

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

NOVEMBER 12, 2007

3:00 P.M.

* * * *

* * * *

W. T. YOUNG LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY CAMPUS
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

* * * *

* * * *

AN/DOR REPORTING & VIDEO TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
179 EAST MAXWELL STREET
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40508
(859) 254-0568

* * * *

* * * *

KAVEH TAGAVI, CHAIR
DAVID RANDALL, VICE-CHAIR
BRAD CANNON, PARLIAMENTARIAN
SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

CHAIR:

... so please realize that we are not discussing the proposal that was distributed -- distributed among the faculty. Rather I'm using the word update and I'm going to ask Provost Kumble Subbaswamy to come and give us an update. Is he here?

SUBBASWAMY:

Thanks, Kaveh. As our memo -- joint memo indicated, really the best way give you an update now and try to see if we can -- well, seeking your Council on the best way to proceed, and in that context we would like to take a

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
few minutes to set up the context of where we are in the process and what's the best way to move forward and -- and I have a suggestion that Kaveh and I have discussed. The training starts -- left the station in 2004 with USP -- it was a studies program self-study that began in 2004. That was Lori Gonzales, who I think at that time was not Dean if I -- if I am right, and she was the Chair of the Self-Study Committee then. And then in 2005 an External Review Committee appointed released a preliminary report. Dr. Alan DeSantis was the chair of that committee. In 2005 the General Education Reform & Assessment Committee, a GERA Committee was formed within the Senate Council and then Provost -- let's see, I think in 2005 that would have been Scott Smith and -- sort of go by time in who's what. 2006 University Senate received the final report on GERA. Dr. Ernie Yanarella was the chair of that and I think he made a presentation if I remember correctly. And then in 2006 (inaudible) also the USP External Review Committee released its final report, and by that time Dr. Renz (phonetically) was the chair of that committee. In 2006 Fall, after I got here in November, I believe, I took all that and tried to digest it in the form -- and brought it in -- in tune with national conversation at the American Association of Colleges & University was -- had -- had undertaken and had been going on for a couple of years and -- and that program had -- had by then brought a whitepaper that (inaudible). They still don't have that down, and that was circulated widely. And then the Senate Council Chair and I jointly appointed a Steering Committee, and that was, in fact, the recommendation that came out of the GERA Committee and that Steering Committee then was appointed -- Phil Kraemer was appointed the Steering Committee Chairman, and they were duly charged of coming up with

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
something concrete.
And this is what I want to point out something that's obvious to anyone who's been in this business, is that it's very easy to criticize existing programs. It's very easy to come up with some abstract ideas of this is what a Provost program should look like and so forth, but then actually coming up with something concrete that incorporates all those criticisms and builds something new is extremely complicated.

You can do it in a couple different ways. You can have a committee of a thousand come up with a com -- with a program, and that then begins to look like a camel. Or you can charge a small group to say, take all this and come up with something and then we can find holes in it or shoot bullets at it or something like that.

And that's really -- the latter was what was recommended by GERA, and that's, in fact, the method we took. And I want really to thank that committee who worked very hard from January through, in fact -- through October in fact. Through the summer they met and worked very hard to incorporate all that and come up with something that was quite radically different from -- from the kind of program; tried to (inaudible) take kind of all the criticisms and national conversations and so forth and came forward with that.

Just to remind you, in 2007 April, Phil Kraemer did give you an update on -- with the work of the Steering Committee, not in detail because nothing had been really worked out at that time. Let me see if I can figure out how to work this. Is that correct?

CHAIR:
SUBBASWAMY:

Yes.
And then in August we came to the Senate Council with a particular calendar on how we might move forward and the Senate Council accepted that calendar of submitting the proposal, circulating it in -- on October 1, revising it in light of some comments we received from the open forum and then coming to the

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
Senate for this meeting and then hopefully have it voted upon in the December meeting.

In October the open faculty meetings were held. Before that actually the committees had a preview of this, and then open faculty meetings; really glad to see the level of engagement that those engendered. People really paid close attention, they had read the proposal which is not easy to get done in a large, complex organization like ours so -- and that was really the intended outcome and we wanted that to happen.

And based on that, we concluded that the proposal really was not mature, as Kaveh said, for presentation -- a formal presentation to the Senate for debate and then we adopted and we need to continue this. It's clear that substantive changes need to be made, and now the question is: What's the best way to move forward? Again, before we set up a process I think it's important that the Senate be comfortable with the process that we put forward so that when it comes back to you in some form of the new proposal or revised proposal, you are comfortable that there was actually input in the process.

All right. So with that said, then his -- what we learned, I think, among other things, and this is my own sort of lone slight distillation of the responses received.

There was major (inaudible) were concerned, concerning the foundations of inquiry forces, in particular the five-week modules in which everything was supposed to be done and then the class size of 70 students and how do you take all that and, in fact, make it into something that's substantive and -- and one -- one that would have all the desired elements. That was certainly a major point of concern, for instance. And then there were other concerns, ranging from vetting the (inaudible) review disciplinary content, to the number of National Science courses and things like that. There was a misunderstanding

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
about what happened to the
foreign language (inaudible) or
some who thought we dropped it.
We said there's no change,
really, (inaudible) Steering
Committee (inaudible) said there
would be no change in it. But
then, also, there were others who
felt that given the emphasis on
globalization shouldn't there in
fact be more foreign language
(inaudible), and those types of
issues really. But those were
all the kinds of concerns that
were expressed based on
individual differences of
perspective, but I think that the
foundations of inquiry
(inaudible) (inaudible) certainly
as it was almost uniformly people
expressed concern with that.
So here -- we are where we are,
and we would really very much
like to (inaudible) and decipher
the courses (inaudible) and move
forward and Kaveh and I have
talked about this over the last
week in consultation with the
Steering Committee. And here's a
suggestion we have, and that's
what we hope -- at least we can
discuss a little bit, and then
it's up to the Senate Council on
how exactly it wants to
approach this. The suggestion
here is that --there's been a lot
of work here, going --starting in
2004. We've had the benefit of
all those committees, and then
the Steering Committee. And I
think we can distill from the
Steering Committee's curricular
proposal certainly some
principles, which really come
from all over (inaudible). This
isn't anything new.
And then ask whether, in fact,
the Senate might debate, discuss
the principles and adopt them
(inaudible), and if they do then
we certainly have approval to
build a curriculum around those
principles because then the
Senate will have been -- have
explicitly given approval to a
set of principles and say, go
develop a curriculum based on
these principles. That's one.
And then if you agree to that,
the Senate Council (inaudible)
for you -- before you, then
jointly appointed vision
committee, another committee that

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
again we can talk about the composition of it and what -- how much consultation makes sense and whether, in fact, there are, you know, multiple subcommittees, what -- whatever the structure might be, with a charge to translate each of the adopted principles into an actual curricular element of a revised (inaudible) education curriculum similar to what the Steering Committee did. But the Steering Committee didn't -- we didn't come to you with a set of principles that you had -- (inaudible) approval, so we're asking now that you, in fact, pre-approve a set of principles which will be incorporated into a curricular proposal. And then that should be thoroughly (inaudible) with the campus community. And, again, the elements of what -- what constitutes thorough (inaudible) is something that we would like your guidelines on and incorporate the campus feedback into that revised proposal yet again, and then make also sure that the learning outcomes and assessments are integrated into the revised proposal and then bring it before the Senate at that point, send it to Senate Council, whether they can adopt (inaudible). This sort of is in taking it in multiple steps and keeping you informed, keeping you involved in it more than, let's say, we did in the last curricular proposal. And with that in mind, we did work with the Steering Committee to distill seven principles that I think have been documented, that you probably picked up while walking in. Again, we don't need you to discuss that now, but I just wanted to make sure that it was in your hands to give you an idea of what it is that we're thinking about and then requesting the Senate Council that it consider bringing this to the Senate for a debate and discussion on whatever time frame the Senate Council thinks is appropriate. And I would like the timelines to be set by the Senate Council and the Senate, and we'll -- we're happy with that. I think, again,

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
Uni -- experiences with all universities suggest that, you know, this is a major undertaking. Taking -- making changes -- changing (inaudible) requirements typically have been going on something like 15, 20-year cycle, is one that takes many years, it takes a lot of work. It -- it takes collaboration which is what I like about the way we're proceeding here, is that it is in collaboration between University Senate and Council in particular and the administration, (inaudible) administration and we need to make sure that we are all on the same page going forward and bring this to a successful conclusion. We certainly owe it to all the previous faculty-led committees that we bring this to a successful conclusion in a reasonable time frame, whatever that might be, and I think, again, the Senate Council and Senate should discuss what that reasonable time frame might be. But it's -- we owe it to both -- all the faculty involved in this effort so far, as well as to the students that we do bring this to a successful conclusion. That's really all I wanted to say about this. I'm happy to answer any questions. Kaveh and I both can answer any questions.

CHAIR:

YANARELLA:

Okay. I saw Ernie's hand first then I'll go to Bob Grossman. During GERA's existence it was -- there was effort on our part to vet what we had pulled together from various conversations that took place across some 19 forums over that -- that year. Students didn't seem to be particularly interested because there was -- there wasn't any meat on the bones at that point. In terms of this -- this schedule, I know incorporating campus feedback and we can assure that students will have this opportunity to -- to look at the various iterations of the principles and then the -- the actual revised curriculum so that they can be satisfied that their questions are answered. Certainly. I think that in the, you know, the Steering Committee work (inaudible) through the

SUBBASWAMY:

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
forum following the Steering
Committee, there was a student
session as well, but that may not
be enough and we'll certainly do
more as necessary and as, in
fact, any advise you have on what
might constitute sufficient
vetting. We, in fact, we'd like
to do so.

GROSSMAN: Grossman, Arts & Sciences.
I have a question or a comment.
First of all, this debate about
the general education principles
and the adoption, when do you see
that happening?

SUBBASWAMY: I -- I really want to be guided
by the Senate Council on this.
In other words, the principles
are now extracted; distilled from
the Steering Committee's work and
all the previous work and now
officially -- now really it is
being submitted to the Senate
Council and then the Senate
Council should decide what it's
want to do with it.

