

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL

Regular Session

**March 4, 2002
3:00 p.m.**

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

Professor William Fortune, Chair

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

FREELANCE COURT REPORTERS & VIDEO SERVICES

STEPHANIE K. SCHLOEMER, PRESIDENT

10 NORTH UPPER STREET

P. O. BOX 85, LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40588

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

e-mail: ctreport@aol.com

WILLIAM FORTUNE, CHAIR

GIFFORD BLYTON, PARLIAMENTARIAN

CELINDA TODD, SECRETARY TO SENATE COUNCIL

JACKIE PERKINS, RECORDING SECRETARY

STEPHANIE K. SCHLOEMER, COURT REPORTER

VOTES TAKEN

(Page)

71

78

1 MR. FORTUNE: Thanks for
2 coming.

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

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

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

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

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

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

47 But just to note for you the contributions that he
48 made to the University of Kentucky and to the

1 University of Kentucky Senate, he was a leader of the
2 Civil Rights Movement in the State of Kentucky. He was
3 the first -- second Chair of the Human Rights
4 Commission. He was a long-time faculty member at the
5 University of Kentucky College of Law. He was a Chair
6 of the Senate Council. He was one of the first, if not
7 the first faculty Trustee. He was head of the AAUP.
8 He was, in all respects, an asset to the University of
9 Kentucky. And he died last Friday. His memorial was
10 this morning.

11 Committee Reports, I think we have
12 several committees to report. Andy? Andy Spears.

13 MR. SPEARS: The Academic
14 Facilities Committee arranged a meeting with the
15 University Master Planners -- that's the firm, Ayers,
16 Saint Gross from the Baltimore area -- on February the
17 20th. There weren't many of us there but we had quite
18 a good turnout of students. An Architecture and a
19 Landscape Architecture class came, as well as good
20 representation from the Academic Facilities Committee.

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

30 MR. CHAIRMAN: Brad Canon I
31 saw come in. Where did he go? Brad Canon has a
32 report.

33 MR. CANON: Well, on the Board
34 of Trustees election, we did get into the *KERNEL* and
35 even into the *HERALD-LEADER*. So most of you probably
36 know that Mike Kennedy was elected to the Board of
37 Trustees by your ballots that we counted in the middle
38 of February. Is Mike here? If you don't show up, your
39 office is forfeited.

40 (LAUGHTER)

41 MR. FORTUNE: I think Michael
42 deserves -- Let me say that this was not a chad-
43 hanger, as they say. I think Michael beat me by more
44 than--

45 MR. CANON: I can give you the
46 numbers.

47 MR. FORTUNE: --George Bush --
48 Yeah, go ahead.

1 MR. CANON: I didn't want
2 to...

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Embarrass.
4 (LAUGHTER)

5 MR. CANON: The three
6 candidates were Mike, Bill and Davy Jones. On the
7 first ballot Mike got 502 votes. Bill got 382 and Davy
8 Jones 210. We then counted the second-choice ballots
9 of the Jones voters with Bill getting 40 and Mike
10 getting 98. And so the final ballot, with the second-
11 choice voters included, was Mike Kennedy 600, Bill 422.
12 And there were 1,094 ballot votes cast, 1,022 on the
13 second round.

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

16 MR. CANON: Not quite.
17 (LAUGHTER)

18 MR. FORTUNE: But, in any
19 event, I think Michael deserves, in absentia, a round
20 of applause. He clearly has the mandate.
21 (APPLAUSE)

22 And I can go back to a normal life.
23 Bill Kraemer -- We have a First-Year
24 Committee that Mike Nietzel appointed and it's a pretty
25 exciting committee. Phil Kraemer is chairing that
26 Committee. And I'd like for Phil to give a brief
27 report.

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

35 The goal is to try to take some of the
36 ideas that we have floated here and have been
37 lingering, languishing perhaps, and to take some new
38 ideas and really focus this in a kind of package way so
39 that we'd be able to say to our undergraduates: Here's
40 what we're going to do to help you succeed, to foster
41 engagement with the institution, and then ask them to
42 make some commitments to us.

43 The proposals will focus on the first-
44 year experience, certainly, and try to find better ways
45 for our students to hit this campus with enthusiasm and
46 a level of commitment that will improve their success
47 rates. But we're also going to look at things like the
48 graduation contract, once that passes through the

1 Senate Committee, and a number of other ideas that are
2 really meant to highlight the nature of our
3 undergraduate experience, both in terms of faculty
4 perspectives and in terms of the student perspectives.

5 And I'm excited about some of the ideas. We'll be
6 looking at a teleconference next week by an
7 organization that is regarded as the leader in
8 retention and other issues.

9 And any ideas you may have, please pass
10 those along. This is clearly one of those areas that
11 we have to have the cooperation of all faculty. It's a
12 collaborate adventure for us and I'm excited that we're
13 going to be able to really make some progress here
14 quickly. This is a committee that will have at least
15 some very concrete proposals out before the end of this
16 term but may also continue to work on some other issues
17 as we move ahead.

18 MR. FORTUNE: I didn't ask him
19 ahead of time but -- Yes, Ruth?

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

22 MR. KRAEMER: I could post
23 that on the Undergraduate Education home page. I'll do
24 that. It has good representation, including members of
25 the Senate. Deans are representing the faculty and
26 students, of course. But I think it's a committee that
27 also wants to hear from anyone that has anything to
28 say. And I will take any idea at this point.

29 MR. FORTUNE: And closely
30 related to that, as you recall, the Senate has asked us
31 to move forward on the graduation contract. And Jeff
32 Dembo, who is here, is chairing that committee. And I
33 believe Jeff's committee has met once at this point.
34 And so that committee will be coordinating with Phil's
35 committee.

36 Do you have anything you'd like to say
37 with--

38 MR. DEMBO: In contra-
39 distinction to Phil's committee, we did not meet at
40 8:00 in the morning. We also had catered food
41 available, you know.

42 (LAUGHTER)

43 We've only had one meeting so far. And
44 the goal that we have is first to determine whether or
45 not a need exists on campus for a graduation contract.

46 Secondly, if a need is determined to exist, is it
47 feasible to have such a thing. And then if it is
48 feasible, what are the different ways we can approach

1 it. And then at that point we'll bring our ideas back
2 to the Senate and the Senate Council for further
3 hearing.

4 MR. FORTUNE: And one more
5 aspect of this whole issue of Undergraduate education,
6 but after the vote on the College of Communications
7 proposal, Mike Nietzel asked the Senate to declare a
8 moratorium on selective admissions proposals and to
9 study the issue, to appoint a committee to study the
10 issue. And I have not -- I was ill last week and
11 haven't had a chance to appoint the committee but I did
12 look through the Senate rules. And the variety of
13 criteria for selective admissions into the college and
14 the different standards within the colleges, it really
15 is a -- It really is a Byzantine thing. The selective
16 admissions issue is noted in the self-study report as
17 something that needs to be addressed. So I'm going to
18 appoint a committee shortly to try to get a handle on
19 the selective admissions in the Undergraduate colleges
20 on a campus-wide basis.

