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Master Plan Update: Meeting with our Neighbors
University Planning and Metrics

Reviewing our Existing Plans
150 Years of Excellence and Perseverance

• Sacred century-and-a-half mission and transformative leadership in the state and region.

• Uncommon depth and breadth of academic programs that support interdisciplinary work.

• Decisions have never been more important and carry long-term implications.
SACS Reaffirmation

3.3.1 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas:

- Education programs, to include student learning outcomes,
- Administrative support services
- Academic and student support services
- Research within its mission
- Community/public service within its mission

**APRIL 9-11, 2013**
Goal I: Prepare Students for Leading Roles in an Innovation-driven Economy and Global Society. (11 metrics)

Goal II: Promote Research and Creative Work to Increase the Intellectual, Social, and Economic Capital of Kentucky and the World Beyond Its Borders. (5 metrics)

Goal III: Develop the Human and Physical Resources of the University to Achieve the Institution’s Top 20 Goals. (7 metrics)

Goal IV: Promote Diversity and Inclusion. (6 metrics)

Goal V: Improve the Quality of Life of Kentuckians through Engagement, Outreach, and Service. (3 metrics)
Summary of progress on Strategic Plan Goals:

- Achieved = 7
- Some Progress = 13
- In Progress = 6
- No Progress = 6
## 2012-13 Operating Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Investment (in thousands)</th>
<th>Goal 1: Students</th>
<th>Goal 2: Research</th>
<th>Goal 3: Faculty, Staff and Facilities</th>
<th>Goal 4: Diversity</th>
<th>Goal 5: Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty investments (promotions &amp; fighting fund)</td>
<td>$1,108</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits*</td>
<td>($2,928)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Scholarship Investments</td>
<td>$10,328</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Readiness</td>
<td>$530</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development staffing initiative</td>
<td>$675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency preparedness/planning</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management investments</td>
<td>$1,814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology investments</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Enhancement Program / SACS</td>
<td>$285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIIF and Summer</td>
<td>$2,150</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility M&amp;O</td>
<td>$1,041</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital renewal</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital debt service pool</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,012</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Benefits credit is a result of net of a savings created from an updated rate calculation. Employee benefit package was not reduced.
# Top 20 Business Plan vs. Reality

## General Revenue Funds (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top 20 Business Plan 2006</th>
<th>Reality 2013</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriations</td>
<td>$314</td>
<td>$452</td>
<td>($284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Return</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Appropriations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDC</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Services</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryforwards</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>$1,216</td>
<td>$1,718</td>
<td>$2,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Smart Growth: Distribution of Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USNWR Ranking and Public University</th>
<th>Student-to-Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. University of California (Berkeley)</td>
<td>17:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. University of California (Los Angeles)</td>
<td>17:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. University of Virginia</td>
<td>16:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. University of Michigan</td>
<td>16:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. University of North Carolina</td>
<td>14:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. College of William and Mary</td>
<td>12:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Georgia Tech University</td>
<td>17:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. University of California (Davis)</td>
<td>16:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. University of California (San Diego)</td>
<td>19:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. University of Wisconsin (Madison)</td>
<td>17:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Kentucky</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.5:1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IPEDS Instructional Faculty
Questions & Comments
2011 Board Retreat and Other Planning: Recap and Progress

Ensuring Kentucky’s Promise
2011 Priorities and Planning

• Enhance and expand the undergraduate educational experience in terms of student quality, academic programming, and opportunities for more Kentuckians and students from other states and background to learn and grow at the University.

• Renew and rebuild the core of the nearly 150-year-old campus.

