

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL

Regular Session

March 4, 2002
3:00 p.m.

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

Professor William Fortune, Chair

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

FREELANCE COURT REPORTERS & VIDEO SERVICES

STEPHANIE K. SCHLOEMER, PRESIDENT

10 NORTH UPPER STREET

P. O. BOX 85, LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40588

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

e-mail: ctreport@aol.com

WILLIAM FORTUNE, CHAIR

GIFFORD BLYTON, PARLIAMENTARIAN

CELINDA TODD, SECRETARY TO SENATE COUNCIL

JACKIE PERKINS, RECORDING SECRETARY

STEPHANIE K. SCHLOEMER, COURT REPORTER

VOTES TAKEN

(Page)

71

78

1 MR. FORTUNE: Thanks for
2 coming.

3 The minutes were available to you as you
4 came in. They were not distributed with the Agenda. If
5 there's any question about the minutes, we can hold off
6 approving them until April. So I could give you a moment
7 or two to look those over before I ask if there are any
8 objections or corrections.

9 And so to move on into Chair's
10 Announcements -- and then we'll come back to the minutes
11 -- since the last Senate meeting we met with both President
12 Todd and Provost Nietzel on separate occasions. Both of
13 the meetings were very productive, I think. We talked
14 to President Todd about organizational matters. We talked
15 to President Todd about town/gown relations. We talked
16 with President Todd about -- and I think you might recall
17 I brought this up before -- we talked to him about our
18 desire to have the Senate make appointments to the Athletic
19 Association Board and to the Hospital Board. Now, the
20 Bylaws and Articles of those two organizations are being
21 rewritten. We have informally asked to have a Senate
22 appointment to those two organizations.

23 With Mike Nietzel we talked primarily about
24 first-year matters, about -- Phil Kraemer is going to talk
25 about the First Year Committee in a little bit, but about
26 the retention issue. We talked with Provost Nietzel about
27 this issue of selective admissions, the matter which
28 surfaced in connection with the College of Communication's
29 proposal at the last Senate meeting.

30 Now, let's see ... By way of other
31 announcements, no rule waivers by the Senate Council since
32 last time. The Health Benefits Report you all have outs.
33 I don't think there's any need to go through that.

34 A possible meeting on April 22nd. I think
35 I noted that at the last Senate meeting. We will
36 definitely meet on April 8. That's a regularly-scheduled
37 meeting. I think there will be a number of Agenda items
38 at that time. As far as the 22nd is concerned, if there
39 are matters that we cannot deal with on the 8th, plan on
40 meeting on April 22nd.

41 And one other matter, and this is a bit
42 of a personal note. Paul Oberst died last Friday. And
43 I think we'll have a memorial in April; I hope we will.

44 But just to note for you the contributions that he made
45 to the University of Kentucky and to the University of
46 Kentucky Senate, he was a leader of the Civil Rights
47 Movement in the State of Kentucky. He was the first --
48 second Chair of the Human Rights Commission. He was a
49 long-time faculty member at the University of Kentucky
50 College of Law. He was a Chair of the Senate Council.

1 He was one of the first, if not the first faculty Trustee.
2 He was head of the AAUP. He was, in all respects, an
3 asset to the University of Kentucky. And he died last
4 Friday. His memorial was this morning.

5 Committee Reports, I think we have several
6 committees to report. Andy? Andy Spears.

7 MR. SPEARS: The Academic
8 Facilities Committee arranged a meeting with the
9 University Master Planners -- that's the firm, Ayers, Saint
10 Gross from the Baltimore area -- on February the 20th.
11 There weren't many of us there but we had quite a good
12 turnout of students. An Architecture and a Landscape
13 Architecture class came, as well as good representation
14 from the Academic Facilities Committee.

15 Subsequent to that, the Committee met on
16 the next morning and we generated several questions for
17 the planners which I took to the Steering Committee that
18 afternoon. And they gave us some pretty good answers to
19 most of the questions that we had asked. Stay tuned, there
20 may be another opportunity to meet with this group on April
21 the 3rd. We're working on that right now and there will
22 be an announcement very soon if that's possible. So that
23 process is perceived.

24 MR. CHAIRMAN: Brad Canon I saw
25 come in. Where did he go? Brad Canon has a report.

26 MR. CANON: Well, on the Board
27 of Trustees election, we did get into the *KERNEL* and even
28 into the *HERALD-LEADER*. So most of you probably know that
29 Mike Kennedy was elected to the Board of Trustees by your
30 ballots that we counted in the middle of February. Is
31 Mike here? If you don't show up, your office is forfeited.
32 (LAUGHTER)

33 MR. FORTUNE: I think Michael
34 deserves -- Let me say that this was not a chad-hanger,
35 as they say. I think Michael beat me by more than--

36 MR. CANON: I can give you the
37 numbers.

38 MR. FORTUNE: --George Bush --
39 Yeah, go ahead.

40 MR. CANON: I didn't want to...
41 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Embarrass.

42 (LAUGHTER)

43 MR. CANON: The three
44 candidates were Mike, Bill and Davy Jones. On the first
45 ballot Mike got 502 votes. Bill got 382 and Davy Jones
46 210. We then counted the second-choice ballots of the
47 Jones voters with Bill getting 40 and Mike getting 98.
48 And so the final ballot, with the second-choice voters
49 included, was Mike Kennedy 600, Bill 422. And there were
50 1,094 ballot votes cast, 1,022 on the second round.

1 MR. FORTUNE: Well, that was
2 something on the order of Johnson and Goldwater.

3 MR. CANON: Not quite.
4 (LAUGHTER)

5 MR. FORTUNE: But, in any event,
6 I think Michael deserves, in absentia, a round of applause.
7 He clearly has the mandate.
8 (APPLAUSE)

9 And I can go back to a normal life.
10 Bill Kraemer -- We have a First-Year
11 Committee that Mike Nietzel appointed and it's a pretty
12 exciting committee. Phil Kraemer is chairing that
13 Committee. And I'd like for Phil to give a brief report.

14 MR. KRAEMER: Well, I'll be very
15 brief because we've only had two meetings but the work's
16 in the future. We've got a good core of individuals who
17 are coming together. And a measure of their diligence
18 is that they have appeared at 8:00 in the morning to talk
19 about issues of undergraduate education.

20 The goal is to try to take some of the ideas
21 that we have floated here and have been lingering,
22 languishing perhaps, and to take some new ideas and really
23 focus this in a kind of package way so that we'd be able
24 to say to our undergraduates: Here's what we're going
25 to do to help you succeed, to foster engagement with the
26 institution, and then ask them to make some commitments
27 to us.

28 The proposals will focus on the first-year
29 experience, certainly, and try to find better ways for
30 our students to hit this campus with enthusiasm and a level
31 of commitment that will improve their success rates. But
32 we're also going to look at things like the graduation
33 contract, once that passes through the Senate Committee,
34 and a number of other ideas that are really meant to
35 highlight the nature of our undergraduate experience, both
36 in terms of faculty perspectives and in terms of the student
37 perspectives. And I'm excited about some of the ideas.

38 We'll be looking at a teleconference next week by an
39 organization that is regarded as the leader in retention
40 and other issues.

41 And any ideas you may have, please pass
42 those along. This is clearly one of those areas that we
43 have to have the cooperation of all faculty. It's a
44 collaborate adventure for us and I'm excited that we're
45 going to be able to really make some progress here quickly.

46 This is a committee that will have at least some very
47 concrete proposals out before the end of this term but
48 may also continue to work on some other issues as we move
49 ahead.

50 MR. FORTUNE: I didn't ask him

1 ahead of time but -- Yes, Ruth?

2 MS. STATEN: Where would you
3 find a list of members on the Committee?

4 MR. KRAEMER: I could post that
5 on the Undergraduate Education home page. I'll do that.
6 It has good representation, including members of the
7 Senate. Deans are representing the faculty and students,
8 of course. But I think it's a committee that also wants
9 to hear from anyone that has anything to say. And I will
10 take any idea at this point.

11 MR. FORTUNE: And closely
12 related to that, as you recall, the Senate has asked us
13 to move forward on the graduation contract. And Jeff
14 Dembo, who is here, is chairing that committee. And I
15 believe Jeff's committee has met once at this point. And
16 so that committee will be coordinating with Phil's
17 committee.

18 Do you have anything you'd like to say
19 with--

20 MR. DEMBO: In
21 contra-distinction to Phil's committee, we did not meet
22 at 8:00 in the morning. We also had catered food
23 available, you know.

24 (LAUGHTER)

25 We've only had one meeting so far. And
26 the goal that we have is first to determine whether or
27 not a need exists on campus for a graduation contract.
28 Secondly, if a need is determined to exist, is it feasible
29 to have such a thing. And then if it is feasible, what
30 are the different ways we can approach it. And then at
31 that point we'll bring our ideas back to the Senate and
32 the Senate Council for further hearing.

33 MR. FORTUNE: And one more
34 aspect of this whole issue of Undergraduate education,
35 but after the vote on the College of Communications
36 proposal, Mike Nietzel asked the Senate to declare a
37 moratorium on selective admissions proposals and to study
38 the issue, to appoint a committee to study the issue.
39 And I have not -- I was ill last week and haven't had
40 a chance to appoint the committee but I did look through
41 the Senate rules. And the variety of criteria for
42 selective admissions into the college and the different
43 standards within the colleges, it really is a -- It really
44 is a Byzantine thing. The selective admissions issue is
45 noted in the self-study report as something that needs
46 to be addressed. So I'm going to appoint a committee
47 shortly to try to get a handle on the selective admissions
48 in the Undergraduate colleges on a campus-wide basis.

