                   opportunity to look at how students  
13                   evaluated their advising. Here we  
14                   have a class of about 3,000. These  
15                   are just going to be freshmen. Here  
16                   we have a class of about 36 to 37;  
17                   here we have a class about 37 to  
18                   38. We're going to look at how, on  
19                   a one-to-five scale, the freshmen  
20                   evaluated their advising experiences  
21                   at UK. I will let you know now that  
22                   this is the magnitude of difference  
23                   that you're going to see in almost  
24                   every slide, so when it goes up from  
25                   '01 to '04 in each of these cases,

1 I'm not going to make much out of it  
2 because it's a trivial difference.  
3 When it goes down, I'm going to  
4 suggest it's a trivial difference as  
5 well. I think you're going to see a  
6 couple that aren't trivial, but you  
7 ask, in these classes with 20 to 30  
8 percent more students, their  
9 perception of their advisor spending  
10 sufficient time, as being  
11 accessible, someone I'd recommend to  
12 other students, you don't see any  
13 effect associated with the larger  
14 cohort size. Here's our national  
15 measure. That's a local measure.  
16 Here's our national measure, the  
17 [ ]NESSI. Now, what we're going to  
18 look at here are in five measures:  
19 Level of academic challenge, active  
20 and collaborative learning,  
21 interactions with faculty, enriching  
22 educational experiences, and how  
23 supportive is the campus  
24 environment. We're going to look at  
25 the change between '01, a class of

59

1                   3,000, and '03 -- we do these  
2                   surveys every few years -- a class  
3                   of about 3,700. And out here I have  
4                   our public doctoral universities,  
5                   the same kind of institutions as UK  
6                   so you can compare where we are.  
7                   And here we're doing the same things  
8                   for seniors. These are arithmetic  
9                   means converted to a 100-point  
10                  scale. There are different ranges  
11                  on the items for these scales, and  
12                  so to make them comparable, they  
13                  were put on a 100-point scale. The  
14                  highest NESSI scores you'll almost  
15                  ever see are in the 60's. If you  
16                  were to take a score in the 60's,  
17                  you'd be in the 90th percentile. So  
18                  what we're looking at here is what's  
19                  happened between this smaller and  
20                  larger cohort: How do we fare  
21                  against our peers? You will see, of  
22                  these five comparisons, there's an  
23                  upward movement on four out of the  
24                  five, a slight downward one on this  
25                  one. This one actually is, I'm

60

1                   sure, a significant difference, a  
2                   move from 53.3 to 59 in terms of the  
3                   supportiveness of the campus  
4                   environment. I suspect the rest of  
5                   these are probably not changes that  
6                   amount to a whole lot. If you look  
7                   at how we compare to our peers:  
8                   Very close, a little low, a little  
9                   over, significantly lower, and a  
10                  little over. Here we are with the  
11                  seniors. Between '01 and '03, they  
12                  went up on every single one of the  
13                  five dimensions, went up fairly  
14                  dramatically there. And again, you  
15                  see we compare closely to seniors at  
16                  publics: Lower there, higher there,  
17                  close there, close there. About  
18                  400, 350 institutions participate in  
19                  the NESSI. This is a very large  
20                  database. Freshmen were asked to  
21                  rate the overall quality of  
22                  instruction by their faculty, their  
23                  TA's, the individual attention they  
24                  got from instructors, and the  
25                  willingness of faculty to meet with

61

1 students. These are interesting  
2 items because you would expect that  
3 if class size -- if the cohort size  
4 was impairing opportunities for our  
5 students with respect to faculty, if  
6 faculty were letting that happen, if  
7 faculty were saying, "I don't have  
8 time for you," we should see them on  
9 these kinds of items; but in fact,  
10 you don't. In fact, TA goes up a  
11 little; this goes down a little.  
12 Really no change here. Down a  
13 little bit here in terms of  
14 willingness to meet with faculty,  
15 but that's less than a tenth of a  
16 point. This suggests, again, to me  
17 very good work by the faculty in  
18 terms of being attentive to these  
19 increasing numbers of students. Now  
20 I want to shift gears. Here's  
21 another kind of comparison I want  
22 you to think about and give me your  
23 reactions to, as you've had time to  
24 study this. Connie and I tried to  
25 find, now, between fall 2001 and

62

1 subsequent semesters, those classes  
2 that had actually -- those sections  
3 that actually had had dramatic  
4 enrollment increases because we  
5 wanted to see what happens to a  
6 student who has had the experience  
7 of being in chemistry with this size  
8 versus the same chemistry course of  
9 this size. So here's what we did:  
10 We looked for those fall 2001  
11 classes that had at least 200  
12 students in them, and then we picked  
13 those that increased by at least 25  
14 percent; in other words, by an  
15 increase of at least 50 students in  
16 that section. And we did that at  
17 the one and two hundred level. At  
18 the three to five hundred level, we  
19 looked at classes that had at least  
20 an enrollment of 15, and we said:  
21 Let's look -- let's pick those that  
22 have increased by at least 50  
23 percent; in other words, gone from  
24 15 to at least 22 or 23 in their  
25 size. Here are the classes that



63

1 we're going to look at in terms of  
2 the impact of that. At the one and  
3 two hundred level, you're going to  
4 see some old favorites: Biology  
5 152, Chemistry 104, Comm. 101,  
6 Computer Science 101, History 104,  
7 Philosophy 120, Math 213, Physics  
8 231 and 241. At the three and five  
9 hundred level we had 28 courses that  
10 met the criteria of having at least  
11 15 students in '01 being taught  
12 again in -- what semester are we  
13 looking at here, Connie?

14 RAY: '03.

15 NIETZEL: '03? Being taught again in  
16 '03 and having at least a 50 percent  
17 increase in their enrollment. Those  
18 28 came from five colleges: Ag,  
19 Arts & Sciences, B & E, Education  
20 and Engineering. We actually did it  
21 for three semesters. We took seven  
22 items off of your course evaluation  
23 form to look to see what happens to  
24 the ratings of those courses that we  
25 deliberately selected as having the

1 largest enrollment growth for  
2 students, and it's going to be  
3 monotonous to look at this, but as  
4 we go across, you'll see at these  
5 one and two hundred levels, it  
6 really is associated with no  
7 changes, including overall quality  
8 of teaching and overall value of the  
9 course. Were students still  
10 evaluating the comments they got on  
11 graded papers the same? They were.  
12 Were papers being returned  
13 promptly? According to their  
14 ratings, they were. Were they  
15 participating in class or being  
16 encouraged to at the same level?  
17 According to their report, they  
18 were. What happens at the three to  
19 five hundred level? All right. The  
20 first thing that you will see here  
21 is that these scores are a little  
22 bit higher than the comparable  
23 scores on the table before. Not  
24 surprising. You see that in our  
25 teaching course evaluation form

