

# UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

## SENATE COUNCIL

---

### Regular Session

February 11, 2002  
3:00 p.m.

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

Professor William Fortune, Chair

\*\*\*\*\*

### **ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**FREELANCE COURT REPORTERS & VIDEO SERVICES**

**STEPHANIE K. SCHLOEMER, PRESIDENT**

**10 NORTH UPPER STREET**

**P. O. BOX 85, LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40588**

**(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197**

e-mail: [ctreport@aol.com](mailto:ctreport@aol.com)

\*\*\*\*\*

*WILLIAM FORTUNE, CHAIR*

*GIFFORD BLYTON, PARLIAMENTARIAN*

*CELINDA TODD, SECRETARY TO SENATE COUNCIL*

*JACKIE PERKINS, RECORDING SECRETARY*

*STEPHANIE K. SCHLOEMER, COURT REPORTER*

-----

*VOTES TAKEN*

*(Page)*

17

29

30

1 MR. FORTUNE: The minutes of  
2 January 14th were distributed and there is one  
3 correction and that is that Brett Ripley should be  
4 noted as having been excused.

5 Are there any other additions or  
6 corrections to the minutes of January 14th?

7 MR. TAGAVI: What was the  
8 correction?

9 MR. FORTUNE: He should be  
10 noted as excused, Brett Ripley.

11 Let's wait till these folks get in.

12 Okay. The minutes of January 14th will  
13 stand **APPROVED** with that one correction.

14 There are a number of announcements,  
15 first by way of waivers that the City Council has done  
16 since the January meeting. We did three waivers. And  
17 then there's one implicit waiver that I need to tell  
18 you about.

19 But the three specific waivers that we  
20 did, an issue came up about a student who had taken 12  
21 hours, nine of them graded and three of them pass/fail  
22 and so that student could take academic bankruptcy at  
23 that point. And we referred the issue generally to the  
24 Rules Committee. And the Rules Committee ruled that  
25 the hours had to be graded. However, on the specific  
26 facts of the case and at the request of the college,

1 the Senate Council waived the rule to allow that  
2 particular student to take bankruptcy. But the  
3 interpretation of the rule was that all 12 hours have  
4 to be graded.

5 We exercised our discretion to waive the  
6 rule with regard to a student who was -- desired to  
7 exercise the repeat option. This is a student who is  
8 not enrolled presently. He's not in school anywhere.  
9 The question was whether or not he could exercise the  
10 repeat option. At the request of the college, we  
11 granted that waiver.

12 And we granted a waiver again at the  
13 request of the college for a student for an "I" grade  
14 extension, one of these situations where the "I" grade  
15 has not been completed within two years but where there  
16 are extenuating circumstances.

17 Now, the implicit waiver -- this was  
18 brought to my attention by one of the senators -- is  
19 that we have two Committee Chairs who are non-senators.

20 And the Senate Council approved the Committee Chairs  
21 back in September. These are two individuals who have  
22 been very responsible and who have done the particular  
23 jobs at my request -- in fact back to the time of Roy  
24 Moore, at his request -- because these two individuals  
25 do the job better than anyone else that we can count  
26 on. But we have, in fact, had two folks chairing these

1 committees, whereas the Senate Rules require that  
2 Senate rules -- excuse me, that senators chair the  
3 committees. All right. That's what we're talking  
4 about in the way of waivers. We did also reinstate a  
5 student in education. That's not a waiver. That was a  
6 second drop situation. And we reinstated him.

7                   Now, by way of general announcements,  
8 the Graduation Contract, there has been a committee  
9 appointed to look at that. The committee is going to  
10 chaired by Jeff Dembo. Bill Thom is on it, Michele  
11 Sonar from Jeff's office, Enid Waldhart, Jake Gibbs  
12 from LCC, and there might be one other person. But in  
13 any event, they're going to look at that and they're  
14 going to look at it in connection -- Oh, Tony, Tony  
15 Stoeppel. Tony is the drafter of the whole thing. In  
16 any event, they're going to look at that issue and  
17 they're going to look at it in connection with a First-  
18 Year Committee, which has been appointed by the Provost  
19 and chaired by Phil Kraemer. And that First-Year  
20 Committee is looking at the entire first year to deal  
21 with the retention issue primarily but, beyond that, to  
22 deal with the whole academic atmosphere of the first  
23 year. So the Graduation Contract Committee is going to  
24 coordinate closely with that committee.

25                   I was asked to mention some things that  
26 -- I was asked to mention this, that the -- I think

1 I've already mentioned this. But in any event, if I  
2 haven't, I'm mentioning it now. And that is that the  
3 Senate Council back in the fall designated COSFL, which  
4 is Council of Senate Faculty Leaders, to be our  
5 representative to recommend folks to the governor to  
6 put on the Special Nominating Commission that he has,  
7 to submit names for state boards, state boards of  
8 trustees and regencies, so on, the various state  
9 boards. There's the Selection Committee and we  
10 appointed COSFL, we collectively -- that is, the  
11 representatives of the various state institutions --  
12 appointed COSFL to make those recommendations. And I  
13 was asked to make that announcement.

14 I was also asked to make an announcement  
15 as to the status of the Ben Carr Fix-It Committee, and  
16 that's to attempt to fix up administrative regulations  
17 that are burdensome and so on. And Liz Debski -- We  
18 were asked to make an appointment to that committee.  
19 It's going to be primarily concerned with not academic  
20 regulations so much as just things that get in your way  
21 type regulations. And our nominee was Liz Debski. And  
22 I spoke to Liz today to see what the status of that is.  
23 And the status is, that the committee has been divided  
24 into subcommittees but nothing's happened yet. And I  
25 was asked to report that.

26 And I was also asked to report and kind

1 of explain, I guess, the fact that there was an  
2 amendment to the governing regulations which was done  
3 without it being posted to the Senate website, as I  
4 said we would do. This came about when -- As you  
5 recall, back in the December meeting we proposed to the  
6 -- through the administration of the Board of Trustees  
7 that they amend the governing regulations to allow  
8 better student representation in the Senate.

9                   When Nancy Ray looked at that, she  
10 basically said, why do we have all this micro-managing  
11 in there; why don't we just take all that out and  
12 basically allow you to select your senators any way you  
13 want, is what it amounts to. And I said I thought that  
14 was a fantastic idea, and it was done. And so the  
15 regulation was stripped -- The governing regulation  
16 was stripped of all the verbiage which controlled the  
17 way in which we elect senators. I didn't think,  
18 frankly, to put it on the website. I couldn't have at  
19 that point because it was going before the Board almost  
20 the next day and there wouldn't have been time anyway.

21 But in any event, I was asked to explain that that  
22 happened and to explain why it wasn't on the website.  
23 So I'm doing that.

24                   A few other things here. Bear with me  
25 for a moment. This is a pitch for the Inauguration.  
26 On this blue sheet which we circulated out there, is a

1 schedule of the Inauguration events. This is  
2 downloaded off the e-mail that came out by the Provost  
3 and Jack Blanton and Jim Holsinger on Friday. But it  
4 lists all the events on Thursday and Friday. And at  
5 the top, and I had bolded this, it requests that folks  
6 -- to the extent possible that folks allow staff to  
7 attend these Inauguration activities. And I will speak  
8 on behalf of the Inauguration Committee and encourage  
9 all of you to attend as much of this as you can. I  
10 think it's going to be a very fine thing, both the  
11 Thursday and Friday events.

12 And, as you can see, the College of Fine  
13 Arts and particularly the School of Music have just  
14 gone out of their way to arrange all these things on  
15 Friday and we certainly want to have a big turnout.  
16 And I hope you all will come and I hope you all will  
17 encourage other folks to come. That's staff and  
18 students, as well as faculty.

19 Let me see here ... Okay. And then the  
20 only other thing by way of announcement, just looking  
21 at my list, is that if you all would note on your  
22 calendars that we might have to meet on Monday, April  
23 22nd. It's possible. We have a lot of stuff in the  
24 mill. And I'm not sure how it's going to work out as  
25 far as getting everything done in the March and April  
26 meetings. So I'm asking you all to reserve that, if



1 necessary, for a special meeting of the Senate on April  
2 22nd. And I think that's all I had by way of  
3 announcements.

4 And we have a resolution at this time.  
5 Kaveh.

6 MR. TAGAVI: I'd like to  
7 comment about one of your announcements. I'm delighted  
8 that the governor is not getting input from the faculty  
9 on future appointments of Board of Trustees members.  
10 But I'd also like to add that this item was, I think,  
11 discovered and pushed by one senior faculty of U.K.,  
12 Davy Jones, who also happened to be a candidate for the  
13 Board of Trustees ballot. I thought it would nice just  
14 to mention his name and give him some credit for that.

