

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

26 September 1986

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet in regular session on Monday, October 13, 1986, at 3:00 p.m. in room 115 CON/HSLC Building.

AGENDA:

1. Minutes of September 8, 1986.
2. Resolutions.
3. Reports on financial status of the Lexington Campus and Medical Center. Vice President James O. King, Associate Vice President Edward Carter, Chancellor Peter P. Bosomworth, and Vice Chancellor Donald B. Clapp.
4. Chairman's remarks and announcements.
5. ACTION ITEM:
 - a. Proposed Policy on Student Attendance at University Sponsored Functions (circulated under date of 19 September 1986).

Randall Dahl
Secretary

/cet
1431C

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, OCTOBER 13, 1986

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, October 13, 1986, in Room 115 of the Health Sciences Building.

Wilbur W. Frye, Chairman of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent: Curtis W. Absher*, Frank Allara, Sandra Allen*, Roger B. Anderson, Richard Angelo, Michael A. Baer, Charles E. Barnhart, Raymond F. Betts, Dibaker Bhattacharyya*, Tex Lee Boggs, Charlie Boyd*, Jeffery A. Born, Darla Botkin*, Stanley D. Brunn, Harry Clarke, Emmett Costich*, Ellen Edmondson*, Donald G. Ely*, Gerald Ferretti*, Thomas R. Ford, James Freeman*, Michael Freeman, David L. Fulks*, Richard W. Furst, Fletcher Gabbard*, Hans Gesund*, Donna G. Greenwell, Andrew Grimes, John R. Groves,* O. J. Hahn, Marilyn Hamann*, Jody Hanks*, Zafar Hasan*, James Houglan, Jr.*, Jennifer Jacquet*, Mehran Jahad, Joseph Krislov*, James R. Lang, Robert G. Lawson, Arthur Lieber*, Bruce A. Lucas, Edgar D. Maddox, Paul Mandelstam*, John Menkhaus*, Robert Murphy, Michael T. Nietzel, Robert C. Noble, Thomas Olshwesky*, Philip C. Palmgreen*, Robin D. Powell, David J. Prior, Madhira D. Ram, G. Kendell Rice, Christy Robinson, Thomas C. Robinson, Thomas L. Roszman, Edgar L. Sagan, Donald E. Sands*, Timothy Sineath, Otis A. Singletary*, Karen Skaff, Robert H. Spedding*, Michael G. Tearney*, Sheree Thompson*, Thomas L. Travis*, Enid Waldhart, Marc J. Wallace, Jesse Weil, Charles T. Wethington, Carolyn Williams*, Constance P. Wilson*, Peter Winograd.*

Approval of the Minutes of 8 September 1986 was postponed to a subsequent Senate meeting.

Chairman Frye recognized Professor John Thrailkill, who read the following memorial resolution on Arthur Crane McFarlan, Department of Geological Sciences.

Arthur C. McFarlan, known to students and colleagues as "Dr. Mac," died on April 9, 1985, in Lexington, at the age of 87. He came to the University in 1923 to join Arthur McQuiston Miller, founder of the Department of Geology. In 1927, during Dr. Miller's illness, Dr. Mac became departmental head, a position he held until his retirement in 1967. In this period he built the Department from a two-man faculty to one with nine members. Shortly after coming to the University he led in the development of a graduate program in geology, so that, beginning in 1925, many geology students earned the MS degree at UK. Then, during the years of World War II, he directed the development and teaching of courses in geography. He also served as State Geologist and Director of the Kentucky Bureau of Mineral and Topographic Surveys from 1932 to 1934, and Director again from 1948 to 1958 after the Bureau had once more become the Kentucky Geological Survey. At this time he was among those who successfully lobbied to have the Survey transferred to the University of Kentucky from the politically charged atmosphere of Frankfort. While Director he was instrumental in arranging joint

*Absence explained.

state and federal funding of the program for the topographic mapping of the entire state on the scale of 1:24,000, the first state, other than Rhode Island, to be completely mapped in this detail.

In 1952 Dr. McFarlan was elected Distinguished Professor of the Year by his colleagues in the College of Arts and Sciences, and in 1965, he was named Distinguished Member by the Geological Society of Kentucky. In addition to his membership in the society, which he had served as president, he was a Fellow of the Geological Society of America and a member of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, the Society of Economic Geologists and Paleontologists, and Sigma Xi.

Over the years Dr. Mac came to be recognized as an authority on the geology of Kentucky. His updating and considerable revision (1943) of Dr. Miller's "Geology of Kentucky" (1919) was a major contribution. He was also the author, or co-author, of more than 50 publications on various aspects of Kentucky stratigraphy and paleontology.

As a teacher and departmental head, Dr. McFarlan stressed the importance of field experience in the education of geologists, and semester after semester headed a caravan of students going into the countryside every Saturday to gain just such experience. He also initiated a summer field camp in western Colorado, where undergraduates were introduced to the geology of the Rocky Mountains. It was a tent camp, since Dr. Mac always tried to keep costs for the students as low as possible. As such, accommodations were far from luxurious, but for nineteen years Dr. and Mrs. McFarlan (Gail) spent several months each summer camping out. Mrs. McFarlan was purchasing agent, nurse, confidant and general resolver of problems for the students.

