

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL

Regular Session

October 8, 2001
3:02 p.m.

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

Professor William Fortune, Chair

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

FREELANCE COURT REPORTERS & VIDEO SERVICES

STEPHANIE K. SCHLOEMER, PRESIDENT

10 NORTH UPPER STREET

P. O. BOX 85, LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40588

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

e-mail: ctreport@aol.com

University Senate Council Session - October 8, 2001

WILLIAM FORTUNE, CHAIR
GUFFORD BLYTON, PARLIAMENTARIAN
CELINDA TODD, SECRETARY TO SENATE COUNCIL
STEPHANIE K. SCHLOEMER, COURT REPORTER

SPEAKERS
(in order)

David Durant	8
Mary Molinaro	8
Kaveh Tagavi	9
Phil Kraemer	9
Scott Gleeson	10
Brad Canon	16
Lee Edgerton	20
Hans Gesund	20
Bill Thom	22
Ruth Staten	27

VOTES TAKEN
(Page)

11
18
21
23
25
28
29

(Counting votes: Celinda Todd and Michelle Sonar)

1 MR. FORTUNE: Good afternoon.
2 The September 10th minutes were
3 distributed. Are there any additions or corrections?
4 (No response.)

5 If not, they'll stand **APPROVED**.
6 And by way of Chair announcements, there
7 were no rule waivers between the time of the last meeting
8 and today. I would announce two things, however, that
9 are going on on campus that I've been a party to that you
10 all might want to attend or at least be familiar with.

11 One is the Futures Committee. We have now
12 -- I'm sitting on that as a representative of the Senate.
13 And we have now met with all of the Deans except one.
14 And we had a meeting this morning with a few members of
15 the faculty -- and there's a meeting going on right now
16 with some other folks. There is a meeting on Thursday,
17 the 11th, from nine to eleven in the AG-C auditorium.
18 And that is an opportunity for anyone who is on the Faculty
19 to come in and say whatever they would like to say. The
20 Futures Committee, as you know, is charged with making
21 recommendations on areas of excellence and also on
22 restructuring issues. So if any of you all have feelings
23 about that, you might want to come to that meeting on
24 Thursday and let us know.

25 The other is the Health Benefits Committee
26 and I've been sitting on that since the beginning of the
27 semester. And it's meeting regularly on Wednesdays at
28 2:00 in the Student Union Building. And we have received
29 a tremendous amount of information, a tremendous amount
30 of input. It seems to me that most of the input we're
31 getting on the web site and in person is coming from staff,
32 not faculty, but there will be recommendations coming from
33 the Health Benefits Committee probably early in November.

34 So if you all would like to kind of get abreast of what's
35 going on there, you might come to those meetings.

36 There are no resolutions.

37 The first agenda item -- There are four
38 agenda items; three that were noted on the agenda that
39 was sent out, and a fourth agenda item that you were
40 notified on e-mail by.

41 Now, as to the fourth item, and that was
42 a proposal from the Admissions and Academic Standards
43 Committee, for a change in Senate Rule 4.3.1, which has
44 to do with the time in which a person can AD in the summer,
45 the concern being that six days is way too long for an
46 AD period in the summer. It turned out after the
47 recommendation came to me from the Admissions and Academic
48 Standards Committee that this problem was actually taken
49 care of last year and that the existing Rule gives the
50 registrar authority to set an AD period of less than six

1 days in the summer. And I've spoken with Don Witt, the
2 Registrar, and he is comfortable with exercising that
3 authority. So he will -- For the upcoming summer
4 session, he will have an AD period which is proportional
5 to the length of those summer sessions. I don't know
6 exactly what it would be but my guess is it would be two
7 days. And in light of that, we're withdrawing this
8 proposal, 4.3.1, that came to you on an e-mail because
9 it doesn't make any sense. The problem was cured last
10 year.