15 MR. FORTUNE: All right.  
16 That's fine. Anything else? (No response.)

17 Okay. We have a resolution at this  
18 time. David?

19 MR. MOHNEY: Good afternoon.

20 The College of Architecture mourns the  
21 passing of its founding Dean, Charles Parker Graves,  
22 Jr. Chuck Graves was 31 years old when he came to  
23 Lexington as the head of a new program in architecture.

24 The year was 1958, and architecture had existed as a  
25 loosely defined area of concentration in the Department  
26 of Civil Engineering for several decades. The

1 program's advance was swift under Dean Graves, guided  
2 by his efforts. By 1965 the program had achieved its  
3 present status as a college at the university. In that  
4 same year, professional accreditation was granted, and  
5 the first class graduated. His aspirations were high  
6 from the start of the program, and they never faltered.

7 Under Dean Graves' leadership, the  
8 College was recognized nationally for its efforts in  
9 Kentucky. In 1962 he worked with Grady Clay and others  
10 to develop a proposal for a New Town in Appalachia, a  
11 proposal that was singled out for recognition by then-  
12 Governor Bert Combs. In the late 1960s he forged an  
13 alliance with the Yale University School of  
14 Architecture, initiating a series of building projects  
15 in Eastern Kentucky involving Yale and Kentucky  
16 students working together. This effort, in part,  
17 facilitated the establishment of Appalshop in  
18 Whitesburg, Kentucky. He was involved with the first  
19 efforts to restore the Shaker settlement at Pleasant  
20 Hill, and served as an advisor to Cincinnati on its  
21 master planning efforts.

22 Dean Graves believed strongly in the  
23 value of international education. Accordingly, he  
24 began one of the first international programs for  
25 architecture students when he set up a atelier in  
26 Venice, Italy. That program continues to this day.

1                   Prominent among architectural  
2                   educations, Chuck made sure these accomplishments were  
3                   known at a national level, and many projects served as  
4                   models for similar efforts at other schools of  
5                   architecture.

6                   Born and raised in Kansas City, trained  
7                   as an architect at the University of Pennsylvania when  
8                   it was one of the pre-eminent programs in the country,  
9                   Dean Graves taught at Clemson and Georgia Tech before  
10                  arriving at the University of Kentucky. He also did a  
11                  stint in the Marines near the end of the Korean War,  
12                  where his drawing abilities were immediately recognized  
13                  and he became a staff artist for the military magazine.

14                  When he stepped down as Dean in 1972  
15                  after 14 years, and at the ripe old age of just 45,  
16                  Dean Graves stayed in Lexington and continued to teach  
17                  at the College of Architecture. He established a  
18                  series of professional partnerships, and carried out a  
19                  number of notable building projects in central  
20                  Kentucky. He remained a fixture in professional  
21                  organizations nationally, and served as a consultant to  
22                  the United States Department of State on the design of  
23                  embassies around the world.

24                  Best of all, though, from his point of  
25                  view, he had time to immerse himself in his teaching,  
26                  and it was the students who benefited from this. Part

1 of his ability as an educator came from his willingness  
2 to inject a social dimension into everything that he  
3 did. For his students, it meant the tradition of a day  
4 at Keeneland, where he bought everyone an admission  
5 ticket and one beer, and required all the students to  
6 dress up, including ties for the men. It wasn't just  
7 an idle day-off for Chuck; instead, he was inculcating  
8 the values of human interaction among his students,  
9 encouraging them to stretch themselves socially as well  
10 as intellectually. Dean Graves understood that the two  
11 were intractably linked. Indeed for him, it was a way  
12 of life.

13                   Noted urban affairs critic Grady Clay  
14 remembers a discussion with the Dean at Penn about the  
15 time Chuck Graves had been a student there. "I recall  
16 Chuck Graves well," said Dean G. Holmes Perkins.  
17 "Regardless of whether his team won the class  
18 competitions, they always had more fun than any other  
19 team."

20                   A fellow Dean from the 1960s remembered  
21 the unofficial Deans of Architecture Club that Chuck  
22 established for his peers, and how he would entertain  
23 them during annual visits to Lexington -- always during  
24 the Keeneland meet, by the way: "The meeting was  
25 agenda-less, supposedly social. Older deans in a  
26 corner instructed younger deans and vice versa. We

1 went to the races. We ate, we drank and it was  
2 probably the most productive gathering in the annals of  
3 architecture..."

4                   The social graces Chuck cultivated  
5 extended much further, of course. They set the tone  
6 for interaction within the College of Architecture. To  
7 this day, I believe that a high and somewhat rare  
8 degree of collegiality among faculty within the College  
9 derives from the climate that Dean Graves did so much  
10 to instill. Especially from the administrative side,  
11 it is my view that this is one of those intangible, yet  
12 essential, components in advancing the cause of  
13 education, in striving to reach those high aspirations.

14       It is not only a worthy goal; it is, in the words of  
15 Dean Perkins, "fun" as well.

16                   Near the end of the Korean War, young  
17 Chuck Graves hitched a ride home on a military bomber.

18       The only open seat was a bombardier's glass  
19 compartment on the belly of the plane, and it was  
20 damaged; portions of the glazing were cracked and  
21 missing. The flight path took them from a base near  
22 Washington to Kansas City directly over Kentucky at  
23 night. And as Dean Graves told the story, he looked  
24 down on a beautiful Kentucky landscape of rolling hills  
25 lit by moonlight and an occasional farm light, with  
26 cold wind pouring past him through the gaps in the

1 plane, and thought to himself what a remarkable country  
2 this was, with so many resources, and how anything was  
3 possible.

4 On behalf of the alumni, students, staff  
5 and faculty of the College of Architecture, I am  
6 honored that Dean Emeritus Charles Parker Graves chose  
7 to prove that anything was possible here in Kentucky.  
8 We are all the better for it.

9 MR. FORTUNE: Can we have a  
10 moment of silence.

11 (SILENCE)

12 MR. FORTUNE: Thank you, Dean  
13 Mohney. And I was remiss in not introducing Dean David  
14 Mohney for the resolution.

15 There are, I believe, Committee Reports.  
16 Andy Spears.

17 MR. SPEARS: Academic  
18 Facilities Committee, as I announced at our January  
19 meeting, was arranged for this body to meet with the  
20 campus master planners. The architects are doing the  
21 master plan for our campus next Wednesday, a week from  
22 this Wednesday, on February the 20th. I told you  
23 before we were going to meet at 3:00. That meeting's  
24 been moved a little bit earlier. We're going to start  
25 at 2:00 in the College of Law courtroom. And we urge  
26 you all to come and hear their presentation and have

1 input into what they're doing, relative to planning for  
2 our campus over the next ten years or so. So February  
3 the 20th, two p.m. College of Law courtroom.

4 MR. FORTUNE: Now, this is a  
5 public meeting, of course, and everyone is invited and  
6 I would urge you to let the folks that you represent  
7 know about it. These are the architects you've been  
8 reading about in the newspaper with the downtown  
9 planning and so on.

10 And I believe Brad Canon has a report.  
11 Brad?

12 MR. CANON: Yeah. You may  
13 recall at the last Senate meeting that one Senate  
14 Council seat was vacate and in a run-off between Kaveh  
15 Tagavi and Ernie Bailey. On the run-off Ernie Bailey  
16 won on a very narrow vote and is now on the Senate  
17 Council. Ernie is from the College of Agriculture and  
18 I believe Veterinary Science. Would you take a bow.  
19 (APPLAUSE)

20 The only other announcement, the Board  
21 of Trustees' ballot is due Friday, if you haven't  
22 gotten it in yet. And we will -- For those of you who  
23 are on the Rules Committee, I've sent an e-mail around  
24 trying to get you to help count on Monday or Wednesday  
25 of next week. And please answer. When we sit and  
26 count the ballots, we will notify the candidates. And

1 I will call the *KERNEL* and see if it is interested in  
2 publishing this information. And, you know, if all  
3 else fails, we'll get word to you at the March meeting.

4 MR. FORTUNE: Any other  
5 committee reports? (No response.)

6 Okay. If not, we'll move on to the  
7 action items. There's one listed agenda item and then  
8 one other -- No, I'm sorry. They're both listed.  
9 Let's take the University Calendars first. That's the  
10 second listed agenda item, action item. And we sent  
11 this out electronically this time, because this seems  
12 to be the kind of thing that really becomes kind of a  
13 perfunctory thing. I've been in the Senate for quite a  
14 while and I've never seen an objection to the  
15 University Calendar. But it is part of our  
16 responsibility to approve that. And so we sent it out  
17 electronically. We have not heard any questions  
18 concerning it. It does come to you with the  
19 recommendation of the Senate Council and, therefore,  
20 needs no second. So the University Calendars are  
21 before you as an action item.