CHAIR: I think Senate is getting maybe a
one day heads up on this. I
think this might be broadcast
tomorrow or the day after to the
entire faculty. What I would
like is to bring this to Senate
Council immediately, next week,
and then get their guidance, how
to proceed. With that, we would
get input from every college's
curricular committee or ask a
Senator to be the conduit of
getting college faculty input to
the Senate Council and then
eventually to the Senate. And I
am not rushing this, we are not
committed to this, but perhaps we
could approve as a faculty body,
this faculty body could approve
this in December, January or
whenever we are ready. This is
our proposal. It's going to be
our timeline and we're going to
go as fast as we feel
comfortable.

SUBBASWAMY: Right. I think that after -- we
can agree with that. I think
what we can't do is do nothing.
I mean, I think that it's
important that we take adequate
time for processing it and
discussing it and so forth, but
we can't do a, we'll get it to
next year because we're too busy
with other things. That's the
only thing I think we cannot do.
But, in terms of how long is the

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
process that is doing the
necessary discussion and vetting
and approving and revising and so
forth, then I think it should
take however long the faculty
feels -- the Senate in particular
feels comfortable with.

GROSSMAN:

Yeah, I also have a concern and
-- which involves, okay, suppose
we adopt these general education
principles, will that oblige us
to adopt whatever proposal comes
out later? I mean, they're --
meaning if this is going to
proceed, there shouldn't be an
air of inevitability. I mean, it
shouldn't be inevitable that
whatever proposal comes forward
is one that we must adopt. We
need to be able to have the
freedom to say, this isn't good
enough, go back and come up with
something else.

SUBBASWAMY:

We all want convergent processes
so I think that at the second
(inaudible), that is, when the
proposal comes out, the primary
concern should be (a) does the
new curriculum satisfy the
principles adopted (inaudible)
principles adopted. But I think
that if we start changing those
principles after the fact, this
is not a convergent process
(inaudible) so it's very
important that these principles
be thoroughly vetted and then --
because they are distilled from
all the work that's been done in
the -- up until now, and so I
think if we don't even have that
guidance, then we're -- I don't --
I don't know how we will design
a convergent process. But if you
have a suggestion for how we
might set up a convergent
process, I'm open to that.

GROSSMAN:

No. I do just -- I do just want
to emphasize that because -- yes,
the curriculum -- if we decide
these principles are a good
thing, and the curriculum doesn't
obey those principles, then the
curriculum isn't -- shouldn't be
something we adopt. However, it
could conform with the principles
but still not be acceptable to
the faculty for other reasons and
we need to -- yeah, we to be able
to feel free to --

SUBBASWAMY:

I think that's correct. Because,
you know, the last step here is,
you know, when it's all said and
Page 9

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
done, it has to come back to the
Senate again.

CHAIR: Can I add something slightly
different from what the Provost
said. We are the (inaudible)
body, so ultimately, we cannot be
receded by ourselves, but in a
sense we are trying to give
structure to this. Yes, the
intent is that once we agree on
this set of principles, unless
there is obvious flaw with it,
that we stick with it. But
again, ultimately, we are the
(inaudible) body and there is no
logical mechanism that we could
put ourselves into (inaudible).
Maybe we are agreeing on some
part (inaudible) but we are still
in charge.

UNIDENTIFIED: Any other comment or question?
Just a question. Have we looked
at any --

CHAIR: Name, please?

STEINER: Shelly Steiner, Biology.
Have we looked at the general
education principles of the
previous USP proposal? I mean,
how similar are they to these
prop -- to these principles?
Because that went through a lot
of vetting at that time.

SUBBASWAMY: I think there are some
fundamental differences, you
know, being suggested here
through all this and in that --
in -- and it shift the emphasis
from content towards critical
thinking and that's a major
shift. And it's a major shift
being suggested for different
reasons, including, you know,
changes in information literacy,
information availability and all
that sort of thing. And also
another aspect of this is that we
have a lot of survey courses
serving dual purpose of both
serving general education and
being a pre-major course and --
and those are the kinds of things
that are being -- being
(inaudible) here. Saying that --
that -- how can we agree on a
smaller number of hours but
minimize or avoid double dipping,
so that the courses that satisfy
general education are
specifically -- can be
specifically designed such that
the goals of general education
are the primary factor in
designing those courses. So, I

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
think there are differences and they're meant to be as part of all the criticism and national conversation, that's really what's coming out of this. If I could reiterate. It is potentially possible that something will come to you, after approval of the Senate Council, by December. So Senate Council members are here. I see a lot of them, if not all of them. We are listening to you very carefully, so please comment to us as Senators, if you have any comment regarding the procedure from now on -- not the content, we are not necessarily debating the merit of the content, but please let us know if you have any input in the procedure.

CHAIR:

Yes. Over here.

UNIDENTIFIED:

I would like to ask --

CHAIR:

Judith --

LESNAW:

I'm sorry. Judith Lesnaw, Biology. In putting together this set of principles, were principles from benchmark and public prestigious institutions taken into consideration, and if so, have they been compiled and could we make some of them available to us so that we can see how we fit in a larger community?

SUBBASWAMY:

Certainly the -- there are, you know, many universities are going through the cycle right now, even as we speak, and those that have revised their general education within the past decade or so have all gone in this direction. I mean, certainly we can give you a list of places where these changes have all taken place recently. Learning outcomes is sort of the major emphasis and the different ways of mapping this in different places and also you have to recognize that some institutions assume that you already know writing coming into the university and others don't and so forth. So I think one side does not (inaudible) and so what this was trying to do was really trying to take all the previous discussions, all the national conversations and then distill that into something that will apply here; appropriate for UK (inaudible)... But the answer is, yes. I mean, the AAC & U

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
discussion really involved in
doing this a great deal and we
have URLs that are provided on
the general education website.
And we can provide more of what's
going on elsewhere as well.

CIBULL:

Mike Cibull, College of Medicine.
I think, I guess one thing that
seems to be a criticism was that
this process wasn't perceived as
being open even though it was
quite open. We might want to use
some of the methodology that was
used in the health care benefits
committee, which sort of
publicized their thinking every
step of the way, opened their
meetings, published their minutes
and so everybody who was
interested would know where
everything was every step of the
way, and that way if there are
problems, that might become known
early in the process rather than
waiting until the end.

SUBBASWAMY:

I think that's an excellent
suggestion. Even there,
ultimately, the final decision
was challenged as not being open
enough, but I think you're right
though.

CIBULL:

But it passed.

SUBBASWAMY:

It passed. That's correct. Good
point. It did pass.

CHAIR:

The only criticism that I heard
was during a very small slice of
time this proposal was available
to curriculum committees of
colleges but was not readily
available to faculty-at-large.
And I think we all realize that
this was a mistake and, of
course, it's not going to happen
again. At least we have learned
that much from (inaudible).
Over here and then I go over
there.

JANECEK:

Jerry Janeczek, Modern Classical
Languages. One problem I had was
figuring out to whom to send my
comments, and so I'd appreciate
when -- in any communications or
particularly when the principles
get sent out, that it will have
one email to be provided for the
people to respond to.

SUBBASWAMY:

The way it was set up was such
that the -- all the comments in a
blog format could be posted;
isn't that right, Richard?

RICHARD:

Yes.

SUBBASWAMY:

On that website. And that way
for those who wanted to even

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
identify themselves -- or even
identify themselves
or be anonymous and can get
comments that way and that was
sort of the purpose of being
completely open in a town hall
format so everybody could hear
the comment. But if anyone wants
to send something privately,
either to Kaveh or to me, that's
absolutely fine too.

CHAIR: As a general rule, when I receive
comment from a Senators, I keep
the name -- I remove the name and
forward the comment, unless there
is a very good reason to keep the
name or unless requested by the
person who sends me the comment.
So if you want to send your
comments somewhat confidentially
you're (inaudible) send it to me,
of course, you have to trust me,
but send it to me and I will send
it forward. There was a comment
over there.

HALLMAN: Diana Hallman, Fine Arts.
Maybe this question belongs in
future discussions, but do you
perceive hiring more faculty to
enable the actualization of more
full-time faculty in first year
classes and more (inaudible)
critical inquiry, because I think
that was some of the -- the
stumbling block for people who
would do this; such large classes
and how are we going have faculty
shifted away from already
overloaded schedules.

SUBBASWAMY: Certainly, logistical
considerations have got to be an
important part of implementation.
If you can't implement it, then a
proposal that's -- if it doesn't
have the resources, and cannot
make resources available to
implement, is not a proposal
that's going to be meaningful.
There's several factors here. In
abstract, I can't answer that,
but in terms of looking forward,
part of the question is, we are
going to be adding faculty and
the University is suppose to
expand but at the same time it's
also suppose to grow and -- and
enrollment is suppose to be able
to grow. Are we going to be able
to teach every class in a small
class environment? The answer is
absolutely no. There's just no
way that it's possible. I think
we have to look at the pedagogies

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
that are currently available for
reasonably sized classes,
whatever that means. How do you
use, again, teaching assistants
in a different context? I think
depending on what gets proposed
and passed ultimately, some of
those things would have to be
part of the discussion as well.
I think in the abstract, it's
hard to answer that. Yes.

CHAIR:

By the way, if I could say
something to Ernie, then I'll
come to you. It only looks like
I have to say something after
every time the Provost
(inaudible). This will be maybe
the last time. I just want to
mention that even though -- this
is a certain nuance, and that is
that even though we are in
charge, totally self-governed
when it comes to education and
policy, when it comes to
implementing this policy,
especially this one which
requires a lot of funding, the
control of the purse obviously is
not with the Senate and it's with
administration and therefore, we
have get the administration and
the Provost and the President to
buy-in this proposal, so please
keep that in mind. Ernie
Yanarella.