With the help of Margaret Tuttle of the University's library system, Dr. McFarlan established the Geology Library, and, for a number of years, earmarked departmental funds for its support. He took great pride, therefore, in seeing it become one of the best collections of geological literature in the Southeast.

His dahlias (flowers which bloomed after the return from field camp), were another source of satisfaction. His garden was notable not only for the variety it contained, but also for the size of the flowers it produced, "some the size of dinner plates." Then there was the added enjoyment of trading root stocks with faculty colleagues and friends.

A.C. McFarlan was a big man, and in his younger days a shock of red hair topped off his six feet, five inches. It was thus to be

expected that he could wield a geology hammer with the best, but it was perhaps surprising to find that few were his equal in the delicate task of grinding thin-sections down to an even few hundredths of a millimeter.

At the time of Dr. McFarlan's retirement, alumni and friends presented the Department with his portrait, which hangs today in the Geology Library. They also established the McFarlan Fund, as a token of their appreciation for the education and help that they had received from him. This fund continues to grow, enabling the Department to give financial help to students and student projects, so that it stands as a fitting memorial to Arthur C. McFarlan, for geology and students were an important part of his life.

Arthur Crane McFarlan was the son of The Reverend and Mrs. Frank C. McFarlan. He was born in Mansfield, Ohio, on May 7, 1897, but shortly thereafter the family moved to Cincinnati, Ohio. He received his bachelor's degree from the University of Cincinnati in 1919, and his doctorate from the University of Chicago in 1924.

He is survived by his wife, Gail Parker McFarlan; a daughter, Mary Beth Graves; one sister, a brother, three grandchildren and one great-grandchild.

Thraikill requested that this resolution be entered into the minutes of the University Senate and that copies be sent to the McFarlan family.

The Senate stood for a moment of silent tribute.

Chairman Frye announced that he had invited Vice President James O. King, Associate Vice President Ed Carter, Lexington Campus Chancellor Art Gallaher, Jr., and Medical Center Chancellor Peter P. Bosomworth to present the University's budget process and planning objectives to the University Senate. Messrs. King and Carter will present an overview of the University's financial status and the chancellors will address their sectors more specifically. Chairman Frye then called on Mr. King, whose remarks follow.

KING: Thank you very much. Let me express our appreciation for the opportunity to appear before the University Senate to describe the budget process and the major decisions that emanated from it. Last year, we had the opportunity to discuss with you the biennial budget request. This year we would like to discuss the University's operating budget that was made possible by the actions of the 1986 General Assembly. Wilbur has indicated that Ed Carter and I will discuss the major internal policy issues that went into this and the Chancellors of the Lexington Campus and the Medical Center will discuss the preparation and policy issues related to the sector budgets. For several reasons, I considered coming to you and giving the speech I gave last year. One of those reasons is that the process we go through with the

operating budget is a repeat of the process that begins with the biennial budget and the planning process. It reminded me of the story that is told about Dizzy Dean back when he was a young pitcher with the St. Louis Cardinals. Following a game, Dean was interviewed by several newspaper reporters. Each one asked him where he was born. He told the first reporter he was born in Texas; another he told he was born in Arkansas; and the third he told he was born in Mississippi. Obviously that caused a great stir in the press. When the owner of the team called him in, he said: "Diz . . . why in the hell did you tell each reporter that you were born in a different state?" to which Dean responded: "Well . . . I thought each one of them wanted an exclusive!" Therefore, I'll give you a new presentation this year.

First of all I'd like to review the planning process that emanates in the preparation and adoption of the budget. The internal planning process began in January 1985, with department, college, and sector involvement and ultimately led to the adoption by the Board of Trustees of the Five Year Plan and biennial budget in September, 1985. The Council on Higher Education then reviewed the University's requests and made its recommendation in November 1985. Governor Collins, preparing her executive budget, made her recommendations on the University of Kentucky budget to the General Assembly in January 1986. The General Assembly completed action on the biennial budget in April 1986, and from that action, the 1986-87 operating budget of the University of Kentucky was formed and subsequently approved by the Board of Trustees in June, 1986.

Three or four key points are important for you to understand about this process: 1) the operating budget is a culmination of a process that began with planning; 2) we use the same planning objectives in the operating budget that are included in the biennial budget request and the five-year plans; and, one which is extremely important for all of us, 3) the University of Kentucky did well in the 1986 General Assembly. As a matter of fact, higher education fared well in the 1986 General Assembly and if we attain the same progress in 1988--using the formula approach--then higher education in Kentucky will be essentially at the 100% level which all of us have sought since the formula was adopted.