21 MR. KRAEMER: Bill, could I
22 make one other quick--

23 MR. FORTUNE: Yes.

24 MR. KRAEMER: One of the
25 issues that we're trying to deal with, with this First
26 Year Task Force, is to try to collect ideas on
27 traditions and inaugural events. And each of you, no
28 doubt, has attended an undergraduate institution. So
29 if you have any of those traditions or ideas, pass
30 those along. We need to begin to find something that
31 becomes the signature for undergraduates attending the
32 University of Kentucky. And I think that would also
33 help us in just getting engaged and helping faculty to
34 recognize that engagement. So pass anything along to
35 us. I will put on the website, maybe, if I have the
36 technical support, a way to communicate easily with us.

37 MR. FORTUNE: Kaveh. Kaveh
38 Tagavi?

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

42 MR. FORTUNE: Yes, we can do
43 that. I'll have Cindy do that.

44 Are there any other committee reports?
45 (No response.)

46 Okay. If not, there are no action items
47 today. We deliberately did not put any action items on
48 because we thought it was important to devote this

1 session of the Senate to the Futures Committee Report.
2 And I will just say, by way of introduction of Genia
3 and David -- I think you probably know both Genia Toma
4 and David Watt -- that this was a very broad-based
5 conscientious Committee that worked over many, many
6 hours, and I know because I was there, that worked in
7 good faith.

8 And while you might disagree with
9 aspects of the Committee's report -- you might feel
10 that some of the proposals are wrong, long headed or
11 whatever -- I wish that you would accord this
12 Committee, and you'll see the Committee membership when
13 it's flashed up there -- I wish you would show this
14 Committee the respect that it deserves for many, many
15 hours of hard and conscientious work trying to deal
16 with what is obviously a very difficult charge.

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

22 (APPLAUSE)

23 MR. WATT: Thank you, Bill.
24 Can you hear me in the back?

25 (AFFIRMATIVE AUDIENCE RESPONSE)

26 MR. WATT: Good. I'd like to
27 begin by picking up where Bill left off, and that is
28 that I want to thank the members of the Committee.
29 These individuals attended many, many meetings over
30 many hours. We have not had an easy task before us.
31 And I appreciated the good thoughts that each one of
32 them brought to this process.

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

36 (LAUGHTER)

37 And I, too, want to commend the faculty
38 for the nature of these messages. Although they have
39 disagreed at times with the nature of some of our
40 recommendations, they have brought a level of civility
41 and discourse to those disagreements, which I think is
42 very helpful.

43 And I want to emphasize right at the
44 outset that this is not the final report. This is
45 still very much a work in progress. We felt it would
46 be wrong for us to simply issue a report and disappear
47 into that goodnight. Rather, we wanted to put forward
48 our current thinking on a variety of issues and let the

1 faculty react to this. And I suppose this is an
2 opportunity for all of us, an opportunity that we
3 perhaps haven't seen for a number of years. We, as a
4 faculty, have a new administration. We are excited
5 about where the University is going. And this is, for
6 the first time in many years, the opportunity for the
7 faculty to participate collectively in deciding what
8 our future might look like.

9 I am going to talk briefly about a few
10 of the things that I presented last Friday. But rather
11 than bore everyone, I thought I might begin by asking
12 for a show of hands. How many of you endured Dave
13 Watt's presentation last Friday? Would you raise your
14 hand if you went to...

15 (SEVERAL HANDS RAISED)

16 All right. So I see a number of hands.
17 So I will give a somewhat abbreviated presentation.

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

24 All right. So the charge to our
25 Committee. And, unfortunately, we have been given this
26 name, the Futures Committee, which has led some to
27 conclude that we are to handle all things related to
28 the future of the University. And we've had a number
29 of interesting e-mail messages along those lines. In
30 fact, our charge was fairly specific: To assess the
31 current status of the University's scholarly and
32 educational strengths, as indicated in the first
33 bullet; and then in the second, to recommend seven to
34 ten areas of contemporary scholarship that should be
35 the priorities for investment.

36 The committee essentially lumped the
37 first two of these charges together. And I will try
38 and give you a snapshot of where we are in that
39 particular part of our charge. And then I will turn it
40 over to my Co-Chair, Genia Toma, and let her talk about
41 the third charge which was to propose specific options
42 for academic restructuring.

43 Before I get to the recommendations, let
44 me talk a bit about the process that we followed. As
45 Bill indicated, we started meeting in August. We met
46 with the Provost to make sure that we understood
47 precisely what it was that he had in mind when he
48 appointed this Committee. We divided initially into

1 subcommittees, one to look at the priority areas for
2 investments, the other to look at restructuring. But
3 we found, after a month or so of trying that out, that
4 it really was not workable. So we reconvened as a
5 Committee of the whole and basically proceeded down the
6 road in that fashion.

7 In our early meetings we decided we
8 would try and develop some guiding principles. These
9 are the six that we settled on. As we would debate the
10 various issues in our charge, we felt that number one
11 should be the issue of trying to serve students better,
12 whether this be through advising that might grow out of
13 different structural reorganizations or some other
14 aspect of building a program that might serve students
15 well.

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

21 Streamlining administrative structure.
22 A good deal has been done along these lines by our
23 President, already.

24 And serving multidisciplinary interests.
25 All of us are aware that our disciplines are changing.
26 Boundaries are dissolving. And it is important that we
27 not necessarily erect barriers that would inhibit
28 multidisciplinary activities.

29 Then we want to respond better to the
30 needs of the Commonwealth. We recognize that there are
31 many constituencies out there. We have one group that
32 is exhorting us to look at those particular programs
33 that might lead to enhanced economic development.
34 Those, however, are simply one of the constituencies
35 that we had to listen to and try and respond to. We
36 could not listen to all of them. But we tried to, in
37 fact, take into account all of these various issues as
38 we devised our list.

39 Finally, to invest in areas of current,
40 established strength. One of the temptations that you
41 face whenever there's new resources on the table is to
42 invest in some new program -- there are always new
43 areas of scholarly endeavor -- and we tried to resist
44 this temptation. It was our feeling that we needed to
45 look across the University for those key areas where
46 there was already some strength and to invest in those
47 areas, bringing them truly to national prominence.

48 What did we do? Well, in order to

1 gather data as a committee, we met with each and every
2 Dean. We met with Centers and Institute Directors. We
3 held three open meetings for the faculty. I will
4 confess to you that probably a number of you did not
5 have the opportunity to participate in those. Perhaps
6 it wasn't clear exactly what direction we were thinking
7 of taking at that time. Some came but perhaps not
8 every voice was heard at that point.

9 We solicited input from faculty via the
10 website. And, as I said, I guess I would have roughly
11 a ream of paper that I have printed out of e-mail
12 messages that have arrived since last Friday. And a
13 number of you solicited information prior to that, as
14 well. And we have carefully read that and tried to
15 take that into account. And we have been through, as
16 listed here, a variety of documents that we could
17 obtain either from internal or external sources in
18 trying to evaluate programs.

19 So at the end of this process, we ended
20 up with nine areas that we will recommend. These are
21 not listed in priority order. These are simply an
22 alphabetical listing of those areas. Under each one of
23 these, we have listed a number of departments that
24 might in fact be eligible for funding. I will be glad
25 to expound on what some of those are, if you're
26 interested in the specifics.

