

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE

Regular Session

**April 22, 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)

19
27 & 28
29
32

MR. FORTUNE: Thank you for coming to the final Senate meeting of the academic year 2001-2002.

We have a number of Agenda items plus Committee Reports. And I hope that we get through at 4:30 promptly. That's my goal. But if we don't, you know, bear with us. It's the last Senate meeting of the year. We'll take a stand-up break or whatever. We've got a lot of people who are going to give brief reports from our committees today, as well as Agenda items.

The minutes of the April 8th meeting were distributed. I had a request to make a change in the minutes, or an addition to the minutes, from Davy Jones. I am declining to do that. That gets back into not what was said in this meeting but what was said in a Senate Council meeting about our position regarding Mike Nietzel. That is a matter of interpretation. My interpretation was and is that the Senate Council unanimously asked the President to consider Mike Nietzel as the Provost. I think Davy takes issue with that on the theory that there was not a vote taken or some such thing. But, in any event, I am declining to amend the minutes of this meeting, rather, the minutes of the April 8th meeting as he wishes. And if anybody wants to move concerning that, they can do so. But I

am declining to do that.

With that having been said, are there additions or corrections to the minutes of April 8th?

(No response.)

If not, they'll stand **APPROVED** as distributed.

Now, by way of announcements, as far as rule waivers since the last meeting, the Senate Council has only met once -- that was on April 15th -- and we approved a second change of a grade at the request of the instructor. The rules require that -- or the rules call for only one change of grade at the instructor's request. This particular situation involved seemed to us to warrant a second change of grade. And we waived the rule concerning that.

A matter that I don't think you would be aware of but Martha Sutton died. And Martha Sutton was the Secretary of the Senate. She worked in the Registrar's office and was the Secretary of the Senate at the time when the Senate's responsibilities for taking minutes and whatnot, sending out notices, vested in the Registrar. And she was the Secretary of the Senate from 1976 to 1992. And she died last week.

Now, the other matter is this. And this concerns an administrative regulation. And I felt -- I received two e-mails on this, two from Davy, and one

which was very courteous and non-confrontive from Kaveh on this. But there was an Administrative Regulation which was promulgated effective on April 8 concerning administrative reorganization. And I felt, after getting these e-mails, that it warranted looking into and I did do that. And I have a prepared statement which I'm going to read. And there are copies of this statement outside if anyone would like a copy.

And I'm doing this -- I felt it important because exactly what I say and so forth is being called into question in this forum. And I thought it important to reduce this statement to writing. So here it is:

When President Todd announced the reorganization last summer creating the Provost position, he said at that time that he planned for promotion of tenure files in the Medical Center side to go to the Vice-President and Chancellor of the Medical Center -- that's Jim Holsinger -- and then to the Provost. Now, that was a statement that he made. It wasn't a regulation. It was a statement that he made at that time.

When the Board of Trustees approved the reorganization, it said that any regulations affecting the academic relationships within the University needed to be vetted by the Senate Council. And this,

obviously, would be a matter which would concern academic relations.

You might recall that several months ago the Senate Council put proposed changes in the governing regulations up on the web. We put them up there and solicited comments. We voted on the suggestions that came in. And we sent those suggestions on to the President and to the Board. And several of those suggestions, by the way, were adopted by the Board at that time.

An Administrative Regulation was recently promulgated. The effective date of the regulation was April 8th. And what that does, is it codifies that that portion of the reorganization plan, which calls for promotion in tenure cases to go first to the Vice-President and Chancellor of the Medical Center and then to the Provost. This regulation -- it's an amendment to, not a lovely numbering system -- AR II-1.0 affects academic relationships and should have been sent to the Senate Council for comment prior to adoption. That did not occur.

When the omission was brought to my attention -- and, as I say, two e-mails from Davy and one from Kaveh -- I discussed the issue with Nancy Ray and she has succeeded to Juanita Fleming's position as the drafter of regulations. Nancy did not understand

that the Regulation should have been sent to Senate Council. And I fault myself for not making that clear when we talked about the Governing Regulations back last winter. In other words, I didn't sit down with her and say, now, Nancy, when the Administrative Regulations come forward, they need to be sent to us, too. So I fault myself for not making that clear to her. In the future -- and I've cleared this with both Nancy and Mike Nietzel -- proposed Administrative and Governing Regulations will be sent to the Senate Council for comment.

If possible, we're going to put these proposals, any which affect academic relations, up on our web for comment. And then we'll take those comments. We'll consider them. And if we agree on suggestions that should be made, we'll forward those on. If they're non-academic, if they have nothing to do with academic relationships, then we won't do that. But if they have something to do with academic relationships and we can get them up there, we will do that.

Now, the Regulation in question, that is the regulation of April 8th, will be subject to revision by the President and by the Provost based on comments received from the Senate Council, along with other proposed changes in AR II 1-1.01. And I believe

the rest of these things are non-substantive. The April 8th Regulation was received in our office this morning showing the additions and deletions and so forth. Cindy is posting -- in fact, she already has. Cindy has already posted these changes on our web site. And I've got the thing listed here. But it's **www.uky.edu/USC/usc-meetings**. Faculty will have until Friday, May 3rd to send their comments by e-mail or letter to Cindy. Senate Council is going to meet on May 6th. And so we're going to consider any comments that were received at that time.

We will consider any proposals that you've got for revisions in the Administrative Regulation which was adopted and we'll consider any comments that you've got on the proposed Administrative Regulations. Nancy Ray has agreed to come meet with us on May 6th to just make sure we're all in agreement on this thing and that there aren't anymore -- and this kind of thing doesn't happen in the future.

Now, what I -- The following paragraph reads as follows:

(Reading:) This was not an attempt by the Administration or by anyone to hide matters from the faculty. It was simply an oversight brought on by a change in the person performing the job

of drafting the Regulations, and my failure to adequately go over the procedures to be followed.

As far as I'm concerned, that ends the matter. There are copies of this, as I say, outside and you're welcome to take the copy and whatever. But, as far as I'm concerned, that ends it.

Okay. Chuck Dembo?

MR. DEMBO: May I make a comment, Mr. Chair, on what you said?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. DEMBO: Okay. As a Medical Center faculty, I think that the AR that was approved, without faculty approval, had the potential to have influenced faculty promotions and especially the Medical Center, because it added an extra layer of approval that wasn't provided for the Lexington Campus faculty. I think that the acknowledgement from you and from Nancy, I think that -- she approved the statement that you read, as well--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. I went over this with Nancy and with Mike Nietzel.

