

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

May 9, 2011

3:00 p.m.

* * * *

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
209 Main Building
Lexmark Room
Lexington, Kentucky

* * * *

HOLLIE SWANSON, CHAIR

DEBRA ANDERSON, VICE CHAIR

KATE SEAGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

ANN E. CHASTANG, COURT REPORTER

* * * *

SWANSON:

Good afternoon. We have quorum. Welcome to our final Senate meeting. Thank you very much for accommodating our change in schedule and arising on today. We have our slide. Your name and affiliation when you speak. Communicate with your constituency, attend meetings, but you don't have to pay attention to that for the rest of the year. Respond to e-mails. I hope not very many. Acknowledge and respect others' (unintelligible) cell phones, and
Page 1

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
beepers. As you've seen, the minutes are not ready. That's our summer project. There are a couple of waivers. If you remember, we had a little bit of confusion with respect to the science versus sciences with the department name change, and that had to go in front of the Board, and so they asked me please can we do that, and I gave provisional approval and the Board approved it last week. And then we also had a case where we had a student in 1959 who we needed to make sure that he got his BS, but the program he had finished -- had initiated his degree in was no longer in existence. And so I gave a provisional approval there of that degree. We have three web transmittals, so we've been posting transmittals like mad. And this is -- please review these. And I also asked Sheila to give you an idea just how busy our office has been. And so in September we had three hundred thirty courses approved. And as of January, we had three hundred fifty approved and they are still counting. So because of all the changes we've had a considerably high number of courses and the same number of staff. So we can all do that math. I'd also like to tell you about the Interim Oversight Committee. One of the things that we've talked about with this committee is that this is a committee that sees all of these courses coming in. And so this should be the committee that develops the policies as they see this. And so when Bill came to talk to us at the Senate Council, what we had -- the idea then -- the motion was that (unintelligible) be allowed and encouraged to formulate policy during its term; that it reports such policies to the Senate Council and that at the end of its term propose to the Senate Council and Senate which of its interim policies should be codified as part of its Senate rules. Is that a motion that needs to be voted on?

No.

BROTHERS:
SWANSON:

So that's a Senate Council motion. And so they will be bringing forward the policies as we go along with this. And then I'd also like to make note many of you were at the general education celebration program last week, May 4th. It

celebrated the accomplishments of a hundred sixty-seven faculty. But somebody said to me the only person that wasn't thanked last week was Mike Mullen. So I'd like to thank Mike.

MULLEN: May I make a motion?

SWANSON: Did I make an error?

MULLEN: There was someone else who was not thanked. It's because you and I were on stage together. And Hollie Swanson was not recognized.

SWANSON: It's not really fair because I came in at the tail end of the game after you guys had already done the heavy lifting. 2011 May commencement there were many, many of you there. And I thank you. It was wonderful. We had the graduate and professional ceremony. We had four hundred eighty graduates. We had twenty-five hundred in the audience. It lasted for two hours and thirty minutes. And then at the 1 p.m. ceremony we had nine hundred sixty-four grads, seventy-five hundred in the audience. Now, this was a brisk pace of one hour and forty-eight minutes. Dean Lester timed it, and we processed eighteen students per minute. And then at the 6 p.m. ceremony nine hundred twenty-four grads, sixty-nine hundred in the audience. And that was at one hour and forty-six minutes. And so I'd really like to thank Jeannine for her tremendous effort in doing that. Thank you, Jeannine. We have a brief presentation from the Violence Intervention and Prevention Center. They are on their way so we won't have that now. Davy Jones. Is Davy here? Davy, would you like to tell us about the election?

JONES: Some of you may have noticed, we had an election recently. Here are some stats on it. The winner is Dr. (inaudible.) She received over half of the vote on the initial round. This is something unusual. Typically when there's more than five candidates you have to go through two rounds. But when a candidate gets more than fifty percent of the vote on the initial round, it's over. That has happened last year and this year in the Trustee election. We had forty-three percent voter participation overall. There was a wide variety in the participation on the colleges. Hats off to

social work who had the highest participation. Some of the other colleges did not have such a high participation, and I'm hoping that the respective faculty council will look at why that was the case. The candidate will take the oath of office which includes I think -- I know it's in the provision not to engage in any duty and take office July 1st taking over the seat that will be vacated by Dr. (inaudible.)

SPEAKER: It doesn't add up to a hundred percent, Davy.

SWANSON: Davy, it doesn't add up to a hundred percent.

JONES: There's some rounding.

SPEAKER: Twenty percent missing.

JONES: There's one in the front. Going through --

SWANSON: Sally Evans is here.

EVANS: Thank you. Well, good afternoon. I just made a little trek. I went over to Young Auditorium. I didn't realize it was over here so I just had a little --it was just gorgeous out. Enjoy the rest of your afternoon. My name is Sally and I'm from the Violence Intervention Prevention Center. Many of you are already aware of our office to some extent, but I want to thank Sheila Brothers so much for inviting me to share very briefly a little more about us and just a little bit about how you might be able to be involved. I see some wonderful familiar faces out here. We have so much support from the faculty here at the University of Kentucky, but I want to make sure that you're each aware of what this involves. As many of you already know, the environment where a student can flourish academically, what's absolutely essential is that environment is free of violence and fear; that that kind of experience at college can triple somebody, can set them back significantly. Maybe you've had a student in your course who's experienced and watched them have to kind of get back up from that. So we are committed at the VIP Center to reducing power based personal violence. And when we say that, we are referring specifically to stopping partner violence and sexual violence. And so today I just wanted to share very briefly that as some of you may know, we're a center that responds specifically to this. If you ever have a

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
student who discloses they have had this experience to you or maybe another staff or faculty member, we're that first place, kind of that first place they can go to receive, you know, someone to specifically share with confidentiality about this, and we can kind of help them navigate through all these different resources here on campus so that they're able to make an appointment at UHS. Getting connected to a long term therapist. Maybe even some communication with professors on their behalf so they're not sharing what happened over and over again. We do a variety of things communicating with parents, et cetera. So we're kind of that first place someone might go. On the other hand, we are passionate about our prevention effort and many of you are already aware of our Green Dot Campaign which has started here at UK and is now spreading literally all over the country. Many of our benchmark schools have now adapted the same prevention program that was started right here at UK. And we're very proud of the success of this. And essentially the Green Dot is this single moment in time that any one of us might have where we could specifically support someone who's experienced this. We can express intolerance. We can do something proactively or reactively to contribute to the movement. And today I brought with me that I can leave for you all to gather on your way out the best distribution plan as I'm looking around today. But simply a card that explains the so what's with the Green Dot that you can keep around. It also has a little -- just a card here that is wonderful to have handy in your desk drawer or on your desk that is a network of resources. If you happen to be, you know, in a position to respond to a student or another community member about this, this has all the numbers available. It's our number. It has twenty-four hour numbers in the community. It has the counseling center. It has UKPD and others. It's a whole network called the safety net here at UK that's sort of a tool for you guys to have to say wait a minute, I don't have to

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt

have all the answers; I'm going to refer you and connect you to these other folks who can take it from there. The other thing on here is a pin -- a Green Dot pin that can go easily on a purse, a lapel, a collar, anything. And it's just a great Green Dot away from being proactively say yeah, I'm a part of this here at UK; I support this. And it's great to wear as you're lecturing or in the classroom or anything like that. Other ways that faculty members have been a Green Dot in our community, some have done research for us. We've had some wonderful research initiatives done with power based personal violence and their work. We've also had faculty put up on their power point at the bottom something about, you know, what's with the Green Dot and information about VIP. Maybe you put it in your syllabus, you know, during your semester. If you have anything along these lines, here's a resource. Maybe it's something you mention in class. Maybe it's a topic -- a research topic that's included, you know, thinking of ways that you can include this. One last thing that we provide that I'd love to do is we use this training that we do, our bi-standard training into the curriculum. So if you have a course that is conducive to that, feel free to contact myself at the VIP Center. You can call the number right on here and I'm there a lot of the time. And we come in and we do trainings right in the classroom. And we kind of coordinate with what you're studying. So we've had all kinds of professors from psychology to social work to all the communications and beyond that have said yeah, we want to infuse this into my classroom, my research, and my experience for this semester. So we come and use clickers and power point and all kinds of videos. It's a great interactive thing for us to use. So we're always glad to do that. So I just wanted to let you know there are ways to be proactively and reactively involved with the Green Dot on campus. I want you to know about our research, our campaign here. And you're welcome to take

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
one of these. I hope you'll consider taking this with you. It's a helpful thing for you to take away and have as you continue throughout the summer. I hope you're all having a restful summer, hopefully switching gears as well. But any other questions that I can respond to very briefly or just -- I'm right over here at Frazee Hall if you ever need anything else and want to call and contact us. Thank you, again, Sheila. We appreciate your time greatly. And I'll leave these up here so you can take these as you go. Thank you.

SWANSON:

Thank you, Sally. In our honor of Mother's Day, I'm going to sound like your mother, but Senate Council is used to this now. My mother taught me to be gracious and kind. She's my role model. And I'm going to ask the same of you because I think we never regret being gracious and kind. I'm going to suggest that we pass the following resolution. We thank President Todd for service to the University over the past ten years and wish him the best in his new endeavors. The recommendation is that the Senate thank President Todd for his service to the University over the past ten years and wish him the best in his new endeavors. All those in favor, voice vote?

Aye.

ASSEMBLY:

SWANSON:

Opposed?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Abstained?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Thank you very much. Ernie, would you like to tell them about the petition?

YANARELLA:

Sure. I'd like to give you a quick report on the faculty petition that emanated from discussions in the Senate Council and beyond. We have two hundred fifty-three faculty who over a couple days signed this petition opposing the UKAA request for a \$3. million loan for the video boards and sound system for Commonwealth Stadium. At its April 25th meeting, I brought to the Senate Council for discussion a petition I drafted which I hoped that the Senate Council would support in some manner. The petition was precipitated by the news that the Council on post secondary education would shortly

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt

vote on this 3. -- actually this \$6.15 million proposal. At that meeting the Senate Council passed the resolution on behalf of the University Senate to urge that the Board of Trustees vote down this UKAA request. I don't know if that is up there or not.

BROTHERS:

The resolution is up there. I can put the petition up if you'd like.

