

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

6 January 1986

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet in special session on Monday, January 20, 1986, at 3:05 p.m. in ROOM 116 of the THOMAS HUNT MORGAN BUILDING.

AGENDA

1. Minutes of 9 December 1985.
2. Resolutions.
3. Chairman's Remarks.
4. The 1986-88 budget request will be outlined by Vice President James O. King and Associate Vice President Ed Carter.
5. ACTION ITEM:
 - a. Proposed revision of the General Studies Curriculum. (Final Report of Ad Hoc Committee circulated prior to the November Senate meeting and also attached to the November Senate minutes. Other material and 15 proposed amendments circulated under date of 25 November 1985. A correction and additional items for consideration are circulated under date of 3 January 1986.)

Randall Dahl
Secretary

PLEASE NOTE:

Because several votes on the amendments proposed to the revision of the General Studies curriculum are likely, we ask that all voting members of the Senate sit in the center section of the room and that all non-voting members and visitors sit in the side sections. If the Senate is not close to completing action on the proposed revision of the General Studies curriculum by 5 p.m., deliberations will be resumed at a special meeting a couple of weeks later or at the regular meeting on February 10, 1986.

/cet
0950C

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, JANUARY 20, 1986

The University Senate met in special session at 3:10 p.m., Monday, January 20, 1986, in room 116 of the Thomas Hunt Morgan Building.

Bradley C. Canon, Chairman of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent: Curtis W. Absher, Roger B. Anderson*, Michael Baer, Charles E. Barnhart, Brian Bergman*, Raymond F. Betts, Tex Lee Boggs*, Ray M. Bowen, Charles W. Byers, John Cain, I. K. Chew*, Robert Dennis*, Richard C. Domek, Herbert N. Drennen, Anthony Eardley, Kimberly Ellis, Donald G. Ely*, Gerald Ferretti, Richard W. Furst, Lester Goldstein, Willburt Ham*, Marilyn D. Hamann*, S. Zafar Hasan*, Leonard E. Heller, Donald Hochstrasser, Alison Hodges*, Susan Johnson*, John Just, Robin Lawson, Robert G. Lawson, Arthur Leiber*, Edgar D. Maddox*, Kenneth E. Marino*, Richard McDougall, John Menkhaus*, Mark Moore, Michael T. Nietzel*, Robert C. Noble*, Merrill W. Packer*, Leonard K. Peters, John A. Rea*, Thomas C. Robinson, Kirk Rowe, Edgar L. Sagan, Karyll N. Shaw*, Timothy Sineath, Otis A. Singletary*, Carol B. Stelling*, Laura Stivers*, Louis Straub, Joseph V. Swintosky*, Kenneth R. Thompson, Kellie Towles, Enid S. Waldhart*, Marc J. Wallace, Charles Wethington, Paul A. Willis, Constance P. Wilson*, Judy Wiza

The approval of the Minutes of the meeting of December 9, 1985, was postponed until the following meeting.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

James McClellan Elliott

James McClellan Elliott, a retired Assistant Professor of Mechanical Engineering, died August 23, 1985.

Professor Elliott earned a bachelor of science degree in mechanical engineering in 1956, followed by a master of science degree in 1959 - both at the University of Kentucky.

After teaching several years at the University of Kentucky, Elliott took a four year leave of absence to do further graduate work at the University of Minnesota. He then returned to this University, where he taught until ill health forced his retirement. Professor Elliott's retirement became effective July 1985.

While at the University of Kentucky, Professor Elliott taught a wide variety of undergraduate engineering courses, but his major interests were in fluid mechanics and heat transfer.

Through the engineering continuing education office, Professor Elliott developed and taught several special courses to help employees of state government extend their knowledge of engineering and to prepare them to become registered professional engineers.

*Absence explained

He was well respected by his students, who sought his advice on both academic and non-academic matters. Professor Elliott was never too busy to talk to a student, and it was the rule, rather than the exception, to find one or more students in his office any time during the day. Professor Elliott's keen intellect, remarkable wit, and genuine compassion will be missed by both his students and his colleagues.