11 Now, Agenda Item B is the proposal to do
12 away with the "college circulation" rule. And, as was
13 indicated in the e-mail that was sent out or the agenda
14 that was sent out, the Senate Council is recommending that
15 this matter be recommitted to us. In fact, I think we
16 could simply do that by consent, unless there's an
17 objection. The information I received from Phyllis Nash,
18 who is Chair of the Academic Council for the Medical Center,
19 is that the four members of the Academic Councils are
20 working on this issue, working on both the issue of tracking
21 proposals and the issue of proper notification of
22 interested parties. And in light of that, I think it's
23 appropriate that we leave the "college circulation" rule
24 in place so we'll have something there on the books, at
25 least, and allow that Committee and let that group of folks
26 do their work. So without -- Unless there's an objection
27 -- It's on the agenda. But unless there's an objection,
28 we, as the Senate Council, will simply take it back, take
29 this issue back, and hold it until we hear from the academic
30 councils. Is there any problem with that? (No response.)
31

32 Does anyone want to ask any questions
33 concerning that? (No response.) Okay.

34 Item C is a petition for transcription of
35 the Senate proceedings. Now, this came to us and the
36 petition was signed by over 100 folks, 11 of whom are
37 Senators. And under the Senate Rules, a matter like that
38 is automatically on the Senate Agenda -- or at least unless
39 the Senate Council were to agree to that and I didn't feel
40 it appropriate to do so because it involves expenditure
41 of money -- that it comes on the Senate Agenda automatically
42 with ten senators having signed the petition. The Senate
43 Council met on this and the Senate Council discussed it.

44 And Davy Jones, who was the author of the petition, was
45 present and he agreed to certain changes in the proposal.

46 And the changes are, in effect, that the Senate minutes
47 will be as they have been, that is the action taken without
48 any kind of summary or transcription of the actual debate,
49 but that there will be, in addition to that, a transcript
50 prepared. And the transcript will be available on the

1 web and copies of the transcript will be archived in the
2 library and kept in the Senate Council office and the
3 transcript will be properly indexed so that the person
4 doing research into the proceedings of the Senate would
5 be able to access that information from the transcript.

6 Now, the summary of what we did is Item
7 C. And the matter is before you and it will not need a
8 second, of course. And the floor is open for debate.
9 Before we have debate, I would like to introduce you to
10 Stephanie Schloemer. The recommendation of the Senate
11 Council, with one dissenting vote, was to recommend
12 approval of this. And I thought in light of that, the
13 Senate Council recommending approval, that the chances
14 were pretty good that the Senate, as a whole, would go
15 along with it.

16 And so Stephanie Schloemer -- (indicating)
17 Stephanie -- is the person that we have hired to do the
18 transcripts. The procedure, of course, that will follow
19 is that all senators will announce themselves.
20 Stephanie's got a list of the senators. So she'll be able
21 to get the spelling correct. If there's a guest, the guest
22 should so state and if the name is an odd name, just spell
23 the name so that we can get the names correct. But, with
24 that, the floor is open to debate on this petition. The
25 floor is open to David Durant.

26 MR. DURANT: David Durant. It
27 gratifies me to know that at the mere cost of \$250, these
28 inane comments that I am now making ... (Crowd laughs)
29 I think this is a trivial waste of money.

30 MR. FORTUNE: Are there other
31 comments?

32 Mary Molinaro.

33 MS. MOLINARO: Mary Molinaro
34 from the Library. I think that this is important to have
35 a transcript of what people actually said. What we had
36 before was what people -- what we thought we said and,
37 in fact, what we wish we had said. Because people, whoever
38 was taking the notes, would call people and say, "What
39 did you really say?" Then you had a chance to really
40 reflect on it and say it again. So -- But I think this
41 is important for an archival record for the University.
42 When we look back over time, being a librarian, I think
43 this is important to have this in the archives of the
44 University.

45 MR. FORTUNE: Other comments?
46 Yes, Kaveh Tagavi.

47 MR. TAGAVI: T-a-g-a-v-i. I
48 want to speak to the entire merit of this. I'll just give
49 you one example. When somebody gives a -- makes a motion
50 for amendment, it is unfair to that amendment, whether

1 it gets passed or not passed, not to have the rationale
2 for that amendment. If you only seem to say this was the
3 amendment and the vote was either yes or no, that doesn't
4 do service to that amendment and to the thought process
5 and the process of other senators here. Because usually
6 after the amendment, the author of the amendment gives
7 the rationale. And the rationale is very important.
8 Agenda items that come from Senate Council have their own
9 rationale and they should have. Same way with the
10 amendment. So I just wanted to give you one aspect of
11 this, which is very positive.

12 MR. FORTUNE: Other comments?

13 Phil Kraemer, K-r-a-e-m-e-r.

14 MR. KRAEMER: I just have a
15 question. What does that do for the audio record? Are
16 we obtaining an audio record of each Senate meeting?