YANARELLA:

If you'd do that in a second. This was very simply worded but it was flatly stated and I think it had some important impact. A slightly toned down version of the faculty petition I wrote was then introduced in various quarters and distributed across the colleges by contact people who I requested to assist in securing names. Bob Grossman -- Bob, are you here? There he is, way in the back. who had helped in shall I say modifying or sanitizing the original language took charge of obtaining electronic signatures which -- while I coordinated the paper petitions. By Thursday, Hollie Swanson, Senate Council Chair received a phone call from Jay Blanton indicating that the Board of Trustees's agenda item would quote, probably, unquote, be pulled from the Board of Trustees' agenda. Then on Friday morning, I requested the opportunity to speak before the UK Board of Trustees at the Tuesday meeting in opposition to the request and to deliver all of the signed petitions that we had gathered at that point. A scant two and a half hours later the original UKAA request was withdrawn. My purpose in recounting this sequence of events is really two-fold. One, to underline the power and the influence that UK faculty can exert when it speaks with a loud and collective voice. And two, to emphasize that more zero some decisions are likely to be in the offing over the next couple years that will require similar concerted faculty responses. It is clear that the Board of Trustees has shown greater openness in interacting and listening to faculty leaders since Britt Brockman assumed the Board Chair position. And I can assure you that I and others are prepared to seek opportunities to address the Board of Trustees on future issues

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
of faculty concern through the revised petitioning process that Robin Peace, Ryan Smith, and I set in motion and that Joe Peek and Sheila Brothers so ably revised and brought to successful passage and institution. In closing I want to thank the Senate Council, especially Deb Anderson. Deb was the person who brought to our attention the CPE agenda item. Bob Grossman, who played such a crucial role in the electronic petition and in other areas as well. And certainly Hollie Swanson for her good work on the Council. I also want to thank the petitioners across the colleges who helped to secure over two hundred fifty-three signatures. I'd also like to thank Joe Peek who used his communications network to mobilize the faculty. And not least of all, all of the faculty who channeled their anger and their outrage and their sense of insult into signing this petition. Thank you very much.

SWANSON:

Thank you, Ernie. I'd also like to make note I've been in contact with President Eli Capilouto and he tells us that what he is going to work on is establishing our trust. I'll be meeting with Tom Harris this week, and we'll be developing some plans of how he can interact with the faculty. So if you have additional ideas, please let me know.

GROSSMAN:

Who is Tom Harris?

SWANSON:

Tom Harris is our Vice President in Public Relations. Debra Anderson?

ANDERSON:

I have the pleasure of bringing you guys good news today. I'd like to begin by (unintelligible) Raphael Finkel and Dan Wermerling if you guys would stand up, please. These are the folks who stand on the Outstanding Senator Award Committee. They had a really, really difficult job before them. As one of them stated, I would like to award this to all five of the nominees because our nominees for the Outstanding Senator award were superb. I'd like to ask Davy Jones to please come forward as I read the plaque and, Hollie, will you then give Davy this Outstanding Senator award. Davy Jones. I had to make sure there was something on the agenda that would insure he be here today. Davy Jones is

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt

recognized for his contributions to the University Senate by showing active and exemplary service on Senate committees by making notable substantive contributions on important issues that impact the faculty. By consistently giving strong voice to faculty issues and the principle of shared government and by generating and affecting the Senate's agenda and goals.

Congratulations. We would also like to recognize the additional four persons who were nominated and express our appreciation to them for their outstanding service to the Senate and the University. As I call your name, would you please stand and stay standing so we can give you a round of applause. Connie Woods, Joseph Shapelle, Lee Meyers, and Cavay. Stand up. Thank you very much.

SWANSON:
PEEK:

Joe?

I joke around a bit, but I want you to know I do take my oath of office very seriously. Since I was sworn in last July 1st or so I have not participated in a single (inaudible.) Now in a couple years on July -- well, actually the first full week after my term I've already -- I'm fully booked. Anyone interested I can work you in after that. So let me mention kind of three highlights from the last Board of Trustees meeting. One was that Ernie referred to the new regulation on appearances before the Board. While he was not successful in part, I think, because it was taken care of beforehand, there were two law students that did petition and did speak before the Board of Trustees about the differential tuition increase for the law school. So that is working. I mean someone actually, you know, from the University community actually made it to the Board to speak. And so - and did so before the vote. And so I think, you know, we are making some progress. The second thing is that another thing Ernie brought up which is on the scoreboard sound system, I ended up voting against it even though the loan portion had been removed. But I want to be clear why I voted against it. Because it has nothing to do with athletics. I voted against it because this was another in a long

line of cases where we were asked to vote on a motion for expenditure of money after having been given absolutely no information whatsoever. Over and over again the Board of Trustees, you know, we're faced with, you know, doing our duty. We have a fiduciary duty. We must do due diligence. But we're rarely given the information with which to fulfill our duties. And so my protest vote was really about that. Not about athletics. It was about you can't, you know, hold back information. And we're really not asking for a lot of information. And the nice thing is that during the conversation there and, of course, there were opposing views, right, and supporting views expressed by the Trustees, but Britt Brockman said what I'm hearing here is Executive Vice President of Finance should provide such financial information in the future. And so, again, I think we're really making some progress this year. And the third thing had to do with the new president. We now have a President Elect or something, Incoming President so, you know, that was the other big piece of news. So I can answer some questions if you have questions.

SPEAKER:

This scoreboard, I never understood how the math was worked out because first it was a \$3.1 million loan and three million together, \$6.15 million or so.

PEEK:

Six and a quarter.

SPEAKER:

And later they said okay, we can do it for 4.2 million or so which we --

PEEK:

It's still the same price. But what changed was where the money was coming from. So what they're doing is they're taking I think it's 4.6 out of their endowment or quasi-endowment, they call it. So at first they were going to borrow the money from us and raise the money from private donors so that they didn't have to touch their money. And then what changed was that they were going to touch their money, but there was more than that. It wasn't just they were going to touch their money for the 3.1 million that they were originally going to borrow from UK but, in fact, they were going to touch it for more than that, I

think 4.6; so that means maybe private investors didn't cough up as much as they had anticipated. But the price didn't change as far as I know. Yes?

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, A&S. Do we know whether the Council on Post Secondary Education ever voted on the request because I believe that the withdrawal of the request for the Board of Trustees happened the day after (inaudible) was supposed to vote on that.

PEEK:

I don't know. Does anyone? Do you know?

YANARELLA:

Yeah, I was told by Cheryl Crewman that when she checked that that particular agenda item had been removed on Friday morning, and as a result they did not vote on it. The reason that I continued forward in pressing on this was because I was afraid that this item would simply be postponed until the June board meeting when most of us would be gone.

PEEK:

And the reason I pressed forward was that it's just like a vote of confidence or no confidence or anything else. You don't do it unless you've got the votes. And the same thing here. If we start a petition and end up with thirty-three names because it became a non-issue, we look pretty stupid. So we really need -- I wanted to push through and get enough signers or, you know, enough names on the petition so that it looked like the faculty cared because otherwise it looks like we're a bunch of wimps.

SWANSON:

Joe, could you clarify to everybody how the surveys were incorporated on Tuesday morning to the Board?

PEEK:

Yeah, so we had a closed meeting which means I probably can't talk about it so I won't -- or I won't tell you what happened. But were I allowed to, I'd probably say that we had this meeting and it was a closed meeting and so they did, you know, there were written summaries from faculty, staff, and students from their quorums or from the online survey. And then they had some explicit comments but there also were some reasons. So the discussion had to do with so what do we do with this stuff. And the decision was well, let's put it out in summary form because there is a concern that if we were to publish or provide specific comments in

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
some cases, you could trace those
back to specific individuals. And
so this would give a sense of what
the sentiment was. Did that answer
or not?

SWANSON: Well, I think the other --
PEEK: But I can't tell you that so I
won't.

SWANSON: And I wanted to make sure this was
correct. I thought that they were
giving the raw data to President
Elect Capilouto; is that correct?
PEEK: It was discussed. And I sort of
suggested that they do because he
ought to know kind of what's going
on and give him some sense. So I
don't remember the exact answer,
but I think they may be doing that.
I thought it would be good for him
to know what he's up against in the
sense of what are people happy
about, what are people concerned
about. If you know what they're
concerned about, you at least have
the opportunity of addressing those
concerns. So I think that may be
the case.

WERMERLING: Dan Wermerling in Pharmacy. Back
to the \$3 million they discovered.
Have you now had a conversation to
decide what the utility of those
funds will be in the future,
perhaps building renovations or
other things that we might take an
interest in?

PEEK: I think there was a little bit of a
misunderstanding in the sense that
that \$3.1 million was a loan out of
our operating budget. And so that
would not have been an expenditure.
And so there was never an
expenditure involved but by UK. It
was merely a loan that was going to
be paid back. And so in that sense
that money is now invested in the
operating budget or the operating
fund, and so it's not available to
go into an expenditure budget as a
separate item. So all it was going
to be was instead of investing
short term treasuries or some other
instrument, we were going to invest
in a loan through UKAA. And so it
never was really an expenditure by
UK. It was just a loan to UKAA so
that they could make an
expenditure. But there is a bigger
issue which I've been bringing up
which is we carry a gigantic amount
of money in our operating budget.
It's five hundred some or six
hundred some million dollars. And
the interest we get on that is

almost nothing. And so that affects the size of the endowment going forward. And so I brought this up a couple times, and I think they're looking into it. But I'm told that there are state restrictions on how we can invest those funds as well as University restrictions. So I don't know. But my guess is we've got to sit down with that list of restrictions, we could probably find a way to invest some of that money in a much higher yielding instrument. But, you know, we can't run out of cash. And we have to have some liquidity, but I can't imagine with a two and a half billion dollar budget that we really need to keep \$600 million on hand on average. Yes?

NADEL:

Back to the presidential search. Alan Nadel. You mentioned what was discussed about the fifty words comment we're allowed to make. But there were also a bunch of scored responses. We weren't told in advance that there would be scored responses so at the last -- at the last meeting when I asked the Chairman of the Board what kind of a response would be unsatisfactory, had I known there would have been scores, I would have said would you need a score of such and such. The first question I would have is why were we not told the averages from each of those responses?

PEEK:

(Unintelligible.)

SWANSON:

No, I didn't average them.

NADEL:

Why weren't we told the averages?

SWANSON:

Because I decided not to.

NADEL:

Yeah, well, all right, why weren't we -- from what I can tell, Hollie explained to me in the e-mail there were three that were all counted as favorable. From what I can tell the three that were all counted as favorable, the average on every one of them would almost have to be below three. They would have to be in the two point something range, would have to be, because if it's a bell curve and the threes count, I would get fifty-one percent. The bell curve if the threes count, then the average would have to be below three.

PEEK:

But that's presuming the distribution.

NADEL:

That's why I'm asking the question.

SWANSON:

Alan, I explained to you that that -- it really is not a statistical

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
survey; it's a very small sample size. It's biased. And I did not feel comfortable adding very descriptive statistical incremental details on a flawed survey.

NADEL: The average is not a very specific incremental detail. The average is no different than saying fifty-one. How would you use that information?
SWANSON: One would know what the average is.
NADEL: Why?

SWANSON: Because people filled it out believing that those points matter. And what would that outcome change?
NADEL: well, apparently my belief is nothing. My belief is that the claim by the Chairman of the Board that we would have input was zero. My belief is that is the case.

SWANSON: (Unintelligible.)
NADEL: (Unintelligible.)
SWANSON: (Unintelligible) overwhelmingly negative they would pull the candidate and that was what we talked about (unintelligible.)

NADEL: well, you just told me it wasn't a statistically significant sample. Now, if it wasn't a statistically significant sample --
SWANSON: Alan, thank you very much. We are going to move on from here. Do you have anything more?

PEEK: Only if there are other questions.
SWANSON: Thank you, Joe. We have the UK August 2011 degree list. A handful of additions and deletions have been made. Thank you for paying attention to that. We have a recommendation that the elected faculty senate (unintelligible) approve UK's first August 2011 degree list for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees as the recommended degrees to be confirmed by the Board. May I have a second?

