

**UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY**

**SENATE COUNCIL**

---

**Regular Session**

**October 8, 2001  
3:02 p.m.**

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

**Professor William Fortune, Chair**

\*\*\*\*\*

**ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.**

**FREELANCE COURT REPORTERS & VIDEO SERVICES**

**STEPHANIE K. SCHLOEMER, PRESIDENT**

**10 NORTH UPPER STREET**

**P. O. BOX 85, LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40588**

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

**e-mail: [ctreport@aol.com](mailto:ctreport@aol.com)**

\*\*\*\*\*

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

-----

***SPEAKERS***  
***(in order)***

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

***VOTES TAKEN***  
***(Page)***

11  
18  
21  
23  
25  
28  
29

(Counting votes: Celinda Todd and Michelle Sonar)

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

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

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

27 The other is the Health Benefits  
28 Committee and I've been sitting on that since the  
29 beginning of the semester. And it's meeting regularly  
30 on Wednesdays at 2:00 in the Student Union Building.  
31 And we have received a tremendous amount of  
32 information, a tremendous amount of input. It seems to  
33 me that most of the input we're getting on the web site  
34 and in person is coming from staff, not faculty, but  
35 there will be recommendations coming from the Health  
36 Benefits Committee probably early in November. So if  
37 you all would like to kind of get abreast of what's  
38 going on there, you might come to those meetings.

39 There are no resolutions.

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

44 Now, as to the fourth item, and that was  
45 a proposal from the Admissions and Academic Standards  
46 Committee, for a change in Senate Rule 4.3.1, which has  
47 to do with the time in which a person can AD in the  
48 summer, the concern being that six days is way too long

1 for an AD period in the summer. It turned out after  
2 the recommendation came to me from the Admissions and  
3 Academic Standards Committee that this problem was  
4 actually taken care of last year and that the existing  
5 Rule gives the registrar authority to set an AD period  
6 of less than six days in the summer. And I've spoken  
7 with Don Witt, the Registrar, and he is comfortable  
8 with exercising that authority. So he will -- For the  
9 upcoming summer session, he will have an AD period  
10 which is proportional to the length of those summer  
11 sessions. I don't know exactly what it would be but my  
12 guess is it would be two days. And in light of that,  
13 we're withdrawing this proposal, 4.3.1, that came to  
14 you on an e-mail because it doesn't make any sense.  
15 The problem was cured last year.

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

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

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

1 having signed the petition. The Senate Council met on  
2 this and the Senate Council discussed it. And Davy  
3 Jones, who was the author of the petition, was present  
4 and he agreed to certain changes in the proposal. And  
5 the changes are, in effect, that the Senate minutes  
6 will be as they have been, that is the action taken  
7 without any kind of summary or transcription of the  
8 actual debate, but that there will be, in addition to  
9 that, a transcript prepared. And the transcript will  
10 be available on the web and copies of the transcript  
11 will be archived in the library and kept in the Senate  
12 Council office and the transcript will be properly  
13 indexed so that the person doing research into the  
14 proceedings of the Senate would be able to access that  
15 information from the transcript.

16 Now, the summary of what we did is Item  
17 C. And the matter is before you and it will not need a  
18 second, of course. And the floor is open for debate.  
19 Before we have debate, I would like to introduce you to  
20 Stephanie Schloemer. The recommendation of the Senate  
21 Council, with one dissenting vote, was to recommend  
22 approval of this. And I thought in light of that, the  
23 Senate Council recommending approval, that the chances  
24 were pretty good that the Senate, as a whole, would go  
25 along with it.

26 And so Stephanie Schloemer --  
27 (indicating) Stephanie -- is the person that we have  
28 hired to do the transcripts. The procedure, of course,  
29 that will follow is that all senators will announce  
30 themselves. Stephanie's got a list of the senators.  
31 So she'll be able to get the spelling correct. If  
32 there's a guest, the guest should so state and if the  
33 name is an odd name, just spell the name so that we can  
34 get the names correct. But, with that, the floor is  
35 open to debate on this petition. The floor is open to  
36 David Durant.