A native of Harrodsburg, Kentucky, Elliott was a member of the Masonic Lodge, the ritual team of the Oleika Shrine and Scottish rites, the Grand Lodge of Kentucky F & A.M., the Thoroughbred Bass Club, and the Bruners Chapel Baptist Church of Harrodsburg.

He is survived by his wife, Patricia M. Elliott; two stepsons, Ronnie and Kevin Dolen; three brothers, Edwin T. Elliott, Virgil P. Elliott, and Ralph G. Elliott; and two sisters, Eunice Tyler and Genevieve McCandless.

(Prepared by Professor Robert A. Altenkirch, Department of Mechanical Engineering)

Professor Altenkirch requested that this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the University Senate, and that copies be sent to the Elliott family. The Chairman asked the Senators to stand for a moment of silence in tribute and respect to Professor James McClellan Elliott.

Chairman Canon made the following announcements:

"There is a change in the agenda for today's meeting. We have an addition to the agenda. Mr. Robert D. Bell, Chairman of the Kentucky Advocates for Higher Education, was invited to speak to the Senate by the Senate Council. Originally he had been invited to speak to a later Senate Meeting, but the later meeting turned out to be inconvenient for his schedule whereas today's meeting was convenient. It also seemed appropriate to have him talk about his group's activities on the same day that we were having a budget presentation. Moreover, as the Kentucky Advocates are trying to stimulate support for greater state funding for higher education in the current session of the General Assembly, it seems most appropriate to have Mr. Bell talk to this body now before the session is very far along.

Because we are having both the budget presentation today and the talk by Mr. Bell, there will be little time left on the agenda to consider the proposed revisions in the general studies program. The Senate Council believed that the remaining issues concerning the general studies program should be considered at one time and not handled piecemeal over two or three meetings. Consequently, we will not be considering the general studies revision today. There will be a special

meeting of the University Senate two weeks from today, Monday, February 3, 1986, at 3:05 p.m. in this room at which time the only item of business will be the revision of the general studies curriculum.

Also, let me mention briefly that the Senate Council hosted a breakfast for the Fayette County legislative delegation on December 16. Seven of the nine members of the delegation were present as were all but two of the members of the Senate Council. By-and-large we talked with the legislators on a one-on-one basis and tried to give them some illustrations of the University's problems in accomplishing good teaching and research from the faculty's perspective. Many of the members of the delegation asked a lot of followup questions and expressed a lot of interest in our problems and what the legislature might do to help alleviate them. I believe it was a productive meeting and all in all the Fayette County legislators have a better idea of the University's problems. If possible, the Senate Council plans to followup this meeting with another breakfast session with the delegation next month.

Finally, let me announce the results of the nominating ballot for the Board of Trustees. The person with the most votes was Jim Kemp of the Department of Animal Sciences, College of Agriculture, with 106 votes; Raymond Betts of the History Department, Arts and Sciences, also of the Honors Program, received 84 votes; Emmett Costich, College of Dentistry, received 56 votes; Bob Bostrom, the College of Communications, received 34 votes; Bobby Pass of the College of Agriculture, Department of Entomology, received 31 votes; Louis Swift of the Classics Department, Arts and Sciences, and Robert Hemenway of the English Department in Arts and Sciences, tied with 22 votes. These will be the people, assuming they are all willing to stand for election, who will be on the second ballot for the Board of Trustees.

Chairman Canon introduced Vice President for Administration James O. King and Associate Vice President for Budgetary and Fiscal Affairs Ed Carter to the Senate for the purpose of outlining the University's 1986-88 budget request. Chairman Canon said it was unfortunate that the presentation to the University Senate preceded the Governor's budget message to the General Assembly by one day, but there was no way of knowing when that would occur when the special University Senate meeting was scheduled. He also noted that the budget presentation followed from a suggestion by the Senate's Committee on Institutional Finances and Resource Allocation. One of the goals of this committee is to enhance administration/faculty communication about budgetary and fiscal policies and choices. Both the Senate Council and the speakers agreed that this presentation was a step in that direction.

