

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, MARCH 7, 1994

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, March 7, 1994, in Room 115 of the Nursing Health Sciences Building.

Professor Daniel L. Fulks, Chairperson of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent were: Debra Aaron, Stephanie Atcher, Mark C. Berger, David T. Berry*, Suketu P. Bhavsar, Antimony Bishop, Robert L. Blevins*, Rick Boland, Maria Boosalis*, Peter P. Bosomworth, Douglas A. Boyd, Joseph T. Burch, Laretta Byars, Allison Carll-White*, Ben W. Carr, Edward A. Carter, G.L. Monty Chappell, Louis C. Chow, Michael L. Cibull*, Donald B. Clapp, Jane Clark, Jordan L. Cohen, Darby Cole, Delwood Collins, Michael P. Connors*, Jean C. Cooper*, Melissa Cox, Nancy Custer*, Susan E. DeCarvalho*, Lance E. DeLong, Clarence Robert Dowdy, Richard Edwards, Joseph L. Fink*, Michael B. Freeman, Richard W. Furst, Lorraine Garkovich, Thomas F. Garrity, William Gibson, William S. Griffith, David A. Harmin*, J. John Harris, Zafar S. Hasan*, Christine Havice, Robert E. Hemenway, James Hertog*, Chester A. Holmquist, James Knoblett*, Kenneth K. Kubota, Donald C. Leigh*, Thomas W. Lester, Thomas T. Lillich*, C. Oran Little, Sandra Miller, Karen A. Mingst, Roy L. Moore*, James S. Mosbey, Anthony L. Newberry, Michael Nietzel*, Judith Page*, Clayton R. Paul, Barbara Phillips, Rhoda-Gale Pollack*, Thomas C. Robinson, Ellen B., Rosenman*, Daniel Rowland*, Edgar L. Sagan*, Horst Schach, Janice Schach*, David Shipley, Thomas J. Stipanowich, William J. Stober*, David H. Stockham, Michael Stover, Louis J. Swift, Phillip A. Tibbs*, Miroslaw Truszczynski, Salvatore J. Turco, Mary Walker, Chris Webb, Charles T. Wethington*, Brent White, Carolyn A. Williams*, Eugene R. Williams, Paul A. Willis, Emery A. Wilson, H. David Wilson*, Mary L. Witt, Linda K. Worley.

Chairman Fulks thanked everyone for coming to the March 1994 meeting of the University Senate.

The Chair made the following announcements:

There is a new Administrative Regulation concerning the Family Medical Leave Act. The act was implemented in an administrative regulation earlier this year. The Administration has in response from requests from the Senate incorporated an extension of the probationary period as part of the act. The Senate Council is not entirely finished. They are not entirely pleased with the regulation as it is currently written. Given the parameters set

by the President, the primary one being whatever is done has to be imbedded with in the act, they have a start. At this point if a faculty member files a claim under the act, the faculty member can also request an extension of the probationary period. In initial requests would be for a six month extension of the probationary period, and there would then be the option to request an additional six month extension. The issue has been sent to the Ad Hoc Committee on Privilege and Tenure Issues. What they would like to have is a policy concerning extension of the probationary period separate and apart from the act itself. There is some concern about taking care of situation where a faculty member would have reason to take leave during the summer months when they are not technically on contract. They have been assured that can be taken care of under the policy as it is now written with interpretation.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Privilege and Tenure Issues is meeting weekly and addressing a variety of issues, including but not limited to the one just mentioned as well as prior service questions, other reasons to extend the probationary period, and a variety of issues. If there are issues to be brought before the committee, please contact Sheldon Steiner, who is the chair, or any member of the committee.

* Absence Explained

We are in the process of putting together another Ad Hoc Committee to look into retirement incentives and retirement situations. Now that there is no longer a mandatory retirement age, at the request of the emeritus faculty group, a group will be put together to look at what the University might do to encourage people to retire.