YANARELLA:

Yes. I'd like to follow-up on
the last question because I think
the issue of resources includes
more than just faculty as -- as
was just implied. It includes
(inaudible). It seems to me that
in as -- as dramatic a change as
this likely to be in terms of
general education, there will --
there will need to be opportunity
for further faculty development.
There will be -- need to be
perhaps a -- a -- a pool of money
available for -- for pedagogical
innovation and so forth. If a
reasonable program is -- is put
together that -- that receives
the support of the faculty, can
we -- can we get assurances from
the administration that it is
prepared to -- to fund it in a
way that will allow us to make
that kind of transition to a --
to what Carol Schneider calls a
21st Century academy.

SUBBASWAMY:

The answer is absolutely yes. I
mean, what I said was in terms of
some notion that a -- with the

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
same enrollment, we might have significantly larger numbers of faculty so everything can be taught in small classes in a research university, public university environment. I don't see that happening. I don't see that degree of resources being available, but everything else you said, the answer is absolutely. I think that we owe it to our students. Tuition has nearly doubled in what, a six-year, time frame, and I think that we have to demonstrate to our students what it is that they're getting for the money that they are paying.

CHAIR:
ELDRED:

Over there.
Janet Eldred, English. I just want to say that even though this last part I think was rushed, I feel like sometimes we run into trouble because the process started so far back, in 2004 with the self-study, so when I heard Shelly Steiner asking is there anywhere where we have the principles from the last general education, in fact, that document is huge, but it's that huge self-study that goes through the history and you can see from that that we not only have the principles of the last self -- of the last general ed, but also the way in which it was amended, I don't remember how many times, but multiple times, so that even before it got out of this body it was a camel, and that was before (Recording is interrupted) communication is suspended and so we created an impossible system, in part because of that -- that process. And so there's tons of information on this, almost an overwhelming amount of -- of information on the GERA website. It's all there. It's just a mound or amounts of -- of information.

SUBBASWAMY:

I mean, I agree. That's -- that's the reason I'm sort of puzzled when people sort of reopen all of this. Given that, this is a three-year-old process, and by now all the criticisms and suggestions on what should be in the new -- new curriculum are -- are well articulated. And -- and you're exactly right, I think that if a coherent proposal comes

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
out and then every piece of it is
undone at the Senate and then the
whole package doesn't get passed,
then that coherence that
hopefully was a part of the
curriculum is destroyed. And
that's what happened with USP
from that respect, and it finally
got passed. I think that -- that
it was flawed to -- to start with
because -- for that reason. And
to keep it simple, have the
outcomes be very clearly
articulated, a small set that way
we can -- everyone can understand
and work on, is the only way to
have meaningful general education
curriculum. And I think that
what else is true, is different
from some time ago, is that
outcome assessment is -- is now
really more and more becoming a
part of how universities evaluate
themselves and are compared from
one to -- one to the other.
Starting in 2009, a majority of
the public universities are going
to be publishing results on their
own assessment for general
education outcomes. And we're
going to really have to think
about what those outcomes should
be and how we're going to build
that and how we're going to build
assessment that GERA so well
articulated in (inaudible). So I
think we really need to get this
done and get this done
expeditiously, but obviously with
sufficient input to have the
benefit of the majority -- the
support of the majority of the
faculty.

CHAIR: Any other comments? Okay.

SUBBASWAMY: Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED: I just object to all this abuse
of camels. Camels are a
beautifully designed animal.

CHAIR: Okay. This next item is a
familiar item to us. It comes
two or three times a year. It's
the UK December 2007 degree list.
Here is the recommendation. I
have modified this to preempt --
address some of the recurring
questions that comes up, and that
says, That the elected University
Faculty Senators approve UK's
December 2007 degree list as
distributed for submission
through the President to the
Board of Trustees as the

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board, pending further certification by the colleges. That last part that says, pending further certification, the reason for that is often we have professors who have direct knowledge, and they get up and say, I know such-and-such student, and she will not be ready to graduate because a, b, c. Of course, after the action of the Board of Trustees, degrees are not granted. After that, degrees go to the registrar, registrar contacts the colleges. At the time that the Board of Trustees recommendation some grades are not even there yet. Some people might pass; some people may not pass; some people -- some students might have dropped a course. So one more time the college certifies that the student is ready to graduate and the registrar then goes ahead and does the degree granting. The list is in your handout, I believe. This comes to you with no specific recommendation from the Senate Council but doesn't require -- does not require motion and -- and seconding. Is there a comment over there? Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED:
BROTHERS:
CHAIR:
UNIDENTIFIED:

Just a clarification, the --
I'm sorry, name?
Name?
Joe Chappell, College of Ag. If a name of a student that does graduate doesn't appear on this list, does that compromise them from consideration?

CHAIR:

That's a more serious omission. Names that are not supposed to be there are not -- first, we don't you to have all the names just (inaudible) -- just to -- to leave it there, but a name which is supposed to be there and it's not, it's a problem. And yes, they will not get the degree if by the time the Board of Trustees approve these, the name is not there. However, what has happened is with the help of people such as yourselves, Senators, other faculty, from time to time we have done an emergency approval. Senate Council has the authority to approve the name on behalf of the Senate and send it to the Board

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
of Trustees, but we have to move
very quickly on that, if that's
the case. Follow-up?

CHAPPELL: Follow-up. So can we entertain
adding names to this list today?

CHAIR: We can do whatever we want, but I
suggest that you give us the
name, and we will investigate and
-- and talk to the registrar and
add the name on behalf of the
Senate.

FINKEL: I just had a particular name I
wanted to add. Raphael Finkel,
Computer Science. If you want to
do it that informal way by
sending e-mail, we can do that.

UNIDENTIFIED: You want to add Raphael Finkel to
the registrar?

FINKEL: I've got a name that I need to
add.

UNIDENTIFIED: Oh.

FINKEL: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED: I thought the name was
Raphael Finkel.

FINKEL: I'll be starting to get letters.
I'm Raphael Finkel. I have a
name that I wish to add. How do
you wish me to do that?

CHAIR: Let -- I'll talk to you after the
meeting.

FINKEL: Okay.

CHAIR: And Jacques Hager is here from the
Registrar. Any other question,
suggestion? Okay. Michelle, are
you ready to count their -- the
votes, that we do by raising
hands, correct?

BROTHERS: Yes.

CHAIR: All right. All those in favor of
this recommendation and motion,
please indicate so by raising
your hand, all the elected
faculty.

MICHELLE: Do I have to count these, Kaveh?

CHAIR: Opposed, raise your hand.
Abstain?

MICHELLE: One.

CHAIR: One abstain. And otherwise
unanimous. Okay. Unless
somebody wants us to count the
hands, we're just going to move
on. The motion carries.
Next topic. This is a curricular
proposal. It's New Track:
Masters of Public Policy. Here
is the footprint of where it has
been. The proposal basically
will allow students without a
Master's degree who are on their
way to get a Ph.D. or a Doctorate
degree, to fulfill all -- and who
have fulfilled all of the
requirement for the MPA to

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
substitute their doctoral
Qualifying Exam for the final
Master's exam, and thereby
receive an MPA. Courtesy of my
good friend, Connie Wood, it was
brought to my attention that such
a similar rule is already in the
grad school for when a student is
receiving a Master's degree in
the same program as the Ph.D.
degree. This requires approval
by us because it is not quite in
the same program, although it's
in the same college and may be
the same department. So the
proposal is in your handout. Do
we have anybody from that program
here who wants to add something?
Yes.

DENISON: I'm here if there's questions. I
should point out --

CHAIR: Your name?

DENISON: Dwight Denison, from the Martin
School.

CHAIR: Dwight Denison, yes.

DENISON: This should actually be an MPP
instead of MPA to substitute.

CHAIR: I can fix it.

DENISON: It's correct in the paper, but --

CHAIR: So it's MPP, not MPA. That's my
mistake. I'm sorry about that.
Since the more official one is
the one you are holding, we will
have to correct this on the
screen. Is everyone okay with
that? Are there any comments
regarding this proposal? This
has come to us, the Senate
Council has approved it with a
positive recommendation. Sheila,
do we have the effective date on
this? Did we discuss effective
date? We usually discuss
effective date. I think actually
Connie Wood said effective Fall
2007? Was that the one you said
effective Fall 2007?

WOOD: Yes, sir.

CHAIR: Okay. So it then was out of
the Senate Council that this
would be effective Fall 2007,
which means those students who
are already in this program right
now and might be taking the
qualifying exam, they could use
this as their final Master's
exam. All right, friends, all
those in favor of this proposal,
please indicate so by raising
your hands. I see a lot of
hands. I -- you don't have to
count. Any opposed? Abstain?

MIHELLE:

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
CHAI R: One abstain, otherwise unanimous.
Okay. All right, we have an announcement or a short presentation by Kentucky Blood Center. Jack Hillard is here.
Okay. Let me just give it to you. Please go there.
HILLARD: Thank you very much. The twentieth anniversary of the Kentucky-Tennessee Big Blue Crush. I don't think that I have to share with you the importance of that research. First, let me say in thanking you, thank you for the partnership for those 20 years between University of Kentucky and the Kentucky Blood Center. Thank you for the invitation to be here today. And thank you for allowing me and my involvement in this community for almost 20 years. I was a part of this community as an employee for more than a decade here. I've studied at the university numerous times. Currently, under the direction of Dr. Thelin in the Graduate School here. But more importantly, at least to me and I think to thousands of Kentuckians, thanks to the University and specifically the Medical School, and more specifically the Markey Cancer Center. I'm a 20-year, successful, 20-year leukemia patient. If it weren't for the research that happens at the Markey Center and those like Dr. Arnold and her colleagues, I wouldn't be standing here today. If it weren't also for the thousands of Kentuckians who've donated units of blood, I wouldn't be here and neither would the thousands of others that have received oncology care, trauma care here at this University and at 70 other hospitals throughout the state. How many of you, just by a show of hands, how many of you have contributed in that effort? How many of you are blood donors? About half. When I was here last month and spoke to the Senate of the staff, they were kind enough to entertain the challenge of which they have issued to the faculty, and their numbers were about the same, about half. So I'm simply here to ask you to meet the challenge of the Staff

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
Senate to give blood this week to help us through this twentieth anniversary, to help us win this battle of helping healthcare patients and to do what is simply one of the few things that you can do in life where you can take one hour of your time and save three lives. There are many things that you can do, writing a check, volunteering time, things that we do in our lives that are valuable, but in time commitments of taking one hour to save three lives, donating a unit of blood is pretty powerful, and I'm here as the proof of that. So thank you and please give blood this week. Thank you.

CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Please consider giving blood yourselves and also encourage your colleagues in your colleges to do the same. Okay. Now, we have, according to our agenda, we have one curricular item after this one. I would -- I would entertain a motion to reverse the order and get done with the curricular item and then we are --

CI BULL:

So moved.

GROSSMAN:

Second.

BROTHERS:

Name, please.

CI BULL:

Ci bull.

GROSSMAN:

Grossman.

BROTHERS:

Sorry. The court reporter is not here. She'll have to do it from the tape.

CHAIR:

Thank you very much. So all those in favor of this rearranging, please indicate so by raising your hand. And thank you. Any opposed? Any abstain? All right, it is unanimous. Okay. So I'm going to go to the -- Okay. Proposed change to Senate Rule 5.3.1.1, Repeat Option. I just want to mention there were three proposals coming -- initiated by Arts & Science. Of course it applies to (inaudible). Two of them -- all of three were -- they -- they went through Senate committees. They were all approved. Perhaps some minor changes here and there. Some (inaudible), some very minor. Two of them required to go back to -- to the Rules Committee to be codified to be -- to correspond to the present language because from the time

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
that these proposals initiated,
by the time it got approval, some
of those rules slightly were
changed. Therefore we had to
send them back to Rule Committee.
At this point we have the Repeat
Option. It's approved by the
College of Arts & Sciences,
October 2006; Undergraduate
Council; HCCC; Senate's
Admissions & Academic Standards
Committee, October 2007. The
proposal will change the method
by which a student request a
Repeat Option. Here
is -- here are the changes. We
are using two different colors or
three different colors. White is
the text currently, the current
language. Yellow is -- yellow is
underlining the change requested
by the proposal originally. And
the green underline is the change
that was made as the Senate
Council. We almost never make
changes without getting agreement
of the proposer, and we always
invite the proposer. The
proposer was present at the time.
They agreed to this. They agreed
this was an improvement. So here
is the proposal in front of you.
Are there any questions?

HULSE:

David Hulse, College of Business
Economics. What is the rationale
for having the language about,
have the approval of the
student's advisor?

CHAIR:

Are there proposers here?
Adrienne?

ADRIENNE:

The rationale, as I understand
it, was that they wanted to make
sure that the student was certain
about which course they should be
using a repeat option on and that
they didn't waste that option.
So they wanted to make sure that
they sought advice first. They
didn't want the original proposal
which just had the student
sending it directly to the
Registrar's Office.

CHAIR:

Anybody from Senate Council
who -- I'm sure this was
suggested by somebody on the
Senate Council. Anybody want to
speak to that? Yes.

SOTTILE:

Joe Sottile. I'm not on the
Senate Council but I think I can
answer the question. I recently
had a situation where a student
used a repeat option on a
remedial course and is now

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
delayed in getting upper division standing because he could have used that repeat option more wisely on a required course that he did poorly on the first attempt. And if he had been advised a little better, that probably wouldn't have happened, and I think that's why the advisor is in there. Just so the repeat option is used wisely instead of being wasted. If affects GPA, there's all sorts of things that come into -- that have an impact on this.

HULSE: If I understand this correctly, an advisor would have the authority to disapprove the request of the student, right?

UNIDENTIFIED: The way it's written there, it would be.

ADRIENNE: Yes.

HULSE: So if the intent is to require the student to seek the advice of the advisor, then I would suggest that the language be rephrased accordingly.

CHAIR: Okay. I'm going to make a comment. Meanwhile, will you please think of the way you want to amend it. I think that's a good point, but beyond that, several years ago student had to request repeat option during the semester in which they were repeating the course. That rule changed. Now, students could request repeat option all the way up to their graduation, meaning that there is some logistics that students have to consider. Some -- if you repeat a course that you have a D in and later on you need it for a course that you have a D or B in, those are the times that I think advice of the advisor will be important. So would you like to make a motion?

HULSE: I meant it to be a friendly amendment, but would you consider it to be a friendly to replace that with, shall consult with student's advisor?

CHAIR: It doesn't have -- we don't have to be all friends. This is not a friendly amendment, but that doesn't mean it's unfriendly; it's just -- it's a substantial -- substantial amendment. So I would appreciate if you make a motion and we get a second and we would vote on the amendment.

HULSE: I move we strike the language,

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
have approval of the student's
advisor, and replace it with,
shall consult with student's
advisor.

CHAIR: Okay. Did everybody hear that?
I need a second.

ARNOLD: Second.

CHAIR: Sheila, Arnold --

ARNOLD: Second.

CHAIR: -- seconded.

UNIDENTIFIED: Question?

CHAIR: Let's discuss only amendment at
this time. Over
there.

YATES: Well, how are you going to
document?

BROTHERS: Name, please?

YATES: J.W. Yates, College of Education.
How do you document -- how do you
document that?

CHAIR: Jacque, can I ask you if there is
any mechanism of how one would
document this? Jacque Hager,
Associate Registrar.

HAGER: I would perceive that until we
have this electronic, what we
would require from the advisor is
something that the student has
consulted with me. They don't
have to say I have approved it or
disapproved, but I just want to
know that they did talk to them.
So I mean, that's still a
signature just like it would be a
signature if you had approved it?

YATES: A signature that says they
consulted, doesn't say they
approved it.

HAGER: I saw another hand somewhere.
There. I'll come to you later.

CHAIR: Diane Snow, College of Medicine.
The same idea in the second
(inaudible) notify the Office of
the Registrar; is that in
writing? Both of these issues
need to discern whether it's in
writing or not.

HAGER: It has to be in writing.

CHAIR: In writing. It could be
electronically, but it --

HAGER: Until we get it electronic --

CHAIR: Until we get it electronic --

HAGER: -- it has to be in writing.

CHAIR: -- it would be in writing. Over
here.

GROSSMAN: Just a very minor, friendly
amendment to the neutral
amendment back there, which is he
put in the word shall consult,
and there's already a must there,
so I suggest we strike the word
shall and just consult the
student's advisor would be the

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
amendment.

HULSE: I accept that.

CHAIR: Would you accept that?

ARNOLD: Yes.

CHAIR: Okay. So we are all friends and we accept that. We -- we have the amendment somewhat modified. I said I'm going to go back there, and then over here, and then...

DEEM: Jody Deem, College of Health Sciences. I do think that it's just a ticky-tacky logistical issue, but I think it is an important one, how this consulting and notifying happens. Like now if we change a grade, you know, I as the advisor have to sign the form, and it has to go to the Registrar's Office. I just have this vision that the Registrar's Office getting all these handwritten notes from advisors. Will there be a form before it becomes electronic or that's like the grade form or how -- just a logistical question, I guess?

CHAIR: Jacque, can you tell us anything about that?

HAGER: We will develop a form, working with the advisor's network, that can be used by all the colleges. Okay?

CHAIR: Did everybody hear that? I know I said who I'm going to go first next, but I don't remember, so I'm going to go here.

CIBULL: I just need some clarifi -- or guidance. My college doesn't really do this, I don't think, so I need to know which is a good idea. I mean, do students need to have a level of guidance for their -- either they're required to get approval and can be prohibited from doing something, or should it be their decision based on guidance. So I'd like to hear from people who deal with this problem, Logistics aside. Okay. Back there.

CHAIR: Joe Chappell, College of Ag. I think the students should have the discretion to exercise this right. It's a privilege to them, and inserting an advisor's approval is -- is really micro-managing the student's responsibility.

CHAIR: Any other comments? Over there.
HERTOG: Jim Hertog, College of Communications and Information

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
Studies. A number of our pre-
major students wouldn't even know
who their advisor is, and that --
that, I think, could cause
confusion for them in trying --
because essentially they use
repeat option to get into our
college. And so a lot of them
really aren't certain who their
advisor is until they become a
major, and I'm wondering if
saying their advisor rather than
an advisor or something, I'm --
I'm wondering if they're going to
cause confusion and -- for them.

CHAIR:

Does anyone want to -- please
speak only to that comment right
now? You have a comment?

GROSSMAN:

Yeah. Yeah. If a student
doesn't know who his or her
advisor is, they ought to, and so
this is -- this would be a good
thing for them to find out who
their advisor is.

UNIDENTIFIED:

Either way.

HERTOG:

What they should know, et cetera,
isn't always what they do know.

GROSSMAN:

Exactly. And that's why this is
a good idea.

CHAIR:

Does anyone else want to talk to
this particular comment, and then
I go to other topics? Back
there.

CHAPPELL:

They have to go to their advisor
in order --

BROTHERS:

I'm sorry, your name, please.

CHAPPELL:

Joe Chappell. -- in order to
officially get the advisor hold
lifted for their registration.
If that isn't in place, then the
unit is not functioning as is
expected to function in advising
in general. So the student will
have to know who their advisor is
if they're going to enroll in
anything at the University of
Kentucky.

CHAIR:

Okay. I think we have
sufficiently addressed that
point. Let's move on to other
points. Are there any other
comments?

CALVERT:

We're still discussing the
amendment, are we not?

CHAIR:

We are --

BROTHERS:

Name?

CHAIR:

-- still discussing the
amendment, yes. Your name?

CALVERT:

Oh, Ken Calvert.

CHAIR:

Ken Calvert.

CALVERT:

Engineering.

CHAIR:

Okay. Let's then go ahead and
vote on the amendment. Does

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
anybody need the amendment to be read back to them? Does everybody -- anybody needs that? No. Okay. All those in favor of the amendment, please indicate so by raising your hand. Any opposed? Okay. Let's count the opposed.

MI CHELLE:

CHAIR:

Seven.
If I could indulge you, those in favor please raise your hand so we can count those.

