

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

April 11, 2011

3:00 p.m.

* * * *

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
WILLIAM T. YOUNG LIBRARY AUDITORIUM
401 Hilltop Avenue
Lexington, Kentucky

* * * *

HOLLIE I. SWANSON, CHAIRWOMAN
DEBRA ANDERSON, VICE CHAIR
KATE SEAGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN
SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR
ANN E. CHASTANG, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

SWANSON:

Good afternoon. Welcome to the April 11th, 2011 University of Kentucky Senate meeting. I'd like to welcome everyone, including our special guests. We have our Board member, the Chair, Britt Brockman. Dr. Brockman is managing partner of the John Kenyon Eye Institute and a partner of the Novamed Ambulatory Surgery Center. We have Joe Heard, a practicing lawyer who specializes in tax, estate planning, and elder law. He has also been a visiting Professor of Law at the University

Page 1

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
of Kentucky and University of Iowa.
We have Pam May. Pam has also her
own law firm and specializes in
health law. She teaches at the
Pikeville College School of
Osteopathic Medicine. We have Myra
Tobin. Myra is a part of our
presidential search committee and
she has -- is retired as Managing
Director of Marsh and Leeman
Company (unintelligible) insurance
brokerage firm. We have Taylor
Cox, who is our student
representative on our presidential
search committee. And we have Lee,
that we see often, which a good
thing. Lee is our faculty
representative on the search
committee. We have Joe Peek who is
our faculty representative on the
Board. And we have Everett
McCorvey who is a faculty member of
the Board. We have the Chair of
the presidential search committee,
Jim Stuckert. He is the past
Chairman and CEO of Hilliard Lyons.
Welcome, Jim. And we have, of
course, Sheila Brothers who is our
staff representative, welcome.
This is our first faculty
perspective, and so we will see how
we go. The first thing that we
talked about when we thought about
giving a faculty perspective is why
is the perspective and the faculty
(unintelligible.) well, to look at
that question, we first looked at
how a university is measured with
respect to its metrics. And we've
noticed that I have to stand in
front of the microphone. We've
noticed that most university
quality metrics are directly
related to the quality of the
faculty; that because of our tenure
and our retention, faculty provides
an institutional memory and our
longevity. We're on the front
line. We interact regularly with
the students, with our funding
agency, and with the community. I
also turned to the words written in
a recent manuscript that is now
available on the Ace website. And
this is entitled "The Innovative
University." And here the author
states that traditional
universities benefit from having
invested heavily and getting the
right people on the institutional
bus. We have heard that bus thing
before (unintelligible.) That's
what they're referring to. They

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
also state that the tenure process assures intellectual capacity and work ethic. The compensation level means that most professors have put the love of discovery, memory, and mentoring ahead of financial (unintelligible.) I also turn to -- further they state that the typical university has a team of remarkable capability and commitment. Its potential for innovation is vast. In considering the future of our institutions, they go on to state that maintaining individual commitment while changing the fundamental aspects of the university's DNA requires an equally high level of commitment from the institution. I also turn to the words of former Chancellor Beardoll. And this was in 1998. He's addressing Texas A&M and their concern about the status of a flagship university. So this is a flight paper that where he states that a flagship campus requires internationally recognized and competitive faculty. The institutional support is not merely made possible by the herding of undergraduates into large graduate classes with graduate instructors. The institutional support emphasizes the virtuous circle of research advance and teaching (unintelligible.) The institutional support guarantees that student teacher ratios that are comparable to those at the best universities in the country and that institutional support requires money. Money for higher salaries. Money for high quality research. And money for low student faculty ratios. Let me first then describe to you the process by which we obtained this faculty perspective. We started soliciting input from the faculty in February, March 2011. I contacted our hard-working chairs of our senate communities. I contacted the college faculty councils. I contacted Associate Provost Heidi Anderson who has participated in this coach study. This is a collaborative on an academic careers and higher education. It was initiated by researchers at Harvard in a national survey. And the intent of this survey is to understand the job satisfaction of our pre-tenure colleagues. We participated in

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
2008, 2009. I also interacted with Robin Peace who is here, and she provided the preliminary report for the workplace. Now the process itself provided a number of opportunities. First, a number of you asked that this be a regular annual event. You also made a number of comments that have been procreated in here. We also looked at a number of colleges that realized they did not have a faculty council. For example, the College of Pharmacy has now incorporated their faculty council into their college teaching plan. And last but not least, I have another opportunity to pick on Joe Peek. Additional input is welcome. We plan on distributing our final report in June 2011. What will we do with this report? Many people ask me that question. The answer is that we will use this to set our goals for our upcoming senate committees, and then we'll also use it to begin our dialogue with our incoming president. I have distributed this perspective into different divisions based on our faithfulness and based on our different missions. And so first let's look at our students and student (unintelligible.) The strengths are indicated as follows: We note that there are improvements due to our general ed reform. And as you all know, we'll be implementing gen ed in the fall of 2011. Emphasis on intellectual inquiry, informational literacy, and regular program assessments are strengths of this program. We also know that improvements have been made to the transfer processes. This included improvements in the improvements, admissions, and communications with KCPCS. There have been improvements in the transfer equivalency processes. This has been in direct response to our concerns expressed by our students, our parents, and our lawmakers. Weaknesses, the faculty note that we're concerned that we have an over-reliance on the tuition budget. Some of our classrooms and laboratories facilities are overcrowded. Some are outdated. We have a high student teacher ratio in some of our classes. We're also concerned that the enrollment pressures

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
encourage faculty to cut back on active learning techniques in the classroom. And we recognize there is a need for greater faculty involvement in the evaluation of transfer purposes. We're also concerned about the UK's decline in external rankings. We question whether this is indicative of a decline in the stature of undergraduate programs. We worry whether this would threaten the goal of our Top 20 status. Let's now turn to teaching. What we note is that the quality of faculty is high. Our junior faculty appreciates that the upper limits on teaching obligations free them to get started on their research mission. They also appreciate the availability of travel funds, but these travel funds are very important for them to increase their teaching effort, increase their research effort, and also for them to gain the national recognition that's required for them to obtain tenure. We also note that a number of major classroom renovations have been made and are ongoing. So, for example, in the College of Nursing, they have one hundred computer classroom that is going to be in place. We are concerned, however, that there's inadequate infrastructure for online learning, development, and delivery. We're also concerned about decreasing financial support of the library, how that will affect our teaching and research mission. What about teaching administration? And so by teaching administration I mean the activities that go on in this senate body. For strengths, we've noted that there is a high commitment of quality that is demonstrated by staff, faculty, and administration. Now this weaknesses -- and this came right out of our senate committee -- the senate approval processes are inefficient, lengthy, and plagued by poor communication. It stymies innovative and creative teaching; it undermines trust and faculty governments. We really need to take this seriously. As you know, we've already heard from Dr. Anderson that we've working and the document handling system. We've met with IT. We have the full

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
support of the Provost on this. He has asked IT to put this as their number one priority. And so the plan now is to roll this out in August of 2011. And so what we'll be needing is some faculty involvement in that and what the IT person told us specifically, finds some faculty that know how to break processes. So if that is in your skills set, let me know. We are also in the process of gathering data so that we can understand each step in the process. Where is the value added? Where is the compliance breaking down? And what do we need to do at each step? And so I'm meeting with the different councils. We'll also be setting up a committee, and we'll be looking at templates to solidify the policy, et cetera. And so all of these are in process right now. Let's turn to discovery. And by discovery I mean our research program. Our research committee notes that we have a diverse number of graduate programs. We offer one hundred fifty-three graduate programs on this campus. A high number of these are nationally recognized. The National Research Council ranks them within the top fifty in the nation. Our research administrators have been working very actively and collaboratively with us to improve the processes associated with our research programs. Here are our concerns. We're concerned about decreasing graduate enrollment. We have difficulty in recruiting high quality graduate students. We're also concerned about the decreasing availability of funding for stipends to pay these students with and the severe pay disparities across the campus. We're also concerned about excess emphasis on regular (unintelligible) compliance. This has resulted in severe, adversarial faculty-staff relationships. And, again, it also stymies innovation. We have inconsistent veterinary support and oversight of (unintelligible) programs, and in some areas we have very poor laboratory facilities. We're concerned about dwindling institutional support. This is the support that allows our new faculty to get started on our research. Support that allows us to replace