• Affordability and Access

• Work/Life Environment
Student Success – Fall 2012 Class

**Enrollment Trend**

- African American:
  - 2007: 3,865
  - 2008: 4,110
  - 2009: 4,153
  - 2010: 4,328
  - 2011: 4,139
  - 2012: 4,645

- Hispanic:
  - 2007: 2,850
  - 2008: 3,111
  - 2009: 3,256
  - 2010: 3,316
  - 2011: 3,066
  - 2012: 3,185

- International:
  - 2007: 1,015
  - 2008: 999
  - 2009: 897
  - 2010: 1,012
  - 2011: 1,073
  - 2012: 1,460

**Underrepresented Student Enrollment**

- African American:
  - 2007: 255
  - 2008: 347
  - 2009: 403
  - 2010: 418
  - 2011: 422
  - 2012: 533

- Hispanic:
  - 2007: 44
  - 2008: 62
  - 2009: 78
  - 2010: 111
  - 2011: 115
  - 2012: 166

- International:
  - 2007: 20
  - 2008: 32
  - 2009: 44
  - 2010: 47
  - 2011: 56
  - 2012: 110

**National Merit Scholars**

- 2007: 28
- 2008: 37
- 2009: 27
- 2010: 32
- 2011: 29
- 2012: 71

*Number includes students who reported two or more races, one of which was “Black or African American.”

**Includes National Achievement Scholars**
Student Success – Graduate School

Graduate & Professional Enrollment

- Doctoral
- Masters
- Professional
- Post-Doc

Student Credit Hour Comparison

- Total Rev: $206.3m
- Net Rev: $168.7m

- Undergraduate
- Graduate

Total Rev: $55.2m
Net Rev: $35.5m
FY 2010 R&D Expenditures

$ in Thousands

- Michigan
- Wisconsin
- Minnesota
- UNC Chapel Hill
- Ohio State
- Florida
- UC Davis
- Arizona
- Iowa
- Michigan State
- Kentucky
- Missouri

- Federal
- Non-federal
Research Metric 3: Sponsored Programs Expenditures per Net Assignable Square Foot (NASF)

Purpose: Reflects productivity of research space

Higher Number is Favorable

Formula: Sponsored Programs “Recorded” Expenditures

Non-class lab NASF

Mean = $372 Total Costs per NASF

UK = 58

Fiscal Year 2010
Student Success – Campus Safety

The $4.8 million project includes:

• Video management system
• Centralized access control system
• Identification badges
• Early warning speakers
2011 Priorities and Planning

• Student Success
  – Undergraduate education
  – Graduate education and research
  – Campus safety

• Retention
Retention – Student Success by Cohort

Figure 1. 1st to 2nd and 1st to 3rd Year Retention for the 2000-2010 cohorts.

Areas for Improvement?
Selected themes from the Sophomore Attrition Survey

- Academic Advising
- Major Selection
- Access to Competitive Majors
- Course Availability
- Difficulty with Courses

Areas for Improvement?
Selected themes from the Graduating Senior Survey

- Changed Major/Lost Credit
- Work Conflicted w/ Class
- Course Availability
- Family Conflict
- Tuition and Cost
## Benchmark of Effective Educational Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark of Effective Educational Practices</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Challenge</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active &amp; Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enriching Educational Experiences</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Campus Environment</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **UK outperformed peers**
- **UK was outperformed by peers**
- **No statistical difference**

2012 Results of a NSSE Survey
Provost’s Office Re-Organization

- Provost
  - Chief of Staff
  - Assoc Provost for Faculty Advancement
  - Assoc Provost for Finance & Operations
  - Assoc Provost for Clinical & Translational Science
  - Markey Cancer Center Director*

- Sr. Vice Provost for Student Success
  - Assoc Provost International Programs

- Sr. Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Analytics and Technologies

- Colleges:
  - Dentistry
  - Design
  - Education
  - Engineering
  - Fine Arts
  - Graduate School
  - Health Sciences
  - Agriculture
  - Arts & Sciences
  - Business & Economics
  - Communication & Information
  - Libraries
  - Medicine
  - Nursing
  - Pharmacy
  - Public Health
  - Social Work

* Dotted line report to EVP/Health and Dean of Medicine
2011 Priorities and Planning