MI CHELLE:

CHAIR:

Fifty.
Fifty for. Seven opposed. Any abstain? One, two abstain, three. I saw another hand. You hand up? Okay. Three.

MI CHELLE:

CHAIR:

Here's one more, I guess.
Four abstain. Motion for amendment passes. Now, we are back to the main motion that has been amended. Are there any discussion on the main motion? No more -- well, you could still discuss the amendment part of it, but we already voted on that. Are there any discussions? Okay. Then we are ready to vote. All those in favor of this amended motion, please indicate so by raising your hand. Okay. Before counting that, let's (inaudible) opposed, which is somewhat irregular. All those opposed?

MI CHELLE:

CHAIR:

CIBULL:

CHAIR:

Five.
Five
It's an overwhelming majority for it.
Okay. We're going to go with overwhelming majority with five opposed. Any abstain? No abstain. Okay, we're done with it. All right. We have the rest of the afternoon to ourselves. Okay. Let me set this up. It'll take a little bit of time for it to set up. In the October meeting, if you recall, we had the issue of Robinson Forest logging on the agenda. I divided the time that we had, which probably was around maybe one hour, maybe less than that. And the first half we had six panel members to present variety of opinions. In fact, it was a mixed panel, for and against. And after that I said -- I think (inaudible)... At that time, I said during the first part I would like this to be presentation by the both sides

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
and questions regarding the presentation. And I asked that no motions and statements from the Senators be made, only questions pertaining to the panel members' discussion. And I said, the second half then it could be a discussion among the Senators. No more participation by the panel members. And at that time, any motion would be then accepted. During the discussion one of my colleagues, Susanne Arnold, made a motion that started with -- or had somebody -- I would make this motion. I assumed that she was not ready at that time. It was a mistake. She was ready. In her mind, she made a motion. I assumed that was like for future, and I made the comment, let me know when you are ready. Of course, nobody made a motion after that, and then I adjourned. And I -- I received a comment from my colleague, Professor Arnold and then one other Senator wanted to make a motion. So Senate Council decided to open this in a very limited way. But before going to there, just for future, when a motion is made and seconded, and there was somebody who said, I would second it, would is not a very good word for making motions. I will or I am or I move. Also just because a motion is moved and seconded, it is not yet in front of the assembly until the Chair puts it in front of the assembly. And the Chair has to make a decision almost immediately either to rule the motion invalid or put it in front of the assembly. So if I don't do that, I have made a mistake; it is a misunderstanding. You guys have to correct me. And the remedy for a mistake, even if it is a mistake by the Chair is not to do it over again. The remedy is to object, make an objection right there and then. The objection will be heard. But this is just for the future. For now the Senate Council has decided that we would open this in a very limited way. I sent you an e-mail. I asked for written motion. We received two motions. And Senate Council decided to combine the two

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
motions. First off, the motion is sense of the Senate motion, and I'd like to tell you why. In fact, one Senator asked me and I thought, maybe I should not assume that everybody knows why this is the sense of the Senate motion. But even before that, this is not a Senate Council motion. Senate Council only voted to allow the motion. So momentarily I'm going to come to you. I give you the first chance to Professor Arnold and Judith Lesnaw to make a motion, a second and if they want to, or if not, somebody else could make it. But we need that motion to be moved. But this is not a motion by the Senate Council and there is no recommendation attached to it. So it's completely neutral. Why sense of the Senate is because if you read Senate Rule 1.2.1 which defines the function of this University Senate, a lot of it derived from governing regulations, not all of it. It says that -- yes, in fact, it is, it says that -- specified that the Senate has no administrative or management responsibilities. Over the years when non-curricular items come before the Senate, there's always a Senator who raises the validity of such a motion, and then there's always another Senator who says, okay, we cannot approve or disapprove. But we could say this is our sense. So before I give you the motion, let me just put these ground rules. Please read them. Let's follow these ground rules as much as we can. No other main motions will be allowed because Senate Council decided to open this only for the motion that will be sent to us in writing. Substantive motion, which means you totally change the motion, which is basically a new motion, therefore will not be allowed. And amendments that do not drastically alter the nature of the motion will be allowed. We, the Senate Council agree to allow amendments. Last and most importantly, discussion, this is where I have to be very strict. I will stop you in mid sentence if I catch it. Discussion will be limited to matters directly

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
related to the one motion under
consideration. So statements
regarding the merit, or lack
thereof, of the logging should be
avoided today in order to have an
expeditious and fair
consideration. We also received,
as you notice from my e-mail, we
received an input from Dean
Smith, Dean of College of
Agriculture, who is also a
Senator. He could not be here.
He's in -- out of state, I think,
attending some learning program,
function, I'm sure. Is there a
Senator from Forestry here?
Okay. So we -- you have that
statement with you, correct?
Sheila, do we have that on the --
somewhere where we could display
it? If not there, I will give --
four points or three points was
forwarded to me by -- from the --
through the Dean of the Ag
College from the Forestry
Department which either the
Senator would read them or to
assist the Senator, I will put it
on the screen so you will see it.

BROTHERS:

Kaveh, it's on page 36 in the
email.

CHAIR:

It's on page 36 of your handout.
Okay. It wasn't on my -- I -- I
started to panic. I thought
maybe (inaudible). So actually
you have that. Meanwhile on
Friday or so, I received from a
Senator, and of course, you know,
this is a body of Senators, I
received a white -- a green paper
as opposed to a white paper. It
is a white paper that you had
last time. We, again, I
submitted it to you. It's from
the -- that's coming from
Forestry Department. There is a
white -- green paper written, and
it's a very long paper. I -- I
have to admit I didn't read every
word of it. I looked at it and I
thought it was (inaudible) that
the Senators requested. I want
you to know the Senate Council
had not seen that. It came to us
or to me way after that. This is
by no means either approved or
disapproved by the Senate
Council. The Senate Council has
not directed me to send this to
you. We are kind of on the
Senate Council -- and neither
(inaudible) with the white or
green. We are kind of color

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
blind; whether it's it's white or
green we just forward it to you
for your reviews. So did I
forget anything? I think we are
now ready. Okay. So here is the
proposals of the Senate motion.
It is in your handout. I'm going
to put it one more time up here.
I'm sure you have already read
it. So at this point now before
you have to -- by the way, one of
the ways that you -- to have a
discussion on a motion, it has to
be put in front of the assembly.
So I'd like to give first --
Question, verification.

CI BULL:

CHAI R:

CI BULL:

CHAI R:

CI BULL:

CHAI R:

CI BULL:

CHAI R:

CI BULL:

CHAI R:

CI BULL:

CHAI R:

CI BULL:

CHAI R:

CI BULL:

CHAI R:

PARLI AMENTARI AN:

CI BULL:

CHAI R:

HAYES:

CHAI R:

HAYES:

BROTHERS:

HAYES:

CHAI R:

Yes.

Do you have to consider both of
those points together? I mean --
Yes.

-- can one point be dropped and
the other kept, or do they have
to both go off or you've got them
together?

One could be amended. You put
amendment -- there are two -- I
don't think you want to drop one
because then two makes no sense.
So logically, you don't want to
drop one.

Can you pass one without passing
two, just because it's only one
motion?

One amendment. It's not two
motions.

It's substantive amendment.

Yes. It is substantive but it's
not substitute amendment.

All right.

So it is allowed.

Okay.

Yes, according to the ground
rules.

Okay.

Brad, do you want to say
something?

You simply move to drop one.

I just wanted to make sure it was
in the ground rules.

Yes. Number two could be
dropped.

I had a ground rule question
only.

Yes, please.

If --

Name, please.

Oh, Jane Hayes, College of
Engineering. If this sense of
the Senate motion is rejected, is
it possible that we're going to
see this again as a different
sense of the Senate motion?

Today?

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt

HAYES: In December? In January? In February? I guess what I'm asking is --

CHAIR: My understanding --

HAYES: -- we'll be -- we'll be finished with this sense of the Senate at the end of it?

CHAIR: I hope so.

HAYES: Okay.

CHAIR: Robert's Rules of Order says a motion that has been voted on cannot be brought back unless there is intervening -- intervening matters, not just one Senate meeting, but something should happen that changes the background, therefore it makes sense. Otherwise it is not fair to bring the same motion or essentially the same motion again and again. Okay. Now --

STRINGER: Point of fact.

CHAIR: Yes.

BROTHERS: Name, please?

STRINGER: Jeff Stringer, Forestry, not a Senator. You indicated it was on page, I believe 36, which was Scott's Smith e-mail that he sent you.

CHAIR: Yes.

STRINGER: And it was (inaudible). And you indicated that that came through him from the Department of Forestry. It did not. That -- what you see on that page 36, the e-mail was -- was from the Dean himself.

CHAIR: Okay. I stand corrected. I assumed too much. Okay. Now, I'm going to give the first chance to my colleagues, Professor Arnold and Professor Lesnaw, if they want to make -- this is not yet a motion, so it has to be moved.

ARNOLD: Right. So this will probably be my last motion, and I apologize for my wimpy attempt at a motion last month. Being a doctor, I'm not used to doing this as much as the rest of you. I would move that the University Senate recommend that the University of Kentucky Board of Trustees develop a set of guidelines as listed in number 1. I had no interest in or knowledge of number 2 and would amend my motion or my -- I motion to only include number 1.

CHAIR: Okay. First, I want to take a motion for this and then amend it.

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt

ARNOLD: Okay. All right. Well, I was just going to offer my motion. All right. Then I motion both of these, number 1 and number 2, to be considered by the Senate, respectfully.

CHAIR: By the way, Professor Arnold was most gentle with me over e-mail. I don't deserve it but yet she was. Is there a second?

LESNAW: I second.

CHAIR: There is a second. Okay. Now we have this motion in front of us. At this point we could start discussing it or we could start amending it.

ARNOLD: Might I just begin the discussion? Am I allowed?

CHAIR: Absolutely. Usually the proposers are given the first chance to discuss.