17 MR. FORTUNE: We do have an
18 audio record, that's correct.

19 MR. KRAEMER: So we'll
20 duplicate that with a written record.

21 MR. FORTUNE: Right.

22 MR. KRAEMER: Any other
23 formats?

24 (Crowd laughs)

25 MR. FORTUNE: That's correct.
26 We will have an audio record and we will have a transcript.
27 I think the thought, and Mary Molinaro expressed it, is
28 that the transcript will be much more accessible, I think,
29 than an audio record.

30 Yes?

31 MR. GLEESON: Scott Gleeson,
32 G-l-e-e-s-o-n, Biology. I just had a question because
33 it wasn't clear to me. Does this include transcripts of
34 the Senate Council, as well as the Senate meetings?

35 MR. FORTUNE: No. These are
36 just the Senate meetings.

37 MR. GLEESON: And this person
38 is employed just for the time of the meeting?

39 MR. FORTUNE: Correct.

40 Stephanie is a freelance court reporter.

41 Other comments? Kaveh Tagavi.

42 MR. TAGAVI: You mentioned the
43 vote by the Senate Council was not unanimous. What was
44 the vote?

45 MR. FORTUNE: Well, there was
46 one dissent. And I don't know how many folks were there
47 but maybe Cindy--

48 MR. TAGAVI: That's enough.

49 One dissent?

50 MR. FORTUNE: Yes.

1 MR. TAGAVI: That's all I meant.
2 MR. FORTUNE: Other comments?

3 (No response.)

4 All right. All in favor of the motion,
5 which is as stated on Item C, signify by saying aye.

6 ("AYE" VOICE VOTE: MAJORITY)

7 MR. FORTUNE: Opposed say nay.

8 ("NAY" VOICE VOTE: TWO)

9 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Ayes have
10 it.

11 Okay. Now, I have Stephanie seated next
12 to me in case that I forget in the heat of the moment to
13 ask someone their name or something. And she will poke
14 me and tell me to shape up. Okay.

15 Now, we have -- In connection with the
16 Election Rules, the Senate Council met and considered
17 proposed amendments to the Election Rules. And this is
18 Item A. And we're going to vote on these separately.
19 We have three matters.

20 And so Item A, the first, Item A, if you
21 will, or we'll just call it the Board of Trustees Election
22 issue is set out -- is Item A and it's the first couple
23 of pages. But we met as the Council and considered some
24 amendments which had been offered. Those which appeared
25 to be not substantive, not controversial, we just agreed
26 to and just incorporated into the version of this that
27 you have before you. So, for example, we eliminated the
28 little "a" there because we don't have a subsection "a."

29 This is on the first page. We -- There is no subsection
30 "a" so we eliminated that. We didn't feel that there was
31 any legitimate reason to require that the nominators have
32 primary faculty appointments. In other words, if you're
33 a faculty member, even if you're holding an administrative
34 appointment, we didn't see any logical reason why faculty
35 members -- why those faculty members shouldn't be
36 nominated. So to the extent that we were going to require
37 50 percent or more for a person to be a nominator, we took
38 that out.

39 We also included a provision to deal with
40 the unlikely situation of having a tie by an amendment
41 which is actually not so designated. And it's in the last
42 two lines on page two. And there was no provision for
43 a tie, no tie breaker. So we went with the -- "or by lot,"
44 you know, throw fingers or something, if both received
45 the same number of first choice votes. So the part of
46 that within the parentheses which reads, "... or by lot
47 if both receive the same number of first choice votes ..."
48 is an amendment that we thought was non-controversial.
49 And so we just included that.

50 So what we're putting before you is Item

1 A with this minor amendments in it. This was the subject
2 of discussion last time. I think I noted in the minutes
3 some matters that were raised, some issues that were
4 raised. And of course, obviously, the floor is open to
5 those folks who made those suggestions if they would like
6 to amend the proposal at this time. We have two amendments
7 which are placed before you because we felt that these
8 are substantive, one of which the Senate Council agreed
9 to or recommending approval, one of which the Senate
10 Council did not recommend approval. And those proposed
11 amendments are on A-1 which is -- it follows the entire
12 Item A but it applies only to the Board of Trustees. So
13 if you want to look at that with me.