65

1 across the years. Once again, as  
2 you go across the three semesters,  
3 these two representing 20 percent  
4 enrollment increases, you don't get  
5 any -- I'm sorry, not in this case.  
6 In this case, it's 25 percent or 50  
7 percent enrollment increases in the  
8 same course. You don't get any  
9 effects, according to the students'  
10 perception, of course, their rating  
11 of it. Here's our students'  
12 evaluations back in '02. Remember  
13 that's, now, they're commenting on  
14 their fall '01 semester. So again,  
15 you see the big change here in terms  
16 of the size. Their ability to write  
17 effectively between that level and  
18 these two semesters, to make  
19 effective oral presentations, to use  
20 statistics and math, to appreciate  
21 the arts, and to understand methods  
22 and signs. I think we'd be best to  
23 discount the increases and the  
24 decreases. They tend to be trivial  
25 in those comparisons. Now, what

1 about actual performance? Again,  
2 we're looking, going to compare this  
3 semester with the 20 to 25 percent  
4 increases in the grade  
5 distributions. Percent of A's, they  
6 go down a little bit; percent of  
7 B's, they go up a little bit. C's  
8 and passes, we put passes on this  
9 level, a slight increase. Slight  
10 decrease in the DO rate, which is --  
11 you want the DO rate to be as low as  
12 possible. That is not -- DO is not  
13 good in this case. Was that the --  
14 yeah, that's the one and two hundred  
15 level courses. Here's the three and  
16 five hundred level courses. Again,  
17 you'll find the grades a little  
18 higher. That's not to be, probably,  
19 of much surprise to you. A little  
20 change: A's go up, B's go down a  
21 little bit. The C and pass rate up  
22 a little bit with the larger  
23 classes; the DO rate no, change.  
24 Here's your retention rate. This is  
25 our 2000 and 2001. This is about

67

1                   2,900 students. This is about 3,000  
2                   students. We came in, in '02. We  
3                   had a big class. Retention went  
4                   down. We thought, "Uh-oh," and then  
5                   we had a bigger class and retention  
6                   went up. I think what we find here  
7                   is we can't find a relationship  
8                   between the size of the entering  
9                   freshman cohort and the retention.  
10                  Finally, here's the first semester  
11                  GPA of entering freshman, so we're  
12                  looking at their fall overall GPA.  
13                  Here I think you should be pleased  
14                  with this. You see three and a half  
15                  to four. That's probably -- a four  
16                  percent increase is something to be,  
17                  I think, particularly -- that's  
18                  particularly nice. Here this goes  
19                  up a little bit, down a little bit.  
20                  Now, as we get into this, down a  
21                  little bit, and now we're getting  
22                  into where you don't want to be:  
23                  Probation time, and you see these  
24                  actually are declining a little bit  
25                  with those larger classes. That is

1 the summary of the data with respect  
2 to the cohorts and how students in  
3 those cohorts have been doing, and I  
4 think it introduces the topic in a  
5 good way, for us to discuss how this  
6 squares with our own personal  
7 experiences. For me, at least at  
8 this presentation, it's another  
9 opportunity to credit you with  
10 having done a very good job in  
11 educating these students. But I  
12 also want, I think, to tip my hat to  
13 the fact that we've got really good  
14 students coming to the university.  
15 We now have a selective admission  
16 rate at this university that's  
17 pushing 92 percent. Four years ago,  
18 it was 84 percent, and that  
19 difference, I think, is translating  
20 into better classroom performance.  
21 It's probably part of what helps  
22 offset some of what you would  
23 anticipate might be negative effects  
24 of larger classes. So finally, I'd  
25 like to spend a little time talking

69

1                   about how necessity could lead us to  
2                   think about some new things, and I  
3                   want to talk about some academic  
4                   initiatives that are either underway  
5                   or will be underway this year and  
6                   then -- ten of those, as a matter of  
7                   fact. I'm going to go through them  
8                   real quickly, just so you're  
9                   familiar with them; some of them you  
10                  already are familiar with. And then  
11                  six proposals with respect to the  
12                  status or compensation or treatment  
13                  of faculty at the university that  
14                  I'd like to talk about. Some of  
15                  these, I think, will be very  
16                  noncontroversial for you and it  
17                  would be hard for me to imagine that  
18                  you wouldn't like them. Others are  
19                  deliberately provocative, and I  
20                  think it will probably lead to a  
21                  wider-spread opinion about those  
22                  proposals. But let's look first at  
23                  some new undergraduate -- new  
24                  academic initiatives. I want to  
25                  give you a little bit of an update

70

1 on these. A couple of them, I'm  
2 going to come back because I  
3 actually have slides on them to talk  
4 about. We have reorganized the  
5 Enrollment Management Team. We have  
6 brought it under an umbrella headed  
7 by Don Witt. It has had, I think, a  
8 very good impact, still under Phil  
9 Kramer's overall coordination. I  
10 think it's had a very good impact on  
11 the organization with respect to  
12 financial aid, scholarships, and  
13 recruitment of students. We believe  
14 we're getting good reviews back from  
15 the high school counselors about how  
16 this reorganization is impacting  
17 them. We've been to Northern  
18 Kentucky and to Louisville to meet,  
19 in each case, with about 40 to 50  
20 high school counselors, and I think  
21 that they see the better  
22 coordination in UK's recruitment  
23 efforts of students and see a  
24 continuation of very high-end  
25 students more and more often looking



71

1 to the University of Kentucky as an  
2 institution of choice for them. The  
3 Center for Undergraduate Excellence,  
4 I'm going to come back to next with  
5 a slide. Expanding the honors  
6 program: Kathi Kern is chairing, I  
7 think as many of you know, a  
8 committee that's been charged with  
9 calling for and evaluating some new  
10 proposals for our honors  
11 curriculum. It's motivated by three  
12 desires: One is to increase, a bit,  
13 the percentage of our very good  
14 undergraduates who can participate  
15 in honors, so to grow our capacity a  
16 bit, to expand the curriculum for  
17 honors. We've had a very good  
18 honors program centered in the  
19 humanities. We have not had any  
20 honors opportunity in the  
21 disciplines of the social sciences,  
22 the life sciences, the physical  
23 sciences. Hopefully, these  
24 proposals will allow us to expand  
25 the nature of honors, as well as how

72

1                   many students it touches. And then  
2                   finally, I would like to eventually  
3                   move to less of a reliance on  
4                   part-time instructors in our honors  
5                   program. We have had to rely a  
6                   great deal on part-time instructors,  
7                   which does not seem to me to be the  
8                   ideal way to populate an honors  
9                   curriculum. Performing  
10                  Undergraduate Studies Program:  
11                  We've had a self-study completed. I  
12                  know people always sort of take a  
13                  deep breath on this one because  
14                  you're so excited about the  
15                  prospects of doing this. We've had  
16                  a self-study completed, the first  
17                  periodic review team in USP's  
18                  history appointed, or nearly  
19                  appointed; I think maybe there's one  
20                  more member to go. We need to look  
21                  at, I think, how best to deliver a  
22                  high quality liberal arts core at  
23                  the University of Kentucky. It's  
24                  always a difficult discussion. It's  
25                  one where the temptations to yield