Vice President King's remarks follow:

Vice President King expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to meet with the Senate and discuss the University's budget request. He also expressed Dr. Singletary's regret in not being able to attend the Senate Meeting.

"The first step in the biennial budget request," Vice President King said, "is to update the planning process." This process began at the University on a formal basis in 1976 when the first comprehensive plan was submitted to the Board of Trustees for their approval. Since that time, planning has been updated each two years as a part of the biennial budget process.

"In January 1985, the President met with the Chancellors to resolve the broad planning assumptions which would be used for this biennial budget submission. Using the broad assumptions as a guide, the Chancellors went about developing specific planning assumptions for their respective sectors. Once the sectors completed their phase of the planning, including the programs, capital, and land use, it was brought back to the University level where any conflicts were resolved."

Although the planning process is an internal one, Vice President King said it was not done in isolation, because it was the basis for the biennial budget request. He added that the plan was very comprehensive integrating academic and nonacademic needs. Planning for the University and providing for the financial resources to make the plan a reality is basic to getting this University closer to becoming a comprehensive, research and teaching institution. "I tell you about this process because it is extremely important," he said. It became an integral part of the strategic planning by the Council on Higher Education. He was pleased to see that one of the provisions in the strategic plan for higher education included the provision that the State should have one state-wide university nationally recognized for scholarship, research, and graduates and that the University of Kentucky should emerge as that institution. In effect, the university was a step ahead in its budget request of moving toward that goal.

The planning document had five objectives: First, providing for the continuation of existing programs for meeting existing contractual fixed costs such as staff benefits; continuing institutional commitment to affirmative action and equal opportunity; and putting the institution on a solid financial footing by establishing recurring funding for activities which had previously and partially been funded on a nonrecurring basis, such as equipment, library, renovation, and computing needs.

He said the second planning objective was to provide adequate support for faculty and staff through reaching the benchmark median for all faculty salaries in 1986-87, and reaching the marketplace levels for staff salaries and adequately supporting each faculty position and providing a competitive environment to attract and retain quality faculty.

The third objective, he said, was to identify and actively support a limited number of Centers of Excellence which would enhance the region's and state's economic development. Those Centers are for aging, cancer prevention and education, research and patient care, equine health care, pharmaceutical science and technology, computational sciences, biotechnology, biomedical engineering, public administration, and technical transfer.

Objective four is providing for the development and enhancement of the institution's graduate and research programs through (1) increased graduate student support and (2) special funding for equipment. The University has initiated a special funding request for equipment. A bond issue has been proposed so that the University can immediately acquire approximately \$30 million worth of equipment to be funded through revenue bonds with the expectation that if the university gets the equipment, we will keep it up-to-date with replacements on a scheduled basis through the regular budget.

Planning objective five was to enhance and develop academic areas of excellence as a catalyst for support of academic programs.

In conclusion Mr. King pointed out that the planning process is comprehensive, and it is vital to the future of the University. The planning process lets the University determine where it is now, where it wants to be in five years and how to get there. He felt if the biennial budget request is approved, the University would for the first time have resources that are necessary to achieve excellence, to have adequate faculty salaries and support, modern, state-of-the-art equipment, adequate space, and the environment to attract truly outstanding students.

He added that the Council on Higher Education has recommended the budget essentially as it was requested except for some new building projects. They did not recommend any building projects on the main campus. The request is now in the hands of the Governor, and when she presents her budget message the figures will be analyzed to know specifically the impact they will have on the University of Kentucky.

Associate Vice President Carter's remarks follow:

Mr. Carter reviewed the months of work that went into the development of the biennial budget. He presented several charts to the Senate which he said reflected the Council's recommendation to the Governor and not the original request. The charts were an estimate not only of the state appropriation need and expectations of revenue from other sources, but also the projected amount of tuition and fee revenue to be generated for the institution including the Community College System as a result of the fee schedule which has been approved by the Council.

