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CHAIR DEMBO: Welcome, everybody. We'll get underway with our October meeting for the University Senate. This is the agenda. By now I hope you've all learned how to negotiate the University Senate Web page. Certainly if you have any suggestions about the layout of the Web page, please send them to us, especially to Rebecca Scott sitting to my left. We're always looking for ways to streamline, to make it easier to get the links that you need. First item of business, if I don't hear any objections, we can assume that the minutes from the previous meeting stand approved as is. Pregnant pause. Okay. Next section, we have some
announcements. Finally our College Senate Elections have been completed. We have a bunch of senators from Arts and Sciences. Not to put you on the spot, but just so we can get to know each other: Michael Cavagnero, welcome; Janet Eldred, hello, Janet.

ELDRED: Hi.

CHAIR DEMBO: You're behind Grossman's large head. You can't help it.

GROSSMAN: Thanks, Jeff.
CHAIR DEMBO: Daniel Gargola, welcome. Jennifer Lewin. When the Senate Roster says replacing another senator, what that indicates is that the other senator is either ineligible to serve or has stepped down, and the person replacing that senator serves the amount of time that was left in the previous senator's term. So when somebody new comes on, they serve three years. If somebody is replacing another senator, they serve whatever period of time was left in that senator's spot. Stan Brunn? Michael Bardo? I'm not taking attendance. I'm just trying to -- Don Gross, Tamara Brown, Dick Jefferies. Hello, Dick. Tom Zentall? Hello, Tom. And then from the graduate school, there was an election and also I think a new set of
rules that the graduate school is now developing. Davy Jones is now an elected senator with voting privileges.

Davy has been on the Senate Council in his ex officio membership as a faculty trustee; now he's a senate -- a voting senate member. Communication Information Studies, Tom Lindlof, welcome. And from Fine Arts, Bob Haven. Welcome to the Senate.

As always, if there are any questions for new senators, feel free to ask. We had a little orientation session, but I'm happy to go over anything that you'd find helpful to you. Since we're talking about Senate functions, $I$ need to just make a short announcement that Senate Council Elections will be held and you will be getting a ballot. Ms. Scott, when will ballots be going out?

SCOTT: Ballots should be mailed Wednesday morning.

CHAIR DEMBO: On Wednesday morning. And in a
second, Kaveh Tagavi, who's Chair of the Rules and Elections Committee, will also add something. I just wanted to outline to you how this works. It's a strange
sort of system because, as a senator, your Senate term begins on August 15th and goes till three years later, till August 14th. The Senate Council terms go from January 1st to December 31st, so it's an odd cycle. Then on top of that there are Senate Council Officers. So this time of year is when we elect Senate Council members. There are nine faculty who are voting members of the Senate Council, the SGA president, and three members from the Student Government -- two members from the SGA. There are nonvoting members, of course, which are the faculty trustees. And the rules say that three faculty members shall be elected annually during the fall semester and the election is conducted by mail under the supervision
of the Secretary of the Senate. This is where, Kaveh, I think it would be a good place for you to step in if you want to talk a little bit about the election process. I have some of the rules up here in case people wanted to see them.

TAGAVI: Yes. Very briefly, sometime I think Wednesday or Thursday, we're going to be mailing you the ballots. They are this color this time and an index card. The important things are that you have two weeks to vote and vote for three people, exactly. If you vote for less than three or more than three, your vote will be disqualified. It's not my doing. That's the rules, and I have to follow the rules.

Then what we would do is there are three openings, twice as many, that's six, plus any ties for the sixth place will be on the next ballot. And you will only win the election by having 50 percent plus, and we keep going, having a second round or third round until all
three members are chosen.
Another thing for you to pay
attention is not more than three could be from any college or eight from any sector. So when you are nominating and voting, realize that, for example, Arts and Sciences already has two people or
three people, then nobody else -- if it's three, nobody else. If it's two, only one more person from College of Arts and Sciences, as an example, could be elected. That's all.

GROSSMAN: Any reason we're not doing this by Web?

TAGAVI: Rules.
GROSSMAN: Huh?
TAGAVI: Rules says it has to be by ballot. We could change that.

GROSSMAN: Can it be electronic ballot?
TAGAVI: No, it has -- it says --
GROSSMAN: Does it say paper ballot?
TAGAVI: It says paper ballot.
GROSSMAN: Okay.

TAGAVI: But something to think about.
CHAIR DEMBO: Other questions about the Senate Council Elections? There are usually at least two rounds. One is the nomination round, and then after that will be the actual ballot. And all members who are nominated and make it to the first ballot will be contacted to see if they're willing to serve. And one more
thing before we leave the subject of the Senate Council: Officers of the Senate Council are also elected at the end of the fall semester, and the term of the new Senate Council Chair starts on June 1st. This is a list of the members of the Senate Council who will be eligible to chair. That's an election that occurs just within the Senate Council itself.

Before we get to Faculty Trustee reports, we don't have an official memorial resolution. I just wanted to mark the passing of two beloved faculty at the University of Kentucky. One is

Joe Davis from the College of
Agriculture, well-known to everybody in that community, a real advocate for students and fairness and good, sound academics for a number of years, so we all miss -- miss him.

The other is Russ Groves, a senator from the College of Design, was a former academic ombud for the university who died in a plane crash. You may have
read about it several weeks ago, weekends ago. So I would imagine that official memorial resolutions will be coming forward, but I just wanted to mark the passing of these two faculty at this meeting.

Next on the agenda, we have Faculty Trustee reports. We'll start with Michael Kennedy.