1 to departmentalism and factionalism  
2 and turf can often overwhelm the  
3 best general philosophy that might  
4 otherwise guide a USP or General  
5 Studies Program. But I hope that we  
6 can have a very good discussion  
7 about what should the underlying  
8 philosophy for USP be at this  
9 university. As I compare it to  
10 other USP or General Education  
11 programs at other universities, it's  
12 frankly like us; it's frankly no  
13 worse than most of them. But we  
14 have an opportunity to make it  
15 clearly better than many of them,  
16 and I think that's an opportunity we  
17 ought to try to grab, and I am  
18 hopeful that, as the review  
19 committee does its work in the  
20 spring, it will be focused primarily  
21 on directions that we can take USP,  
22 to improve the overall liberal arts  
23 core for our undergraduates. I want  
24 to mention this: Enhanced Teaching  
25 Resources for Undergraduate

1 Education, I call this TRUE. This  
2 is the program by which we have  
3 funded ten or eleven full-time  
4 instructors for regular title  
5 faculty lines to address some of the  
6 enrollment growth that we are  
7 experiencing in the undergraduate  
8 program. It is funded by the  
9 15-dollar surcharge that upper  
10 division students pay on their  
11 tuition. We've identified, with the  
12 competition, ten or eleven of these  
13 lines. I think a couple of them may  
14 actually even be present this  
15 spring. I would anticipate all of  
16 them would be here in the fall.  
17 Now, associated with this, I believe  
18 we will shortly hear from SACS that  
19 all of the remaining follow-up  
20 questions for the university have  
21 been satisfactorily resolved and we  
22 have no more SACS attention with  
23 respect to the recommendations that  
24 came from that review back in 2001.  
25 I believe this program -- the

75

1 presence of this program was very  
2 useful in addressing one of those  
3 primary SACS concerns, which was the  
4 overreliance we had on part-time  
5 instructors and TA's. It remains an  
6 issue here. In comparison to other  
7 universities like this, we rely more  
8 on PTI's than do other institutions,  
9 but I think this one has helped  
10 demonstrate some progress and got us  
11 out of whatever hot water we might  
12 have had with SACS over that  
13 particular lingering  
14 recommendation. The Committee on  
15 Academic Priorities: This is a  
16 follow-up to the Futures Committee.  
17 Remember the Futures Committee  
18 recommended 22 priority lines to be  
19 invested in: 13 on the North  
20 Campus, nine in the Medical Center.  
21 Provost's Office funded those  
22 faculty lines for up to three or  
23 four years, and those were a  
24 follow-on to the discussion of:  
25 What are the best opportunities in

1 the university in its research and  
2 education areas? This committee is  
3 chaired by Nancy Cox, Associate Dean  
4 for Research in the College of  
5 Agriculture. They were charged with  
6 evaluating how we're doing with  
7 those 22 lines, how were the hires  
8 going, did those priorities still  
9 make sense, but they also issued a  
10 call for a small number of  
11 initiatives where we would go after  
12 a senior investigator or a  
13 senior-investigator-led team; again,  
14 for an investment in which the  
15 provost office would put up three or  
16 four years of funding for the  
17 salaries of those leaders. And the  
18 intent here was to be looking at  
19 leaders that would have a capacity  
20 to be members in the Institute of  
21 Medicine or the National Academy of  
22 Engineering or the National Academy  
23 of Sciences or they've had great  
24 recognition in humanities. That  
25 committee has made five -- submitted

1 five proposals to me that they've --  
2 of about 15 that they thought were  
3 worthy of consideration. I'm going  
4 to be meeting with the deans and, I  
5 suspect, department chairs over the  
6 next two weeks to discuss  
7 initiatives in translational  
8 neuroscience as one of these  
9 initiatives, and environmental  
10 chemistry as a second one of these  
11 initiatives, and cultural  
12 transformational studies, largely  
13 centered in the Department of  
14 Geography, as the third. Whether  
15 the other two that are still in  
16 limbo are ones that we can fund, I'm  
17 not sure. I want to see how the  
18 colleges and I can come to an  
19 understanding about how we would  
20 fund these three priorities, all of  
21 which received very enthusiastic  
22 support from the Cox committee.  
23 Winter Intersession: We're about  
24 ready to roll on one that. I think  
25 we're at, Phil, 13?

78

1 KRAMER: 12.

2 NIETZEL: 12? Have had a very good  
3 initial response to this. Now, I  
4 define very good in the limited way  
5 that I'm going to make money on it  
6 and so are the colleges. This is a  
7 profit. We now have to look and  
8 see: How do students evaluate these  
9 courses after they've had them to  
10 see what their educational value is  
11 going to be. But at least in terms  
12 of the initial response to it, it  
13 has been terrific. Of the -- maybe  
14 you could very quickly, Phil, say of  
15 the 14 or 15 that we started with,  
16 most of them were sufficiently  
17 subscribed after four or five days  
18 to be profitable for the university.

19 KRAMER: Break even or better. And at  
20 this point, actually as of a week,  
21 across those 12 going courses, we  
22 have 419 students, for an average of  
23 just under 35 per class.

24 NIETZEL: So I'm going to be coming back  
25 to you to talk, after we get the



79

1 course evaluations from students, to  
2 talk about expanding the Winter  
3 Intersession because I think our  
4 experience is going to be the same  
5 as every other university that's  
6 done this will find, and that is  
7 that this is a good program.  
8 Students respond well to it. It  
9 addresses a variety of needs, not  
10 just for them, but also some good  
11 opportunities for faculty. Okay.  
12 Provost Work Group on International  
13 Affairs and Public Policy, that's  
14 chaired by Jeannine Blackwell.  
15 That's a group looking at  
16 opportunities for us to promote  
17 international affairs from a  
18 curricular standpoint as well as  
19 from an organizational standpoint.  
20 I believe Jeannine is going to be  
21 getting a report to me on behalf of  
22 her committee sometime in early  
23 January in terms of how this  
24 particular priority, which, as you  
25 know, is one of the 14 strategic

80

1 priorities for the university, can  
2 be advanced. There's also a Provost  
3 Work Group on Multimedia Studies.  
4 That's chaired by Bob Shay. It's a  
5 composition of the Fine Arts,  
6 College of Design, College of  
7 Engineering and Arts and Sciences  
8 and College of Communications. It's  
9 looking mainly at: What are our  
10 opportunities for developing visual  
11 media as an area of study and  
12 scholarship at UK? I hope to have a  
13 report from that group early in the  
14 spring as well. And then finally,  
15 the Commonwealth Collaboratives:  
16 This is an idea that I've proposed  
17 to the President about  
18 institutionalizing a connection  
19 between your research and university  
20 service. I'll come back to that on  
21 my last slide. Let me go back to  
22 this Center for Undergraduate  
23 Excellence. I believe that we  
24 should put in place a banner under  
25 which we would organize, not in a