22 Questions on this? Anyone want to speak  
23 on the University Calendars? (No response.)

24 Okay. If not, all in favor, signify by  
25 saying aye.

26 ("AYE" VOICE VOTE: ALL)



1                   Opposed, say nay.

2   ("NAY" VOICE VOTE: NONE)

3                   The second action item, this is, of  
4   course, Action Item A, is the proposal from the College  
5   of Communication and Information Studies to raise the  
6   undergraduate grade point average to a 3.0 for the  
7   2002-2003 academic year. And for those of you that  
8   have had an opportunity to read the attachment, it  
9   gives the background of this. Back in 1987 at the time  
10   that selective admissions was approved by the College,  
11   there apparently was a proposal. Part of that action  
12   at that time apparently was to allow the College to  
13   raise the requirement for admissions on notice to the  
14   deans and on approval by the Senate Council. That part  
15   of the proposal back in 1987 wasn't codified. And this  
16   all took us on the Senate Council, I think with one  
17   exception, by surprise. And I personally felt it was  
18   inappropriate for the Senate Council to be approving  
19   this kind of thing.

20                  And so the Senate Council sends this to  
21   you as the College of Communications' request for a  
22   waiver of the rule for 2002-2003. And it's my  
23   understanding that the College is going to submit a  
24   proposal to the Senate Committee on Admissions and  
25   Academic Standards for a general change in the rule.  
26   Now, the reason this is before you, as basically an

1 emergency matter, is that if the Senate approves it, it  
2 can appear in the bulletin. And we simply did not have  
3 time to take this through the regular channels. It  
4 comes to you without a recommendation so it will need a  
5 second. Excuse me. I'm sorry. There will be a  
6 motion. There will be a need for a motion and a  
7 second. So if we could have a motion for this waiver.

8 MR. JOHNSON: So move.

9 MR. FORTUNE: We'll have  
10 everything taken down stenographically. So I'll need  
11 to have whoever made the motion announce -- Well, Dean  
12 David Johnson made the motion. And is there a second?

13 MS. WALDHART: Second.

14 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. And Enid  
15 Waldhart seconded the motion. Okay. Now, the motion  
16 is before you and I would like to have someone speak in  
17 favor of the motion. Is that you, Dean Johnson?

18 MR. JOHNSON: I'd, first of  
19 all, like to make a couple of minor corrections to the  
20 motion, itself. It should read the College of  
21 Communication and Information Studies.

22 MR. FORTUNE: Okay.

23 MR. JOHNSON: And the four  
24 undergraduate programs are Communication, without an  
25 "s," Journalism, and Integrated Strategic  
26 Communication, as well as the Telecommunications that

1 we have there.

2 MR. FORTUNE: Okay.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Our Faculty  
4 Council acted on this in December after reviewing a lot  
5 of information that you have before you. We've been  
6 considering this in the College for the last several  
7 years. It's not an action that we've taken lightly.  
8 It's received considerable discussion in all of the  
9 advisory bodies within the College. And it came to the  
10 Faculty Council with recommendation of the two  
11 undergraduate units within the College.

12 Following the rules, as I understood  
13 them at the time, I circulated the letter to my fellow  
14 deans and other administrators asking for their advice  
15 on this particular matter and I've received no  
16 response. And that had a deadline of a couple of weeks  
17 ago to that particular message. And I think it's in  
18 part because they are privy to some of the same  
19 statistical information that I presented to you and  
20 several handouts that were available at the beginning  
21 of the meeting.

22 In 1987 when the Senate acted on this,  
23 they had a standard, quote, to student enrollment at a  
24 level consonant with teaching resources, unquote. And  
25 that was the standard behind the 2.6 and it's the  
26 standard that we're applying in this request to move to

1 a 3.0.

2                   If you'll turn to some of the handouts  
3 that I distributed to you, first of all, the one with  
4 the color bars, on the far left of the handout it sort  
5 of gives you a resource context for our particular  
6 College. That's the amount of money that we get in the  
7 general fund as a proportion of what used to be called  
8 the Lexington Campus Budget. It's now managed  
9 underneath the Provost, as I understand it. And as you  
10 can see from those various bars, our College has  
11 contributed a substantial amount to the University in  
12 writing criteria above and beyond what we get from the  
13 general fund.

14                   Most noteworthy is our head count  
15 enrollment and also the number of majors at the  
16 undergraduate level and the number of majors who  
17 graduate at a master's level, which both come close to  
18 10 percent of the total at those particular colleges.  
19 We also account for a substantial proportion of the  
20 indirect cost in terms of the Lexington campus and we  
21 get the lowest return of our indirect cost of any unit  
22 on the old Lexington campus, roughly 22 percent when  
23 the average was 77 percent. In the last four years,  
24 our grants have grown from 600,000 to roughly 3  
25 million. So in addition to having a pronounced  
26 increase in our undergraduate enrollment, we also have

1 had a substantial increase in our response to the  
2 projects.

3                   The next sheet that I'd like to call  
4 your attention to is the Fact Sheet. One thing that's  
5 particularly noteworthy here is the undergraduate  
6 enrollment of the undergraduate GPA average for the  
7 University as a whole. That's increasing at roughly  
8 .015 per year. Unfortunately, I asked for this  
9 information and couldn't receive it. I don't know what  
10 the average was in 1987 when this was passed. But one  
11 can speculate that a large part of what we're asking  
12 for here is just adjusting for the great inflation  
13 that's already occurred at the University.

14                   Our annual review report, which is an  
15 official University document that specifies our goal as  
16 a college for the last several years has said that we  
17 want to have an undergraduate enrollment of 709.  
18 That's based on a successful accreditation at that  
19 point, having similar resources at that point, and  
20 having a faculty-to-majors ratio that's roughly  
21 equivalent to where the University is right now. And  
22 that's a statistic a little bit further down on the  
23 page.

24                   Our current undergraduate enrollment is  
25 1161. I'll come back to that in a second when we  
26 review the next page. As you can see in terms of our

1 averages and the University averages, both in majors  
2 per regular faculty member, undergraduate degrees  
3 awarded, total degrees awarded and sponsored project  
4 activity are almost double the rest of the campus in  
5 terms of averages for our particular College.

6 Those ratios are particularly important  
7 in terms of majors per regular faculty member because  
8 we're coming up on an accreditation review for our  
9 journalism program. And normally journalism programs  
10 have a roughly 15-to-1 faculty to student ratio. And,  
11 as you can see from looking at this document, we're  
12 more than double that particular ratio.

13 The next information I would like to  
14 refer you to is a report prepared by the registrar's  
15 office. This is from last spring. Since then, we've  
16 added 160 undergraduate students. And you'll see from  
17 the abbreviations down below under "CI," which is  
18 Communication Information Studies, that our enrollment  
19 is the only enrollment that has grown substantially  
20 over the years since this report has been compiled of  
21 all of the units on campus.

22 Business and Economics a couple of years  
23 ago had an enrollment management plan approved by this  
24 body that allowed it to go up to a 3.0 undergraduate  
25 GPA. And the impact of that -- they raised it to a  
26 2.8; it's a discretionary within a particular range --

1 was largely to taper off enrollment, not to decrease  
2 enrollment. And, quite frankly, given national trends  
3 and trends within our college, that's what I expect  
4 would happen as a result of this proposal. We wouldn't  
5 decrease the normal; rather, we'd just slow the  
6 acceleration in enrollment in our particular college.

7                   The other thing I'd like to point out to  
8 you is our enrollment, since this report has been  
9 prepared, has grown by 452 students. That's equivalent  
10 to the enrollment in almost all of the professionally-  
11 oriented colleges on this sheet of paper. So in other  
12 words, we have an enrollment equivalent to or greater  
13 in our increase than five other colleges on campus.

14 Thank you.

15                   MR. FORTUNE: Thank you, Dean  
16 Johnson.

17                   Is there anyone who would like to speak  
18 in opposition to the motion? (No response.)

19                   Okay. Kaveh, would you like to -- Go  
20 ahead. Kaveh Tagavi.

21                   MR. TAGAVI: Not opposition.  
22 I'd just like to ask -- I assume that these are the  
23 freshman admission rather than, like, sophomore  
24 admission after they have been here for a couple of  
25 years or one year?

26                   MR. JOHNSON: The enrollment

1 figures I presented to you are both pre-majors and  
2 majors. That's usually how U.K. counts for head count  
3 enrollment. We're roughly split equally between pre-  
4 majors and majors, which means we have roughly 600  
5 students in each category.