KENNEDY: I will try not to make this too long, but there's a lot to -- a fair amount to cover. We do this, I think, once a year now, have a report by the Faculty

Trustee. That's contact information. I'll show that slide again at the end. I would also try to get -- are we set up to get the Internet? No. Okay. Let me just give a little overview of the Board of Trustees. It consists of 20 people from across the state. There are 16 appointed by the governor. Three of those are nominated by the Alumni Association. The other four are two faculty trustees, a staff trustee, and a student trustee. The board meets
about -- well, it's been back and forth, somewhere between six and ten times a year. There's been a move by President Todd to have the board meet fewer times and for longer. And previous to his assuming the presidency, the board would come in and basically meet for two hours, eight times a year. Four times are mandated by the legislature. And as the person who became chair in 1998 said, what we would do is come in and smile and nod because most of the work
was done by the Executive Committee and the Administration. That's been changed considerably. We come in the day before. I say we come in. I live in Lexington, obviously, so I don't have to come in very far, but the trustees meet the night before, have dinner at Maxwell Place, and have about two to three hours' worth of discussion. And lots of issues get brought up at that, at those meetings. It's very open. It's a good group. Currently there -- it's half women, half men, ten of each. It has an

African American chair. It has a woman who's vice chair. The staff representative is the secretary of the board, so it's really different from the Board of Trustees of, say, five years ago.

Under modes of operation, I've described that for the board. I'm essentially one year, plus a little bit, into a three-year term on the board, and

I spent the first year kind of getting to know people and keeping my head down for the most part. Let's see. If I -I think that's -- we don't have an Internet link, and I think that this doesn't work, Ben, but we'll know in a second.

Basically my method for communicating with the board and participating with the board is to get to know the people. And I could count maybe a third of them as what $I$ would say friends. I'm on good terms with most of the rest of them. And what $I$ do is, there's a lot of sort of verbal or
oral interaction. And then occasionally, when I feel something's important, I'll write them an e-mail or a letter. For those of who you might be interested, it takes about 15 or 20 hours a week to do the Board of Trustees stuff on the average.

A lot of board business gets done at athletic events, football games, which
seem to be mandatory. I went to, I think, three football games prior to going on the board and I've now been to every one since, because that's where people talk about things, talk about issues. I also find it's hard to walk across -- it takes much longer to walk across campus now because I get buttonholed by people. I'm currently on the Academic Affairs Committee, which is responsible for passing on the organizational changes in the university and name changes and so on. The Nominating Committee, which nominates officers for the board, and the Ad Hoc Committee on
the President's Compensation, which I'll say a little more about later. Other committees are the Executive Committee, which is elected by the board, the Investment Committee, the Audit Committee, and the Finance Committee, which deal with issues that I don't know
very much about. There's some fairly substantial business people on the board, and I'm trusting that they know what they're doing. University relations, as far as I know, hasn't met. And then, again, there's an Ad Hoc Committee on the president's bonus. Student participation, there's a student representative. That got sort of bent out of shape when Jim Robinson resigned as Student Body President. The student -- the student representative is automatically a Student Body President unless the Student Body President resigns, in which case they have to have a special election, and it looked like there was going to be a disenfranchisement of the students. So
this is one of the e-mails I wrote to the board. Let me say that all of this will be on my Web site, so don't worry about reading it. If you're that interested, as I say, the whole presentation will be on the Web site.

And because of -- partly because of my letter and partly because of other people's concern, they did have a special election for a student Board of Trustees member. It could not be the person who simply assumed the presidency. Now, if I could make that go away... The current Student Body President is Rachel Watts. Is she here? Anyway, she's great. She's really doing a nice job both, as I understand it, with Student Government and certainly on the board.

State budget, which is of primary concern, this is not good, as I think everyone in this room probably knows. The governor has had a conference on trusteeship for all trustees for the nine -- the eight universities, six
comprehensive universities: Kentucky, University of Louisville, and KCTCS, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{S}$, the community college and technical school.

Think we might be possibly hooked up? Okay. Great. This has been a yearly thing that Governor Patton installed, and the last one was a month ago in Northern Kentucky, basically. Governor -- both the candidates for governor spoke, and then the next day Governor Patton spoke. He predicted there will be these statements after the election: We didn't know it was this bad, and the cupboard is bare. And depending on how the election goes, they may also say: The bastard spent it
all. The deficit is somewhere between a quarter of a billion and three-quarters of a billion dollars. And where higher education falls in this, from just -from listening to people, it seems like we're sort of behind -- behind primary and secondary education, behind Medicare and -- I'm sorry, Medicaid, and maybe
behind prisons. So it remains to be seen, how thing are going to -- how things are going to play out.

One of the things $I$ did was to put a letter in the Kernel -- Rachel Watts and I cooked this up together -- basically saying: You don't want your tuition to go up another 15 percent, write to your legislators, suggest that we raise Kentucky's absurdly low tobacco tax. It's three cents a pack. That's the lowest in the nation except for Virginia, which is two and a half cents a pack. The average is something like 70 cents a pack. Hawaii is $\$ 1.51$. We could probably increase that a little bit and then direct the revenue to higher education. I can't say there's been a great response to that letter, but there's going to be another letter writing campaign that Student Government and the student governments from the other universities are going to engage in.

The question I would raise is: Are
state-assisted university? University funding has dropped from more than half, a decade or so ago, to about a third. Our budget, just for your information, is about 1,400 million dollars, 1.4 billion dollars. We did approve a 15-percent tuition increase. Because most of the university's costs are fixed in terms of salaries and then operating expenses, there's very little -- very little of what the legislators and perhaps the people in the Commonwealth believe is fat in the university budget.