This budget did not give us all we asked for, and I don't want to imply that, but substantial progress was made in comparison to the 1984 budget. We were able to give a faculty average salary increase of 7% and an average increase for staff of 6%. In addition to faculty salaries, the action of the General Assembly had a significant impact on other areas. One of those areas is the University's research programs, including the EPSCORE funding. We have identified an appropriation of funds for Centers of Excellence and endowed chairs--both new. We had funds appropriated at UK for construction and for programs in Robotics and Manufacturing Systems. We had an appropriation of funds specifically for the purchase of a super computer on this campus to be in partnership with the state, with industry and other institutions. And for the first time, we had an appropriation of funds to purchase approximately 20 million dollars in research and graduate equipment--extremely important if we

are to move with competence and be competitive in the field of research. These are program dollars.

We also fared well in the capital construction side. I think the level and magnitude of this support is indicated by the fact that we have more under construction or in the planning stage than the total value of the plan of the University of Kentucky in 1968. That tells us two things: we have had lots of inflation and we have lots of construction under way, including the Equine Center, the Mining and Minerals Building, the new Faculty Club, Ag. Regulatory Services, etc. In addition to approved building projects at five Community Colleges, a new Community College will be built in Owensboro. These represent substantial departures from the 1984 budget, and will, we believe, enhance our ability to fulfill the mission assigned to the University of Kentucky.

It is important for the members of the faculty to recognize that at the central administration level, funds are allocated to the sectors based upon institutional priorities. The decisions for specific items and funding of specific units not mandated in the appropriations bill are made by the chancellors. From an institutional standpoint, let me give you the general outline of the priorities that are incorporated in the budget: 1) Salaries were, have been, and will continue to be our number one priority and number one need for new funds. 2) This budget, unlike the past, incorporates several Centers of Excellence which have been funded within our formal allocations. 3) The budget includes additional funds for graduate stipends in order to make us more competitive in the recruitment of graduate students. 4) We are giving and placing a high priority to the purchase of the graduate research equipment authorized by the 1986 General Assembly and we hope that all the ordering will be done this year so that delivery can be made and equipment in place as quickly as possible. 5) The supercomputer authorized by the General Assembly is being evaluated for both non-recurring and recurring support as well as for the configuration that best meets the University of Kentucky's needs. We expect to place an order this academic year. For those of you who might not be so familiar, we are linking the supercomputer directly to our Computational Science Center of Excellence that will be funded beginning our next academic year--July 1st. Taken together these items are substantial enhancements of our graduate and research programs as well as the overall educational program at the University. They will enhance our ability to move an additional step closer toward national recognition for graduates, scholarship and research that the Council on Higher Education's Strategic Plan sets out as objectives for us. Ed Carter will go into some of the details of the budget preparation and the chancellors will discuss with you their budget decisions at the second level.

Let me conclude with a reminder that the decisions in the preparation of a budget involve major policy decisions of the institution including priorities and program direction. I cannot overemphasize the importance to every unit on the campus and for that reason, I would urge you to work actively in the revision of the five-year plan that will be initiated early next year.

It is extremely important to each department and to each college because that revision will form the basis of our biennial budget request to be submitted to the Council on Higher Education and to the 1988 session of the General Assembly. Thank you.

CARTER: I'm not going to give you an exclusive; I'm just going to add on to what we talked about in the Fall of last year when we came and dealt with the planning objectives and funding requests. So I will hit the highlights of what's in the 1986-87 operating budget as it relates to those planning objectives which you saw last Fall. [Copies of the transparencies Mr. Carter showed are attached.]

As Jim mentioned, our first objective was to maintain our existing programs by meeting the contracted fixed costs and providing for continued funding both in personnel and operating expenses as well as dealing with the commitment to the affirmative action program of this institution. In planning objective two, the objectives as we entered this five year planning cycle included: 1) reaching the benchmark median for all faculty salaries, and, 2) reaching marketplace levels for staff salaries. We obviously did not do that [see p. 4 attached]. In 1985-86 the UK average Lexington Campus/Medical Center salary was \$34,624. and benchmarks were \$37,000, thus putting us behind about \$2,700. With the 7% faculty salary increase in this operating budget, we are projecting that we can get within \$2,100. of the benchmark median. That is not a great deal of advancement. We don't know where we are in relation to that number right now, but hopefully we will close the gap some. In the Community College System, the projection is that we move from \$1,200 to within \$600 of benchmark median. In non-faculty staff catch-up, salary objectives have been established based on comparable jobs at selected benchmark institutions and/or local industries as appropriate. Based on surveys, staff salaries are at a level of approximately 90% of the marketplace, and we think the 6% may cut that by 1%, so we're not moving in that area at a very rapid rate either.

Jim mentioned the Centers of Excellence. Those identified in the planning process can be found on page 6, attached. Centers which received increased funding included in this operating budget may be found on attached pages 7-11. The Centers will also come into play in the 1987-88 operating budget.

Planning Objective 4, page 12, was a fairly significant factor in our five year plan. We are not able to do everything we intended to do, but made what we hope is a significant stride in one of the areas I think is of great concern to all faculty--attempting to deal with graduate student stipends (see page 13). We are at an average of somewhere around \$5,200. and we added \$780,000 to that fund--hopefully moving halfway toward the benchmarks in terms of graduate students.