49 MR. KRAEMER: Bill, could I make
50 one other quick--

1 MR. FORTUNE: Yes.
2 MR. KRAEMER: One of the issues
3 that we're trying to deal with, with this First Year Task
4 Force, is to try to collect ideas on traditions and
5 inaugural events. And each of you, no doubt, has attended
6 an undergraduate institution. So if you have any of those
7 traditions or ideas, pass those along. We need to begin
8 to find something that becomes the signature for
9 undergraduates attending the University of Kentucky. And
10 I think that would also help us in just getting engaged
11 and helping faculty to recognize that engagement. So pass
12 anything along to us. I will put on the website, maybe,
13 if I have the technical support, a way to communicate easily
14 with us.

15 MR. FORTUNE: Kaveh. Kaveh
16 Tagavi?

17 MR. TAGAVI: Yeah. The same
18 line of the previous request. Will we please be informed
19 who are on Jeff Dembo's committee, also?

20 MR. FORTUNE: Yes, we can do
21 that. I'll have Cindy do that.

22 Are there any other committee reports?
23 (No response.)

24 Okay. If not, there are no action items
25 today. We deliberately did not put any action items on
26 because we thought it was important to devote this session
27 of the Senate to the Futures Committee Report. And I will
28 just say, by way of introduction of Genia and David --
29 I think you probably know both Genia Toma and David Watt
30 -- that this was a very broad-based conscientious Committee
31 that worked over many, many hours, and I know because I
32 was there, that worked in good faith.

33 And while you might disagree with aspects
34 of the Committee's report -- you might feel that some of
35 the proposals are wrong, long headed or whatever -- I wish
36 that you would accord this Committee, and you'll see the
37 Committee membership when it's flashed up there -- I wish
38 you would show this Committee the respect that it deserves
39 for many, many hours of hard and conscientious work trying
40 to deal with what is obviously a very difficult charge.

41 And with that, I will introduce to you the
42 Co-Chairs of this Committee -- and they deserve a special
43 thank you -- Genia Toma and David Watt. I don't know how
44 they're going to present this. But, collectively, it's
45 yours.

46 (APPLAUSE)

47 MR. WATT: Thank you, Bill.
48 Can you hear me in the back?

49 (AFFIRMATIVE AUDIENCE RESPONSE)

50 MR. WATT: Good. I'd like to

1 begin by picking up where Bill left off, and that is that
2 I want to thank the members of the Committee. These
3 individuals attended many, many meetings over many hours.
4 We have not had an easy task before us. And I appreciated
5 the good thoughts that each one of them brought to this
6 process.

7 Let me also say that since last Friday I
8 have received, as you might guess, more than just a handful
9 of e-mail messages.

10 (LAUGHTER)

11 And I, too, want to commend the faculty
12 for the nature of these messages. Although they have
13 disagreed at times with the nature of some of our
14 recommendations, they have brought a level of civility
15 and discourse to those disagreements, which I think is
16 very helpful.

17 And I want to emphasize right at the outset
18 that this is not the final report. This is still very
19 much a work in progress. We felt it would be wrong for
20 us to simply issue a report and disappear into that
21 goodnight. Rather, we wanted to put forward our current
22 thinking on a variety of issues and let the faculty react
23 to this. And I suppose this is an opportunity for all
24 of us, an opportunity that we perhaps haven't seen for
25 a number of years. We, as a faculty, have a new
26 administration. We are excited about where the University
27 is going. And this is, for the first time in many years,
28 the opportunity for the faculty to participate
29 collectively in deciding what our future might look like.

30 I am going to talk briefly about a few of
31 the things that I presented last Friday. But rather than
32 bore everyone, I thought I might begin by asking for a
33 show of hands. How many of you endured Dave Watt's
34 presentation last Friday? Would you raise your hand if
35 you went to...

36 (SEVERAL HANDS RAISED)

37 All right. So I see a number of hands.
38 So I will give a somewhat abbreviated presentation.

39 I also want, in case I should forget at
40 the end, to thank Lisa Collins from the Graduate School
41 for her staffing of our Committee's effort. She handled
42 this gracefully and with professionalism that I can say
43 that I haven't seen in many others but, certainly, she
44 did a marvelous job.

45 All right. So the charge to our Committee.
46 And, unfortunately, we have been given this name, the
47 Futures Committee, which has led some to conclude that
48 we are to handle all things related to the future of the
49 University. And we've had a number of interesting e-mail
50 messages along those lines. In fact, our charge was fairly

1 specific: To assess the current status of the
2 University's scholarly and educational strengths, as
3 indicated in the first bullet; and then in the second,
4 to recommend seven to ten areas of contemporary scholarship
5 that should be the priorities for investment.

6 The committee essentially lumped the first
7 two of these charges together. And I will try and give
8 you a snapshot of where we are in that particular part
9 of our charge. And then I will turn it over to my Co-Chair,
10 Genia Toma, and let her talk about the third charge which
11 was to propose specific options for academic
12 restructuring.

13 Before I get to the recommendations, let
14 me talk a bit about the process that we followed. As Bill
15 indicated, we started meeting in August. We met with the
16 Provost to make sure that we understood precisely what
17 it was that he had in mind when he appointed this Committee.

18 We divided initially into subcommittees, one to look at
19 the priority areas for investments, the other to look at
20 restructuring. But we found, after a month or so of trying
21 that out, that it really was not workable. So we
22 reconvened as a Committee of the whole and basically
23 proceeded down the road in that fashion.

24 In our early meetings we decided we would
25 try and develop some guiding principles. These are the
26 six that we settled on. As we would debate the various
27 issues in our charge, we felt that number one should be
28 the issue of trying to serve students better, whether this
29 be through advising that might grow out of different
30 structural reorganizations or some other aspect of
31 building a program that might serve students well.

32 Achieve national prominence. We have a
33 good deal of discussion about this term "Top 20." I may
34 not like that particular terminology. I'd rather say that
35 we're working toward some form of national prominence for
36 many of our programs.

37 Streamlining administrative structure.
38 A good deal has been done along these lines by our
39 President, already.

40 And serving multidisciplinary interests.
41 All of us are aware that our disciplines are changing.
42 Boundaries are dissolving. And it is important that we
43 not necessarily erect barriers that would inhibit
44 multidisciplinary activities.

45 Then we want to respond better to the needs
46 of the Commonwealth. We recognize that there are many
47 constituencies out there. We have one group that is
48 exhorting us to look at those particular programs that
49 might lead to enhanced economic development. Those,
50 however, are simply one of the constituencies that we had

1 to listen to and try and respond to. We could not listen
2 to all of them. But we tried to, in fact, take into account
3 all of these various issues as we devised our list.

4 Finally, to invest in areas of current,
5 established strength. One of the temptations that you
6 face whenever there's new resources on the table is to
7 invest in some new program -- there are always new areas
8 of scholarly endeavor -- and we tried to resist this
9 temptation. It was our feeling that we needed to look
10 across the University for those key areas where there was
11 already some strength and to invest in those areas,
12 bringing them truly to national prominence.

13 What did we do? Well, in order to gather
14 data as a committee, we met with each and every Dean.
15 We met with Centers and Institute Directors. We held three
16 open meetings for the faculty. I will confess to you that
17 probably a number of you did not have the opportunity to
18 participate in those. Perhaps it wasn't clear exactly
19 what direction we were thinking of taking at that time.

20 Some came but perhaps not every voice was heard at that
21 point.

22 We solicited input from faculty via the
23 website. And, as I said, I guess I would have roughly
24 a ream of paper that I have printed out of e-mail messages
25 that have arrived since last Friday. And a number of you
26 solicited information prior to that, as well. And we have
27 carefully read that and tried to take that into account.

28 And we have been through, as listed here, a variety of
29 documents that we could obtain either from internal or
30 external sources in trying to evaluate programs.

31 So at the end of this process, we ended
32 up with nine areas that we will recommend. These are not
33 listed in priority order. These are simply an
34 alphabetical listing of those areas. Under each one of
35 these, we have listed a number of departments that might
36 in fact be eligible for funding. I will be glad to expound
37 on what some of those are, if you're interested in the
38 specifics.

39 I will tell you that we probably left a
40 few people off the list, judging from messages we've
41 received in the last week. Blame me. I'm the typist that
42 tried to put these together. Never attribute to some sort
43 of cunning what is probably better attributed to just
44 stupidity on my part in trying to assemble this perhaps
45 in too hurried a fashion.

46 We debated, I would say, some 40 odd areas
47 for a conclusion. We then had a series of votes by all
48 the participating members of the committee. And, based
49 on those votes, these were the nine that emerged as areas
50 worthy of investment. As I have said before, and hopefully

1 it will be repeated by you to your colleagues, we believe
2 that there are many more fine areas of scholarship than
3 the nine that we have listed here. We have selected these
4 nine simply because we think they are poised at this point
5 in time to achieve national prominence were we to infuse
6 additional resources into them.

7 Okay. With that, I will end my comments,
8 introduce my Co-Chair, Genia Toma, who will talk about
9 the restructuring part of our recommendations and we will
10 then throw the floor open for discussion and questions.

11 Genia.

12 MS. TOMA: Thank you. And I
13 want to thank David for taking care of things last Friday
14 when I was ill. I timed it perfectly. I couldn't get
15 out of bed for the presentation.

16 I'm going to talk about the restructuring
17 for a few minutes. And I wanted to tell you that we divided
18 this into three parts. When we looked at restructuring,
19 we thought about central administration, then colleges
20 and then finally centers and institutes, including
21 graduate centers. That was part of the charge that was
22 given to us explicitly at the beginning.