One other thing that was done was to not have the same tuition for all units. I think there was a 25 -percent tuition increase for a program in the business school, and that's another approach to dealing with this budget crisis. I don't think -- if you go to this on the Web, you can go to the University of Kentucky operating budget. You can get there lots of ways,
obviously, but this would be one way. And if you're interested in the budget, you can examine the 21 pages or whatever to your heart's content.

Faculty salaries: That may get your attention a little bit. An e-mail from Steve Reed, which was short but worth bringing to your attention, he wants to know what -- he wrote to Dave Jones and myself asking what the board could do to increase faculty salaries in the long-term. This has stirred up some activity in the Senate Council, as you might imagine, and Ernie Yanarella is heading a committee to examine what an answer to this question might be. So I think -- what date are you talking about having something back to?

YANARELLA: November 15th.
KENNEDY: November 15th.
CHAIR DEMBO: Lexington Community College is on probation, and it's on probation not because of any lack in quality of doing its mission but because the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
questions whether or not it is
sufficiently autonomous from University of Kentucky, I guess partly because this Senate is composed both of Main Campus Medical Center and LCC members. And for a number of reasons, they feel it's not sufficiently separate from UK. So there's the desire on the one hand to keep the connection between LCC and UK and, on the other hand, to not get unaccredited because that association is too close. There seem to be -- I'm just telling you some of the issues the board is going to have to confront, and this is a major one.

A committee has been appointed to look at three options. One is keep LCC autonomous but connected to UK; that is, comply with some of the requirements of SACS for doing that. Another one is that LCC joins KCTCS with the other community colleges, and finally that LCC rolls into UK, perhaps as a college or some other method.

I've written to the LCC faculty and
gotten back a score of responses and talked to other people, and apparently number one is their first choice and number two is their second choice and number three is not considered viable. The faculty don't want to do number three. The feeling is that they would pretty much get lost in UK, and so this is something that's coming up. Human Environmental Sciences Relocation, my -- that's sort of my philosophy about when you reshuffle academic units. And we had to -- the board finally, after getting -- I would say I got 40 letters on both sides of this. The question was, would all of the units -- well, let me first say what happened. Interior Design went into the College of Design, and that was something that almost everybody wanted. There was a lot of discussion about whether Family Studies ought to go into
the Education College or into the
Agriculture College. The things that pulled this back and forth were mission,
on the one hand, and the fact that there's a large extension component which the agriculture people are responsible for, on the other hand. And a great many Alumni and a great many other people wrote letters on both sides of this issue. The decision was made to move all but the Interior Design Department into the College of Ag , where I gather they have been pretty warmly welcomed. But to examine where Family Studies ought to ultimately wind up and particularly where Early Childhood Education, which is a part of Family Studies, ought to be. So you can see this was a kind of thorny problem. Shared Governance: The Governing Regulations are being revised, and this was a necessary step because we moved from a chancellor's model to a provost model, but it's beginning to look like
maybe more is going to happen in this Governing Regulations revision, and it's something that the faculty needs to watch closely. Dave may have more to
say about this, but it's something to keep on the radar.

The Council of Senate and Faculty
Leadership, COSFL, is composed of trustees, the Senate Council Chair, and the AAUP president from each of the colleges, each of the universities across the state, and they meet monthly. They have a Web site. Maybe he plugged another cable in here. Hah! Well, great. So that's the COSFL Web site, and that's, I think, an important organization for us.

There's a conference coming up this
Saturday, and it's on the -- it's going to have two major speakers: Tom Layzell, who's the new president of the Council on Postsecondary Education, talking about the next stage of

Kentucky's postsecondary reform; and Jane Buck, who's the president of the National Organization of AUUP, is going to talk about the use and abuse of contingent faculty, which is something COSFL's very concerned about and I think
we should be very concerned about.
It's -- the institution sees two
positive things out of that. One is
contingent faculty that is
nontenure-track and part-time faculty
are cheap. You don't have to pay benefits, low salaries, you can call them up the night before Wednesday -classes start on Wednesday and say, well, it looks like we don't need you or, hey, can you come in and teach three sections?

The problem with it, of course, is that it kind of tears the core out of the faculty. They don't have particular allegiance to the university. They're not involved in making policy and so on and so forth. So the short-term, it's
like -- it's one of those very difficult problems where there -- where there's a lot of short-term gain and a lot of long-term loss, so I encourage you to go to this conference. Lunch is five dollars, if you do. And that is this Saturday, so send me an e-mail if you're
interested in going and I'll get you hooked up with the right people. President's compensation, it's an issue that the board has been sort of battling with nicely, but it's hard to know what to do. The president -- a president of a university is different from the rest of us. We spend a million dollars to search for one. They get a lot of perq's. They get paid big bucks, not as large as some other people in the athletic and medical fields, but they get paid fairly big bucks. And the question of how to handle that is being looked at by the trustees. Should there be retention bonuses for the president
who agrees to stay on? Should there be a performance bonus, which currently we are paying and frankly aren't all that good at assessing. It's hard to assess when your sample size is one. So I'll know more about this in the next month or two.

Athletics: It's interesting, I've heard several comments by -- or read of
comments by presidents who came in to do, you know, something in the educational realm and wound up spending half their time on athletics and some of them not surviving that. Dr. Rossell, as you may remember, didn't survive an athletics issue, basically. There was at Vanderbilt University -- now, this isn't the recent move by Vanderbilt to kind of do away with their athletics director, but they had a conference last spring that I attended and Myles Brand, the president of the NCAA was there, and Mike Slive, the Southeastern Conference Commissioner, also spoke. And so this
was also something as a trustee that I didn't plan to do anything with, including go to the games, and then I found out you've got to do that. And then it begins to look like the tail wags the dog after a while.