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
our aging equipment. There's been changes in our indirect formulas. This is how much money the colleges get back from the overall University. We're concerned about apparent non-transparency and limited awareness on behalf of the faculty of the grants management process. And we're concerned about poor dissemination of policy and regulatory changes. What about the faculty body? We note that we have a very collegial environment, and this is a tremendous strength. This was even noticed by one of our dean candidates in the College of Medicine. He noted that just because of the way the committee interacted, he could tell that we were a very collegial environment. In the work life survey, the faculty reported that almost seventy percent are very satisfied with their faculty positions here at UK. Almost seventy percent of faculty are highly committed to UK's teaching mission. Our junior faculty commends us for our informal mentoring. And we should also take note that unlike other research (unintelligible) universities, we have not had furloughs. We're concerned about the decreased ratio of tenure track to non-tenure track faculty. And many are concerned with limited parking and lack of childcare. We have compensation issues. There is pay inequity. It's particularly between the teaching and the administrative faculty. The salary compression has a new faculty come in with higher salaries and the existing faculty salaries being stagnant. There's overall low salaries. We note that teaching excellence as compared to research excellence is not similarly supportive. So, for example, a successful researcher has the opportunity to obtain (unintelligible) scholarships. And these similar types of scholarships are not available to teachers who are in that excellent caliber. What about faculty administrative matters? We note that there's an increased role for faculty in decision-making processes that are related to academic matters, but the faculty have become more engaged in sharing government processes. Our junior faculty

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
particularly note that a number of our policies with respect to their performance and reviews, stop the clock policy, et cetera, are very effective. We note a number of weaknesses, however. The consultation with faculty needs improvement. Decision-making is better equipped and could be improved if we include everyone within the entire campus. At times we note there's poor dialogue and lack of trust. There's a lack of accountability and transparency at all levels and there's a perceived lack of administrative support for faculty and students. So when I look at this slide, one thing that comes to mind is again poor communication. Some of these comments specifically refer to your deans. And when I talked to the Provost about this, it became apparent that the expectation of provost for the deans and the expectation for the faculty are two different things. And so one of the things that I would encourage us to do is start asking questions. Ask a dean what does a dean do. I started asking this question about five years ago, and I found myself in the office of Dean J. Herman. And he asked me well, would you like to shadow me for a year, and so I did. I spent a year learning about our interactions with the Corrections Department. Learning about our interactions with the development office. We participated in workforce planning for the new hospital. I went on hospital rounds with him. I held my breath when he quizzed the graduate students and the medical students and the pharmacology. But we all passed. We went to Frankfort to talk to lawmakers. They asked me what department I was in and I said sales. He said the College of Medicine does not have a sales department. But it was a wonderful experience. We wrote it up and presented it at a national AA of CD. And, finally, the faculty note that there's an unwillingness of administration to test athletic's budget for greater contribution to the general fund and their concern that our high emphasis on athletics and health care enterprise model may overshadow and may perhaps threaten

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
academic success.

(Unintelligible.) We're concerned about the decreased commitment to funding and all fronts, our state support, our national support, particularly with respect to our NIH and NSF research fund. We're concerned that there may be a lack of vision. We question whether the resources are sufficient for us to be able to reach top twenty. We're also concerned with our apparent lack of emphasis. What is our UK brand? What is our greatest strength with respect to our academics? We're really concerned about our student retention and in particular the faculty are concerned about our current policy of recruiting all students versus recruiting the best and the brightest. The faculty note that we have a number of opportunities and we offer the following suggestions. We suggest that UK should be the primary destination for the best students in the Commonwealth. There's a number of mechanisms that we could use to make this happen. We could increase investments in our Honor's programs to attract Kentucky's best and brightest. We can offer more competitive scholarships to keep them here in the Commonwealth. We could increase our focus on the core, and by the core the faculty means UK's undergraduate education mission. We could also share our teaching mission across the colleges and specifically what the faculty noted is teaching from the College of Medicine and College of Arts and Science. We could better explode the synergies among student learning faculty expertise and practical experiences. So what this means is that we could better take advantage of opportunities within the public sector, for example, city government and private industry and bring those experiences into the classroom. Take the classroom experiences out to the community. We need to develop additional resources to support teaching (unintelligible) missions. We need to develop good laboratory practice programs for animal care. And so for the biomedical researchers what this means is that this would allow us to be competitive for private

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
funding. We need to increase our educational and communication efforts to enhance the research mission. And we need to provide more incentives for interdisciplinary collaborations because we need to be more interdisciplinary in our nature, in our teaching mission, and in our research mission in order for us to be nationally competitive. We also need to establish an employment ombuds office to informally resolve conflicts. And as you know, we have that committee ongoing that is exploring the feasibility of that. And we would really like to enhance the awareness of (unintelligible) very high quality of work study and life in all recruiting efforts. I'd like to offer you a few final comments. First, when we think of who we are, we typically have very high expectations. We have high expectations for ourselves, for our students, and our superiors. But when our expectations exceeds our realities, the writer Parker Palmer calls this the tragic gap. The tragic gap is when we feel that that next challenge is insurmountable. And so what we need to remind ourselves is that our reality is what C.S. Lewis describes as it doesn't. So if it feels like it doesn't, it's supposed to feel like it doesn't. We need to question everything. And I know I really don't need to tell this crowd this. But we need to question everything. And we need to expect the best answers. But when we question, we need question in an open style, collaborative and constructive manner. And, finally, then we need to maintain our focus and ask ourselves why we're really here. Our focus should be student learning and discovery; faculty learning and discovery; community learning and discovery. And I suggest by keeping on that focus, we can best be able to improve the Commonwealth. Thank you.
Questions or comments?

SPEAKER:

I thought it was excellent, my comment.

SWANSON:

Thank you. Other comments? Dr. Brockman, the chair is yours.

BROCKMAN:

Thank you, Chair Swanson. It's really interesting because I was thinking back to 1982, I was
Page 10

actually student body president here at the University, and we brought a superstar called Hunter S. Thompson to campus. And I'll never forget going to the airport and picking up Hunter Thompson and bringing Hunter to right across the Memorial Coliseum to give a talk to three thousand fans. And, you know, Hunter Thompson, I was expecting some opening comments, and he walked up to the podium and said are there any questions? Three hours later we finished. And I've always wanted to do that, but alas, today is not going to be one of those opportunities. So if you'll -- but I do want to thank you very much for having us here today. It's an exciting time, but it's also a historic time, and I would defy you to tell me the last time you've seen this many of your Trustees sitting in this room or any of your Trustees except for your faculty and staff sitting in this room. I'm off of comments for a little while, but simply to say this is a historic time in that we are sitting here. As a matter of fact, I'm sitting here scared to death. We've got quorum and I don't know what to do about that by statute. But anyway, I'm going to say we have only nine Trustees here. So we don't have a quorum so we're fine. But as many of you know, we just came from a meeting of the presidential search committee, and the committee today, as we had hoped, narrowed the field of candidates for UK's twelfth president to a much smaller reduced field. And we'll get into that in just a little bit. We remain on track with our ambitious time line for selecting one -- someone in early May with a start date of July the 1st. I want to thank again Professor Swanson for her timely and appropriate comments. Her leadership as part of the search process has been instrumental. We depend on her in a profoundly important way and will continue to do so in the weeks ahead. Her comments reinforce to us the partnership among the Board of Trustees, senior administrators, and the faculty and the governments and operation of the University of Kentucky. We have an agreement that we shall meet prior to each

Page 11

board meeting to discuss issues that are important to you so that no disconnect exists between you and us the Board. And I assure you that the members of the Board and I understand and appreciate the fundamental necessity of shared governments, particularly at this moment in this university's history. Four serve on the thirteen person search committee including Professor Swanson. Their institutional knowledge, their understanding of higher education in a broader national context and their commitment to this university have been instrumental to this process. The leadership they have provided throughout this process is why we have invited them to be part of the Board meetings in a few weeks in which we will select a preferred candidate for the presidency. It is recognition of the fact that your involvement and your support will determine not only the future success of our next president but of this institution which we all serve. And that's what I want to talk with you about a few moments this afternoon; the future of our institution; how important is this moment. Well, we've only had twelve moments like this in our nearly one hundred fifty year history to choose a president. To that end I want to discuss two issues briefly that I believe frame the challenges that lie ahead and then engage in a give and take with you this afternoon. First I want to insure you that you have the information you need about the time line that we have for the next few weeks in selecting a new president. No process is perfect. This one certainly is not perfect. But I believe that as a governing Board, we have been committed to an appropriate and delicate balance. A balance between engaging the campus community, particularly faculty, and insuring that we have a process that will allow us to select and retain the best possible president to lead this university at a critically important moment in our history. Second, I want to discuss some of the challenges, and, yes, some of the opportunities that will determine how we fare during that critical moment. How we deal with those challenges; how