23 Our first recommendation has to do with
24 central administration. We argued that the President
25 should consider an immediate administrative structural
26 change that creates one central administrative body for
27 the academic units of the entire University. We debated
28 this for quite some time and discussed the merits of having
29 a central administrative team that's looking out for the
30 welfare of the entire University and in setting the values
31 of the entire University. And that's what we intended
32 with this recommendation.

33 We also had a recommendation that I don't
34 really think we should even talk about much, but to look
35 a little bit at the office of the vice president for
36 research and, in particular, thinking about how indirect
37 costs are distributed. Because this is one of the issues
38 that kept coming up to us when deans came to see us, when
39 we had some of the open forum for the faculty, and when
40 the center and institute directors came before us. So
41 we heard this a great deal. We are not making a specific
42 recommendation, just suggesting that this is something
43 that really merits some further review.

44 Then when we went to the colleges, we
45 started with one that came very much internally. There
46 are faculty within these groups that have been working
47 together and that had formed an external group and asked
48 an external group to come in and examine what was going
49 on with their groups. This was -- We've pulled from three
50 different groups, the College of Architecture, the

1 Department of Interior Design, and the Department of
2 Landscape Architecture. We are arguing that these groups
3 should be merged and form a new College of Design. This
4 is one that has truly risen from the faculty. It's bottom
5 up. And we are putting a stamp on something that an
6 external consultant has already argued. And we find merit
7 to this notion that these persons and these groups are
8 all looking at design issues and that they could benefit
9 by being in one administrative structure.

10 The next -- Once we started thinking about
11 this, when we -- if we pulled the Interior Design group
12 out of the College of Human Environmental Resources, there
13 is clearly a gap in that college. And then there is an
14 issue of, what is the research core that remains in the
15 College of Human Environmental Sciences? We talked about
16 this a great deal. We talked to faculty. We talked to
17 -- We got lots of inputs from this.

18 We went back to some of the reports that
19 were done earlier in the '90s, as many -- And many of
20 you may be familiar with the Hackbart Report that was done
21 in the early '90s. We pulled from a recommendation that
22 was made at that time. Some people have argued that it
23 would take 15 years to get things through at the University
24 of Kentucky. So you're just pulling on that and making
25 the same recommendation.

26 (PAUSE; FIRE ALARM TEST)

27 We are recommending the elimination of the
28 College of Human Environmental Sciences. We have
29 tentatively made some suggestions about the placement of
30 different areas that are currently in this. We
31 inadvertently left out one of the groups. And in the last
32 two weeks we've received many alternative recommendations
33 for where these groups should go. I might suggest again
34 that in terms of the faculty, many of the faculty
35 recommendations are not really arguing against the
36 elimination of the college but more where the specific
37 groups should go. So that is one of the issues that we
38 are still considering. And I'm not certain what we're
39 going to recommend at the end in terms of where the groups
40 might go.

41 Once we did -- After we did this one, we
42 went to another one that has, as were based on e-mails,
43 created a great deal of anxiety, consternation, certain
44 other adjectives that might be used to express this, the
45 College of Arts and Sciences. And I might tell you that,
46 again, our thinking on it originated from those faculty
47 forum when we had persons from the different groups coming
48 in arguing to us that the college does not work well.
49 So this was where the seed was planted.

50 And we started thinking about this and then

1 examining it. And, as we thought through the College of
2 Arts and Sciences, it did appear to us that this is a college
3 that has been, in some sense, a stepsister to what -- the
4 way it should have been if you think about what Colleges
5 of Arts and Sciences should be at the University of
6 Kentucky. It's been a poor college. It's been one that's
7 had lots of problems in terms of having highly-regarded
8 PhD programs and other graduate programs in the University.
9 Our notion was that we could strengthen this by thinking
10 about it in terms of the way that the groups are arranged,
11 in terms of disciplinary cohesion. We thought a great
12 deal.

13 A lot of our thinking behind this came from
14 looking at structures at the National Science Foundation
15 where there's funding for these different groups and how
16 they're structured, and also looking at it, I must confess,
17 from a book by E.O. Wilson called *Concilience*. So we were
18 thinking about all of these sorts of things as we
19 recommended that the College of Arts and Science be broken
20 into three new colleges. And what we suggested at the
21 time was a College of Science and Mathematics, a College
22 of Social and Behavioral Science, and a College of Arts
23 and Letters.

24 Our thinking was that the College of
25 Science and Mathematics would be from combining
26 departments that are currently in the college who, quite
27 frankly, feel that they have been subsidizing others within
28 their college, that the funding that they receive has not
29 been shared by these groups, and that they are being asked
30 disproportionately to fund others within the college and
31 that their argument is, that the funding realignments
32 should actually come from the entire University, not just
33 from this group. So all of these were elements of what
34 we were thinking.

35 I confess culpability on this next one.
36 We thought a great deal about this. This is a college
37 that if it were to occur, we believe, would be one of the
38 strongest colleges in the Institution. This would be a
39 College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. It's one where
40 if you put all the units together that we have suggested,
41 would have great funding potential at National Finance
42 Foundation, at the National Institutes for Health, several
43 different possibilities. And it is one that would really
44 bring together some of the social sciences that have not
45 been together at the University of Kentucky. And,
46 speaking again from -- as a social scientist myself, it's
47 one that I think would give it more credence than has been
48 given in the past. We would actually have a stronger
49 emphasis on Social Sciences. We've, again, been rather
50 weak at the University of Kentucky, from the opinion of

1 the committee, and this would be a move that we see as
2 strengthening Social and Behavioral Sciences here.

3 And, finally, we have two other suggestions
4 and we are not wedded to these. But one would be to take
5 the departments that now consist of what we would consider
6 the Humanities within the Arts and Sciences and combine
7 those with the School of Journalism and, also, the College
8 of Fine Arts to be a College of Arts and Letters. And
9 this would be a college, then, where we would have all
10 Humanities and Fine Arts under one administrative
11 structure. So, logically, we think it makes sense. Now,
12 I know some of you don't but we can discuss that.

13 (LAUGHTER)

14 And then, finally, and I've had many
15 discussions with people from the multidisciplinary groups
16 this week, what we would suggest is that this is something
17 that needs further consideration -- we aren't certain at
18 this point; this is something we're going to consider still
19 before we make a final recommendation -- where the
20 multidisciplinary groups that are currently within the
21 College of Arts and Sciences should be housed. One of
22 the things we've heard this week is that they should be
23 in a separate unit that really emphasizes
24 multidisciplinary. That's something we will take back
25 to the committee and consider. There are other
26 alternatives that we've heard. We're going to take all
27 of those back and consider them as we meet the next time.

28 Then we move to colleges and current
29 Medical Center. We heard lots of discussion about the
30 College of Allied Health and, really, questions raised
31 about what the research core is within the College of Allied
32 Health and how this college is integrated into other
33 programs within the Medical Center. Our committee did
34 not meet long enough, nor did we have enough information
35 to answer the kinds of questions that were raised by people
36 that came before our committee. So what we are doing is
37 not making a recommendation about the college but, instead,
38 recommending that another committee look at this and ask
39 questions very explicitly about the role of the College
40 of Allied Health in our University's future.

41 And then, finally, one of the things that
42 we were given by the Chancellor of the Medical Center was
43 a request to create a sixth college within the Medical
44 Center, a College of Public Health. Our committee looked
45 at this a great deal. We spent a great deal of time talking
46 about it, talking with the Chancellor, talking with others
47 about the College of Public Health. We were not able to
48 agree with the Chancellor that this is something that we
49 should be doing at this point in time.

50 Instead, what we suggest is that the

1 President should appoint another committee, and one with
2 scholarly credentials, that looked at what role Public
3 Health should play at the University of Kentucky, whether
4 there should be a School of Public Health and what, if
5 anything, its research mission should be, its scholarly
6 mission. What should its national -- What should we
7 focus on if we're striving for national prominence in these
8 colleges, in these different areas; where is it going to
9 be in a future School of Public Health, if there is to
10 be one. So we're recommending further discussion about
11 this issue.

12 We then turn to centers and institutes.
13 We were asked explicitly to discuss the current graduate
14 centers that answer to the Graduate School Dean. I will
15 give you, rather than the long report, the short report
16 in terms of our recommendations for these graduate centers.

17 We recommend that Toxicology stay where it is, that
18 Nutritional Sciences go to the College of Medicine,
19 Gerontology be folded into the Sanders-Brown Center on
20 Aging, which should then be folded into the College of
21 Medicine.

22 Biomedical Engineering came to us with a
23 request that they start an undergraduate degree program.

24 If so, it cannot be done under the current structure
25 reporting to the Graduate School Dean. We had a great
26 deal of discussion about which place it should go, whether
27 it should be Medicine or Engineering. We concluded
28 because it's fundamentally an Engineering program, that
29 this is where it should be, the College of Engineering.

30 And, finally, the Martin School and
31 Patterson School, which are the two current, in quotes,
32 Lexington Campus Multidisciplinary Programs that answer
33 to the Graduate School Dean, we have suggested that they
34 either stay with the Graduate School or if there is a new
35 College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, that this is
36 where they might best belong.

37 And then, finally, we had recommendations
38 concerning centers that do not provide degrees. And at
39 this point -- and again, this has not been a complete study
40 -- we still have much to go because there are many, many,
41 many centers on campus. But these are the ones that at
42 the moment that we're recommending stay independent,
43 report to the Vice President for Research. Many of these
44 have State mandates behind them that would make it
45 difficult to put them into a particular college. It would
46 make fulfilling that State mandate difficult. And so
47 we're recommending that they stay independent.