ARNOLD: Well, you know, I did screw it up badly before so... (Inaudible) in no means meant as a decision-making process for the logging of Robinson Forest. In my mind, this was a notation that we did not have any oversight of our undeveloped lands as a University, and that that is a weakness of many universities throughout the country. And thus, the intent of number 1 was to set forth guidelines as we go forward for undeveloped lands which, as I understand from Mr. Smith or Dean Smith, are -- that's an unworkably vague and prejudicial term, and I apologize for that. We've already vetted the logging of Robinson Forest in a previous meeting, and I do not think it is appropriate for the Senate to be making any decisions about that as it was already decided by the Board of Trustees in 2004. That's my thinking.

CHAIR: Okay. Now, we have a motion and it has been seconded. Let's discuss it. Before I come to you, I would like if you allow me to go first to the Senator who has -- do you want to mention those? Do you want to discuss those four -- three arguments that you have?

BARNES: Tom Barnes, Forestry. This was given to me this morning in your e-mail, and I did not know about it until my chair informed me on it. And so I -- I do not want to speak specifically to what Scott Smith is asking here. However, I

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
would like to state that my esteemed Senator, Susanne Arnold, is absolutely correct in supporting and separating these two because they're really two issues. And I think that that's how they should be dealt with. I know our department has vetted the issue of logging Robinson Forest at length, as have members of the College, and they have some sense of -- and some items that were brought to my attention and our department doesn't really have an issue with the first part of the motion. And -- but we do have significant issue with the second, in that, several million dollars worth of money and several years of time have been invested into the second part of it, and we don't feel that that would be appropriate at this time to try to kind of take a step back and to make this kind of retroactive.

CHAIR:

Let me come to here.

CIBULL:

So I move -- I move an amendment to delete point 2 and only consider point 1.

McNEILL:

Second. Sam McNeill, College of Agriculture.

CIBULL:

Mike Cibull, College of Medicine. The motion which is in front of it has been amended. I would like -- in fact, I was going to go and see -- ask if any other Ag Senator or any other faculty would like, in fairness to Senator Dean Scott Smith, to -- to more pointedly discuss those, but if it comes up, I'll be happy to discuss the amendment unless one of those three points is regarding this amendment, and then we could do this. So let's start with only the amendment. Your hand was up before that.

LESNAW:

Yes. I would like --

CHAIR:

Judith Lesnaw.

LESNAW:

Judith Lesnaw, Biology. I would like to discuss the amendment and in that context I would like to discuss Dean Smith's points because they are extremely germane to number 2. So if you let me begin, and if you feel this out of order, please --

CHAIR:

Sure.

LESNAW:

-- do what you must.

CHAIR:

And if anybody else feels that a discussion is not regarding amendment, please help me and

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
make an objection. By the way,
please, go ahead.
So it was I who actually
asked that number 2 be
considered, not as part of this
amendment, but that is what
happened at the Senate Council
meeting. So you see this
(inaudible) before you. It is
clear from the enthusiasm with
which point number 1 has been
accepted here that this is a very
important set of principles that
need to be established. It is
the case that that logging has
not actually been initiated. It
is an extremely important issue,
and I -- I just want to point out
that this -- these guidelines
should be applied. Dean Smith
makes three extremely important
points. His first point asks
about the extent to which the
guidelines in number 1 be applied
to other research. In point 2,
he asks, well, to what other
lands should this number 1 be
applied. In fact, this is the
essence of these guidelines. In
point 3, he points out that, in
fact, the Board of Trustees did
already consider guidelines, but
they weren't these guidelines.
And that is why I support Dean
Smith's points wholly. I think
that they will be addressed very
adequately by the guidelines set
by the Board of Trustees,
hopefully in consultation with
faculty committees, perhaps, and
the administration. And my
goodness, we should -- in fact,
all that point number 2 asks is
that we re-examine -- that the
Board re-examine this particular
proposal of research for this
particular piece of land under
guidelines that are being
enthusiastically supported here
by this body.

CHAIR: Okay. Please speak to the
amendment which is at the moment
to drop point number 2. Over
here.

GROSSMAN: I have a question about your --
CHAIR: Bob Grossman.

GROSSMAN: Yeah, Bob Grossman, not Don
Grossman. According to your
rules, if we agree to strike 2
right now, can it be raised as a
separate motion?

CHAIR: According to my rule that was
given to me by the Senate Council

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
-- I raised the very identical question was raised, and the Senate Council said, no. If it is dropped -- in fact, I was just -- was told by the parliamentarian, if we drop it, it means the Senate doesn't want it, and it's not fair to bring it up, even if it's not under my rule; it would be under Robert's Rule. So, no, if we drop it, it cannot be resurrected today.

PARLIAMENTARIAN: Yeah, if it's dropped that's the equivalent of defeating it.

CHAIR: Speak to the motion.

YATES: J.W. Yates, College of Education. I would suggest that we separate the two as opposed to dropping it.

CHAIR: That's not speaking to the amendment. I'm sorry, we cannot consider that now. Although enough --

YATES: Well, it's speaking to the amendment to me if he's saying we drop it, and I'm saying we're just -- instead of dropping it --

CHAIR: So you're saying what again?

YATES: I'm saying we -- we vote on number 1 and number 2 separately instead of just dropping number 2.

CHAIR: Could an amendment be amended at this point. I know (inaudible) could be. Senate Council members have opinion on that because we discussed this very fact that these would not be discussed separated.

PARLIAMENTARIAN: I don't see why you could not have a motion to consider the two separately.

CHAIR: Well, it has to be an amendment to amendment which is allowed. I know one regular amendment is allowed to the amendment. So parliamentarian has said there is under the -- our rule --

CIBULL: That section was the purpose of my amendment was to do that because I thought you could not separate them because you said you couldn't change it substantively. Now, you know, you're -- so I have absolutely no problem with separating these and considering these as separate issues, and that would be the fairest thing to do.

CHAIR: Actually, logically speaking, if we vote for this amendment, it means --

CIBULL: But --

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt

CHAIR: -- forgive me if I'm wrong, it means that if we consider number 2 separately, it will be defeated. Do we agree on that?

GROSSMAN: Mike, withdraw your amendment. Withdraw it.

CI BULL: I withdraw my amendment.

CHAIR: Yes, Ernie.

YANARELLA: Wiser people than I --

CHAIR: You got to stand up.

YANARELLA: Wiser people than I can understand the mechanics of this. I simply want to point out what I believe is the case, and that is that the -- as stated by Susanne Arnold, the basic meaning and trust of number 1 is different from what the Senate Council understood it to mean and to -- to intend. In collapsing the two separate motions that came forward to the Senate, Senate Council, I think I believe that it was a common understanding -- misunderstanding, as we have now learned, that -- that 1 was applicable to the Robinson Forest, and number 2 therefore was a follow on -- follow on motion. We now learn from the -- the person who developed the initial part of this recommendation, originally a separate motion, that she does not intend for it to apply to Robinson Forest. Therefore it seems to me for the sense of the Senate Council bringing this forth, number 2 does need to be voted on.

CHAIR: Professor Arnold.

ARNOLD: Clari -- clarification. I do not intend number 1 to apply to past decisions about Robinson Forest.

CI BULL: That's what he said.

YANARELLA: That's right. But you --

ARNOLD: Now future decisions regarding --

YANARELLA: But you also said that it had been settled by the 2004 --

ARNOLD: Correct.

YANARELLA: -- Board of Trustees.

ARNOLD: But a future decision regarding Robinson Forest would fall under number 1.

CHAIR: Let's limit ourselves to the amendment. Anybody want to speak to the amendment?

GROSSMAN: Well, Dr. Cibull withdrew it or tried to withdraw it.

CHAIR: Okay. Who seconded Dr. Cibull's amendment? Over there. Do you agree to be withdrawn?

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt

YATES:
CHAIR:

Yes.
Now, at this point if a single person objects, I'm not going to let it to be withdrawn. We have to vote on it because that's just the (inaudible). Are there any objections to withdrawing the amendment? I do not hear any objection. Then the amendment is withdrawn. We are back to the original two-part motion. Yes.

YATES:

J.W. Yates, College of Education, I move that we vote on these two policies separately.

CI BULL:
CHAIR:

I second.
Okay. When I came here, according to my understanding, this would have been against a ground rule that I (inaudible) on, but my parliamentarian said it's allowed. Let me get a chance to -- before I put that motion in front of you, are there any Senate Council members who want to speak to it because allowance is given by Senate Council.

YANARELLA:
CHAIR:
YANARELLA:
CHAIR:

I -- I --
You already spoken, right?
I have spoken to it.
Yes, you already spoke. Yes, right here. Raphael Finkel.

KINKEL:

College of Engineering. This seems perfectly reasonable. Our intent was not to suppress the possibility of voting for 1 and possibly not accepting 2. And it was quite clear at the Senate Council meeting that this was an acceptable potential outcome.

CHAIR:

Okay. Please speak only to separating these two. Yes.

HARDESTY:

David Hardesty, College of Business and Economics. Do we now have two motions on the floor?

UNIDENTIFIED:

No (inaudible) --

HARDESTY:

Well, we have a motion to --
(UNINTELLIGIBLE CONVERSATION AMONG MANY)

CI BULL:

No. The amendment was withdrawn. Another amendment was proposed. That's the only motion on the floor.

PARLIAMENTARIAN:

The amendment on the -- what's on the floor is Mike's procedural motion to separate 1 and 2.

CHAIR:

We're discussing that only at this point. Are there any further discussion on separating these two? Okay. We're going to go and vote on that. All those in favor of separating the two amendments, please indicate so by

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
raising your hands. Any opposed?
One opposed. Any abstain? Two
abstain. Overwhelmingly the
motion is carried with one
abstain, one opposed.
Okay. Now, I need -- I know I
said a little bit, I need
somebody to move part number 1.
You want me to do that again?
Yes, please.
I move part number 1 be
considered by the University
Senate.

CHAI R: Any second?
CIBULL: Second.
CHAI R: Okay. Now, we are discussing --
this is now before you. We are
discussing part number 1 only.
Let me go little over there.