The capital projects recommended by the Council for the Community College System include new buildings for Lexington, Elizabethtown, Hazard, Prestonsburg, and Madisonville Community Colleges, and on the Lexington campus \$31 million of academic equipment and a fire safety project in Patterson Office Tower. [Charts follow at end of minutes]

In questions from the floor, Senator Allan Butterfield said he wondered if there was any increased dollar figure anticipated for a typical graduate assistant. Mr. Carter said that the graduate assistant would be included in the salary catch-up package. If the package is fully funded, it would put the University in a position of being very competitive with the benchmark institutions. Professor Butterfield wanted to know if the \$31 million for research equipment included a "so-called super computer." Mr. King said part of the money was for the "super computer."

Senator Paul Eakin felt that putting that much money in a super computer might well be a poor investment. Mr. Carter responded that this might be so from an academic perspective, but he added that the request also took into account the economic development needs of the state and that the request was "add on" money in that nothing from UK's current computational needs was omitted from the budget and that the super-computer was not part of the formula funding request.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Carter and Mr. King for their remarks to the Senate.

Chairman Canon introduced the next guest, Mr. Robert D. Bell. Mr. Bell is a UK graduate, class of 1949 in political science; did graduate work in public administration and has spent most of his career in public service for the Commonwealth of Kentucky. He has served in various cabinet posts under five different governors. For the past eight years he has been an executive of the Ashland Oil Company and currently he chairs the Board of Trustees of the Ashland Oil Foundation. He also is chairman of the recently formed Kentucky Advocates for Higher Education and he was asked to speak before the University Senate in that capacity.

A summary of Mr. Bell's remarks follows:

Mr. Bell said the Advocates for Higher Education had its genesis in an unfortunate press story that occurred when a speaker addressing the faculty senate at the University of Louisville said that higher education would not receive increased financial assistance from the General Assembly before 1988 because there were other pressing governmental problems. That provoked considerable discussion within the broader higher education community. "This caught the ear and eye of the lay regents and trustees and for the first time there was communication in the state among the lay leaders about higher education and its needs," he said. He added that new communication started to build between the university presidents, the chairmen of the Boards of Trustees and out of that came the Kentucky Advocates for Higher Education, which was formed in October. There are thirty-five directors of the organization who are broadly and fairly representative of all the

institutions in the Commonwealth. He said they are not a governance or study group but instead are advocates for the broad generic interests of higher education in the state. They are trying to raise the level of awareness of the funding problem in higher education and hope to become some kind of a catalyst to bring together the different elements of this whole community and the interests of the whole.

They have filed articles of incorporation and established a non-profit, non-stock corporation and adopted three broad objectives. These objectives are: (1) to seek full funding of the statutory formula that is in place in Kentucky; (2) to be supportive of the new requests to establish the Commonwealth Centers and the endowed chairs for matching public and private donations; and (3) to achieve more adequate financial assistance for students in financial need.

Their first effort was the January 6 rallies which were held in eight locations across the state. He said they could be considered successful by any standard of measurement. The attendance was quite good and exceeded the expectations of the press. He said the coverage was almost phenomenal. "One of the primary purposes of holding those events was to stage an event that would attract attention, raise visibility, cause press commentary, and attract the interest of elected officials," he said. He added there was very effective and positive coverage at all state, regional and local newspapers about the events.

He felt the movement of large companies in the state to signal the elected leaders that they are not only strongly for any steps taken to enhance quality education in the state, but they are willing to pay for it was helpful in creating the climate that made the special session possible and certainly made the votes possible in the general assembly. He also felt the lay citizens town meetings sponsored by the Prichard Committee were helpful.

Mr. Bell said the group was trying to plagiarize some of the excitement and color that people are attracted to at collegiate athletics; to seize that and capture some of those techniques and turn them into something that will be for a more lofty purpose, the support of quality higher education across the state. He said they were meeting with some success. He said the Advocates' efforts were in an area of what he called "soft politics." We now have a younger breed of political people who read polls, watch television and who wait for signals to see if there is an interest, concern and organization to a constituency. If there is, they are drawn to it. The KAHE is trying to show the state legislators that there is a concern and commitment throughout the state. The constituency extends beyond students and faculty into alumni, friends and concerned citizens.