81

1 formal reporting relationship, but  
2 in a kind of federation of units, a  
3 Center for Undergraduate  
4 Excellence. And I'll talk about the  
5 goals for that center in a minute,  
6 but basically the overall goal would  
7 be to have a coherent integration of  
8 these programs in an overall context  
9 or framework where we're promoting  
10 very, very high expectations and  
11 quality in terms of undergraduate  
12 education at this institution. So I  
13 am not proposing that we change  
14 reporting relationships here. I am  
15 proposing we create an umbrella  
16 under which we bring these seven or  
17 eight existing, very good programs  
18 together for the purpose of  
19 developing synergy. Now, shortly  
20 into the next semester, I think it  
21 will be possible for me to make an  
22 announcement that there's been a  
23 very, very generous investment by an  
24 individual in this center, and it  
25 will create, associated with this

1 center, chairs, professorships, and  
2 a research fund that will allow  
3 these programs and faculty  
4 affiliated with these programs to  
5 raise their sights about what we do  
6 for our undergraduates, to expand  
7 their programs a bit, and to really  
8 send a very strong signal to  
9 students throughout Kentucky, as  
10 well as outside the Commonwealth,  
11 that they will reap great benefits  
12 from the research university that UK  
13 aspires to be, experiencing those at  
14 the undergraduate level, not just at  
15 the graduate level. So Discovery,  
16 the Expanded Honors Program, and  
17 expansion of Living/Learning  
18 Communities, we are way behind on  
19 this one with respect to what other  
20 research universities are doing. In  
21 the attempt of being -- programming  
22 into the living arrangements for our  
23 undergraduates, an expansion of the  
24 Office of Undergraduate Research,  
25 which has a terrific publication,

1 Kaleidoscope, that Bob Tannenbaum  
2 directs. If you haven't seen it,  
3 it's really very, very good. When  
4 the donor that I approached about  
5 supporting this center read  
6 Kaleidoscope, he called back up and  
7 said, "I want to come down and talk  
8 with you. I didn't know the  
9 university had such a thing or that  
10 it had students doing that kind of  
11 work." We have not made sufficient  
12 use of study abroad as a priority  
13 for our undergraduates. We really  
14 need to double the percentage of  
15 students at UK who are studying  
16 abroad. We're quite low on that  
17 score. The Gaines Center for the  
18 Humanities can be a very nice, not  
19 endpoint, but a point near the end  
20 of the finishing of a really  
21 high-quality undergraduate student.  
22 It does serve a small number of  
23 students, but it is a premier  
24 program. I'll come back about the  
25 external scholarships. UK has done

1 well historically in promoting  
2 students for Marshalls, Trumans and  
3 Goldwaters, but we've begun to slip  
4 in the past couple of years, and  
5 that record has not been so good the  
6 past two years. And then  
7 intercollegiate debate has been  
8 under student affairs, somewhat  
9 isolated, I think, from some of --  
10 again, from these kinds of  
11 activities, and I'd like to see the  
12 possibility of bringing it into,  
13 again, the theme that the Center for  
14 Undergraduate Excellence would  
15 advance. Here are the goals that I  
16 would have for the center: To  
17 strengthen each of those individual  
18 programs through resources, to  
19 enhance the synergism among the  
20 programs, because we will have some  
21 sort of attempt to coordinate them  
22 with leadership, faculty  
23 leadership. Continue to improve the  
24 academic profile of the entering  
25 class, based on the conviction that

1                   that is part of what's making it  
2                   possible for to us educate more  
3                   students effectively. Have it shine  
4                   as a beacon of really outstanding  
5                   undergraduate education that  
6                   hopefully can begin to be moved into  
7                   some areas of the university not  
8                   under the center's organization.  
9                   Begin to groom our students again  
10                  for external scholarships. You  
11                  don't do this when they're juniors;  
12                  you do it when they're freshman.  
13                  And you tell them: You need to  
14                  study; you need to travel; you need  
15                  to study abroad. You need to begin  
16                  to do as a freshman what we have,  
17                  I'm afraid, been waiting until  
18                  they're juniors to talk to them, and  
19                  it's why we have begun to fall  
20                  behind in an area where, as late as  
21                  2001, this university received  
22                  recognition as a Truman Institution  
23                  because we had done so well with  
24                  Truman Fellows. We've had very few  
25                  since that time. And then prepare

1                   our best students for admission to  
2                   prestigious graduate/professional  
3                   schools. Those would be the six  
4                   overall goals for the center.  
5                   Faculty issues. All right. Let me  
6                   start with one. There's six of  
7                   these that probably won't be  
8                   controversial. We are in a period  
9                   where the overall pull for salary  
10                  increases has been a struggle;  
11                  you-all know that. I have proposed  
12                  to the President, and I believe he  
13                  is prepared to accept that for next  
14                  year we would increase the promotion  
15                  increments from 2,600 to 4,000 for  
16                  dollars for the promotion from  
17                  assistant to associate and from  
18                  3,800 to 5,500 from associate to  
19                  full. Our current promotion  
20                  increments here and here are way  
21                  behind what similar institutions do;  
22                  in fact, they're behind what  
23                  institutions with less prestige or  
24                  standing than UK does. And so I  
25                  think this is one that we simply



1                   have to find a way to afford and am  
2                   hopeful that the tentative agreement  
3                   from the President to do this will  
4                   be one that you'll see reflected in  
5                   the promotion increments from this  
6                   point forward. That's probably the  
7                   last totally noncontroversial one.  
8                   Sabbatical: I'd like to invite you  
9                   to think about a change in our  
10                  sabbatical policies. Here are data  
11                  on the sabbatical leaves at the  
12                  university, and you can see, it's  
13                  pretty steady. This includes Med  
14                  Center and North Campus. I merged  
15                  them for '01, '02, and '03 and in  
16                  '04 and '05, they're already  
17                  merged. You see that the vast  
18                  majority of our faculty are taking  
19                  semester leaves, where they receive  
20                  full pay for that semester. They're  
21                  not taking the full-leave sabbatical  
22                  where they get half pay. For a  
23                  variety of reasons, if possible, I  
24                  think that it is better for faculty  
25                  members to be able to take full-year

1 sabbaticals. It looks like it's  
2 going to be difficult, from a  
3 compensation point of view, for many  
4 people. It also is the case that if  
5 you're in a wet lab, you just may  
6 not be willing to give up a year out  
7 of that lab to take a sabbatical.  
8 But we have a policy for  
9 compensating faculty on sabbaticals  
10 that's very much like most other  
11 institutions: If you go on a full  
12 year's sabbatical, you get half  
13 pay. Maybe we could encourage to  
14 more faculty to take full-year  
15 sabbaticals if we increased the  
16 percentage of compensation you would  
17 get for that sabbatical, contingent  
18 on some agreed-upon prior  
19 performance. Let me give you an  
20 example: Instead of a full year at  
21 50 percent, maybe we ought to think  
22 a full year at two-thirds  
23 compensation if, in the prior X  
24 years, you taught in the honors  
25 program or if you taught in the