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

41 MR. FORTUNE: Are there other  
42 comments?

43 Mary Molinaro.

44 MS. MOLINARO: Mary Molinaro  
45 from the Library. I think that this is important to  
46 have a transcript of what people actually said. What  
47 we had before was what people -- what we thought we  
48 said and, in fact, what we wish we had said. Because

1 people, whoever was taking the notes, would call people  
2 and say, "What did you really say?" Then you had a  
3 chance to really reflect on it and say it again. So --  
4 But I think this is important for an archival record  
5 for the University. When we look back over time, being  
6 a librarian, I think this is important to have this in  
7 the archives of the University.

8 MR. FORTUNE: Other comments?  
9 Yes, Kaveh Tagavi.

10 MR. TAGAVI: T-a-g-a-v-i. I  
11 want to speak to the entire merit of this. I'll just  
12 give you one example. When somebody gives a -- makes a  
13 motion for amendment, it is unfair to that amendment,  
14 whether it gets passed or not passed, not to have the  
15 rationale for that amendment. If you only seem to say  
16 this was the amendment and the vote was either yes or  
17 no, that doesn't do service to that amendment and to  
18 the thought process and the process of other senators  
19 here. Because usually after the amendment, the author  
20 of the amendment gives the rationale. And the  
21 rationale is very important. Agenda items that come  
22 from Senate Council have their own rationale and they  
23 should have. Same way with the amendment. So I just  
24 wanted to give you one aspect of this, which is very  
25 positive.

26 MR. FORTUNE: Other comments?  
27 Phil Kraemer, K-r-a-e-m-e-r.

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

31 MR. FORTUNE: We do have an  
32 audio record, that's correct.

33 MR. KRAEMER: So we'll  
34 duplicate that with a written record.

35 MR. FORTUNE: Right.

36 MR. KRAEMER: Any other  
37 formats?  
38 (Crowd laughs)

39 MR. FORTUNE: That's correct.  
40 We will have an audio record and we will have a  
41 transcript. I think the thought, and Mary Molinaro  
42 expressed it, is that the transcript will be much more  
43 accessible, I think, than an audio record.  
44 Yes?

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

1 MR. FORTUNE: No. These are  
2 just the Senate meetings.  
3 MR. GLEESON: And this person  
4 is employed just for the time of the meeting?  
5 MR. FORTUNE: Correct.  
6 Stephanie is a freelance court reporter.  
7 Other comments? Kaveh Tagavi.  
8 MR. TAGAVI: You mentioned the  
9 vote by the Senate Council was not unanimous. What was  
10 the vote?  
11 MR. FORTUNE: Well, there was  
12 one dissent. And I don't know how many folks were  
13 there but maybe Cindy--  
14 MR. TAGAVI: That's enough.  
15 One dissent?  
16 MR. FORTUNE: Yes.  
17 MR. TAGAVI: That's all I  
18 meant.  
19 MR. FORTUNE: Other comments?  
20 (No response.)  
21 All right. All in favor of the motion,  
22 which is as stated on Item C, signify by saying aye.  
23 ("AYE" VOICE VOTE: MAJORITY)  
24 MR. FORTUNE: Opposed say nay.  
25 ("NAY" VOICE VOTE: TWO)  
26 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Ayes have  
27 it.  
28 Okay. Now, I have Stephanie seated next  
29 to me in case that I forget in the heat of the moment  
30 to ask someone their name or something. And she will  
31 poke me and tell me to shape up. Okay.  
32 Now, we have -- In connection with the  
33 Election Rules, the Senate Council met and considered  
34 proposed amendments to the Election Rules. And this is  
35 Item A. And we're going to vote on these separately.  
36 We have three matters.  
37 And so Item A, the first, Item A, if you  
38 will, or we'll just call it the Board of Trustees  
39 Election issue is set out -- is Item A and it's the  
40 first couple of pages. But we met as the Council and  
41 considered some amendments which had been offered.  
42 Those which appeared to be not substantive, not  
43 controversial, we just agreed to and just incorporated  
44 into the version of this that you have before you. So,  
45 for example, we eliminated the little "a" there because  
46 we don't have a subsection "a." This is on the first  
47 page. We -- There is no subsection "a" so we  
48 eliminated that. We didn't feel that there was any

1 legitimate reason to require that the nominators have  
2 primary faculty appointments. In other words, if  
3 you're a faculty member, even if you're holding an  
4 administrative appointment, we didn't see any logical  
5 reason why faculty members -- why those faculty members  
6 shouldn't be nominated. So to the extent that we were  
7 going to require 50 percent or more for a person to be  
8 a nominator, we took that out.