Jim mentioned the special equipment funding (see page 14). The area that probably suffered most in terms of our planning objectives and our ability to meet those was to enhance and develop academic areas of excellence and

adequately support current academic programs (see p. 15). We were able to do some things in that area, but in terms of increasing and further enhancing generally the academic program of the institution, we were not able to meet that objective because of funding levels. To give you some dollar figures see chart, p. 17. For an overview of the sources, see pages 18 and 19. For your information, see pages 20 and 22. That is a very quick overview.

GALLAHER: I appreciate very much the opportunity to meet with you to discuss the 1986-87 budget for the Lexington Campus. Mr. King and Mr. Carter have provided a brief overview of the process and objectives, so I want to couch my comments to you around the organizational framework used by Ed Carter that characterized our budget. Before getting into specifics, however, I want to make a few generalizations about the entire process.

The first is the basic planning process. As Chancellor, I worked with the President on overall budget strategy. I then worked with the deans and directors who in turn developed the basic data from the academic and service units. [As an aside, Gallaher indicated that much of the process is determined for us by formats that come to the University from the Council on Higher Education.]

A second generalization is that this year there was an overalay put on the overall planning process and that was the strategum of the Centers for Excellence. It is essentially political in nature. We felt that this concept might improve our chances with the legislature by communicating some of our strengths and potential contributions to those responsible for understanding this place and making judgments about it. I think that was a wise strategy and it is in part responsible for some of the success we've enjoyed this year.

Third, I want to put a few figures before you that are applicable to the Lexington Campus. The total budget from general funds on the Lexington Campus for 1986-87 is 147.4 million dollars. With benefits and debt service, that figure increases to 169.7 million dollars, representing a total budget increase over 85-86 of 11.5 million. The distribution of our budget roughly is as follows: 80.9% to personnel; 15.3 to current expenses; 1.4% to equipment; and 2.4% to student aid. As Mr. King and Mr. Carter have noted, the biennial budget request and the operating budget for the total university and for the sectors are built around the same planning objectives. Those objectives included: provisions for the continuation of existing programs, provisions for adequate support for current faculty and staff, support for the College of Engineering to develop and enhance graduate and research programs of this institution, and appropriately manage a special program appropriation made directly to us by the state. Let me spend just a few moments on each of these to indicate how our budget increase was spent.

Our highest priority was of course for support of faculty and staff. Roughly half of our increase went to the personnel sector. In addition, we had another approximate half million dollars for Ag. Extension. Our concern for

supporting faculty and staff is also closely related to the second objective--enhancing graduate and research programs. The equipment that will be possible in our sector--made available to us through the 21 million bonding capacity approved by the legislature--will have an incredible impact on our area. Approximately half of those dollars will go toward equipment needs of the Lexington Campus. From the small equipment needs to the supercomputer, we have had an incredible boost to our sector. And as you may know, Vice Chancellor Royster is now in the process of screening applications and making allocations on the research side.

A second element in this objective is that we increased our level of teaching assistant support some 24% overall this year. That comes to about \$700,000. Most of the increase in teaching assistant support, of course, goes to our sector. This infusion combined with the funds set aside over the last three years to offset the tuition charges, gives us an excellent opportunity to get this institution into a more competitive posture than we have been in some 15 years in attracting TA's to this institution.

A third item that belongs here of course is the Robotics Center--a specially earmarked budget item for our College of Engineering. A fourth area for us and particularly germane to the Lexington Campus is the legislative support for the EPSCORE proposal, a 6 million dollar research enhancement grant--about half of which comes from the state. It's a state-wide grant, as you know, but approximately 75-80% of the funds are relevant to the Lexington Campus.

A third planning objective related to the two just mentioned is support for the designated Centers of Excellence. There are a couple of comments about the Center concept. The Centers that are noted in the budget are envisioned as multidisciplinary, with some to receive support the first year of the biennium and some to receive support beginning in the second year of the biennium. In our sector \$100,000 has been added to the equine research center this year and \$300,000 went to the Public Administration area, a Center for Excellence that was put in at the Governor's request. Although not funded until next year, we have begun the search for a Director of Computational Sciences and as pointed out earlier, we are seeking a Director of the Robotics Center.

A fourth planning objective provides for continuation of existing programs. We've been working for some time to get a variety of sustaining activities off a non-recurring funding base. One of our biggest efforts to date has been the library, which as recently as three or four years ago was funded on a 2 million dollar non-recurring basis.

Under the fourth objective, another big area of concern is current expenses. We're already considerably out of kilter in this area, and threatening to becoming more so--especially, with the infusion of the computing and research equipment. Another area where the pinch is felt is in the form of gifts, which we must agree in advance to maintain. For example, this year we received a \$252,000 increase in current expenses and virtually all

that money was allocated to promised maintenance and computer hardware. There is no question that this continues to be major problem area--one that we're sensitive to and one which were working on.

While not part of our new dollars, I should note that this objective accounts for the sustaining of current programs; and it is in this area where much of the internal reallocation of dollars occurs--at the sector level as well as at the college level. High priorities for us include Engineering, especially Electrical, and B&E, particularly a Management and Information Science program that is being developed over there. Other areas accountable in this objective are the fixed cost on utilities and several mandated programs including the Geological Survey, University Press of Kentucky, etc.