BARNES: Tom Barnes, Forestry. My --
regarding what Senator Smith said
with undeveloped land and being
prejudicial, I understand where
he is coming from. I mean, the
College of Agriculture typically
manages and has more land than
other colleges. And I would
indicate that the University has
done a very poor job of all of
its lands in terms of the
environment, not just undeveloped
lands but even on campus. We
continue to plant invasive exotic
species. We continue not to
look at the environmental legacy
of how this campus is treated,
let alone the undeveloped lands.
And in many cases some of the
undeveloped lands have
(inaudible) stewardship. So I
think that -- that we need to
look at it from all land, just
simply straight undeveloped and
say, regarding land owned or
obtained by the University.
Over here.

CHAI R: Is that an amendment?
GROSSMAN: He made a motion.
UNIDENTIFIED: Is that a --
CIBULL: No. I didn't get --
BARNES: (INAUDIBLE)
I would like to amend the rule of
the word undeveloped.

CHAI R: Any second on that?
LESNAW: Second.
CHAI R: Judy Lesnaw second.
GROSSMAN: No, she seconded.
CHAI R: Okay. I'm sorry, she seconded
first.

NEWMAN: It got seconded. Melissa Newman.
CHAI R: Okay. The amendment in front of
you, let's only discuss to the
amendment. I want to hear only

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
discussions regarding removal of
the -- what word?

UNIDENTIFIED:
CHAIR:

Undeveloped.
Undeveloped. Anybody want to
discuss that? Then I'm assuming
you're ready to vote on that
amendment? All those in favor of
that amendment, please indicate
by raising your hand.
Opposed?

MICHELLE:
CHAIR:
MICHELLE:

Five.
Five. Abstain?
One. I'm sorry, one, two, three
four.

CHAIR:

Four. Five opposed. Four
abstain. Overwhelmingly in
favor. The amendment passes. So
now we have a motion that has
been amended. Let's discuss to
the amended motion. Yes.

GROSSMAN:

Yes. So I -- I support this, but
there is -- there's one thing
this leaves out which is that the
-- the people who make the
decisions are -- do not always
include a substantially wide
group of people. So who is
involved in making these
decisions is crucial for, I
think, the intent of this -- of
this policy. So I would like to
propose an amendment that we add
a sentence to this motion saying
that the -- the policies and
decisions on how these policies
are implemented should -- the
people who decide the policies
and who are charged with
implementing the policies should
include as wide a group of
stakeholders as is reasonably
possible.

CHAIR:
GROSSMAN:
BROTHERS:

Where would that go?
At the end, replace the word and.
I'm sorry, the people who decide
who decide the policies and are
responsible for implementing the
policies should include as wide
--

GROSSMAN:

A group of stakeholders as is
reasonably possible.

CHAIR:

Okay. I have -- a second I
need? Anybody second the
amendment?

YATES:

Second. J. W. Yates, College of
Education.

CHAIR:

Okay. Now, we're only discussing
the amendment only. Let me go
back to

CHAPPELL:

I want to speak to the initial
description of where it says that
University of Kentucky --

CHAIR:

No, let me stop you.

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt

CHAPPELL:

No, I'm sorry, we're talking about this right now. This --

CHAIR:

No. I want the amendment --

CHAPPELL:

The amendment, and it says the University of Kentucky Board of Trustees will bring a recommendation on research initiative proposed within .1. And I object to the University of Kentucky Board of Trustees because I doubt that they can really judge the research initiatives that would be proposed within the use of this land.

CHAIR:

This is a valid comment, but not to the amendment that we have to vote first before we can discuss what you are discussing. So I would like to ask Senator to discuss the amendment which was to add one sentence. Does anybody want the sentence to be read back to you? Okay. Let me go there and then here.

THELIN:

John Thelin, College of Education. With all due respect, I think the proposed amendment is gratuitous. There are a number of guidelines and documents that set forth how the Board of Trustees proceed, and also pragmatically, the more specifics you add into that, the more chance you have of derailing it. Speak to the amendment.

CHAIR:

John has articulated one --

UNIDENTIFIED:

All right. Anybody wants to speak to the amendment. Let me go there.

CHAIR:

ELDRED:

Janet Eldred, English. At the last meeting I heard from people that they felt that the very idea of stakeholders was too narrow. I heard several people say that Robinson Forest is not something that belongs to one department but to the whole University. And I understand what you're saying, John, except that it hasn't happened. And so for me, I'm not sure that the language that Bob Grossman proposed says what I need it to do because it's the very idea of stakeholders that seems to me that's been either assumed or under defined. And so I don't know what the Board of Trustees' guidelines are, and I don't know that they explain that, for example, Robinson Forest is a University-holding as opposed to a holding that belongs

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
to a specific department at the
University. And so that's my --
my problem is the word
stakeholders, because I feel like
stakeholders is exactly what's at
issue. Who are the stakeholders?

GROSSMAN: I'm willing to entertain a
friendly amendment.

CHAIR: Okay. In -- in using your time,
I want to remind you that there's
a second part that you want to
consider. And once we adjourn,
then we have adjourned this time.
So anybody wants to speak on the
amendment? Over there and then
I'll go next to Calvert. Yes,
you.

HALLMAN: Diana Hallman, Fine Arts. I
don't know what wording to add,
but I think the general concern
is that this be environmentally
sensitive, a consideration to be
environmentally sensitive. And
we can put language in there that
-- that reassures us there are
going to be spokes people who are
environmentally sensitive to a
greater degree than -- than has
been reflected so far, perhaps
that's responding to some of the
green paper suggestions. I think
that would satisfy a greater
range of people.

CHAIR: I said I'd go to Calvert.

CALVERT: Ken Calvert, Engineering.
Correct me if I'm wrong, but
ultimately the Board of Trustees
makes all the decisions regarding
all the lands owned by the
University, right?

CHAIR: Right.

CALVERT: So it seems to me that the
notion -- you want to talk about
process by which decisions or
recommendations would come to
them, but ultimately they're
going to -- it would be hard for
us to state what they really want
but they're -- they're the
representatives, and they're
going to make the decision.

CHAIR: We'll go back, way back there,
and then I'll come here.

WILLIAMS: Thank you. David Williams
College of Agriculture.

Concerning the suggestion to the
amendment, it appears to me to be
extremely arrogant to assume that
the faculty in the Department of
Forestry are not environmentally
sensitive. As a matter of fact,
I take that as an insult even
though I'm not a member of that

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
faculty. And then secondly, in
support of Dr. Grossman's
amendment, I think we should have
a very broad representation on --
Please speak to me. Yes.

CHAIR:
WILLIAMS:

-- any kind of regulatory
committee as we should probably
be regulating all research
activities if we're going to
micro-manage the research
activities of the College of
Agriculture. We should also
micro-manage those of the College
of Medicine, Arts and Sciences,
and so on and so forth.

CHAIR:

Okay. The sooner we vote
on the amendment, then we could
then discuss the motion itself.
Anybody want to speak on the
amendment? You want -- to the
amendment?

ATWOOD:

David Atwood, Arts and Sciences.
Is this not something that the
Senate can actually have more
involvement as being guardian at
the gate for the stakeholders
since we are a broad body for the
campus? I'm not trying to
increase the workload for
everyone, but thought that --

CHAIR:

We just leave the comment as that
and go here.

WOOD:

Connie Wood, Arts and Sciences.
Bob, would you consider a
friendly amendment which replaces
the word stakeholder with, I
believe, with members of the
University community?

GROSSMAN:

How about concerned members of
the University community? As
wide -- as long as where it says,
wide as reasonably possible, is
retained because you can't have
everyone in the room, obviously.

WOOD:

I was not; it's just that I was
objecting to the -- the -- those
--

GROSSMAN:

No. Actually, I think I prefer
the word stakeholders. I think
as wide a group of stakeholders
--

CHAIR:

You can amend the amendment if
you want. Okay? Please speak
to the amendment. Yes.

HALLMAN:

Stakeholders, if you want that
term from a range of disciplines
in the --

CHAIR:

The most efficient way is to
amend an amendment. Okay. I
hope we won't -- we are
(inaudible) close to losing
quorum, but if we lose quorum
then we cannot continue. So I

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
suggest that please stay here
until 5:00. Are we ready to vote
on the amendment?
UNI DENTIFIED: Could you please repeat the
amendment?
CHAIR: Please repeat the sentence which
is supposed to go at the end of
the part number 1.
BROTHERS: The people who decide the
policies and are responsible for
implementing the policies should
include as wide a group of
stakeholders as is reasonably
possible.
CHAIR: Okay. I'm hoping that we are
ready to vote on that amendment.
All those in favor of this
amendment, please indicate so by
raising your hands.
MICHELLE: Twenty.
CHAIR: Opposed?
MICHELLE: Twenty-eight.
CHAIR: Twenty-eight. Abstain?
MICHELLE: Four.
CHAIR: Four. Amendment fails. We are
back to the language of one.
Okay. Let's remember we have one
more full motion to discuss.
Anybody want to talk -- speak to
the language of one as it is in
front of you?
ANDERSON: Debra Anderson, College of
Nursing. Can I call the motion?
CHAIR: Of course you could.
ANDERSON: I'd like to call the motion.
CHAIR: Okay.
GROSSMAN: Second.
CHAIR: We cannot discuss that. We have
to immediately vote on the
question.
UNI DENTIFIED: Call the question.
CHAIR: Yes, call the question. Two-
thirds -- that means no more
discussion about this -- this
motion which is number 1.
UNI DENTIFIED: Do we need to vote on the
question?
CHAIR: We need -- yes, we need two-
thirds, in fact, more than 50
percent. All those in favor of
stopping the debate on number 1
indicate by raising your hand.
Opposed? One, two, three.
Abstain? One, two.
Motion carries. We have to
immediately now vote on the
motion, was not amended. The
motion in front of you. We
cannot discuss it. We have to
vote right now. All those in
favor of this motion, including
the striking of the word
undeveloped, please indicate so,

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
if you agree with this motion
indicate so by raising your hand.
Opposed? Let's count out loud.