9 We also included a provision to deal  
10 with the unlikely situation of having a tie by an  
11 amendment which is actually not so designated. And  
12 it's in the last two lines on page two. And there was  
13 no provision for a tie, no tie breaker. So we went  
14 with the -- "or by lot," you know, throw fingers or  
15 something, if both received the same number of first  
16 choice votes. So the part of that within the  
17 parentheses which reads, "... or by lot if both  
18 receive the same number of first choice votes ..." is  
19 an amendment that we thought was non-controversial.  
20 And so we just included that.

21 So what we're putting before you is Item  
22 A with this minor amendments in it. This was the  
23 subject of discussion last time. I think I noted in  
24 the minutes some matters that were raised, some issues  
25 that were raised. And of course, obviously, the floor  
26 is open to those folks who made those suggestions if  
27 they would like to amend the proposal at this time. We  
28 have two amendments which are placed before you because  
29 we felt that these are substantive, one of which the  
30 Senate Council agreed to or recommending approval, one  
31 of which the Senate Council did not recommend approval.  
32 And those proposed amendments are on A-1 which is --  
33 it follows the entire Item A but it applies only to the  
34 Board of Trustees. So if you want to look at that with  
35 me.

36 The first amendment provides that each  
37 voter may indicate a first and second choice. And we  
38 will talk about the rationale of that when we discuss  
39 the amendment. The Senate Council considered that and  
40 voted to recommend approval of that.

41 The second amendment is a provision  
42 which would deal with the situation where a faculty  
43 member is 50 percent administrative in nature, has 50  
44 percent DOE, 50 percent administrative appointment on  
45 the DOE. And the proposed amendment would mean that  
46 that person could not serve on the Board of Trustees,  
47 would be ineligible. And the Senate Council recommends  
48 disapproval of that, in other words, leaving the rule

1 alone on that particular provision.

2 What I would like to do is to deal with  
3 these two amendments first and then to deal with any  
4 amendments from the floor on the -- either on the  
5 amendments or on the proposal as it now stands. So the  
6 first amendment -- and Kaveh Tagavi is the maker of the  
7 amendment -- it will need a second.

8 MR. GESUND: Second.

9 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Let me  
10 get through the second. Hans Gesund, G-e-s-u-n-d,  
11 seconded. Okay.

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

15 MR. TAGAVI: Yes. I admit I  
16 am the person who made this amendment. The way -- For  
17 those of you who might not recall, the way it is right  
18 now or the last time we voted for Board of Trustees,  
19 there was one vacancy but you had to vote for two  
20 people, first choice and second choice. And my point  
21 is, you should not be forced to vote for a person that  
22 you don't feel comfortable. That's just fundamentally  
23 wrong. And I simply recommended to change the word  
24 "should" to "may." Therefore, if you want -- if you do  
25 have a second choice, you may vote for a second choice  
26 and it would count in case of a tie. But if you don't  
27 have a second choice and, more importantly, if you  
28 don't want any other person to get on the Board of  
29 Trustees, you don't have to vote for anybody that you  
30 don't want to. So that explains my amendment.

31 MR. FORTUNE: I think I saw  
32 Brad Canon come in and he's -- Yes, there's Brad.  
33 Brad is Chair of the Rules Committee and has dealt with  
34 this particular rule over the years. And I think it  
35 would be appropriate for the members of the Senate to  
36 hear what Brad has to say about this, about the history  
37 of this voting rule and how this would change it.

38 MR. CANON: Well, as you know,  
39 we've always had in the past a requirement that you  
40 have a first and second choice. And I have no strong  
41 feelings about Kaveh's amendment either way. I think  
42 I'd agree with it. What this would do, in effect,  
43 would be just let you cast a first-choice vote. And if  
44 you did not want to cast a second choice vote, you  
45 didn't have to. Now, the second-choice votes that were  
46 cast would, of course, determine the winner and,  
47 perhaps, even without a majority of all the voters if  
48 enough people did not cast second choice votes. But

1 this way we would avoid what Kaveh thinks is the  
2 unfortunate or unfair situation of forcing you to cast  
3 a second choice vote.