The Advocates next rally will be February 5 in Frankfort. He said they were going to create a scene there which would involve lots of people, color and excitement to attract the media and political leaders, but also some things would be said that are serious. Former North Carolina Governor, James Hunt, who showed great concern and interest in higher education during the eight years he was Governor, will be the speaker. Also, the Advocates will give away a van which will attract some interest and attention.

Mr. Bell said the group has had the best support from the press that he has ever encountered in all the good causes in which he has been involved, and he felt the news people are interested in what the Advocates are doing. He added that they are going to do everything they can to make the public have a greater awareness about the problems of higher education. They are going to raise the visibility of this issue, but most important of all they seek to coalesce this broad group of interested people which extends to students, parents, faculty, staff, and alumni.

He said he hoped the faculty would understand, as they read about it in the paper, what the Advocates are doing.

Senator Andy Grimes told Mr. Bell he was glad he was out there and the Senators applauded enthusiastically.

Senator Jesse Weil wanted to know if the main agenda of the group was to set up media events that will demonstrate public interest or if there was some one-on-one lobbying. Mr. Bell's response was that there was a lot of one-on-one lobbying which has been going on for several months. Mr. Bell said he was impressed with the positive and favorable quotations that are being printed in the small newspapers in the state from members of the General Assembly concerning their interest in higher education. He said it was of utmost importance that the legislative delegations in the General Assembly who represent the constituencies where there are Community Colleges be on board. He further stated that the expression of the faculty's interest to the legislators was meaningful. He told the Senate not to assume it would be discounted because they worked at the University.

Mr. Bell named many large companies who are working in the interest of higher education, and will work during the current session. He said it was good business and to their interest, and he felt the business community in this state has come to the conclusion that they must do something. He said that Ashland Oil had decided if they were going to grow in Kentucky, there had to be some growth to Kentucky.

Mr. Bell believed the Advocates will become a permanent organization. He said they might be more effective as a group of lay citizens.

The date of the Rally is February 5, in the late afternoon. Mr. Bell said the larger the crowd the more impact it would have. Mr. Bell thanked the Senate and again he was applauded.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Bell and echoed Andy Grimes' statement, "We're glad you are out there." The Chairman said he did not think there had been a citizens group that has come forward to advocate increased funding or even attention to higher education. He said he certainly hoped it continued beyond the current General Assembly.

Mr. King said he wanted to echo Chairman Canon's statement that the Advocates continue. He said for the first time there were business and community leaders pushing for higher education rather than primary and secondary education only.

The Chairman reminded the Senators again about the special meeting on Monday, February 3, at 3:05 p.m. for the purpose of finishing the revision of the general studies curriculum.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Randall W. Dahl
Secretary

NOTE: The charts which Mr. Carter presented are attached.

TOTAL SOURCES OF REVENUE
(MILLIONS)

	1985-86		1986-87		1987-88	
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%
STATE APPROPRIATION	\$187.3	41.1	\$218.6	43.1	\$256.6	46.1
TUITION AND FEES	42.7	9.4	45.7	9.0	48.7	8.7
FEDERAL & LOCAL APPROPRIATIONS	17.1	3.7	17.4	3.4	17.8	3.2
SALES AND SERVICES/ EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES	9.4	2.1	10.0	2.0	10.5	1.9
ENDOWMENT & INVESTMENT	9.9	2.2	9.9	2.0	9.9	1.8
SALES & SERVICES OF AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES	23.9	5.2	27.5	5.4	28.6	5.1
PRIVATE GIFTS, GRANTS, AND CONTRACTS	7.8	1.7	8.1	1.6	8.4	1.5
HOSPITAL	84.8	18.6	94.4	18.6	97.9	17.6
FUND BALANCES	12.2	2.7	12.2	2.4	12.2	2.2
AFFILIATED CORPORATIONS	38.8	8.5	40.7	8.0	42.5	7.7
RESTRICTED FUNDS	21.8	4.8	22.7	4.5	23.6	4.2
TOTAL	\$455.7	100.0	\$507.2	100.0	\$556.7	100.0