6 MR. TAGAVI: So just to  
7 continue on that, I'm just wondering, if somebody  
8 started U.K. last year, based on this type of a  
9 guarantee that you have 2.6, you will be admitted to  
10 this college and then they have spent one year here,  
11 paid tuition and have a GPA of 2.7 or 2.9. Now, all of  
12 a sudden, we are changing the rules on them. What  
13 happens to them?

14 MR. JOHNSON: The ruling in  
15 the past of the Senate on this -- and you correct me if  
16 I'm wrong, Bill--

17 MR. FORTUNE: We'll ask Brad  
18 Canon.

19 MR. JOHNSON: --has been that  
20 since this is something that is publicized in the  
21 bulletin in great detail, in terms of procedures, that  
22 the students have been given due notice. And I think  
23 that that is under the Business and Economic Program.

24 MR. FORTUNE: Brad, do you  
25 have anything you want to add to that?

26 MR. CANON: Well, this isn't a



1 Rules Committee matter so much as a contractual matter.

2 I think that the normal assumption is, the students  
3 are governed by what's in the bulletin the year they  
4 come in, so long as they haven't dropped out.

5 MR. FORTUNE: Anything else  
6 anyone else would like to -- Yes?

7 MR. FORGUE: I just wonder  
8 what the response has been for the request--

9 MR. FORTUNE: If you will,  
10 for--

11 MR. FORGUE: --Ray Forgue,  
12 Family Studies --response has been related to requests  
13 for increased resources to meet this demand.

14 MR. JOHNSON: The Provost and  
15 the chancellor before him have both been generous  
16 within the limits of their budget to respond to the  
17 enrollment growth within our college. Provost Nietzel  
18 has put forward a request that within the context of  
19 our contributory budget, it's a very generous one.  
20 However, my calculations are, in order to get us up to  
21 the average of the University in terms of funding per  
22 SCH or funding per head count enrollment, and also to  
23 deal with space issues and other concerns, we would  
24 need over a million dollars. And his generosity hasn't  
25 come up to quite that level yet.

26 MR. FORTUNE: Would anyone

1 else like to speak on this issue? Kaveh Tagavi. Let's  
2 see if anyone else would like to speak first, Kaveh.  
3 And then I'll come back to you.

4 MR. FORGUE: I'd like to  
5 respond to that. It just seems like we're setting up a  
6 pattern whereby students select majors based on the  
7 resources the university gives to the various programs  
8 rather than the merits of the programs, per se. So  
9 that the students that are left over are forced to be  
10 somewhere else because the university won't give them  
11 resources for graduate demands.

12 MR. FORTUNE: Would anyone  
13 else like to speak to this issue?

14 Okay. Kaveh?

15 MR. TAGAVI: So do I  
16 understand this correctly, that if a student is between  
17 this gap, then question this rule and this will come to  
18 the Rules Committee. Professor Canon already has  
19 mentioned how he would look at this. Seems problematic  
20 what -- In addition, what I'd like to know, how  
21 retroactive is this? If somebody has applied for your  
22 program yesterday and they have 2.8, what happens to  
23 them if this is approved?

24 MR. JOHNSON: This, obviously,  
25 wouldn't take effect until this fall. So if they did  
26 it yesterday, they would still be admitted to college.

1       Also, as part of the Senate Rule, there's an appeals  
2 procedure and all of our appeals committees are well  
3 versed with the problems that are addressed by these  
4 comments.

5                               MR. FORTUNE:   Would anyone  
6 else like to speak to this issue?   Kathi Kern?

7                               MS. KERN:   One of the issues  
8 that we've been talking about on Undergraduate Council  
9 over the past year, is how many admissions requirements  
10 are we going to ask of our students so that they have  
11 been accepted into this institution to study.   How many  
12 more steps should there be where they have to be  
13 admitted into the programs?   And I'm in the College of  
14 Arts & Sciences.   So I can't speak to some of these  
15 other colleges to know how many other specialized  
16 admissions requirements are there.

17                              I can tell you that one thing that  
18 happens when someone has a 2.8 is, they go to their  
19 Arts & Sciences and other professors and try to argue  
20 for a higher grade in that class so that they can get  
21 the 2.9 or whatever it is that they need to be  
22 admitted.   So it does have a residual effect, I think,  
23 in other colleges.   And I'd just like to open that up  
24 to see if anybody would like to talk about that.

25                              MR. FORTUNE:   Anyone else?

26       (No response.)

1                   If not, we'll vote. All in favor --  
2     And this will be a rule waiver for the 2002-3 academic  
3     year to waive the 2.6 requirement and allow the College  
4     of Communications to have a 3.0 requirement for  
5     admission into its programs next year. All in favor,  
6     signify by saying aye.

7     ("AYE" VOICE COUNT: SEVERAL)

8                   Opposed, say nay.

9     ("NAY" VOICE COUNT: SEVERAL)

10                  May we have a show of hands? May we  
11     have the ayes, please? And if there are any non-  
12     senators -- I didn't ask that but if you're a non-  
13     senator, please don't vote. I'll put you on your  
14     honor.

15     (LAUGHTER)

16                  All right. All in favor, hold up your  
17     right hands, please.

18     ("AYE" HAND COUNT: 31)

19                                 COUNTER: 17 and 14.

20                                 MR. FORTUNE: Thirty-one.

21                  All opposed?

22     ("NAY" HAND COUNT: 39)

23                                 COUNTER: 23 and 16.

24                                 MR. FORTUNE: Motion fails.

25                                 COUNTER: (Indicating a need  
26     to recount.)

1 MR. FORTUNE: Hold them up  
2 again. All opposed. Did you have a question back  
3 there?

4 COUNTER: Do you want a  
5 recount?

6 MR. FORTUNE: No, just -- I  
7 thought she had a question.

8 All opposed, please hold up your hand.  
9 Pretty important matter.

10 ("NAY" HAND COUNT: 39)

11 COUNTER: 22 and 17.

12 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Motion  
13 fails 39 to 31.

14 Okay. There are two discussion items.  
15 And the first is Phyllis Nash, who is Chair of the Top  
16 20 Task Force, and she will address you on some  
17 preliminary conclusions or perhaps more than  
18 preliminary conclusions of that committee. And I might  
19 say, as Phyllis comes up, that one other -- An  
20 announcement that I did not make, is that Phyllis is in  
21 charge of Senate's Fix-Up Committee as far as academic  
22 program approval process is concerned. And we hope to  
23 have a report on that and perhaps a pilot project this  
24 fall. But in any event, if you have questions or  
25 thoughts about the approval process or programs and  
26 courses, address your concerns to Phyllis.

1 MS. NASH: Thank you so much,  
2 Bill, for allowing me to come and represent the Task  
3 Force that is helping to define "Top 20" for this  
4 institution. It's very important that we have your  
5 feedback.

6 (Giving PowerPoint presentation:)

7 Let me just say that at the end of this  
8 session, we're actually going to be giving you two  
9 handouts. One will really summarize for you all of the  
10 material, plus more, that I'm going to talk about  
11 today. I didn't give it to you ahead of time because I  
12 wanted you to pay attention to me. But, trust me,  
13 there's lots of information on here and I'll be  
14 referring to that chart in just a few minutes.

15 You will remember that on his first day  
16 in office, President Todd appointed two Task Forces,  
17 Futures of the Institution Task Force and the Top 20  
18 Task Force. And, very quickly, we operationalized this  
19 task force. Mike Nietzel, as Provost, and I are co-  
20 chairing this group. And I'm just going to briefly run  
21 through very quickly the names of the members. I will  
22 tell you ahead of time we'll be giving the website for  
23 this task force and we encourage you to go and take a  
24 look at the website. And all the task force members  
25 are there.

26 I will say that we've had really good

1 representation from the Futures Committee. John Thelin  
2 is sitting actually on both committees and, hopefully,  
3 we're getting some carryover there. In addition, the  
4 Commission on Women and the Commission on Diversity  
5 have members that are serving on the group. And then,  
6 finally, we have a person outside the university, a  
7 member of the Prichard Committee, Bill McCann, who sits  
8 on the committee. We have a student, a graduate  
9 student. So it's a very well-rounded group. And this  
10 group has worked incredibly well.

11 And I've left the slide up here that  
12 shows the staff because, as you all know, we don't get  
13 much done around here if there's not a terrific staff  
14 working with us. And Maria Kemplin is here with me  
15 today and I just want to acknowledge the staff.

16 You will remember that the charge to  
17 become Top 20 came from the governor and the  
18 legislators several -- a couple of years ago. But to  
19 really understand what that Top 20 challenge means, the  
20 President said to us, as a university, that we need to  
21 define that for ourselves. And so he charged this Task  
22 Force with really recommending both the criteria and  
23 the measures that we would employ as a university in  
24 order to assess our progress in reaching this status.