Being not particularly shy, I sent an op-ed piece when I figured out what I thought ought to happen with athletics nationally. As I said, I wasn't shy,
and I did talk to Myles Brand about this and he didn't throw me out. Basically the idea -- and this appeared in the Herald-Leader. Basically the idea is that we take any -- that any, not just Kentucky, any university takes any high school graduate to play -- this is just in the revenue sports of men's basketball and football, which incidentally is where all the money for the whole athletics program and some academic programs come from -- comes from. So we take anybody. They have to
attend one class. It can be anything, doesn't matter what grade they make in it. So the cheating of, you know, trying to get these students who are on the road and playing in front of 40,000 people and trying -- trying to be students too, that goes away. They play four years, and then we hand them a certificate of scholarship, good over the next ten-year period for either a four-year college education or a community college education or a
plumbing school or whatever works for them, but we separate the athletic experience from the academic experience and we quit pretending that they can -they can be students, not to say that some of them don't do very well at this. But the correlation between academic ability and athletic ability is, I think, zero and there are students who can do very well athletically and don't really -- would have trouble academically even if that was their
full-time job. But their full-time job is really playing athletics for -during the season. So that -- that's my proposal. Myles Brand called me up and said: We'll try to get that in by next fall. I make joke.

But that's where I think -- that is opposite the direction they are actually headed. NCAA is fundamentally -- well, they're lowering the bar a little bit on admissions, but they're raising the bar on retention. Now, at the end of the sophomore year, a student has to be 40
percent of the way toward a degree, whereas before I think it was 30
percent. So this is going to make it more difficult for those students and it's going to make it harder on us, those of us who have athletes in our classes who are doing marginally. So as I say, it's a complex and difficult issue.

Another issue about Athletics is,
for those of you who've had season tickets, you know that the university has raised the price for football and basketball, men's basketball tickets. And I got a letter from Glen Collins detailing what he felt about this; again, it's on the Web page. I wrote to Mitch Barnhart and said: Do we have a way of determining how many UK employees are affected by this new policy and what the financial implications are for the university if we went back to what we sort of promised them to begin with, because now they have to come up with sort of a surcharge on the ticket. I
haven't heard anything back, and that was the 27 th of August.

Early on, I became concerned and we'd sit in board meetings and accept contributions of $\$ 100,000$ for the Athletic Department, \$100,000 for the Athletic Department, \$50,000 and -- for the Athletic Department, plus four more \$50,000 pledges to come in over the next
several years. You know, I mean page after page of these things. And so one of the things I did was to write to the trustees just asking them to consider linking people who make contributions to the Athletic Department, either asking them to contribute also to the academic program or siphoning off 25 percent of whatever they said they wanted to send the athletic program and send it to the academic program.

It turns out that this is a fairly
tricky situation. What is coming about is that everybody who contributes to the athletic program is going to be asked to contribute to the academic program. 30
percent of them already do. It seems to me the other 70 percent ought to as well. We'll see how that goes. One thing, which I was sort of going in loaded for bear based on the idea that the university was supporting the athletic program, and it turns out that

Kentucky's one of maybe a dozen to two dozen at the most -- and this came from Myles Brand -- schools in the country where the athletic program actually makes money. And they are now contributing a million dollars a year directly to the -- to the academic program in the form of scholarships, plus of course all the tuition that gets paid, both in-state and out of state for the athletes. But not counting that, this is a million dollars a year. Plus President Todd discovered that we were paying to clean up the stadium after games and the basketball arena, and it turns out that's a million-dollar-a-year operation which is now being taken over by Athletics.
million-dollar budget, but certainly the money flow's going in the right
direction. Although I don't -- it's not much fun, I'll continue to look at that.

Robinson Forest, as you may know, there was -- Grady Stumbo said that some legislators had asked him to look at the issue of mining again in Robinson Forest and the board commissioned a report, which took several months, almost a year to complete. The decision was no mining in the forest for the foreseeable future. The university went in and argued a dozen years ago to the legislature that they should declare that as lands unsuitable for mining and gave all kinds of reasons, like academic and research use and a number of
others. And what we'd have to do is go back to the legislature and say, gee, we were really just kidding about that, we'd really like to mine it, so that's
not going to happen. The reason for the Robinson Forest issue is that there are Robinson Scholars, now down to one from each of the Eastern Kentucky counties. At one point it was, I think, four. We got a lot of money originally to do -to fund the Robinson Scholars program, but it got spent on other things. And so they spent -- basically they spent the endowment and bought Lees College, was one of the big things that happened with that, which then went with, you know, community colleges elsewhere.

So the question is what to do about the Robinson Scholars program, and the answer is to make a concerted fundraising campaign in Eastern

Kentucky. My belief is that they could find people who would sponsor a Robinson scholar. It starts in eighth grade. They identify these people in eighth
grade, and it's sort of like the, you know, adopt-a-child in Malaysia or whatever, you know, where you get a
picture of the child and you write letters and so on. It seems to me that we could find sponsors, but there's a major fundraising program underway for that.

Campus issues, building design:
People from the Med Center, is it true that the final design on the new building across Limestone is still open labs, or did that get changed?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't know.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: To my knowledge it's the open labs.

KENNEDY: Still open labs? I plan to make a full court press -- see how I can swing into this athletic stuff -- that from now on people will be surveyed, that the users of the building will be interviewed, surveyed, and they told, well, they did that; they just didn't listen. So then they get to come back to the users of the building and say: Here's what we
have as a preliminary design; how does
this look? And I don't know whether that would be board action or whether the president would, you know, make that an administrative reg or what, but that definitely needs to happen.