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

34 We debated, I would say, some 40 odd
35 areas for a conclusion. We then had a series of votes
36 by all the participating members of the committee.
37 And, based on those votes, these were the nine that
38 emerged as areas worthy of investment. As I have said
39 before, and hopefully it will be repeated by you to
40 your colleagues, we believe that there are many more
41 fine areas of scholarship than the nine that we have
42 listed here. We have selected these nine simply
43 because we think they are poised at this point in time
44 to achieve national prominence were we to infuse
45 additional resources into them.

46 Okay. With that, I will end my
47 comments, introduce my Co-Chair, Genia Toma, who will
48 talk about the restructuring part of our

1 recommendations and we will then throw the floor open
2 for discussion and questions.

3 Genia.

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

8 I'm going to talk about the
9 restructuring for a few minutes. And I wanted to tell
10 you that we divided this into three parts. When we
11 looked at restructuring, we thought about central
12 administration, then colleges and then finally centers
13 and institutes, including graduate centers. That was
14 part of the charge that was given to us explicitly at
15 the beginning.

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

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

38 Then when we went to the colleges, we
39 started with one that came very much internally. There
40 are faculty within these groups that have been working
41 together and that had formed an external group and
42 asked an external group to come in and examine what was
43 going on with their groups. This was -- We've pulled
44 from three different groups, the College of
45 Architecture, the Department of Interior Design, and
46 the Department of Landscape Architecture. We are
47 arguing that these groups should be merged and form a
48 new College of Design. This is one that has truly

1 risen from the faculty. It's bottom up. And we are
2 putting a stamp on something that an external
3 consultant has already argued. And we find merit to
4 this notion that these persons and these groups are all
5 looking at design issues and that they could benefit by
6 being in one administrative structure.

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

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

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

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

1 And we started thinking about this and
2 then examining it. And, as we thought through the
3 College of Arts and Sciences, it did appear to us that
4 this is a college that has been, in some sense, a
5 stepsister to what -- the way it should have been if
6 you think about what Colleges of Arts and Sciences
7 should be at the University of Kentucky. It's been a
8 poor college. It's been one that's had lots of
9 problems in terms of having highly-regarded PhD
10 programs and other graduate programs in the University.

11 Our notion was that we could strengthen this by
12 thinking about it in terms of the way that the groups
13 are arranged, in terms of disciplinary cohesion. We
14 thought a great deal.

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

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

37 I confess culpability on this next one.

38 We thought a great deal about this. This is a college
39 that if it were to occur, we believe, would be one of
40 the strongest colleges in the Institution. This would
41 be a College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. It's
42 one where if you put all the units together that we
43 have suggested, would have great funding potential at
44 National Finance Foundation, at the National Institutes
45 for Health, several different possibilities. And it is
46 one that would really bring together some of the social
47 sciences that have not been together at the University
48 of Kentucky. And, speaking again from -- as a social

1 scientist myself, it's one that I think would give it
2 more credence than has been given in the past. We
3 would actually have a stronger emphasis on Social
4 Sciences. We've, again, been rather weak at the
5 University of Kentucky, from the opinion of the
6 committee, and this would be a move that we see as
7 strengthening Social and Behavioral Sciences here.

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

19 (LAUGHTER)

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

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

1 And then, finally, one of the things
2 that we were given by the Chancellor of the Medical
3 Center was a request to create a sixth college within
4 the Medical Center, a College of Public Health. Our
5 committee looked at this a great deal. We spent a
6 great deal of time talking about it, talking with the
7 Chancellor, talking with others about the College of
8 Public Health. We were not able to agree with the
9 Chancellor that this is something that we should be
10 doing at this point in time.

11 Instead, what we suggest is that the
12 President should appoint another committee, and one
13 with scholarly credentials, that looked at what role
14 Public Health should play at the University of
15 Kentucky, whether there should be a School of Public
16 Health and what, if anything, its research mission
17 should be, its scholarly mission. What should its
18 national -- What should we focus on if we're striving
19 for national prominence in these colleges, in these
20 different areas; where is it going to be in a future
21 School of Public Health, if there is to be one. So
22 we're recommending further discussion about this issue.

23 We then turn to centers and institutes.
24 We were asked explicitly to discuss the current
25 graduate centers that answer to the Graduate School
26 Dean. I will give you, rather than the long report,
27 the short report in terms of our recommendations for
28 these graduate centers. We recommend that Toxicology
29 stay where it is, that Nutritional Sciences go to the
30 College of Medicine, Gerontology be folded into the
31 Sanders-Brown Center on Aging, which should then be
32 folded into the College of Medicine.

33 Biomedical Engineering came to us with a
34 request that they start an undergraduate degree
35 program. If so, it cannot be done under the current
36 structure reporting to the Graduate School Dean. We
37 had a great deal of discussion about which place it
38 should go, whether it should be Medicine or
39 Engineering. We concluded because it's fundamentally
40 an Engineering program, that this is where it should
41 be, the College of Engineering.

42 And, finally, the Martin School and
43 Patterson School, which are the two current, in quotes,
44 Lexington Campus Multidisciplinary Programs that answer
45 to the Graduate School Dean, we have suggested that
46 they either stay with the Graduate School or if there
47 is a new College of Social and Behavioral Sciences,
48 that this is where they might best belong.

1 And then, finally, we had
2 recommendations concerning centers that do not provide
3 degrees. And at this point -- and again, this has not
4 been a complete study -- we still have much to go
5 because there are many, many, many centers on campus.
6 But these are the ones that at the moment that we're
7 recommending stay independent, report to the Vice
8 President for Research. Many of these have State
9 mandates behind them that would make it difficult to
10 put them into a particular college. It would make
11 fulfilling that State mandate difficult. And so we're
12 recommending that they stay independent.

13 I think that is the fundamentals of what
14 we have suggested. As Dave said, this entire report
15 was presented to you as a means of starting discussion,
16 not as a means of suggesting that this is something
17 that should happen tomorrow. And it's not saying that
18 anything that we're recommending that we feel 100
19 percent certain that we're right and that we're going
20 to defend it until we go down in flames. Okay? All of
21 this is intended for us to think about how we might
22 look at us in the future and whether there are some
23 structural changes that we might make that would truly
24 enhance our program that would move us further along as
25 we try to achieve national prominence, because our
26 committee was committed to the notion that achieving
27 national prominence is something that we truly want to
28 do. Thanks.

29 MR. FORTUNE: I think David
30 and Genia will take questions and comments. And if you
31 will, as you know, we have a stenographic transcript
32 made of these proceedings. So when you speak, if
33 you'll announce your name.

34 Richard Labunski back there was the
35 first person, I think.

36 MR. LABUNSKI: Thank you. I'm
37 Richard Labunski from the School of Journalism and
38 Telecommunications. And I do want to preface my
39 remarks by commending the committee for its hard work.
40 Nothing I'm about to say should be interpreted as not
41 appreciating the difficult job that you all have
42 undertaken.