14 The first amendment provides that each
15 voter may indicate a first and second choice. And we will
16 talk about the rationale of that when we discuss the
17 amendment. The Senate Council considered that and voted
18 to recommend approval of that.

19 The second amendment is a provision which
20 would deal with the situation where a faculty member is
21 50 percent administrative in nature, has 50 percent DOE,
22 50 percent administrative appointment on the DOE. And
23 the proposed amendment would mean that that person could
24 not serve on the Board of Trustees, would be ineligible.

25 And the Senate Council recommends disapproval of that,
26 in other words, leaving the rule alone on that particular
27 provision.

28 What I would like to do is to deal with
29 these two amendments first and then to deal with any
30 amendments from the floor on the -- either on the amendments
31 or on the proposal as it now stands. So the first amendment
32 -- and Kaveh Tagavi is the maker of the amendment -- it
33 will need a second.

34 MR. GESUND: Second.

35 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Let me get
36 through the second. Hans Gesund, G-e-s-u-n-d, seconded.
37 Okay.

38 So amendment number one is now before you.
39 And, Kaveh, do you want to explain the rationale for this?

40 MR. TAGAVI: Yes. I admit I am
41 the person who made this amendment. The way -- For those
42 of you who might not recall, the way it is right now or
43 the last time we voted for Board of Trustees, there was
44 one vacancy but you had to vote for two people, first choice
45 and second choice. And my point is, you should not be
46 forced to vote for a person that you don't feel comfortable.

47 That's just fundamentally wrong. And I simply
48 recommended to change the word "should" to "may."
49 Therefore, if you want -- if you do have a second choice,
50 you may vote for a second choice and it would count in

1 case of a tie. But if you don't have a second choice and,
2 more importantly, if you don't want any other person to
3 get on the Board of Trustees, you don't have to vote for
4 anybody that you don't want to. So that explains my
5 amendment.

6 MR. FORTUNE: I think I saw Brad
7 Canon come in and he's -- Yes, there's Brad. Brad is
8 Chair of the Rules Committee and has dealt with this
9 particular rule over the years. And I think it would be
10 appropriate for the members of the Senate to hear what
11 Brad has to say about this, about the history of this voting
12 rule and how this would change it.

13 MR. CANON: Well, as you know,
14 we've always had in the past a requirement that you have
15 a first and second choice. And I have no strong feelings
16 about Kaveh's amendment either way. I think I'd agree
17 with it. What this would do, in effect, would be just
18 let you cast a first-choice vote. And if you did not want
19 to cast a second choice vote, you didn't have to. Now,
20 the second-choice votes that were cast would, of course,
21 determine the winner and, perhaps, even without a majority
22 of all the voters if enough people did not cast second
23 choice votes. But this way we would avoid what Kaveh
24 thinks is the unfortunate or unfair situation of forcing
25 you to cast a second choice vote.

26 MR. DURANT: Brad, when do the
27 second-cast votes get counted?

28 MR. CANON: When did what?

29 MR. DURANT: When do the second
30 votes get counted?

31 MR. CANON: The second? They
32 get counted right after the first votes. Let's say X gets
33 45 percent, Y gets 40, and Z gets 15 percent. The 15
34 percent second choice votes get counted right away. We
35 kind of vote two elections into one. This avoids a run-off
36 ballot and the month or so that is consumed in holding
37 a run-off ballot.

38 MR. FORTUNE: Do you all
39 understand how this works? I didn't until I actually got
40 to counting the votes. When you have a required
41 second-place vote, that means that you have three
42 candidates. And the third-place person drops out and then
43 you look at the way in which that person's second-place
44 votes were split up. And you add those to the folks who
45 have gotten -- are in the top two positions. And it's
46 going to wind up with one or the other of these people
47 having an actual majority of votes cast, which is a little
48 bit deceptive because some of those votes are second-place
49 votes. But that's the way it is currently working.

50 Kaveh's amendment would eliminate the

1 necessity of casting a second-place vote, which means that
2 you might well have someone who would not have had a
3 majority of folks express a preference for that person.
4 That's basically what we're talking about. But let's
5 see -- In the back, sir?

6 MR. RANDALL: It looks to me,
7 however, is we retain the two votes on a second ballot.
8 Is that what we want to do?

9 MR. CANON: Yes.

10 MR. RANDALL: Okay.

11 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Yes, sir.