MR. DEMBO: --indicates to me, at least, as a Medical Center faculty, secure that it's not the Todd Administration that has taken a new view on asking the faculty or the Senate or the Senate

Council for approval but rather it was an oversight. So I feel good about that. Nonetheless, I want to make the comment that even if an administrator somewhere were to make a change that they thought was just editorial in nature, that it still should be for the faculty to decide whether there's any substance or whether it's merely editorial.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think this is a substantive change. I don't think there's any question of that. Okay. And, as I say, folks will have until May 3rd to send us whatever they would like to send us. Okay. Thank you, Jeff. Okay.

We have a resolution about a very dear man from a very dear person, Jean P. Walt, who taught English at the University for 25 years--

MS. WALT: Many.

MR. CHAIRMAN: --many moons--

MS. WALT: Many moons.

MR. CHAIRMAN: --and was a member of the Senate and was Faculty Ombud and has been a good soul in her retirement from the University. And this is a resolution for Mike Adelstein.

MS. WALT: I'd rather not do this but here it is.

Michael E. Adelstein earned his undergraduate degree at the Pennsylvania University

Wharton School of Business; then, after a stint with the 3rd Army during World War II, he completed his MA and Ph.D. in English at the University of Michigan, where he also served as a teaching assistant.

He came to the University of Kentucky English Department in 1958, after a year's instructorship at William and Mary College. In 1967, he was promoted to Associate Professor with tenure, and in 1974, was named Professor of Composition.

In his early years at U.K., he taught lecture courses in eighteenth century literature and also directed the business English program for the department. His undergraduate work in Business gave him a special interest in teaching professional writing. In 1966, he was named Director of Freshman Composition, a position he held until 1970.

Mike Adelstein was, almost from the beginning of his career, active in faculty governance, serving as a faculty senator for several terms. From 1970 to 1973, he served as Chair of the U.K. Faculty Senate Council and subsequently served two terms as a faculty trustee on the U.K. Board of Trustees. Not only was he an advocate for the faculty, but also for the students, both the graduates who taught in the Freshman English program and for the freshmen who were their charges. During the Oswald years, he played a

major role in the development of the Student Code.

During his career, he won several awards, both for teaching and writing. In 1968, he received the Alumni Association Great Teacher Award. He was also the recipient of an award for the best article in a professional journal.

His publications were prodigious. Besides many articles in professional journals, he authored a critical book, *Fanny Burney*; two texts on business writing, the second co-authored with Keats Sparrow. And counting all the editions, he co-authored or co-edited ten freshman English texts with Jean G. Pival. In addition, he was a pioneer in the use of television as a teaching tool. From 1969 to 1974, through the auspices of KET, he developed 34 one-half hour TV programs with accompanying instructional materials which supplanted the large lecture classes prevalent at the time in teaching freshman composition. Later, he produced a television series on Business English that was aired on a number of public television stations and was widely used by business and government organizations. He gained a national reputation for his expertise in business writing and was in much demand as a speaker at professional conferences.

In an interview for the Harcourt Brace publication, *Shop Talk*, Mike was asked why he had

chosen a career in the teaching of writing. He replied, "I believe that teaching writing is important. I feel that it is a valuable skill, not only in the marketplace, but in the home, the community, and in every sphere in life. If I had it to do all over again, I'd still take the tough road - the teaching of writing."

MR. CHAIRMAN: A moment of silence.

(PAUSE)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Jean.

We have a number of committee reports. And I'm going to ask all of the committee chairs, those other folks who are reporting on behalf of committees, to hold their reports until after our action items, except for John Garen. And John Garen has a meeting that he must go to. And so John is going to give his report now. John has been the most excellent Chair of our Budget & Finance Committee and he has a report for you.

MR. GAREN: Thank you, Bill.

Okay. As Bill mentioned, I am Chair of the Institutional Finance and Resource Allocation Committee. And our committee meets with the Administration to discuss budget issues and fiscal

matters. And this has been, I think in some ways, a remarkable year for the committee in many ways. And the first is the openness of central administration. Exclamation point.

President Todd apparently has been very encouraging. We have not met with President Todd but he has apparently encouraged Central Administration to be very open with us and they have. We have met on several occasions with Vice-President Blanton and Provost Nietzel before, during and after the budget process. And so it has been a very open -- open to faculty comment and whatnot all along.

So what else has been happening, I guess a lot of people already know. The next thing I've got down here on the list, and this is just sort of a grab bag of things that I'm going to talk about, not any careful list of everything that we went through. We had a \$6 million budget cut this year. And it looks like we're going to be down another \$6 million next year. And this will be partly restored, though, in the following budget year. This, of course, is depending on what -- This is not official yet because the State Legislators haven't approved the state budget yet. But, apparently, it looks like UK's part of the budget is not under question.

Okay. Well, one of the things that we

discussed at length: How are these cuts handled? And the next -- The answer to that, well, it's kind of a long answer but this is the short answer. These cuts are not passed along to academic units. Exclamation point. Exclamation point. Okay? That is sort of historic, I guess, in my time here anyway, that they have not been passed along to academic units.

And here is sort of a short list of some things that have been done. The first is the downside from Central Administration. Of course, this came along since I got here. Three exclamation points on that one. And I list here the savings -- the savings from each of these things here. So there's several other, I guess, noteworthy ways in which these were handled.

The next one is a four exclamation mark here. Athletics is now going to be charged for services provided by the University, such as painting and other kinds of things. This is apparently about \$1 million a year. So this is a big surprise there or a pleasant surprise, I should say.

What else is on my list? Let's see ... Now, the other things here -- Well, just stop the suspense here. And there are various and sundry things here. Over funding of parking, environmental, safety and health is _____. Various service units will

start charging clients for certain items and I have a detailed list that was provided. Certain benefits we'll begin to be able to charge to grants rather than Central Administration pick-up. And there's going to be a tuition increase coming along. Now, the things I've listed here are sort of big things and this is a grab bag of things that are recurring and non-recurring. So I haven't got a real careful list here. But these are kind of big things that I thought were noteworthy to point out.

Now, this is more than \$6 million of things I've listed here but there are some additional expenditures. And the next one has got five exclamation points. Lower health insurance rates. This is going to cost Central Administration about \$3.8 million more this year. Again, this is -- I put lots of exclamation points on there, because I just -- I haven't seen this before. And this is a nice benefit for faculty and staff.

I think the next one's got six exclamation points. Increased operating budgets for the colleges. This is .2 million from Central Administration, .2 million from the Provost office. This was a major priority of Provost Nietzel. So Deans and Chairs, you aren't going to have to fund your operating expenses out of unfilled lines anymore, which

I think is a very welcome change from the way things have been budgeted in the past. Okay. Of course, we get our three percent one-time salary compensation. And then there's various other items here, the maintenance and utility rate hikes and things like that here, which I haven't detailed.