43 MS. TOMA: We've heard that
44 many times in the week.

45 (LAUGHTER)

46 MR. LABUNSKI: Professor Toma,
47 I really have two questions for you. One is -- Our
48 faculty has met three or four times since this report.

1 I mean, we've been meeting constantly about this. And
2 the first question I have for you is: Do you want us
3 to simply say whether we support or are in favor of the
4 recommendations of the Futures Committee and leave it
5 at that, or do you want us to suggest an alternative?
6 But then I do have a second follow-up question. So can
7 you tell us what it is you would like the academic
8 units to do at this point in reacting to your report?

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

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

16 MS. TOMA: Absolutely.

17 MR. LABUNSKI: Okay. Then the
18 other question, if I may, our school which is currently
19 in the College of Communications and Informational
20 Studies, everybody knows that because you wouldn't let
21 us raise our GPA last month.

22 (LAUGHTER)

23 Our school is in the College of
24 Communications and Informational Studies with the
25 Department of Communication and with the School of
26 Library and Informational Science. And we, of course,
27 have a Graduate program at the college level. My
28 personal opinion is that it ought to not be called the
29 College of Arts and Letters. It ought to be called the
30 College of Miscellaneous Departments.

31 (LAUGHTER)

32 We wonder what in the world we have in
33 common with Germanic language, French languages,
34 Spanish, Classical languages. I just wonder if the
35 committee really understands what the School of
36 Journalism does, the three majors within our school,
37 Integrated Strategic Communications,
38 Telecommunications, Print and Broadcast Journalism.
39 That includes Public Relations and Advertising. The
40 idea that we would be separated from our Graduate
41 program so none of the JAT Faculty members could
42 participate in the Graduate program, as we know it, and
43 would then be moved over to be next door to Germanic
44 languages in a closet in POT, we just don't understand.

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

1 MR. WATT: Well, I guess we
2 understand the gist of the message we're likely to
3 receive.

4 (LAUGHTER)

5 But, you know, let me assure you that
6 not all of the departments that are in that list are
7 technologically backward. Many of the humanities are
8 moving more and more to be technology driven, which was
9 part of the point that I think you made with regard to
10 where Journalism is at this point in time. Is
11 Journalism well positioned if it were to be in a
12 College of Arts and Letters? A term that I prefer over
13 the one that you suggested. I don't know the answer to
14 that. And I think that that's up to the faculty.
15 Remember, we're here to engage in the discussion.
16 We're not telling you what the outcome is.

17 MR. LABUNSKI: Well, Professor
18 Watt, what led to the decision to move us away from the
19 other units of our college and put us over there, to
20 begin with?

21 MR. WATT: It was based upon
22 discussions with faculty group that that seemed an
23 appropriate position for the School of Journalism. And
24 you had a member of your college on that committee.

25 MR. LABUNSKI: Yes. Somebody
26 who remains in the college and is not over in the new
27 College of Miscellaneous Departments. So it's not
28 exactly a representative view of the School Faculty.

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

35 MR. LABUNSKI: Okay.

36 MS. TOMA: Yes?

37 MS. JENG: Ling Hwey Jeng from
38 the School of Library and Informational Science. I'd
39 like to frame that question a little bit broader and to
40 try to understand from the committee's point of view
41 what is the rationale behind eliminating the College of
42 Communications and Informational Studies and put it
43 underneath another college.

44 MS. TOMA: One of the things
45 we did when we started looking at the college
46 restructurings, was to go to our benchmarks and look at
47 the structures of the benchmark institutions. And, of
48 course, we were more interested in going to look at

1 universities that are ranked higher than ours, as
2 opposed to those who are ranked lower than ours. And
3 one of the things we found, is that there are many
4 institutions where colleges -- there are no College of
5 Communication but, in fact, it's in Arts and Sciences,
6 Arts and Letters, in a variety of arrangements.

7 And so we could find no compelling
8 argument to keep a College of Communication separate
9 and incur all the different costs that are involved
10 with having a college, because it seems to us that at
11 least within Communications, for example, that it is a
12 social and behavioral science. And so why not bring it
13 in with the other Social and Behavioral Sciences.

14 MR. FORGUE: I'm Ray Forgue in
15 Family Studies. One question is more procedural. I
16 assume, then, based on the comments you're getting,
17 you'll be making final recommendations. If you could
18 kind of give us an idea of when that would be and then
19 if you have any clues as to when those suggestions or
20 recommendations that you make will begin to be
21 operationalized in these specific proposals.

22 MS. TOMA: We would hope that
23 within a couple of weeks our report will be finished.
24 That's our hope and that's what the Provost and
25 President have kind of suggested, that they would like
26 to see something within a couple of weeks.
27 Implementation is not ours. Implementation will be
28 entirely left up to--

29 MR. FORGUE: (Unintelligible)

30 MS. TOMA: No.

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

38 MR. WATT: We're certainly
39 open to those suggestions, Ray.

40 MR. FORGUE: Because I'm
41 concerned that one of the bigger areas of need in this
42 Commonwealth has to do with things that relate to -- if
43 you look at a lot of measures of teenage pregnancies,
44 education level, things that based in the human capital
45 of this state are kind of left off that list. And
46 something that focuses on poisoning the Commonwealth to
47 be ready to participate in some of the very strong
48 science areas that you've talked about in that list

1 would be a good addition to this.

2 MR. WATT: Any suggestions
3 that you send to us, we will certainly take back to the
4 committee.

5 MR. FORGUE: Thank you.

6 MR. WATT: Mr. Tagavi.

7 MR. TAGAVI: You know, I
8 certainly have a lot of respect for the two of you.
9 You have gone boldly where no other man or woman would
10 like to go, voluntarily.

11 (LAUGHTER)

12 Having said that, I've been given these
13 recommendations and asked for input. My first input on
14 the surface is, I like it a lot. But if you wanted
15 more meaningful input from me, I would like to read for
16 myself the rationale that have gone into these
17 decisions. Some of them you have mentioned right now
18 and I appreciate it a lot. But, for example, I see you
19 mentioned Toxicology should remain. I'd just like to
20 know why you have made that decision, if it's possible.

21 What I'm asking, is it possible that you would share
22 with us, before finalizing, some of your rationales on
23 these recommendations?

24 MS. TOMA: Well, that's what
25 we're trying to do when we come before you, is to
26 provide our rationale for what we're thinking and we're
27 doing. We are not -- We are not thinking about
28 putting draft proposals out there in terms of a written
29 document.

30 MR. JOE _____: Well, but
31 you've given -- Joe _____, Department of Physics.
32 You have given us no reasoning for any of this. Dr.
33 Watt's presentation last Friday was to plunk down one
34 new graph over another of what the proposal was but
35 with no explanation for it. Every question you have
36 heard is: What is the rationale for? Now, I think
37 that you could give us a paragraph, at least an
38 explanation. I went to the web page fully expecting to
39 find some more explanation than the executive summary.
40 That is all that's been posted.