Mr. King listed the capital construction projects, so there is no reason to repeat them here.

I do want to mention one item that has to do with our fund balances and the so-called tax that we levy against your budgets on the Lexington Campus. As you are aware, we leave most fund balances in the colleges to be used at the college's discretion--used for a variety of excellent purposes--but there are certain kinds of activities that require fund balance expenditures to be made centrally. So we have a tax in order to meet obligations for the coming year. Just to give you some feel for what we are about in that area, \$600,000 of those funds are going into library books; \$150,000 is earmarked for fire safety projects in our sector; \$50,000 into sidewalk and road repairs; and well over the \$430,000 designated by the Lexington Campus to deal with asbestos removal.

In conclusion I feel better about our financial condition right now than at any time since I've been in the administration. We received absolutely excellent support for research hardware and we've been investing fairly heavily with our own resources. We're making progress on the salary front as Jim King indicated. It's not as good as we would like, but we have made considerable headway. If we could get the benchmarks to stand still--just for a little while--we'd be in good shape. Thank you.

BOSOMWORTH: The biennial budget planning process began two years ago at Medical Center retreats, but the development of the strategy we've been following really began five years ago. That led to an agreement to development planning around Centers of Excellence. Eventually more than 160 faculty and administrators from all Medical Center colleges and the hospital were organized into 10 groups and were asked to evaluate existing resources and potential for excellence in ten program areas. We also asked them to make specific program proposals, including the budgetary elements. Subsequently, five programs were proposed for resource and program enhancements in the biennium which we are now in. All of these programs will require multidisciplinary participation; there are only one or two that are actually limited to a single college. They all basically have an expectation of involving multiple colleges and hopefully that involvement will extend to the

entire campus of the University where it is appropriate. Most, therefore, will incorporate faculty from several colleges. The specific program areas are: Pharmaceutical Sciences and Technology, the Aging Program, the Cancer Program, and jointly with Dr. Gallaher's sector the Biomedical Engineering Program, and Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering. These programs have been funded or hopefully will be funded in the next year of this biennium and will significantly enhance our capability to move toward Centers of Excellence. I believe that our faculty has been highly receptive to this approach; they've been actively involved in it in many instances and we are hopeful that the concept will survive to another biennium as we look to the future.

We have proposed expanding the Centers concept in the next biennium to include Heart, Lung and Blood Vessel Diseases, Occupational and Environmental and Health Sciences, Oral Health, Nutrition, and Health Promotion and Disease Prevention. Some of those, particularly Nutrition, will have an impact on the Lexington Campus, and will necessitate some joint planning.

Regarding the Medical Center budget, I am just going to give you a perspective of how we finance ourselves in the Medical Center. I'm not going to give you a lot of individual numbers, just some percentages of the state appropriation based on historical figures of what the percent of the state appropriation is with reference to the total operating budget of our principle units. The state appropriation to the University Hospital represents only 9% of the total operating cost of the University Hospital. Therefore, we are generating the rest from services that we provide. The state appropriation to the College of Medicine when taking into account all sources, including grants, contracts, and professional fees is approximately 26% of the operating budget of the College of Medicine. The College of Dentistry state appropriation represents 66%; the College of Pharmacy 57%; the College of Nursing 75%; and the College of Allied Health Professions 78%. So that's the base that we're building on in terms of relative percentage of state appropriations within each of those colleges. The State's response to biennial budget has created for us what I believe to be a positive environment. The state's response has created a positive environment for higher education in general. The recognition of the importance of higher education in the Governor's speeches, the rallies sponsored by the Advocates for Higher Education and the increased funding was long overdue and was very well received. I am particularly appreciative of the role the President of the University played in that process in terms of providing up front and behind the scenes leadership in achieving many of these objectives.

The increased appropriations for salaries and Centers of Excellence will have significant impact. The regular salary increase fund should permit us to at least maintain our relative salary position with other institutions and the special salary incentive funds should enable us to retain those key faculty members subject to recruitment by other institutions. So far we have been able to retain all but one faculty member to whom we awarded special salary incentive funds, and he lacked good judgment and made the decision to become a dean.

Let me say a word about the actual distribution of the salary funds. We broke our funds down into a six percent salary incentive fund generally, which was distributed according to the salary base in each college, and then we retained one percent for promotions and for the excellence awards. I convened a group of six people who reviewed nominations from each of the colleges with reference to the exceptional merit proposals. This is the first time that we've ever tried this, and I hope that the faculty viewed it as both fair and appropriate. They in turn advised me of their recommendations based upon the nominations and we ultimately awarded some forty special merit increments.

The equipment appropriations that will eventually come to the University of Kentucky Medical Center in the order of 8.9 million are the largest in my history at the institution and will have a profound and lasting impact on our research program.