48 I think that is the fundamentals of what
49 we have suggested. As Dave said, this entire report was
50 presented to you as a means of starting discussion, not

1 as a means of suggesting that this is something that should
2 happen tomorrow. And it's not saying that anything that
3 we're recommending that we feel 100 percent certain that
4 we're right and that we're going to defend it until we
5 go down in flames. Okay? All of this is intended for
6 us to think about how we might look at us in the future
7 and whether there are some structural changes that we might
8 make that would truly enhance our program that would move
9 us further along as we try to achieve national prominence,
10 because our committee was committed to the notion that
11 achieving national prominence is something that we truly
12 want to do. Thanks.

13 MR. FORTUNE: I think David and
14 Genia will take questions and comments. And if you will,
15 as you know, we have a stenographic transcript made of
16 these proceedings. So when you speak, if you'll announce
17 your name.

18 Richard Labunski back there was the first
19 person, I think.

20 MR. LABUNSKI: Thank you. I'm
21 Richard Labunski from the School of Journalism and
22 Telecommunications. And I do want to preface my remarks
23 by commending the committee for its hard work. Nothing
24 I'm about to say should be interpreted as not appreciating
25 the difficult job that you all have undertaken.

26 MS. TOMA: We've heard that many
27 times in the week.
28 (LAUGHTER)

29 MR. LABUNSKI: Professor Toma,
30 I really have two questions for you. One is -- Our
31 faculty has met three or four times since this report.
32 I mean, we've been meeting constantly about this. And
33 the first question I have for you is: Do you want us to
34 simply say whether we support or are in favor of the
35 recommendations of the Futures Committee and leave it at
36 that, or do you want us to suggest an alternative? But
37 then I do have a second follow-up question. So can you
38 tell us what it is you would like the academic units to
39 do at this point in reacting to your report?

40 MS. TOMA: It would be helpful
41 to us if you do not simply say yes or no, but if you provide
42 us with an argument for why you're saying yes or no.

43 MR. LABUNSKI: And then I take
44 it, then, following up on that, you would like us to suggest
45 what an alternative would be.

46 MS. TOMA: Absolutely.

47 MR. LABUNSKI: Okay. Then the
48 other question, if I may, our school which is currently
49 in the College of Communications and Informational
50 Studies, everybody knows that because you wouldn't let

1 us raise our GPA last month.
2 (LAUGHTER)

3 Our school is in the College of
4 Communications and Informational Studies with the
5 Department of Communication and with the School of Library
6 and Informational Science. And we, of course, have a
7 Graduate program at the college level. My personal
8 opinion is that it ought to not be called the College of
9 Arts and Letters. It ought to be called the College of
10 Miscellaneous Departments.

11 (LAUGHTER)

12 We wonder what in the world we have in
13 common with Germanic language, French languages, Spanish,
14 Classical languages. I just wonder if the committee
15 really understands what the School of Journalism does,
16 the three majors within our school, Integrated Strategic
17 Communications, Telecommunications, Print and Broadcast
18 Journalism. That includes Public Relations and
19 Advertising. The idea that we would be separated from
20 our Graduate program so none of the JAT Faculty members
21 could participate in the Graduate program, as we know it,
22 and would then be moved over to be next door to Germanic
23 languages in a closet in POT, we just don't understand.

24 If somebody could explain to us why the School of
25 Journalism was ripped from its current place and tucked
26 over in the College of Miscellaneous Departments, I would
27 sure be interested to hear the answer.

28 MR. WATT: Well, I guess we
29 understand the gist of the message we're likely to receive.
30 (LAUGHTER)

31 But, you know, let me assure you that not
32 all of the departments that are in that list are
33 technologically backward. Many of the humanities are
34 moving more and more to be technology driven, which was
35 part of the point that I think you made with regard to
36 where Journalism is at this point in time. Is Journalism
37 well positioned if it were to be in a College of Arts and
38 Letters? A term that I prefer over the one that you
39 suggested. I don't know the answer to that. And I think
40 that that's up to the faculty. Remember, we're here to
41 engage in the discussion. We're not telling you what the
42 outcome is.

43 MR. LABUNSKI: Well, Professor
44 Watt, what led to the decision to move us away from the
45 other units of our college and put us over there, to begin
46 with?

47 MR. WATT: It was based upon
48 discussions with faculty group that that seemed an
49 appropriate position for the School of Journalism. And
50 you had a member of your college on that committee.

1 MR. LABUNSKI: Yes. Somebody
2 who remains in the college and is not over in the new College
3 of Miscellaneous Departments. So it's not exactly a
4 representative view of the School Faculty.

5 MR. WATT: You know, I'm not
6 sure that this is the forum for us to try and debate back
7 and forth as to what every member of our committee said.
8 We didn't do this in a cavalier fashion. We certainly
9 listened to arguments, just as we're inclined to listen
10 to your arguments.

11 MR. LABUNSKI: Okay.

12 MS. TOMA: Yes?

13 MS. JENG: Ling Hwey Jeng from
14 the School of Library and Informational Science. I'd like
15 to frame that question a little bit broader and to try
16 to understand from the committee's point of view what is
17 the rationale behind eliminating the College of
18 Communications and Informational Studies and put it
19 underneath another college.

20 MS. TOMA: One of the things we
21 did when we started looking at the college restructurings,
22 was to go to our benchmarks and look at the structures
23 of the benchmark institutions. And, of course, we were
24 more interested in going to look at universities that are
25 ranked higher than ours, as opposed to those who are ranked
26 lower than ours. And one of the things we found, is that
27 there are many institutions where colleges -- there are
28 no College of Communication but, in fact, it's in Arts
29 and Sciences, Arts and Letters, in a variety of
30 arrangements.

31 And so we could find no compelling argument
32 to keep a College of Communication separate and incur all
33 the different costs that are involved with having a
34 college, because it seems to us that at least within
35 Communications, for example, that it is a social and
36 behavioral science. And so why not bring it in with the
37 other Social and Behavioral Sciences.

38 MR. FORGUE: I'm Ray Forgue in
39 Family Studies. One question is more procedural. I
40 assume, then, based on the comments you're getting, you'll
41 be making final recommendations. If you could kind of
42 give us an idea of when that would be and then if you have
43 any clues as to when those suggestions or recommendations
44 that you make will begin to be operationalized in these
45 specific proposals.

46 MS. TOMA: We would hope that
47 within a couple of weeks our report will be finished.
48 That's our hope and that's what the Provost and President
49 have kind of suggested, that they would like to see
50 something within a couple of weeks. Implementation is

1 not ours. Implementation will be entirely left up to--

2 MR. FORGUE: (Unintelligible)

3 MS. TOMA: No.

4 MR. FORGUE: Okay. Let me
5 follow that up then with -- Not talking about the
6 structural aspects, but again going back to the nine areas
7 of emphasis that we initially talked about, to what degree
8 is that in the same kind of a frame where you're asking
9 for input on those and suggestions for additional ones?

10 MR. WATT: We're certainly open
11 to those suggestions, Ray.

12 MR. FORGUE: Because I'm
13 concerned that one of the bigger areas of need in this
14 Commonwealth has to do with things that relate to -- if
15 you look at a lot of measures of teenage pregnancies,
16 education level, things that based in the human capital
17 of this state are kind of left off that list. And something
18 that focuses on poisoning the Commonwealth to be ready to
19 participate in some of the very strong science areas that
20 you've talked about in that list would be a good addition
21 to this.

22 MR. WATT: Any suggestions that
23 you send to us, we will certainly take back to the
24 committee.

25 MR. FORGUE: Thank you.

26 MR. WATT: Mr. Tagavi.

27 MR. TAGAVI: You know, I
28 certainly have a lot of respect for the two of you. You
29 have gone boldly where no other man or woman would like
30 to go, voluntarily.

31 (LAUGHTER)

32 Having said that, I've been given these
33 recommendations and asked for input. My first input on
34 the surface is, I like it a lot. But if you wanted more
35 meaningful input from me, I would like to read for myself
36 the rationale that have gone into these decisions. Some
37 of them you have mentioned right now and I appreciate it
38 a lot. But, for example, I see you mentioned Toxicology
39 should remain. I'd just like to know why you have made
40 that decision, if it's possible. What I'm asking, is it
41 possible that you would share with us, before finalizing,
42 some of your rationales on these recommendations?

43 MS. TOMA: Well, that's what
44 we're trying to do when we come before you, is to provide
45 our rationale for what we're thinking and we're doing.
46 We are not -- We are not thinking about putting draft
47 proposals out there in terms of a written document.

48 MR. JOE _____: Well, but
49 you've given -- Joe _____, Department of Physics.
50 You have given us no reasoning for any of this. Dr. Watt's

1 presentation last Friday was to plunk down one new graph
2 over another of what the proposal was but with no
3 explanation for it. Every question you have heard is:
4 What is the rationale for? Now, I think that you could
5 give us a paragraph, at least an explanation. I went to
6 the web page fully expecting to find some more explanation
7 than the executive summary. That is all that's been
8 posted.

9
10 MS. TOMA: Well, one of the
11 reasons we cannot give you a written document behind this,
12 is the committee doesn't have one that has gone out of
13 our committee yet. We don't even have something that has
14 gone into written form that has been approved by the
15 committee that could be shared with you. We're still
16 working on this. It's work in progress. And, for that
17 reason, we just can't share it with you. I mean, we're
18 trying to do this so that we can provide some of the
19 arguments orally. And that will help us in constructing
20 the rest of the written draft.

21 MR. WATT: Joe, your position
22 seems to be one of, we should state exactly why we're making
23 a recommendation so that you can attack it. What we would
24 rather say to you is, if you look at the notion of a College
25 of Science, what in your mind are the pros and the cons?