Chairman Fulks read the following resolution:

DATE: February 28, 1994

To: President Charles T. Wethington

FROM: Daniel L. Fulks, Chair
University Senate Council

RE: Women/Minorities in Administrative Positions

The following resolution was passed unanimously by the University Senate Council on February 23, 1994:

The University Senate Council wishes to express deep concern and disappointment about the lack of diversity among the three finalists selected for the position of Chancellor of the Medical Center. This is particularly

discouraging in light of the recent departure of Dr. Lee Magid from the position of Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies.

The University Senate and the Senate Council have consistently reaffirmed the importance of increasing diversity at the highest levels of leadership in the University since the 1990 issuance of the reports on the status of women and minorities. The makeup of the finalist group sends a message to members of the university community and the larger public: There is no room at the top. Furthermore, this action may discourage non-traditional applicants from seeking similar positions in the future. We sincerely hope that this missed opportunity does not create this expectation for future choices. Future searches must increase the diversity of university leadership at the sector and central administration levels.

The Chair wanted to make it clear they were not being critical of any of the three finalists for the position of Chancellor. They were expressing their disappointment for the fact that neither minorities nor women were included.

The Chair recognized Dean Dan Reedy (Graduate School), for the presentation of the list of candidates for Honorary Degrees. The Chair reminded the Senate the information was confidential, that it was not yet official, it had to be approved by the Senate and the Board of Trustees. Dr. Reedy, representing Dr. Emery Wilson, Chair of the Honorary Degrees Committee, stated the recommendations came from the Honorary Degrees Committee and had been approved by the Graduate Faculty. Dr. Reedy read biographical information on the three nominees for the Senate's consideration.

Chairman Fulks stated he would take that as a motion for approval, the motion was seconded and there was no discussion. The motion was unanimously approved for recommendation to the President.

The Chair then recognized Professor Ray Cox, Chair elect of the Senate Council to present the next action item. Professor Cox on behalf of the Senate Council recommended approval of the item concerning student access to Course and Teaching Evaluations. The item was circulated under the date 13 February 1994. The Chair stated the item was brought before the Senate Council during the fall.

It was discussed with the students and recommendations were made for changes. It went back to the Student Government Association and returned to the Senate Council a month ago with a revised proposal. The Chair then read the following three comments concerning t

he
proposal.

March 1, 1994

TO: University Senate

FROM: Donald E. Sands

SUBJECT: Evaluations of Teaching

The proposal before you would disseminate, to anyone who asks, the numerical scores from the teaching evaluation forms filled in by students. I urge that you reject this proposal.

The original purpose of teaching evaluations at this University was faculty development. The shift of these anonymous evaluations to influencing the merit ratings and pay increments of faculty generates serious ethical questions. In every other evaluative process, the person being evaluated knows who the evaluator is and exactly what is being said. Certainly the identities of the faculty are known to the students they grade. Promotion and tenure procedures now afford the candidate under consideration full access to the comments of every contributor to the dossier, and the openness that has evolved has, I think, helped make the promotion processes fairer and more responsible. Similarly, there is no cloak of confidentiality for the department chair who must evaluate the performances of the faculty.

These requirements for responsibility recognize the power granted implicitly to an evaluator. Another essential balance to this power is the right to privacy of the person being evaluated. Thus, we do not post student grades or divulge them to anyone lacking a valid need to know (not to parents, not to friends, not to classmates, not to newspapers).

Even if there were a valid reason for publicizing the individual ratings of the faculty, there remains the objection that the numerical average computed from the teaching evaluation forms is not an adequate measure of teaching. It is one piece of evidence, one indicator of teaching performance; a substantive assessment of teaching cannot be based upon such flimsy data.

As a department chair charged with evaluating the teaching of my colleagues, I consider, along with the numerical scores, the distribution of the numbers, the written comments of students, discussions with students and former students, the observations of colleagues, evidence of special efforts to enhance instruction, and the nature of the classes. Teaching is a highly complex human activity and a simplistic assessment of teaching based upon

a
single numerical measure is wrong, logically and morally.
Contrary to its claims, this proposal will not improve teaching. It has
no
relevance to helping students select courses that will benefit their
educations. It is too superficial to contribute to improved retention.
With
no apparent purpose but to demean or embarrass faculty members, it is
malicious, and it should be defeated.