41 MS. TOMA: Well, one of the
42 reasons we cannot give you a written document behind
43 this, is the committee doesn't have one that has gone
44 out of our committee yet. We don't even have something
45 that has gone into written form that has been approved
46 by the committee that could be shared with you. We're
47 still working on this. It's work in progress. And,
48 for that reason, we just can't share it with you. I

1 mean, we're trying to do this so that we can provide
2 some of the arguments orally. And that will help us in
3 constructing the rest of the written draft.

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

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

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

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

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

26 MS. SCHMITT: My name is Laura
27 Schmitt. I'm a Graduate School Senator. I see here
28 that one of your guiding principles is to serve
29 students better. I also see that your sources of data
30 are faculty forums, meeting with the deans, the
31 directors, faculty website. What were your initiatives
32 out there and when did you address student forums or
33 our concerns? Did you actively ask for our opinions or
34 are you just serving us better through the faculty's
35 opinions?

36 MS. TOMA: We did not have--

37 MS. SCHMITT: Stop and think
38 of that.

39 (LAUGHTER)

40 MS. TOMA: We did not have any
41 forum explicitly for students. We did solicit opinions
42 from faculty about their considerations, what would
43 serve students better.

44 MS. SCHMITT: Okay. On those
45 lines, before you make your final recommendations in
46 two to three weeks, would you perhaps try to have some
47 type of student forum? And if it doesn't work for you,
48 we have student government representatives that might

1 be willing to meet with you so that you don't have to
2 do an entire University forum. Would that be possible?

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

10 MS. TOMA: Go ahead.

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

22 MS. TOMA: I actually think
23 that maybe it's because we didn't describe it when we
24 were going through. But, again, we talked about public
25 service a great deal. But, remember, when we're
26 choosing the areas of excellence, that we're starting
27 with those programs where there is some sense of
28 national prominence, that we think we could get there.

29 One that I can point to very explicitly that has large
30 public service components to it is the public policy
31 area that we chose as an area of excellence. It's one
32 that has national prominence and has a very active
33 public service role. That's not to say that's the only
34 place. But many of the public service dimensions of
35 what the University does can be captured through that.

36 MR. WATT: In the back, yes?

37 MS. WALDHART: Enid Waldhart
38 in Communication. I have a question about the seven to
39 ten areas. I guess I would like to know how you see
40 these defined in terms of forever. These are areas of
41 strength that we would like to emphasize. But does
42 this mean that forever after, that's all we'll get?
43 Okay.

44 MR. WATT: Enid, that's come
45 through in a number of e-mail messages. We believe
46 that our report probably has a finite lifetime, let's
47 say, somewhere between two to five years. My guess is
48 that three years from now, if we are fortunate enough

1 to again have a governor interested in making an
2 investment in this University, it would behoove us to
3 get another faculty group together and go over this
4 again. So we are not proposing that this will be
5 carved on stone tablets and set up in front of the
6 Administration Building. We think it is a -- you know,
7 a list that will evolve and change over time.

8 It would have been a hell of a lot
9 easier for us if we had been allowed to construct a
10 list of 40-odd categories. I actually argue just the
11 opposite; I argue that we ought to choose four or five
12 areas. Again, many would recognize that they would not
13 be on that list. And we would really be forced to
14 argue for only the very best. But here we are. We
15 were given seven to ten as our charge and we've done
16 our best. Now, we're hearing from faculty that we
17 neglected this area; we forgot about this group. We'll
18 go back to the committee and see how they feel about
19 it.

20 Yes?

21 MS. JENG: Jeng.

22 MR. WATT: Go ahead.

23 MS. JENG: Another aspect that
24 I have not seen addressed in the report is the aspect
25 of professional schools. And because the Library and
26 Informational Sciences, for example, is a professional
27 school in most major universities. It is, you know, a
28 separate college or a separate school, graduate school.
29 And Journalism has a big component of professional
30 services. A big part of Communications also have a
31 component of professional services. And I wonder how
32 the committee see the whole mission of professional
33 services within the colleges.

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

47 MS. JENG: The reason I asked
48 that is that we do see around many of the faculties

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

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

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

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

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

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

31 (LAUGHTER)

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

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

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

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

46 MS. ARTHUR: Mary Arthur.
47 It's unclear to me how you identified and selected the
48 departments that would fit into each of your areas of

1 excellence. Can you say more about how you selected
2 those individual departments?

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

11 MS. ARTHUR: That wasn't my
12 point. But -- Right.

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

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

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

39 MS. TOMA: And some of this
40 information came to me--

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

43 MR. GOVINDARAJULU: My name is
44 Govindarajulu from Statistics. I would like to commend
45 you with the very bold and provocative suggestions.
46 And, number two, I have a couple of suggestions for the
47 committee. One is, they identified only nine areas
48 based on an existing standard. If I were to truly buy

1 my stocks on the stocks that have five stars, morning
2 stars, they may not do well next year, for example. So
3 I suggest that the recommendation to have another set
4 of departments and programs which have a very
5 promising, aspiring to a national prominence.

6 Number two, the committee has not
7 addressed one question. Has it done anything on cost
8 effectiveness of this restructuring? If they can show
9 it is cost neutral, can save some money and throw some
10 resources at some college which is battered and bruised
11 like the Arts and Sciences, it would be very helpful.

12 Number three, I hope your committee will
13 not go out of business in two weeks. I would like the
14 committee to go on and look at other areas like the
15 future of the LCC and some of the other pressing
16 questions.

17 MR. WATT: Speaking for my Co-
18 Chair, we very much want to go out of business.
19 (LAUGHTER)

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

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

43 Dan?

44 MR. ROWLAND: Dan Rowland from
45 the U.K. Center of the Humanities, from the Department
46 of History. This is a kind of related question. I
47 think there's a lot of anxiety that's been raised by
48 the conversations that you all have started about the

1 creating of a sort of set of "haves" and "have not"
2 groups with some groups wanting more funding in order
3 to be able to pursue their research. This has come out
4 in some of the questions in public forum and has been
5 part of e-mail conversations that I've seen. And other
6 groups, seeing as how budgets are zero to some gains,
7 other groups seems like being pushed further outside of
8 something. Now, this is just an anxiety I've heard
9 from many people.

10 I don't know whether it's something --
11 whether that's also something you didn't consider or
12 whether -- how you felt funding for these new specialty
13 three-college -- those colleges that were to be placed
14 in the College of Arts and Sciences would work. My own
15 feeling is that the College of Arts and Sciences has
16 been suffering a lot because it's had an annual \$1
17 million deficit that has been taken from it in taxes.
18 And maybe the problem is not the structure of the
19 College of Arts and Sciences but with the money that's
20 given to them.

21 (APPLAUSE)

22 MS. TOMA: You asked several
23 questions there. So I don't know where you want to
24 start with. But we'll go back to the anxiety that's
25 being created by haves and have-nots. The first thing
26 I wanted to say though is, we did not define this task.
27 The task was given to us. We were asked to do what we
28 have done. And so to the extent that this was not, in
29 quotes, something that should be done, I think needs to
30 be taken up with people higher than us, because we were
31 just doing what we were asked to do.