26 MR. JOE _____: Yes. But
27 this means I'll never find out what anyone else ever thought
28 about it. It means the discussion is taking place entirely
29 in this vacuum. I would like to see, for example, an online
30 bulletin board where everybody's comments are out there.
31 We'd know more than we know now.

32 MS. TOMA: I don't know if we
33 can do that or not.

34 MR. WATT: I just don't know
35 what we can do in our time line, Joe, with what we've been
36 given. But I appreciate your point and I read your e-mail
37 message. It said essentially the same thing. Now, are
38 there other questions before we come back to you?

39 Yes. I'm sorry, I don't know your name.

40 MS. SCHMITT: My name is Laura
41 Schmitt. I'm a Graduate School Senator. I see here that
42 one of your guiding principles is to serve students better.
43 I also see that your sources of data are faculty forums,
44 meeting with the deans, the directors, faculty website.
45 What were your initiatives out there and when did you
46 address student forums or our concerns? Did you actively
47 ask for our opinions or are you just serving us better
48 through the faculty's opinions?

49 MS. TOMA: We did not have--

50 MS. SCHMITT: Stop and think of
that.

1 (LAUGHTER)

2 MS. TOMA: We did not have any
3 forum explicitly for students. We did solicit opinions
4 from faculty about their considerations, what would serve
5 students better.

6 MS. SCHMITT: Okay. On those
7 lines, before you make your final recommendations in two
8 to three weeks, would you perhaps try to have some type
9 of student forum? And if it doesn't work for you, we have
10 student government representatives that might be willing
11 to meet with you so that you don't have to do an entire
12 University forum. Would that be possible?

13 MR. WATT: We would be -- I would
14 glad -- I can't speak for my Co-Chair. But we will be
15 glad to meet with a group if that's important. We have
16 certainly received a number of messages from students in
17 the course of the last week and those will be read and
18 synthesized as we take things back to our committee.

19 MS. TOMA: Go ahead.

20 MR. THOM: Bill Thom from
21 Agriculture. I guess one of the questions or one of the
22 things I did not see was addressing any outreach or public
23 service, and particularly as those work together with
24 research and scholarly interest, or to identify what I
25 perceived was clientele problems that was mentioned in
26 terms of criteria. That sometimes is a very important
27 interaction that needs to take place even as you identify
28 areas of emphasis. And I didn't see anything resulting
29 from that or any recommendations or input or anything.

30 MS. TOMA: I actually think that
31 maybe it's because we didn't describe it when we were going
32 through. But, again, we talked about public service a
33 great deal. But, remember, when we're choosing the areas
34 of excellence, that we're starting with those programs
35 where there is some sense of national prominence, that
36 we think we could get there. One that I can point to very
37 explicitly that has large public service components to
38 it is the public policy area that we chose as an area of
39 excellence. It's one that has national prominence and
40 has a very active public service role. That's not to say
41 that's the only place. But many of the public service
42 dimensions of what the University does can be captured
43 through that.

44 MR. WATT: In the back, yes?

45 MS. WALDHART: Enid Waldhart in
46 Communication. I have a question about the seven to ten
47 areas. I guess I would like to know how you see these
48 defined in terms of forever. These are areas of strength
49 that we would like to emphasize. But does this mean that
50 forever after, that's all we'll get? Okay.

1 MR. WATT: Enid, that's come
2 through in a number of e-mail messages. We believe that
3 our report probably has a finite lifetime, let's say,
4 somewhere between two to five years. My guess is that
5 three years from now, if we are fortunate enough to again
6 have a governor interested in making an investment in this
7 University, it would behoove us to get another faculty
8 group together and go over this again. So we are not
9 proposing that this will be carved on stone tablets and
10 set up in front of the Administration Building. We think
11 it is a -- you know, a list that will evolve and change
12 over time.

13 It would have been a hell of a lot easier
14 for us if we had been allowed to construct a list of 40-odd
15 categories. I actually argue just the opposite; I argue
16 that we ought to choose four or five areas. Again, many
17 would recognize that they would not be on that list. And
18 we would really be forced to argue for only the very best.

19 But here we are. We were given seven to ten as our charge
20 and we've done our best. Now, we're hearing from faculty
21 that we neglected this area; we forgot about this group.

22 We'll go back to the committee and see how they feel about
23 it.

24 Yes?

25 MS. JENG: Jeng.

26 MR. WATT: Go ahead.

27 MS. JENG: Another aspect that
28 I have not seen addressed in the report is the aspect of
29 professional schools. And because the Library and
30 Informational Sciences, for example, is a professional
31 school in most major universities. It is, you know, a
32 separate college or a separate school, graduate school.

33 And Journalism has a big component of professional
34 services. A big part of Communications also have a
35 component of professional services. And I wonder how the
36 committee see the whole mission of professional services
37 within the colleges.

38 MR. WATT: Well, of course,
39 there are many professional programs at the University
40 and we recognize that. But we did not -- Our charge was
41 not: How do we elevate the stature and improve the quality
42 of professional services? Our charge from the Provost
43 was: What programs are positioned for national
44 prominence? Now, if those programs happened to fall
45 within colleges that currently house largely or
46 exclusively professional degreed programs, sobeit. And,
47 if not, then we needed to move on. So we did not use that
48 as a sole criteria for judging who's in or who's out,
49 anymore than we chose grant dollars for making decisions.

50 MS. JENG: The reason I asked

1 that is that we do see around many of the faculties within
2 the college that there is a big major component of
3 professional services, which is not always weak when it
4 comes to national prominence. And we do see that across
5 several disciplines in the college.

6 MR. WATT: Well, I'm not sure
7 of the argument you're trying to make. Are you making
8 the case that since you do have a large professional
9 program, you shouldn't be expected to meet the same
10 standard as a college that does not?

11 MS. JENG: Absolutely not.
12 That was not the case at all. That wasn't in my argument
13 at all. My argument is that a professional school is just
14 as comparative and could -- could achieve national
15 prominence just like any other school. But the mission
16 of a professional school is slightly different, the major
17 is slightly different from a research--

18 MS. TOMA: I think we recognize
19 that. All of us were very aware of that. That's a role
20 of a professional school.

21 Don? If you're mean, I'm taking those Girl
22 Scout cookies back.

23 MR. GROSS: Don Gross,
24 Political Sciences. From listening to the report and
25 recommendations, you said the President should consider
26 eliminating, merging, et cetera. There only seems to be
27 one exception to that, and that's that the President should
28 invite the faculty of the Department of Econ, Ag Econ.
29 Does that imply that they have a choice and no one else
30 does--

31 (LAUGHTER)

32 MR. GROSS: --or is this an
33 ambiguity where they're going to be placed?

34 MR. WATT: The committee was
35 divided on those particular departments. And so that was
36 the language that we crafted for those particular
37 departments, namely, the President should invite them.
38 But we recommended to the President that he certainly
39 consider doing all of them. Should we have swept them
40 all into the same language? Probably.

41 MS. ARTHUR: Mary Arthur,
42 (inaudible). Maybe you've said this and I just didn't
43 get it.

44 COURT REPORTER: I didn't get
45 your name. I'm sorry.

46 MS. ARTHUR: Mary Arthur. It's
47 unclear to me how you identified and selected the
48 departments that would fit into each of your areas of
49 excellence. Can you say more about how you selected those
50 individual departments?

1 MR. WATT: We did our best to
2 basically rely on the committee and the information we
3 had in front of us. And, as I said at the outset, is it
4 a perfect list of departments under each of those? No.
5 And, Mary, if we left you out and you feel you have a
6 role to play in one of those, then, by all means, let us
7 know. Give us the argument as to why you should be
8 included.

9 MS. ARTHUR: That wasn't my
10 point. But -- Right.

11 MR. WATT: Okay. So what is
12 your point, Mary? I'm not trying to evade your question.

13 MS. ARTHUR: It's unclear to me
14 how you selected those, what the criteria were for
15 identifying those individual departments, whether those
16 are departments with excellence throughout the entire
17 department or whether they had to have 50 percent of their
18 faculty engaged in excellent work or just what that process
19 was by which you said, here's a department that belongs
20 in this. I mean, it's really not a personal concern about
21 my department, which I'm not surprised was left off the
22 list.

23 MR. WATT: Well, let me say,
24 well, it's not an easy matter to basically say, here are
25 the -- here's the one or two things that we looked at in
26 order to decide which of these thematic areas we would
27 pick and which departments would be on the list. We did
28 our best to rely on committee information, data that we
29 had accumulated internally, in order to decide that in
30 some cases there were clearly nationally prominent
31 figures, based on invitations to meetings, presses that
32 were accepting their books, grant and contract dollars,
33 and that these individuals would likely be part of a program
34 that would fit that thematic area.

35 MS. TOMA: And some of this
36 information came to me--

37 MR. WATT: You're still not
38 satisfied. So, you know, ask the question again. No?

39 MR. GOVINDARAJULU: My name is
40 Govindarajulu from Statistics. I would like to commend
41 you with the very bold and provocative suggestions. And,
42 number two, I have a couple of suggestions for the
43 committee. One is, they identified only nine areas based
44 on an existing standard. If I were to truly buy my stocks
45 on the stocks that have five stars, morning stars, they
46 may not do well next year, for example. So I suggest that
47 the recommendation to have another set of departments and
48 programs which have a very promising, aspiring to a
49 national prominence.

50 Number two, the committee has not addressed

1 one question. Has it done anything on cost effectiveness
2 of this restructuring? If they can show it is cost
3 neutral, can save some money and throw some resources at
4 some college which is battered and bruised like the Arts
5 and Sciences, it would be very helpful.

6 Number three, I hope your committee will
7 not go out of business in two weeks. I would like the
8 committee to go on and look at other areas like the future
9 of the LCC and some of the other pressing questions.