Several construction activities have already been mentioned. I will briefly reference a few that were not. As everyone is aware, we entered the Pharmacy Building this year. We have completed the construction of an animal care facility which will benefit the entire campus. This facility is awaiting activation--it's tied into the construction of the cancer research building which is underway and will be completed next year. We are in the final stages of planning a hospital and related parking structure in the south lot and hospital renewal project which will cost forty million dollars--all of which will be financed from hospital revenues. That project will create new operating rooms for us, new equipment and state of the art technology, a new emergency center--a trauma center--a new parking structure and heliport, and new intensive care beds. It will not actually expand the bed capacity of the University Hospital. The completion of the 4th floor of the Markey Cancer Center is anticipated in this coming year as part of the whole hospital renewal project.

The absence of flexible dollars is a problem. I should point out that since all the new dollars are earmarked for salaries and fixed costs and Centers of Excellence, there are essentially no new dollars for current operating expenses, new faculty positions or support staff, instructional or support equipment (as opposed to research equipment) or library acquisitions. These are all significant needs and we have essentially no capability to respond at this time. I strongly support the established priorities as a central figure of authority in the Medical Center, but I do recognize the very real needs in the areas indicated. I want to keep these areas of additional need before us as we begin the development of another biennial budget request. Thank you.

Chairman Frye thanked the guests for their presentations and asked the Senate to join him in a round of applause.

Chairman Frye opened the floor to questions. Senator John Just (Biological Sciences) said that all speakers spent considerable time

addressing the Centers of Excellence and research allocations. In conjunction with these, he wanted to know if anyone cared to predict what the legislature is looking for in terms of "return for its bucks"--and if we don't give them the return, will this come back to "bite us" five years down the road? Vice President King responded as follows: First of all, let me say that the question you have does carry with it a big risk, because legislative bodies tend to want quick returns and research very seldom grants a quick return. But we believe that in our discussions with the members of the legislature, and with the support they have given us toward enhancing the research capability on the campus, that they recognize and agree with the direction we've chosen to move. They recognize the identifiable areas and needs that exist, the impact of that research state-wide, and that research at the University of Kentucky is a major function that should be enhanced. There is a burden on us to show progress but I don't think they will expect the normal quick return that they expect in other areas. The members of the General Assembly recognize that research is not a "quick fix approach." Chancellor Gallaher added that this was the first time in his memory that legislative support for an aggressive approach toward research was recognized as essential to the State's future. Gallaher added that currently the University has a favorable image with the legislature.

Senator Leo Demski (Biological Sciences) asked what some of the negative aspects might be on faculty and/or educational units outside those initially chosen to participate in the Centers for Excellence, to which Dr. Gallaher responded that he did not feel that there would be a negative impact and that one of the objectives of the institution is to support the faculty and continue existing programs. Chancellor Bosomworth added that it is envisioned that as the Centers expand and develop that there will be a need to bring in more and more faculty participation in those Centers, and that the faculty appear to favor this approach. Following his initial question vis a vis "legislative payoff," Senator Just commented: "If the State is really not looking for a payoff, I expect we would be seeing proposed Centers in Philosophy, Art History, Modern Romance Languages, etc.," to which Chancellor Gallaher responded that "we have to start somewhere."

Professor John Thrailkill (Geological Sciences) asked if someone would explain the difference between the Council on Higher Education's Centers for Excellence and the University's Centers for Excellence. Mr. King responded as follows: When we submitted our budget to the State, we identified certain Centers of Excellence. In their Strategic Plan, the Council on Higher Education proposed Commonwealth Centers. In our budget, we identified our Centers of Excellence, what we expected them to do, and how much money we expected to put into them. The CHE was unable to say precisely what the Commonwealth Centers were and how they were to be funded and ultimately changed the name of the Commonwealth Centers to Centers of Excellence, thus causing some confusion. The legislature appropriated 1.8 million dollars beginning next fiscal year for the CHE's Centers of Excellence and 2 million

dollars to the CHE for endowed chairs for next year. Our next step will be to establish a procedure for identifying and applying for Centers of Excellence from the Council on Higher Education--which in many cases may be the Centers of Excellence we have identified--for which we would hope to get some supplemental money. There are two different approaches. Our Centers are an integral part of our operating budget and theirs' (CHE's) are Centers of Excellence based on a competitive application process to be awarded by the CHE to all state institutions of higher education. This competitive application process will apply to the CHE's endowed chairs also.

Professor Thrailkill said that his past impressions have been that budgetary allocations are dependant in large part on head count and asked if this continues to be true. Vice President King responded that "Unfortunately, it still happens." Mr. Carter added that the basis for aligning head count to budgetary allocations would lessen when the State incorporated the full formula funding approach.

Senator James Applegate (Communications) wondered if the University was still in trouble in terms of operating expenses on the Lexington Campus and would the need be met through the tax being levied against college budgets. He wanted to know if the tax would be continued and what would need to happen in terms of improvement in the operating budget to look forward to not having a tax. Chancellor Gallaher said in terms of utilization of fund balances would always have to be centralized and the only way to get around that was to have a reserve. He said there were too many needs on the campus to cut the tax, and there would always be some kind of tax.

Chairman Frye thanked the guests again and they departed.