There's an issue of changing faculty contracts. In one college apparently people on a 12-month contract were told -- some people were told, well, we're moving you back to ten months. Well, that's fine, you know. Well, but you're also going to lose 18 percent of your salary. That's not so fine. So I don't know what's going to happen with that. It's not at the moment a board issue, but $I$ just wanted to give you a heads-up.

Task Force on Retiree Benefits, that's about to report and you will not like it. Basically because of federal regulations, the university has to figure out -- and again, we're in the financial area, which I don't know much about, but the university has to talk
about how it's going to fund retiree benefits in the future. You can't just -- what we've said before is, hey, we'll pay your -- what the university has said to faculty is we'll pay your premiums for your health insurance from now on. Well, that apparently is not anymore legal without some sort of plan for doing that. And then when they began to look at the numbers, they said: Well, we're going to have to do something; we'll have to cap this. And as $I$ understand it, and this is -- when I do my classes, I have a truth in lecturing percentage and so that -- and that's not the probability that I'm right, but it's the probability that I think I'm right and it's about 75 percent on this issue. If you -- for current retirees and people who retire in the next two years, better be careful, stand near the door here. If you retire in the next two years, you get 7,500 a year for the -- for your --

TAGAVI: Up to.

KENNEDY: Sorry?
TAGAVI: Up to.
KENNEDY: Up to, right, up to 7,500 a year for your premiums on your health insurance. After that you get a total of \$50,000, lifetime. So it would be a good idea not to -- either to retire in the next two years or not to plan to live too long. I don't know what's going to happen with this, and it hasn't gotten to the board but it's -- I feel I need to bring it to your attention. Something I just heard this weekend was that someone got a bill or notice from the university saying that the University Clinic was no longer going to accept Medicaid. This may be totally specious. I may be totally out of line with this, but it's certainly a worrisome thing.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.
KENNEDY: No? Don't know anything about it, right? I said I want to see that piece of paper, and I never got the piece of
paper, so I don't know, so I won't spend
much time.
How many people are -- here are in Patterson Office Tower. Okay. Enough so that I'll say this. There's always been an issue of the 18th floor express elevator. And back when we were down to three elevators, when they were revamping them, one of them was the 18th floor express and, you know, 70 people stood out in the lobby. So I've received e-mails and heated remarks from various faculty members and have made some myself, especially when we were down to three elevators, that why do we need -- you know, we're whisking these board members up and down to the 18th floor while everyone else has to wait. Well, I looked into it. The first thing is, you have to have an 18th floor express. As many as 170 people go to the 18th floor in a 15, 20, 25-minute period and then come down. And camera
equipment, television camera equipment goes up and down and so on, so you've got to have that. That's the first
thing I found out. So what I did was I wrote to the trustees. And now, at this point, I know these people pretty well, and so I was able to write kind of an explanatory letter about the issue and then I said that there was something they could do if they were inclined to do it and that is not ride the 18th floor express; that is, all the people who -- you know, the administrators and the cameramen and all the guests and so on can go up and down the 18th floor express, but $I$ asked the trustees not to. I said: If you've got a few extra minutes, take one of the other elevators, rub elbows with the faculty, because there's this perception that you come in and just go "whoosh" to the top and back down and never have to either deal with the elevators or listen to the conversation in the elevators or
whatever. And I got like five e-mails back from trustees saying: Sure, be glad to do that, happy to do that. President Todd wrote and said: That's a
great idea. And a couple of other trustees came up to me and said: Yeah, I'll be doing that. So I told them that I would take the 18th floor express, however, since $I$ got to ride the other elevator --

GROSSMAN: You need to take the stairs, Mike.
KENNEDY: I would never get there. Charge for dropping courses was broached, is in abeyance at the moment. I don't know how many of you are annoyed by bicycles and nonbicycle areas on campus. I walk between Maxwell Place and the physics building and just about get run over one time out of three. Is that an issue that other people are concerned about? A lot of nodding heads. Noise pollution, leaf blowers just outside your classroom window, and other. I'll
do feedback at the end.
Provost search issue: This is here only because I promised you that it would be a year ago, the question of appointing Dr. Nietzel as the permanent provost and the way that was done. Let
me preface this -- I'm going to go through very fast -- preface it by saying there are two issues: One is product and one is process. I think most people are in agreement that the product is fine, that Dr. Nietzel is doing a really good job, at least that's my impression. That's my feeling about it, that he's doing a good job and most of my impression from talking to people is they think he is too. Process was just sort of one damn misstep after another, and so I'm just -- sort of a bulleted list of mistakes and we'll go on unless somebody wants to talk about it.

The original intention of the acting provost, considering an internal
candidate and avoiding an acting provost, I don't know whether those are mistakes are not. I mean, we have good people here. Should they be shut out?

That's debatable.
What wasn't a mistake was the search committee recommendation, which I, in
the interest of time, won't bring up, but it's on the Web site. And basically it said to Dr. Todd that, you know, that if you decide based on the paper that we've given you, even though we've got these other six or seven candidates, that Dr. Nietzel is the person that you feel is best, then go ahead and appoint him rather than bringing these other people to campus. That was not a good idea. What they could have said was: We suggest you bring Dr. Nietzel to campus first and let him go around and candidate and interact and get feedback from the faculty and students and staff and then decide what to do. Another
mistake was the president's sudden announcement. Claire, the other trustee, and I found out about this along with the rest of the board about 20 minutes before we went into the board meeting to approve it.