12 MR. FORGUE: Forgue,

13 F-o-r-g-u-e. But it's true on a second ballot you wouldn't
14 have to vote. Whereas, on the first ballot, the way it's
15 set up now, you have to vote, is that correct, my
16 interpreting? In other words, if we had had a second
17 ballot, the votes come out, two parties are less, you cannot
18 vote if you choose not to?

19 MR. FORTUNE: I'm going to defer
20 to my Rules Committee Chair.

21 MR. CANON: Well, under Kaveh's
22 amendment, this would be the same thing.

23 MR. FORTUNE: All right.

24 Further questions or comments on this? (No response.)

25 Okay. All in favor of the amendment,
26 signify by saying aye.

27 ("AYE" VOICE VOTE: ALL)

28 MR. FORTUNE: Opposed, say nay.

29 ("NAY" VOICE VOTE: NONE)

30 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. The second
31 amendment that we've received, also from Kaveh Tagavi,
32 was to switch -- this is subtle but to switch 50 percent
33 or more faculty appointment to more than 50 percent. And
34 the Senate Council recommends disapproval of that on the
35 agenda that was sent out. Kaveh's rationale is set out
36 and the Senate Council's rationale for recommending
37 disapproval was sent out. So the motion is before you.

38 We would need a second.

39 MR. GESUND: Second.

40 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Second by
41 Hans Gesund on the second amendment. Okay. Discussion
42 of this? Kaveh, do you want to explain your rationale?

43 MR. TAGAVI: Yes. This is,
44 admittedly, of much less practical importance than the
45 first amendment, a lot more philosophical. I think
46 there's periods of the original rule that says 50 percent
47 or more is that you want the faculty representative to
48 represent faculty rather than the administration.
49 Therefore, my amendment, which only filled the gap of one
50 percent immediately, would ensure those who would go to

University Senate Council Session - October 8, 2001

1 the Board of Trustees representing the faculty would be
2 more faculty than administrative. It's philosophical.
3 I admit it. It is a philosophical amendment.
4 MR. FORTUNE: Would any member
5 of the Council like to speak to state the rationale
6 opposing? (No response.)
7 Okay. No one would. Other comments on
8 this?
9 Yes. Lee Edgerton.
10 MR. EDGERTON: Bill, I don't
11 want to speak for the Council--
12 MR. FORTUNE: Edgerton.
13 MR. EDGERTON: --but I think the
14 view opposing it is that this is such a minor change that
15 people can quickly shift the percentage of appointment
16 and it will have, as you said, no practical value. It
17 seems to be a minor issue that will not really resolve
18 a problem.
19 MR. FORTUNE: Other comments?
20 Hans Gesund.
21 MR. GESUND: I believe that I
22 agree with Kaveh. I think it's a matter of philosophy
23 and logic. It really should be 51 percent faculty. I
24 agree that one percent doesn't make a darn bit of
25 difference. In fact, it could be 50.01 or 50.001. But
26 it's a matter of philosophy of saying yes, we want a faculty
27 member on the Board of Trustees to be more than half
28 faculty.
29 MR. FORTUNE: Any other
30 questions or comments? (No response.)
31 Okay. All in favor of amendment number
32 two, signify by saying aye.
33 ("AYE" VOICE VOTE: SEVERAL)
34 MR. FORTUNE: Opposed, say nay.
35 ("NAY" VOICE VOTE: SEVERAL)
36 MR. FORTUNE: Show of hands.
37 All in favor of the motion, please raise their right hand.
38 ("AYE" HAND COUNT TAKEN)
39 MR. FORTUNE: We need counters.
40 MS. SONAR: I haven't counted
41 them yet. (Pause while counting...) There would be 33
42 total.
43 MR. FORTUNE: All right. All
44 opposed? Thirty-three ayes. Okay.
45 Opposed, please raise your hands.
46 ("NAY" HAND COUNT TAKEN)
47 MS. SONAR: Fourteen and 27.
48 MR. FORTUNE: Fourteen and 27
49 is--
50 MS. SONAR: Yes.