1                   Discovery seminar or if you  
2                   submitted some agreed-upon number of  
3                   extramural grants or maybe even if  
4                   you just applied for external  
5                   funding for partial support during  
6                   your sabbatical. The point I would  
7                   make is: It's probably going to be  
8                   better for most faculty's careers,  
9                   it's probably better for the  
10                  institution, if we can find ways to  
11                  encourage more of these. One way to  
12                  do it would be to improve the  
13                  percent of salary that the person  
14                  can get on that full year's  
15                  sabbatical and tie it to some  
16                  agreed-upon activities prior to it  
17                  that would translate into those  
18                  increments. Conceivably, one might  
19                  engage in enough of these  
20                  agreed-upon activities that you  
21                  could take a full year, 100-percent  
22                  paid sabbatical. I'd like to have a  
23                  discussion about tying some of the  
24                  goals we have for teaching and  
25                  research to improve compensation for

90

1                   your sabbatical year, making it more  
2                   likely that we can increase these  
3                   percentages. I must admit, I don't  
4                   know how these compare to other  
5                   universities, but it seems like we  
6                   are missing an opportunity for the  
7                   fullest kind of professional  
8                   development for the faculty when we  
9                   have what's obviously a pretty  
10                  stable two to one likelihood that  
11                  it's going to be that one-semester  
12                  leave as opposed to the full-year  
13                  leave. Faculty title series: I  
14                  think we ought to have a discussion  
15                  about whether it makes sense to  
16                  continue four tenurable title  
17                  series. We have regular title,  
18                  special title, extension, and  
19                  library. Those are all tenure track  
20                  title series. For the purpose of  
21                  this presentation, let me not talk  
22                  about library or extension. Is the  
23                  distinction between special and  
24                  regular title series continuing to  
25                  be a useful one? Is it one that we

91

1                   have to have? As I look at many  
2                   institutions, I see that they have  
3                   faculty who devote -- tenured  
4                   faculty who devote a higher  
5                   percentage of their time to  
6                   instruction than 40, 45, 50  
7                   percent. Very few of those  
8                   institutions have a special title  
9                   series to recognize that kind of  
10                  effort. Maybe it would be better  
11                  for to us look at ways to define  
12                  faculty effort -- particularly, now,  
13                  I'm talking about tenured faculty --  
14                  that would allow much more  
15                  differentiated distributions of  
16                  effort with respect to teaching and  
17                  research and maybe even with  
18                  service, which I'll come back to at  
19                  the very end. And what I'd like to  
20                  have is a discussion about whether  
21                  preserving the special title series  
22                  is really something, in the long  
23                  run, that's good for special title  
24                  faculty, is good for the  
25                  institution, and is necessary for us

1 as an institution to address what,  
2 admittedly, are going to be, between  
3 units, very different kinds of needs  
4 with respect to teaching effort and  
5 research effort. My proposal might  
6 be that there should perhaps be one  
7 path toward tenure and promotion at  
8 UK, and that's what one thinks about  
9 when you think about regular title  
10 series activity, a mixture of  
11 important scholarship, effective  
12 teaching, and useful service. But  
13 once someone is tenured, once  
14 someone reaches different points in  
15 his or her faculty career, we all  
16 know that our interests change, that  
17 our energy changes. Sometimes the  
18 energy changes away from the kind of  
19 intensive research that we've done,  
20 and we'd be grateful for some kind  
21 of period in which we would spend  
22 more time in instruction and in  
23 education and perhaps a little less  
24 time in research. That can be  
25 accomplished here, with a

1 meaningful, accurate -- I'll  
2 emphasize accurate, Davy --  
3 differentiated DOE. I'm not sure  
4 that the two title series, regular  
5 and special, have many more  
6 advantages left for us as an  
7 institution. I'd like to have a  
8 discussion about that. I think  
9 Scott Smith and Carol []Dietrich  
10 even are interested in having a  
11 discussion with respect to the two  
12 tenured title series they're  
13 responsible for, extension and  
14 library, but I believe that's going  
15 to be a more difficult one, perhaps,  
16 to merge into one regular title  
17 series that's tenurable. We can  
18 come back if there are questions  
19 about that, but what I really want  
20 to do here today is start the  
21 discussion and get people to think  
22 about this. There have been  
23 disadvantages for special title  
24 faculty -- you know that --  
25 associated with that status, and I

1 believe there are all kinds of ways  
2 we can handle people who want to  
3 stay in special title, who want to  
4 grandfather over to regular title,  
5 who are in the tenure stream right  
6 now, we can't change anything for  
7 them. Clearly, they would have to  
8 go through with the guidelines and  
9 criteria that have already been  
10 established for their position.  
11 Lecture faculty: There is some  
12 unfinished business I'd like us to  
13 address with respect to lecturers,  
14 and mainly I'd like us to treat them  
15 a bit better. I would like us to  
16 consider an opportunity for an  
17 advancement to some kind of -- have  
18 some kind of minimum career ladder  
19 of lecturer and senior lecturer  
20 where, after a certain number of  
21 years of very effective teaching,  
22 judged by the department, we could  
23 move those folks from lecturer to  
24 senior lecturer and have a  
25 commensurate bump in compensation



1 associated with that. I also think  
2 we ought to, as many universities  
3 do, consider the opportunity for  
4 multi-year appointments rather than  
5 year-to-year appointments for  
6 lecturers, to give a little more job  
7 stability and protection. Back in  
8 '97, we gave lecturers benefits.  
9 These two elements were also  
10 considered at that point. The  
11 President at that time decided not  
12 to do these two things. If you look  
13 at the University of Kentucky's use  
14 of instructional resources, we are  
15 about 10 to 12 percentage points  
16 behind other universities just like  
17 us, our benchmarks, so just like us  
18 or maybe better, in the use of these  
19 people: Full-time instructional  
20 staff delivering particularly lower  
21 division undergraduate courses. And  
22 I do think we ought to look at an  
23 improvement in the way these  
24 individuals are compensated and  
25 recognized in the university. I'm

1                   certainly not proposing anything  
2                   like tenure for these faculty. That  
3                   is not something that I would  
4                   advocate. I think we probably ought  
5                   to have departments recommend caps  
6                   on how many of their total  
7                   instructional faculty could hold a  
8                   lecturer position. And frankly, as  
9                   I have said to some of you, I'm not  
10                  so concerned that departments would  
11                  set the cap too low as I am too  
12                  high. Remember, these people are  
13                  teaching four-and-four course loads,  
14                  for the most part, making it  
15                  possible for us to, even at our  
16                  somewhat limited use of lecturers,  
17                  have 63 percent of our undergraduate  
18                  credit hours taught by full-time  
19                  faculty. Okay. This one's going to  
20                  maybe be a little more interesting  
21                  for you to think about: An  
22                  opportunity for accelerated  
23                  advancement. How useful is the rank  
24                  of Associate Professor? If we  
25                  looked at the amount of time that