1 March 1994

MEMORANDUM

To: The Senate Council
From: Robert W. Kiser
Re: Student Access to Course and Teaching Evaluations

I am absolutely astounded by the action (under date of 13 February 1994)
of
the Senate Council in recommending approval to the University Senate of
student access to course and teaching evaluations.
In this memorandum, which might well contain many criticisms of your acti
on
on legal, logical, and moral grounds, I will restrict myself to the simpl
e
case of fairness and privacy.
If it is fair to protect the rights to privacy of student records, and I
believe it is, then it is equally fair to protect the rights to privacy o
f
faculty records. You cannot have one without the other. Unless you are
prepared to deny the privacy act extension to student records, you must
logically reverse your earlier recommendation concerning student access t
o
course and teaching evaluations, and unanimously withdraw it from Senate
(and
other) consideration.

It is assumed that you are well aware of the unreliability of anonymous
comments, that there is something called constitutional rights to due
process, and the right to face one's accuser. How then could the Senate
Council make such a recommendation? Would not encouraging students to use
these evaluation data in any publication be akin to encouraging them in
potentially libelous activity?

There are several other possible issues involved in your recommendation t
hat
also cause me much distress. Suffice it to say that I strongly believe t
hat
your recommendation was made erroneously and that it should be promptly a
nd
publicly rescinded.

Date: Wed, 02 Mar 94
From: Carol Brock
Subject: Senate Agenda Item

To: Dan Fulks
Allan Butterfield
Jim Holler

ng
Here are some of my reactions to the idea of making the results of teaching evaluations electronically available to students et al.:

1. The number of add/drop transactions is expected to be reduced.

sor
I
ks
pon
Maybe so if the course has a single section and is not required for any major, but otherwise not. Years ago, when we had a very unpopular professor teaching general chemistry, the drop/add period was always a nightmare. I remember having lines in front of my door every day for the first 1.5 weeks of classes. Students were frantic to get out of the "bad" professor's section. (Actually he wasn't bad at all - as several Chairs discovered upon investigation - but he did tell students things they didn't want to hear)

2. The measure is supposed to improve retention and lower attrition.

bout
lar
Again, maybe so for single-section classes of pure electives. But what about the students who will eventually be "forced" to take courses from less popular professors? If students with higher GPAs have preference during registration they can be expected to fill the sections with the more popular teachers, leaving the weaker students with the professors this measure is designed to help them avoid. And how will the University cope with the inevitable complaints from students that they would have gotten a better grade if they had just been allowed to take the course from a "good" (as opposed to a "bad") professor?

3. This measure should improve teaching through peer pressure.

now
I don't know how other departments operate, but in Chemistry we already know what each others ratings are. They are an essential part of the required teaching portfolio.

4. This measure is a positive response to accountability issues. This measure is a positive statement re the importance of teaching.

ad
asis
g
Perhaps, but this measure would also provide students with yet one more reason for believing that they would be successful if only the professors would do their jobs correctly. Again, I don't know so much about other Departments, but I do know that all the professors in the Chemistry Department teach at least as well as well as the chemistry professors I had at a prestigious and expensive private college. A result of all the emphasis on improvement of teaching has been a shift of responsibility for learning from the student to the professor. The single most useful step administrators could take to improve the climate for learning on this campus

pus

would be to tell the students it is their responsibility to learn.

sed

There are a number of other important issues, but the points made above should be sufficient to convey my opinion. In summary, I think the propo

al

action would both create substantial work and would degrade the education environment.

Professor Allan Butterfield (Chemistry) wanted to put the three letters into context.

Namely the teaching evaluations as determined by the students consistently rate the professors in the Chemistry Department among the highest in the College of Arts and Sciences. They tend to have very high numerical values. Please understand the comments that were read by the Chair are given by professors who in his opinion, are rather good professors as judged by the students. It is a matter of principle, that were outlined by the three people, you can see where this is going to go, it is a terrible proposal and they recommend its defeat.