Chairman Frye then made the following announcements and remarks. He apologized for the meeting conflict that day with Yom Kippur. When a similar conflict occurs in the future, the Senate Council has agreed that we would move the Senate meeting one week forward or one week backward in order to avoid the conflict, but for today we were not aware of it in time to do anything about it.

Briefly, the Presidential Search Committee has met one time since the last Senate meeting when you received a report from Mary Sue Coleman. At the last meeting the Search Committee developed the qualifications statement that was then sent out. There will be another meeting soon to begin the process of screening the applicants and nominees.

The End-of-the-Semester Social will be from 4-6:00 p.m. in the King Alumni House on December 9. Please mark your calendars.

I announced to you last time that Bob Hemenway left the University this last summer; Bob was elected last spring as Chairman-elect of the University Senate Council. Since that time, we have held an election to replace Bob as Chairman-elect, and the person who was elected is Bill Lyons from the

Political Science Department.

Chairman Frye recognized Senator William Lyons, Chairman-elect of the Senate Council, to present the action item on the agenda. On behalf of the Senate Council, Professor Lyons moved approval of the proposed Policy on Student Attendance at University-Sponsored Functions. The proposal was circulated to members of the Senate under date of 19 September 1986.

Chairman Frye said the motion did not need a second, and the floor was opened for discussion. Senator Donald Leigh (Engineering) was basically supportive of the proposal but moved an amendment to change the last period to a comma and add:

"with the proviso that when attendance is limited by available facilities, persons paying the registration fee receive first priority."

The amendment was seconded and passed without discussion. Senator John Rea (French) indicated that he was unsure about what was to be included; does the statement "be permitted to" mean that this is an official activity, and that students may cut class, for example? Chairman Frye said that the Senate Council did not take into account class attendance in their discussions--that it was discussed strictly from the standpoint of money.

There was no further discussion and the motion as amended passed unanimously and reads as follows:

Proposal: The University recommends to the President and the Chancellors that the following policy statement be approved:

Student Attendance at University Sponsored Functions

It shall be the policy of the University of Kentucky that students in good standing be permitted to attend scholarly conferences, meetings and other academic activities that the University subsidizes directly with funds, or indirectly through the use of its facilities or assigned time and efforts of its faculty or staff, and which take place on the campus or in the vicinity. Fees charged students shall not be larger than the incremental direct expenses incurred to the sponsoring organization by their attendance, with the proviso that when attendance is limited by available facilities, persons paying the registration fee receive first priority.

Rationale:

The University of Kentucky sponsors, hosts, or provides support for many short-term scholarly conferences, meetings, symposia, and other academic activities. Registration fees commensurate with the anticipated value of the functions to professionals and set to cover direct and/or indirect costs are

often charged attendees. Many of our students can greatly benefit from attendance at and participation in such scholarly activities but should not be expected to pay the full registration fees. At the same time, sponsoring organizations or groups should not be expected to pay for direct-cost items, such as food, refreshments, and handout materials, for the students. Students attending the function should pay for such items that they receive.

This policy will permit both undergraduate and graduate students to obtain the benefits of the many scholarly events associated with the University without a financial burden to them or the sponsors.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:20
p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randall Dahl
Secretary

Attachments

/cet
1462C

JAMES W. ARCHDEACON

1911 - 1986

Dr. James W. Archdeacon was born in Carlisle, Kentucky, October 29, 1911, and died November 4, 1986, at the Veterans Hospital Hospice in Lexington. His death, following a long struggle with leukemia, marked the end of a meritorious career of research and teaching, 32 years of which were spent at this University.

Bill was reared in central Kentucky, attending both parochial and secular institutions. Although the country was in a deep economic depression, he found the resources to attend the University of Kentucky. Under the influence of Professor Richard S. Allen, Chairman of the Department of Anatomy and Physiology, he obtained a B.S. in 1933 and and M.S. in 1940. He was principally interested in physiology so he went to the University of Rochester to work on his Ph.D. in the Department of Vital Economics. At the time, this oddly-named department was perhaps the leading department of physiology in the United States with, however, a strong orientation toward nutrition. The Chairman was Wallace Fenn who pioneered in muscle physiology. After obtaining the Ph.D. in 1943, Bill entered the Air Force as a second lieutenant. He was one of those fortunate few who were actually well-employed by the Armed Forces, since he was entrusted with the task of instructing pilots in the proper use of their oxygen supply on bailing out at high altitudes.

He returned to the University of Kentucky in 1946 as an assistant professor in the Department of Anatomy and Physiology. Bill's teaching load was heavy. Nevertheless he continued to do research and publish. He moved to the newly-formed Department of Physiology and Biophysics in the early

sixties. The move to the Medical School meant that he had much less teaching and more time to do research.