I and some other -- the other trustees and a couple of other faculty released a letter trying to explain why
we had voted in favor of $\operatorname{Dr}$. Nietzel's appointment, because some people thought we shouldn't have, which was all well and good, except that we -- in so doing we released the Senate Council's proposed resolution on the matter before the Senate Council did. Not cool, sorry about that. The Senate Council's recommended resolution was amended by the Senate. There was a question about whether or not it passed. That also was partly my fault. I'm supposed to know something about parliamentary procedure. I could have asked for a show of hands; I didn't. I think the

Senate resolution itself, the amendment, was a mistake. I don't think it's had serious repercussions. There's a letter from Loys Mather on that subject, which I won't go through, and finally we will consider today that -- the results of that resolution, which required a meeting of a committee of the Senate Council and administrators, but we could have used that several months ago. So
just, as I say, one thing after another.

I couldn't give this report without talking about Dr. Wethington's contract. Oops. It's thinking. Maybe it isn't thinking. Okay. Well, on my laptop, this all comes up as one picture. Well, what you see here is somebody in a shaving basin, a knight with a shaving basin, educating some other knights around him. This has to do with the fact that the Senate plus AAUP basically refers to the decision of
the Board of Trustees to extend Dr. Wethington's contract by two years. He would have -- if that hadn't happened, he would have been president until this last July. And down below here it says: So you see, it's mainly a matter of timing and footwork. That's a windmill. That's a tilting lance. Funny, huh? Okay. Well, at any rate, so we did good.

I mean, Dick Wilson of the University of Louisville -- of the

Louisville Courier-Journal told me afterwards -- by way of history, the way things finally got reversed was the Kentucky Press Association and the Courier Journal and the Herald-Leader filed suit against the university for an illegal, closed meeting. And at that point depositions would be taken, questions would be asked, who knew what, when, how was this all put together? And the board reversed itself. Wilson told me that if the faculty hadn't
gotten behind this thing, they never would have filed that suit. So -- and along with that, I will just say AAUP, which actually led that, needs and deserves your support. AUP used to -back in the 40 's, 80 percent of the faculty was part of AUP. Now we're down to 125 members or something, so...crass commercial advertisement. Dr. Wethington spent two years fundraising for the university, and I don't know what the amount was, but I think it was about -- it was at his
enhanced salary and now he has gone to LCC, where he makes 80 percent of his previous salary, he's tenured. He could do this forever at a quarter of a million dollars a year. I wrote to the board and to Dr. Kerley and Dr. Todd and Dr. Nietzel basically complaining about that, and Davy will probably have something to say. He's followed up more to find out what Dr. Wethington's
assignment is. It isn't five courses, as is the standard.

Advisors to me, Senate Council, the Senate, you as individuals, and I'm going to try to put together some faculty forums. I've also asked Professors Chard, Goldman, Hackbart, Kern, Mather, Regan and Sineath to sit down with me about every six weeks and talk to me about what they hear around campus and what the issues are and so on and may combine this with the faculty forum.

Again, the contact information and there's -- you can get to my Web page at
the University Web page: /trustees/ member/kennedy. All you have to do is go to the University Trustees Web page and follow the links.

I would encourage you to come to board meetings at least once to see what it's all about. The next one's the 29th of October, and then there's one in December and then the schedule is
printed there. At this point Jeff is looking very antsy. Feedback, comments, questions? If not --

CHAIR DEMBO: Thank you. Thank you, Michael, Davy, I think we probably will have to put off your --

JONES: I've got nothing to say.
CHAIR DEMBO: October 13th, 2003. You heard it. Okay. We have our first action item. This is an item that was brought up at the last Senate meeting of spring 2003. There was not a quorum of senators present, so this was not voted on. Because you as senators may encounter a number of organizational structure items, $I$ just wanted to take one moment
to give you some background as to how this works so you understand when you vote on future items as well as this one.

The Governing Regulations are the extension of state government through the Board of Trustees to the
university. The GR's have a line in it saying what the role of the Senate is:

For matters having to do with organization of the university, the board relies upon the advice of the University Senate, along with that of the President. So if you take a look at the flow chart, if somebody's wanting to change a name, change a structure, change a college, it goes through a departmental vote or a vote of the affected faculty, and one would hope students and staff of the unit, goes for a full college vote. It gets routed through the Senate Council Office, where it's forwarded to the Senate's Committee on Academic Organization and Structure. That is chaired, again, by Kate Chard,
who will talk in just a second. After the Senate committee makes its recommendation, it's forwarded to the Senate Council, who then considers it and then will either ask further questions to develop the proposal or
will send it to the Senate, either with a positive recommendation, a negative recommendation, or no recommendation at all, but it's put on the Senate agenda.

Once the Senate votes on it, assuming it's a vote to go -- well, in either event, the Senate will come up with an opinion and that -- that gets forwarded to the Board of Trustees. So it's possible that the Senate and the President might be both in favor of creation of a college or changing a unit and the board votes with that information. It's possible the Senate and the President might disagree, as happened with HES, and the board will vote based on that information.

There's one more document to be aware of, and you can get this through
the Senate Council -- the Senate Web
site. There are guidelines for
proposals to create, alter, or change an educational unit or alter its status.

And last year there was some important modifications made to these guidelines that Kate was involved in. Kate, if you want to talk very quickly in general about this process and then maybe specifically about this ophthalmology name change.