1 faculty spent preparing a dossier  
2 for it, that departments spent  
3 evaluating it, and that area  
4 committees spent devoting scrutiny  
5 to it, we would say the Associate  
6 Professor rank is real important  
7 because we spend hundreds and  
8 hundreds of hours doing it. The  
9 vast majority of our faculty don't  
10 stay at the Associate Professor  
11 rank; they get promoted, eventually,  
12 to Full Professor. Is it worth it  
13 to have the Associate Professor rank  
14 in terms of the faculty tenure  
15 series? Let me suggest two  
16 alternatives for to us talk about.  
17 One is one we can already do. In  
18 discussion with the Senate Council  
19 on this, it was pointed out and I  
20 think the Senate Council had, if not  
21 unanimous, at least a consensus that  
22 this one is one that we could do and  
23 perhaps even seen cases in which we  
24 knew that the person who we were  
25 promoting from Assistant to

1 Associate Professor with tenure  
2 already met the criteria for Full  
3 Professor. There's nothing in our  
4 regulations that prevent us from  
5 promoting that person to Full  
6 Professor at that point, if they  
7 meet the criteria, other than  
8 tradition, other than that's just  
9 not the way we do it. There have  
10 been at UK, I believe, one or two  
11 examples that some of us old timers  
12 could think of in which faculty were  
13 promoted directly from Assistant to  
14 Full Professor and tenure. The  
15 critical decision is tenure. Is the  
16 rank of Associate Professor a useful  
17 one at this point? Would there be  
18 advantages to the institution to  
19 either begin to be -- encourage  
20 departments to look more favorably  
21 upon the promotion from Assistant to  
22 Full? Or should we even, then, go  
23 one step further and have a  
24 discussion about just eliminating  
25 that rank altogether? And at the

1                   time a person is promoted -- excuse  
2                   me, is tenured, they're promoted  
3                   from Assistant to Full Professor.  
4                   Now, I can anticipate what some of  
5                   the discussions would be, some of  
6                   the concerns. Would that be a  
7                   dilution of our standards, to do  
8                   that? I doubt it. Would it -- what  
9                   kind of signal would it send to  
10                  other universities? I think it  
11                  actually would send a very helpful  
12                  signal and might help us with  
13                  recruiting and retention, and it  
14                  would be something where UK would be  
15                  one of the institutions actually  
16                  doing something first for a change.  
17                  I'm sure it would result in freeing  
18                  up a lot of faculty time. Maybe  
19                  you-all like evaluating dossiers  
20                  from Assistant to Associate, knowing  
21                  that in 90 percent of those cases,  
22                  it's a way station before the person  
23                  eventually gets promoted to full.  
24                  My proposal would be that, if we did  
25                  away with the Associate Professor

100

1 rank, or if we made more aggressive  
2 use of the opportunity to promote to  
3 Full Professor, we'd give both bumps  
4 in terms of the increment for that  
5 promotion. They'd get the increment  
6 that they would have gotten to go to  
7 Associate, as well as to Full. So  
8 I'd like to have a discussion about  
9 that and see if people think this  
10 might not be worth -- certainly the  
11 first you can do, I'd encourage you  
12 to do it. When we have outstanding  
13 faculty, there's no reason to make  
14 them tread water at the Associate  
15 Professor rank if they already meet  
16 the criteria. But maybe we ought to  
17 think a little bit more boldly on  
18 that and have a discussion about  
19 whether the Associate Professor rank  
20 has become more trouble than it's  
21 worth with respect to your time and  
22 to our recognition of outstanding  
23 faculty. Okay. Last one, the  
24 Commonwealth Collaboratives: This  
25 is an idea that I'd like to propose

101

1 about institutionalizing a  
2 connection between scholarship and  
3 service. And basically what it  
4 would say is the following: The  
5 university, in its strategic plan,  
6 has 14 academic research priority  
7 areas. My proposal would be that  
8 for every one of those 14, we need  
9 to find one or two senior faculty  
10 leaders who are going to take and  
11 develop service activities for the  
12 good of the Commonwealth that would  
13 be tied to the strategic plan  
14 priority. Let me give you an  
15 example, which would be: Teacher  
16 preparation is one of our  
17 priorities. I'd say we already have  
18 a Commonwealth collaborative in the  
19 form of the special initiative we've  
20 done with Fayette County where 16 of  
21 the colleges are going to be helping  
22 Fayette County focus on two  
23 historically low-achieving primary  
24 schools to bring the achievement  
25 levels of those students up. I

1 think we ought to look at finding  
2 senior faculty who are at a point in  
3 their career where they have an  
4 expertise in a scholarly area and  
5 they are compensated, perhaps one  
6 month or two month's salary for  
7 those individuals who are on  
8 nine-month appointments, or in the  
9 case of faculty who are on 12-month  
10 appointments, an overload that  
11 compensates them for developing the  
12 service outreach, the service  
13 activities associated with each one  
14 of those 14 strategic plan  
15 priorities, demonstrating very  
16 clearly to the state that we don't  
17 give just lip service to service,  
18 that we actually want to have it  
19 integrated with the areas of  
20 research expertise that the  
21 university is going to claim will be  
22 ones where we have national  
23 leadership. So that's another area  
24 for to us discuss, as far as faculty  
25 opportunities, faculty leadership.



1                   Again, I think it would have to be  
2                   reserved for senior faculty, who  
3                   would have the credibility, the  
4                   time, the freedom, the interest to  
5                   do that kind of service  
6                   development. That's the end of my  
7                   show in terms of the slides. Ernie,  
8                   I don't know if you have any other  
9                   business or --

10                  CHAIR YANARELLA: We don't, but we'd  
11                   certainly like to give the senators  
12                   an opportunity to raise any  
13                   questions that they have about not  
14                   only the noncontroversial but  
15                   certainly the more provocative ideas  
16                   that he's offered. Jim?

17                  ALBISETTI: Jim Albisetti, History  
18                   Department. I would say the one you  
19                   said is noncontroversial is, for  
20                   people like me, highly  
21                   controversial, the salary  
22                   compression and increasing  
23                   increments is going to do -- what  
24                   are you going to do for people who  
25                   had total promotion raises of 1,000

1                   and 2,000 in the 1980's? It wasn't  
2                   400 percent inflation, but the  
3                   promotion rate has gone up 400  
4                   percent.

5                   NIETZEL: Yeah, you want to try to have  
6                   the biggest salary increase we can  
7                   have. But there's always been the  
8                   ability, Jim, to look back and say  
9                   someone now is getting more than I  
10                  did; therefore, I'm getting  
11                  screwed. We can't do that. We have  
12                  to -- if we have noncompetitive  
13                  increments associated with  
14                  promotion, we need to make them  
15                  competitive, just like we need to  
16                  make competitive, as best we can,  
17                  faculty salaries, and the goal is to  
18                  get to 90 percent of the mean. But  
19                  the fact is that it costs \$400,000,  
20                  or a little less, to fix the  
21                  promotion increment. It costs three  
22                  and half million dollars to do every  
23                  one percent with respect to the  
24                  overall faculty increase. So, you  
25                  know, any time that something gets

1 better, people who didn't have it  
2 that good in their history are  
3 likely to feel somehow  
4 disenfranchised, but that can't be a  
5 reason to not do it.