Page 12

a president partners with you on them will determine our future success. We will either stagnate or regress in the face of significant economic challenges or we will be creative in finding new ways to continue to move forward. A new president will play an important and large role in determining how we do. But I would submit the partnership he or she forges with you ultimately determines the president's success in UK's future. The time line, with the selection of finalists this afternoon we are now moving into the last and most important phase of the search process. On Saturday, April 30th, our Board and your faculty members on the search committee who we have invited to join us will meet near Cincinnati to review the resumes and vetting conducted with respect to our finalists. We will begin interviewing finalists that day. On Sunday, May the 1st we will interview the remaining finalists throughout the day. That afternoon we hope to be in a position to select a preferred candidate and make a brief announcement. On Monday May the 2nd the candidate and his or her spouse will be on campus all day for visits and to provide an opportunity for feedback to the Board. We will be working with the Senate to sponsor a forum for faculty. A meeting will be held with student leaders and we will discuss with the staff senate sponsorship of a blog as well. Following those forums, we're working on a survey instrument that will allow for immediate feedback. We already conduct some elections on this campus, staff, senate, and student government elections are conducted online, for example. So we have a mechanism that insures confidentiality of UK faculty, staff, and students, and it creates quick feedback. We will develop the survey instrument, the specific questions in consultation with your leadership. That feedback will be tabulated and forwarded to the Board Monday evening and Tuesday morning for review. On Tuesday, May 3rd, this is a regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Trustees. If the feedback is as we hope and expect it to be, the Board

will be in a position to consider whether a formal offer at that time can be extended to our preferred candidate. If so, the candidate will be introduced at the board meeting for remarks. We also I am sure will need to provide time for the media to interview the selected candidate. After several intensive and fairly grueling days, I'm sure the candidate and his or her spouse will then need some time to begin finalizing plans for a very important transition, the business of finishing one position and moving forward with another as President of UK. Now we are in the process of asking the finalists whether we are at a point in which they are willing to have their identities disclosed. If they all agree, we will do so quickly. If any one of them does not agree, we will maintain confidentiality until we announce a preferred candidate on May the 1st. I understand the concern this commitment to confidentiality raises in the campus community. Probably most acutely among faculty for whom transparency, openness, and public debate, and dialogue are cherished values. I understand their concern. But in my judgment that has to be balanced with our commitment and indeed our need as an institution to find, recruit, and select the best possible president for UK. We believe that in a world of highly competitive searches for positions that are coveted and difficult to recruit, we must maintain confidentiality as long as possible. Increasingly, this type of search in higher education is the norm as it has been for a long time in the corporate world. That's not to suggest it's without its shortcomings, but it is the system in which we must participate to have a shot at the candidate we want and that we believe is in the best position to lead UK going forward. After several months of intensive involvement in this process, I can assure you of two things. First we have been reviewing a very deep and talented pool of candidates. Second, that pool would not be nearly as deep or talented without our commitment to confidentiality. At the same time,

Page 14

we've built in safeguards to try to address the valid issues you and others have raised. More than a third of our search committee is composed the faculty and staff. Your elected faculty leadership is on the search committee. Our respect for that leadership and faculty has lead us to include them in the search process going forward, and we are committed to providing a mechanism for continued feedback before a final offer is tendered to our preferred candidate. I ask for your trust that our commitment to finding the best person is sincere and that our efforts which have relied heavily on faculty leadership will yield the best result. I am confident that we have a pool of finalists today in which any of the candidates would be outstanding presidents of this institution. Our goal and our commitment allows us to find the absolute best person from the remaining pool. The candidate pool throughout this process has been diverse in terms of gender, ethnicity, race, and breadth of experiences. We have had candidates who have climbed through the faculty ranks to the position of president. We have had some candidates who are still making that journey as provosts, deans, or administrators at a different point in their careers. And we have had some candidates whose reflect different experiences outside the academy in the world of business and government. That range, that diversity gives the Board an opportunity to evaluate the quality of an individual relative to UK's needs, its challenges, and its opportunities. And those challenges and opportunities are where I want to spend my remaining few moments with you this afternoon before taking questions. I've been reading with great interest in the Herald Leader's recent series on the challenges facing UK as we select a new president. I don't always agree with the Herald and some of the views espoused, but the series in my judgment has been both timely and comprehensive in articulating some of the major issues confronting UK. First, the retention and recruitment of

faculty is critical to our future, and we must address that issue. Compensation, of course, is not the only issue that determines moral on this campus, but it is without question a critical piece of the puzzle. The President and the Provost and this Board are committed to doing everything within our power to addressing that in the upcoming budget. If successful, that will only be a start. As you know better than anyone, even as our faculty ranks have grown by eighteen percent over the last ten years and average pay by sixteen percent, we rank last among our top twenty benchmarks in compensation and near the bottom in faculty size. We have made significant gains in both those areas relative to our colleagues in the southeastern conference but the southeastern conference is not our measuring stick. It is not where we want to be and it is not who we compare ourselves to every day. Furthermore, I know and the Board knows that while faculty ranks have grown, so too have your obligations. Enrollment is up thirteen percent today over 2001. That is what our admission requires of us, I believe, and I believe we will have to find ways to educate even more students in the future. But as state support has stagnated or declined, President Todd has been forced to reallocate or cut nearly \$120 million. That was necessary to stave off mass layoffs, furloughs, or more dramatic changes in increases in the cost of health care and retirement benefits. I believe those were the right measures to protect this institution and its mission. And they're a testament to his leadership and abilities as chief executive. It was necessary but it also means that you've been asked to do more with less. Our need to grow even as state support stagnated has meant the student to faculty ratios have increased from 17:1 to 18:1. And yet because of the investments our President and Provosts have committed and the work you have done, our retention rates have improved by several percent. Our research expenditures virtually doubled since 1977 even as we faced the reality that more

Page 16

than two-thirds of our buildings are more than thirty years old and we are nearly out of research space. In the long term, we cannot reach our ambition with what amounts to a two steps forward and one step back approach to budgeting and finance. Second, we will continue to expect the state to fund the daily operations of this institution and push for increased flexibility. After all, we have a mandate and the state has a responsibility to help us realize it. But we will also like many other institutions have to find creative and innovative ways to fuel our ambitions. What does that mean? We will become even more aggressive in private philanthropy and development. We have no choice. We can't continue to fund more than \$50 million annually in scholarships out of the general fund, to point to just one example. The more scholarships we can endow, the more we can use our recurring base budget to fund faculty growth, adequate compensation packages, and infrastructure and programmatic needs. We will become more innovative in how we deliver education and instruction. Those of you who teach in the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Communications, to name just two, are experimenting in online course instruction. That experiment will grow as will the revenues that go back to the colleges for investments in faculty, staff, and equipment. We will have to develop new programs internationally and new certificate programs to help us reach new students and generate additional dollars. That's something many colleges and departments are already doing, and it's an issue many of our candidates have discussed with us. And we will have to examine how we grow and how our student mix is comprised. Other top twenty institutions enroll more out of state students and charge them more than we can currently. We cannot and we will not forget our responsibility to educate Kentucky's brightest students, those students who will stay in this state and grow our economy. But we also cannot expect those students and their families

to completely shoulder the cost of our ambition and our mission. How we achieve that balance between our responsibilities as a flagship land grant university and our vision to be a leading institution will be a critical challenge for the next president and our faculty. Third, we will have to address the ongoing maintenance and classroom and research capacity needs that confront UK. We cannot sustain our commitment to excellence much less achieve our ambitions when three quarters of our one hundred sixty-seven buildings on campus need remodeling, a cost of nearly \$1.3 billion. Fourth and finally, our new president will face the challenge that I would submit is confronted by leaders at every major public institution. Insuring a more inclusive, diverse, and collaborative environment. In every conversation with presidential candidates we talk at length about insuring academic priorities. We discuss the challenges and, yes, the benefits associated with a major intercollegiate athletic program. We talk about how you balance the needs of the entire campus to avoid splintering and silos among units and departments. And we all ask the candidates about how they make collaboration and shared governments a commitment they live with and practice every day. As significant as the challenges are though, embedded in each of them are equally significant opportunities. Opportunities that exist because of work and commitment each of you has demonstrated in the last ten years. I believe Dr. Todd deserves immense credit for his vision and dedication to this institution. It has been as significant a tenure period and as consequential as any in recent memory, particularly when you consider the progress made during incredibly challenging times. In every tangible measure of progress, research, retention, graduation rates, diversity, faculty citations, and quality, we have taken bold steps and made dramatic improvement in the last ten years. You the faculty of this institution are the foundations for all of that progress. You are what

we must continue to build upon going forward, the unwavering commitment as a Board to select a leader who will be your partner in making that vision a reality. So thank you for your time and your dedication to the University. And I'd be happy to take any questions, slings, or arrows.

SWANSON:
SPEAKER:

Questions?

To summarize your talk, it's like we don't have enough money to do things right, right? Is that what it comes down to?

BROTHERS:
SPEAKER:

I'm sorry, your name, please?
(Unintelligible) College of Pharmacy. Our buildings fall apart. In other words, if we have a lot more money, then we could start everything. So where should it come from? I think you ought to -- did you ask the candidate to accept online course? What's addressed to bring in these huge amounts of money to bring us into top twenty from any of the candidates?

BROCKMAN:

Well, I don't think there's any getting around the fact that money would solve a lot of our problems. And so the bigger issue, I think, is with the stagnant economy, with the state budget, and the forecast, I don't think we can count on any increased funding from the state. I think in 1997 -- to get to your point -- we had a mandate to reach top twenty by year 2020. The business plan came out in '95. But times have changed. 2005 rather. Times have changed since 2005. And so the problem is I think all of the presidential candidates were asked for their opinion on the top twenty business plan, on the top twenty mandate. They all had ideas. Some were very creative, ingenious ideas, ideas that we don't currently do, but everybody is struggling for the same dollar. And, you know, it's going to be a tough time. I wish I had a magic bullet answer for you. But I can simply tell you that I think the personality that we bring in as the next president is going to be the only chance we have of helping to drive that process forward. And, honestly, that's what we talk about with each candidate during the interviews. That's what we talk about in private after the interviews. So there are a

multitude of ways, but there's only so much money in the kiddy the way I see it. So we're going to have to get creative in how we do it. I don't have specifics for you today. But I can tell you that it weighs heavily on our minds when we're talking to these candidates.