MICHELLE:
CHAIR:

Eight.

Since this is the final vote,
let's also count in favor.
Please raise your hand if you are
in favor. So eight was opposed.

MICHELLE:
CHAIR:

Thirty-nine.

Thirty-nine. So we are losing
some. Abstain? One, two, three,
four abstain. Thirty-nine, 8, 4,
motion pass.

ARNOLD:

May I go on the record as saying
this was never intended to insult
anyone in the Department of
Forestry.

CHAIR:
ARNOLD:
CHAIR:

All right.

Very good.

Okay. Now, I need a volunteer,
and I give that first to Judith
Lesnaw since this was her
original motion to -- if she
wants to move part 2.

LESNAW:

I move that we place -- that
we -- that the University Senate
recommends that the University of
Kentucky Board of Trustees place
a moratorium on the logging of
Robinson Forest until the
guidelines for use of lands owned
by the University are established
and are applied to Robinson
Forest.

CHAIR:

Since this was never a motion
this is completely acceptable;
doesn't require any approval by
anybody; it's her motion, and --
Needs a second.

CIBULL:

CHAIR:

Any second?

PARLIAMENTARIAN:

Needs a second.

CHAIR:

Needs a second.

STEINER:

Second. Joe Steiner, Biology.

CHAIR:

Okay. Now the motion is in front
of you. Everything that you see
except the word undeveloped.
Let's start discussing this
motion, and if anybody here could
speak to Dean Scott Smith's
points, in favor of it
especially, please let me know,
and I'll give you the chance.
Yes.

CIBULL:

I'm not speaking for Dean Smith
at all, but from my understanding
of the discussion last time, this
-- this specific proposal was
vetted through all the
appropriate channels. It was
peer-reviewed, and it was
approved, and it was then
approved at the level of the
Board of Trustees using the

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
guidelines that are in place. So all the Is are dotted and all the Ts are crossed, and I think it is dangerous for the Senate to second guess research in this fashion. This could be done in the College of Medicine for controversial proposals. It could be done in the College of -- in the Department of Biology. If somebody doesn't like your research, they could bring it to the Senate to be discussed. I think if all the appropriate steps are taken, and the outcome is the outcome, and I don't think it should be reviewed in this fashion.

CHAIR:

WILLIAMS:

Go back there. David Williams, College of Agriculture. I think by passing the first amendment, we've already opened that very box of problems, and I fully intend to pursue exactly that. If we're going to micro-manage these -- this laboratory, which is exactly what it is, albeit outdoors, then we should manage all laboratories. So we have to draw that line somewhere. It will be up to the Senate to come up to where that is.

CIBULL:

We tried it in your lab, test your lab (inaudible).

WILLIAMS:

CHAIR:

Yeah.
Okay. Let me go over there. I'm sorry, I'll come back to you next.

REMER:

Rory Remer, Education. I think it should be clear that this is not so much discussing the management of laboratory or attacking the Forestry Department, but it's calling to question the Board of Trustees and their processes. And I don't know how to take -- I don't know what they went through. I don't know if they followed any guidelines, but it would be very beneficial to know if they even have guidelines. So I don't know -- I would like to separate those two things if it's possible to do so. At least in my mind, I know that I'm questioning the Board of Trustees.

CHAIR:

HAYES:

Let me go -- right.
Jane Hayes, College of Engineering. I just wanted to comment that I do agree with what the gentleman said up front, and

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
that if you're still concerned
even if you vote down number 2,
that project and any other
project that's going on there is
still going to fall under item 1
unless those guidelines are in
place. So stopping someone's
project that's in process doesn't
really seem kosher to me.

CHAIR:

Anybody else want to speak to
this? Yes.

VIELE:

I just actually have a question.

BROTHERS:

Name, please.

VIELE:

Kert Viele, Arts and Sciences.
Considering that even though it
was maybe directed at the Board
of Trustees, I certainly don't
want to sacrifice the Forestry
professor in order to make our
point. So I was wondering if --
what would be the ramifications
for this study. I mean is this
catastrophic or can it be put on
hold for two months or what, and
I'd like to invite, we have a
guest who perhaps hasn't had a
chance to speak, at least not to
the Senate, but any comments
would be welcome.

CHAIR:

Back there.

HOUTZ:

Bob Houtz, Horticulture. I
appreciate Senator Cibull's
comments because I think that's
very true. You know we run a
research farm on South
Nicholasville and that's where a
lot of research is done. Number
1 opens the possibility that
someone would say, it has a
better use in some other design
than what we in our profession
have decided as we pursue
research that establishes, for
example, sustainability practices
for horticulture in this state,
as well as other production
practices. This is relative to
Scott Smith's note saying, to
which University research and
education facilities which this
motion addresses. It's more than
just the College of Ag and
Forestry. It's all of those
research farms that are used in
this way.

CHAIR:

Let me go there and then up here.
You, Ernie.

YANARELLA:

I -- I did not vote on the first
motion. I will not vote on the
second one since I'm on the Board
of Trustees. I do want to offer
some information with regard to
number 2. A little over a month

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
ago, there was a Herald-Leader editorial which I brought to the attention of the Board of Trustees and to its chair. I requested of the chair two things; number one that the Board have the opportunity to engage in a site visit, and that number two, she request of the powers that be that a moratorium on -- on proceeding with the project, specifically the commercial logging, be postponed until the Board had -- had had an opportunity to engage in a site visit. We have -- have done that. We just had late in October, and to the best of my knowledge, that -- that moratorium was put in place. So that is a point of information. I am looking for signals from the University Senate, as one of the faculty Trustees, for advice on and guidance with regard to how the Board of Trustees should proceed.

CHAIR: It's good that only I see the clock. I just want to let you know -- you guys don't see this -- almost 5:00 now so let me go to this gentleman.

GARRITY: Tom Garrity, College of Medicine. I read pretty carefully the green paper document that you sent out today, and it raises a lot of points, many of them very, very thought-provoking and to me personally troubling. And I guess I feel like some attention needs to be paid to the care and nurturing of this property. And this huge experiment, probably well designed, will tear a very, very large portion of this pristine forest area. I mean, my problem is I feel right at this moment that I will support the second for a moratorium because I think there are enough questions raised in the document, many of them may be erroneous, but there's an awful lot of points that I think would make most of us hesitate. So I'm speaking in favor of the second motion.

CHAIR: Any other comment? Over here.
SUBBASWAMY: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, I am a voting member of this Senate.

CHAIR: Yes.
SUBBASWAMY: And I take this extraordinary step of urging my colleagues in

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
the Senate to vote against the second motion. I think there are assumptions being made about the integrity and the thoroughness of the study being conducted by the Department of Forestry. Just now talking about pristine forest, does the esteemed Senator even know what a pristine forest is and has he talked to the colleagues in Forestry about whether it is, in fact, a pristine forest? And -- and so there are being -- assumptions being made and a degree of knowledge that's being presumed on the part of the Senators that they do not possess, and I think that it's pernicious and dangerous to place a moratorium on an experiment that has been in planning and process for three years, has been approved, and has been indicated, has been vetted in multiple ways and peer reviewed, and I think it's a dangerous precedent to do so, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, this motion.

CHAIR:

CALVERT:

CHAIR:

FINKEL:

CHAIR:

Any other comment?

Call the question. Ken Calvert, Engineering.

Calling the question. That's not --

Second.

Second. That's not debatable.

So we are going to immediately vote on the question. If you -- if you vote yes, it means the debate must be stopped and immediately we have to vote on the motion. If you say no, then it means we can still debate some more. All those in favor of calling the question, stopping the debate, indicate so by raising your hands. Opposed? Yes has it. It's more than two-thirds. So we are stopping the debate. Now, we are going to vote on the motion. Does everyone understand what we are voting on? We are voting on item 2. If you say yes, item 2 is approved. If you say no, item 2 is not approved. All those in -- yes.

ANDERSON:

Deborah Anderson, College of Nursing --

CHAIR:

We cannot discuss this. Is this like a parliamentary inquiry? Yes.

ANDERSON: Parliamentary inquiry. I'm -- I'm

curious if it was really two-thirds.

CHAIR: We'll go ahead and count. All those in favor of stopping the debate, again, show by raising your hand. This is back -- called the question, yes.

MI CHELLE: Thirty-eight.

CHAIR: Thirty-eight. Opposed?

MI CHELLE: Eleven.

CHAIR: Eleven. Abstain?

MI CHELLE: Three.

CHAIR: Thirty-eight, 11, 3, the motion passes. It means we are stopping debate. We are ready to vote on the item itself. If you vote yes, you are accepting item number 2. If you vote yes, you are rejecting item number 2. We're going to count --

UNIDENTIFIED: You said yes twice.

CHAIR: If you say no, we are not approving, we are rejecting number 2. I'm sorry. Thank you. All those in favor of item number 2, as it is in front of you without the word undeveloped, please indicate by raising your hand.

MI CHELLE: Eight.

CHAIR: Eight. Opposed?

MI CHELLE: Do you want these counted also?

CHAIR: Yes, sir. We have waited one hour for this moment.

MI CHELLE: Thirty-eight.

CHAIR: Thirty-eight. Abstain? One, two, three, four. Four. Motion is defeated. Somebody make a motion to adjourn.

UNIDENTIFIED: Motion to adjourn.

CHAIR: Second?

UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

CHAIR: Okay. I see that you all are in favor.

* * * * *

WHEREUPON, the University of Kentucky Senate Council meeting for November 12, 2007, was adjourned.

* * * * *

STATE OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

I, LISA E. HOINKE, the undersigned Notary Public in and for the State of Kentucky at Large, certify that the facts stated in the caption hereto

Xcript 11-12-07 Senate.txt
are true; that at the time and place stated in said caption the UK Senate Council Meeting was taken down in stenotype by me and later reduced to computer transcription under my direction, and the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings which took place during said meeting.

My commission expires: January 26, 2011.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 6th day of February, 2008.

LISA E. HOINKE
NOTARY PUBLIC,
STATE-AT-LARGE
K E N T U C K Y