Now, I guess kind of in the beginning of our meetings with the Administration, we were told the priorities -- I guess this is sort of after the budget cut came along. We were told there are the priorities that the Administration had in budgeting for this coming year. And the first was to manage the \$6 million shortfall, without passing the cuts along to academic units. The second was what's said there, managing the health care premiums. And third was provide some additional compensation to faculty and staff. And I agree with these priorities in this kind of a budget year, a very rough budget year. And I think the Administration -- I agree with these priorities. And I think they met them. They met them very well.

So while -- I do think it's proper for folks to disagree when they disagree. And I know there is some disagreement about the issues regarding the reorganization people have expressed. I know Brad Canon here is pretty upset about the new lockers over

in Alumni Gym.

MR. CANON: Speak for
yourself.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. GAREN: But, anyway, I'm a
believer in giving credit where credit is due. And I
think that this has done a very good job. I think we
need to congratulate the Administration on the way the
budget's been handled this year. So that's all I have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you,
John.

MR. GAREN: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Appreciate it.

We're going to go on to action items.
And the first action item was carried over from the
Senate meeting of April 8th. And that is the proposal
to create the Department of Community and Leadership
Development in the College of Agriculture. And this
was continued to this date on motion of Dean Johnson
from the College of Communications to give the folks
from the College of Agriculture an opportunity to meet
with the folks from his departments. And so at this
point, it is back before you. It needs no second,
since it comes from the Senate Committee on Academic
Organization and Structure. So, with that, I'll ask if
there's any discussion concerning this motion? (No

response.)

Okay. If not, all in favor, signify by saying aye.

("AYE" VOICE COUNT: ALL EXCEPT ONE)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, say nay.

("NAY" VOICE COUNT: ONE)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think the ayes have it on that one.

The next two action items are from the College of Arts & Science. I have them divided into item B and C and we'll vote on them separately. The report, as a whole, from Dean Grotch discusses both of these items. But I think they should be voted on separately. One is an organizational matter in which the Departments of German Studies, French, Russian and Eastern Studies & Classics would be merged into a single department of Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures and Cultures. And Italian would be picked up in that, also. Italian, the major is no longer offered but there are still Italian courses. And if the major were reactivated, it would be picked up in that. Now, that proposal comes from the Senate Committee with a non-unanimous recommendation of approval and from the Senate Council with a non-unanimous recommendation for approval.

The second item, which is item C, which we would pass to after we discuss B, the second item is the renaming of the Spanish Department into the Department of Hispanic Studies. And that comes to you with the unanimous recommendation of both the Senate Committee and the Senate Council. So with that, I'll open the floor for discussion of item B, which is the merger.

And I'd ask Dean Grotch just to briefly state the rationale for the merger of the departments.

MR. GROTCHE: There were a number of rationales for this. One of the concerns that we had had for a number of years was that the CPE was looking at us with increased scrutiny with respect to some of these programs being low-productivity programs in terms of the number of majors. And this is one of the reasons why we considered this as our reason for moving forward but it certainly is not the only one.

These four departments that we're talking about have been very small departments with five, six or seven faculty members. And, quite frankly, from a budgetary basis, they have always been in a certain amount of peril. This year, for example, the college had to institute a 2 percent budget cut because of reallocation. And we found that some of

these units were really unable to provide for that budget cut without seriously impairing their program. So we feel that such a merger will put these units on a sounder budgetary footing. They will also be protected from further budgetary cuts.

One of the things that we are doing in the merger is, we are providing to the units more resources. How are we doing that? Well, one of the reasons -- One of the things that we're doing is we're collapsing a staff line, which is possible, and taking that staff line and essentially putting that into the budget.

In addition, by having one department Chair instead of four, there will be some salary savings in terms of the supplements that the Chairs receive. And we are reallocating that, as well, into the budget. So we feel that there will be more resources available to faculty for travel and for some of the other things that they need.

We also feel that by putting their heads together, these units will be more able to make progress in teacher education in the state. One of the things that we are doing is we're talking seriously to the College of Education about the master of arts in teaching. And we're going to work together with them and we feel that, in a larger unit, we'll be able to

make much more progress in terms of the general issues of teacher education. More people talking to each other will be good pedagogical inundation across the college and also have foreign languages.

A final point I would say, from the point of view of the Dean's office, is that we have a fairly-lean staff and it will be much easier for us and much more efficient to be able to deal with one department rather than four departments.

So these are some of the things that are behind us. I think that the reasons are all very well stated and Phil Harley and some others did an excellent job of putting this together. There has been very extensive discussion of this going back to the beginning of the year, perhaps earlier, with faculty in the foreign languages and also with the department Chairs. And I think that, you know, pretty much the folks are on board. They understand the necessity of this and they're looking forward to progress in this direction.

There are some foreign language Chairs here. I don't know if they want to speak to any of the issues.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to ask if anyone has questions of Dean Grotch or if anyone would like to speak in opposition to the proposal?

Kaveh Tagavi?

MR. TAGAVI: Question. Not opposition. I'm wondering when Senate Council was considering this proposal, did it inquire whether there have been faculty vote by these departments which are being affected. And if you did, what's the answer?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We asked for reports from the Chairs and we did receive reports from the Chairs which reflected that their faculties had been consulted. I don't recall and perhaps someone else could speak more specifically to that, whether there'd been a formal vote of the faculties.

MR. GROTCHE: Any of the foreign language Chairs care to comment about that? We certainly met in one meeting with all of the faculty and all of the foreign language Chairs and we discussed this. And it is my recollection that no one stood up in serious opposition to that. But you can't construe that as a vote. We didn't take a formal vote.

MR. PICKETT: Not in our department, French Department--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. If you will, if you'll -- You have to state your name and all that.

MR. PICKETT: I'm Wilbert Pickett, Chair of the French Department. In the French

Department, while we did not take a formal vote yes/no, we did have serious discussions on the matter. And I would say my colleague, who is a senator, I think would agree that there was no opposition to this merger.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes? If you will, state your name, please.

MS. BLACKWELL: Jeanene Blackwell, former Chair--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MS. BLACKWELL: --of the German Department. I stopped in December being the Chair of the German Department. And what the four of us did, the four pack of Chairs did, is go back to consult with our colleagues and then come back together again to discuss the outcome of the discussions. And we also did not have a formal vote. But I think that it was the -- It was a consensus poll taken kind of activity that the four of us did. And then the four of us Chairs got back together to move on in discussions with the Administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions or ... Yes, Jeff Dembo?