Professor Georgia Collins (Allied Health) doesn't think the same teaching evaluations are used consistently throughout the University. This in itself would allow for some disparity of evaluations. She asked the students how it would accomplish the first two items; fewer drop adds, and better retention. She doesn't see that at all.

Bouali Amoli (Chairman of Student Academic Rights Committee) stated the committee as a whole had no malicious intent to embarrass the faculty in any way, form, or fashion. Their goal is for student awareness, to increase student awareness concerning the courses they are taking and the teachers who will be teaching the classes. There are four strong points to support the proposal: 1) Reducing add drop - they have been in contact with a lot of other universities and the ones that have already implemented this program where students have access to teachers evaluations, benchmark institutions about the same size as the University of Kentucky; University of Arkansas, University of South Carolina, University of Mississippi, University of Virginia, University of Michigan, Mississippi State University, University of Florida, Vanderbilt University, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill. All these Universities have student access to teacher evaluations. They have had a lot of contact with the University of Michigan since it is about the same size as the University of Kentucky. Concerning the reason for add drop from a student

point of view it is mainly due to the fact that the students did not have a good awareness concerning the courses they were taking, they did not know what was expected from them. Professors have complaints about students taking classes and not knowing what is expected of them in class; what level it is, if they are having essay, written, or multiple choice tests. Through teachers and course evaluations students would have a higher awareness. At the University of Michigan it dropped their add drop rate. 2) Retention and lower attrition - this is the same as add drop, when the students are more aware of what they are taking, they are less likely to drop out of school or get a lower grade because they know what is expected of them. 3) Improving teaching through peer pressure - this is meant in a constructive way. At the University of Michigan and Indiana University a lot of professors, when this program was first implemented, were hesitant about having their names and ratings published. The interesting thing was that after one or two years they saw their colleagues were getting high ratings, they considered themselves equal to their colleagues and put their names on the list. At the University of Michigan and the University of Florida most faculty got high ratings from good to excellent. That should not come as a surprise, as he considers most of his faculty as fair evaluators and fair graders. He feels students should be looked at the same way, they are fair graders and evaluators. If a professor is doing a satisfactory job in teaching and explaining what is being done in class, there is no reason why students should give him a bad evaluation. Faculty members are being evaluated day in and day out, when the students walk in the hall ways they ask each other about certain professors and their classes. Unfortunately the ones who are really vocal about teacher evaluations are the ones who have the negative view toward teachers. Actually the ones who really like the class are less likely to talk about a professor, while the ones who had a hard time in class, for whatever reason are the ones who are more vocal. Through this there will be a large number around two to three hundred students evaluating a teacher. That is why at the University of Michigan the scores were tremendously high. 4) Accountability issue - professors are accountable just as students are accountable to faculty members. There will be more emphasis on teaching. This is a trend of the future. A lot of the benchmarks have already implemented the program. Some schools like the University of Georgia, Auburn University, and Louisiana State University are in the process of implementing such a program

. This would be the first school in Kentucky to have this program. It would be good to have a leadership role rather than a following role. This will be better for the faculty in the long term and better for the students also.

Professor Martin McMahon (College of Law) stated until that little speech he was mildly opposed to the proposal, he is now vigorously opposed. The first part of the explanation about why there would be less activity in add drop and why there would be higher retention is really addressed by the syllabus requirement. If that is taken seriously all of the important information will be disseminated to students. The type of information that was recited as being necessary appears in the syllabus not in evaluations. The rest of the speech was really about the fact that teachers do not do their jobs unless they are pressured to do it by the humiliation of having evaluations published. He finds that attitude very offensive. In fact, what this is all about is shopping. It is about shopping for courses that don't require a great deal of effort relative to other courses. Any faculty member who over hears students talking in the halls about courses knows that is what the proposal is about.