JONES: Second.

GROSSMAN: That was Davy Jones. What's the first in parentheses mean?

SWANSON: What does the first in parentheses mean?

BROTHERS: There are two August degree lists that come out. There's the first list that's primarily for students who must have their diploma posted to their transcript in order to accept jobs in certain fields, particularly education, for the school year that begins in September. If they wait until August, those diplomas don't get posted -- excuse me, if the degree list comes out only in August, the

Senate gets it in September, and then the Board gets it in September or October, then those students who would have graduated over the summer and are done don't have the diploma posted to their transcript until the middle of the fall. So it's an opportunity for folks who need their diploma posted to transcript for job purposes to have it done and ready. This is kind of a new thing over the last three or four years. It used to be that the Chair approved quite a few additions over the summer on behalf of the Senate Council and Senate to accommodate a lot of the education students.

GROSSMAN:

I just have a follow-up question. Then from what you said we will approve the second August 2011 degree list after August in our first meeting in the fall; is that correct?

BROTHERS:

Yes.

GROSSMAN:

Which is different from all the other degree lists that we approve which are done in advance?

BROTHERS:

It's called the August degree list but the Board approves it, the folks do not -- the people who get their -- excuse me. Let me try that all over again. The students that are on the second August degree list are the ones who walk for commencement in December.

GROSSMAN:

Okay.

BROTHERS:

So you're not really approving it in advance. The month doesn't necessarily describe the degree list completely.

GROSSMAN:

Thank you.

SWANSON:

Any other questions? Are we ready to vote? All in favor?

ASSEMBLY:

Aye.

SWANSON:

Opposed?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Abstained?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Motion carries. Thank you. We have the winter intercession calendar for 2011 and 2012. The recommendation from the Senate Council is that the Senate approve the 2011-2012 winter intercession calendar as presented. Could I have a second?

GROSSMAN:

Second, Bob Grossman, A&S.

SWANSON:

All in favor?

ASSEMBLY:

Aye.

SWANSON:

Opposed?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Abstained?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Motion carries. Thank you. All right, this one is proposed changes to the Senate rules 1.3.3.A. This came out of some discussion in the Senate Council. And I'll go ahead and introduce the amendment. So this is word of thinking is. The thinking is that we would make four changes. The first one is that we were thinking that it would be more inclusive if we would allow the entire Senate to vote on the Chair. Right now what we're doing is we're only having voting within the Senate Council. So we've got to broaden it. We would do that. And then currently we usually take that vote in December. So the way we would change that then is that we would have that voting done at the Senate meeting in December. And then the voting process would change. Usually we do it just with the Senate Council. And then we would change it over to an electronic ballot. And then the other thing we talked about is that the term of the Chair would be increased, okay? And so that currently what we've been doing, we've been doing one year at a time. And so I'm in my second term, right? But from my experience I didn't even know what I was supposed to be doing until six or eight months. And I'm starting to get a clue now, right? So we've got for the body of the Senate to have that continuity would be a good thing. And so those are the general ideas. Shelly or Bob, do you have any additions?

STEINER:

Shelly Steiner. (unintelligible) post their qualifications, see their experience or whatever (unintelligible.) something would be posted much like (unintelligible.)

SWANSON:

So we would run a nomination process, same as we do the Board of Trustees?

GROSSMAN:

I guess all I would say is the first three changes are sort of a one package and the fourth is a different package, and if the sentiment of the Senate is against one or the other, then perhaps my proposal amendment to strip one or the other from the entire resolution so that these two issues could be separated from each other.

SWANSON:

Right. So we'd like discussion on this and we'll discuss this time and bring it back however (unintelligible.)

SPEAKER:

(Unintelligible.) College of Pharmacy. I'd like the idea of two year terms for the Senate Council Chair but then I would think there should be a Vice Chair who works a year later and gets kind of introduced into the job. Otherwise the idea what you said to get used to it and understand what you're going to do is lost if there's no learning process involved. So I would think it would be good. I don't know. Is there a Vice Chair now?

SWANSON:

Yes, Debra Anderson is our Vice Chair.

SPEAKER:

I should have known.

THELAND:

John Theland, Anthropology Studies. (Unintelligible) go so far as wanting the Chair interview to be held at the Cincinnati Airport, I draw the line. Under the current arrangement I think there is a logic to it in that one has served in the Senate Council and had an opportunity to observe the work load and demands. And so I think it makes very good sense, the existing arrangement. And on the fourth clause there, I do worry about a colleague -- I would be weary of a colleague would want to serve two two-year terms. I think there is a danger of formalization and becoming embedded. So I like the existing arrangement. All senators, all faculty members have opportunities to be elected into the Senate Council which is something of a staging ground, and I think the biggest problem you're going to have under the new proposal is to have good colleagues stand for election.

SWANSON:

Other comments?

GROSSMAN:

Yeah, in terms in the Senate Council, under this proposal only members of the Senate Council would be eligible to be elected Senate Chair. So people who -- it's true the voters will be extended to the entire Senate but someone -- because the eligibility is restricted to current Senate Council members, they will have at least had the opportunity to see, you know, the business of the Senate Council, the kinds of things that Senate Council Chair does, et

STEINER:

I think that the Senate Council Chair is the most important position, faculty position on campus. It outdistances the Board of Trustees. They can initiate lots of things. I think people should state their positions before being elected, and I think it's -- I think it's been terribly underpowered. It's not understood. I didn't understand it really fully, the full extent of it. The issues that are brought up before the Faculty Senate can be generated by the fact that the Chair of the Senate Council issues of academic this and lots of lots of issues can be brought up. And in many university faculty Senates are very powerful. I think we have to be driven by the faculty Senate Chair. So I think it needs to be evaluated in terms of -- and this would start it at any rate. Have people understand where you come from, what you think is important, and, you know, so I'm really -- I'm supporting this in that way. It democratizes the process some, so I think it's very important.

SWANSON:

Davy, did you have a comment? Davy Jones, College of Medicine.

JONES:

One way to look at it, there's two tensions involved. One is the (unintelligible) Senate Council Chair aware, the Senate Council Chair presides over this body and so this body's concerned about how effective its processes are being conducted by the person who is leading it. The Senate Council also does a tremendous amount of heavy lifting to make these meetings effective, and so the Senate Council Chair is also presiding (unintelligible) to the Senate Council. And so those who have been in Senate Council know there's a temperament that's involved. If you're looking for some way to keep meetings moving and build consensus, come to a decision, I'm not sure that everybody who's in this body has had a chance to see the way the Senate Council members have because of the interaction (unintelligible) Council members which person there is really best suited to be -- to chair the Senate Council. But that shouldn't be the only decision, the only weighing factor because,

again, that person is also having to manage this body. You can feel a tension either way on this, and I don't know if there's an ideal resolution. But I just want you to be aware there's both of these tensions that are involved here.

MEYER: Lee Meyer, College of Ag. What's been the history? How many in the last several years, how many Chairs have served two terms and how many Vice Chairs have moved into or not moved into the Chair?

SWANSON: I was the Vice Chair and I moved into it. Davy, you did two terms. Cavay did two terms. And you were Vice Chair previous to that. What is Cavay's history?

BROTHERS: Cavay did two terms.
SWANSON: Cavay did two terms. And Ernie did two terms. Jeff Dembo did two terms. So we do have a history of two terms; is that correct?

JONES: The Senate Council Vice Chair is not obligated though, the one who will become the Chair.

SWANSON: No, sometimes they're coerced.
SEAGO: Kate Seago, Libraries. There has been a Vice Chair in recent memory that refused and that was Stephanie Aiken.

BROTHERS: Yes.
SPEAKER: As I did about ten or twelve years ago.

SWANSON: Common sense. Other comments?
SPEAKER: (Inaudible.) I didn't quite catch, are these going to be voted in or against as a package or are we going to do the change for --

SWANSON: That was our intent, but I was going to wait for a motion from somebody. I didn't know. Bob, do you want to do a motion and do you want to do it as a package?

GROSSMAN: It's possible. But I guess before we do that point of order for our Parliamentarian, would this be considered a major change? Because if it is, it needs to be introduced in one meeting and discussed --

SEAGO: I would say it's a major change. This is a discussion period.

SWANSON: I agree. I think people need a bit of time just to really think it over. Any other questions?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: So let's bring it up to our next meeting then in September. If you have other additions, corrections, let me know, please. We'll start with our committee reports. We have Chair Dan Wermerling.

WERMERLING: This, as you know, is our last

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
meeting, and fortunately we have been able to get all of our business finished with the faculty this year, at least all that I'm aware of. So everything that has been posted to us has been addressed. There is one housekeeping item that is on here. I think we may have addressed this a little bit once but didn't finish it. But this is basically to delete the Master of Arts in Distributive Education. The College of Education discovered that this hasn't been in operation for at least twenty years. So they're making a move to have it removed from the books. And so the recommendation that came from the committee to Senate Council and subsequently through the Senate Council is to move that the Senate approve the deletion of the Master of Arts in Distributive Education. Do we have a motion on the floor from the committee? All in favor?

SWANSON:

ASSEMBLY:
SWANSON:

SWANSON:

SWANSON:
WERMERLING:

Aye.
Opposed?
(No audible response.)
Abstained?
(No audible response.)
Motion carries. Thank you.
Number two, okay. This was a very interesting proposal that came. This is for a new Master's of Music in Music Therapy. And my first introduction to this was actually through our radio station where some of the members are actually trying to recruit funding by offering to -- if you would donate \$50 for them to come and play at University Hospital for some of the patients. And so you could donate to have patients' access to music there. And so as we came on to this a little bit farther, we also discovered in the application this is substantially supported by UK Health Care. They have a \$3 million grant from UK Health Care for the initiation and implementation of the program. So this is again from the music school and the program itself is actually quite well organized. The application mirrors the accrediting body, and so there is a professional organization that actually examines the educational components. And so the application itself was quite a mirror image of what the accrediting body would

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt

come in and examine once the program was approved. There appears to be plenty of students who are interested in doing this. We see some of them actually if you go to the Markey Cancer Center now, you'll see some of these students who are actually playing piano in the atrium. So the committee was - - actually even reviewed this because it mirrored so much the accrediting body documents and UK's general programs that we actually didn't have any questions for it. And so the recommendation, that is, the Senate Council and subsequently to the Senate is that we approve the new Master's of Music in Music Therapy effective fall of '11.

SWANSON: Would anyone like to argue in favor or against the motion?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON: We're ready to vote. All in favor?

Aye.

ASSEMBLY: Opposed?

SWANSON: (No audible response.)

SWANSON: Abstained?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Motion carries. Thank you.