MR. DEMBO: I think, Bill, the only question that came up at the Senate Council meeting that hasn't been answered formally by faculty is, how does the Spanish Department faculty feel about

not being part of the Department of Modern & Classical Languages.

MR. _____: Well, I guess I'll answer that.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. _____: They really did want to stay on their own. They were larger departments than the others with 13 faculty. They are the only one of the departments that has a Ph.D. program and, therefore, has a National Research Council ranking that's done every ten years. And I think, you know, some of those were really the key issues. They really wanted to stay on their own. And we felt it was reasonable to come forward with the two-department line.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions or comments? Hans Gesund.

MR. GESUND: You mentioned, Bill, it was non-unanimous in the Senate Council and non-unanimous in the--

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's correct. And you're going to ask me what the vote was.

MR. GESUND: And I would like to know what the opponents felt or why they opposed it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think -- Let me see if we have any of the opponents here. Lori

Gonzalez, you were the -- Lori Gonzalez is the Chair of the Academic Organization and Structure Committee which considered this. And Lori might be able to speak to that, as far as that committee is concerned.

MS. GONZALEZ: We have six committee members. And it was a vote of five in favor and one not in favor of the proposal. And I'll just summarize the reason for the vote to disapprove it. That was the fact that Spanish was not included in the merger and that it should be one department, but five others approved it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me ask if there are any members of the Senate Council who voted negatively on this, if they are here, if they would speak to it. I don't recall -- I really honestly do not recall who was opposed to it. But I know that it was non-unanimous. Liz Demski?

MS. DEMSKI: Let me just say it was for exactly the reason that Gloria said. I don't remember whether it was one opposed or more than one opposed but it was simply that Spanish was not included.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other questions or comments? (No response.)

Okay. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

("AYE" VOICE COUNT: ALL)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, say
nay.

("NAY" VOICE COUNT: NONE)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Item C
is, of course, the name change. And Mike Nietzel.
Provost Nietzel?

MR. NIETZEL: I just wanted to
-- And if the Chairs would stay just for a minute
before they go back to their--

(LAUGHTER)

MR. NIETZEL: --smaller
administrative responsibilities.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. NIETZEL: Now that the
vote has been taken, I just wanted to have the
opportunity on the Senate floor to commend the faculty
and the Chairs in the foreign language departments for
the process that we went through in working out this
merger and, also, the administration in Arts &
Sciences. I think it was a model for how to approach
and accomplish a difficult task.

No one likes to think sometimes about
these reorganizations. There's always a degree of
threat involved in that respect. The Chairs and the
faculty in these departments were extraordinarily

diligent in asking the important questions about what this involved and also very resourceful about how we could make it work and committed to making it work. And I just wanted to pay my thanks to them and the faculty for having the process be conducted that way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Item C should be no problem at all. That's just a name change for Spanish to the Department of Hispanic Studies. This comes with the unanimous recommendation of both Lori's committee and the Senate Council. I don't know that there's any need for someone to state the rationale for this. Is there any discussion? (No response.)

Okay. Anyone want to speak in opposition to this? (No response.)

Okay. If not, all in favor, signify by saying aye.

("AYE" VOICE COUNT: ALL)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, say nay.

("NAY" VOICE COUNT: NONE)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The fourth action item is a request by the College of Law for an extension of one semester for the operation of the Honor Code. It was approved in the spring of 2000 for a two-year period which is up at the end of this

academic year. And Dean Frost, Associate Dean Frost brought to the Senate Council a request for an extension of time for one semester. That is action item D. It comes to you with the recommendation for approval of the Senate Council by a unanimous vote. And Dean Frost is here and I'd like for him to just briefly state what the rationale for the extension is.

MR. FROST: The rationale for the extension -- And I should add that I've got with me Steven Marshall, a _____ law student who has taken time out of his studies for exams to come and present the students' perspective. But our rationale is simply that we've had the Honor Code for a couple of years. We have yet to go through a full-blown factual hearing with the Honor Code. One should be happening within the next month or so, unfortunately. But we have had some observations. We have -- The faculty has had time to think about it and we will have gone through an experience with it. And we'd like to spend the summer thinking about it, talking about it.

We have appointed our Honor Council for next year and we have also appointed a joint faculty student committee that has four faculty members and we'll have four student members, including Mr. Marshall and three others appointed by him, to examine the operation of the Honor Code. And we'll be able to come

back for -- at that point for, we hope, permanent approval of the Honor Code with something that we can -- that we can look forward to having work for us for years to come.

Mr. Marshall, do you want to add anything?

MR. MARSHALL: I would only add that with the committee that we're putting together now, made up both of faculty and students, we would just like the opportunity over the summer to be able to get together and look at the Code. There have been some complaints about it, some suggestions, some input. And we just want the opportunity to gather, get both sides, and work out a new Code that we can have in place by September.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions of Dean Frost or Mr. Marshall or comments, questions? Kaveh Tagavi?

MR. TAGAVI: Seems like I participated in this when we were originally discussing this. And, since, from the Dean I've heard that there's a chance that they would ask for an extension. From the students I heard that there is a chance that they would get a new Code.

I'd just like to remind the Senate and also my two colleagues that the problem that I had with

this Code was, it is not governed by students. And the Senate Rule says, "Honor Code must be governed by students." And if you have a case which is going through on this Code, good luck to you, because if the answer is no against the student, you might have a problem with it because the Code is not governed by students. And I hope when you think about a new Code that the Code will be governed by students.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions or comments? (No response.)

Okay. If not, all in favor, signify by saying aye.

("AYE" VOICE COUNT: ALL)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, say nay.

("NAY" VOICE COUNT: NONE)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much on the action items.

We have -- I don't know if you all realize -- well, many of you do, because many of you have been on Senate committees or Chairs of committees, but the Senate functions through its committees. We have excellent standing committee Chairs and we have had very, very good Chairs of ad hoc committees this year. And what I'm going to do -- I'm going to brag on these people maybe a little bit individually later but

I'm going to just call off these committees as they appear on my sheet and ask if any of the Chairs would like to make brief oral reports.

We have as we have received written reports put them up on the web and we have about six up there now and I can't tell you exactly what they are but they're on our web site that we have received in. But, as I say, I'm going to call these off and call off the standing committees first and then the ad hoc committees and ask if the Chairs would like to make reports.

And I just -- Well, I'll just -- I'll brag just a little bit now, then more later. But I just cannot say enough about our committee chairs this year. This has just been an extraordinary group of folks, particularly the committees that are proactive, like John Garen, where there isn't anything coming to you that demands your attention; you've got to go out there and make the contacts and so on. And we've just had really good folks chairing these committees this year. And I certainly appreciate it.