Professor Hans Gesund (College of Engineering) asked Professor McMahon if the proposal were not liable, publishing anonymous evaluations in this way would perhaps open the University to liable charges. Anonymous evaluations could not possibly be documented as being valid. Students may be fair, but they are totally unknowledgeable about the subject, at least in Engineering. When they walk in they haven't the foggiest notion what it is all about. He has had two colleagues in the past, both retired, who got very high evaluations by giving all As and by teaching easy outdated material. The people who took over after these people retired started teaching up to date material, gave normal grade distribution and their ratings plummeted, even though they were doing good jobs. The students do not know whether what they are getting is up-to-date. The students want an easy course; they do not want to have to work hard and if they are forced to work hard the professors get low evaluations. When anyone evaluates the student ratings, the numerical ratings, they should divide those by the average of the grades given to the students. That would normalize the student ratings much more fairly.

Chairman Fulks stated he had checked with the University Legal Office who assured him

that there is not a legal problem. This is not a violation of privacy.

Professor Davy Jones (Toxicology) said he was excited to see this appear in his mailbox. As indicated, this is the trend of the future and just a few years ago here at UK the students themselves created an instrument to evaluate the faculty and published a newspaper on it. It is going to happen either next year or the year after, at some point the students are going to get the data. Are they going to get it with the instrument the faculty has developed or with the instrument they develop? The students are not the enemy here; there seems to be a tone of that. The faculty is here to serve the students interest. He feels they have a legitimate interest in how well they are performing their duties as paid public servants. They can go down in the history of the Senate as one of the last bodies to keep the door closed. He would urge they go down as the first one to open the door.

Amy Sullivan (Student Senator - College of Law) responded to Professor McMahon's statement about students shopping for easier courses. She took Professor McMahon for Tax One at the Law School and it was the hardest class she had ever had, but recommends it as the best class she had at the Law School. She rated it in the highest grouping. She feels the students know the difference between a good and bad professor and it doesn't have necessarily anything to do with the grade received, matter of fact it doesn't have anything to do with the grade received. There were alternatives to taking Professor McMahon's tax class. There were easier professors and easier courses. It was not a required course, and he wasn't the only professor offering it. She took it because she heard he was a great professor even though she worked harder in the class than she had ever worked.

Professor Richard Milich (Psychology) said when he was an undergraduate 25 years ago at a prestigious expensive school they would never take a course without looking at the evaluation. He was surprised it had taken 25 years for UK to do the same thing.

Professor James Applegate (Communications) stated he was not sure he had heard any reasons for not making the evaluations available. He strongly supports the proposal. The institutions around are doing it, the negatives that are predicted here have not happened elsewhere. A lot of research on student evaluations support all the contentions made here

about the validity of them. It is another piece of information. If the student wants to use that as the only piece of information that is bad use of research.

Professor Joseph Gardner (English) would like to hear more on the question about the logistics of the proposal. There are so many different forms being used around campus. Mr. Amoli said they were not looking for written comments. On the evaluations it goes from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Other institutions give a number to each one of those. Professor Gardner asked how they were going to deal with the question of there being so many different forms being used and looking for so many different things. Mr. Amoli stated he had talked with Gene Williams who is in charge of the computer technology and was told there was already a data base where the information is available. This will be made available to students through computers just as courses are made available now.

Lora Weck (Student Senator - Education) stated as far as the written comments are concerned they can not use those. If that is all the college has they will not be able to use those. They will try to use all other evaluations that are there for them to use. They will list the questions and list the answers. They can not use anything written, but as far as all the rest is concerned, it is on the data base. Chairman Fulks said the results will be made available for each professor for each class.

Professor Jacqueline Noonan (Medicine) asked why they could not use the written comments. Could they not be summarized? Mr. Amoli answered they were too subjective. Professor Noonan said her point was sometimes the comments are much more important than whether it is a four or a two. Ms. Weck said that was one of the things that was discussed with the Senate Council and it was one of the things suggested to be left off; it was highly subjective. Professor Noonan asked did they say why? Chairman Fulks said it was mostly a matter of implementation. It would be difficult to deal with.

Professor Gretchen LaGodna (Nursing) stated the written comments only represented one opinion where the numerical responses represent the entire class.

Professor Bill Lubawy (Pharmacy) asked if it was known if these things were subject to the open records law. Could people get the information if they wanted it without regard to what they do? Chairman Fulks said a request had never been filed through UK. The legal office is of the opinion that it should be subject to open records. There

was a fairly similar case at Western Kentucky University, in which the open records request was denied.