WERMERLING: Okay, we have two of them sort of together and so we'll talk about them together but I think they probably require separate votes. So the first one, there's a single sponsor, Matthew Wells, who is also here -- yes. And so there is a proposal then for a new minor and a new major in Chinese. And so this follows from the fact that the Commonwealth of Kentucky has been sponsoring Chinese languages in high school. And so now there are students who are beginning to matriculate through high school and would like to take Chinese as an continuing extension of their education and perhaps it's in line with their future career goals. There are some undergraduate first year courses that you can take without having to be enrolled in the major itself, and so you can take introductory Chinese if you want to. But the sponsoring program has come through with two applications. The first is a new minor in Chinese. They have both the language and cultural literature components of China and Chinese embedded and so students can kind of matriculate back and forth through art history, culture, language, linguistics, all these

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
sorts of things are all embedded.
We did have some additional
questions because they had
different tracks that at least
according to the committee's
opinion didn't make quite as much
sense as we thought it would be
confusing to students, and so they
just went back to a more
traditional curriculum offering.
So we submitted some questions to
Matthew, and he was able to answer
all of them for us quickly so we
could get before you today. So the
Senate Academic Program Committee
then recommends to the senate to
approve the new minor in Chinese
effective fall of 2011.

SWANSON: would anyone like to speak in favor
or against the motion?

SPEAKER: I just have a question.

SWANSON:

SPEAKER:

Yes.
(Unintelligible.) Didn't we
approve something from the
(unintelligible) last year?

SPEAKER:

WERMERLING:

That was Japanese.
We haven't seen any other Chinese.
At least for me this is -- the last
two years we haven't taken anything
else.

GROSSMAN:

I just have a question, too. Is
this just Mandarin or is it many
different dialects?

WELLS:

WERMERLING:

Just Mandarin.
We had the same question, which
version. No Cantonese.

SWANSON:

ASSEMBLY:

SWANSON:

We're ready to vote. All in favor?
Aye.

Opposed?
(No audible response.)
Abstained?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

SWANSON:

SWANSON:

WERMERLING:

Motion carries. Thank you.
Okay, so this is basically a rerun
of the same thing. This is for a
proposed BA in Chinese language and
literature. The follow-through on
comments and questions that we had
were virtually the same between the
minor and the major. So this is
kind of a repeat. Again, we
received appropriate answers in a
letter back from Matthew and some
editing that occurred in the
proposal itself. Part of it was
also making sure that the major was
in line with the gen ed
requirements and all the postings
because this would be effective in
the fall along with gen ed. So we
closed the loop on all of that as
well with him. So our committee
then recommends to the Senate that

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
we approve the proposed new BA
Chinese language and literature
effective fall of 2011.

SWANSON: Any questions?
SPEAKER: All these teachers of languages and
culture are in place already?
WERMERLING: Yes, we went through that question
actually as well. And so they have
professors who are both in
linguistics and in his department
that are already here, and I
believe they also have new lines
approved.
SPEAKER: (Unintelligible) we have in Chinese
actually. Three in modern
(unintelligible) and one in
history. The three faculty have
(unintelligible) modern and Chinese
(unintelligible.)
WERMERLING: We were able in the tables they
submitted to line up all the
proposed courses or the actual
courses, and all the courses are
pretty much in place already so we
lined up the faculty force and
semester to semester, and so all of
that made sense. The resources
were there.
WELLS: Matthew Wells. This will be a
(unintelligible.) Everything is
already being taught. Everything
is in place. We just don't have a
panel. All the faculty are here.
Everyone, you know, we have all of
the languages and all of the
language and all of the culture
courses are already in place and
(unintelligible) need to formalize
(unintelligible.)
SWANSON: We have a motion on the floor.
Would anybody like to argue for or
against the motion?
(No audible response.)
SWANSON: All right, let's go ahead and vote.
All in favor?
ASSEMBLY: Aye.
SWANSON: Opposed?
(No audible response.)
SWANSON: Abstained?
(No audible response.)
SWANSON: Motion carries. Thank you. We
have the Senate Admission Academic
Standards Committee. Alison was
not able to join us today so I will
go ahead and present it to you.
This is a proposed rating change,
the College of Medicine, for the
800, 900 level courses. We have
Dr. Darryl Jennings with us. There
he is. If anybody -- would you
like to describe a little bit in
detail, Dr. Jennings? Just tell
them what it is and what you're

JENNINGS:

trying to do. Tell them why you're trying to pull this over on us. Darryl Jennings, College of Medicine. (Inaudible) exception language to the standard grading scheme dates to the mid 1980s. In the mid 1990s the college of Medicine reworked its curriculum and attempted to achieve integrated courses. In doing so created a number of large block courses with a large number of credit hours and yet left the grading scheme the same as it is with an A, B, C. As a consequence, the College of Medicine does not record a GPA. The residency program reports a class rank generally decided by (unintelligible.) In one of those large courses a student who misses the A/B cutoff by 0.2 percent in a very large credit course can actually have their class rank changed from the bottom of the first quarter tile to the upper part of the third quarter tile. Needless to say this has produced years and years of enormous angst and consternation both by faculty and the students. This proposal was originally put forward by students of the College of Medicine. It was then supported and crafted by the Student Progress and Promotion Committee, then approved by both third and fourth and first and second year course directors, then approved by the curriculum committee and then approved by the faculty council. Those were all unanimous approvals. And what it does is once a determination of competency or incompetency or in a pass fail standard is determined, students then get a numeric grade between 70.0 percent and 100 percent and then that fraction times the credit hours becomes the quality point calculation. So it does not change what the College of Medicine ultimately reports as a class ranking but it now gives faculty the freedom and partition students along essentially that 300 point interval rather than simply A, B, and C. And it was the partitioning that created all the anxiety. So now it's 0.2 difference. It's 0.2 times the credit hours and not a four versus a three.

SWANSON:

And they have a problem nationally is that we've had a tremendous

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
increase in the number of medical
schools. So we've got an increase
in graduating students but no
change in the residency slots. And
so now the competition for those
residency slots is intense.

JENNINGS:

Right.

SWANSON:

So this helps our students be more
competitive.

JENNINGS:

(Unintelligible) medical schools
have gone to a strict pass fail
system, but we feel at this point
that disadvantages our students
particularly if they're trying to
compete for very highly competitive
residency programs either a
selective school or a selective
specialty. And they need that
class ranking to give them that
boost. So we did not want to move
away from being able to do class
rankings, but we did want more
freedom and less angst over an
artificial partitioning point.

SWANSON:

Questions?

LEE:

Brian Lee, College of Agriculture.
Does this affect any other 8 or 900
level courses?

JENNINGS:

No.

SWANSON:

Other questions?

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, A&S. Do we have a
language in front of us that's not
in this packet as far as I can
tell?

SWANSON:

Language for what?

GROSSMAN:

Language for what we're voting on?

SWANSON:

You mean in addition to the
recommendation?

GROSSMAN:

The proposed language that will be
incorporated into the rules?
Senate Council members were
presented with last week and some
of us had some comments?

BROTHERS:

It's on page eighty-two of the
handout. It was posted with the
agenda.

GROSSMAN:

No, this isn't the language that
will go into Senate rules.

BROTHERS:

You're right.

SWANSON:

It was posted?

BROTHERS:

I hope so. My apologies.

ANDERSON:

Debra Anderson. It looks like
there was a proposal up a few
pages.

GROSSMAN:

It was a rationalization of the
proposal. It wasn't the actual
language.

BROTHERS:

Bob asked for the exact track
change language.

SWANSON:

Could we go on to the next agenda
item and Sheila will look into
that? I think our next agenda item
is Dwight Denison; is that correct?

DENISON:

Dwight? Oh, there you are. Okay, so it has been proposed that there is a Department of Otolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery that would be formed by moving a division out of the Department of Surgery. The proposal was very detailed and it's -- also has a consultant analysis that verifies the benefits or suggests the benefits and some of the weaknesses of proposal. But by in large as we looked at this we thought the academic merits of this had strong merit. It received approvals from the appropriate college committees and also support from Dean Wilson and the Senate Academic Organization and structure committee has fully vetted this and has voted to send forward the floor this motion which is I guess there's two motions. And Dr. Raleigh Jones is here if there are questions. So the first motion that the Senate approved the proposed new Department of Otolaryngology, Head, Neck and Surgery effective upon the Board of Trustees' approval based upon the academic merits. Second motion is that the Senate approves the proposed new Department of Otolaryngology, Head, Neck and Surgery effective upon the Board of Trustees' approval based on its non-academic merits.

SWANSON:

We have two motions on the floor.

FINKEL:

The first motion, any questions? Raphael Finkel, College of Engineering. What's the reason for two motions and what's the difference between these two sets of merits?

SWANSON:

The first we should approve and the non-academic we recommend. Is that correct, Davy? That should have been recommended?

JONES:

Motion one is actually approving the academic programs in its own stand alone environment. That's our substantive approval. The second one is our advice to the administration that its infrastructure to the Department (unintelligible) and we only advise on that.

SWANSON:

So this should be recommended or advised?

GROSSMAN:

Just endorse.

JONES:

Endorse.

GROSSMAN:

May I also make a friendly (unintelligible) nonacademic is not

hyphenated. Thank you. Much better.

SWANSON: Are there questions, comments? All right, let's go ahead and vote then. So we have a motion on the floor that the Senate approve the Department effective upon Board of Trustees' approval based on its academic merits. All in favor?

Aye.

ASSEMBLY:

SWANSON: Opposed?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Abstained?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Motion carries. Thank you. The second motion is that the Senate endorse the proposed new Department effective upon the Board of Trustee's approval based on nonacademic merits. All in favor?

Aye.

ASSEMBLY:

SWANSON: Opposed?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Abstained?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON: Motion carries. Thank you. Okay, we have the changes. Can you read them? No, all right. 5.1.2.3, all professional program courses in the College of Medicine will be termed to be minimum level of competency. Courses taken for grade will be reflect student performance with a numeric value of three significant digits between .7 and 1 for those students achieving minimum competency. The course performance will be valued at the chief numerical performance for each credit hour. Students failing to achieve minimum competency will receive one of the grades below. For courses taken on a pass fail basis the achievement of minimum competency will be the only determination. And then class rank will be determined by multiplying the numeric values assigned for each course by the total number of credit hours for that course and summing all courses taken for grade. Pass fail courses will not contribute to their determination of class rank. Represents failure, that must be F. What is that over there, E?

JONES:

Yes, E.

SWANSON: E represents failure to achieve minimum competency and unacceptable performance in a numeric graded or pass fail course. It is valued at zero points for each credit hour. P represents achievement of minimum

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
competency in a passing grade in a
course taken on a pass fail basis
and, of course, W doesn't change.
U represents unsatisfactory
performance in a specific area of
course requirements. Students must
earn a passing grade .7 or above.
Upon completion of makeup work in
the interim the U will be valued
between .6 and .699 depending upon
student performance for each credit
hour. A temporary grade must be
replaced with a permanent grade
before the student can be promoted.
The quality point calculation will
then utilize the numeric grade
after the makeup. Failure to
satisfy makeup of the work will
result in an assignment of an E
grade as described above.

Questions, additional comments?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

All right, so we have a motion on
the floor. It is recommendation
that the Senate approve the
proposed grading change to college
of Medicine's 800 and 900 level
courses effective fall 2011. Would
anyone like to argue in favor or
against the motion? All right, all
those in favor, aye?

ASSEMBLY:

Aye.