BRION: Gail Brion, College of Engineering. I'm curious, you've narrowed it down to twelve?

BROCKMAN: Twelve what?

BRION: Candidates?

BROCKMAN: We haven't discussed a number. We've narrowed it down.

BRION: Okay, that's all you'll say. But in those candidates, what percentage of them have academic experience?

BROCKMAN: I won't say what percentage but I will say the vast majority have academic experience. As a matter of fact, they all have academic experience. A hundred percent have academic experience.

BRION: As students or as staff?

BROCKMAN: That was good. I think they all have experience as faculty.

BRION: Thank you.

PERRY: Yes, Peter Perry, Department of Mathematics. Have you in your discussions with candidates considered how the organization of the University at its highest levels affects the flow of funding and the ranking of priorities? As I understand it, currently the Provost is only one of several people who sits in the President's cabinet. I wonder if an inevitable corollary of that organization is that we have a magnificent investment in a new hospital and decaying infrastructure of unbelievable proportions on the north campus.

BROCKMAN: I can assure you your Board has heard loud and clear the problem that I would call the vast wasteland between what you typically -- what you left out athletics -- but typically you all refer, and I think correctly, of the vast wasteland of land and neglected core corpus of this University, that being academia between athletics and health care facilities. I understand that. I can assure you the Board is cognizant of that concern.

PERRY: But my point is that unless the organization changes, until the provost really has control of the

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
budget, why should we expect that
that's going to change?

BROCKMAN:

I cannot think of a time where
there's getting ready to be more
change when you're talking about
change than what's getting ready to
happen in the next sixty days --
pardon me, thirty days. So I think
that's a very valid point. So what
a great opportunity to get your
point across.

PERRY:
GROSSMAN:

I was kind of hoping I could.

Bob Grossman, Arts and Sciences.
As we bring on a new president, the
question of how this new president
will be evaluated comes up. And I
know a lot of the faculty has been
dissatisfied with the I would
describe as infinitesimal
contribution that the faculty
opinion has had to the evaluation
of President Todd. And so how is
the Board going to put together the
evaluation process and criteria for
the new president?

BROCKMAN:

We just decided to turn it over to
you. No, in all seriousness, we
have talked about that as well. I
will be the first to tell you that
I think we've had a flawed system
in the way that we've done the
evaluation. There was some reasons
for that before many of us came on
the Board they were valid, good
reasons at the time. But I think
the grading system has not worked
out. I think it's got to be re-
vamped from scratch. So I can
assure you what you will see going
forward will in no way, shape, or
form, resemble what you've seen in
the past.

NADEL:

Alan Nadel, Arts and Sciences. You
were talking about this process
whereby you'll narrow it down to
the point where you bring the first
choice and his wife, so I assume
there are no women in the pool?

BROCKMAN:

No, I didn't say that. I said his
or her spouse and I said it twice.

NADEL:

That's not the core of my question.
I just misremembered and I
apologize.

BROCKMAN:

NADEL:

People only hear what they want to.
I've been noticing that in your
comments. Now then there would be
some sort of survey mechanism or
tool or instrument devised and then
when you get the results from this
that you -- in your words and I did
hear this expect you will be able
to go forward and make the
appointment. Could you tell us

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
specifically and concretely what
kinds of information would get you
to change your mind, and, if you
can't, why anyone should bother to
fill it out?

BROCKMAN:

That's a great question.
Specifically if there were an
overwhelming unanimous.

NADEL:

Unanimous?

BROCKMAN:

Okay, obviously you're going to
pick apart all my words which is
okay. I'm a big boy. I can take
it. If there was an overwhelming
sentiment that this candidate was
flawed -- let me take you two steps
back. If your representatives and
us as a Board do our job, they
won't have a problem. But if they
did, if they had warts on their
nose, if something in their
background search came out the day
before, if for some reason you as a
faculty felt the candidates -- or
the staff I might say the candidate
were totally unacceptable, and I
don't know what that would be,
maybe you should tell me what it
is, but if you had an overwhelming
sentiment that I think the Board
would reassess.

NADEL:

I can tell you exactly what my
question is and it makes a lot of
sense to me. If we had three
people, all of whom might be good,
we could tell you we think this
person is better because of reason
A or their answer to this question
was better or shows a better
vision. But when we only have one
to choose from, we're giving a
thumb's up or thumb's down. Under
those circumstances the bar is much
higher for the criteria for making
that kind of a decision. Indeed
the third choice among three might
still be acceptable, if not
excellent. But that's different
than a thumb's down. Having said
that then, it would be helpful if
we were to know what kinds of
things we should look for that
would persuade the Board that our
thumb's down was meaningful.

BROCKMAN:

That's a great point. As a matter
of fact, as you know in my talk, I
said that in conjunction with your
leadership we will select those
criteria. And I think you should
get with Hollie and you all should
develop some criteria and present
them that these are important to
us. I mean how am I going to know
what's important to you? I'm

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
sitting here to get dialogue back
and forth. This is what it's all
about.

SWANSON:

Write me. Send me an e-mail.

NADEL:

Well, again, I'm not trying to turn
this into that. I'm asking what
kinds of things would be persuasive
to you because it is an up down
vote. We can then add other
things. Warts on the nose I think
is irrelevant really which is what
you mentioned.

BROCKMAN:

I think if there was an
overwhelming sentiment by the
faculty that the academic
credentials were so unacceptable
that there would be a rebellion on
campus, that that would be
persuasive to our Board; is that
what you're looking for?

NADEL:

Well, that's among the things.
That's good, yeah, thank you.

DEBSKI:

Liz Debski, AMS. So obviously the
situation called for a lot of trust
and I thought you put your finger
on one of the concerns right at the
beginning when you were saying I
bet you never looked around and
seen so many Board of Trustee
members in this meeting before.
And I was just wondering whether
the Board ever discusses or has
plans to sort of -- sort of take
the pulse of the faculty or the
students or have any informal
meetings or anything like that in
order to sort of regenerate
situations in which we can trust
more easily?

BROCKMAN:

I understand that the history --
first of all, trust is earned. And
I understand we haven't earned it,
okay? But you have to start
somewhere. So I'm standing up here
taking the bullets to show you that
this is -- this is the starting
point. And so from this point
forward we have to earn the trust
which we have not earned for
whatever reason historically. I
get that. But we have to start
somewhere and we're here today.
Now, to your point, we did have
forums. You can criticize them any
way you want. But we have them. I
am meeting with Professor Swanson,
and to my knowledge, it's not never
happened monthly before our Board
meetings to understand what your
issues are. I met with your
leadership already in your senate
council which I don't think that's
ever happened before. So I don't

know how to start in a better
fashion than how we've tried to
start so --

DEBSKI:

No, I just mean from ongoing. So clearly we're starting here at this most critical decision right at the top. And I'm just wondering if there are plans to sort of continue this past the presidential search so that, for example, when we evaluate the president, maybe we can feel our input has more value. You know, faculty input in general. So I applaud the forums and all that kind of thing. But I'm just thinking ongoing, you know. So we're at the most critical decision for all of us. We're going to be -- the faculty are going to be under this President. As you've said, we've only had twelve in the history of the University. So this we're going to be working with this man, woman for a long time. And I'm just wondering what the Board sees as important for the establishing communication going forward.

BROCKMAN:

well, I think honesty is the best policy. The Board hasn't discussed this. Hollie Swanson and I have discussed this and I think you should discuss it with her and give us some ideas, what's important to you; how do you want to do it? We have to understand there is -- we're not the same body, folks, as you well know. But at the same time you are, as I referred to, the corpus of the University, the heart and the soul. We have to understand the pulse of what's going on here. That's what you're getting at, ongoing. So my suggestion would be as a group, throw us some curve balls, see if we'll swing.