25 He asked us to identify two types of  
26 metrics. First of those, those that were collected

1 independently at the national level, and then those  
2 local measures that would really reflect our  
3 contributions to what he has called Kentucky's higher  
4 purpose or U.K.'s higher purpose or addressing  
5 Kentucky's uglies, as you've heard. He asked that we  
6 do all of this by March. And if there are 31 days in  
7 March, we may make it.

8 I want you to know that this committee  
9 has worked long and hard. And I wanted to just show  
10 you the notebook that we filled for them and actually  
11 the material that they reviewed. We actually studied  
12 the various approaches to ranking, including NRC,  
13 Graham and Diamond, the Carnegie Classification, AAU.  
14 I'll have to just tell you that we did make a call to  
15 AAU and they basically said, don't call us, we'll call  
16 you. But we'll keep trying to get in the door.

17 The center is a -- You may be not as  
18 familiar with the center. It's out of the University  
19 of Florida created about two years ago and is really  
20 gaining a lot of respect for their ability to rank and  
21 show the accomplishments of higher education.

22 We, of course, reviewed *U.S. NEWS*. And  
23 I will tell you that the committee, me included, went  
24 into this with not having a tremendous amount of  
25 respect for the *U.S. NEWS*' rankings. But, actually,  
26 having studied their approaches, they are getting much



1 better. And whether or not they should be doing  
2 rankings is one issue, but they're actually getting  
3 much more scientific in their approach. We thought it  
4 was only reasonable that we look at what our own  
5 Council on postsecondary education has asked us to do  
6 and, of course, we refer to our own strategic plan and  
7 indicators.

8                   Now, before I move too much further  
9 today, I want to issue some cautions. And, first of  
10 all, I want you to know that we know, as a Task Force,  
11 that any definition of university quality is going to  
12 evoke controversy and disagreement. So that's why  
13 we're here and that's really why we're here early in  
14 the process. You'll see in just a minute that we are  
15 really about halfway in terms of what we have to  
16 accomplish. Hopefully, the second half won't take us  
17 quite as long. But we're really only about halfway  
18 through with our process. And rather than wait until  
19 we almost had the draft ready to go to the President  
20 and then ask your input, we wanted your input now.

21                   I've been to the deans. I have been to  
22 both of the commissions. I will -- We're actually  
23 conducting two open sessions for faculty and staff.  
24 And that's what the yellow flier is. I think you all  
25 got an e-mail about that today, hopefully, from the  
26 President's office. And we'll be setting up a session

1 for students. So we're out there really now asking for  
2 your feedback so that you can shape this work at this  
3 point in time, because we really need you to help us  
4 come to agreement about what quality is.

5 Also, I would tell you that the variance  
6 both within and across institutions make it really hard  
7 to determine what those quality criteria or those  
8 measures are. I will tell you, however, that we have  
9 found, and I've come to believe, that universities of  
10 the highest quality tend to do most things well. And  
11 you may say, well, why is that a caution? Well, that's  
12 a caution because if, indeed, we try to rely on one or  
13 two measures to really reflect the breadth of what this  
14 institution has to do and has to become to be  
15 recognized as a premiered institution, then we will be  
16 selling the institution short.

17 And I also would say to you that really  
18 no single indicator or one composite number can really  
19 represent what an institution has done, can do or will  
20 do. But what we really need to do is to follow a  
21 number of indicators which, taken together, at least  
22 approximate our accomplishment and our relative  
23 strength. And that's really the goal that we have  
24 tried to achieve.

25 And I will just tell you that any kind  
26 of measure that you look at is problematic.

1 Reputational measures are problematic. Ranking  
2 measures are problematic. Collection of data on even  
3 publications and citations is problematic. And so, we  
4 realize that we are in an arena where no matter what  
5 criteria that we choose and what measures we choose,  
6 that there's going to be some problem with the  
7 measurement. And so what we've decided to do is to  
8 move boldly, go forward, but just indicate in our  
9 report some of the limitations of various kinds of  
10 measures that we are proposing.

11 Well, in terms of defining Top 20, the  
12 very first thing that we thought we had to do was to  
13 really determine: What are the characteristics that an  
14 institution that's recognized as a national premiere  
15 outstanding Top 20 -- any adjective you would want to  
16 use -- institution would have? And that was our  
17 starting point. And so we have identified six  
18 attributes or characteristics that we believe are  
19 markers. And, again, I'm going to give you a handout  
20 that have all these characteristics listed. So you  
21 don't need to take notes right now.

22 The first thing that we believe is an  
23 outstanding institution will have a comprehensive array  
24 of programs and many of those programs will have  
25 national prominence. We believe that any outstanding  
26 institution has to attract and graduate outstanding

1 students that go on to make an outstanding contribution  
2 in their fields of study and in their communities, as  
3 well. We believe that, in addition to this array of  
4 programs and to outstanding students, we must have a  
5 distinguished faculty and that that faculty's research,  
6 scholarship, teaching and service are really recognized  
7 as being outstanding.

8                   In addition to faculty, students and  
9 programs, we believe that a national premiere  
10 institution is noted because of its discovery, its  
11 dissemination, and its application of new and  
12 significant knowledge. We believe that an outstanding  
13 institution is noted for its diversity, its diversity  
14 of thought, its diversity of culture, diversity in  
15 ethnicity that really creates on campus communities of  
16 learning in the true sense of the word so that students  
17 are really prepared for the world that they will face.

18       And that we not just only touch our own institution  
19 but this diversity helps touch beyond this institution  
20 and makes the world a better place.

21                   And, finally, we believe that any  
22 outstanding institution will be noted for its  
23 improvements to the educational, the social, the  
24 economic, physical and cultural well-being of the  
25 citizens, particularly in this state of our  
26 Commonwealth. And so these are the characteristics

1 that we believe we must achieve if we're to be a Top 20  
2 national institution.

3 Now, in moving to the next level, then,  
4 how do we know if indeed we have those characteristics?

5 Our next goal then was to set up those lists of  
6 indicators that would really show us whether or not we  
7 are accomplishing those characteristics. And these  
8 indicators become the yardstick that we use to evaluate  
9 ourself and to evaluate our progress.

10 Now, we are working on two sets of  
11 indicators. As you know, the president said to us he  
12 wanted two sets. He wanted those national measures and  
13 he wanted those higher purpose or local measures. And  
14 what I'm about today being here, is to report to you on  
15 only the national set. And I want to really make that  
16 clear, that you don't think that I have come to you  
17 with a full set of indicators. The characteristics we  
18 have pretty much identified. And so we want you to  
19 really respond to those. And the national indicators  
20 that I'm going to share with you, we want you to  
21 respond to. But please be clear that we have not  
22 developed what we're calling the local or higher-  
23 purpose measures.

24 Now, before we came up with our  
25 indicators, we actually set criteria for our  
26 indicators. And we said that, first of all, if there

1 are going to be national indicators that they should be  
2 widely used nationally; that we would not gain respect  
3 and be recognized as a premiere institution if indeed  
4 we had only measures that we would choose ourself,  
5 particularly if we could stack up pretty good from  
6 those measures. So that these measures really did have  
7 to be widely used. And, as much as possible, we wanted  
8 measures that were already collected by someone because  
9 of the person power that it takes. We are  
10 demonstrating that it is a huge effort to collect all  
11 of this data and to do the comparison data.

12 We believed that we ought to be  
13 measuring things over which we had control and that we  
14 wanted to make sure that when we looked at these  
15 measures that we were moving in the direction that we  
16 thought the institution ought to go. And, finally,  
17 that these measures really reflect the heterogeneity of  
18 the program and of this institution, this institution  
19 that has a community college, an undergraduate campus,  
20 a graduate campus, all the professional schools, a  
21 medical center, a law school, and has the Land Grant  
22 Mission, as well. And so having measures that really  
23 reflect this heterogeneity in terms of our national  
24 accomplishment we think is important.

25 And I would encourage you when you  
26 evaluate the material that we're giving you that you

1 think of these indicators, the criteria for our  
2 indicators, and you help us determine whether or not we  
3 have achieved what we wanted to achieve.

4                   Now, what I want to do very quickly, and  
5 I know time's limited, I am going to put through very  
6 quickly the measures, the indicators for each of the  
7 characteristics. When we hand out this in just a few  
8 minutes, you will see that you have much more  
9 information that I'm going over just now. You will  
10 have a column that has the characteristics. You will  
11 have a column that has the indicators. You will also  
12 see that we have indicated where we will go to get the  
13 information. And we have the data definition or the  
14 data source so that you can see exactly what we mean  
15 when we say ranking or exactly what we mean when we say  
16 level of academic challenge and where we'll go to get  
17 that information. And then we have a column, also,  
18 that indicates how often this data is collected by this  
19 national group.