SWANSON:

Opposed?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Abstained?
(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Motion carries. Thank you. Our
next item of business is to vote on
(unintelligible.) So the way we'll
do this is we will take a vote by
raising your hand. We will vote
for A, B, C, or D, and the one that
receives the least amount of votes
-- how many times is Wanda going to
vote? The ones that receives the
least amount of votes will get
knocked off, and then we'll go to
the next round. Is that clear?
Okay, so all those in favor of A,
building leaders through
undergraduate education BLUE, raise
your hand. All those in favor?
Let me give you some background.
We had decided that the
(unintelligible) committee would be
the one that put these forward and
then Senate Council moved forward
and this came out of -- it was
electronically solicited for about
three weeks, Bill?

SPEAKER:

Yes.

SWANSON:

B, Cat's Core. All those in favor
of Cat's Core?

SPEAKER: One.
ANDERSON: Make it two.
SWANSON: C, the UK Core 21st Century Studies, all those in favor, please?
SPEAKER: Eleven.
SWANSON: Okay, eleven. And D, UK Core, all those in favor? That was so easy. Do we need to go ahead and count? Let's go ahead and count.
GROSSMAN: I move that we accept the results of the first round.
SWANSON: All those in favor?
ASSEMBLY: Aye.
SWANSON: Opposed?
(No audible response.)
SWANSON: Abstained?
(No audible response.)
SWANSON: Motion carries. Thank you. It is now called the UK Core. The next item on our agenda is the person who left the room. State of academic affairs, Provost Subbaswamy. One of the things I think I've told you about before that the Senate Council will be talking about in June, we still haven't selected a date, but we'll be talking about how to move the faculty interest forward and in front of the President. Now what we're going to use as our base for that is what I presented April 11th. And I've gotten some feedback since then and I'll continue to incorporate that. But if you have additional comments, comments, some of the things if you remember from that that really came to the front was the desire of the faculty to strengthen our academics. Another thing that, you know, and we need to vet and talk about is increase our recruitment and retention of Kentucky's best and brightest. That was another thing that came out. And then we also need to look at the Honors College. And I think that's something that Joe has brought up to the Board, the need to increase our Honors College. So those are some of the ideas and I'd like to hear some more. We could also talk a little bit about the grievance committee or the ombuds committee. We're in the final stages of preparing our report and we're working on a date to present that report to Swamy. Joe, can you remember the faculty members who are on the committee?
PEEK: No.

SWANSON: Debra's on there. Debra, do you remember?

ANDERSON: Joe, you, anybody else wants to admit to it?

SWANSON: We have somebody from the College of Law. We have somebody in Library.

PEEK: Yes, somebody from the College of Law.

SWANSON: It's the end of the semester. We can't remember anything.

PEEK: Right after the last final exam.

SWANSON: You're on the committee. What is your name again?

SPEAKER: Ray (unintelligible.)

SWANSON: Yes, thank you. Any other issues?

SUBBASWAMY: I wasn't sure how much time I was going to have. So I only have a handful of slides and I would rather open it for discussion because that's the best interaction we get, so a few opportunities to interact, so that's what I'd like to do. I'm tempted to call this presentation of report, a peek outside. A peek outside my window on to the Garden of Eden. But I won't. I thought it would be worthwhile to just sort of take a look at what's going on out there in terms of additions and so forth because that's a part of the reputation management, if you will. People, you know, come and have a good experience. We must be doing something right. So this is not -- depending on how you say it can you say that acceptance rate declined from 80.5 percent just a year I started to 68.5. It could be a good thing or a bad thing. We could either interpret that as we've gone away from our land grant mission and becoming selective or you could say you know what, since we're keeping the enrollment relatively fixed and the number of applications is going up and the demand for UK brand is going up, we have, you know, better ability to select and shape the class we want to shape. And frankly it is the latter. We haven't changed the percentage of in-state out of state students. So the entering class is still twenty-five percent out of state and seventy-five percent in state. So we've been able to maintain that ratio and hence our obligation, our mission as a land grant university because that was really what was there before all of this started. The (unintelligible)

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt

percent rating of ACT is one way of classes are measured, and in fact, frankly that's a measure that goes into US News and World Reports. That's not something we focus on, but as you shape your class to get the best class you can get, that should, in fact, move and, in fact, it went from 21-26 to 22-28. The 28 we're very happy about. The 22-25 level is something we're working on. So on that score I'll just have a little bit of data to present as well. The average ACT at UK you can look at moved from 24.2 to 26. Those of you who -- approximately 26. I don't want to over-promise in the sense that this is now what the current incoming class looks like, but until they're all here and paid their tuition and so forth, we won't know. Assuming all of that happens, that's approximately in SAT terms a hundred point movement. That's nothing to sneeze at. What that says among other things frankly is that we are going to be getting a better prepared class, better and better prepared class and we as a faculty need to be challenging our students more as well. I think that's something that I hope is a message we can all take. Let's challenge them more because they are a better prepared class. Challenge means a lot of different things including disseminating information inside the classroom that could be easily obtained online and things like that without reviewing something more by way of active learning and so forth. So there's that. The war on (unintelligible) -- I think I can use this. So again, we have been stuck in the 77 range, 78 range in terms of percentage of students who came back the second year after the first year, and that's like saying as I've said this before, it's approximately a quarter of the class not returning. For the hospital it would be like a quarter of the patients dying immediately or something like that. So that has improved to above eighty, a jump up of approximately four points give or take and we think we'll get just a little bit higher by just doing continuing to do what we're doing, but frankly it is what you're doing at the low preparation

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
end of students that are entering where we need to do more, and, in fact, that's where I'll have something to say. Of course, the graduation rate is a lagging indicator. It's a six year graduation rate. It's a cohort by cohort measurement. And so the first class here where the war on attrition started being waged, if you will, will show itself in the '12-13 period and then beyond that we need to do. We already know we need to do more in terms of the sophomore to junior year. The freshman to sophomore year I think we might have saturated in terms of the kind of interventions we have in place. We probably need to do more. Where we want this to be really regardless of Top 20, forget all of that, as a flagship university, as a responsible university, if we do everything right, the six year graduation rate for the American system and for the American student body should be in the seventy-five range. That's something that we ought to be working on both in terms of shaping them in class as well as in terms of what we do and once they're here, to get into that range. One other, you know, measure of how well our students are doing is because we're getting a better and better class of students, and, in fact, I shared with Hollie Swanson the quality of the thirty-three Singletary scholars that are going to be entering this fall is just amazing. An anecdote, my son is in the MSBC program at Dunbar and he is really more arrogant than I am, if you can imagine. So three years ago the notion that anyone from that program would come to UK unless the engineering or something like that was unheard of. And all of a sudden, more and more students from that program are coming here valid proportion works, and he himself is sort of saying gee, maybe my dad works for a reasonable place. That's just anecdote. Another anecdote, I was at a grocery store, that will remain unnamed, it's an ethnic grocery store, and the storekeeper's daughter, again, very bright student, and he was complaining that if his child had gotten a 31 ACT would have qualified for our

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
Commonwealth Scholarship but was off by one point and Centre offered a free ride. Centre College offered a free ride to her. She didn't want to come to UK. There wasn't anything I could do. The part of the message here is that the way you bring more and more better quality students is to offer scholarships or student discounts as private universities tend to do. We also need the revenue, folks, so there is a limit. As you shape this curve, you've got to make sure that the revenue is what you need it to be. And as somebody who worked at a private university for two years, I know how that whole business works. But anyway, that's something that, you know, as we get better and better students, it expresses itself in terms of the full rides and the (unintelligible) and the, you know, yet to get on the Rhodes Scholarship, but we have at least one candidate identified in this fall incoming class who if he doesn't get the Rhodes Scholarship, there is something wrong with the Rhodes program. We'll see. So another thing, we weren't paying attention to what was happening on international student on the graduate level. So from 2001 to 2005 it dropped precipitously and I came and look what happened. So, you know, it's a good thing. We're looking like a global university and this is not enough. I need to see this number go to seven hundred. And this is going to happen. We will have approximately I think six hundred fifty students study abroad this year and that number is again something that I want to see around a thousand. But when I came here, it was four fifty. That's again some things, you know, we're doing all the right things. And all these things take time and persistence. And graduate research, twenty-three students participated in National Council. One hundred seventy-five presented the research grade to work at undergraduate showcase just a couple weeks ago. It was spectacular, I've got to tell you. It was exciting. It was really rewarding to go see that. And that was a peek outside my window. Two hundred sixty-four undergraduates

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
were formally partnered with
faculty research creativity. And
Diane Snow is doing a terrific job
and I expect that thing to really
grow as well provided the faculty
really participates and say hey,
where is my undergraduate student.
So we need more participation from
the faculty across campus.
Improving the quality of the
cohort. As I said, really we need
to make sure that students come
prepared. 2009, well, there was a
state law passed that said certain
ACT and math and reading cutoffs
were to be applied in terms of
admission standards. None of the
other Kentucky universities have
adopted that. They're going to be
starting this year. But we
actually went ahead and did that as
soon as the law was passed because
we thought it would have been hard
for us to do it. So 2009 we had
seven hundred sixty-six people who
were deficient in one form or
another, math, or in the entering
class of four thousand. So we're
talking about a significant portion
that had noted deficiency by what
the state considers to be
deficiency. For math it was four
hundred seventy-eight. 2010, we
pared that down to four hundred
sixty-eight total. Two hundred
fifty-three math deficiency. And
for the 2011 class, again, don't
hold me to this because there may
be a big meltdown for all we know
we have one hundred fifty-eight
with one hundred fourteen in math
deficiency. So the idea is to try
to get it down to zero or at least
what we're working with over the
summer to have that deficiency
addressed and so forth. All right,
on the research front, you know,
unfortunate that the easiest
measure is always dollars, and I
have no other way of offering
something that's broad based. The
research are the expenditures of
\$360 million, record for us. Still
a little increase over 2009, a
twenty-one percent increase in
funding from industrial commerce
sponsors, some commercial sponsors.
That's something that we'll need to
look at. Federal funding was
nineteen percent (unintelligible.)
Our faculty, they're extremely
successful in getting competitive
grants. I mean it's just

phenomenal. There were one hundred eighty-four awards from the stimulus funding competition. These were rigorous competitions like any other competition. There were one hundred eighty-four awards with \$150.5 million. So a faculty very capable of competing nationally. And that's something to celebrate. The Research Enrichment Fund was designed -- changed to stimulate collaborative research and cross units, and that, there's an incentive system for return dollars, FNA dollars, back to the unit plus the center or institute 6.4 million return to the Department compared to a 5.3 in the previous year. And so that's also growing in collaborative research. And other process improvements, under development, and again, I recommend that if you haven't already, I think you did have Vice President Jim Tracy come and address the Senate so you probably know more about this already. There are challenges. Congressional ban on earmarks certainly puts approximately \$18 million of support in infrastructure projects and other things across the campus but primarily agriculture and medicine at risk. In fact, we've lost it for this year and probably next year as well. And, of course, the whole Federal budget is going through such a confusion at this point in terms of what might happen. There's no telling exactly where that money will go. The number of faculty anticipating the question I've broken it down to tenure, tenure track and nontenure track faculty, and you will notice that the light blue or the North Carolina blue is the number of tenure faculty from 2005 to 2011, 1207 to 1180, loss of twenty-seven through retirement, nonreplacement, or through retirement with replacement (unintelligible) at the professional level. So it's within the noise there. The UK blue line represents tenure eligible faculty higher in track. Thirty-two -- I'm sorry, three ninety in 2005 to four hundred thirty-eight. And I'm reading this right, four hundred thirty-eight. So it's certainly not decreased, not grown a whole lot because we added about a