Shea Chaney (Student Senator - Arts and Sciences) said they discussed filing open records but wanted the input of the Senate. He was mildly offended by the idea that students have certain attitudes and will take easy classes and give good evaluations. The hardest classes he has taken at UK, which includes physical chemistry, he gave that teacher the best evaluation. All his teachers are doing their jobs, he is doing his job, and he feels teachers deserve credit. At least evaluations will be published and they will receive that credit. This is a pro-student proposal but indirectly it is a pro-teacher proposal. The resistance to change is very typical. Many of their colleagues are probably pressuring them to resist the change. UK does not need to maintain the status quo. The students who hire this University to educate them deserve this, students are under no obligations to fill out the evaluations. If UK is going to continue to ask students to go through this process, a process most colleges and departments put a lot of credit in, he believes they deserve to know the results. They should follow the recommendation of the Senate Council and pass the proposal.

Professor Donald Frazier (Medicine) said they all know performance varies from day to day, certainly from year to year. What are the thoughts in terms of putting the proposal together in terms of looking at a professor's performance over time, which is a much more realistic way to evaluate anything. Student personalities change; their response to a professor changes. He didn't hear anything that they might want to have a cumulative value looking at this over time which is a much more realistic way to look at performance than a three point shot once a year. Mr. Amoli said the data base which will be used will look at evaluations for the past two or three years. There are some professors who teach a course one semester and not the next or every other year. They are trying to get as much data as possible to try to have a fair evaluation of the professor or faculty member. Ms. Weck said that was the original idea that they would do it on a cumulative basis, a long term basis.

Professor Bill Moody (Animal Sciences) is very pro-student but feels this proposal is not in the best interest of the student or the faculty because some of the best teachers he had he did not recognize it until 10 or 20 years later. This is too manipula

tive.

Some of the better students, some of the freshmen and sophomores will look at the scores and stay away from some of the best teachers. He is convinced that the student evaluation is not all that accurate. Students know where the good teachers and the solid courses are. They do not have to do this. It plays up the fact the student evaluation form is the answer to an excellent teacher or a good course. He feels that is wrong and the proposal should be voted down.

Professor Don Howard (Philosophy) questioned the manner in which the information would be disseminated electronically. Would it be available to students as a menu item on view or gopher? If not how would it be available to students and is the manner in which it will be available to students such that anyone else logging onto the University computer system, say from another university could also read this information? Mr. Amoli stated in talking with Mr. Williams he was told it would be put on Prime, but Prime will be going away in a year or so. He did not know what system the information would then be on. Some universities have it in paper form. They felt putting it on View it would be more accessible, less paper used, and most cost effective. Professor Howard said it was not a question of what system it would be on but how it is accessed on that system. He can telnet to computers all over the world and read through what is equivalent to their view menu and look at all the items there. Would people elsewhere be able to do the same thing with the evaluation results. That maybe changes the implication, if it is going to be available to the entire world as opposed to the student body. Chairman Fulks said the answer to the question was yes.

The question was called. The motion passed to end debate. A role call vote was called. The motion for a role call vote passed. The proposal passed in the roll call vote, 28 to 26 with three senators abstaining. The proposal reads as follows:

The following proposal is offered by the Student Government Association. The Senate Council recommends approval.

Recommendation:

To pertain to the undergraduate courses of the University of Kentucky.

Course and teaching evaluations will be administered as they have been in previous years and the results, with the exception of written comments, will be

made available in a form most accessible to all students.

Background and Rationale:

Students are requesting access to summary data, not including written responses to open-ended questions, related to course and teaching evaluation. Access would be made available electronically in the format now provided to the deans' offices of the respective colleges. With such access, students will be better informed during the registration process. Additional expected benefits include:

- Fewer transactions during the Add/Drop period
- Improved retention/lower attrition
- Improved teaching through peer pressure
- Positive response to accountability issues
- Positive statement re importance of teaching

Effective Date:

If approved, this policy would become effective with the Fall 1994 term.

The Chair then recognized Professor Hans Gesund for the next item.