CHARD: Sure. I'll make this very fast. What we did is we added -- I think the most important piece is we added a routing sheet because we kept getting phone calls from people when they were going through a name change, whether it be just a programmatic name change or a department name change or if it was the creation of a new unit or a new center. There was uncertainty about who needed to be contacted, so we created a wonderful routing sheet and Ernie -- I'm going to give you credit -- Bailey created a sample of how you would move
one of these people through. So please don't think everything has to go through Veterinary Science. That is a sample,
not necessarily a necessity. All right? But it's a really good example, and when I get to ophthalmology, I think it will make sense, why this is important. What we expect -- and the guidelines I think make this more clear -- is that the students and the faculty and the staff that are affected by any name change are consulted and that we can see some demonstration that there was an attempt to allow these people to have input into any change. In addition, if there are other programs, units, faculty, students in other departments or units on the campus that could be affected by that particular change, they should also be consulted. And we did not create a strong standard of who that needs to be that creates this kind of system of consultation, but we did recommend that using the faculty senators could be one of the best ways
e-mails sent in or you can have conversations in the hallway or you can have a full-fledge election if you want to.

So I urge you, if you know that something's happening in your unit where a name change or a change in structure is happening, please check out our Web page because it does have the routing sheet. And if you have any questions at all, please feel free to e-mail me to ask me questions. And I'm going to give the report right now on the Department of Ophthalmology, which wanted to create a name change from Ophthalmology to the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences. And we did go ahead and approve this, but one of the things we noticed is that the committee did note -- and I think you're going to see some of this in here, is that the Medical College faculty never had a chance to vote on this matter. So this is a department in the Medical College,
yet there was never a vote put to the Medical College faculty. And in addition, the two Medical College representatives that sit on the Medical Center Academic Council, which is the governing voting body, did not attend the meeting when they did the vote on this name change.

So in other words, what we discovered is there was absolutely no faculty input or governance into the name change that affected directly the faculty. So it was left to my committee to decide whether adding "visual sciences" was going to affect anyone else in the entire Med Center or anyone else in any other unit on campus. And fortunately for us, we decided this was a pretty easy one and we were going to go ahead and pass it, but that's not always the case. So I really urge you to keep that in mind, that we do need to see that, at least at some basic level, the faculty that are involved in the program or unit are consulted and do get to vote. Okay? Any questions?

CHAIR DEMBO: So you probably have read through this. This is the rationale on the department. Is there any -- it's on the floor.

LESNAW: I just have a question about the second point, bringing under one umbrella basic scientists, is that implying a real motion of scientists in other colleges who are conducting vision research into this unit?

CHAIR DEMBO: Is anybody from the College of Medicine willing to answer that?

SCOTT: I'm sorry; your name, please?
LESNAW: Oh, I'm sorry; Judith Lesnaw, Arts and Sciences, Biology.

SCOTT: Thank you.
CHAIR DEMBO: Well, $I$ don't have an answer myself, Professor Lesnaw. I think that -- an editorial comment -- from what I've seen, sometimes these name changes occur in principle because it should spur interdisciplinary research. How often that happens is less frequently than one might think is
ideal. Professor Grossman.
GROSSMAN: Grossman, Arts and Sciences. How much is this going to cost?

CHAIR DEMBO: I don't recall that there was any cost analysis.

GROSSMAN: You have to reprint stationery, etc., etc. I'm just wondering how much it's going to cost. This is not a time when we want to be adding unnecessary expenses to the university. Is it going to cost much?

CHAIR DEMBO: That was not supplied on the documents that we received.

GROSSMAN: This is already on the floor for discussion since it was recommended by the committee, right?

CHAIR DEMBO: Correct.
GROSSMAN: I mean, I guess I would like to recommend that we table it until we get an idea from Ophthalmology and Vision Sciences, or whatever they want to call themselves, on how much it's going to
cost because we really need to start thinking about such things before we start approving things like this.

CHAIR DEMBO: So is that a motion to table?
GROSSMAN: That is a motion to table until -until we get some input on that issue.

CHAIR DEMBO: Professor Blyton?
BLYTON: Is that a motion to postpone temporarily or definitely or indefinitely?

GROSSMAN: Until we get some information, postpone indefinitely until we get information, I guess is what I'm saying. I don't know. Is that -- you tell me.

NOONAN: I'm not aware that the university pays for any printing for the clinical departments anyhow. I never saw any --

GROSSMAN: I would like a cost estimate.
CHAIR DEMBO: So that's -- I guess $I$ hear a motion to table definitely, pending the receipt of that information; would that be correct?

GROSSMAN: Yes.
CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. Is there a second to that
motion? There's a second. I'm sorry?
LEWIN: Yeah, I second that.
CHAIR DEMBO: Identify yourself.
LEWIN: Oh, Jennifer Lewin.

CHAIR DEMBO: Jennifer Lewin. Professor Blyton, how much of a vote do we need to pass tabling?

BLYTON: It's just -- it's just to postpone, so it's a majority vote.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay.
TAGAVI: Can we have brief discussion on this?
CHAIR DEMBO: Discussion on tabling or postponing?

BLYTON: What you've got is three motions to postpone, and that's what you're talking about is postponement. Forget the lay on the table stuff. That's obsolete. So you're postponing definitely or indefinitely or temporarily.

KENNEDY: Is it a discussable motion?
BLYTON: You discuss only whether to postpone, not the motion.

CHAIR DEMBO: Proffesor Tagavi.

TAGAVI: Well, stop me the moment you realize it's out of order, but do we know if this expense is anything other than stationery? Because I cannot think of anything other than stationery.

CHARD: No.
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CHAIR DEMBO: We don't even have enough information to answer your question, as far as I know.

TAGAVI: Does anybody know whether a name change requires any expenses other than stationery?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, the T-shirts, of course.

BLYTON: That's out of order because you're talking about postponement; you're not talking about the motion.

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. So the question at hand is to postpone definitely until we receive information related to the cost involved with changing the name; is that correct, Bob? Okay.