20                   And, finally, you'll see a blank column.

21       And this blank column is the column we're going to  
22 start working on, because we believe that if indeed all  
23 we do is put out to the University community, this is  
24 what we need to do, that we will be selling our  
25 community quite short. But we believe that we ought to  
26 be able to indicate -- If indeed we are to move to

1 have national rankings, we need resources. And we will  
2 be trying to identify when all -- whenever possible  
3 what the resources are that we believe are going to be  
4 needed in order to move us in the direction that we  
5 want to go.

6                   So we think this can be a wonderful  
7 working document for the President as he works with the  
8 governor's office, as he works with the legislators, in  
9 trying to sell not only what we want to achieve but  
10 what we need to do in order to get there. So you'll  
11 have this document at the end. Also, at the bottom of  
12 this is the website for the committee where you can go  
13 and review this material. And then finally my e-mail  
14 address is here. And we want you to send your e-mails  
15 fast and furious really helping us again polish this  
16 document and make it better.

17                   So in terms of really measuring the  
18 comprehensive array of programs, we are proposing that  
19 we use rankings, that we use publications and  
20 citations, both total numbers for the institution but  
21 also on a per capita basis; that we use total and  
22 federal research dollars generated, again using both  
23 total and per capita.

24                   Number of doctoral students produced,  
25 number of postdoctoral appointments, and level of  
26 academic challenge. In terms of outstanding students,



1 we propose to use undergraduate SAT scores and class  
2 rank of the students coming in, their high school class  
3 rank. Our undergraduate retention and graduation  
4 rates, undergraduate honors. And again we've spelled  
5 out the undergraduate honors on the handout that will  
6 be given you that will lay out exactly which honors  
7 we'll be looking at. And again we'll be comparing  
8 ourself to other institutions and how they achieve on  
9 these indicators. The number of doctoral students  
10 produced and the level of academic challenge. You will  
11 know that again some of these are showing up more -- in  
12 more than one category.

13 In terms of a faculty, how are we going  
14 to judge whether or not we have a distinguished  
15 faculty. We are proposing that we use membership in  
16 academies, faculty awards, publications and citations  
17 and total and federal research dollars.

18 In terms of new and significant  
19 knowledge generation, we propose that we use  
20 publications and citations, and probably the citation  
21 one is one that gets at the significance of the  
22 knowledge, total and federal research dollars, patents  
23 and licenses. And in terms of diversity, we propose to  
24 use faculty diversity, indicators of student diversity,  
25 minority student success, student experiences, both the  
26 enriching-ness of the student experience and the

1 supportive educational environment. And we have,  
2 again, a study that's being done now, the National  
3 Study on Student Engagement, the NSSE Study, that the  
4 Council on Postsecondary Education mandates. And that  
5 has questions about student experience, as well as  
6 level of academic challenge. And we've actually, on  
7 your handout, indicated the items under each of those  
8 so that you can get a sense of the questions that  
9 undergraduate students are being asked.

10 Another thing I should mention to you is  
11 that any item that we thought ought to be looked at in  
12 terms of diversity that we could not get national  
13 measures on, we have actually proposed that we use  
14 those in terms of local measures. And so you will see  
15 that coming up in just a minute.

16 Let me just very quickly then take --  
17 Because we have duplicates, I want to just very quickly  
18 let you take a glance at the 21 indicators of national  
19 prominence that we are suggesting. This is just a  
20 repeat so you could see the entire list. And then what  
21 I'd like to do -- and I notice there's a little out  
22 there but I really wanted to make sure that I got your  
23 attention -- to say that the indicator for  
24 characteristic six, that is, the improvements, the  
25 higher purpose, the Kentucky uglies, the contributions  
26 locally, we are just starting to work on those.

1                   Now, we've talked about things like  
2    faculty diversity, student diversity, staff diversity,  
3    things that we cannot measure nationally that we've  
4    already pulled here. But we're just starting to work  
5    on these. And so what I wanted you to know is that  
6    we'll -- In fact, Bill, I'll be asking to come back,  
7    hopefully, to bring those higher purpose or local  
8    measures to you for review in the same manner before,  
9    again, they go into the final report to the President.

10                   Now, how you can become involved or what  
11   we want for you. First of all, the website, we'd love  
12   for you to visit, share your comments, share your  
13   questions. And the website will be on the handout  
14   we're giving you. Send your feedback to me and I will  
15   summarize it, take it back to the committee. Again,  
16   we're having a number of these kinds of meetings and  
17   we'll compile all the information and the committee  
18   will process it. Let us know your thoughts on the  
19   following question: In terms of the characteristics,  
20   have we selected the characteristics that you believe  
21   mark a nationally prominent public institution,  
22   university? Are the characteristics too broad or are  
23   they too narrow? In terms of the national indicators,  
24   are the indicators we've selected the right ones to  
25   measure the characteristics? Assuming those are the  
26   correct ones.

1                   Are the indicators reflective of the  
2                   breadth of the university's accomplishments? Or you  
3                   may say we have too many indicators. If you think we  
4                   have too many indicators, let us know which ones you  
5                   think should be eliminated. Do you trust the  
6                   indicators? And that goes back to those issues around  
7                   reputation and rankings or whatever. And then: What  
8                   institutions do you believe we should be using to  
9                   compare ourself, to our current benchmarks or to all  
10                  public institutions that are like us? So that's a  
11                  question.

12                   And then because we're just now starting  
13                  to work on these higher purpose or local indicators, if  
14                  you have advice to offer us in what you think we should  
15                  be using as indicators of higher purpose, we'd be  
16                  thrilled to death to have that input on the front end.

17                  So please do not hesitate to send us your feedback  
18                  regarding those indicators, as well.

19                   Now, Bill, I'm actually finished but I  
20                  don't know how much time you have. I'm willing to  
21                  entertain any feedback now or--

22                                   MR. FORTUNE: Let's see if  
23                  there's some questions.

24                                   MS. DEBSKI: On the citation--

25                                   COURT REPORTER: Identify  
26                  yourself, please.

1 MS. DEBSKI: Oh. Liz Debski,  
2 Biological Sciences. On the citations and  
3 publications, the emphasis seemed to be on number. I'm  
4 wondering if you also considered impact of journals and  
5 that kind of thing.

6 MS. NASH: We did, Liz. We  
7 had some long talks about that. But the ability to get  
8 anybody to agree on what the top journals are just  
9 seemed like an overwhelming task. And we might come up  
10 with a list. But then if nobody else agrees with us,  
11 then it becomes one of those, you know, local measures.  
12 So, you know, your point's well taken.

13 MS. DEBSKI: Well, of course,  
14 other people have come up with lists like that and  
15 there was no consensus as to any of these being  
16 valuable or more accurate?

17 MS. NASH: Well, again, we  
18 didn't think we could get consensus. If you really  
19 believe that there's some reliable and valid list out  
20 there that we could get agreement on, we'd love to hear  
21 from you and, you know, be happy to make that case.  
22 So, you know, the Committee is very open to looking at  
23 anything.

24 MR. GROTCHE: Howard Grotch,  
25 Dean of Arts & Sciences. One characteristic that I  
26 note of outstanding universities is that their faculty

1 are asked to deliver major talks at conferences and  
2 also they're in great demand at very elite  
3 institutions. Is anything going to be done to collect  
4 such data? I know in our college, if somebody in a  
5 given year gives a talk at Harvard, Stanford, MIT, you  
6 know, and places like that, I say, "Wow, that person  
7 must have done great work."

8 MS. NASH: Excellent point.  
9 The question is, you know, how do we get measures for  
10 our benchmarks or other publics to know how many of  
11 those and where they are. I'll be happy to take that  
12 back to the committee but, Howard, I really think it's  
13 a collection problem.

14 MR. GROTCHE: I'm sure it's  
15 collected on a department-by-department basis. All of  
16 our departments probably have that data.

17 MS. NASH: But whether we  
18 could get comparable national data to -- But maybe we  
19 just want to look at it as sort of an internal move.  
20 So, definitely, I'll take that back and present it to  
21 the committee. Yes?

22 MR. SIEBEL: Dick Siebel,  
23 Medicine. What about measuring the amount of resources  
24 that the state puts into their Top 20 university areas?  
25 (LAUGHTER)

26 MS. NASH: And, actually,

1 Connie Ray's office does that and she has a great  
2 website up now that really looks at our benchmarks and  
3 compares things like spending. So I think your point's  
4 well taken, that if we look at spending for the top  
5 public institutions and compare that to our own, we  
6 know that we have a ways to go. So that's a good  
7 point.