10 MR. WATT: Speaking for my
11 Co-Chair, we very much want to go out of business.
12 (LAUGHTER)

13 Let's see ... With regard to your point
14 that we should anoint a group of departments to be in the
15 "Reedy" terminology of tier- two departments, we resisted
16 that temptation. Yes, it was there and we discussed
17 whether to do that. Clearly, as I said, our job would
18 have been a lot easier to put 50 names on a list and then
19 let someone else select who really gets the resources.
20 Instead, we tried to do the difficult thing which was to
21 hone it down to a handful of those units that we really
22 felt were deserving. I'm certain that if we constructed
23 a list of tier-two departments, we would generate another
24 couple of hundred e-mail messages as to, "Why aren't we
25 on that list," as well.

26 And, finally, with regard to this issue
27 of cost effectiveness, it's a perfectly valid point. All
28 I can tell you is that we met for hundreds of hours and
29 wrestled with things. Frankly, I wish we had more time,
30 given the size of our charge and the difficulty of our
31 charge. We did not do the type of calculation that you
32 are suggesting. We basically divorced ourselves from
33 issues of finances. Perhaps that was foolish but,
34 frankly, we just did not have the time to delve into it.
35 Dan?

36 MR. ROWLAND: Dan Rowland from
37 the U.K. Center of the Humanities, from the Department
38 of History. This is a kind of related question. I think
39 there's a lot of anxiety that's been raised by the
40 conversations that you all have started about the creating
41 of a sort of set of "haves" and "have not" groups with
42 some groups wanting more funding in order to be able to
43 pursue their research. This has come out in some of the
44 questions in public forum and has been part of e-mail
45 conversations that I've seen. And other groups, seeing
46 as how budgets are zero to some gains, other groups seems
47 like being pushed further outside of something. Now, this
48 is just an anxiety I've heard from many people.

49 I don't know whether it's something --
50 whether that's also something you didn't consider or

1 whether -- how you felt funding for these new specialty
2 three-college -- those colleges that were to be placed
3 in the College of Arts and Sciences would work. My own
4 feeling is that the College of Arts and Sciences has been
5 suffering a lot because it's had an annual \$1 million
6 deficit that has been taken from it in taxes. And maybe
7 the problem is not the structure of the College of Arts
8 and Sciences but with the money that's given to them.

9 (APPLAUSE)

10 MS. TOMA: You asked several
11 questions there. So I don't know where you want to start
12 with. But we'll go back to the anxiety that's being
13 created by haves and have-nots. The first thing I wanted
14 to say though is, we did not define this task. The task
15 was given to us. We were asked to do what we have done.

16 And so to the extent that this was not, in quotes,
17 something that should be done, I think needs to be taken
18 up with people higher than us, because we were just doing
19 what we were asked to do.

20 MR. ROWLAND: But you make
21 recommendations that have consequences. So then one has
22 to deal with--

23 MS. TOMA: Because that's what
24 we asked to do.

25 MR. ROWLAND: Right.

26 MS. TOMA: And have we made it
27 better or worse? We think we are doing things to make
28 it better. If we're not making it -- Our intent with
29 this restructuring was to actually raise everybody in terms
30 of could rise in potential so that -- In fact, maybe there
31 are redistribution questions here that need to be addressed
32 by the central administration, and that those shouldn't
33 be relegated to a single college but, in fact, that this
34 is a University question--

35 MR. ROWLAND: Yeah.

36 MR. TOMA: --and that it needs
37 to be really addressed at the central administrative level
38 of how you help those programs that cannot fund themselves.

39 Because, clearly, there are programs within the
40 University that are never going to be self-financing.
41 We recognize that. But we think that it's something that
42 the University needs to look at centrally.

43 MR. WATT: On the anxiety issue,
44 let me say that we've received a number of messages from
45 students fearful that their fellowships will be taken away
46 at the end of the month, even assistant professors who
47 wondered if they needed to look for a job. We certainly
48 have tried to respond personally to each one of those to
49 assure them that ultimately the decisions are made by this
50 body, not our committee but this body. You ladies and

1 gentlemen are really going to decide what, if anything,
2 is done with this report. And I think you need to basically
3 carry that message forward to your departments, your peers,
4 that this is a deliberative process in which the Faculty
5 Senate will play the key deciding role.

6 MR. ROWLAND: Okay. Thank you.

7 MR. WATT: Yes?

8 MS. DEBSKI: Liz Debski,
9 Biology. And I hate to get back to this point but you've
10 led me to it. Since we will ultimately have to decide,
11 I'd like to know what kind of data we'll be provided with
12 to decide. So as you were talking about reorganization
13 and this was the way our benchmarks did these things, I'm
14 wondering, you know, did you have the time to actually
15 collect much data regarding how that structure was working
16 out for them. Just because of the fact they have that
17 structure doesn't mean that it is the correct structure,
18 a positive step and, you know, all those kinds of things
19 that I think have been said.

20 MS. TOMA: You can think about
21 the answer to this. We started this in August.

22 MS. DEBSKI: Yeah, exactly.

23 MS. TOMA: This is a huge task.
24 We started with nothing on the plate except past reports
25 that have been done by the University. So we have taken
26 those reports; we have taken the things that we could get
27 rather easily--

28 MS. DEBSKI: Yes.

29 MS. TOMA: --and take notes.
30 Have we done a detailed assessment of which colleges, which
31 college structures? We didn't have time.

32 MS. DEBSKI: Right. But who is
33 going to collect that data? I mean, are you then expecting
34 this study--

35 MR. WATT: We anticipate that
36 the Provost would appoint an implementation committee;
37 that that implementation committee will certainly need
38 to drill further into the data, which I think you and I
39 would both agree, is necessary to make ultimately an
40 intelligent decision on any of these recommendations.
41 On first pass, as best we are able with whatever information
42 we could get, with whatever voices came to us that we heard
43 and listened to, we tried to make recommendations.

44 MR. EDGERTON: Lee Edgerton,
45 Animal Sciences. This is just a repeat because I didn't
46 quite understand the answer. But with respect to the issue
47 of faculty being invited, do you envision that there will
48 be some departments that would be invited and then split
49 up so that half remain in the current college and half
50 go to a new program or -- I just didn't understand what

1 the answer was.

2 MR. WATT: You ultimately leave
3 -- The authority for what happens with any department
4 is going to rest with this body. It would have to come
5 forward as a proposal, you know. You've probably seen
6 these proposals over the years. I remember when Computer
7 Science moved from the College of Arts and Sciences to
8 the College of Engineering, the amount of effort that went
9 into basically documenting that the faculty were
10 supportive and wanted that transition to take place. We
11 would anticipate, with any of our recommendations, there
12 will have to be a similar group of faculty which will study
13 this.

14 MS. TOMA: I guess I'd like to
15 share. One of the questions that drove our committee as
16 we kept thinking about this -- Because it's the structural
17 issues that people are having the most anxiety about.
18 One of the questions that the committee kept coming back
19 to was: Are we the best that we can be at the University
20 of Kentucky currently? Is our structure such that change
21 should not be considered? And as we thought about that
22 question, that drove a lot of our decisions to recommend
23 that we at least think about some alternative ways of
24 structuring our programs.

25 The underlying objective, again, as we've
26 said throughout, was to think about how we could make us
27 better, we can elevate the programs, the academic programs
28 throughout the University. And we think that this
29 committee -- Dave and I are deeply appreciative to this
30 committee. You cannot imagine the number of hours that
31 have gone into this. We have had multiple four-, six-hour
32 sessions, eight-hour sessions. And the group has worked.
33 And I can truly say that they have given it their all
34 in terms of thinking about what's best for the Institution.

35 And, Bill, maybe that could be where we
36 -- Maybe you could decide whether this is the end.

37 MR. FORTUNE: I don't know.

38 (LAUGHTER)

39 Kathi Kern on the--

40 MS. KERN: I do agree--

41 MR. FORTUNE: --back has a
42 question.

43 MS. KERN: And I think I -- I
44 have another question--

45 MS. TOMA: Oh, great. I'm
46 sorry.

47 MS. KERN: --just to prolong
48 your agony a little bit longer. I'm Kathi Kern from
49 History and what is still known as the College of Arts
50 and Sciences. And I guess I would want to first of all

1 raise a question about benchmarks. We hear that language
2 trodded out in certain arguments. The colleague from
3 Journalism wants to know. Your response is, we looked
4 at our benchmarks and we did not see a benchmark with a
5 separate college of communications. In the College of
6 Arts and Sciences, we are not aware of--

7 MS. TOMA: There are, but not
8 uniformly.

9 MS. KERN: I'm sorry?

10 MS. TOMA: There are colleges
11 of communications but it's not uniformly.

12 MS. KERN: It's not uniformly.
13 Okay. So one of the issues we raised two weeks ago when
14 David was before us, was this issue of benchmarks and
15 colleges of arts and sciences. And we were not, as a
16 college -- I think I can speak of a college senator --
17 terribly satisfied with what we had found on our own, which
18 was, I believe, Ohio State and University of Arizona as
19 benchmarks with similar organizations. So I'm wondering
20 if the benchmark issue is one that is considered with the
21 disaggregation of the College of Arts and Sciences.

22 And then my second question is: Many of
23 us are very concerned about the invisibility of
24 undergraduate education as a priority reflected in any
25 of this, in either of the two pieces of the puzzle here.

26 So I'd like to hear how you'd like to address that.

27 MR. WATT: Kathi, benchmarks
28 that we looked at in this list was compiled by one of our
29 committee members, was only one piece of information that
30 we looked at in trying to make a recommendation. And we
31 found that there were some colleges of arts and sciences,
32 as I said a week ago Friday, that were larger and embraced
33 still other units like Economics and Communications, and
34 some which were divided into the component parts.