- Student Success
- Retention
- Infrastructure
## 2008-12 UK Major Capital Construction by Funding Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>UK Funds</th>
<th>UKHC Funds</th>
<th>UK Bonds</th>
<th>State Bonds</th>
<th>State Grant</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Project Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand &amp; Upgrade Livestock Disease Diagnostic Lab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$28,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct Biological Pharmaceutical Complex Building</td>
<td>$14,335,101</td>
<td>$119,892,000</td>
<td>$385,611</td>
<td></td>
<td>$385,611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$134,998,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit-up 4th &amp; 5th Research Floors Bio-Pharm Building</td>
<td>$15,523,141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,476,859</td>
<td></td>
<td>$28,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct Patient Care Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$215,538,719</td>
<td>$350,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$572,838,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Village Building #2</td>
<td>$2,013,475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,328,125</td>
<td>$8,328,125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,669,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Wildcat Lodge Student Housing (Wildcat Coal Lodge)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct CAER Laboratory Building #3</td>
<td>$2,151,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$11,832,685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,984,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovate 4th Floor Sanders-Brown Center on Aging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,428,471</td>
<td>$6,428,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovate Track and Field Facility</td>
<td>$5,900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct UK/Nicholasville Road Flood Mitigation</td>
<td>$2,003,866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,011,597</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,015,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire/Renovate Academic Facility - University Lofts Facility</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovate/Upgrade Softball Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,700,000</td>
<td>$9,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovate/Expand Soccer Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$56,927,203</td>
<td>$215,538,719</td>
<td>$375,000,000</td>
<td>$148,392,000</td>
<td>$28,190,595</td>
<td>$24,272,753</td>
<td>$47,863,736</td>
<td>$896,185,006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: State Grants include RCTF Capital Match
2008-12 UK Major Capital Construction by Funding Source

Note: State Grants include RCTF Capital Match
Infrastructure

• 2008-2012 Construction

• Public/Private Partnership with EdR

• Debt Study
  – Currently at 3.7% of revenues
  – An additional $200 million would move our debt level to 4.1% of revenues

• Building Priorities
2011 Priorities and Planning

- Student Success
- Retention
- Infrastructure
- Access and Affordability
## Access & Affordability – Tuition & Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Undergraduate Resident</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>4 Year Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03-04</td>
<td>$2,274</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>$2,583</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-06</td>
<td>$2,906</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-07</td>
<td>$3,255</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-08</td>
<td>$3,548</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>$3,868</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-10</td>
<td>$4,062</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>$4,305</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>$4,564</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>$4,843</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14*</td>
<td>$4,983</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Preliminary

### Annual Tuition Rate Increase

A line graph showing the annual tuition rate increase from 2003-2004 to 2013-2014.
Average Debt of Resident Baccalaureate Graduates from the Fall 2006 Entering Freshmen (full-time resident) Cohort

- KY Residents = 3,415 (81.5%)
  - 1,759 students graduated after 5.5 years (51%)
    - 53% of graduates had no student loans
    - 47% of graduates with loans had average debt of $23,500

Number of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt Range</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$80,001 - $80,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,001 - $70,000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001 - $60,000</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001 - $50,000</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001 - $40,000</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001 - $30,000</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001 - $20,000</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,001 - $20,000</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$298 - $10,000</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Debt</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2011 Priorities and Planning

- Student Success
- Retention
- Infrastructure
- Access and Affordability
- Work Environment
  - Faculty performance
  - Employee evaluations
  - Manager training
Faculty Performance

R3 (Review, Rewards and Retention) Report

- Review
  - Process that truly evaluates performance and assists in professional development
  - Promotes advancement throughout the career
  - Post-tenure review

- Rewards
  - Rewards aligned with performance
  - Recognition of contributions in all areas (teaching, research and service)

- Retention
  - Competitive salaries with peer institutions

Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement

- GT Lineberry, PhD – Engineering

- Responsibilities
  - Comprehensive faculty development programs
  - Assist in faculty advancement to full promotion
  - Chair development program
Faculty Performance

Average Faculty Salary by Rank, Thousands

Institution

Michigan, Ohio State, UNC, Davis, Wisconsin, Iowa, Michigan State, Minnesota, Arizona, Florida, Missouri, Kentucky
2011 Priorities and Planning