PEEK:

I just want to say something and speak to this question. And I'll tell you what publicly what I've said to Chairman Brockman privately. You know, I myself really appreciate what he's done in terms of opening up the Board of Trustees. In the past I've been very critical of the Board of Trustees. Currently I'm critical. And in the future I'm sure I'll be critical. But perhaps he's fooled me, but I truly believe that he does have the commitment to continue this. He did meet with the Senate Council and he was very

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
open and he was very prepared, and I think the Senate Council felt he meant it. I did. And he's here. And other Trustees are here. And so I think this really is a different Board of Trustees. Now, we're just starting, and it could go bad and it could turn, but I see him and others making an effort. And while I'm up here being nice because this isn't going to happen again, let me just say, there are two other Trustees here in particular, Pam May and Jo Curris, and in terms of again speaking to openness, they made a really big push, tremendous self-sacrifice and effort to organize these presidential forums out in the state. And I think that did a tremendous service for the University out in the state because many people out in the state feel they're ignored by UK. And that isn't about faculty. That's about the openness they're say no, no, we need to be open to faculty, yes, but also to the people out in the state. And so I see a change in a sense that I believe the Board of Trustees today is different than a year, two years, five years ago. And so to me, that's promising. Now we're here as opposed to here but, you know, that's a lot better than it was. And so I've told Britt this in private and I'll say it in public. I really appreciate the effort that he's made in trying to interact. He does listen and he doesn't always laugh immediately when I talk to him. You know, he will listen or he'll chuckle sometimes, but he doesn't, you know, like okay, okay, leave me alone. He actually does listen and he'll not agree with everything I say. I don't agree with everything I say. But, you know, I truly believe his heart is in the right place and he is trying to change. He does understand the complaints that have come from faculty, staff, students, and the world, in fact, about the insolidarity of the Board of Trustees. You have to give him credit for that and some of the other Board of Trustee members who are here.

BROCKMAN:

Can the record show that was Joe Peek that said that?

PEEK:
YANARELLA:

The evil twin.
Britt, I think there are at least

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
two key issues that are of concern to the faculty community that both a new President and you are going to have to confront. One I think is the general trend that we've seen across higher education of the corporatization of the University. And I must say we've gotten press lately that suggests that that seems to be continuing and it seems to be operating within the context of the presidential search. This consultant who was paid a fair amount of money came up with a figure of at least \$700,000 for presidential compensation, and by all accounts that puts us in a position that maybe seen as competitive with other universities nationally but is certainly a significant step level jump from the compensation that President Todd was receiving. This is occurring this concern with presidential salary is occurring at a time when we have gone three dry years in terms of faculty where, you know, over the last ten years despite minimal merit increases, if one looks at the administrative salaries, executive administrative salaries we find a continuing upward trend there. And so I'm really concerned about the general context within which this presidential search is taking place and the lack of apparent understanding that the University is not a corporation. The second point I would make is that the next president and this Board needs to come to grips with Big Blue Nation and with the UK Athletics Association. Clearly that program is one of the few growth industries on our campus. It is pushing upwards toward, what, 75, \$80 million. And its contribution to the general fund remains minuscule by comparison. When David Rozell instituted this, he demanded 1.25 million dollars, and only in the last couple of years of the Todd administration has it gone up to 1.75 million dollars. We can compare this with institutions that we would like to be competitive with. If we look at Ohio State which arguably has the highest salary -- sports revenues, they give something on the order of 23 or 25 million dollars a year towards that general fund. I think

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
that these are really crucial
issues, and having served on the
Board, I have discovered much to my
dismays that under the present
circumstances the Board of
Trustees, the highest decision-
making body of the University of
Kentucky, has virtually no
oversight of the athletic program.
And I think that needs to be
changed.

BROCKMAN:

As you know, Terry Mobley is
chairing the oversight and
governments committee for athletics
to address that very issue. And as
you also probably know, I think --
I may be wrong and correct me, that
Ohio State number is quoted by
everybody, but they fail to mention
that that's the charge-back that
occurred for the use of the
facilities and use of the clean-up
and parking lot. And we would have
23 million back to the University,
too, except we do have a charge
back. So that's apples and
pumpkins comparing those two. So
that's not really fair to say that.
But I understand your point about
athletics, and it is being
addressed. And what was the first
thing you were talking about?

YANARELLA:

I was talking about
corporatization.

BROCKMAN:

I can tell you the compensation
committee will be meeting in
twenty-nine minutes to try to
address that issue. But it really
is -- and I don't know how to say
this -- it's sort of chicken or egg
question if you ask me. You want
Moses to take you to the Promise
Land but you want me to settle for
Joshua. I mean so do we get Moses
to take you to the Promise Land or
not? You need leadership and so I
don't know what the answer is going
to be. I'm just asking you.

YANARELLA:

I don't know that Moses was
particularly concerned with
compensation.

BROCKMAN:

That's good. Next question?

SNOW:

Diane Snow. I attended a number of
these forums that were held by the
early stages of the presidential
search. And what I heard over and
over again was that people were
very interested in good old fashion
academics. They're really looking
for somebody to pay close attention
to what's going on in academics in
undergraduate education here at UK.
So without giving up any

transparency, I think you can probably -- I hope -- give us some very specific examples of what some of these candidates have been talking about that we're doing right, what are we doing wrong, and where would they focus if they were actually to be standing in the position of president.

BROCKMAN:

Specific examples?

SNOW:

We've had plenty of these conversations by this time.

BROCKMAN:

Oh, we've had plenty of these conversations. I would have to talk in generalities unless you want -- I mean I don't know how specific you want to drill down. But I would simply say to a candidate they have each stressed and have the background by which to understand. I mean they're all coming from -- it's a diverse pool, but for the most part they're all coming from the background that you're describing. I can simply say they understand it. They get it. They've been there. They've been coming up through the ranks. Some of them are still in the ranks. It's a broad spectrum of where they exist right now as far as their academic positions. But this pool, I believe, will please you when the candidate is announced. I know I haven't addressed it. I know I'm being a little obtuse, but I have to be. I'm just simply telling you this pool gets it.

SNOW:

How about an easy one like gen ed reform. Have they made specific comments about our general ed reform?

BROCKMAN:

No. I mean Hollie can address this as well as I can. She's sat in every meeting. So, no, they really haven't. Here's the thing. We really are hiring a president who needs to have sort of a global ability to see a university as a whole. And I mean that includes the medical complex and athletics. It includes the hundred twenty counties we have with extension offices. It includes agriculture. It includes the ability to understand the political needs to go out and get money for you folks. But they also -- so we don't drill down in this first ground. We still have another round of interviews where we can drill down a little farther. But if you understand the process we've just

gone through, there's very little time thus far to get into the specifics that I think what you're asking for some very specific things. That has not really happened yet. We've talked more. We've got their resumes. We've got their background checks. We've spent time with them but in sort of a global perspective rather than a micro environment. We haven't done that.

SPEAKER: We've been talking about our education goals would be one of the major things you're talking about first, but I'll wait.

SWANSON: We have time for one more question.
JONES: Davy Jones, toxicology.

BROCKMAN: You're Davy Jones. I've been wanting to meet you.

JONES: I was on the Board of Trustees previously and one thing that I was advocating back then and perhaps Joe's comments indicate that you're already moving on to this, and that was the entire time I was there I never saw an occasion in which the Board assessed how are we performing as a Board. There were retreats but those were more like extended board meetings. There was never a time when the President was gone from the room and we as Board were talking and self-assessing. What is your thinking?

BROCKMAN: I think you're absolutely right. We've been remiss in many aspects of a Board. That's what -- to be honest with you, we're on cycle to do something like that had President Todd not made his announcement. We actually spent -- we had two retreats specifically talking about what we're looking for in the next president. You know all about that. That really would have been -- it's been three years since we've sat down and talked about ourselves. So we're remiss in that. I've already been looking at doing a deal like that this summer with the association of governing board coming in and leading us through to facilitate us so we can do a self-assessment. And quite honestly I think we need to understand as a Board what Boards are supposed to do. You know; you've been there. Sometimes a Board thinks it's supposed to figure out what ticket prices are at athletic events. That's not what a Board does.

SWANSON:

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
All right, thank you very much. Thank you. Much appreciated. We need now to go on to our business. There's my (unintelligible) slide. Give your name and affiliation when you speak. Communicate with your constituency. Attend meetings. Respond to e-mails and web postings as appropriate. Acknowledge and respect others and silence your cell phones and beepers. Thank you. And we did that. Minutes and announcements. One of the executive decisions I made a couple of weeks ago or probably a month ago was that we at the Senate Council Office are a student centered unit. We have marshaled our scarce resources to focus on the students' needs which is your course approvals, your program approvals, and we know they're slow and with all of that, your minutes are not ready. We have a few more announcements. The Senate Council approved waiver of SR5.2.4.5 -- oops, (inaudible) .2.4.1 common examinations from two sections of MA202. I'd also like to remind you that we are still selecting nominations for the outstanding Senator award. And please remember that your current senate council members are not eligible. Dr. Anderson will be taking those nominations, please. As I mentioned in my address, the Senate Council is working to address a number of these issues that are surrounding our course approval processes. And one thing I wanted to mention to you that I'm a SAC's accreditation team with Associate Provost Mike Mullen. It's almost an embarrassment because Mississippi is ahead of us on this. We're using Mississippi as our model? Got to get going. I'd like to also remind you that we have a campus celebration of the Todd's tenure. That's tomorrow at the POT plaza. I'd also like to extend congratulations to 2011-2012 university research professors. These were announced last week at the Board meeting. Carrie Messer, Department of Physiology. Brandon Look, Department of Physiology. Gregory Smith, Department of Psychology, and Su Long Jung, Department of Animal and Food Sciences. Congratulations to those individuals. We have UK Remembers

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
memorial service for faculty,
staff, and students on Thursday,
April 21st. It's in the main
building of the north lawn. We'd
also like to make note that all
five honorary degree recipients
were approved by the Board last
week, and also remind you that
April 13th 2 p.m. Singletary
Center, we will have the honorary
degree award ceremony for Aman
Agranda and Barbara Holden. Also
we have a faculty trustee election.
I know we have several nominations
that are in the works now. The
nominations are due tomorrow,
Tuesday, at 12 p.m. And then the
first round of voting is Wednesday,
April 13th until Tuesday, April
19th. The Senate elections, your
colleges have received their list
of faculty eligibilities and the
elections should be underway. Your
colleges were asked to send in
results prior to May 10th so we can
get all of that organized before
the upcoming year. We have a
presidential search update.