35 We're proposing this one for a number of
36 reasons, not simply because some other university that
37 we admire has done this. We think some of the issues are,
38 and I'm not sure I can go through all of these, but at
39 least some of them, in my mind -- let's put it that way
40 -- are: Does the dean adequately represent the
41 departments and faculty and students and staff at the table
42 where resources are ultimately awarded? When was the last
43 time this institution built a building that basically would
44 serve the humanities and fine arts? Does that dean really
45 understand enough of those disciplines, that he or she
46 can recruit quality faculty members to serve our students
47 well.

48 And, again, I perhaps shouldn't say this
49 but I've received a few e-mail messages from members of
50 the faculty which, if I took out the titles and headings

1 and showed them to you, I think you would be appalled at
2 what you would read.

3 So I think that the issue of what the nature
4 of the faculty are and whether those faculty and students
5 are being well served by a dean, was far more important
6 to us than whether one institution had divided them up
7 or left them altogether. And we were also aware in our
8 discussions with people who had attended some of these
9 institutions where they were grouped together, allegedly,
10 as a whole that, in fact, they did functionally behave
11 as three independent units. There were essentially
12 division leaders in those three areas. But don't get hung
13 up on the benchmarks. I mean, I heard Kevin recite the
14 list. I was there.

15 MS. KERN: I know you were. But
16 this is the problem when the rationale -- Everybody, David,
17 from every possible disciplinary perspective, is asking
18 for the -- If I'm a historian, I rely on documents and
19 evidence. The person from statistics -- People want,
20 they want to see how the formula got worked out. So if
21 it's not provided, then we grope for whatever little bit
22 you're throwing us. And so if it's benchmarked on one
23 question, okay; let's look at the benchmark issue, you
24 know. If it's something that's coming from the bottom
25 up, a faculty concern for the College of Design, then let's
26 find out how that played into it, I mean. But it builds
27 the climate of suspicion and conspiracy when there's not
28 a document.

29 And I understand, you know, you feel like
30 you're already being attacked for an overhead, you know,
31 God forbid, a document.

32 (LAUGHTER)

33 But it just makes people -- You know, it
34 makes people have to try to fill in the blanks as best
35 they can. And that's where the anxiety comes from.

36 MS. TOMA: Well, our best e-mail
37 so far was one sent today that said, "Too bad you're here.
38 Some village is missing its idiot." So that--

39 (LAUGHTER)

40 But, you know, I think it would be -- I
41 think a lot of you should go back and talk to your deans.

42 We asked each dean to come before us and present the
43 scholarly mission of your college. This was way back in
44 the early part of our process. And I think it would be
45 fruitful for you to go back and talk to your deans about
46 how they see the scholarly missions of your college and
47 see to what extent that the deans can represent the full
48 breadth of what's going on in these different colleges
49 and the strengths of the different colleges.

50 MS. GONZALEZ: Lori Gonzalez,

1 Allied Health. I'll just follow up on that comment that
2 my understanding is our dean had an hour, 15 minutes to
3 present the breadth of research in our college and then
4 45 minutes for questioning. So to say that they may have
5 represented us well or not is a little bit difficult, I
6 think, in 15 minutes. It sort of goes to all the pieces
7 of evidence that were used when you made the
8 recommendations.

9 MS. TOMA: And we've been
10 criticized by the centers because they got -- each director
11 got ten minutes. And they've said there's no way that
12 we could adequately understand. So we've had to use pieces
13 from the information they provided us with other bits of
14 information that we can get. And, again, we have a time
15 constraint. If you remember, when we were charged to do
16 this, we were assigned this responsibility in August and
17 asked to have it finished by December 31st.

18 MR. WATT: But it's a perfectly
19 valid criticism, that we did not have as much information
20 or as much time as even we would have liked to deliberate
21 these issues, for all the hundreds of hours that we met
22 together.

23 MS. TOMA: Which is also why we
24 continue to say, this is a document that we're only using
25 to open conversation.

26 MR. WATT: Liz?

27 MS. DEBSKI: I was just going
28 to ask you, then, why or whether you did consider just
29 reducing the task a little to actually provide some of
30 the documentation with regard to a more narrow focus?
31 I mean, because clearly you were under incredible time
32 constraints. But the answer that, well, the center people
33 only got ten minutes to provide the breadth is not really
34 going to speak to the concerns of these people here.

35 MS. TOMA: We went back and
36 talked to people about our charge and the magnitude of
37 the charge. And we were reassured that this was the charge
38 that was before our Task Force.

39 MR. WATT: By the end of
40 December we basically had hammered out most of the nine
41 areas. That's where we were. And we then took on the
42 restructuring piece. And we were notified that our report
43 needed to be in by the 15th of February in order to have
44 some impact on any budgetary decisions that might be made
45 next year. Then we shifted into high gear and worked as
46 hard as we could to try and hammer out those. They had
47 always been a sub-text in part of our discussion ever since
48 August. But, yes, we faced a daunting challenge for the
49 time frame that we had.

50 And could there have been two committees

1 that looked at this? Absolutely. Could there have been
2 a third committee that wrestled with how undergraduate
3 education ties into the success of the graduate enterprise
4 and how that might be strengthened? Of course.

5 Ray.

6 MR. FORGUE: I think a lot of
7 the anxiety seems to stem from a concern that the process
8 for this is whereby that the recommendations are going
9 to be the -- whatever recommendations do come out, are
10 going to be the thing. And the degree to which you can
11 continue, as you've said, to reassure people that this
12 is going to be something that's going to be talked about
13 further and that a further climate can occur even after
14 your recommendations are made, will be very helpful to
15 people.

16 MS. TOMA: One more time. This
17 is the group that ultimately decides.

18 MR. CANON: Well, no, it isn't.
19 We make recommendations to the President but they're not
20 binding on the President.

21 MR. KRAEMER: And we don't
22 decide the areas.

23 MS. TOMA: Not the areas, you
24 don't decide. That's right.

25 STUDENT: When your committee
26 ends their final report in two to three weeks, are we going
27 to be given a disclosure of everything that you've found
28 out?

29 MS. TOMA: Yes.

30 MR. WATT: There's a question
31 in the back.

32 MS. GAETKE: I've been trying
33 to insert one here. But I guess I'm -- Now, I'm gathering
34 that this was based pretty much on what our Dean presented.

35 But I'm from -- Lisa Gaetke from the College of Human
36 and Environmental Sciences. And there is strong
37 opposition in my college, as you can imagine. I'm

38 wondering if any history of what had gone around in our
39 college was considered, because many a good years ago --

40 Well, actually, your recommendation was for some of us
41 to go to the College of Agriculture. Many years ago we
42 came out of the College of Agriculture. And I'd hate to
43 think we're going backwards rather than going forwards.

44 So I hope some of that will be considered.

45 MS. TOMA: The main thing --
46 That was one part of what we looked at. That was a part
47 of the input into the whole process. And, yes, we did
48 look at the history.

49 MR. FORTUNE: I do have one item
50 of business. And then I want to thank Genia and David.

1 And the item of business is simply that I forgot to have
2 the minutes approved. These minutes were distributed as
3 you came in. If there are no additions or corrections,
4 they'll stand approved as distributed.

5 Okay. John Piecoro.

6 MR. PIECORO: May I make a short
7 announcement about self-study?

8 MR. FORTUNE: Absolutely.

9 Let me see if there are any additions or
10 corrections, first. (No response.)

11 Okay. If not, the minutes will stand
12 **APPROVED** as distributed.

13 John Piecoro wanted to make an announcement
14 about self-study.

15 MR. PIECORO: I know all of you
16 are aware that we're going to be visited soon by a peer
17 review team from SACS. That will take place April 15th
18 through the 18th. The key days where you might be involved
19 are April 16th and 17th. We were notified last week about
20 who our visiting committee is. And we've notified our
21 various Chairs about that and the Deans of the Colleges.
22 That information will be on the web soon, along with the
23 charges of the respective committee members. They will
24 want to meet with you. So on April 16th and 17th is when
25 they will be largely doing that.

26 The kinds of things that they'll be
27 interested in are your mission statements of your college
28 or department, strategic plans, how they dovetail with
29 the University's strategic plans; your planning and
30 assessment, and actually what you do with that once you've
31 done that. So those are some of the things that I know
32 they will want to talk with you about.

33 MR. FORTUNE: John, do you have
34 a hard copy of the self-study available for senators and
35 the like?

36 MR. PIECORO: Yes.

37 MR. FORTUNE: Do you have some?

38 MR. PIECORO: We are
39 distributing hard copies now. And, also, it's on the web
40 in pretty much everything we have. We have a limited
41 number that we can give out. At this time I'm not sure
42 how many of those hard copies we can give out. We can
43 put some here in the library.