• **Work Environment**

  – Faculty performance
  – Employee evaluations
  – Manager training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Communication from HR to management</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Meetings with Budget Officers, Deans Council, HR Facilitators</td>
<td>October 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 18</td>
<td>Communication from President to all staff</td>
<td>October 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 18</td>
<td>Communicate training WBT available</td>
<td>October 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1</td>
<td>Conduct division / department workshops</td>
<td>January 15, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2013</td>
<td>Completion of Campus PEs</td>
<td>February 28, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2013</td>
<td>Conduct Healthcare workshops</td>
<td>May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completion of Healthcare PEs</td>
<td>June 30, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2011 Priorities and Planning

- Student Success
- Retention
- Infrastructure
- Access and Affordability
- Work Environment
- Values-Based Budget Model
Values-Based Budget Model

• Aligns revenues and expenses
• Revenues are attributed to unit that earns them
• Expenses (both direct and administrative & service) are attributed to units
• Incentivizes colleges to be entrepreneurial
• Allows for longer-term (3-5 year) planning
• Current model is “incremental budget model” and results in managing to expenses.
Value-Based Model Implementation Timeline

- **Sept**: Listening Tour and Provost meetings with College Deans, Budget Officers, and Unit leaders
- **Oct**: Value-Based Model refined using input from key stakeholders
- **Nov**: Technical model assistance from Implementation Team
- **Dec**: College-level models developed and shared
- **Jan**: Development of Value-Based budgets along side FY14 incremental budgets
- **Feb - Jun**: Refine Value-Based Model as needed
- **Regular Discussion at Steering Committee, Deans’ Council, and Budget Officer Meetings**
- **On-going communication between Colleges, Units, and Implementation Team**
Value-Based Model “Parallel Process” Year

**Current Budget Process**
- September: Discuss and refine academic priorities incentivized in the Value-Based Model
- October: Plan and implement 2nd round of expense reductions
- November: Examine College-level financial implications of defined priorities; Work with Implementation Team on College-level models
- December: Develop FY14 Value-Based budget models in parallel with current process
- January: Submit FY14 budgets
- February: Develop FY14 budgets
- March: FY14 budgets approved

**Value-Based Model Process**
- September: Discuss and refine academic priorities incentivized in the Value-Based Model
Questions and Comments
The 21st Century University
Ensuring Kentucky’s Promise
UK – A First Choice Institution

• First choice in the state and region, for the best and brightest.

• First choice in the state and region, for cutting-edge research and creative scholarship.

• First choice in the state and region, for life-saving patient care and service.
The Kentucky Effect
“… leaders used to be judged by how well they responded to a crisis. Now, they are judged by how well they anticipate one …”

IBM Advertisement
The Burning Platform

Regulation and economic pressures

- Citizen demand for accountability
- State and federal funding reductions
- Concerns about access
- Middle skill job loss, high skill job growth
- Need and desire to cap tuition

Competitive pressures

- Governors launching university alternatives
- Venture capitalists funding online programs, MOOCs
- Persistent pressure from for-profits, elites
- Traditional students choosing community colleges
Federal Nondefense R&D Under BCA Caps With and Without Sequestration (in billions of constant FY 2012 dollars)

Source: Based on AAAS estimates of R&D funding and the FY 2013 budget, and CBO analyses of the Budget Control Act. © 2012 AAAS
The Future of Research

NIH Clinical and Translational Science Award ($24M)
- One of only 60 in the U.S. (Elite Club)
- A national research consortium
- Positions UK for conducting “big”, transformative research
- Requires significant internal investment beyond grant
- Pittsburgh just invested $100M in “Informatics”

NCI-Designated Cancer Center application ($7.5M +)
- $90M investment
- 36 faculty hires and counting
- At least 9 colleges involved
- Sets stage for NCI-Comprehensive status and more network grants
The Future of Research

Center for Applied Energy Research
- NIST, KY, UK-funded energy laboratory ($21 M)
- New approaches to use existing resources (“clean coal” technologies)
- Renewable energy (biofuels, solar)
- Energy storage devices (batteries, capacitors)
- International collaborations leading to new research revenue

College of Design
- River Cities
- Houseboat to Energy Efficient Residences

Center for Visualization and Virtual Environments
- Virtual Opera Sets

Anthropology and Art History
- Prehistoric Roman Settlement
The Future of Research