Professor Gesund made the following remarks:

This concerns money and parking, topics of interest to most of us. First of all, let me say that I have never before been asked to pay for something four years before I am to receive it. Usually one pays for things after receiving them. I don't believe that the staff, with its low salaries and small pay increases for the past four years, should be asked to pay more for parking. The faculty can generally afford a modest cost increase better.

I have two concerns about the planned solution to the parking problem. The first, and lesser, perhaps, concerns those of us who, while still reasonably healthy, should not be exposed to climatic extremes. The planned locations of parking areas would mean that we would have to walk perhaps 1/4 to 1/2 mile between car and office. In good weather this would be beneficial. At zero or a hundred degrees it could be very detrimental to our health. Ditto in snow, blowing rain, and when there is ice on walkways. No provisions are apparently being made for this, probably in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act since such weather could prevent us from working. I am sure this problem can be solved. Sooner or later it will affect almost everyone of us, including the administrators who have dreamed up the new scheme.

This brings me to the second concern: The administrators and their view of the faculty. The proposal to eliminate the difference between A and B parking

will
mean that faculty will directly compete for favored parking places with their
graduate student teaching assistants, mainly young people in their twenties,
and
also with part time and temporary clerical workers, perhaps even younger. This
indicates a total lack of respect for the faculty on the part of the
administrators. We are just employees, like everyone else, and can jolly well
park in E lots. You will note that almost all senior administrators have access
to Service tags, permitting them to park almost anywhere.

I believe it is time that this body respectfully request that the most senior
faculty members of the University, that is the President and the Chancellors,
take immediate steps to remind all administrators, and especially those who
are instituting the new policy, that the work of the faculty is primary, that their
function is to aid and support the faculty in its work, and that the faculty
is to be accorded the respect and privileges commensurate with the primary
importance of its work.

As one who has many years of administrative experience both in the U.S. Army
and
in the University, let me share a secret with you: Any faculty member has the
ability and knowledge to fill most administrative positions after a couple of
weeks of orientation. I know of no administrator who can teach our engineering
courses, or our physics or chemistry or biology, or our math or social science
or
humanities courses, or direct our graduate students, or conduct research or
provide the manifold services we provide to the Commonwealth.

I therefore move that the Senate respectfully requests that the President take
the necessary action to preserve and enhance the distinction between faculty
and
staff parking, and remind all administrative employees who might have forgotten,
of the primacy of the faculty's work. We are not just another group of
employees. We are the heart and soul and brains of the University, and we
deserve commensurate respect and privileges. In return, the faculty could accept
a modest increase in parking fees, but staff parking fees should remain at
present levels.

Professor Ray Forgue (Family Studies) found it interesting and ironic that in
one
sentence Professor Gesund is talking about the need for respect for the staff and
their
pay scales related to this increase and then make comments about the distinction
between
them and the faculty when they are all going to be paying the same fees. Profes

sor Gesund stated he asked that they not be required to pay the same fees. He wanted the distinction preserved and the staff pay lower fees.

Chairman Fulks stated the Senate Council had invited Joe Burch to discuss the parking situation with them, which he did willingly. When he left the Council discussed what their move should be and decided their primary realm and function is academics.

They did not choose to issue a statement at that time because they feel this is a non-academic matter. He also believes that the Senate serves as a valuable forum. Therefore if the Senate wants to make a statement to the administration there is no harm in passing it on.

Professor Dave Elliot (Fine Arts) wanted discussion on the closing of the Central Campus parking. Many of them bring large satchels and in his case instruments on the campus. Having to walk any great distance will be an extreme hardship. He would urge the administration to reconsider that. He would like to make that an amendment to the proposal. The amendment was accepted.