1 MR. FORTUNE: --is 41. Okay.
2 **THE MOTION FAILS.** Okay.
3 (FINAL COUNT: "AYE" 33; "NAY" 41)
4 Now, are there four amendments? Bill
5 Thom, T-h-o-m.
6 MR. THOM: I would like to move
7 that -- And I guess, Bill, I'll ask the question first.
8 Have all these been repeated twice in this handout?
9 MR. FORTUNE: Bill Thom is
10 asking about a Rules Committee ruling that seems to be
11 outmoded. And I suggested that the matter be taken care
12 of by a motion to delete this. And now that I look at
13 my copy of the proposal--
14 MR. THOM: We have two. We have
15 -- It's repeated, isn't it? But what I have concern about
16 is on both page four and page six. Are they repeated?
17 MR. FORTUNE: Well, let's see.
18 It's on page four.
19 MR. THOM: Also, look on page
20 six.
21 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Now--
22 MR. THOM: Looks like the same
23 thing to me.
24 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Let's do
25 this. That's actually -- We're going to vote on the --
26 That's election to the Senate, isn't it?
27 MR. THOM: Yes.
28 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Let's deal
29 -- see if there are any floor amendments to the motion
30 to change the rules for voting for the faculty
31 representative on the Board of Trustees, first, and then
32 go on to the election of the Senate. Are there no floor
33 amendments? (No response.)
34 Okay. All in favor, signify by saying aye.
35 I mean -- Excuse me. I'm sorry. The vote now will be
36 on the original proposal with the first amendment which
37 passed. So all in favor of the proposal to change the
38 election rules pertaining to the Board of Trustees with
39 the first amendment, signify by saying aye.
40 ("AYE" VOICE VOTE: ALL)
41 MR. FORTUNE: Opposed, say no.
42 ("NAY VOICE VOTE: NONE)
43 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Now, the
44 next item is the election. I think the way we have it
45 in here, the next election is to the Undergraduate Council.
46 So this is page three and--
47 MS. TODD: It looks like there
48 are two different sets of election to the Senate here.
49 It's repeated.
50 MR. FORTUNE: I'm not sure I'm

1 tracking here. But my page three, anyway, shows -- Let's
2 vote on this. On page three is the proposal to change
3 the rules relating to the Undergraduate Council. And this
4 was discussed at the last minute -- meeting very briefly.
5 Phil Kraemer is here who is the -- His title is not Dean
6 of Undergraduate Studies any more. Phil, should we adjust
7 your title to reflect that?

8 MR. KRAEMER: That would be
9 wise.

10 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. So without
11 -- We'll take as a friendly amendment, if you will, a
12 proposal to -- And how should we make that read, Associate
13 Provost for--

14 MR. KRAEMER: For Undergraduate
15 Education.

16 MR. FORTUNE: Okay.

17 MR. KRAEMER: Unless you would
18 like some other office to--
19 (Crowd laughs)

20 MR. FORTUNE: The Associate
21 Provost for Undergraduate Education. So in the paragraph
22 which shows the addition, that's the way it should read.
23 And, of course, whenever it reads "Dean" it should read
24 "Associate Provost." So that's the -- That's the
25 proposed change in election of the Undergraduate Council.
26 Any questions or comments? (No response.)

27 Okay. With those changes, all in favor
28 of the proposal signify by saying aye.
29 ("AYE" VOICE VOTE: ALL)

30 MR. FORTUNE: Opposed say nay.
31 ("NAY" VOICE VOTE: NONE)

32 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Now,
33 election to the Senate and this is where I think I get
34 lost a little bit. Is this where we have duplication?

35 MS. TODD: Yeah. Four, five
36 and six are the ones that should be considered. There's
37 just a repeat in pages four, five and six.

38 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. The third
39 election proposal has to do with election to the Senate.
40 And that starts on page four and runs through the middle
41 of page six. Am I correct, Cindy--

42 MS. TODD: Yes.

43 MR. FORTUNE: --that the rest
44 of that is just a delete after that?

45 MS. TODD: Yes.

46 MR. FORTUNE: It just got
47 repeated?

48 MS. TODD: It got repeated.

49 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. So...

50 MS. TODD: Sorry about that.

1 MR. FORTUNE: What's on pages
2 six, seven and eight should be stricken.

3 Now, basically what this proposal does is
4 to turn over the election to the Senate to the various
5 academic units so that the Senate Council Office would
6 no longer be running the elections. We would still be
7 responsible for telling the academic units how many
8 representatives they're entitled to but we wouldn't be
9 running the elections. So this is basically what this
10 does. Okay. The floor is open for questions or comments
11 on this. Bill Thom?