TOTAL SOURCES OF REVENUE - INCREASES
(MILLIONS)

	1986-87		1987-88	
	INCREASE	% INCREASE	INCREASE	% INCREASE
STATE APPROPRIATION	\$ 31.3	16.7	\$ 38.0	17.4
TUITION & FEES	3.0	7.0	3.0	6.6
FEDERAL & LOCAL APPROPRIATIONS	0.3	1.8	0.4	2.3
SALES & SERVICES/EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES	0.6	6.4	0.5	5.0
ENDOWMENT & INVESTMENT INCOME	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0
SALES & SERVICES OF AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES	3.6	15.1	1.1	4.0
PRIVATE GIFTS, GRANTS, AND CONTRACTS	0.3	3.9	0.3	3.7
HOSPITAL	9.6	11.3	3.5	3.7
FUND BALANCES	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0
AFFILIATED CORPORATIONS	1.9	4.9	1.8	4.4
RESTRICTED FUNDS	0.9	4.1	0.9	4.0
TOTAL	\$ 51.5	11.3	\$ 49.5	9.8

EXPENDITURE BY PROGRAM
(MILLIONS)

	1985-86		1986-87		1987-88	
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%
INSTRUCTION	\$133.5	29.3	\$151.0	29.8	\$168.1	30.1
RESEARCH	51.3	11.2	56.9	11.3	61.7	11.1
PUBLIC SERVICE	42.8	9.4	46.8	9.2	50.7	9.1
LIBRARIES	8.5	1.8	10.3	2.0	11.1	2.0
ACADEMIC SUPPORT	21.4	4.7	24.5	4.8	30.0	5.4
STUDENT SERVICES	10.7	2.4	12.2	2.4	12.9	2.3
INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT	17.4	3.8	18.5	3.6	19.8	3.6
OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE	28.5	6.3	31.4	6.2	36.2	6.5
STUDENT FINANCIAL AID	10.1	2.2	10.4	2.1	10.6	1.9
MANDATORY TRANSFERS	12.7	2.8	12.8	2.5	18.2	3.3
AUXILIARIES	32.9	7.2	36.9	7.3	38.4	6.9
HOSPITAL	85.9	18.9	95.5	18.8	99.0	17.8
TOTAL	\$455.7	100.0	\$507.2	100.0	\$556.7	100.0

EXPENDITURE BY CATEGORY
(MILLIONS)

	1985-86		1986-87		1987-88	
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%
PERSONNEL COSTS	\$258.2	56.6	\$297.7	58.7	\$324.9	58.3
OPERATING EXPENSES	147.8	32.4	157.9	31.1	169.4	30.4
GRANTS, LOANS, OR BENEFITS	10.4	2.3	10.6	2.1	10.9	2.0
DEBT SERVICE	14.9	3.3	15.1	3.0	20.5	3.7
CAPITAL OUTLAY	24.4	5.4	25.9	5.1	31.0	5.6
TOTAL	\$455.7	100.0	\$507.2	100.0	\$556.7	100.0

PROGRAM INCREASES
BY SOURCE OF FUNDS
(MILLIONS)

	<u>1986-87</u>		<u>1987-88</u>	
	<u>STATE REQUEST</u>	<u>UNIVERSITY SOURCES</u>	<u>STATE REQUEST</u>	<u>UNIVERSITY SOURCES</u>
FIXED COST AND CONTINUATION Needs	\$ 9.6	\$11.2	\$ 8.3	\$11.3
FACULTY SALARY CATCH-UP	4.1	-0-	4.1	-0-
STAFF SALARY CATCH-UP	5.4	8.6	5.4	-0-
CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE	2.1	-0-	-0-	-0-
ENHANCEMENT, DEVELOPMENT AND ADEQUATE SUPPORT OF THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM	8.7	.4	13.4	.3
SPECIAL REQUESTS	<u>1.4</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>6.8</u>	<u>-0-</u>
TOTAL REQUEST	\$31.3	\$20.2	\$38.0	\$11.6