44 MS. WALDHART: We've got them,
45 John.

46 MR. PIECORO: Do you?

47 MS. WALDHART: Yes.

48 MR. PIECORO: Okay.

49 MR. FORTUNE: You do?

50 MS. WALDHART: We have the --

1 They're on reserve here in the library.
2 MR. FORTUNE: And, Michael,
3 would you like to -- Michael Kennedy is here now.
4 Michael, would you like to say a few words? This is our
5 newly-elected Trustee. We're already given you a round
6 of applause before you got here.
7 (LAUGHTER)
8 MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. I
9 would like to ask one question about the restructuring.
10 We've done a survey in Arts and Sciences of the faculty
11 and about two-thirds of the faculty responded. Would that
12 be something that would be put on the website for the
13 Futures Task Force?
14 MR. FORTUNE: Genia says okay.
15 MR. KENNEDY: Okay.
16 MR. FORTUNE: Well, I guess just
17 e-mail it to Genia.
18 Jeff Dembo?
19 MR. DEMBO: Would it be out of
20 order, Mr. Chair, to introduce a motion from the floor?
21 MR. FORTUNE: It might be.
22 What is it you want to introduce?
23 MR. DEMBO: In essence, to
24 instruct -- on the behalf of the University Senate to
25 instruct the administration to create or maintain a
26 bulletin board so that the ongoing dialogue can continue
27 about the Futures Committee.
28 MR. FORTUNE: Normally, on a
29 motion like that, we'd have to have -- Well, in terms
30 of parliamentary procedure, we will have to have a motion
31 to receive it without the ten-day notice and that will
32 have to be seconded. And then the body will have to vote
33 on that. And then your motion might be heard. Do you
34 understand? So if you would like to have -- You make
35 the motion to waive the ten-day notice as far as hearing
36 your motion, your oral motion, and we have a second on
37 that and then the vote, discuss that.
38 MR. DEMBO: I make a motion to
39 suspend the Senate Rules for this motion.
40 MR. FORTUNE: Is there a second?
41 MR. JANOSKI: Second.
42 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Who
43 seconded?
44 MR. JANOSKI: Tom Janoski.
45 MR. FORTUNE: Tom Janoski.
46 Okay. Okay. So the motion is to suspend the notice
47 requirements so that the Senate can vote on an oral motion.
48 Would you like to state your motion?
49 MR. DEMBO: The motion will be
50 that the University Senate would instruct the

1 administration to create and maintain an unmoderated
2 bulletin board accessible to all members of the University
3 community for the purpose of continuing the dialogue
4 regarding the future of the University.

5 MR. FORTUNE: That will be the
6 motion that will be voted on or will be considered if the
7 motion to approve the -- to waive the ten-day notice rule
8 is approved. Okay. So is there any discussion of the
9 motion to waive the ten-day notice rule? (No response.)

10 Okay. All in favor, signify by saying aye.
11 ("AYE" VOICE COUNT: ALL)

12 MR. FORTUNE: Opposed, say nay.
13 ("NAY" VOICE COUNT: NONE)

14 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Now,
15 restate your motion again.

16 MR. DEMBO: The motion is, on
17 behalf of the University Senate, we are instructing the
18 administration to create and maintain an unmoderated
19 bulletin board accessible to all members of the University
20 community for the purpose of continuing the dialogue
21 regarding the future of the University.

22 MR. FORTUNE: Second to that
23 motion?

24 MS. STATEN: Second.

25 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Ruth
26 Staten seconds.

27 Okay. Discussion on the motion?

28 MR. EDGERTON: Bill--

29 MR. FORTUNE: Lee Edgerton.

30 MR. EDGERTON: --just a
31 question. Can we define what is meant by "unmoderated"?
32 I'm a little concerned about the comment about some of
33 the responses the committee has gotten. I'm not sure that
34 I want a fully unmoderated--

35 (LAUGHTER)

36 --bulletin board.

37 MR. FORTUNE: Well, Jeff--

38 MR. EDGERTON: But I don't know
39 how to deal with that.

40 MR. DEMBO: In general, my
41 understanding of moderated bulletin boards, is that a
42 central administrator has the right to edit out any and
43 all things that are considered inappropriate for the
44 dialogue. I would argue in this case that the idea of
45 a censorship is exactly what we're not trying to
46 accomplish, but rather we should have an open discussion
47 regardless of how passionate or opinionated the voices
48 are.

49 MR. FORTUNE: That was a
50 question. That was not an offered amendment. Okay. Is

1 there further discussion? Mr. (Unintelligible).
2 MR. RANDALL: Randall from
3 Physiology.
4 MR. FORTUNE: David Randall.
5 I'm sorry. Go ahead.
6 MR. RANDALL: Continuing. I
7 gather, though, you're wanting to focus on the time between
8 now and when the Futures Committee makes its report. Or
9 is the purpose of this thing just ongoing as the University
10 evolves? It's not clear what you mean.
11 MR. DEMBO: I'm anticipating
12 there'll be multiple groups of people over the course of
13 probably the next year or more who will continue to take
14 a look at each individual recommendation and its possible
15 implementation. So the need for continued discussion will
16 exist long after the report comes out of the committee.
17 MR. FORTUNE: Scott Gleeson.
18 MR. GLEESON: I was just
19 wondering what, you know, the administration means in
20 there. Isn't this something the Senate could do so it
21 wouldn't have to -- or is that not...
22 MR. FORTUNE: Not a very --
23 You're asking me and it's a technical question about
24 technology, I believe.
25 MR. GLEESON: Right. And
26 that's why--
27 MR. FORTUNE: And that's
28 totally out of my--
29 MR. GLEESON: Because I don't
30 either.
31 (LAUGHTER)
32 MR. FORTUNE: I don't know
33 whether we could do that or not. Jeff Dembo is going to
34 be Senate Council Chair. So he'll be--
35 (LAUGHTER)
36 MR. DEMBO: When I phrased it,
37 Scott, I'm aware of the various list serves that we have.
38 But I'm not aware of an open bulletin board-type
39 arrangement. So I imagine it would have to come through
40 Information Services or some technical branch of our
41 administration.
42 MR. FORTUNE: Further
43 discussion on the motion? Claire Pomeroy.
44 MS. POMEROY: Bill, can the
45 Senate instruct the administration to do things or do we
46 have to request or recommend?
47 MR. FORTUNE: I think that's a
48 good point. Would you accept as a friendly amendment
49 request?
50 MR. DEMBO: I will not.

1 MS. POMEROY: Recommend.
2 Yeah. Good.
3 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. It's not
4 accepted. The motion is to instruct. Is that the motion?
5 MR. DEMBO: Correct.
6 MR. FORTUNE: Further
7 discussion on the motion? Phil Kraemer.
8 MR. KRAEMER: I just have a
9 question, Jeff. With this process, do you envision that
10 if there are implementation committees, that all
11 discussions among those committee members would be posted
12 on this, or would this be just a voluntary -- a chat room
13 where we go online?
14 MR. DEMBO: That's a good
15 question, Phil. I haven't envisioned yet how each
16 committee will address its particular task. I've heard
17 a lot of comments here that they wish they had insight
18 into the various thoughts behind the Task Force and
19 motivation to make these recommendations. So in that
20 sense, there could be a lot of merit for individual
21 committees having stuff on the same bulletin board. But,
22 I guess, since I'm not aware of any bulletin board we've
23 had here at the University in my time here, this is another
24 experiment to try.
25 MR. FORTUNE: Further
26 discussion? Charles Coulston.
27 MR. COULSTON: Would this
28 bulletin board be open to the student body, also?
29 MR. DEMBO: The word was all
30 members of the University community, which includes
31 students, faculty. Yeah.
32 MR. FORTUNE: Further
33 discussion on the motion? Bill Thom.
34 MR. THOM: I'd like to make a
35 point about the inclusiveness of doing something like this
36 that we have run into from our Outreach Program meeting
37 through the Extension Service. Number one, many of you
38 may not be aware of it but there are several school systems
39 out here that do not allow their students to get information
40 off the University of Kentucky websites. They have
41 blocked them out of their systems. The reason being, is
42 because there are chat rooms and other areas for discussion
43 that the school administrators do not want their students
44 to expose to.
45 And so what I'm saying is, basically, is
46 this something we want for us as more confined discussion,
47 but are we aware of the influence and the opportunity that
48 others will have. And is that what we want.
49 MR. FORTUNE: Further
50 discussion?

University Senate Council Session - March 4, 2002

1 MR. EDGERTON: Yes, sir.
2 MR. FORTUNE: Lee Edgerton.
3 MR. EDGERTON: Another point of
4 clarification. When you say open to all members of the
5 community, is it closed to people outside of the community?
6 MR. DEMBO: I envision the
7 possibility of having a U.K. log on to get access to it.
8 But, again, I'm not aware of the technical limitations
9 that may be.
10 MR. FORTUNE: Enid Waldhart.
11 MS. WALDHART: Would it help to
12 just raise it as faculty, staff and students, and that
13 way to indicate that there needs to be the U.K. connection?
14 Would that be a friendly amendment, Jeff?
15 MR. DEMBO: I think that
16 embodies what I was trying to say.
17 MS. WALDHART: Okay. Then I
18 would suggest that we add those words to indicate that
19 it is to be something internal to the U.K. community, not
20 to all Fayette County and everybody else who might want
21 to see things.
22 MR. DEMBO: I would accept that.
23 MR. FORTUNE: Now, the friendly
24 amendment then is -- I believe yours was open to all.
25 And so it would be open to faculty, staff and students.
26 Is that--
27 MR. DEMBO: Of the University
28 community.
29 MR. FORTUNE: Of the University
30 community. Okay. That has been accepted by the proposer
31 as a friendly amendment. Is there any further discussion
32 of the motion with the friendly amendment in it? (No
33 response.)
34 Okay. If not, all in favor signify by
35 saying aye.
36 ("AYE" VOICE COUNT: MAJORITY)
37 MR. FORTUNE: Opposed, say nay?
38 ("NAY" VOICE COUNT: FEW)
39 MR. FORTUNE: It carries on
40 voice vote. Okay. Thank you very much. It was a most
41 interesting discussion. Now, wait a minute. We really
42 do need to thank David and Genia.
43 (APPLAUSE)
44 Thanks for coming. See you April 8th,
45 maybe the last meeting of the year.
46 =====
47 (MEETING CONCLUDED)
48 =====