• Interdisciplinary Research Teams
• Convergence of Biological Sciences, Physical Sciences and Engineering
• Computational approaches to complex problems
• Alternative sources of research funding
Technology and Education

• Massive online open courses (MOOCs)
  – Fall 2011 Stanford AI class: 140,000 enrolled, 23,000 completed. Not a single Stanford student in the top 400

• Hybrid technologies
  – Lecture capture, blended learning, flipped classrooms, smart boards, projection, tablets
Technology and Facilities

• Foster interactive learning
• Collaboration is the key
• Three groups of three at each table
• Combine discussion, hands on, experiments, group work
• White boards, projection screens
• Web based delivery
• Mobile computing devices and wireless
• With a flipped class, the lecture is listened to in the dorm room and the class is for active participation and deeper learning
Something for everyone

• MOOCs make great content available for free
  – Self-starters can gain skills without attending. Will employers value this?

• Fully online university programs
  – Adult, working learners can weave advanced education into their busy lives

• Hybrid approaches
  – Students who need more preparation can access learning materials 7x24, perhaps in high school
  – Fast-tracking students can progress rapidly at their own pace
  – Working undergraduates gain convenience and flexibility
Where are we?

Percent of Credit Hours Online, 2010-11

- Morehead: 29%
- KCTCS: 26%
- Western: 19%
- Eastern: 16%
- K-State: 15%
- Murray: 12%
- Northern: 12%
- Louisville: 6%
- UK: 5%
Capitulate? Or Compete?

**Regulation and economic pressures**
- Citizen demand for accountability
- State and federal funding reductions
- Concerns about access
- Middle skill job loss, high skill job growth
- Need and desire to cap tuition

**Competitive pressures**
- Governors launching university alternatives
- Venture capitalists funding online programs, MOOCs
- Persistent pressure from for-profits, elites
- Traditional students choosing community colleges

---

Our Unique Strengths
Capitulate? Or Compete?

Regulation and economic pressures

- Citizen demand for accountability
- State and federal funding reductions
- Concerns about access
- Middle skill job loss, high skill job growth
- Need and desire to cap tuition

Competitive pressures

- Governors launching university alternatives
- Venture capitalists funding online programs, MOOCs
- Persistent pressure from for-profits, elites
- Traditional students choosing community colleges

UK Strengths

- 150 years of history, strong brand
  - Healthcare enterprise, athletic programs
- Superb faculty, wide array of disciplines
  - Ability to attract top talent, breadth of program offerings
- Access and affordability
  - 53% graduate with no debt, debt load for the rest is below national average
- Advantageous geography
  - Bluegrass region, Lexington Center, proximity to major markets
The Burning Platform

*Regulation and economic pressures*
- Citizen demand for accountability
- State and federal funding reductions
- Concerns about access
- Middle skill job loss, high skill job growth
- Need and desire to cap tuition

*Competitive pressures*
- Governors launching university alternatives
- Venture capitalists funding online programs, MOOCs
- Persistent pressure from for-profits, elites
- Traditional students choosing community colleges

Our Unique Strengths

Response
Questions to ask

• Are there other threats on our burning platform?
• Where do you want us to focus our energy?
• What are you hearing in your communities about the expectations of the University of Kentucky?
• What are your questions for campus?
“The university is perhaps the single most important institution of the creative age... The places that win this global competition of talent will be the ones that realize that talent moves.”

- Richard Florida
Master Plan Update
Meeting with our Neighborhoods
National Planning Firm of the Year 2012 - American Planning Association

TEAM
Sasaki Associates – Boston, MA
RossTarrant Architects – Lexington, KY

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
AUBURN
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY
SINGAPORE UNIV. OF TECHNOLOGY & DESIGN