TO ACCOMPLISH THOSE OBJECTIVES, THE REQUEST FOR STATE FUNDING FOR THE BIENNIUM IS --

	<u>MAIN CAMPUS</u>	<u>COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM</u>
FIXED COST AND CONTINUATION	\$14.8	\$ 3.1
FACULTY SALARY CATCH-UP	6.4	1.8
STAFF SALARY CATCH-UP	9.5	1.3
CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE	2.1	-
ENHANCEMENT, DEVELOPMENT AND ADEQUATE SUPPORT OF THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM	10.5	11.6
SPECIAL REQUESTS	<u>4.9</u>	<u>3.3</u>
TOTAL STATE REQUEST	\$48.2	\$21.1

-13-
BIENNIAL REQUEST PRIORITIES

LEXINGTON CAMPUS/MEDICAL CENTER

\$ 2,196,700	1	CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS
13,927,600	2	5% SALARY INCREASE (PER YEAR).
2,832,900	3	INCREASED COSTS OF SUPPLIES AND SERVICES.
129,900	4	DESEGREGATION PLAN -- TO CONTINUE AND INCREASE SPECIAL FUNDING.
6,467,900	5	FACULTY SALARY CATCH-UP -- TO BRING FACULTY SALARIES UP TO COMPETITIVE LEVELS.
9,435,000	6	STAFF SALARY CATCH-UP -- TO BRING STAFF SALARIES UP TO COMPETITIVE LEVELS.
2,017,200	7	CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE
59,200	8	COLLEGES OF BUSINESS/ECONOMICS AND ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER CENTER
312,600	9	CENTER FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
4,519,800	10	DEBT SERVICE -- TO SUPPORT PURCHASE OF CRITICALLY NEEDED STATE-OF-THE-ART ACADEMIC EQUIPMENT, TO MEET FIRE CODES IN THE PATTERSON OFFICE TOWER, AND TO PROVIDE A COAL BOILER ADDITION TO EFFECT ENERGY SAVINGS.
1,323,600	11	PHYSICAL PLANT SERVICES FOR APPROVED NEW BUILDINGS AND RENOVATIONS
1,430,400	12	CURRENT EXPENSE IMPROVEMENT -- TO PROVIDE AN ADEQUATE LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR FACULTY.
757,300	13	LIBRARY COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT -- TO INCREASE THE LEVEL OF RECURRING FUNDING FOR LIBRARY COLLECTIONS.
1,491,500	14	RESEARCH/INSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT -- TO PROVIDE FOR EQUIPMENT PURCHASE AND ALLOW FOR REGULAR REPLACEMENT.
1,648,900	15	BUILDING MAINTENANCE -- TO ESTABLISH AN ADEQUATE LEVEL OF RECURRING SUPPORT FOR MAJOR MAINTENANCE AND RENOVATIONS.
3,199,700	16	INCREASED COMPUTING SUPPORT ASSOCIATED WITH THE COMPUTING PLAN

125,000	17	RECRUITMENT PROGRAM - MINORITY GRADUATE HEALTH PROFESSIONS STUDENTS
141,300	18	ASBESTOS ABATEMENT -- TO PERMIT HANDLING AND DISPOSITION OF ASBESTOS DURING REGULAR MAINTENANCE AND RENOVATIONS.
232,700	19	MASTERS IN NURSING -- COMMUNITY HEALTH AND ADMINISTRATION OPTIONS
86,600	20	STAFF SUPPORT FOR PHARMACY PROGRAM
91,100	21	INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE IN PHARMACY AMBULATORY CARE SETTINGS
\$52,426,900 (4,285,000)		TOTAL ADDITIONAL REQUEST FOR 1986-88 BIENNIUM. LESS INCREASE IN TUITION AND FEE REVENUE.
\$48,141,900		TOTAL REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL STATE SUPPORT FOR 1986-88 BIENNIUM.