8 MR. TAGAVI: The  
9 characteristics of Top 20 universities or those who  
10 maintain to being Top 20 universities might be  
11 distinctly different than characteristic of  
12 universities that became Top 20. For example, it would  
13 be nice if it would identify one or two other  
14 institutions who jumped 20, 30 places in the Top 20 in  
15 about 20 years and look at them a little bit more  
16 carefully.

17 MS. NASH: That's a good  
18 point. One of the things that we learned in all of our  
19 studies is that people are saying that, you know, it  
20 may be possible to move two or three points over, you  
21 know, a short period of time. But the kind of  
22 significant movement that we're talking about, you  
23 don't accomplish that overnight. It's not as if that  
24 other publics that are in the Top 20 are sitting there  
25 saying, okay, we'll just sit here and wait till the  
26 University of Kentucky catches us. So, and, you know,

1 that's a real issue.

2                   The other issue that we face is, size of  
3 our faculty and the productivity of our faculty  
4 compared to, for example, number of post-doc students  
5 or appointees or a number of doctoral degrees granted.

6     And it's a real -- Size of the faculty influences  
7 that, as well. So, you know, there are a lot of  
8 factors. And that's one of the things I think the  
9 committee has struggled with, is not setting this  
10 institution up to be shot down for things that are sort  
11 of out of faculty and the administrators' control, like  
12 the amount of money the state gives us, the size of our  
13 faculty now. And that's one of the reasons we're  
14 having that resource column.

15                   MR. ROWLAND: Dan Rowland from  
16 The Gaines Center for the Humanities in the History  
17 Department. On this question of higher purpose  
18 indicators, you know, I don't think there really are  
19 very many national indicators in this way. If there  
20 are some, I don't know what they are. But it seems to  
21 me one of the things you might do is to look at the  
22 percentage of DOE that are given to faculty members for  
23 community service in various units.

24                   MS. NASH: Good.

25                   MR. ROWLAND: I mean, that  
26 seems to me like a real basic point. And another thing



1 that might be possible to do is to ask Deans to count  
2 up the kind of public service functions that are  
3 performed in their own units, because I don't think  
4 most people know the things that are going on.

5 I was just talking to Daniel Mason in  
6 the School of Music and he has that great string  
7 program that's going on. It's kind of -- But these  
8 are -- You know, no one counts these things. So I  
9 think diversity of faculty is good. But, I mean, when  
10 you're really talking about where the rubber hits the  
11 road is, to what extent does the university support  
12 faculty and staff when they work in the community? And  
13 I think that would give you -- those two items might  
14 give you some good ideas.

15 MS. NASH: Excellent point.  
16 And I only put those diversity ones because we'd  
17 already bumped them down. But we really haven't  
18 started to develop that list. The one thing I do want  
19 to say, though, is we're not going to only have  
20 indicators that we can collect national comparisons.  
21 For the higher purpose or local, we're really going to  
22 be looking for local measures. And so things like the  
23 number of contacts we have, the number of service  
24 projects, that kind of thing, will fit very well. So  
25 thank you very much for those suggestions.

26 MR. FERRIER: I'm Wally

1 Ferrier in Business and Economics. It appears that the  
2 Task Force has done a marvelous job, I think, in terms  
3 of identifying that yardstick at the institutional  
4 level. What I worry about, however, is the next step  
5 after the indicators are tallied, differences are made,  
6 then that yardstick may be applied in a one-size-fits-  
7 all kind of way to each department that is either maybe  
8 substandard, relative to benchmarks, or those  
9 departments that are clearly superior or equal to our  
10 institutional benchmarks.

11 For instance, you know, the one  
12 department is not publishing enough in peer referee  
13 journals. Another department is not publishing  
14 relative to others within the University of Kentucky  
15 system, not getting enough grant money. So that --  
16 Can you tell us a little bit about what might come  
17 after we do the tallying comparisons?

18 MS. NASH: Well, no. I mean,  
19 I really can't answer that question, other than to say  
20 that all of our measures that we're proposing are to be  
21 at the aggregate level, the university level. We have  
22 not proposed, for example, that we do publications and  
23 citations down to the departmental level. And then the  
24 other thing that I could say to you is that, you know,  
25 I think you bring up a very valid point.

26 And one of the things that I will

1 certainly take back to the Committee is this concern  
2 that we take these measures and apply them  
3 inappropriately in order to, you know, not become a  
4 yardstick but to become a battering ram and treat units  
5 unfairly. So I'll be happy to carry that message.

6 One other thing I'd like to say -- I  
7 see Bill's--

8 MR. FORTUNE: No. No. I  
9 don't think we have any time problem because I don't  
10 believe our other presenters are here, are they,  
11 Kristina Krampe and -- Oh, Kristina, she is.

12 MS. NASH: One of the things  
13 in presenting this to the groups that I've done thus  
14 far, one of the comments was whether or not these  
15 indicators are fully representative enough of the  
16 humanities. And so -- Yeah, I see some headshaking,  
17 now. So would you -- Those of you in the humanities,  
18 if you think -- After you've gotten a chance to really  
19 study the document with all of the information on it,  
20 if indeed there are some indicators that you think that  
21 we could get national comparable data on that are  
22 better for the humanities and you'd like to suggest  
23 those, it would be really, really helpful.

24 I really urge you to take this request,  
25 to give us feedback now, very seriously, to e-mail me.  
26 We'll summarize all of your comments, as well as the

1 ones today, and take those to the committee. I do want  
2 to say that if we have a contest for Task Force of the  
3 Year, this group gets nominated. They're just a  
4 phenomenal group. And so, it's just been a real  
5 pleasure to work with them. And thank you so much for  
6 your attention.

7 MR. FORTUNE: Thank you,  
8 Phyllis. Thank you.

9 (APPLAUSE)

10 MR. FORTUNE: Kristina, I  
11 apologize.

12 We have another presentation. We have a  
13 brief presentation by Kristina Krampe on the Disability  
14 Resource Center. Kristina, do you want to come down  
15 and tell the folks what this is about?

16 MS. KRAMPE: Okay. I'm  
17 Project Director for the Engaging Differences Project  
18 here on the University of Kentucky Campus. It's a  
19 federally-funded project from the Office of  
20 Postsecondary Education. And the purpose of our  
21 project is to provide training to administrators, to  
22 faculty members, but also auxiliary service personnel  
23 about working with students with disabilities.

24 (Giving PowerPoint presentation:)

25 The approach that we took with our  
26 project is, rather than trying to think about doing

1 face-to-face training, which is pretty difficult to get  
2 people together when they need it at the same time, we  
3 took the approach of developing a website so that if  
4 you wanted to look at this at 2:00 in the morning, if  
5 you had time at lunch, whenever you wanted to access  
6 the information, you were able to get to that.

7                   And what I'd like to do today is just to  
8 quickly demonstrate and show you a few pieces of things  
9 on our site. I have a brochure to pass out to you that  
10 has the URL for the site so that if you'd like to go in  
11 and explore it more, you can do so. Let me close out  
12 of this and get to the internet.

13 (PAUSE)

14                   This is the entry page to our site. The  
15 way that we've tried to develop our site, it was based  
16 on a needs assessment. The first year we met with  
17 students with disabilities, we met with faculty  
18 members, we met with administrators, we met with people  
19 in auxiliary service, and tried to find out what the  
20 needs on the University of Kentucky campus were. From  
21 that, we designed a site.

22                   One of the things that we found that  
23 people wanted were some of the informational types of  
24 things. For instance, we have information related to  
25 etiquette. It seemed to be an area of interest. What  
26 do I do when I'm working with someone who has a

1 disability? So within this area, you can find out some  
2 interaction tips, using appropriate language. For  
3 instance, talking about a student with disability as  
4 opposed to a disabled student. The person is always  
5 first.

6                   Let's say I know that I'm going to have  
7 a student who has a mobility impairment in my class. I  
8 can go in here and I can look over and find out some  
9 specific tips about what to do with someone who has a  
10 mobility impairment. Forgive me. I'm used to using a  
11 Mac. I'm also a little short-fingered here. So ...  
12 Yes, unfortunately, I kind of missed my onions and  
13 ended up getting my finger instead (referring to  
14 bandaged hand).

15                   So I can go in and find out some things  
16 about -- For instance, when you're talking with  
17 someone who has -- who uses a wheelchair, it's always  
18 the best idea if you're going to be talking to them for  
19 more than a minute or two, is to get on their level, to  
20 make sure that you're sitting so that they're craning  
21 their head and looking at you at all times. So that's  
22 just kind of an example. Acting naturally. Not being  
23 worried about if you say something like, let's go for a  
24 walk, to someone who uses a wheelchair. It's perfectly  
25 okay to use those types of language.