STEINER:

Professor Steiner?
I will answer questions and we
covered the technical part of it
very well. I believe
(unintelligible) I will answer any
questions, specific questions about
my impressions. I came from the
same meeting as he did. So if you
have questions, I'll respond to
them in terms of what I think of
the -- the search was open. I also
(unintelligible) he's a very open
guy. I don't agree with some of
the blanket statements but in
general I agree with him. I think
the top candidates were retained
for sure. There is a diversity.
I'm not sure that I would define
all parts of the diversity and
steep in academia but let's hope
the right decision is made. At
this point -- I mean the faculty,
we didn't agree universally on
every candidate. We did split on
some. But the best candidates were
retained. I'll answer any
questions you have.

KLINE:

Mark Kline, College of Agriculture.
Does the pool of candidates reflect
individuals with direct experience
in land grant institutions?

STEINER:

Yes, yes, they were there. They
had some. The top candidates I
would say are all represented by
the kinds of institutions that we

SWANSON: have (unintelligible) land grants. That's something that's really worked well between the three of us because I'm Med Center. We've got Agriculture here. We've got Arts and Sciences. And we will bounce that conversation throughout when we go through the candidates.

STEINER: We do -- we did make the point that from the Arts and Science's perspective that the University is broken in many ways and that means (unintelligible) and hopefully we're a minority. We can scream all we want to scream, but we're a minority on that committee. I can tell you that we hopefully represented in the best way we could as loud and repetitive in the interest of the faculty.

SPEAKER: (Unintelligible) Pharmacy. Shelly, are you similarly enthusiastic about the candidate pool as the Chairman of the Board?

STEINER: I think the top candidates are good. I'm not as enthusiastic of all of them, but I think the top candidate are good.

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. Do you agree with Dr. Brockman that they are listening to the faculty?

STEINER: I'm sorry?

ANDERSON: That the Board -- that your voice is being heard?

STEINER: Yes, I think our voice was being heard. It wasn't always pretty. It was an open process. There was no -- it was an open process. If there were no agenda that I sensed. There were differences of opinion.

ANDERSON: That's okay.

STEINER: (Unintelligible.) But it was (unintelligible.)

SPEAKER: I think it's no secret that over the last twenty years administrative size and administrative salaries have increased at a rate great in disproportion with the faculty salary and size. There is much data to that effect. And I had lunch this weekend with a friend of mine who's vice president at Arizona State where they have been dealing with budget crisis by downsizing the administration. And I told her I thought her school was anomalous. And I wanted to know if any of the candidates have suggested that that might be the way to deal with the budget crisis we all face.

STEINER: The answer is absolutely yes. At

least two of the top candidates, they have done it.
SWANSON: They've done it.
STEINER: They've done it. So I'm very hopeful. I've had many sleepless nights but they did.
YANARELLA: Ernie Yanarella, Arts and Science. I want to ask you a difficult question. And that is this. Can you conceive of any circumstances at this particular time in the decision-making process where you or other faculty members might resign before the final decision is made?
STEINER: I thought of that early on. It's worked out and I talked to my buddies at the Department and they -- it's worked out better than I thought it would. It's been a very frustrating circumstance in many ways. They argue the point that I could do more good by staying than by making this grand gesture and I do agree that's the case. And so the answer to your question is I can see cases -- I cannot see a case where I'd resign as a grand gesture. I bought the argument I can do more good on the inside than I can on the outside. I love being on the outside.
SPEAKER: We're not looking for a grand gesture. We're looking for a symbolic act that suggests that the in the final analysis and choice -- the de facto choice of the president by this search committee for the Board is deeply flawed in ways that would be inimitable to the faculty interest.
STEINER: I think we won't know until the first of May. There are some very -- in my opinion there are some very good choices. I think we'd be very happy with a number of the people in the pack.
SWANSON: We need to move on. Debra?
ANDERSON: Shelly, could you keep talking about, you know, our top candidates? Is that your assessment of who the top candidates are? Is that everybody?
(Unintelligible.)
STEINER: We've had so many confidentiality threats that I don't want to (unintelligible.) The answer to your question is everybody. Everybody thought these were the top candidates and so I'm really hopeful that they'll pick one of them and I think any one of them -- I can't give you a number. But

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
there are several. And any one of
those I think would be happy.

SWANSON: I'm sorry to have to cut this
short. I know you have lots of
questions but it is 4:20 and we
need to move on. Bob, would you
like to make a motion?

GROSSMAN: I'd like to make a motion from the
floor. I would like to propose
that the Senate thank Britt
Brockman and the other Board of
Trustee members who came to our
meeting for what I believe is the
first time ever and also tell them
that we look forward to
communicating with them in ways
like this and in other ways of the
future.

SWANSON: Is there a second?

STEINER: Second.

SWANSON: All in favor?

ASSEMBLY: Aye.

SWANSON: Opposed?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Abstained?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Motion carries. Thank you.
Everett, would you like to give a
Board of Trustees' report?

MCCORVEY: I didn't plan on anything but I'm
glad to be here. I teach a class
at this time so that's why I don't
appear on a regular basis. I'm
delighted to be here today. I will
say that one of the biggest events
that happened at the last Board
meeting was the -- had to do with
the ability for people to address
the Board. And it has now changed
so that there's an easier process
for citizens who would like to
address the Board of Trustees. And
I think this is something that
started with Ernie Yanarella and --
as a faculty trustee and who else?

YANARELLA: Robin Peace.

MCCORVEY: And Robin, that's right.

YANARELLA: And the past president of the
student.

MCCORVEY: Ryan Smith. And this was taken up
by Joe and Sheila and it has now --
is there anywhere where we can go
online to show what is possible
now?

BROTHERS: Yes.

MCCORVEY: It is on the website and it had two
readings and it is now -- so I hope
you will take advantage of that and
make your wishes known and address
the Board of Trustees. I would
also like to say while she's doing
that that my faculty colleagues who
are on the search committee have --

and Shelly will argue you down --
and I want you to know that he is
making sure that the faculty
concerns are being heard. And I
think that the candidates that are
now in the pool are ones that the
faculty will be very proud to have
as president. This is now this is
on the Board of Trustees' website
-- and where is it, Sheila, where
we can --

BROTHERS: I don't think it's up there yet.
It's supposed to be --

DEATON: It's not live. It's going to be
there by contact us. Actually
contact us is going to go away.
Contact us is at the bottom already
or something like that. So instead
of contact us it's going to say
addressing the Board and you would
click there and the form would be
there and the information would be
there.

MCCORVEY: And you can do it by your computer
or you can do it by contacting a
Board of Trustees member, and if
you don't -- if you're not computer
savvy, you'll also be able to do it
by filling out a form.

SWANSON: Thank you, Everett. One other
thing that we've discussed really
just informally, I'll tell you one
of the ideas we're thinking is that
perhaps we could facilitate some
kind of interactions between each
of the committees had a Chair, a
Board of Trustees member who is a
Chair. So, for example, the Chair
of Academic Affairs Committee. And
so perhaps we could use that
structure and meet with those
individuals. So that's a mechanism
we're considering. We have the UK
May 2011 degree list, and so if you
have not already sent in your
additions, corrections, it's too
late and thank you. It is
recommended that the elected
faculty Senators approve UK's May
2011 degree list for submission
through the President to the Board
of Trustees as recommended degrees
to be confirmed by the Court. Do I
have a motion?

GROSSMAN: So moved. Bob Grossman, Arts and
Sciences.

SWANSON: All in favor?

ASSEMBLY: Aye.

SWANSON: Opposed?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Abstained?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Motion carries. Thank you. We

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
have old business. In order for us
to conduct old business, I need a
motion to get it off the table,
please.

GROSSMAN: I move that we take the old
business off the table and address
it.

SWANSON: A second?
SPEAKER: You move to take one specific thing
off, whichever item. It's not a
generic cleaning of the table.

GROSSMAN: I move that --
SWANSON: We don't want the table clean?
GROSSMAN: This item that is up on the screen,
the proposed name change is what I
propose that we remove from the
table and discuss.

SWANSON: Do we have a second to change that?
SPEAKER: Second.
SWANSON: All in favor?
ASSEMBLY: Aye.
SWANSON: Opposed?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Abstained?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Motion carries. Thank you. Could
we have a motion on the floor?
Dwight Dennison, you are here.