hundred and also started reducing unfortunately because of the budget reductions. But, you know, there's a conscious effort across the colleges to try to preserve tenure track lines we're are not growing. There's a marginal growth there. But we're not growing. I'll be the first one to say. But we are very acutely conscious of not losing tenure track lines proportionate at (unintelligible.) So if you look at the tenure ineligible lines, there is a growth, a huge growth from three hundred twenty-three to six hundred two. As you well know, most of that is in clinical faculty growth as the UK Health Care operations have grown and continues to grow and there are some issues there that I know the faculty council and the College of Medicine have been dealing with and we're all dealing with. But certainly in terms of tenure track lines affecting the academic operations, we're trying to do the best to maintain and not lose that. That's obviously both important for graduate education and for research. Salaries. And several things that go on. As I said, I always look out onto the Garden of Eden. I'm going to give you the Garden of Eden. I looked at the SEC group as well. That's important because that's who we have been. As a university we have been a part of the SEC and our comparison group for a long time has been the flagships of the SEC. And I think that's a fair group to start with. Where we are headed is the Top 20 group. So suddenly one day you don't switch and say you know what, we've changed our benchmarks and all of a sudden our salaries are low. Why not just take (unintelligible) tomorrow and say that's our benchmark and say our salaries are low compared to the Ivy League instead of also looking at the performance data and so forth. So I started to say we should be transitioning towards the Top 20 benchmark but the starting point is the SEC. So the medium of the public SEC, I take Vanderbilt out obviously, is -- well '08-'09 was 78,000, 80,722, if you will. University of Kentucky is, in fact, is one hundred three, one hundred two percent. By golly, we should

be. We are among the best in the SEC. I would say top three. That's my own assessment. And so leaving Vanderbilt aside. And so yes, we should be at the high end of that salary and obviously compared to where we want to be, we are. So average University of Kentucky with the same numbers, UK is a percentage of average for the top twenty went from 83.2 to 82. We've digressed slightly and UK percentage medium again the same thing. So the point is that we are well-paid adequately compensated depends on what the competitive group is. I think that both are relevant. One given our aspirations, the other given way beyond. And I believe that we're trying to do the right thing. The last three years hasn't helped. But that's certainly as I said my Garden of Eden. So somewhere between my rosy picture of the Garden of Eden and the Valley of Death, reality exists. And let me give you another factor and you think about the place you come to work every day, please think about this as well. The last five years we have spent approximately \$40 million on tap certainly for renovating, reclaiming, and modernizing academic space on the main part of the campus. Almost every college there's some part of their either laboratory or their classroom, their general office space has been renovated, has been reclaimed. We have emptied the third and fourth -- third and fifth floors of Patterson Office Tower and taken the administrative operations that were there and exiled them to the old credit union building and given that for academic purposes including the Honors program that's now instead of being on the eleventh floor is on a much more accessible third floor of Patterson Office Tower in really nice quarters. Then, let's see, the so-called old pharmacy building which when I was growing up here was the new pharmacy building is being renovated for both the College of Arts and Science Departments and Bio Statistics and Bio Medical Informatics. In my old building chemistry, physics, we have spent about \$8 million in putting

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
lipstick on a pig I admit but none
the less it is expensive lipstick
that we have put on that pig. The
other part that we won't see is the
roughly \$10 million worth of
infrastructure stuff that gets
done. We won't see anything
visible from it but hopefully the
black dust that keeps dropping from
(unintelligible.) Are there
problems, by golly there are
problems. There are problems for
every university, there are. We
have a particularly acute issue
because of the way the state does
capital projects and does not allow
universities to have binding
authority and moreover actually
there are still issues of how we're
going to pay off the debt. It's
one thing to be allowed to borrow
but how do you pay off? What
revenues are you going to have?
It's really complicated set of
stories. Is it possible to
ridicule what goes on? It is
certainly possible. As I said, you
have to get up every morning and
you have to come to work. Do you
want to come to work at a place
where you feel very positive about
not quite the Garden of Eden but
patches of nice flowers and other
patches of desert that still needs
to be irrigated? That's how I see
it. Otherwise I couldn't come to
work every day. That said, I'm
happy to answer questions and no
hold for it. Yes.
Arman (unintelligible) English
Department. What are some of the
places that still need to be
irrigated?

SPEAKER:

SUBBASWAMY:

well, I think almost every -- there
are some places that frankly I'd
like to burn down. I mean it's
that bad. What we're doing is that
systematically we're taking down
classrooms that we ought to be and
are embarrassed about it. There
are still five classrooms that are
on my list. Just yesterday I had a
another conversation with space
manager Wayne Ritchie. He's
absolutely (unintelligible) been at
three different universities. I've
got to tell you he's the best space
manager I've ever come across. And
he and I, we're constantly talking
about what is the next opportunity
to take down the (unintelligible)
classroom and things of that
nature. So we're working on it.

So every opportunity there is to reconfigure space -- you do the best of what you can possibly can while the state really doesn't in my opinion hold up its share of capital projects.

SPEAKER: You say the increase in average SAT scores of incoming students compare to five, six years ago, how is the requirement? Did that change as well as the minimum requirement? Minimum requirement for what?

SUBBASWAMY: For SAT.

SPEAKER: No, admissions across this country are holistic. In fact, a lot of places have dropped in standardized tests. And so there is not a hard and fast anything below this you cannot admit. That's not how any university operates. And, in fact, more and more universities are completely dropping standardized tests. And so it's a holistic way of looking at the rigor of your high school classes, the grades you have made, and the standardized tests and other things. So it is not a simple cutoff. But if you -- I mean there is at the higher end certainly there is a correlation. Somebody who is getting a 31 ACT or 1400 SAT is very good and is going to succeed in college, no question. But can you by the same token say that somebody who is getting 1100 SAT or 24 ACT will not succeed.

SUBBASWAMY: No. There are really brilliant minds in that group especially in a state like Kentucky who with the right support can do extremely well and have done extremely well and that's really the balance especially at the land grant university we have.

ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of Nursing. Could you go back to the one slide where you showed how the math and English scores. Have -- you have fewer students now than you did three or four years.

SUBBASWAMY: That one?

ANDERSON: Right. Could you talk a little bit more about those students? Like what happened to that seven hundred sixty-six students?

SUBBASWAMY: Would you like to respond?

MULLEN: Sure.

SUBBASWAMY: Mike Mullen, Associate Provost for Undergraduate.

MULLEN: Mike Mullen, Undergraduate Studies. So the state has put into place cutoffs if a student ha below a nineteen in math on the ACT they

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
are deemed not ready for college,
credit bearing college work. And
so if they have an eighteen in
writing or below, they're in the
same boat. If it's less than a
twenty in reading, they're
classified the same way. Senate
Bill 1 put this in place a couple
years ago. We frankly didn't pay a
lot of attention all the time prior
to that time. We had students
coming in that were in those boats.
So in 2009 we were just starting to
look at these students and we had
students in math courses going in
math 108 R classes and we had
supplemental writing courses that
English was doing as kind of a
stretch term that took students
from the beginning of the fall and
then work with them on their
writing skills and then they moved
into English 104 in the spring.
Likewise, we have supplemental
reading workshops for students in
those categories. So a couple of
things have happened. We have been
working with enrollment management
to number one look at the
categories of students, who are we
bringing in, and we have to say in
the seven sixty-six there were a
fair number of students with two
deficiencies and there were
handfuls that had all three. And
we know from looking at the success
of those students that have two or
three, it's pretty hard pressed to
be successful here at the
University. And so we've worked
really hard to move away from any
student that has two or three
deficiencies, number one. And
we've also moved now to where we're
providing opportunities for these
students once they've applied, we
now tell a student that has any of
those areas thank you for your
interest in the University of
Kentucky. You are in this
category. We do this in a very
tactful way so we're not upsetting
them.

SUBBASWAMY:
MULLEN:

We first congratulate them, Mike.
Congratulations to be interested
but we defer their admission and
them we are providing them with a
variety of opportunities to do work
outside of the University
whether that --

SUBBASWAMY:
MULLEN:

Before they come in.
Before they come in. So we've got
students working in online hybrid

kinds of courses. We've got some students doing some pilots through a learned K12 program this year. And so we've cut back on the number that are admitted with more than one deficiency, and we're providing more and more opportunities for these students to work outside of the admissions process to up their skills, retake the ACT, take another placement test, pass out of that. So the 766 to 468 represents quite a bit of work outside by the students. The one fifty-eight we're seeing is really pushing back on the idea that we should have students with more than one deficiency being admitted. And this year because of the message students are looking at us and thanks for the opportunities, are really excited about the way that we're phrasing things now. We're also going to be providing on campus hybrid -- online hybrid face to face -- I'm not sure I said that right. We'll have a person in the room with computerized mathematics instruction so that they can work with tutors in lieu of going into math 108 R and perhaps spinning there. So we're doing a variety of things to get that number down because we know that bottom has the hardest time here. And if you're spinning around in developmental math, it's hard to ever move to math 109, to math 123, and actually into your major. So those are some of the strategies we're working on. Bob, do I get to call --

SUBBASWAMY:
GROSSMAN:

Yeah, speaking of burning down buildings and lipstick on a pig, if you want to make us a little bit of pork BBQ sometime, that would be great. But seriously on

buildings --
--

SUBBASWAMY:
GROSSMAN:

This from somebody who should not be eating --

Speaking of buildings, the building priority process, it was a mystery when I first became active in Senate about ten years ago and it's still a complete mystery to me, and I think it's true of a lot of faculty and a lot of us frankly become somewhat discouraged by the way that the University chooses the buildings that go on its priority list, and then, of course, there's the additional discouragement of the legislative process. But in that I understand we don't have any

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt

control over, the legislative process. We have very little control. It seems to me that -- is there going to be any effort to make the whole building priority list more transparent, involve more faculty in making this list and setting the priorities for academics?