But to go through the Chairs. Rules & Elections is Brad Canon. Brad, do you have a report? Have you been busy this year?

MR. CANON: Brief. We conducted the elections. Most of our man-hours are

spent counting ballots. And some years we get a lot of complicated questions about the application and the rules. But this year we were lucky and got only one such question and I won't bore you with the details. We had a meeting on it and solved it. And so it's been a relatively quiet year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ling Hwey Jeng is here. And Ling Hwey is the Chair of our most excellent Library Committee.

MS. JENG: I will have a brief report on the -- There is really not a major issue this year. So what we did was, we concentrated on following up on the focus group studies and several other library system studies that we'd done last year and looking at the recommendations and see how the Libraries have followed up on their recommendations. And let me just, without going through all the details, just point out a few things that the Libraries have done, and in a way to inform you there's certain things that you might not have taken advantage of that you might want to.

One of things, of course, is the Science & Engineering Library which was proposed to be moved to the King Library South. It's not going to moved to the King Library South for a while because of the budget shortage. And so the Library has taken a step to move

the International Document Center to the Library and it will be ready in the summer.

If you don't know, there is an Electronics Reserve System. It is available to the faculty. And the Library staff at the Young Library will help you do the copyright clearance. So you don't have to worry about that. And that's something that faculty might want to take advantage of.

The Inter-Library Loan is completely online. The Library has been trying to encourage all the users to use online Inter-Library Loan. It's on the web called Iliad. And it's very smooth, really very fast. And you do have the option of returning books anywhere on campus. It doesn't have to be at that particular library where you check out the book.

And there is -- The Library has added a Library component to UK 101 just to introduce new students to the Library services on campus. And if you don't know about the Book Express Service, this is a new service that will work very well if you -- Say you have to check out a whole bunch of books. All you have to do is get on the web site and sign up for the Book Express. The Library will collect all the books you need and then notify you when the books are all ready. And then all you have to do is get a big bag and go over there and get the books. So you don't have to

find all the books from the shelves yourself.

And the project that has just started, and the Library is still exploring the possibilities, is to create a portal system for scholars and for other users. And the portal system will be available on the web site at the Libraries. The Libraries are currently looking into different technology that could be used for the support system. It's supposed to be just like Amazon.com.

And then we also did a very unusual interview. It was an exit interview with Director Paul Willis. All of you know that he is leaving to join South Carolina as the Dean of Libraries in the summer. And I thought because he's been here for 36 years, being the Director for 30 years and that that human resource, that all things that he knows in his head really will be lost if we don't have a chance to talk with him.

And several things he did point out at the interview I thought worth mentioning: One is that he said that the position was originally or for a while was to report to the Vice-President of Information Systems and last year was changed to reporting to the Provost. He said it's much much more appropriate for the position to report to the Provost. Who would know more about the academic needs, rather than an

Admissions System person.

And the Young Library will, indeed, need some way -- find some ways to accommodate collection _____ because the Library, itself, was not -- was built for the services center and not really for collection. So we are seeing some problems with the space for collection.

Even though the library has built a big endowment fund with the help of Mr. Young, Director Willis does feel like the new director really needs to work on development so that the money does not diminish its significance over the years. And we did ask him what he saw as the important qualifications of the next director. Technology is going to be a big part of this person's job and the development of fund-raising public relation skills, those skills are very important.

One thing that is other important I think as we were looking for a new Director, is the understanding of the academic nature, the nature of academic work. And one thing that we thought was very important for us to point out, especially as Provost Nietzel's ready to appoint a Search Committee for the new Director, is to make sure that the faculty voice is present at the Search Committee _____ Senate Committee _____ for the _____. And that's my report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ling Hwey.

She's done a really good job for a number of years on this committee.

I was trying to catch Hans because Hans and Charles Coulston -- Charles is here -- Charles and Hans really operated as readers on three program proposals this year?

MR. COULSTON: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And they caught things that had not been caught. And they -- I mean, I really wish Hans had stayed because he and Charles have just -- Particularly on the architecture proposal, Hans had just went way beyond the call of duty, his attention to detail and working things out and so on. And they really improved those programs at the point where they reached the Senate Council. I guess you all -- In a way, that's your report. But do you want to say--

MR. COULSTON: That's a wonderful report.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. CHAIRMAN: But Charles and Hans have an eye for detail that I certainly don't have. Kaveh was about to escape. And I went back and I grabbed him and I don't know whether you're about to

escape again, Kaveh, but I want to say something nice about you.

MR. TAGAVI: I'll stay for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. During the two years that I've been Chair of the Senate Council, you have made many, many motions. And you have not been afraid to raise issues that other people are just willing to pass by. And I think, by and large, that there have been many things that have come through the Senate that you have improved by being a close reader. And I have never felt that you had anything other than the goodwill of the University at heart. And I don't know, Kaveh; I just feel like giving you a round of applause for that.

(APPLAUSE)

MR. CHAIRMAN: And I would have said the same thing to Hans. But, you know, he's escaped. So whatever.

Okay. The next one -- And this is a committee that -- Most of the important proposals go through this committee -- George Blandford has just done a fantastic job through the years that I've been Chair of the Council -- and that's the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee.

George, you want to give a brief report

on this?

MR. BLANDFORD: Very brief report.

All the action items that the committee approved were approved by the Senate. A few had some changes in them I think due to my colleague, Tagavi, here. Many more that he wanted changed did not get changed and that was good, also.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. BLANDFORD: But everything that we approved got approved eventually by the Senate. If you want to read the details, it is on the web. We've got two more items for next fall.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, you've got more than that, George.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure of an academic plan. This is kind of an odd committee and I'm not sure it was active. I asked O.J. Hahn to chair it. I don't know -- We'll go on to the next one. Academic Programs did that one.

Academic Organization and Structure. Once again, a committee chair that I have begged to stay on, because of the job that she does, Lori Gonzalez.

MS. GONZALEZ: I wanted to

just recognize the members of my committee, because they read many proposals over two years and they read them quickly. And I think they took seriously that when we had a name change, we had a new program that we wanted to have on the Senate floor, they got the job done. Then I get to look good to the students. But Mary Arthur, Kate Chard, Charles Jennings, Joyce Logan and John Ross. And John chaired the committee for the Allied Health name change when I stepped down. So he took that one, too.

We had five proposals for name changes, three that we recommended approval that were approved here, one that was withdrawn before it ever got here, and then a fifth that was to change the name of French. That sort of fell apart when they changed that, the merger, and then the two proposals for the academic units that we considered today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No sinners this year.

MS. GONZALEZ: No sinners.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Research Committee was active this year. And Raju's got a report.