26                   Within this area, as well, and we are --

1 We're developing this section right now but I'm going  
2 to kind of give you an idea. We have some information  
3 about universal design for learning. It's an approach  
4 -- Universal design was an approach that began talking  
5 about buildings and facilities. If you've seen curb  
6 cuts, that's an example of universal design. It's  
7 meant for people who use wheelchairs but it's also  
8 great for someone who has a stroller, someone using a  
9 stroller, who's using a cart, different things.

10                   There's the same approach that's coming  
11 about related to learning, thinking about when you  
12 create materials, when you create the content, thinking  
13 about the diversity of the individuals who are going to  
14 approach that. It's not only going to help the student  
15 who has a disability, it's going to help the person who  
16 speaks -- that English is a second language, who has a  
17 different learning style. So it's not only going to  
18 help one student in your class. It may help other  
19 students who are struggling, as well.

20                   The way that we're planning on arranging  
21 this is that you can go in and look at a combination  
22 strategies based on the type of disability. So, for  
23 instance, I know that somebody has a mobility  
24 impairment. I can go in and I can find out a  
25 definition based on law, what does it mean that someone  
26 has a mobility impairment. It may be something that

1 you're interested, may not be. But one of the things  
2 we're trying to do is make sure that you are informed  
3 and educated about what it means to have a mobility  
4 impairment.

5                   There's also background into the topic  
6 of -- for each one of the disability areas. Some of  
7 that gets into talking about how it occurs, the causes  
8 of it. For each disability area, also, you would find  
9 that there are some links. So if you wanted to find  
10 out even more information, we take you to other sites  
11 that have information.

12                   You can find out about how the  
13 disability is documented, determined, diagnosed, not  
14 only from ability impairments, learning disabilities,  
15 attention deficit disorder, psychological impairments.

16                   There will be a wide range that will be in here.

17                   Also within the cycle will be  
18 information related to assistive technology. So if  
19 you're wanting to find out information about the type  
20 of technology that someone's using, you can go in and  
21 explore not only our site but links to other sites that  
22 would provide information related to that. Okay?

23                   Another area of interest may be campus  
24 policy. I worked with Nancy Ray and Jake Karnes on  
25 trying to take the policy that already exists and to  
26 put it online. We have this not only for the



1 University of Kentucky but have also been working with  
2 LCC, as well.

3                   There's information related to  
4 admissions policy, disability determination,  
5 confidentiality, priority registration, instructional  
6 accommodations -- how they're arranged -- the core  
7 substitution policies here, the testing accommodation  
8 policy. What may be of interest is in the testing  
9 accommodation policy area. Not only do you find out  
10 about what the policy is related to testing  
11 accommodations.

12                   We have also tried to include within  
13 this area some information about the Counseling and  
14 Testing Center, that that is a place that if you need a  
15 quiet location, that you can make arrangements. So  
16 we've included that information in this section as  
17 well, not only telling you the policy but trying to  
18 give you some arrangements, as well, including like --

19                   There are some forms out there so that if you don't  
20 actually want to go over to them or to mail it to them,  
21 you can send tests electronically to the Testing Center  
22 to be given. And so that is included in here, as well.

23                   Okay. In this red area, these are what  
24 we call our info pages. These are searchable  
25 databases. We have one related to services and  
26 experts. You can see that we have them specifically

1 for campus but we also have them for the state,  
2 nationally. We're also arranging some based on topical  
3 areas. We'll have the same thing related in the  
4 literature area. If it's possible to link to an online  
5 resource, we try to do that. So in the related  
6 literature area, you may get some citations but you  
7 also may get links if something is available online.

8                   Within this area, also, are legal cases.

9       So if someone is quoting or citing a specific case and  
10 you want to find out more information about that,  
11 you're able to go into it. To kind of give you an  
12 example, I'll just quickly go into one of these and let  
13 you see what ... What you're going to see is a listing  
14 that's going to look like the U.K. Search Page. But  
15 this is specific to our site. We're just taking  
16 advantage of the U.K. Search Engine.

17                   Let's say someone has mentioned a case  
18 to me. I can go into here. And what you're going to  
19 get is a brief summary of the case. If we have things  
20 within our site that are of interest that are related  
21 to that, you'll have links to that. If there is a full  
22 text of the case online, we will link to that as well,  
23 so that you can get as much information as you want to  
24 get about it or as little information as you want to  
25 get about it.

26                   Within our site, as well, one of the

1 things that we found from a needs assessment is that  
2 people wanted to be able to communicate. And what we  
3 tried to do is to arrange some ways for people to be  
4 able to communicate on campus. We tried to arrange  
5 these -- Excuse me. Sorry about that but I think I  
6 got on the wrong one.

7 We have some internal discussion forums.

8 So if you want to talk with someone specifically here  
9 on campus, you're able to do that. Realizing that some  
10 people want to go a little bit broader than just  
11 talking to people on campus, we've also included links  
12 to other discussion forums and list serves that are  
13 available nationwide. Some of them are very specific  
14 to certain types of disabilities and others are more  
15 general.

16 The last section is -- This is more of  
17 an interactive area. The intent of the viewpoints  
18 section is to let you explore your attitudes related to  
19 disabilities. These stories were created from some of  
20 the transcripts that were collected during the first  
21 year from the focus groups and from the interviews. So  
22 everything is based on a real life account. It may not  
23 be word-for-word the account but it is based on a real  
24 life narrative.

25 Some of them are question-and-answer  
26 format such as drawing the line, which is focused upon

1 the providing of accommodations. And what you'll see  
2 in this type is that you'll get a -- you'll have  
3 several questions and you'll have responses that you  
4 can select. If you select a response, then you're  
5 going to have a window that's going to pop up on top of  
6 it that's going to give you just a little bit more  
7 information related to that response.

8           There are other formats. I'm not going  
9 to go into each individual format. But I'm just going  
10 to kind of give you an idea of them. Up at the top, if  
11 you're not necessarily interested in going to each  
12 individual area on your own, we've created a little  
13 faculty guide. This was created with Jake Karnes. We  
14 took the disability handbook and tried to create an  
15 online version of it, expand it a little bit. There is  
16 one that's created for the University of Kentucky.  
17 There's also one created for LCC because some of the  
18 procedures are a little bit different here than at LCC.

19       So what we tried to put into these areas are very  
20 specific to the campus.

21           Disability Rights Laws, we had a couple  
22 of questions, rights and responsibilities. So, say, I  
23 want to go into the rights and responsibilities area  
24 and I want to know what are my responsibilities to a  
25 student with disabilities. I can quickly get just a  
26 couple of paragraphs, response to that. Then you see

1 over in the yellow box I have links if I want to get  
2 even more information that's related to that. I can  
3 find the didactic information. I can also find links  
4 to articles that are available in the Info Search area  
5 so that if I want to see something that's related to  
6 that.

7 Also, you can see up at the top we have  
8 a glossary which includes terms. So if someone is  
9 mentioning a term that's related to disability and you  
10 want to know what that means, we have a glossary of  
11 terms that you can go in and look at. So that's kind  
12 of our site in a nutshell.

13 MR. FORTUNE: Kristina, thank  
14 you.

15 MS. KRAMPE: Yes.

16 MR. FORTUNE: That was very  
17 interesting, very interesting.

18 (APPLAUSE)

19 Of course, they can always call you and  
20 Jake Karnes; right?

21 MS. KRAMPE: Yes.

22 (LAUGHTER)

23 On the back of the brochure, there's a  
24 little bit of information. Our project will be in  
25 existence until September. And we are available to do  
26 workshops for departments, for colleges per unit.

1 We'll tailor them to what your interests are. We'll  
2 make them as short or as long as you want them to be.  
3 So if you're interested, our information is on the  
4 back.

5 MR. FORTUNE: Thank you.

6 And remember the events on Thursday and  
7 Friday of this week and the session with the planners  
8 at 2:00 next Wednesday. Thank you all for coming.

9 =====

10 (MEETING CONCLUDED AT 4:25 P.M.)

11 =====

C E R T I F I C A T E

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY )  
  )  
COUNTY OF FAYETTE                       )

I, STEPHANIE K. SCHLOEMER, a Court  
Reporter and Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth  
of Kentucky, whose commission as such will not expire  
until June 25, 2004, do hereby certify that the  
foregoing transcript is a true, complete and accurate  
transcript of the captioned proceedings, as taken down  
verbatim by me at the time, place and for the purposes  
stated herein. I further certify that I am not related  
to nor employed by any of the participants herein and  
that I have no personal interest in the outcome of  
these proceedings.

WITNESS my hand on this the 26th day of  
February 2002.

---

STEPHANIE K. SCHLOEMER