SCHEDULE
August 2012 to Spring 2013

• Guide Change and Transformation
• Engage a broad range of stakeholders
• Integrated and Comprehensive
• Maximize linkages and partnerships
• Connect People, Places, and Ideas
• Foster Stewardship and Sustainability
• Master plan will embody the strategic priorities of the University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Meeting Counts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, September 4, 2012</td>
<td>Columbia Heights</td>
<td>5:30 to 7:00</td>
<td>Alumni House</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, September 12, 2012</td>
<td>LFUCG/UK Meeting</td>
<td>10:00 to Noon</td>
<td>103 Main Building</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, September 12, 2012</td>
<td>UNAC</td>
<td>5:30 - 6:30</td>
<td>Alumni House</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, September 13, 2012</td>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>3:00 - 5:00</td>
<td>203 Student Center Addition</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, September 17, 2012</td>
<td>Community Organizations</td>
<td>10:00 to 11:30</td>
<td>Alumni House</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, September 17, 2012</td>
<td>Neighborhood Associations Group I</td>
<td>5:30 to 7:00</td>
<td>Alumni House</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, September 18, 2012</td>
<td>Neighborhood Associations Group II</td>
<td>5:30 to 7:00</td>
<td>Alumni House</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, September 18, 2012</td>
<td>Student Workgroup</td>
<td>11:30 to 1:00</td>
<td>Blazer Commons</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, September 26, 2012</td>
<td>Neighborhood Associations Group III</td>
<td>5:30 to 7:00</td>
<td>Alumni House</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, September 27, 2012</td>
<td>Council Members</td>
<td>4:00 to 6:00</td>
<td>Downtown, Government Bldg.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, October 02, 2012</td>
<td>Retail Owners &amp; Merchants</td>
<td>5:30 to 7:00</td>
<td>127 Wethington Building, Commons Room</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, October 02, 2012</td>
<td>UK Deans Council</td>
<td>3:30 to 5:00</td>
<td>103 Main Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 3, 2012</td>
<td>Landlord Associations</td>
<td>5:30 to 7:00</td>
<td>127 Wethington Building, Commons Room</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, October 16, 2012</td>
<td>Faith Communities</td>
<td>5:30 to 7:00</td>
<td>Alumni House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, October 30, 2012</td>
<td>Shadeland Neighborhood</td>
<td>7:00 to 8:00</td>
<td>Crestwood Christian Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meetings with Neighborhoods

- Three well attended meetings in September
- Presented overview of the masterplan
- Discussed our Phase 2A housing plans
- Discussed Greek Park concept
- Presented webpage and ways to provide input
- Listened to needs and concerns
Neighborhood Stated Issues

- Declining Quality of Certain Neighborhoods
- Decrease in Owner-Occupied Homes in Neighborhoods
- UK Alcohol Policies
- Student Off-Campus Behavior
- Parking (On and Off Campus)
- Traffic (Cars, Bikes, Pedestrians)
- Transition Zone
Neighborhood Suggestions

• Expand UK’s ‘Live Where you Work’ Program
• Collaborate with City and Stakeholders
• Create a Transition Zone between campus
• Expand the reach of the Off-Campus Housing Office
• Retain More Students and Social Organizations On Campus
• Improvements to Gateways into Campus
Driving Tour Info
Neighborhood Tour: Specific Issues

Columbia Heights/ Hollywood/Montclair

1. UK acquisition boundary
2. Smaller single family homes confronted with vinyl box additions
3. Backs up to campus – Athletics and Cooperstown areas
4. Protection and stabilization

University/State Street Area/North Elizabeth St

1. Lack of city infrastructure: lighting, curbs and sidewalks
2. Neighborhood radically transformed by student rentals and vinyl additions
3. Post NCAA gathering area of student and community disturbance
4. Conversions to other uses/offices etc.
5. Traffic cut through from Waller to Virginia Avenue
6. UK Acquisition boundary
7. Growth/Expansion of UK Campus/HealthCare

South Broadway/Red Mile Road

1. Major amounts of building or new private student housing
2. Lack of nearby services and retail
3. Uncertainty of what this will mean to older student areas
4. LFUCG concern about density
Community Tour: Talking Points

**Neighborhoods**

- Inappropriate architecture in established neighborhoods
- Number of apartments in original single family homes
- General decline of property in older neighborhoods
- “Vinyl box” additions
- Demolition of older structures
- Parking issues
- Code enforcement

**New “Private” Apartments (South Broadway corridor)**

- Density and number of units
- Lack of services in area
- Safety of students walking
  - Major roadways
  - Railroad crossings