MR. GOVINDARAJULU: Our Chair, Mr. David Randall, is out of town attending a _____ conference. So he asked me to read the final report.

And our committee met on a monthly basis and we had a meeting with the Vice Chancellor for Research and also David Watt, who was the co-chair of the "Futures Committee." And, also, during the Spring semester we considered mechanisms whereby the University of Kentucky Research Foundation could become a more effective tool for enhancing the environment for research at our institution.

In March 2002, members of the committee met with Deborah Davis and Margot McCullers to discuss issues relevant to the mission of UK. As a result of that meeting the members recommend via this communication that representatives from UKRF be invited to address the University Senate at regular intervals, perhaps yearly, to update the Senate on the current state of UKRF, and 2) that the Research Committee continue to explore next academic year ways in which UKRF can further facilitate the research mission of the university faculty.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Raju.

We have had John Garen's report. Andy Spears. The Academic Facilities and Planning Committee has been active this year.

MR. SPEARS: Thank you, Bill. The members of this committee are Ray Forgue, Joan

Mazur, Michael Kennedy, Beth Garvy, David Durant,
Krishnamurty Muralidhar -- how did I do, Krish--

MR. MURALIDHAR: That's okay.

(LAUGHTER)

MS. SPEARS: --thank you --and
Donald Gross. This committee has been active this
year. You may recall that year before this, this
committee did an informal survey, e-mail survey of
faculty, and we were able to compile the results of
that survey. And so we do have some idea of what the
faculty think about classrooms and the facilities they
work in. And a special thanks to David Durant for
compiling that information.

I have been serving on the University
Master Plan Committee. And this committee arranged for
this group to meet with that committee in February.
Academic Facilities met subsequent to that meeting. We
forwarded several questions and comments to the master
planners that they incorporated into their work. That
master plan will be completed in mid fall. And so I
will continue to serve on that committee at least
through the summer until someone else is appointed to
this -- to this job.

We did have an issue come forward to the
committee relating to the Biomedical Building that is
going to be built across Limestone. There was an issue

as to whether the researchers had been adequately discussed with the laboratory facilities in that new building. And so we forwarded a recommendation that the administration provide input, a mechanism for input for researchers and others who are going to be utilizing the building. And that process is ongoing even as we speak. So those are the things we've been involved in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Andy.

David has worked with the Admissions folks. David Durant?

MR. DURANT: The committee works -- The new Director of Admissions, Don Witt, has been particularly open, active oversight. We helped set the parameters for the group that is automatically admitted to the university and we recommended that platform. They approved the change. We brought those standards in line with the new state college for prep curriculum. We meet on a semi-monthly basis to consider applicants who appeal, who have been turned down for admission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next committee on the list is the USP Committee. And Phil Kraemer can't be here and he was going to take 20 minutes. So we're going to get out of here 20 minutes

earlier. But he said that there are lots of things that are going to be cooking next fall on USP. So stay tuned.

Retroactive Withdrawal. I don't know if -- Scott Kelly I don't think is here. But this is, of course, the committee that deals with all these folks who seek to withdraw years after they got their "E" because of whatever it is. And this, the city could attest, is one of the most hard-working committees that we have got because they hear these cases on an individual basis and decide whether the circumstances are sufficiently extenuating that they should go back and undo that "E" that was given. And, Scott -- bless his heart -- has been willing to chair that committee for years. I don't know anybody else that would. But, boy, he's been an invaluable person.

Jane Wells is to chair the Academic Advising Committee. And I don't see Jane here. But that's been an active committee this year. I've been working with a couple -- two or three of the professional advisers. And I can assure you that the Advising Network, as it's known, is a very active group.

Now, as far as ad hoc committees, Bill Loney is here and probably the most interesting ad hoc committee report that we've got is from him on student

evaluations. And it is -- It was received by us at the Senate Council about ten days ago, I guess. And we put -- Cindy, it's up on the web, isn't it?

MS. TODD: No, it hasn't gone up yet. It's not quite ready.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It will be placed on the web for you all to look at. And this, obviously, is going to be the subject of a discussion next fall. But, Bill, if you want to just report briefly on the substance of your report.

MR. LONEY: After three years of what seems like extended labor pains, we finally got the report out. And what we proposed is to divorce the evaluation process into two parts. The first would be a _____ part where it would have to be, say, the bureaucratic part to give the chairman a number they could beat teachers over the head with. We want to keep that as part of the Office of _____ Assessment & Research, the procedure that's used now, with modification that there would be roughly four to five mandatory university-wide questions and each college and/or department have the opportunity to add a series of optional questions to that.

The second part would be the formative or developmental aspects of the evaluation process. We recommend that this be done as part of the duties of

the Teaching & Learning Center; that we will create or they will create a form of roughly 500 questions that apply to different pedagogical approaches to instruction.

A faculty member will work with the TLC to put together a customized evaluation tool that will be used for the class with the software package, recommending the instructor have the option to do it one of seven different ways on hard copy, as we do it now, e-mail to the students, web approach or whatever. And then the results of that will be given back to the instructor. And it will be up to the instructor to make the decision whether anyone else gets access to that information.

There was a concern expressed that faculty are reluctant to try new approaches and new pedagogues because of the fear of getting beaten over the head by bad teaching ratings. The idea is that the instructor will then take this and integrate it with the teaching portfolio to provide support for the statements made in portfolios about particular claims or particular philosophical statements or particular approaches that they're using for the particular course.

Our ultimate goal that we had to reject was to put the entire process on the web, the reason

being we've talked to several other schools that have tried this and the participation rate by students in the process is only 30 percent. We held a series of focus group meetings on campus. The students said they would only participate on the web under two circumstances; one is, if they hate the instructor; and two is, if they love the instructor.

Our participation rate, the way we do it now, is still only 69 percent but it's more than twice what it is at 30 percent. So we felt that we had to go with the higher participation rate. That's not to say that the individual instructor doesn't have the opportunity to go on the web and do it for some _____. As Bill said, the report is going to be on the web. If you have any questions, feel free to give me a call.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The number of ad hoc committees that were started this year. Jeff Dembo and Tony Stoeppel are the Co-Chairs of I guess what we call the Graduation Contract Committee. And I know that you all have met. Either one of you make a brief report on the status of things?

MR. DEMBO: I'll introduce Tony by saying what the role of our committee was. We -- Everybody is here. The idea was to look first at the needs of UK's campus to have something like a

Graduating Contract, especially when looking at the models that Tony had presented at a prior Senate meeting. The second was to look at the feasibility if the need did exist. The third was to look at how something could be implemented if we decided that it was feasible. And the fourth was to actually implement it if we got through steps one through three.