SUBBASWAMY:

Bob, if things were rational especially in the capital world, capital project world, all of that would be true. I'll give you just simply, when I was chair of physics, we were drawing up this \$200 million chemistry physics addition plans. Now the way this whole thing works, unfortunately, is that the CP, Council on Post Secondary Education, has a six year wish list is the only way you can describe it. And any project that ever has any chance of being funded in any way and built has to be on that list. And so every university sends in a billion dollars' worth of wish list to that project because if it's not on there when somebody's estate give a \$200 million check -- well, that's not true -- gift buildings can be built. But let's say the state suddenly had, you know, a psychotic episode and decided to send \$200 million our way we couldn't build it because it was not already approved. So that wish list is one where everyone puts everything and so that brings up people's hope. So I was hopeful when I was -- during my days as Chair we're going to have a new chemistry physics (unintelligible) my day as Provost. So I really think if there were a rational process for doing all that, that would be fine. Another thing is that the legislature just simply spreads the pain or the peanut bur across all campuses. So our average take for every biennium up to the last two biennium where we have zero has been roughly 35, \$40 million. So, in fact, I ask the question why is it that -- is this all being written down? I'm not used to speaking when I'm (unintelligible) but that's okay. So if you sort of look at that \$35 million, one of the questions I asked when I first came here because the ground breaking for the new pharmacy building was going on, I said it's only been fifteen years

or so since the old new pharmacy was built. Why is it? Everyone openly said we built to what money we had available. So that was approximately 30 million, \$40 million. And on the very first day it was built you knew that the College of Pharmacy wouldn't even fully fit into it and there was no expansion possibilities, and it was just an inadequate building. And, in fact, really the (unintelligible) PA system, one of the reasons we can't claim it as modern laboratory space fully is because it's got a (unintelligible) PA system which is horrible. So it starts even there. That doesn't work. And then finally there's always political element in that what sells and what doesn't sell. If you're trying to sell a \$200 million chemistry physics building, in fact, who cares about physics, at least as a chemistry building, in this state where -- if they did that to us, they would have to give at least \$150 million to the University of Louisville and at least \$70 million to Western and so on and so forth. And by the time you add all that, we can't afford it. So I honestly don't know, okay? I just don't know what's a way out of this dilemma. On top of that for whatever reasons, certainly certain fields such as law have accreditation hammers to bring to the table. It's all sort of self-directed. I wish physics department had an accreditation body that said that we will not accredit you unless you got a new building except that nobody would care. Whereas, the lawyer -- the lawyers -- certainly the governor is our law graduate and so on. Senator McConnell is, et cetera, et cetera. So there's more power to accrediting body in law than some other areas and so on. So it's not a rational process. There's a political element to it. And now having made this agreement we'll raise some private funds up front and try to build the law and business building, I think the University needs to really disentangle how it's going to re-prioritize how it's going to go forward. That frankly I think is going to be the toughest challenge that President Capilouto will have

THELAND: when he takes office.
John Theland, Anthropology. I'd like to help out the Provost and provide some rationality to my colleagues in chemistry. For fifteen years on the priority list, every year they've been tenth. They are -- the rationality is they are the North Star. They never go up. They never go down. We can steer by them. Thank you. No charge.

BRION: Gail Brion, College of Engineering. In your slide show we're maintaining the same level of tenure faculty but we're increasing the level of nontenure track faculty. Does that nontenure track include the use of adjuncts on campus?

SUBBASWAMY: No, full-time. What we're showing is full-time. It does include the lecturers.

BRION: Because I'd like to provide some feedback. Just from my son's high school, from the six kids who came to UK from my son's high school, five of them have left the University.

SUBBASWAMY: I'd like to know more.

BRION: One of the things I heard from them over and over again is we weren't even being taught by real faculty. They didn't have offices. We couldn't get through to them. And so if you're looking at the retention rate, I think we should ought to pay attention to the adjuncts.

SUBBASWAMY: I completely agree. In fact, Dean (unintelligible), do you want to say anything in this regard because certainly one of the places where the largest number of adjuncts have been employed and we're working on that as well. So, Dean (unintelligible), take it away.

SPEAKER: I don't have the numbers (unintelligible.) By at least half we've reduced the number in two years. So we've concerted effort to do that. Though it remains a challenge, part of the mandate for the new general education curriculum is to increase faculty student contact so that sort of has slowed our ability to reduce the number of PTI. That's the concerted effort in Arts and Sciences.

SUBBASWAMY: In other words, yes, I completely acknowledge that that is an issue associated with improving

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
undergraduate quality and outcomes.
We're working on it, a lot of
things. I think -- Shelly Steiner
the first time made a statement
which is that we're heavily
underinvested in undergraduate.
We're trying to address that. Dr.
Peek.

PEEK:

I was wondering when we talk about
trying to enhance the undergraduate
program, does anyone keep track of
the college choices of the top
students, top high school graduates
in the state of Kentucky, something
broader than National Merit
scholars because I'd be interested
in seeing what percentage of those
say who go in-state come to UK. We
should be winning the state. We
are the flagship. We need to
actually look like the flagship.
We should be getting a really,
really high percentage of those.
As you pointed out, one of our
problems is we're not competitive
on scholarships.

SUBBASWAMY:

In terms of the answer, do we track
the best schools and how can we
recruit them here, the answer is
yes, more and more. We're going to
put some more effort into analytics
that really didn't exist in our
admissions office. Frankly, our
admissions office was not as
sophisticated as it needed to be in
today's world. We've made the
investments there. And so we are
cracking that. That included, for
example, if you want an example,
there's a gap in the Math Academy
at West. We weren't recruiting
there. And we now are actively
recruiting and as a result getting
the students from there. And
frankly the Council of
(unintelligible) and Professors
(unintelligible) is really helping
in putting out, you know, really
famous and good people out there
and helping them recruit
undergraduate students and so
forth, things like that. But
ultimately scholarship is going to
be an issue. The reason is this
country has got really screwed up
priorities in terms of essentially
a regressive tax system in public
universities where we subsidize the
surgeons' children, the provosts'
children and the professors'
children at the expense of the ones
who are already disadvantaged.
They didn't have the Kaplan course.

They didn't have the AP courses in their schools and so forth. And so take from the poor and give to the rich. You know, that's -- it will take -- this was recognized ten years ago. And as long as U.S. News and World Report keeps playing its game and we keep paying attention to those sorts of things, that's not going to change. I think it will come to some breaking point at some point and it will self-correct itself. Will we be the first ones to go out there and say we will only give need based scholarships and not just merit scholarships? That's the day. U of L and Western will have a big celebration. So unless it is a statewide policy that says state public universities will only do need based scholarships, it's going to be tough.

CONNORS:

Terry Connors from the College of Agriculture. Referring to your slide about the number of tenure faculty and so forth, there's one number that wasn't presented. I'm kind of curious about the number of faculty positions that have been lost. I know in our college as soon as I came here ten years ago we had several positions open we couldn't fill. Over time those numbers have slowly declined a fraction of what we were ten years ago and those positions never (unintelligible.)

SUBBASWAMY:

That's a good point. I think really in order to get at that, what you have to do is there were a significant number of vacancies that we would carry from year to year across the colleges and so forth that have been lost cut after cut after cut. And so what you're seeing here are the lines that still exist. But that flexibility and what you thought we would fill next year or the year after what have you, those are being lost. That is, in fact, I mean I think we try very carefully to minimize the number of faculty positions we lose, and sometimes when possible put them back in and so forth. Dynamically it's changing. But certainly where there's been enormous pressures is where we have tried to do more than in some other places. It's not been uniform across the colleges. But, yes, if you look at the number of vacancies

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
that we would carry from year to
year and how that has progressed,
you'll see there has been a
decline.

CONNORS: well, I think it's kind of like any
of your children to avoid
starvation. When you're trying to
have smaller class sizes, we're not
getting them because the number of
real factors have gone down.

SUBBASWAMY: I will not get into a discussion of
what a real faculty is, but other
than that, yes, in general I agree.

DRESS: John Dress, College of Medicine. I
assume these data were the
undergraduate. How are we doing
with graduate programs and
professional programs?

SUBBASWAMY: The professionals are space limited
by their own limit, their own
limitations and so forth. And, in
fact, if you look, let's take law
and medicine as an example, they
both have huge numbers of
applications, huge demand
especially from our state in
medicine and law both we certainly
(unintelligible) the state. Law
gets about a thousand applications
for one hundred thirty-seven slots.
And medicine gets about two
thousand applications for one
hundred seventeen.

JENNINGS: One hundred thirteen.

SUBBASWAMY: But, you know, that's -- the
doctoral programs are different
this year. I think that there are
multiple pressure points. One is
the stipends we pay the number of
scholarships (unintelligible)
students, it's not (unintelligible)
multi-year packages mostly we're
not competitive. We're doing
better than some others because way
back when the (unintelligible)
dollars there is a big portion of
it that was assigned to the
scholarship pool and we protected
it every time (unintelligible) say
what's this \$4 million. That's \$4
million is what's going for
scholarships such as they are right
now. That's a matter of fact. So
I would say in terms of graduate
education it's more what we're
trying to protect as opposed to
there is not going to be any
(unintelligible.) I think there
will be some -- there has been some
(unintelligible) based on quality.
If you can't improve the high
quality students, then you're only
doing that because you

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
(unintelligible) lecturers and so forth bring and to bring in (unintelligible) students. You know, I don't know what to say. In other words, I wish we had the resources. The very first year when we had funding we did put money into increasing stipends for those programs that provide (unintelligible) and so on to make sure that kept the state competitive. But that's not been possible and I think until we get another funding from somewhere in the state, it will be difficult.

SWANSON:

It's 5:00. We need to move on. We'll put you back in the hot seat for item number nine. For the comprehensive tenure review process, discussion only. The change that we're discussing then in the current language in the comprehensive tenure review the President of the University renders the final judgment on a tenure or promotion (unintelligible.) And that in the case of the appeal what happens is that the committee will appeal to the challenge of the President essentially to change his mind. And so when I was chair, I had -- I would have to talk to this faculty person and ask them all right, how are you going to change the President's mind. What new evidence. That would be the conversation we would have. And so this is the change then. The change would be to sign final approval to the Provost and the tenure and promotion cases and then on appeal it is the President who has the authority to sustain or reverse the Provost's decision. Could I just add an explanatory note that might hopefully help?

SUBBASWAMY:

SWANSON:

SUBBASWAMY:

Yes.
It seems more complicated than it really is and it's also in the category of no good things go unpunished. The starting point for all of this is the notion of the comprehensive tenure review, that is we had a process whereby if a dean said no, that was the end of it. The only other course was to go through Senate ACPT --

SWANSON:

SUBBASWAMY:

SACT.
SACT, whatever that stands for. So there was really not a full review going through the system in the committee and Provost and so on which felt wrong to me. Why is it

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt

that there is greater deference given to a positive vote from a dean than to a negative vote than to a positive vote. It didn't seem right. So we talked around and everybody said yeah, that's a great thing. And as we made the changes, you know, these are complex legal things, and mistakes got made where instead of saying if we go through the normal process was that to the Provost and the President. No one caught that part in the changes. And that then later we discovered in practice that gee, it poses certain contradictions in terms of appealing to the same person who turned you down and so forth. And so this is really a correction to go back to our normal review process except that it is comprehensive and that you're entitled if the dean says no still to go to the committee and come to the Provost and we appeal this. So it's really setting something right as we modify something (unintelligible.)

SWANSON:

Okay, questions?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

The next item on our agenda is a proposed new administrative regulation for international travel and for endorsement. Susan is not here, right? Susan? Okay, so we talked about this in Senate Council. We looked through this policy and really it's a nice look at what happens to our students. What is the policy when we do these travel abroads. There was an incident in which there was a travel warning from the Security Council about students going over there. There have been other incidences. There was one in Florida where a student I think went to Haiti regardless and I think there was also -- was there a death of a student involved in the travel abroad. And so that's what this policy is there to, is to protect us and our students when we get into those situations. So the recommendation of the Senate endorses the proposed new administrative regulation of international travel effective July 1. Could I have a second?