6 ALBISETTI: You're going to produce  
7 salary inversions of people that are  
8 going to be newly promoted to full  
9 professor earning more than those  
10 who've done, by merit rating, decent  
11 to good service for 15 years as a  
12 Full Professor and is now going to  
13 earn less than somebody who gets  
14 promoted next year. That's a  
15 wonderful boost of morale, Mike.

16 NIETZEL: Well, I'm going to advocate  
17 it, Jim, because it's the right  
18 thing to do. We are not  
19 compensating faculty at the level  
20 they need; I grant that. But it's  
21 not going to help the problem to  
22 continue to keep the salary  
23 promotion increments at rock-bottom  
24 levels where we have them now. It's  
25 a problem that we can afford to

1 fix. We can't afford, at this  
2 point, the 15 or 18 or 20 million  
3 that it would take to fix the  
4 overall faculty salaries. We've got  
5 to make as much progress as we can  
6 on that, but I don't think we can  
7 continue with an increase in  
8 promotion salaries that's been --  
9 that's really, frankly, pitiful.

10 CHAIR YANARELLA: Janet.

11 ELDRED: Yes. What about the FTL  
12 position? Because I feel very torn  
13 by them. I feel right now like they  
14 are the most stable part of our  
15 faculty. They are the people  
16 staying the longest, and that's  
17 troubling. And there are many of  
18 them, and I feel like sometimes that  
19 part of our faculty is growing and  
20 our regular tenure track lines are  
21 shrinking. And so we're unable to  
22 hold onto people at advanced ranks,  
23 and yet we're growing this FTL --

24 NIETZEL: Yeah, I'm glad you brought  
25 that up, because it gives me an

1 opportunity to clarify a couple of  
2 things. There are about, I think,  
3 120 full-time lecturers. The single  
4 largest group of them is in Arts and  
5 Sciences, for the obvious reasons  
6 that lecturers are useful -- most  
7 useful when you have multiple  
8 sections of lower division courses  
9 for them to teach. I think the next  
10 most frequent colleges are probably  
11 nursing, B & E, and maybe Comm. So  
12 my proposal, Janet, would be that we  
13 only convert -- I'm not necessarily  
14 talking about more lecturers. What  
15 I was talking about here was  
16 treating the lecturers we had a  
17 little bit better. But if we do add  
18 more lecturers, they should be as a  
19 result of converting PTI's into  
20 lectureships as opposed to  
21 converting tenured track positions  
22 into lectureships. It's a pretty  
23 easy thing to monitor.

24 ELDRED: I would say we need rollbacks  
25 on those, that when a quarter of

1                   your faculty is FTL, that what you  
2                   need is not -- that you need to  
3                   start to convert some of those FTL's  
4                   into -- to find a way to do  
5                   something to do with instruction so  
6                   you can start to roll those back.

7                   NIETZEL: The problem that you have,  
8                   though, Janet, of course, they teach  
9                   eight lower division classes.

10                  ELDRED: Oh, I know the problem.

11                  NIETZEL: If we're talking about a  
12                   regular title faculty position, we'd  
13                   be lucky to have, in a year, that  
14                   person teach one. So what will  
15                   happen, if you roll back lecturers,  
16                   is you roll back the part-time  
17                   instructors; you don't roll back the  
18                   regular title faculty unless you're  
19                   prepared to basically tell SACS: We  
20                   lied to you; we are not going to  
21                   decrease our reliance on TA's and  
22                   part-time instructors.

23                  ELDRED: Or unless we're willing to look  
24                   at the data and to say: Maybe we  
25                   need to look again at large classes

1 and to think in terms of offering  
2 instruction through those venues.

3 NIETZEL: Again, just so you're clear,  
4 what I proposed here was not  
5 increasing the lecturers. I am  
6 proposing that we treat them better  
7 because I do see them as critical to  
8 our ability to hold the line against  
9 the use of more part-time  
10 instructors. This should not be  
11 seen, I don't believe, as a choice  
12 between lecturers and regular title  
13 faculty. It's a choice between  
14 lecturers and part-time instructors.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mike, if I may,  
16 just because -- the number, to  
17 verify quickly, it's 77.

18 NIETZEL: 77, sorry. 77 is the total  
19 number of lecturers?

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

21 NIETZEL: Okay.

22 CHAIR YANARELLA: Kaveh?

23 TAGAVI: What percentage of student  
24 credit hours, as of now, are taught  
25 by noncareer faculty?

110

1 NIETZEL: Well, by noncareer, do you  
2 mean not full-time, because that's  
3 the only way --

4 TAGAVI: Lecturers, instructors, PTI's.

5 NIETZEL: Lecturers are counted as  
6 full-time faculty.

7 TAGAVI: I'm sorry. I said noncareer; I  
8 meant excluding regular faculty,  
9 (inaudible,) extension and library.

10 JONES: Nontenure.

11 TAGAVI: Nontenured is right, yeah.

12 NIETZEL: 62 percent of undergraduate  
13 credit hours are taught by full-time  
14 faculty. That does include  
15 lecturers. That's the only  
16 statistic I can give you, because I  
17 don't know how to break it out. I  
18 don't have it here in front of me.  
19 But 62 percent of undergraduate  
20 credit hours -- I think that's  
21 right -- taught by full-time  
22 faculty. That's regular title;  
23 that's lecturers; that's  
24 instructors. If you compare us to  
25 institutions, to our benchmarks,



111

1                   that figure is closer to 73 to 75  
2                   percent. And it's not because  
3                   they're tenured faculty teaching  
4                   them; it's because they make a much  
5                   greater use of lecturers than PTI's  
6                   compared to us. Our full-time  
7                   tenured faculty teach at -- across  
8                   all the departments, you know,  
9                   you're going to have ups and downs  
10                  on that -- they're teaching loads  
11                  comparable to what you'd find at  
12                  other institutions. The difference  
13                  is the use of PTI's and TA's versus  
14                  lecturers. We're much more likely  
15                  to use the former than the latter  
16                  than our counterparts.

17                 YATES: I have two comments on different  
18                  topics. The first has to do with  
19                  your proposal for eliminating the  
20                  position or the rank of Associate  
21                  Professor. I probably have favored  
22                  that for a long time, because there  
23                  are basically only two things that  
24                  can happen once a person becomes an  
25                  Associate Professor: One is that

1                   they end up their career there and  
2                   they're embittered, or if they do  
3                   get promoted, it's always two years  
4                   later than they think it should have  
5                   been. But one of the things that's  
6                   going to happen, I suspect, is that  
7                   there's going to be greater scrutiny  
8                   of the whole promotion process, so  
9                   you're probably going to find fewer  
10                  people who are actually promoted if  
11                  this is enacted. The other thing  
12                  that I think you didn't mention was  
13                  what you gave us, in terms of all  
14                  these lovely figures that Richard  
15                  put together, is that this is just a  
16                  snapshot. We've seen the first  
17                  wave. There are going to be more  
18                  waves and bigger waves pounding the  
19                  beaches, and it's almost impossible  
20                  to comprehend that, with decreasing  
21                  faculty and increasing number of  
22                  students to teach, that if we're now  
23                  going to continue to do this kind of  
24                  job that takes time away from  
25                  something else, and the only thing

1                   that I can see that is there to give  
2                   is time away from instruction.