Tony can brief you on where we are.

Tony, by the way, has done a yeoman's amount of work to this research and background work. It's still ongoing right now and he'll describe that to you.

MR. STOEPPEL: Thank you, Dr. Dembo.

We have assessed the need, that there is a need here at UK for a Graduation Contract. We are currently taking the student survey to see if there is interest by students. We're doing the web-based survey through student government. Over the summer our committee will continue to meet and hash out a formidable plan. And, hopefully, by this fall we can give you all a final proposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I might say, this is not a Senate committee. But Provost Nietzel asked -- appointed a committee, a First-Year Committee, and Phil Kraemer is chairing that committee. And it's to -- I guess the immediate goal is to improve

retention. But, beyond that, it's to encourage students to -- to cause students to bond with the University more closely than they now do. And Tony is on that committee as well and Jeff is, too. So there's a -- and I am, for that matter.

So there's an overlap between that First-Year Committee and the Graduation Contract Committee and, also, between those two committees and a committee that I formed on Selective Admissions. And that committee -- and I am chairing that one -- we're going to meet on Wednesday of this week. And I think we will have a recommendation or more than one recommendation out on that. And that is to provide both changing the mechanism for transfers between colleges, the mechanism, just the mechanics of that and, secondly, to provide a standard for consideration of proposals for selective admissions changes in colleges. This was all brought on by the proposal from the College of Communications this spring.

Phyllis Nash, of course, is chairing one of the most important committees, arguably the most important select committee, not the Top 20 Committees. She thought I was going to say that but it's not. It's our General Fix-It Committee. And she reported on that several sessions ago. And I'm not going to ask you to provide any update if you don't want to. But...

MS. NASH: I'm not--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, the
Committee of Course and Program--

MS. NASH: That basic
committee. I was thinking of the SACS Fix-It
Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no, no.
Too many committees. No, no. The course and program
approval process and all that.

MS. NASH: Now, let me just
say that we have the implementation team, the Cindy's
of this University. They're actually out looking at
how we're going to implement this. And so when they
come back with a proposal about how it can be done,
then we'll be back to the Senate to talk with you about
when and if we ought to be doing it. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And that's a
next year thing. I believe those are the committees.
Am I missing anybody? Okay.

Now, the only thing -- I'm going to
make my "Thank you"s. And then I'm going to introduce
Loys Mather, who's back in the back, who is going to
give us our benediction and send us on our way. But I
do want to thank some folks. It's obviously dangerous
to start naming names because you invariably leave
someone out. And I will do that; I'm undoubtedly going

to leave somebody out. And the people that I'm going to name are people -- and I'm really not thanking them personally, although I do thank them personally, because they've made my job easier, but I'm acknowledging their contributions on behalf of the University. That's the appropriate way to put it, because these folks are doing what they did not for me but for the University.

What I have learned in the last two years is how many selfless people there are in this institution, how many people there are who've genuinely put the interests of the University ahead of their own self interest, and who give of themselves in ways that rarely is recognized, give of their time in ways that cannot benefit them, cannot benefit their department, and do it willingly. It is remarkable. It is remarkable how many good, decent, selfless people are in this University.

I'm going to ask you -- I'm going to name some names and I'm going to ask you -- And I'm not going to embarrass folks by asking them to stand or anything like that. And I'm going to ask you to hold your applause, except for Kaveh, of course. We wanted it for Kaveh. But I ask you to hold your applause until the end. And then I will ask you to applaud, because these folks -- and in a way you're applauding

yourselves -- deserve to be recognized.

First, those good people who help in these functions: Jackie Perkins, who keeps the notes. Gifford Blyton, and we've talked about Gifford over the years and we honored Gifford before Christmas, our long-standing Parliamentarian.

Stephanie Schloemer, who has kept our running minutes. I hope somebody reads these things. And they are being posted on the web and we do have an accurate record of everything that's said.

Our bailiffs, Joan Bostrom and Michelle Sonar.

Mary Molinaro, who is a member of the Senate Council and who I can rely on to make sure everything clicks over here, that they don't have some other function scheduled in this room at 3:00 on the Monday when the Senate is supposed to meet.

The Senate runs through its committees. And I tried to hold on to those real good committee Chairs that I inherited from Roy Moore. Really, that's probably not the way it's supposed to be done but these folks are so good that I just have begged them to stay on. And you have met them. And I will name a few of them.

Those folks who serve on the Reactive Committees, that is, the committees that react to

things that come in where they've got to do something. These are people where I don't have to worry about it. I know if it's in that committee, it's going to be dealt with. It's going to be dealt with in a timely fashion. I just don't have to worry about it:

Brad Canon, Rules Committee. George Blandford in Admissions and Academic Standard. Charles and Hans on Academic Programs. Lori Gonzalez on Organization and Structure. Scott Kelly on Retroactive Withdrawal. David Durant to deal with anything that comes up on Admissions.

The Proactive Committees, the committees that -- where it isn't coming in and they've got to take the initiative and do something:

Ling Hwey. Remember Ling Hwey Jeng, a jewel on the Library Committee and has been for a number of years. Andy Spears, Planning & Facilities. John Garen on Budget. David Randall in the Research Committee this year which got going. Jane Wells on Advising.

The Ad Hoc Committees and you've met these folks, Phyllis Nash, Bill Moloney, Jeff Dembo.

The folks who coordinate the academic councils who probably don't get -- They don't get the recognition they deserve. Phyllis Nash, of course, in the Medical Center. Doug Kalika from the Graduate

Council. Phil Kraemer in the Undergraduate Council.

The LCC Council is chaired by Jim Curlee. Trai Roberts is kind of the coordinator of that Council. I've worked -- I served on the LCC Academic Council for the last couple of years and have worked with Trai and with Peggy Saunier over there at LCC, and all those good folks at LCC. David Durant helped. In doing the Rules when LCC became part of UK, David worked with Peggy and others in trying to make the marriage as smooth as it could be.

Jackie Hager and Don Witt from the Registrar's Office. All those good associate deans, all those good folks in the Advising Network. Our faithful members of the Senate Council. They do come -- Rarely do they intentionally skip a meeting. It's always for an illness or something like that or a child care or something like that, that causes them to miss.

Particularly, for the first time since I've been on the Senate Council, we have really active student members. One of them is here. Josh Proffitt is the one that isn't here. Tony Stoeppel is the one that's here. I wish we -- We have all this anti-cloning legislation. I wish we could clone Tony Stoeppel.

Our two Faculty Trustees, Claire Pomeroy, who is on the Senate Council and Trustee, and

Loys Mather, who faithfully has come to Senate Council meetings for the years that I've been on there.