32 MR. ROWLAND: But you make
33 recommendations that have consequences. So then one
34 has to deal with--

35 MS. TOMA: Because that's what
36 we asked to do.

37 MR. ROWLAND: Right.

38 MS. TOMA: And have we made it
39 better or worse? We think we are doing things to make
40 it better. If we're not making it -- Our intent with
41 this restructuring was to actually raise everybody in
42 terms of could rise in potential so that -- In fact,
43 maybe there are redistribution questions here that need
44 to be addressed by the central administration, and that
45 those shouldn't be relegated to a single college but,
46 in fact, that this is a University question--

47 MR. ROWLAND: Yeah.

48 MR. TOMA: --and that it needs

1 to be really addressed at the central administrative
2 level of how you help those programs that cannot fund
3 themselves. Because, clearly, there are programs
4 within the University that are never going to be self-
5 financing. We recognize that. But we think that it's
6 something that the University needs to look at
7 centrally.

8 MR. WATT: On the anxiety
9 issue, let me say that we've received a number of
10 messages from students fearful that their fellowships
11 will be taken away at the end of the month, even
12 assistant professors who wondered if they needed to
13 look for a job. We certainly have tried to respond
14 personally to each one of those to assure them that
15 ultimately the decisions are made by this body, not our
16 committee but this body. You ladies and gentlemen are
17 really going to decide what, if anything, is done with
18 this report. And I think you need to basically carry
19 that message forward to your departments, your peers,
20 that this is a deliberative process in which the
21 Faculty Senate will play the key deciding role.

22 MR. ROWLAND: Okay. Thank
23 you.

24 MR. WATT: Yes?

25 MS. DEBSKI: Liz Debski,
26 Biology. And I hate to get back to this point but
27 you've led me to it. Since we will ultimately have to
28 decide, I'd like to know what kind of data we'll be
29 provided with to decide. So as you were talking about
30 reorganization and this was the way our benchmarks did
31 these things, I'm wondering, you know, did you have the
32 time to actually collect much data regarding how that
33 structure was working out for them. Just because of
34 the fact they have that structure doesn't mean that it
35 is the correct structure, a positive step and, you
36 know, all those kinds of things that I think have been
37 said.

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

40 MS. DEBSKI: Yeah, exactly.

41 MS. TOMA: This is a huge
42 task. We started with nothing on the plate except past
43 reports that have been done by the University. So we
44 have taken those reports; we have taken the things that
45 we could get rather easily--

46 MS. DEBSKI: Yes.

47 MS. TOMA: --and take notes.
48 Have we done a detailed assessment of which colleges,

1 which college structures? We didn't have time.

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

5 MR. WATT: We anticipate that
6 the Provost would appoint an implementation committee;
7 that that implementation committee will certainly need
8 to drill further into the data, which I think you and I
9 would both agree, is necessary to make ultimately an
10 intelligent decision on any of these recommendations.
11 On first pass, as best we are able with whatever
12 information we could get, with whatever voices came to
13 us that we heard and listened to, we tried to make
14 recommendations.

15 MR. EDGERTON: Lee Edgerton,
16 Animal Sciences. This is just a repeat because I
17 didn't quite understand the answer. But with respect
18 to the issue of faculty being invited, do you envision
19 that there will be some departments that would be
20 invited and then split up so that half remain in the
21 current college and half go to a new program or -- I
22 just didn't understand what the answer was.

23 MR. WATT: You ultimately
24 leave -- The authority for what happens with any
25 department is going to rest with this body. It would
26 have to come forward as a proposal, you know. You've
27 probably seen these proposals over the years. I
28 remember when Computer Science moved from the College
29 of Arts and Sciences to the College of Engineering, the
30 amount of effort that went into basically documenting
31 that the faculty were supportive and wanted that
32 transition to take place. We would anticipate, with
33 any of our recommendations, there will have to be a
34 similar group of faculty which will study this.

35 MS. TOMA: I guess I'd like to
36 share. One of the questions that drove our committee
37 as we kept thinking about this -- Because it's the
38 structural issues that people are having the most
39 anxiety about. One of the questions that the committee
40 kept coming back to was: Are we the best that we can
41 be at the University of Kentucky currently? Is our
42 structure such that change should not be considered?
43 And as we thought about that question, that drove a lot
44 of our decisions to recommend that we at least think
45 about some alternative ways of structuring our
46 programs.

47 The underlying objective, again, as
48 we've said throughout, was to think about how we could

1 make us better, we can elevate the programs, the
2 academic programs throughout the University. And we
3 think that this committee -- Dave and I are deeply
4 appreciative to this committee. You cannot imagine the
5 number of hours that have gone into this. We have had
6 multiple four-, six-hour sessions, eight-hour sessions.
7 And the group has worked. And I can truly say that
8 they have given it their all in terms of thinking about
9 what's best for the Institution.

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

12 MR. FORTUNE: I don't know.
13 (LAUGHTER)

14 Kathi Kern on the--

15 MS. KERN: I do agree--

16 MR. FORTUNE: --back has a
17 question.

18 MS. KERN: And I think I -- I
19 have another question--

20 MS. TOMA: Oh, great. I'm
21 sorry.

22 MS. KERN: --just to prolong
23 your agony a little bit longer. I'm Kathi Kern from
24 History and what is still known as the College of Arts
25 and Sciences. And I guess I would want to first of all
26 raise a question about benchmarks. We hear that
27 language trodded out in certain arguments. The
28 colleague from Journalism wants to know. Your response
29 is, we looked at our benchmarks and we did not see a
30 benchmark with a separate college of communications.
31 In the College of Arts and Sciences, we are not aware
32 of--

33 MS. TOMA: There are, but not
34 uniformly.

35 MS. KERN: I'm sorry?

36 MS. TOMA: There are colleges
37 of communications but it's not uniformly.

38 MS. KERN: It's not uniformly.

39 Okay. So one of the issues we raised two weeks ago
40 when David was before us, was this issue of benchmarks
41 and colleges of arts and sciences. And we were not, as
42 a college -- I think I can speak of a college senator
43 -- terribly satisfied with what we had found on our
44 own, which was, I believe, Ohio State and University of
45 Arizona as benchmarks with similar organizations. So
46 I'm wondering if the benchmark issue is one that is
47 considered with the disaggregation of the College of
48 Arts and Sciences.

1 And then my second question is: Many of
2 us are very concerned about the invisibility of
3 undergraduate education as a priority reflected in any
4 of this, in either of the two pieces of the puzzle
5 here. So I'd like to hear how you'd like to address
6 that.

7 MR. WATT: Kathi, benchmarks
8 that we looked at in this list was compiled by one of
9 our committee members, was only one piece of
10 information that we looked at in trying to make a
11 recommendation. And we found that there were some
12 colleges of arts and sciences, as I said a week ago
13 Friday, that were larger and embraced still other units
14 like Economics and Communications, and some which were
15 divided into the component parts.

16 We're proposing this one for a number of
17 reasons, not simply because some other university that
18 we admire has done this. We think some of the issues
19 are, and I'm not sure I can go through all of these,
20 but at least some of them, in my mind -- let's put it
21 that way -- are: Does the dean adequately represent
22 the departments and faculty and students and staff at
23 the table where resources are ultimately awarded? When
24 was the last time this institution built a building
25 that basically would serve the humanities and fine
26 arts? Does that dean really understand enough of those
27 disciplines, that he or she can recruit quality faculty
28 members to serve our students well.