DENNISON: I am here. Do we have anyone from
the Department of Family Studies?
Okay, good. Just as a -- you were
not here the last time. The
question came up as to whether or
not it was exactly the way you
wanted in terms of Department of
Family Sciences with an S in Family
Science. And so the motion I guess
is that I put forward and open for
debate is we approve the name
change of the Department of Family
Studies proposed by the Board of
Trustees' approval as stated here,
proposed name change from the
Department of Family Studies to the
Department of Family Sciences; is
that correct?

SWANSON: We have a motion on the floor from
the committee. Would anybody like
to discuss the pros and cons of
that motion?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman. Well, I just have a
question. Is it true that you want
to be the Department of Family
Sciences or would you prefer to be
the Department of Family Science
because I believe that the
documentation we had the last time
was confusing on this point.

WERNER-WILSON: It is confusing. I apologize for
that. With a number of different
people touching the piece of paper,
we really had an extensive
conversation and our faculty about

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
this. We had folks who studied family violence, people who look at -- or clinicians, for example, family therapists and so the belief in the Department was that Family Sciences better represents that diversity of folks within an interdisciplinary department than a singular Family Science. So there may be some papers where it's singular, but our preference as to the Department, we specifically voted on it is to go plural and is our preference.

SWANSON: Any further questions, discussion?
(No audible response.)
SWANSON: All right, let's take it to a vote.
All in favor?

ASSEMBLY: Aye.

SWANSON: Opposed?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Abstained?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Motion carries. Thank you. Our next item of business is the Senate Academic Programs Committee, (unintelligible) chair Dan Wermerling.

WERMERLING: Good afternoon, everybody. We have a proposal and a motion for a new graduate certificate in Public Health Management. The sponsor is here, Dr. Holsinger, if we have any questions for the College of Public Health. This is a program intended to provide additional training and experience for a variety of different health care providers. Some here in the medicine center complex but also perhaps people in social work or communications and other disciplines to receive some additional training in Public Health Management. This is a fifteen credit hour program for those who may have the additional needs to invest how to effectively manage the elements of their health care program. Dr. Holsinger is the Director of Graduate Studies. The program then also will provide in addition to this access for these related health care programs for additional students, they will also provide theoretical, practical, and relevant background educational experiences for Kentucky, the nation, around the globe, and they will provide specific knowledge and skills to develop, implement, manage public health programs with budget and evaluate their effectiveness. The program has

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
fifteen credit hours, six of the credit hours are in two courses that are required. The other nine credits are elective. All but one of the courses are already approved and so it was just one new course addition. The admission requirements are clearly stated and the conditions for certificate completion are also clearly stated. And the benefits of this program overall to the students, the state, and the faculty are all presented. The evaluator for the lead in the committee group found there were three questions that we had for Dr. Holsinger. He addressed all of those adequately and edited the proposal and what you have before you today is the edited proposal. So a motion was made in the committee, and we are making to you that we approve a graduate certificate in Public Health Management. The motion was in our committee was unanimous and we're asking for a positive recommendation of the Senate for this proposal.

SWANSON: There's a motion on the floor?
would anybody like to discuss the pros and cons?

(No audible response.)
All right, all in favor?

SWANSON: Aye.

ASSEMBLY: Any opposed?
SWANSON: (No audible response.)

SWANSON: Any abstained?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Motion carries. Thank you.
WERMERLING: The next one is a little different. The initial date -- I'm going to ask for help if any of the initial proponents of this program are here. The initial date of application for this is December 11th of '07. And so I clearly wasn't the Chair of this program back then, and so I did not hear this program and proposal before. This is a program for a proposal for graduate certificate in lean systems. Part of the delay, as I understand, for getting this approved relates to the academic home for this program. The initial plan I believe was the center of robotics and manufacturing systems and that program has now evolved and changed. And so now the electrical engineering faculty has determined that they will put this into their graduate certificate

programs. The document to us basically has not changed except for the sponsoring academic department. In terms of the background, this is a program that relates to training individuals who might get involved with manufacturing systems and in particular this was initially started as a collaborative program with Toyota Manufacturing. So this is something that allows employees who might be involved with other aspects of engineering, particularly with automotive, to get some additional training in courses that would supplement their ability in the workplace. There are already six of these courses already on Board and cross-listed with other places in the institution. So there isn't any real new programmatic objectives there. The admissions requirements are there. All the faculty have been listed again who are going to participate as the faculty educators. The graduate certificate director is Dr. Arlie Hall and so he is in the electrical engineering department, and I think Dr. Walcott is also going to assist him. So we didn't -- again, here this is a committee but I understand we're making a motion as it's stated up here to approve the new graduate certificate in lean systems effective fall 2011.

SWANSON:

We have a motion on the floor. Are there any questions?

FINKEL:

Raphael Finkel, College of Engineering. I see in the document that the graduation requirement is a GPA of 3.0, not higher, not lower. The previous one that was just approved said GPA at least 3.0. Do you think this really intends to say GPA of 3.0?

WERMERLING:

I'll read their minds. We'll ask for a clarification on that.

FINKEL:

Another comment here. If this was first proposed in December of 2007, I'd like to point out that lean manufacturing was a hot topic then. It isn't anymore. Is there still support? Have you received recent support from electrical and computer engineering which is its current title? That's also changed since this was first submitted. Could you address that, please?

SWANSON:

MARKSBERRY:

Yeah, if I can. Dr. Phil Marksberry, College of Engineering.

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
We're the only school that has a Toyota executive residency program out of all of the world. Toyota has completely committed and pushed the program forward. We have two Toyota executives on staff, Rich (unintelligible) and Ken (unintelligible). Both support the program and they're still committed and rooting for it. Great question, I appreciate it.

NOKES: Sue Nokes, College of Ag. Mine is kind of related. How does this dovetail (unintelligible) or maybe that was an undergraduate certificate?

MARKSBERRY: The (unintelligible) manufacturing program is a very multi-disciplinary program including sciences from all over and psychology and economics and all over the school. Right now we need a home for the academic -- for the certificate which is right now proposed to be electrical.

NOKES: Is mechanical involved?
HALL: The fundamental issue, I happen to be the developer of the curriculum beginning in 1994. A while ago Dr. (unintelligible) came to the University in the fall of 1993 and actually proposed that we teach three basic things. One was teach students about the fundamental issue of lean systems in the Toyota production system because it's become a worldwide phenomena in manufacturing having been primarily proposed or guided by Dr. (unintelligible.) When I started developing the curriculum, I first recognized that it had to be interdisciplinary. So it does teach management. It teaches some organizational learning. It teaches shop floor management. It teaches principles and practices which is a very technical subject that deals with some of the mechanical issues and it also deals with systems. So the broader concept is systems, and you have to understand how systems work and why systems work the way they do. And so that's substantially the way the curriculum and why it fits so very well in electrical engineering versus mechanical engineering.

NOKES: I think my question was a little different. They had something or they have something. I know they had like a lean manufacturing boot camp.

HALL: Yes, well, I guess first of all, we've got to talk about what happened to the boot camp. Yes, we did have a boot camp. There was some people when I was here through 1999 and retired (unintelligible) background and so I retired and turned it over to Dr. John (unintelligible) and another professor. They started a boot camp for summer. And what we began to discover, it took so much resources for the center to operate that boot camp just during the summer months we changed that curriculum to teach two courses in the fall, two in the spring and in the summer so --

NOKES: So it's essentially the same program?

HALL: It's still the same program. It's just been distributed through the years. So one student can get a certificate through one year.

NOKES: Okay, thank you.

SWANSON: Additional questions?

WERMERLING: Actually I just wanted to clarify a point between the two of you as well. This means that there's not a duplication of programs?

HALL: Yes, correct.

KLINE: Mark Kline, College of Agriculture. Does it matter that this curriculum has twelve credit hours as a certificate but we just approved something that has fifteen hours? Is there some sort of normal University policy that says how many hours are required?

SWANSON: Dr. Blackwell, I think you could address that.

BLACKWELL: Jeannine Blackwell, Dean of the Graduate School. Graduate certificates can be in the range of twelve to eighteen hours.

SWANSON: Thank you. Additional questions?

BRION: Gail Brion, College of Engineering. What do you anticipate is your demand for the certificate? How many students?

HALL: Thus far what we do is we teach public courses for people that come here for three weeks and spend five days. That's industry people. It invariably every time we teach one of these public courses there's two or three people wanting to do graduate work in this subject. So the demand we do believe as it's stated in the proposal is probably twenty-five to thirty people per year. We don't know if that will work out exactly that way because

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
the requirements of entry and some
of those kind of things, but we do
believe it's a viable program from
a worldwide point of view that it's
a substantially good thing for this
University to move in this
direction. So I don't know if I've
specifically -- I can't
specifically say what that might
be.

SWANSON:
ANDERSON:

Debra?

Debra Anderson, College of Nursing.
I do want to say in our Doctor of
Nursing practice program we
recommend many of our students to
take courses in the lean system
because it is very, very hot in
health care.