Lee Todd, Mike Nietzel and Jack Blanton for letting the sun shine in. Now, I know that there are some folks who can see a dark lining in every silver cloud but, man, this is a positive move. I mean, I don't see any way in which any objective observer can view the changes over the last year as anything but positive.

And a special thanks, although I've already done it, to Kaveh Tagavi for bringing to our attention things that would have passed us by in making proposals which were okay, better in many instances. And, as George Blandford says, if he lost on a matter, that's a good thing, too.

And, finally -- finally, because you noticed I passed by Cindy before, to the most affable Cindy Todd. Choked up on this one. But, really, seriously, you've got the memory of an elephant.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've got the wisdom of Solomon. You've got the heart of Mother Theresa.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're as faithful as one of your golden retrievers.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are the--

MS. TODD: Oh, shoot, man.

MR. CHAIRMAN: --heart and soul of the Senate Council. Like all these other Senate Council Chairs have gone before, I couldn't have done what I done, however well or how they did it, I couldn't have done it without you.

And now to the benediction, Loys. Loys Mather who -- a former Senate Council Chair -- served three terms as Faculty Trustee. Now, it's not like Dan Reedy is not leaving the University -- Dan gave us our benediction last year but Dan is leaving. Loys' term as Faculty Trustee is up in a couple of months and Michael Kennedy is replacing him. And I thought it only fitting that Loys say whatever he would like to on his experience as Trustee, as Senate Council Chair or anything that he wants to say.

MR. MATHER: Thank you, Bill. Thank you. Considering where this is on the Agenda, I think you probably want the five-minute version rather than the 50-minute version.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. MATHER: So I'll try to be very brief. And I'll try to summarize my remarks in about four main comments.

Number one, you've heard the expression, "Be careful what you ask for, you might get it." Ten years ago Carolyn Brock came to the self study which I was coordinating at that time, and said, "We think that we need a little better involvement and use of faculty trustees on some of the faculty committees." And one in particular she had in mind was the Finance Committee. So our committee recommending on administrative structure in its recommendation suggested that one of the trustees on the Finance Committee, the Board of Trustee's Finance Committee, include one of the faculty trustees. And that was done. And that began to set some things in motion in terms of questions, some ideas from other trustees in terms of the role that faculty trustees could play in their various positions.

And then with the events of three years ago, and particularly with the change of Board leadership, this expression really came into full bloom, because Dan Reedy, as you know, then became Secretary of the Board of Trustees, I think the first time that that had happened. I had up until then been serving on the Finance Committee but then found myself chairing the Ad Hoc Committee on Board Committee Structure and Board Reorganization.

Since then, over the last year, I have

served on that committee again when Mr. Miles wanted that committee to be reconstituted to look at some additional issues, and also have been serving on the Nominating Committee, which in the last two years actually has had some public meetings and actually, rather than the fact of the Trustee being called shortly before the meeting saying, "Here's who we think we're going to nominate," we actually sit down and we have a group discussion about various Board people to put in various Board positions.

And, also, the last year I've served as Chair of the Board's Executive Committee. So I think we can honestly say, Claire and myself, we've not lacked for feeling we have things to do on the Board of Trustees. And I think the initiative that started this body, I think, had something to do with that.

The second point I wanted to make -- this is an obvious one -- we have a new Administration. It's a new era. We have new priorities. And if you don't believe that, reflect back to the report that John Garen made and I won't repeat all that. But I just -- I have to heartily endorse the exclamation points that he had up there, because there is fresh thinking in terms of how to deal with thin budgets. And I commend the Administration for it.

But I have some words of caution. I

remember many, many years ago -- and there aren't too many in this room who were here at that time -- we had another new administration and we had high hopes for it. We, as faculty, probably weren't as careful as we should have been in terms of some steps, some measures that we took. And what looked like a promising relationship didn't quite carry out quite to the extent that we thought that it might.

We have a wonderful opportunity in front of us, an opportunity for working as team members with the Administration in shared governance. And I think they're fully committed to this. But let's make sure we don't drop the ball. Let's make sure we nurture this relationship. Let's make sure that we, as faculty, are as willing to listen to them as we want them to listen to us when we have concerns. I personally think things are going to go fine. But I'm simply saying, I think we need to think through the consequences of things we're asking about before we put it on their table.

The third thing I want to say, the model where the faculty trustees serve as ex officio members of the Senate and the Senate Council, I think is a good one. Why? Because it helps us as trustees keep ourselves attuned to the concerns on the part of faculty, to know what are current issues on campus and,

therefore, representing you, as opposed to primarily just sitting there and representing ourselves. I think it's an excellent model and I think it is working well. I know it certainly helped me keep better focused on the things that were of concern to faculty.

And, finally, the fourth thing I want to say is that of thanks. I feel deeply gratified to have represented this faculty for three terms, for nine years, on the Board of Trustees. This is a wonderful faculty. It's a place where many of us have chosen to spend the better part of our academic lives. And to serve you in this fashion, I think, has been a high honor for me.

But I also want to thank you for having sent some wonderful people to serve with me. I served four years with Deborah Powell. It was a wonderful experience. And she nurtured me and tutored me in my early months on the Board of Trustees. And then I served four years with Dan Reedy and, because of circumstances and all, that was an extremely interesting four years, as many of you well know.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. MATHER: And for the last year I've had the distinct pleasure of serving with Claire Pomeroy. So I commend you for that and I thank you for that, for giving me the opportunity to work

with them.

I also want to thank you for and particularly a member of this body for Cindy Todd. I'm not sure what I would have done many times, especially in the last three years without, as Bill already said very eloquently, the Administrative mindset that Cindy has, the memory that she has, the institutional memory that she has in times that things would come up and I would need somebody to go to as a source of information, sometimes a source of ideas.

But, Cindy, you've just been invaluable. And I hope this body understands the truly significant role that you serve in this institution.

Finally, one thing I'd like to say is, again, I've appreciated this opportunity but I trust that you will provide the same cooperation to my successor, Michael Kennedy, that you gave me. And, again, I say "Thank you."

(APPLAUSE)

MR. CHAIRMAN: George Blandford?

MR. BLANDFORD: Bill, you've been thanking everybody. I think we owe you a round of applause.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'll tell you what, George. Before you do that, let's thank all

the people I said needed to be thanked I didn't give the round of applause, all these committees.

(APPLAUSE)

MR. BLANDFORD: I think we need to give you a round of applause for your two years of dedication to the Senate and the Senate Council.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's been a lot of fun.

(APPLAUSE)

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll see you all in September of 2002. And have a good summer.

=====

(MEETING CONCLUDED AT 4:22 P.M.)

=====