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

6 MR. CANON: When did what?

7 MR. DURANT: When do the  
8 second votes get counted?

9 MR. CANON: The second? They  
10 get counted right after the first votes. Let's say X  
11 gets 45 percent, Y gets 40, and Z gets 15 percent. The  
12 15 percent second choice votes get counted right away.

13 We kind of vote two elections into one. This avoids a  
14 run-off ballot and the month or so that is consumed in  
15 holding a run-off ballot.

16 MR. FORTUNE: Do you all  
17 understand how this works? I didn't until I actually  
18 got to counting the votes. When you have a required  
19 second-place vote, that means that you have three  
20 candidates. And the third-place person drops out and  
21 then you look at the way in which that person's second-  
22 place votes were split up. And you add those to the  
23 folks who have gotten -- are in the top two positions.

24 And it's going to wind up with one or the other of  
25 these people having an actual majority of votes cast,  
26 which is a little bit deceptive because some of those  
27 votes are second-place votes. But that's the way it is  
28 currently working.

29 Kaveh's amendment would eliminate the  
30 necessity of casting a second-place vote, which means  
31 that you might well have someone who would not have had  
32 a majority of folks express a preference for that  
33 person. That's basically what we're talking about.  
34 But let's see -- In the back, sir?

35 MR. RANDALL: It looks to me,  
36 however, is we retain the two votes on a second ballot.

37 Is that what we want to do?

38 MR. CANON: Yes.

39 MR. RANDALL: Okay.

40 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Yes, sir.

41 MR. FORGUE: Forgue,  
42 F-o-r-g-u-e. But it's true on a second ballot you  
43 wouldn't have to vote. Whereas, on the first ballot,  
44 the way it's set up now, you have to vote, is that  
45 correct, my interpreting? In other words, if we had  
46 had a second ballot, the votes come out, two parties  
47 are less, you cannot vote if you choose not to?

48 MR. FORTUNE: I'm going to

1 defer to my Rules Committee Chair.  
2 MR. CANON: Well, under  
3 Kaveh's amendment, this would be the same thing.  
4 MR. FORTUNE: All right.  
5 Further questions or comments on this? (No response.)  
6 Okay. All in favor of the amendment,  
7 signify by saying aye.  
8 ("AYE" VOICE VOTE: ALL)  
9 MR. FORTUNE: Opposed, say  
10 nay.  
11 ("NAY" VOICE VOTE: NONE)  
12 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. The  
13 second amendment that we've received, also from Kaveh  
14 Tagavi, was to switch -- this is subtle but to switch  
15 50 percent or more faculty appointment to more than 50  
16 percent. And the Senate Council recommends disapproval  
17 of that on the agenda that was sent out. Kaveh's  
18 rationale is set out and the Senate Council's rationale  
19 for recommending disapproval was sent out. So the  
20 motion is before you. We would need a second.  
21 MR. GESUND: Second.  
22 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Second by  
23 Hans Gesund on the second amendment. Okay. Discussion  
24 of this? Kaveh, do you want to explain your rationale?  
25 MR. TAGAVI: Yes. This is,  
26 admittedly, of much less practical importance than the  
27 first amendment, a lot more philosophical. I think  
28 there's periods of the original rule that says 50  
29 percent or more is that you want the faculty  
30 representative to represent faculty rather than the  
31 administration. Therefore, my amendment, which only  
32 filled the gap of one percent immediately, would ensure  
33 those who would go to the Board of Trustees  
34 representing the faculty would be more faculty than  
35 administrative. It's philosophical. I admit it. It  
36 is a philosophical amendment.  
37 MR. FORTUNE: Would any member  
38 of the Council like to speak to state the rationale  
39 opposing? (No response.)  
40 Okay. No one would. Other comments on  
41 this?  
42 Yes. Lee Edgerton.  
43 MR. EDGERTON: Bill, I don't  
44 want to speak for the Council--  
45 MR. FORTUNE: Edgerton.  
46 MR. EDGERTON: --but I think  
47 the view opposing it is that this is such a minor  
48 change that people can quickly shift the percentage of

1 appointment and it will have, as you said, no practical  
2 value. It seems to be a minor issue that will not  
3 really resolve a problem.