3           NIETZEL:  There aren't decreasing  
4           faculty, first of all.  The number  
5           of full-time faculty teaching at UK  
6           this year is probably a few more  
7           than it was last year, so the number  
8           of faculty teaching here has not  
9           gone down.  I don't think we can  
10          have enrollment increases -- I mean,  
11          basically, with this next class, if  
12          it's at 38, let's say, which would  
13          be about 200 smaller than we did  
14          this fall, which is, I think, a  
15          reasonable number to shoot for, I  
16          think that's your steady state at  
17          that point.  Then you'll be looking  
18          at entering classes that essentially  
19          are exchanging for a class of about  
20          the same size that should be  
21          graduating.

22          YATES:  But for the three and four and  
23          five hundred level courses, it's too  
24          early to see much of an impact.

25          NIETZEL:  It is.  Well, I don't think it

1 is for the 300 level courses. Your  
2 2002 students are now in their third  
3 year. They should be -- third-year  
4 students should be taking three and  
5 four and occasionally five hundred  
6 level courses. So you haven't seen  
7 very much there, but I acknowledge,  
8 and that's what I tried to emphasize  
9 here, this is a first look at it.  
10 We do need to look at what happens  
11 at the 500 level, but I don't think  
12 you've seen it translated into much  
13 change at the three and four hundred  
14 level at this point. And I think we  
15 can handle a class of about 3,800 as  
16 a steady -- as a steady state. I  
17 think we could look at one more bump  
18 in selective admissions, obviously  
19 not for next year; we're set for  
20 next year, but for the year after,  
21 maybe we ought to -- given the  
22 quality of student that's interested  
23 in coming here, maybe we ought to  
24 look at that again. That's a  
25 much -- that's a Senate prerogative,

1 to look at selective admissions  
2 requirements, and it may be time to  
3 take one more look at it. Because  
4 the majority of students that are  
5 being -- not the majority; nine out  
6 of ten that are being admitted now  
7 are admitted automatically.

8 CHAIR YANARELLA: We have time for one  
9 more question, please.

10 GARRITY: Mike --

11 SCOTT: I'm sorry; your name, please?

12 CHAIR YANARELLA: Name, please?

13 GARRITY: Tom Garrity, Medicine. The  
14 quality of the student experience,  
15 by your data, hasn't fallen off in  
16 any really remarkable way. Do the  
17 data that you have on faculty  
18 research productivity give any  
19 indication that the increasing  
20 number of students is taking a toll  
21 on that part of the total campus  
22 productivity and community?

23 NIETZEL: Well, you've got the same data  
24 I do. We can look at, first of all,  
25 research grants. They are up last

1 year, 238, in terms of total  
2 extramural grants. I believe that  
3 was about a 15-percent increase.  
4 This year, as through the end of  
5 November, they're up 15.5 percent.  
6 Now, that's just one measure, but  
7 that is a meaningful one because you  
8 tie that back, basically, to the  
9 effort and the time that faculty  
10 have to write proposals. If you  
11 look at doctoral and postdoctoral  
12 degree enrollment and productivity,  
13 those are both up as well. Those  
14 are proxies, to some extent, for  
15 research and scholarship. So, you  
16 know, we need to think: What other  
17 measures might we want to look at to  
18 see if there is some kind of harmful  
19 impact on research time. But the  
20 ones that occur to me, just quickly  
21 here, we see very good productivity  
22 and very good increases, actually.  
23 I don't know. Maybe you've got some  
24 other ones that we should be looking  
25 at, and I think it would be

1 important to do that, because you  
2 certainly don't want that to be the  
3 effect. And again, the reason I  
4 don't think it is, is that what I  
5 think has happened with this -- with  
6 these large classes and why I don't  
7 think you see the student experience  
8 changing very much is the student  
9 experience hasn't changed very  
10 much. Suppose in 2001 you have five  
11 sections -- I'll use the course I'm  
12 familiar with -- five sections of  
13 Psych. 100, and you have 200  
14 students in each of those five  
15 sections, which we've taught for 20  
16 years, 30 years that way. Now we  
17 probably have six sections with 200  
18 students in it. The individual  
19 student's experience hasn't changed  
20 a bit. That's a very different way  
21 to handle enrollment growth than  
22 saying 200 goes to 300. And I think  
23 we probably have the majority  
24 solution of the former type rather  
25 than of the latter type. So you

1                   have a larger number of big  
2                   sections, but you don't have  
3                   students necessarily enrolled in  
4                   sections that have increased  
5                   dramatically in their size where you  
6                   would get the effect. However, we  
7                   tried to find those, and as you can  
8                   see, we didn't see that those were  
9                   associated with anything that we  
10                  could, at this point, find to be a  
11                  very negative from the students'  
12                  point of view.

13                 CHAIR YANARELLA: Okay. I think that's  
14                   it.

15                 NIETZEL: Okay. Thank you very much.

16                   (APPLAUSE.)

17                 CHAIR YANARELLA: Thank you so much.  
18                   Before you leave, let me mention two  
19                   things: Given the heavy accent by  
20                   the Provost on issues relating to  
21                   the impact of enrollment increases,  
22                   I'd like to point out that the --  
23                   one of the major concerns of the  
24                   Senate Council which began in our  
25                   discussions at our summer retreat



1 had to do with the faculty role in  
2 enrollment management. And Larry  
3 Grabau is chairing a Senate Ad Hoc  
4 Committee on the role -- the faculty  
5 role in enrollment management, which  
6 I think should be an important  
7 lightning rod for concerns that  
8 faculty have with regard to the  
9 impact of enrollment on their  
10 classroom and seminar work.  
11 Finally, let me again offer you best  
12 wishes for the holiday and a  
13 reminder of our holiday reception  
14 tomorrow from 3:00 to 5:00 in the  
15 public room of the Main Building.  
16 Please stop by if only for a short  
17 while. Thank you, and please have a  
18 good winter break.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF KENTUCKY)

2 COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

3

4 I, ROBYN BARRETT, CSR, the undersigned Notary  
5 Public in and for the State of Kentucky at Large,  
6 certify that the foregoing transcript of the  
7 captioned meeting of the University of Kentucky  
8 Senate is a true, complete, and accurate transcript  
9 of said proceedings as taken down in stenotype by  
10 me and later reduced to computer-aided  
11 transcription under my direction, and the foregoing  
12 is a true record of these proceedings.

13 I further certify that I am not employed by nor  
14 related to any member of the University of Kentucky  
15 Senate and I have no personal interest in any  
16 matter before this Council.

17 My Commission Expires: November 24, 2007.

18 IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my  
19 hand and seal of office on this the 13th day of  
20 January, 2005.

21

22

23

24

25

---

ROBYN BARRETT, CERTIFIED SHORTHAND  
REPORTER, NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE AT  
LARGE, KENTUCKY