BLYTON: I call for the vote.
CHAIR DEMBO: All in favor of postponing
definitely, please raise your hands.
All against it, raise your hands.
Okay. The motion fails. It's still on the floor for discussion now, the name change. Professor Lesnaw.

LESNAW: Judith Lesnaw, Biology. Also the point regarding facilitation of graduate study
at the master's and doctor level for students in other departments, I'm not sure I understand what that means formally.

CHAIR DEMBO: I foreshortened some of their explanation. There was a listing of some of those departments that they gave as examples. I don't have it in front of me.

LESNAW: But how would a name change facilitate someone in another department getting a master's or a doctoral degree?

CIBULL: Well, you can't get a master's or a doctoral in ophthalmology, but you probably can in visual science.

CHAIR DEMBO: That's Professor Cibull.

CIBULL: So we're tricking the graduate (inaudible).

LESNAW: Ah-ha, which is my point. Do we have an existing graduate program in either -in any official science? So I mean, I don't think that this is an appropriate thing to fold into a motion -- not a motion, but a call for changing a name. Changing the name won't create a
graduate program.
CHAIR DEMBO: Dean Blackwell, do you want to respond to that?

BLACKWELL: Yes, if I could. Jeannine Blackwell, Dean of the Graduate School. This language would not create anything approaching a master's or a doctoral program in ophthalmology, but they may have an idea, by the name change to visual sciences, to attract graduate students from programs that might be in related disciplines. But they would have to do it at the 600 or 700 level and not at the 800 level because those courses would not count toward a
master's or doctorate. So this might be a nice gesture, but $I$ don't think that it would really affect specific programs in the graduate school.

CIBULL: To expand on that, I think --
CHAIR DEMBO: Please introduce yourself.
CIBULL: -- it's a name change. It's not a change in program or anything else. When they wake up tomorrow morning, they'll still be ophthalmologists. I
mean, they want to change their name. That's all they want to do. We can debate this forever. Their mistake was giving reason.

ZENTALL: Tom Zentall, Psychology. I suspect that this is merely a matter of advertising, so... Ophthalmology has the idea of surgery in it, and I think students from psychology, from biology might be more interested in looking at courses that might be offered in visual sciences with a name change, so existing courses might be just made more apparent to them.

CHAIR DEMBO: There was another hand up. Yes.
GARRITY: Tom Garrity, College of Medicine. I am in a department that is maybe somewhat in this situation. We have no graduate degree program, and our only degree program really is toward the M.D. degree. However, we have many graduate students who come to our department to conduct research, to take advantage of faculty who are members of the graduate faculty. We support them financially
with research assistanceships, and we have a very active graduate activity in our department. I suspect that what is intended here is, you know, as Tom Zentall said, an advertising of the kind of basic science that can go on within this particular department, which under the name ophthalmology just sort of implies that it's strictly a clinical department. So you know, if the Senate feels okay about this kind of advertising, which I think is fine and
appropriate and helps graduate students find a place where they can perhaps do some of the basic science research that they wish to do, then I think this is not inappropriate.

CHAIR DEMBO: Any other comments against this? Any other comments at all? Okay. We'll go for a vote. The vote is based on the proposal to change the name to Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."

SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR DEMBO: I fooled you. All those opposed say "nay." (NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE)

CHAIR DEMBO: Okay. The next action item is what Professor Kennedy was referring to in response to the University Senate Resolution from the November Senate Meeting. This was again up for a discussion item at the last meeting. There was some limited discussion that
occurred, and now it's to be presented for a vote. Let me skip ahead one here. The recommendation of the committee and of the Senate Council is that this goes forward as an administrative regulation. Again, just to understand how AR's fit into it, in the governing regulations, the Board has delegated responsibilities to the President and to the Senate. So the Senate has its Senate rules to carry out what the GR's state. The President has his or her administrative regulations. So because of the nature of this, that's why we're recommending that it come
forward as an administrative
regulation. So I would trust that you
all read it and it's open for discussion. I'll scroll down. So hearing no discussion, $I$ believe we can move to a vote. All in favor of sending this forward to the President for recommendation as administrative regulation, signify by saying "aye."

SENATORS: Aye.
CHAIR DEMBO: All opposed say "nay." (NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE.)

CHAIR DEMBO: It carries unanimously. Finally I'd like to bring up one more point. There's been some discussion lately about whether the university should or should not offer domestic partner benefits. The Senate Council received an announcement from one of our trustees that the board was beginning to talk about this, and at that time the Senate Council did not achieve a consensus about whether or not this should be discussed either at the Senate Council or the Senate level, but the Staff

Senate has had a very active conversation about this. They've had
one committee who sent forward a recommendation supporting domestic
partner benefits and another staff senator has sent around $a$ counterproposal that's very -- very
passionate. So as you can imagine, there's probably a lot of discussion. For more information, you can contact the Staff Senate Chair of the Benefits Committee. There's also going to be a discussion here in the Room B -Rebecca?

SCOTT: It will be in Room B-10 unless they have too many people, in which case it'll be held here.

CHAIR DEMBO: B-10 at 2:00 tomorrow. This is the Staff Senate, is discussing this, in case any Faculty or Student Senators are interested in participating. Is there any other business or announcements to bring forward? I have one more thing. This year the Staff Senate and the University

Senate are both going to co-host a holiday reception with the Board of Trustees. It's going to be in December. We'll announce the time and place for it, but this is something new that will occur. Typically it's been
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just the University Senate before.
I think we're all done. Thank you
for your time, and we'll see you next month. (MEETING CONCLUDED AT 4:10 P.M.)
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