12 MR. THOM: Basically, I have a
13 concern about old language being involved right
14 after -- just before what was formerly section A with the
15 indented paragraph there. And I would MOVE that that whole
16 section be stricken.

17 MR. FORTUNE: This is -- What
18 Bill is referring to is the -- what is actually a Rules
19 Committee ruling. It's a 1976 Rules Committee ruling
20 which he feels is kind of mischievous. And it's a little
21 tricky to amend a Rules Committee ruling. But we
22 certainly, as a Senate, can delete it. And so his motion
23 is to delete that.

24 MR. EDGERTON: Which one,
25 please?

26 MR. FORTUNE: It's in the --
27 It's on page four its asterisk in the middle of the page.
28 It says:

29 (Reading:) Faculty members with administrative
30 assignments of an academic nature which
31 constitute no more than half of their
32 current duties--the rest composed of
33 teaching and/or research--will be
34 construed as meeting the requirements of
35 "full-time faculty." 1976.

36 So that needs a second.

37 MS. STATEN: Second.

38 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Who did?

39 MS. STATEN: Staten,

40 S-t-a-t-e-n. Okay. Ruth Staten seconded. Okay. Now,
41 this is on the amendment only. So I'll ask the mover of
42 the motion to state the reasons for that.

43 MR. THOM: As I interpret what
44 I read there, first of all, it says, no more than half
45 of their current duties have to be an academic nature.
46 And then the rest composed of teaching and/or research.

47 One of the things that's obviously omitted, since changes
48 have been made in the Senate election process since 1976,
49 is a service component. And, also, in people in
50 administrative assignments like department chairs, we do

1 have some department chairs, like in agriculture, that
2 have more than 50 percent service appointment
3 responsibility because of what they were before they came
4 to be a department chair. But this basically excludes
5 anyone, as I interpret it, who would have a service
6 appointment. They could only be administration, teaching
7 and research.

8 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. So the
9 motion which has been seconded is to delete that Rules
10 Committee interpretation. Questions or comments on the
11 amendment? (No response.)

12 Okay. All in favor of the amendment,
13 signify by saying aye.

14 ("AYE" VOICE VOTE: MAJORITY)

15 MR. FORTUNE: Opposed say nay.

16 ("NAY" VOICE VOTE: TWO AUDIBLE)

17 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. The
18 amendment is adopted and that comment is delete -- or that
19 Rules Committee ruling is deleted.

20 Okay. Now, on the main motion, Hans
21 Gesund.

22 MR. GESUND: Question: The
23 faculty of the academic units shall conduct elections.
24 What happens if there's more than one academic unit that
25 has to elect one senator? And I believe Architecture is
26 lumped in with somebody else, as I recall.

27 MR. FORTUNE: I don't think so,
28 no.

29 MR. GESUND: They have a single
30 senator? So does Library, Science, et cetera?

31 MR. FORTUNE: Yes. All units
32 have at least one senator.

33 MR. GESUND: I see.

34 MR. FORTUNE: Other comments or
35 questions on the proposal? (No response.)

36 All in favor, signify by saying aye.

37 ("AYE" VOICE VOTE: ALL)

38 MR. FORTUNE: Opposed, say nay.

39 ("NAY" VOICE VOTE: NONE)

40 MR. FORTUNE: Good people, I
41 don't have anything else on the agenda. I don't know.
42 Would anyone -- This is the quickest I've ever gone
43 through a Senate meeting. Hans Gesund, do you have
44 something?

45 MR. GESUND: You had something.

46 MR. FORTUNE: What was it?

47 MR. GESUND: That was the
48 resolution. Didn't we have somebody -- a memorial
49 resolution?

50 MR. FORTUNE: Not this time.

University Senate Council Session - October 8, 2001

1 That was last time.
2 MR. GESUND: Oh. You've
3 had -- Then how come you had resolution?
4 MR. FORTUNE: Just if there are
5 any.
6 MR. GESUND: Oh. But we didn't
7 take up any resolutions?
8 MR. FORTUNE: Not this time.
9 Anything else? (No response.)
10 Well, good people, thank you for coming.
11 I'll see you next month.
12 =====
13 (SESSION CONCLUDED AT 3:42 P.M.)
14 =====

C E R T I F I C A T E

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)
)
COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

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

WITNESS my hand on this the 31st day of October 2000.

STEPHANIE K. SCHLOEMER