4 MR. FORTUNE: Other comments?  
5 Hans Gesund.

6 MR. GESUND: I believe that I  
7 agree with Kaveh. I think it's a matter of philosophy  
8 and logic. It really should be 51 percent faculty. I  
9 agree that one percent doesn't make a darn bit of  
10 difference. In fact, it could be 50.01 or 50.001. But  
11 it's a matter of philosophy of saying yes, we want a  
12 faculty member on the Board of Trustees to be more than  
13 half faculty.

14 MR. FORTUNE: Any other  
15 questions or comments? (No response.)

16 Okay. All in favor of amendment number  
17 two, signify by saying aye.  
18 ("AYE" VOICE VOTE: SEVERAL)

19 MR. FORTUNE: Opposed, say  
20 nay.  
21 ("NAY" VOICE VOTE: SEVERAL)

22 MR. FORTUNE: Show of hands.  
23 All in favor of the motion, please raise their right  
24 hand.  
25 ("AYE" HAND COUNT TAKEN)

26 MR. FORTUNE: We need  
27 counters.

28 MS. SONAR: I haven't counted  
29 them yet. (Pause while counting...) There would be 33  
30 total.

31 MR. FORTUNE: All right. All  
32 opposed? Thirty-three ayes. Okay.

33 Opposed, please raise your hands.  
34 ("NAY" HAND COUNT TAKEN)

35 MS. SONAR: Fourteen and 27.

36 MR. FORTUNE: Fourteen and 27  
37 is--

38 MS. SONAR: Yes.

39 MR. FORTUNE: --is 41. Okay.

40 **THE MOTION FAILS.** Okay.

41 (FINAL COUNT: "AYE" 33; "NAY" 41)

42 Now, are there four amendments? Bill  
43 Thom, T-h-o-m.

44 MR. THOM: I would like to  
45 move that -- And I guess, Bill, I'll ask the question  
46 first. Have all these been repeated twice in this  
47 handout?

48 MR. FORTUNE: Bill Thom is

1 asking about a Rules Committee ruling that seems to be  
2 outmoded. And I suggested that the matter be taken  
3 care of by a motion to delete this. And now that I  
4 look at my copy of the proposal--

5 MR. THOM: We have two. We  
6 have -- It's repeated, isn't it? But what I have  
7 concern about is on both page four and page six. Are  
8 they repeated?

9 MR. FORTUNE: Well, let's see.  
10 It's on page four.

11 MR. THOM: Also, look on page  
12 six.

13 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Now--

14 MR. THOM: Looks like the same  
15 thing to me.

16 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Let's do  
17 this. That's actually -- We're going to vote on the -  
18 - That's election to the Senate, isn't it?

19 MR. THOM: Yes.

20 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Let's  
21 deal -- see if there are any floor amendments to the  
22 motion to change the rules for voting for the faculty  
23 representative on the Board of Trustees, first, and  
24 then go on to the election of the Senate. Are there no  
25 floor amendments? (No response.)

26 Okay. All in favor, signify by saying  
27 aye. I mean -- Excuse me. I'm sorry. The vote now  
28 will be on the original proposal with the first  
29 amendment which passed. So all in favor of the  
30 proposal to change the election rules pertaining to the  
31 Board of Trustees with the first amendment, signify by  
32 saying aye.

33 ("AYE" VOICE VOTE: ALL)

34 MR. FORTUNE: Opposed, say no.

35 ("NAY VOICE VOTE: NONE)

36 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Now, the  
37 next item is the election. I think the way we have it  
38 in here, the next election is to the Undergraduate  
39 Council. So this is page three and--

40 MS. TODD: It looks like there  
41 are two different sets of election to the Senate here.  
42 It's repeated.

43 MR. FORTUNE: I'm not sure I'm  
44 tracking here. But my page three, anyway, shows --  
45 Let's vote on this. On page three is the proposal to  
46 change the rules relating to the Undergraduate Council.  
47 And this was discussed at the last minute -- meeting  
48 very briefly. Phil Kraemer is here who is the -- His