29 And, again, I perhaps shouldn't say this
30 but I've received a few e-mail messages from members of
31 the faculty which, if I took out the titles and
32 headings and showed them to you, I think you would be
33 appalled at what you would read.

34 So I think that the issue of what the
35 nature of the faculty are and whether those faculty and
36 students are being well served by a dean, was far more
37 important to us than whether one institution had
38 divided them up or left them altogether. And we were
39 also aware in our discussions with people who had
40 attended some of these institutions where they were
41 grouped together, allegedly, as a whole that, in fact,
42 they did functionally behave as three independent
43 units. There were essentially division leaders in
44 those three areas. But don't get hung up on the
45 benchmarks. I mean, I heard Kevin recite the list. I
46 was there.

47 MS. KERN: I know you were.
48 But this is the problem when the rationale --

1 Everybody, David, from every possible disciplinary
2 perspective, is asking for the -- If I'm a historian,
3 I rely on documents and evidence. The person from
4 statistics -- People want, they want to see how the
5 formula got worked out. So if it's not provided, then
6 we grope for whatever little bit you're throwing us.
7 And so if it's benchmarked on one question, okay; let's
8 look at the benchmark issue, you know. If it's
9 something that's coming from the bottom up, a faculty
10 concern for the College of Design, then let's find out
11 how that played into it, I mean. But it builds the
12 climate of suspicion and conspiracy when there's not a
13 document.

14 And I understand, you know, you feel
15 like you're already being attacked for an overhead, you
16 know, God forbid, a document.
17 (LAUGHTER)

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

22 MS. TOMA: Well, our best e-
23 mail so far was one sent today that said, "Too bad
24 you're here. Some village is missing its idiot." So
25 that--
26 (LAUGHTER)

27 But, you know, I think it would be -- I
28 think a lot of you should go back and talk to your
29 deans. We asked each dean to come before us and
30 present the scholarly mission of your college. This
31 was way back in the early part of our process. And I
32 think it would be fruitful for you to go back and talk
33 to your deans about how they see the scholarly missions
34 of your college and see to what extent that the deans
35 can represent the full breadth of what's going on in
36 these different colleges and the strengths of the
37 different colleges.

38 MS. GONZALEZ: Lori Gonzalez,
39 Allied Health. I'll just follow up on that comment
40 that my understanding is our dean had an hour, 15
41 minutes to present the breadth of research in our
42 college and then 45 minutes for questioning. So to say
43 that they may have represented us well or not is a
44 little bit difficult, I think, in 15 minutes. It sort
45 of goes to all the pieces of evidence that were used
46 when you made the recommendations.

47 MS. TOMA: And we've been
48 criticized by the centers because they got -- each

1 director got ten minutes. And they've said there's no
2 way that we could adequately understand. So we've had
3 to use pieces from the information they provided us
4 with other bits of information that we can get. And,
5 again, we have a time constraint. If you remember,
6 when we were charged to do this, we were assigned this
7 responsibility in August and asked to have it finished
8 by December 31st.

9
10 MR. WATT: But it's a
11 perfectly valid criticism, that we did not have as much
12 information or as much time as even we would have liked
13 to deliberate these issues, for all the hundreds of
14 hours that we met together.

15 MS. TOMA: Which is also why
16 we continue to say, this is a document that we're only
17 using to open conversation.

18 MR. WATT: Liz?

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

28 MS. TOMA: We went back and
29 talked to people about our charge and the magnitude of
30 the charge. And we were reassured that this was the
31 charge that was before our Task Force.

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

43 And could there have been two committees
44 that looked at this? Absolutely. Could there have
45 been a third committee that wrestled with how
46 undergraduate education ties into the success of the
47 graduate enterprise and how that might be strengthened?
48 Of course.

Ray.

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

11 MS. TOMA: One more time.
12 This is the group that ultimately decides.

13 MR. CANON: Well, no, it
14 isn't. We make recommendations to the President but
15 they're not binding on the President.

16 MR. KRAEMER: And we don't
17 decide the areas.

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

20 STUDENT: When your committee
21 ends their final report in two to three weeks, are we
22 going to be given a disclosure of everything that
23 you've found out?

24 MS. TOMA: Yes.

25 MR. WATT: There's a question
26 in the back.

27 MS. GAETKE: I've been trying
28 to insert one here. But I guess I'm -- Now, I'm
29 gathering that this was based pretty much on what our
30 Dean presented. But I'm from -- Lisa Gaetke from the
31 College of Human and Environmental Sciences. And there
32 is strong opposition in my college, as you can imagine.
33 I'm wondering if any history of what had gone around
34 in our college was considered, because many a good
35 years ago -- Well, actually, your recommendation was
36 for some of us to go to the College of Agriculture.
37 Many years ago we came out of the College of
38 Agriculture. And I'd hate to think we're going
39 backwards rather than going forwards. So I hope some
40 of that will be considered.

41 MS. TOMA: The main thing --
42 That was one part of what we looked at. That was a
43 part of the input into the whole process. And, yes, we
44 did look at the history.

45 MR. FORTUNE: I do have one
46 item of business. And then I want to thank Genia and
47 David. And the item of business is simply that I
48 forgot to have the minutes approved. These minutes

1 were distributed as you came in. If there are no
2 additions or corrections, they'll stand approved as
3 distributed.

4 Okay. John Piecoro.

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

7 MR. FORTUNE: Absolutely.

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

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

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

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

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

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

37 MR. PIECORO: Yes.

38 MR. FORTUNE: Do you have
39 some?

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

46 MS. WALDHART: We've got them,
47 John.

48 MR. PIECORO: Do you?

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

1 seconded?

2 MR. JANOSKI: Tom Janoski.

3 MR. FORTUNE: Tom Janoski.

4 Okay. Okay. So the motion is to suspend the notice
5 requirements so that the Senate can vote on an oral
6 motion. Would you like to state your motion?

7 MR. DEMBO: The motion will be
8 that the University Senate would instruct the
9 administration to create and maintain an unmoderated
10 bulletin board accessible to all members of the
11 University community for the purpose of continuing the
12 dialogue regarding the future of the University.

13 MR. FORTUNE: That will be the
14 motion that will be voted on or will be considered if
15 the motion to approve the -- to waive the ten-day
16 notice rule is approved. Okay. So is there any
17 discussion of the motion to waive the ten-day notice
18 rule? (No response.)

19 Okay. All in favor, signify by saying
20 aye.

21 ("AYE" VOICE COUNT: ALL)

22 MR. FORTUNE: Opposed, say
23 nay.

24 ("NAY" VOICE COUNT: NONE)

25 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Now,
26 restate your motion again.

27 MR. DEMBO: The motion is, on
28 behalf of the University Senate, we are instructing the
29 administration to create and maintain an unmoderated
30 bulletin board accessible to all members of the
31 University community for the purpose of continuing the
32 dialogue regarding the future of the University.

33 MR. FORTUNE: Second to that
34 motion?

35 MS. STATEN: Second.

36 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. Ruth
37 Staten seconds.