SWANSON:
HALL:

The College of Medicine.
I have a person right this very
minute in a hospital that wants to
do this graduate certificate in
health care.

GROSSMAN:

Is he going to be okay? You said
he's in the hospital.

HALL:
SWANSON:

He works for the hospital.
All right, would anybody like to
participate in further discussion
pro or con?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Let's go ahead and vote then. All
is favor?

ASSEMBLY:
SWANSON:

Aye.

Opposed?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Abstained?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Motion carries. Thank you. Our
last item of business has to do
with a proposed change in
administrative regulation 6.10,
hazing. And before the presenters
get up here, I'd like to remind you
that I've had a conversation with
Marcy Deaton in the legal office
and remind you that this is part of
a process that we will be rewriting
and offering new policies as
regularly. And one of the things
that Marcy and I talked about is
that because of this we need to
increase our education. And Marcy
has agreed. And I'm just going to
look at her face and make sure she
nods "yes." Marcy has agreed when
we do our new Senate next year that
she will offer UK Legal 101 so that
we can get up on some of our
legalese. And then a second point
then is that when we see these, we
are not here to approve,
disapprove, or not recommend or not
recommend. We are here to offer

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
input. Anything else?

DEATON:
SWANSON:

No.
Thank you very much. Today we have Keith Ellis, David Lowe, and Todd Cox who will do the presentation. Welcome.

COX:

My name is Todd Cox. I'm a student government advisor. We're going to keep this really brief. Just to go over a few key points with regards to this hazing policy. Keith and Dave can jump in at any point. Just going over history, statistics, KRS policy, UK hazing and our new approach, this kind of stems from a couple years ago, me and Keith went to a hazing presentation institute. It's a five day institute over the summer. Dave, you've also been, correct? So he went last year. So we're trying to take a proactive stance towards reducing hazing here at UK. Hazing rituals is not a new thing. It goes all the way back to the 1300s, actually the Middle Ages. And you can see, I'm not going to go through all of these, but in Illinois they passed anti-hazing statutes. Greek letter organizations take over the brunt of hazing activities in the '40's. As recently as the last ten years, Chad Meredith in the state of Florida passed away as a result of a hazing activity so they actually now have a law that makes it a felony in the state of Florida. So we're trying to get -- we're trying to actually leave out on being proactive. These are some statistics from a national study done at the University of Maine. One of the researchers actually works with the Department of Higher Education -- or Department of Higher Ed Division. So it shows that regardless of the type of organization, hazing can occur or the rates do occur. Not just by Greek organizations. One of the things we wanted to pull out was who knows about hazing. These are just kind of percentages. Coach and advisor, alumni are present. Members posting it on the web via Facebook pictures. I don't know if anybody uses MySpace anymore on the student side or advisors posting pictures that are clearly hazing activities. This is the state of Kentucky policy on hazing. The only thing I really want to point

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
out here is that KRS does require us to have a hazing policy that addresses the entire campus community, not just students, not just student organizations, and so that's one of the premises behind creating this new policy. This was the -- this is the current UK policy. You can see it's just a wall of text as Dave would say. It means very little to a student. There's the word buffoonery in there somewhere. So we really wanted to kind of clean it up, make it a much more user friendly version. So, Keith, I don't know if you want to touch on this. When we began this process, we involved Dave and a future other students talking about what does that policy mean to you. How would you write a policy that translates well to students getting that information to taking that into their organizations and using that information. And what we often hear from the wall of text, as Dave would say, is that everything can be defined as hazing when you look at it. And when you get overwhelmed with that, we might as well do whatever we want because everything is going to be defined that way. And so we wanted to break that down a little bit and give a more clear, more concise definition that allows students to kind of go through and can really see what activities are that way, what activities that they're participating in might be questionable from an organizational standpoint. To their credit, the university administrators are often wrong in the way we approach this. We often approach it everything is hazing and so we don't want to talk to you about it. This new administrative regulation provides that opportunity for students to come forward who have either participated in a hazing activity or fear that their organization may be participating in one in the future and come forward and ask the question without facing immediate sanctions which is currently the way the policy sits. If a student comes forward and tries to have that conversation, we immediately have to report it. And we can't as a university administrator say okay, we're going to give you some

ELLIS:

leniency to try to figure it out or help you figure it out. But instead we're just going to get you in trouble. They don't come forward. They don't ask a question. Again, they just continue to propagate the old traditions that are putting our students in danger.

LOWE:

My name is Dave. Everyone has been speaking. But I'm Dave. I'm with the intra-fraternity council of Greek organizations. I'm also in student government. So this policy really Keith touched on it very well. It splits up moving from wall text to legalese. I don't know if that's legal at all. But very bite size digestible comments. Keith talked about right to report and kind of an amnesty clause for students. I think it's important for us to remember that it is our job and our position here to support that student who may be sitting or (unintelligible) staff member sitting in their dorm room or break room kind of going over in their mind is this worth it; do I have friends and allies on this journey to kind of getting rid of this behavior in my organization. I think it really behooves us to lend ourselves to that person and kind of give them a flashlight and some tools for the journey and this policy very much contains just about everything we need to do that effectively.

ELLIS:

These are just a couple highlights. We've already touched on this. Kind of an amnesty clause to where if you come forward, we're going to help you. One of the biggest takeaways from the Hazing Prevention Institute was the idea of having a dialogue. It's not just black or white, either you're hazing, you're not hazing or how can you move forward? I was a member of a fraternity while I was at UK. We had a lot of positive rites of passage. We had some negative rites of passage. And so it's moving those negative rites of passage which often times have a good purpose in transforming them into positive rites of passage and keeping our students safe. This is the new definition which has went through probably eight reiterations. It's been through Senate Council twice. It's been

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt
through some faculty members. It's been through -- Lee Edgerton is actually on our hazing prevention coalition so he helped us with the definition. But the general idea is that action or situation created by a member of the University community against another member of the community that's negligent or reckless, humiliating or endangering or unreasonably interferes with scholastic or employment activities, and again, this definition even changed a week ago when we were meeting with Senate Council into a more inclusive, you know, definition. It's also we've talked with practitioners around the country, kind of the two top folks around the country to say what do we need to do to make this work. It can happen regardless if somebody is into it or not. And then just -- this is just a clause about where, you know, if it's on campus or versus if it's off campus, it might or might not apply. It depends on the situation. We do want to inform campus once we're done about this policy. One of the reasons we're here is we want to make sure that our faculty are aware that if this does get voted in by the Board of Trustees in the President's Cabinet, that this is something we're not asking you to necessarily be the police out there, but if you do have an inkling, we just encourage you to have a conversation with the student or call one of us or submit something so that we can investigate and we can have those conversations. Me and Keith both work in Student Affairs which is very different from Academic Affairs. We're not everywhere. We realize you all aren't everywhere. But together I think we can continue to uphold the values of the University of human dignity inclusivity. So that's why we created this. We're happy to take any questions. I did the best I could to keep it five minutes per the request.

JONES: Davy Jones, Pharmacology. Can you go back to the first slide of the -- right there. Marcy, does it say somewhere in the regulations somewhere who are members of this UC, University Community?

DEATON: It does. It's in the definition.

FL UK SENATE COUNCIL MEETING 4-11-11.txt

COX: It covers students, faculty, staff, vendors, anyone who's interacting in an official capacity with the University of Kentucky. So if we have a vendor, Sodexo, they work with athletics. If they're doing something to their employees, they could be -- I mean not that we're really going to go after them about hazing, but technically they could be held accountable. But, again, that's probably a contract issue, something.

LOWE: University Community means volunteers, organizations, groups, vendors, patients, customers, alumni, and visitors. Organizations and groups are also defined in the policy page fifty-one and two.

COX: And they're in the back of your packet if you have a packet.

SPEAKER: What's the difference between hazing and assault?

ELLIS: The difference specifically is that last sentence there, for the purpose of affiliation with a group or organization. So you can be hazed and assaulted at the same time but not every assault is hazing if that makes sense.

SPEAKER: But hazing can be assault?

ELLIS: Hazing can be assault.

KLINE: Mark Kline, College of Agriculture. In your reporting it says appropriate university official. That seems vague to me.

ELLIS: It's also defined if you read further through there, depending on where you land in the university, that appropriate official is defined.

LOWE: Page fifty-two, it speaks about the students and the (unintelligible.) Thank you.

YANARELLA: Ernie Yanarella. Would this apply given that definition to coaches and assistant coaches of athletics?

ELLIS: Absolutely.

SWANSON: Any further questions?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Thank you very much.

ELLIS: Thank you.

SWANSON: That was the last item on our agenda. Do we have a motion to adjourn?

STEINER: So moved.

SWANSON: Second?

SPEAKER: Second.

SWANSON: Our meeting is adjourned. Our next meeting will be May 2nd. We'll have the provost address. Thank you.

(Thereupon, the University of
Kentucky Senate Council meeting for
April 11, 2011 was adjourned.)

STATE OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

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

My commission expires: May 12, 2015.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
hand and seal of office on this the 30th day of June,
2011.

ANN E. CHASTANG,
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE
K E N T U C K Y