CAPITAL REQUEST 1986-88

COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

CHE RECOMMENDATION

BONDING AUTHORITY

LEXINGTON: ACADEMIC/TECHNICAL BUILDING	\$ 3,600,000
ELIZABETHTOWN: ACADEMIC/TECHNICAL BUILDING	3,600,000
HAZARD: TECHNICAL/LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER	2,900,000
PRESTONSBURG: TECHNICAL/LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER	2,900,000
MADISONVILLE: ACADEMIC/AUDITORIUM BUILDING	
(TOTAL SCOPE \$2,900,000)	2,400,000

ALSO REQUESTED BUT NOT RECOMMENDED BY CHE

ASHLAND: ACADEMIC/LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER	\$ 3,600,000
--	--------------

LEXINGTON CAMPUS/MEDICAL CENTER

CHE RECOMMENDATION

BONDING AUTHORITY

ACADEMIC EQUIPMENT	\$31,000,000
PATTERSON TOWER FIRE SAFETY PROJECT (TOTAL SCOPE \$1,775,000)	1,047,800
COAL BOILER ADDITION (TOTAL SCOPE \$5,500,000)	5,152,200

ALSO REQUESTED BUT NOT RECOMMENDED BY CHE

AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING BUILDING	\$11,000,000
CHILLED WATER LINES ACROSS COOPER	2,400,000
COOLING PLANT EXPANSION	5,500,000
STEAM LINE ACROSS COOPER	1,880,000
BUSINESS/ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGICAL TRANSFER BUILDING	8,750,000

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

3 January 1986

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, January 20,
1986. Proposed Revision of the General Studies Curriculum.

As you recall, fifteen amendments were offered to the proposed revision of the General Studies program developed in the Swift Committee's Report. The Senate disposed seven of the amendments at the December meeting, with Numbers 1 through 6 having failed and Amendment 7 having been adopted. When the Swift Committee Report is on the floor at the January meeting, we will continue consideration of the amendments beginning with Amendment Number 8.

The same rules that applied to consideration of the amendments at the December meeting will apply in January. There will be 15 minutes of debate per amendment, limited to 2 1/2 minutes per speaker. The sponsor of the amendment may speak first and offer a final rebuttal. Otherwise persons should speak only once on an amendment. (Amendments to the amendments may be moved and, if seconded, may be debated for five additional minutes.) Motions to shorten the debate time (previous question) or to lengthen it will require a 2/3 vote to pass.

Again, for reasons of economy, the committee Report and the package of amendments distributed for the November and December meetings are not being redistributed. Please bring your copies to the January meeting. However, three additional items are attached for your consideration.

1. Amendment No. 13. In the December package, we duplicated the wrong amendment and labelled it 13. (Amendment 13 was, however, correctly described in the synopses of amendments accompanying the package.) Herewith is the correct version of Amendment 13.
2. Two alternate versions of Section II (Inference and Communicative Skills), Subsection A, Option 2. The original Swift Committee recommendation specified that only two courses, PHI 120 (An Introduction to Logic) and STA 200 (Statistics: A Force in Human Judgment), could fulfill this requirement. At the November meeting, Senator Lisa Barclay spoke in favor of broadening the course selection possibilities and followed up by sending the Council an amendment to that effect. Version 1 appeared for the first time in the package distributed to Senators for the December meeting and incorporates the essence of Senator Barclay's proposal. Version 2 is proposed by Senator Constance Wood and would more specifically define the goals of the courses in logic and statistics. Because Senator Wood could not have been aware of the change the Senate Council made in Option 2 between the November and December meetings, she could not have introduced her version prior to the November 22nd deadline. Thus the chair holds that Version 2 is not a late amendment. Moreover, it is one that Professor Swift thinks accords with the intent of the Committee Report. Therefore the Senate will vote on both of these versions with the one receiving the most votes being adopted.
3. Amendment No. 16, offered by Senator Hans Gesund. It would amend a part of the Senate Council's changes to the Swift Committee Report which were originally scheduled for a vote, but later accepted by the committee and incorporated as part of its report. Because prior to November 22nd Senator Gesund did not know that this incorporation would occur, the chair holds that this amendment is not late. However, it will need a second to be considered.

Attachments-3

/cet
0878C