38 Okay. Discussion on the motion?

39 MR. EDGERTON: Bill--

40 MR. FORTUNE: Lee Edgerton.

41 MR. EDGERTON: --just a

42 question. Can we define what is meant by
43 "unmoderated"? I'm a little concerned about the
44 comment about some of the responses the committee has
45 gotten. I'm not sure that I want a fully unmoderated--
46 (LAUGHTER)

47 --bulletin board.

48 MR. FORTUNE: Well, Jeff--

1 MR. EDGERTON: But I don't
2 know how to deal with that.
3 MR. DEMBO: In general, my
4 understanding of moderated bulletin boards, is that a
5 central administrator has the right to edit out any and
6 all things that are considered inappropriate for the
7 dialogue. I would argue in this case that the idea of
8 a censorship is exactly what we're not trying to
9 accomplish, but rather we should have an open
10 discussion regardless of how passionate or opinionated
11 the voices are.
12 MR. FORTUNE: That was a
13 question. That was not an offered amendment. Okay.
14 Is there further discussion? Mr. (Unintelligible).
15 MR. RANDALL: Randall from
16 Physiology.
17 MR. FORTUNE: David Randall.
18 I'm sorry. Go ahead.
19 MR. RANDALL: Continuing. I
20 gather, though, you're wanting to focus on the time
21 between now and when the Futures Committee makes its
22 report. Or is the purpose of this thing just ongoing
23 as the University evolves? It's not clear what you
24 mean.
25 MR. DEMBO: I'm anticipating
26 there'll be multiple groups of people over the course
27 of probably the next year or more who will continue to
28 take a look at each individual recommendation and its
29 possible implementation. So the need for continued
30 discussion will exist long after the report comes out
31 of the committee.
32 MR. FORTUNE: Scott Gleeson.
33 MR. GLEESON: I was just
34 wondering what, you know, the administration means in
35 there. Isn't this something the Senate could do so it
36 wouldn't have to -- or is that not...
37 MR. FORTUNE: Not a very --
38 You're asking me and it's a technical question about
39 technology, I believe.
40 MR. GLEESON: Right. And
41 that's why--
42 MR. FORTUNE: And that's
43 totally out of my--
44 MR. GLEESON: Because I don't
45 either.
46 (LAUGHTER)
47 MR. FORTUNE: I don't know
48 whether we could do that or not. Jeff Dembo is going

1 to be Senate Council Chair. So he'll be--
2 (LAUGHTER)

3 MR. DEMBO: When I phrased it,
4 Scott, I'm aware of the various list serves that we
5 have. But I'm not aware of an open bulletin board-type
6 arrangement. So I imagine it would have to come
7 through Information Services or some technical branch
8 of our administration.

9 MR. FORTUNE: Further
10 discussion on the motion? Claire Pomeroy.

11 MS. POMEROY: Bill, can the
12 Senate instruct the administration to do things or do
13 we have to request or recommend?

14 MR. FORTUNE: I think that's a
15 good point. Would you accept as a friendly amendment
16 request?

17 MR. DEMBO: I will not.

18 MS. POMEROY: Recommend.

19 Yeah. Good.

20 MR. FORTUNE: Okay. It's not
21 accepted. The motion is to instruct. Is that the
22 motion?

23 MR. DEMBO: Correct.

24 MR. FORTUNE: Further
25 discussion on the motion? Phil Kraemer.

26 MR. KRAEMER: I just have a
27 question, Jeff. With this process, do you envision
28 that if there are implementation committees, that all
29 discussions among those committee members would be
30 posted on this, or would this be just a voluntary -- a
31 chat room where we go online?

32 MR. DEMBO: That's a good
33 question, Phil. I haven't envisioned yet how each
34 committee will address its particular task. I've heard
35 a lot of comments here that they wish they had insight
36 into the various thoughts behind the Task Force and
37 motivation to make these recommendations. So in that
38 sense, there could be a lot of merit for individual
39 committees having stuff on the same bulletin board.
40 But, I guess, since I'm not aware of any bulletin board
41 we've had here at the University in my time here, this
42 is another experiment to try.

43 MR. FORTUNE: Further
44 discussion? Charles Coulston.

45 MR. COULSTON: Would this
46 bulletin board be open to the student body, also?

47 MR. DEMBO: The word was all
48 members of the University community, which includes

1 students, faculty. Yeah.

2 MR. FORTUNE: Further
3 discussion on the motion? Bill Thom.

4 MR. THOM: I'd like to make a
5 point about the inclusiveness of doing something like
6 this that we have run into from our Outreach Program
7 meeting through the Extension Service. Number one,
8 many of you may not be aware of it but there are
9 several school systems out here that do not allow their
10 students to get information off the University of
11 Kentucky websites. They have blocked them out of their
12 systems. The reason being, is because there are chat
13 rooms and other areas for discussion that the school
14 administrators do not want their students to expose to.

15 And so what I'm saying is, basically, is
16 this something we want for us as more confined
17 discussion, but are we aware of the influence and the
18 opportunity that others will have. And is that what we
19 want.

20 MR. FORTUNE: Further
21 discussion?

22 MR. EDGERTON: Yes, sir.

23 MR. FORTUNE: Lee Edgerton.

24 MR. EDGERTON: Another point
25 of clarification. When you say open to all members of
26 the community, is it closed to people outside of the
27 community?

28 MR. DEMBO: I envision the
29 possibility of having a U.K. log on to get access to
30 it. But, again, I'm not aware of the technical
31 limitations that may be.

32 MR. FORTUNE: Enid Waldhart.

33 MS. WALDHART: Would it help
34 to just raise it as faculty, staff and students, and
35 that way to indicate that there needs to be the U.K.
36 connection? Would that be a friendly amendment, Jeff?

37 MR. DEMBO: I think that
38 embodies what I was trying to say.

39 MS. WALDHART: Okay. Then I
40 would suggest that we add those words to indicate that
41 it is to be something internal to the U.K. community,
42 not to all Fayette County and everybody else who might
43 want to see things.

44 MR. DEMBO: I would accept
45 that.

46 MR. FORTUNE: Now, the
47 friendly amendment then is -- I believe yours was open
48 to all. And so it would be open to faculty, staff and

University Senate Council Session - March 4, 2002

1 students. Is that--
2 MR. DEMBO: Of the University
3 community.
4 MR. FORTUNE: Of the
5 University community. Okay. That has been accepted by
6 the proposer as a friendly amendment. Is there any
7 further discussion of the motion with the friendly
8 amendment in it? (No response.)
9 Okay. If not, all in favor signify by
10 saying aye.
11 ("AYE" VOICE COUNT: MAJORITY)
12 MR. FORTUNE: Opposed, say
13 nay?
14 ("NAY" VOICE COUNT: FEW)
15 MR. FORTUNE: It carries on
16 voice vote. Okay. Thank you very much. It was a most
17 interesting discussion. Now, wait a minute. We really
18 do need to thank David and Genia.
19 (APPLAUSE)
20 Thanks for coming. See you April 8th,
21 maybe the last meeting of the year.
22 =====
23 (MEETING CONCLUDED)
24 =====