1 title is not Dean of Undergraduate Studies any more.  
2 Phil, should we adjust your title to reflect that?  
3 MR. KRAEMER: That would be  
4 wise.  
5 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. So  
6 without -- We'll take as a friendly amendment, if you  
7 will, a proposal to -- And how should we make that  
8 read, Associate Provost for--  
9 MR. KRAEMER: For  
10 Undergraduate Education.  
11 MR. FORTUNE: Okay.  
12 MR. KRAEMER: Unless you would  
13 like some other office to--  
14 (Crowd laughs)  
15 MR. FORTUNE: The Associate  
16 Provost for Undergraduate Education. So in the  
17 paragraph which shows the addition, that's the way it  
18 should read. And, of course, whenever it reads "Dean"  
19 it should read "Associate Provost." So that's the --  
20 That's the proposed change in election of the  
21 Undergraduate Council. Any questions or comments? (No  
22 response.)  
23 Okay. With those changes, all in favor  
24 of the proposal signify by saying aye.  
25 ("AYE" VOICE VOTE: ALL)  
26 MR. FORTUNE: Opposed say nay.  
27 ("NAY" VOICE VOTE: NONE)  
28 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Now,  
29 election to the Senate and this is where I think I get  
30 lost a little bit. Is this where we have duplication?  
31 MS. TODD: Yeah. Four, five  
32 and six are the ones that should be considered.  
33 There's just a repeat in pages four, five and six.  
34 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. The third  
35 election proposal has to do with election to the  
36 Senate. And that starts on page four and runs through  
37 the middle of page six. Am I correct, Cindy--  
38 MS. TODD: Yes.  
39 MR. FORTUNE: --that the rest  
40 of that is just a delete after that?  
41 MS. TODD: Yes.  
42 MR. FORTUNE: It just got  
43 repeated?  
44 MS. TODD: It got repeated.  
45 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. So...  
46 MS. TODD: Sorry about that.  
47 MR. FORTUNE: What's on pages  
48 six, seven and eight should be stricken.

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

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

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

22 MR. EDGERTON: Which one,  
23 please?

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

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

35 So that needs a second.

36 MS. STATEN: Second.

37 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Who did?

38 MS. STATEN: Staten,

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

42 MR. THOM: As I interpret what  
43 I read there, first of all, it says, no more than half  
44 of their current duties have to be an academic nature.

45 And then the rest composed of teaching and/or  
46 research. One of the things that's obviously omitted,  
47 since changes have been made in the Senate election  
48 process since 1976, is a service component. And, also,

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

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

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

15 ("AYE" VOICE VOTE: MAJORITY)

16 MR. FORTUNE: Opposed say nay.

17 ("NAY" VOICE VOTE: TWO AUDIBLE)

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

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

23 MR. GESUND: Question: The  
24 faculty of the academic units shall conduct elections.

25 What happens if there's more than one academic unit  
26 that has to elect one senator? And I believe  
27 Architecture is lumped in with somebody else, as I  
28 recall.

29 MR. FORTUNE: I don't think  
30 so, no.

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

33 MR. FORTUNE: Yes. All units  
34 have at least one senator.

35 MR. GESUND: I see.

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

38 All in favor, signify by saying aye.

39 ("AYE" VOICE VOTE: ALL)

40 MR. FORTUNE: Opposed, say  
41 nay.

42 ("NAY" VOICE VOTE: NONE)

43 MR. FORTUNE: Good people, I  
44 don't have anything else on the agenda. I don't know.

45 Would anyone -- This is the quickest I've ever gone  
46 through a Senate meeting. Hans Gesund, do you have  
47 something?

48 MR. GESUND: You had

University Senate Council Session - October 8, 2001

1 something.  
2 MR. FORTUNE: What was it?  
3 MR. GESUND: That was the  
4 resolution. Didn't we have somebody -- a memorial  
5 resolution?  
6 MR. FORTUNE: Not this time.  
7 That was last time.  
8 MR. GESUND: Oh. You've had  
9 -- Then how come you had resolution?  
10 MR. FORTUNE: Just if there  
11 are any.  
12 MR. GESUND: Oh. But we  
13 didn't take up any resolutions?  
14 MR. FORTUNE: Not this time.  
15 Anything else? (No response.)  
16 Well, good people, thank you for coming.  
17 I'll see you next month.  
18 =====  
19 (SESSION CONCLUDED AT 3:42 P.M.)  
20 =====