Professor Martin McMahon feels that both Professor Gesund and Professor Forge raised good points. He feels the Senate as a whole is too big and has too diverse views to take this up as an initial matter on this one point. He would suggest that the Senate Council reconsider this. Parking is part of the issue, but parking is one facet. The single biggest facet is that administrators in the central administration are not paying attention to the physical quality of life issues on the campus. The construction sites that make it hard to carry things from parking spots, even if they are on central campus, to the building. The fact that no one is controlling the contractors and the sea of mud that has overwhelmed the central campus, you wade up to your ankles in mud to get from your car. That doesn't detract from the fact that parking is the single biggest issue, and that is probably what should be focused on. He feels it is divisive to set up faculty versus staff versus students. A strong message needs to be sent to the central administration, which is not getting the message. He had not heard Joe Burch speak about this, but read his comments in the Kernel. The best he can say is his attitude evidences callous disregard for every member of the University community. The central administration has to be told it is an obligation to provide parking, Lexington is a city that does not have mass transit, it is a sprawl city. Joe Burch may not like that, but people

's only way to get here is by car. He doesn't like that, he doesn't want to have to provide parking for it, but it is an obligation. The Senate is the only vehicle they have to convey the message that the administration has the obligation to provide parking for the entire University community not just the faculty, not just the staff, not just the students, but everyone. He would like that to be a motion to refer the issue to the Senate Council for further development.

Professor Gesund stated that would be a problem because there was not sufficient time before the new parking regulations and fees go into effect for the Senate Council to debate the issue and bring it back. Chairman Fulks said that next years fees were a done deal. Professor Gesund said they were not necessarily a done deal, anything that has been ordered can be rescinded. This would send the type of message that is necessary, at least the staff would not have to pay more, if the faculty has to pay he can live with it, most of them could. The staff should not have to pay more. The distinctions in the present parking can be preserved.

A senator asked if both things could be done? Could they vote on the amendment and also recommend to the Senate Council that it consider the larger issues that need to be addressed.

Professor McMahon withdrew his motion to refer to the Senate Council, stating the Senate should just focus on the one small issue for next year.

The question was called. The motion to end discussion passed in a voice vote.

Chairman Fulks said the motion was essentially asking the Senate to take a message to the administration to reconsider the parking issue. Professor Gesund said his motion was for everything to remain in place, except if they want to increase the faculty fees. He wants the President to remind all the administrative employees who might have forgotten of the primacy of the faculty work and they are there to facilitate the faculty.

In a voice vote the motion passed.

Professor McMahon then moved that the Senate Council reconsider the issue of addressing the parking problem and bring to the Senate a resolution to be directed to the administration with respect to the administration's obligation to provide adequate parking for the entire University community rather than simply refusing to provide parki

ng. He is not presupposing anyone's solution. It would be a good idea for the Senate Council to sit down and think about what is going on on campus, think about the scope of the problem, hear what the administrators are saying but be ready to bring something to the Senate to go back to the administrators that says it is simply unacceptable what is going on. From everything he has seen and understands about what is going on, it is a pure and simple price squeeze tactic. They are basically making a conscious decision not to provide adequate parking on campus. They are raising the fees and saying it is up to you to get yourself here; walk, bicycle, take buses. They are acting without any regard to the fact that this is not an urban city. It is a sprawl city. The options are not available.

Chairman Fulks said the Senate Council met weekly and talked about things like this. They meet with the President regularly. He wants them to understand they have not just done nothing.

Professor Bill Lubawy respects the right of the Senate to get involved in critical issues. He is afraid that getting into shouting match about parking. It detracts from their activities in real academic matters. One thing they can not forget, even though this is a sprawl city, individuals driving one to a car is not the way of the future. They either accept the fact they need to start doing something differently sooner or later or just go on about their own business. He doesn't like the issue, he doesn't like the parking situation but knows the purpose of this project is to try to get less cars on campus, try to get people taking other ways to work. Trying to get people to work together within the University. He has no objection to the Senate Council considering the issue and having input to the administration. He does have objection to the input being the University should supply a parking place for everyone who drives to the University.

Chairman Fulks reminded everyone there is a Parking Committee that consists of faculty and staff. Professor Gesund stated he served on that committee for three years, has not been on it for two now. At the time he was on the committee, there were two faculty members out of about 15 members. The rest were all administration types of one kind or another.

The motion to send a message to the Senate Council to send a message to the

administration passed in a voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Randall W. Dahl
Secretary, University Senate