GROSSMAN:

Bob Grossman, A&S. Second.

SWANSON:

Discussion?

COVESH:

Mike Covesh, A&S. I read through this. I wasn't clear. Does this

SWANSON:
SPEAKER:

apply to undergraduates only or graduate students who are doing research internationally does this apply?
Richard, could you address that?
Let me say that I don't pretend I can answer Susan on any topic is a tough thing to do. We were trying to make sure first and foremost that students informally enroll in a class. Notably undergraduates go under this policy. Graduate and professional students raise a different issue. We'd like them to at least register because it's really important we know who. We had students in Japan. We had a case either Chili or Peru where there was an earthquake in the capital city the day before the students were leaving and living in residence halls in the capital city. It was really important that we knew who was there and how we could help them through evacuation. What this reg will not do is say to a student whose dissertation research is contingent upon he or she going, you can't go. It will not do that. It will simply allow the University in the case of undergraduates to say if there's a State Department travel advisory, no, you're not going. To graduate and professional students at least advise them on the peril, have them making a decision in consultation with faculty, and then at least let us know where they're going. That's the intent. It's to have a fairly rigorous understanding at the undergraduate level. Have at least an advisory role at the graduate level where it isn't a formal graduate course, the language that frankly we're still tweaking is to try and figure out how we identify independent study as something different than other kinds of graduate or professional course work. In fact, the medical college urged us to include, for instance, residents who go overseas, again, not to dissuade them, but have them register so we know where they are. Does that help, Michael?

COVESH:

One other issue though is, again, from my quick reading for those graduate students, again, internationally doing theses and dissertation research, are they obliged to have a UK faculty member

FL UK SENATE HEARNG 5-9-11.txt
accompany them, Mike?

SPEAKER:

No.

COVESH:

Only undergraduates?

SWANSON:

We've talked about that. They're
adults. Presumably.

GRIESMAN:

We try to use a litmus test. But if UK funds are provided, we want everyone to tell you where they're going. In the case of UK funds, we require, we insist that they register. That's a separate question from the question of do they go or not. At the undergraduate level we really feel we have an obligation. At the graduate professional level, it's a very different conversation. And let me say lastly before Dan's question, we see this as a real big deal. Hollie will tell you when we had to say to an esteemed faculty person who for years took students to Mexico every summer that this past summer -- I'm sorry, this coming summer they could not go because there was a State Department travel advisory. Susan came to me. I brought Susan to Hollie and we talked through the conversation about when does academic freedom and privilege move aside and sensible risk management take over. Here was the case we had to do something that, trust me, was real difficult to do and that is tell a faculty person who has gone for years with students this year you're not going to Mexico. Susan has a really, really thoughtful process for vetting that includes faculty consultation. What we're trying to do is balance academic freedom and privilege against risk and what we'll do in a year's time -- promise -- please take notes in this case will come back and say here's how it's working. But we're not. And promise to tweak it if the answer is not. It's a see change in how we do things. We think it's irresponsible of the University to send students abroad on sponsored programs and say good luck and not know where they are. Medical evacuation issues. When my daughter went to New Zealand on her own, I took out the same policy our students do because I was told it would cost 10 to \$15,000 to evacuate her by medical transport airport if she got seriously ill and had to come home. I don't have

a spare 15,000. We can't send students without making sure they spend \$600 on insurance to -- against a \$15,000 tab. So that's kind of a promise in a year's time we'll come back and say here's how it's working.

WERMERLING:

Dan Wermerling. Is there a similar consideration for faculty? Do we have something that already addresses this for faculty?

GRIESMAN:

well, disregard. We ask faculty to at least register. The good news is it's bad news in terms of the process. As you know, international travel requires another level of approval. The bad news is it's real bureaucratic. The good news is we know who's going assuming they're using any kind of University money. So we think there the obligation is to at least make informed decisions. Dan, did you go know that you're going to a country under State Department travel advisory?

WERMERLING:

My question was something I got stuck in Europe because the Icelandic volcano last year.

GRIESMAN:

Yes, yes.

WERMERLING:

I was stuck there for a week. And I was always real curious, who's financially responsible for getting stuck?

GRIESMAN:

I see. Good question. It's why I'm glad to say call Susan.

SWANSON:

Are there other questions? Could I have a motion that the Senate endorses this proposal?

GROSSMAN:

You have one.

SWANSON:

I have a motion. Do I need a second, don't I?

GROSSMAN:

I already seconded it.

SWANSON:

Thank you. All in favor?

ASSEMBLY:

Aye.

SWANSON:

Opposed?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Abstained?

(No audible response.)

SWANSON:

Thank you. Sheldon Steiner, did you want to come give closing comments?

STEINER:

If there are any questions, it's kind of post mortem. I'd be glad to answer questions from a faculty viewpoint. What I thought about after going through the process I see a lot of the anger and angst amongst the faculty for very good reasons, I think. But I'll be glad to answer any questions.

SPEAKER:

How do you feel about the secrecy issue now that (unintelligible.)

STEINER:

Not good. If I came into it now, I would fight and make a big deal out of not having an open search. I think it's a very bad thing. It creates a lot of unnecessary suspicion and angst and doesn't help the new person coming in. And looking back at how it worked, he came in and was strongly told that if it was open, that markedly reduced the quality of candidates that we had. And I would say that was -- looking back on the process I would say that was a minor impact. So I wouldn't give myself a very good grade on that looking back on that. It's not a good thing to do in general. I knew the process was originally set up to go totally closed with no open period, that is no open period which we did fight the latter. We wouldn't have won the former. That is totally open. The latter was very hard. It was in the newspaper to make sure out of respect it was largely (unintelligible.) That's what -- Heaven forbid.

SPEAKER:
STEINER:

Well, that's okay, too. It was largely (unintelligible) but at least there was some respect shown to the faculty in this regard that they could have raised a fuss. I would almost put it into a these things don't happen very often. I would almost put it into some kind of something to state that searches in the future should be open. I don't buy -- I don't think we should buy the argument. Again, I'd like to answer any questions. It's only looking back. I think we did a very good job of fighting for active admission when we saw the list. I think we did a very good job of committee of making sure that academics was an important consideration in the process. We fought very hard on that and I think we won. I think it could have been another way, I think. (Unintelligible.) So that's my retrospect on the search. I wouldn't do it again myself. I wouldn't accept it. It was a very, very stressful situation.

BRION:

Gail Brion, College of Engineering. Do you think that the Senate as a body should go on record stating that this should not set precedence?

STEINER:

To me that would be a very acceptable thing to do. I think

that I guess what I'm saying that would be a very acceptable thing to do.

WERMERLING:

For our parties here with Hollie and Shelly, you know, one of the thing we did pass as a motion in Senate Council was that we would do a post mortem of this entire process and I had asked that the four members of the faculty representative actually get together and write a report to memorialize what actually occurred and then if you have recommendations for the future, and who knows what will happen in the immediate future, the President may get resignations from various members of his immediate cohorts, and we may have some other searches coming up in the very near future if that happens if he wants a different team. I would still recommend the four of you get together and come together on memorializing this and then come up with your recommendations.

STEINER:

I would be very happy to participate. Absolutely.

SWANSON:

We can talk about the process. The other thing I've been thinking about is writing a commentary to either inside higher education or chronicles of higher education and talking about the process because I agree with Shelly. It's good for the consultants and it's good for the candidates perhaps, but it's not good for the universities. And the other thing that I think I can say this legally, but the other thing that was clear is that this was a pool of candidates that this consultant had been cultivating for years.

STEINER:

We will write that. We'll be glad to write that.

SWANSON:

He wasn't like that yesterday. Wait a minute.

STEINER:

I think there's some stuff going around now from blogs and stuff that ought to be set straight. People are writing stuff without confirming or checking on the facts of that in terms of some history of the current President. It was a very hard look at any problems that he had or might have had. Some of these blogs are unchecked. Just send a blog around. A person can write anything they want on a blog. We checked these things and did not see these kinds of problems at all

that were raised. It was just repeating nonsense. And I think we ought to be very careful. Think about yourself in a situation when somebody writes something about you, a former student that (unintelligible) screwed or whatever you did, and they write about you decide that you're the devil. I think you've got to be very careful. Blogs have no -- there is no -- the courts have a system. If somebody is convicted of something, that's something very real and should be dealt with. I've been in a number of situations in which accusations have been made on faculty gender, discrimination, this and that, and the other thing and they have no basis. The courts throw them out sometimes with prejudice. So I think it's very important to filter what you're writing and spread around about an individual because I see some -- received some e-mails with information that is not accurate and shouldn't be spread around. And it just causes a lot of antipathy that is totally unnecessary.

SWANSON:

I understand the frustration.

STEINER:

Pardon me?

SWANSON:

We understand the frustration. It comes from part of the faculty felt shut out.

STEINER:

Okay, I agree with that.

SWANSON:

Dean (unintelligible.)

SPEAKER:

I wonder if it might be useful to contact academic (unintelligible) at some other schools that have recently hired presidents maybe with the same search firms and open a discussion. Clearly this is a systematic issue with how presidents are being chosen (unintelligible) since we have a lot of faculty leadership and (unintelligible) work with the discussion.

SWANSON:

I know the other problem I had was just calibrating, you know, we've all been on search committees and we've all looked at faculty candidates and we look at graduates, et cetera. But just trying to calibrate our brains to what makes a good president.

SPEAKER:

I was interested when you said it was probably good for the candidates because I just thinking, you know, all they met with beforehand when they basically

accepted the job was the search committee and the Board of Trustees and how could they possibly know the problems that have to be addressed at the University without talking to deans and, you know, if other -- the Provost, other members of the administration.

SWANSON:

It's true. A couple of other candidates did make surprise visits on their own. So they on their own came to see the campus. But still that's a visit.

GROSSMAN:

It was good for the losing candidates.

SWANSON:

Yes.

BRION:

Gail Brion, College of Engineering. I just want to go on record saying thank you for your service because I know you took some abuse from us who were suspicious, but thank you for standing in there and at least being a voice rather than having no voice.

SWANSON:

Thank you.

PEEK:

I would actually go further because they were a loud voice because they were very forceful in these conversations and it had an effect on the Trustees who were actually voting. I mean they spoke out very strongly. Hollie and Shelly and Lee, they spoke out very strongly. And when we got to the secret stuff that I'm not going to tell you about, I heard in that discussion Trustees were saying hey, you heard what they said; we have to go with the faculty on this one. And I heard it from not one but from a number and some of which are ones I wouldn't necessarily expected it. And so that says they were very effective. And I think in the end it really, really made a difference, you know, you guys will never know about, right, unless you buy me lots of beer. But short of that, it did make a difference in the end I think what they did, and they spent a lot of time on it, and so we should be amazingly appreciative of what they did. They gave their time, their heart, their energy, everything to it. And I think it made a difference in the end.

SWANSON:

Anything else? All right, with that, motion to adjourn. Hearing no objection, we are 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 UK 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 25th day of July, 2011.

ANN E. CHASTANG,
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE
K E N T U C K Y
ID #442199