Bill was fundamentally interested in research in physiology. His training at Rochester had been under John R. Murlin, a man who had discovered the hormone glucagon and had almost isolated insulin before Banting and Best. At Kentucky Bill continued to do excellent research with co-workers of high calibre such as Dr. William Markesbery, presently head of the Sanders-Brown Center on Aging, who published a paper with him in 1961. He supervised a number of Ph.D.'s who are now professors in respected departments of physiology. His publications usually appeared in prestigious journals such as Biochimica Biophysica Acta, the American Journal of Physiology, and Nature. Because of this high quality he never had difficulty in obtaining research money or graduate students. Some of his success was certainly the result of his ease and skill at writing papers--a task which he actually enjoyed.

So far as I know, Bill was the first to show carefully that bulk fiber in diet inhibited appetite. While these early studies in 1948 were in nutrition, his later efforts were in more fundamental aspects of physiology. He had learned some of the modern tracer methods from a short stay at Oak Ridge in 1951. He became interested in the uptake of iron in 1964 and pursued these studies until his retirement in 1977.

Although in appearance diffident and retiring, Bill was in fact an adventurous character. Following the death of his mother Carrie "Dee" Archdeacon, with whom Bill had lived throughout his life, he began a period of travel as a visiting professor to exotic places. In 1964 he was a Fulbright-Hayes Lecturer in Physiology at the University of Malaya to which he

returned ten years later. These may have been the happiest two periods in his life, since he was deeply attached to the oriental style as manifest in Kuala Lumpur. Unfortunately, his next visiting professorship was at the Medical School at the University of Benghazi in Libya. This was the result of a promise to the Chairman of that department which he felt honor-bound to fulfill. He was very uncomfortable with the mores and restrictions in Libya. He felt happier in Rhodesia, where he taught in 1977. There, however, he contracted a fever of unknown origin whose cause was never satisfactorily determined and which plagued him unremittingly.

Bill was filled with a joie de vivre which his colleagues appreciated and encouraged. When asked to talk at the retirement dinners of Professors Allen and Pratt, he regaled us with his extremely witty observations. He himself had three such celebrations upon each of his three ostensible retirements. In fact, Bill never really retired. He was a regular visitor to the department almost to the end. Bill liked to eat well and to smoke good cigars. He enjoyed playing the stock market which he was able to do after he received a legacy. He would buy extra cars or television sets to raise his spirits. This was a residue of his habit of buying a new hat to alleviate depression in his penurious youth. One of his deepest attachments was to his dog Susie, whose death greatly distressed him. Fortunately, in his last days he was well cared-for, and his death was painless. We shall miss him as a colleague and friend.

L. L. Boyarsky

To be read at the University Senate Meeting

Monday, February 16, 1987

27B

March 9

Reader

1462

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION
Arthur Crane McFarlan

Arthur C. McFarlan, known to students and colleagues as "Dr. Mac," died on April 9, 1985, in Lexington, at the age of 87. He came to the University in 1923 to join Arthur McQuiston Miller, founder of the Department of Geology. In 1927, during Dr. Miller's illness, Dr. Mac became departmental head, a position he held until his retirement in 1967. In this period he built the Department from a two-man faculty to one with nine members. Shortly after coming to the University he led in the development of a graduate program in geology, so that, beginning in 1925, many geology students earned the MS degree at UK. Then, during the years of World War II, he directed the development and teaching of courses in geography. He also served as State Geologist and Director of the Kentucky Bureau of Mineral and Topographic Surveys from 1932 to 1934, and Director again from 1948 to 1958 after the Bureau had once more become the Kentucky Geological Survey. At this time he was among those who successfully lobbied to have the Survey transferred to the University of Kentucky from the politically charged atmosphere of Frankfort. While Director he was instrumental in arranging joint state and federal funding of the program for the topographic mapping of the entire state on the scale of 1:24,000, the first state, other than Rhode Island, to be completely mapped in this detail.

In 1952 Dr. McFarlan was elected Distinguished Professor of the Year by his colleagues in the College of Arts and Sciences, and in 1965, he was named Distinguished Member by the Geological Society of Kentucky. In addition to his membership in this society, which he had served as president, he was a Fellow of the Geological Society of America and a member of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, the Society of Economic Geologists and Paleontologists, and Sigma Xi.

Over the years Dr. Mac came to be recognized as an authority on the geology of Kentucky. His updating and considerable revision (1943) of Dr. Miller's "Geology of Kentucky" (1919) was a major contribution. He was also the author, or co-author, of more than 50 publications on various aspects of Kentucky stratigraphy and paleontology.

As a teacher and departmental head, Dr. McFarlan stressed the importance of field experience in the education of geologists, and semester-after-semester headed a caravan of students going into the countryside every Saturday to gain just such experience. He also initiated a summer field camp in western Colorado, where undergraduates were introduced to the geology of the Rocky Mountains. It was a tent camp, since Dr. Mac always tried to keep costs for the students as low as possible. As such, accommodations were far from luxurious, but for nineteen years Dr. and Mrs. McFarlan (Gail) spent several months each summer camping out. Mrs. McFarlan was purchasing agent, nurse, confidant and general resolver of problems for the students.

With the help of Margaret Tuttle of the University's library system, Dr. McFarlan established the Geology Library, and, for a number of years, earmarked departmental funds for its support. He took great pride, therefore, in seeing it become one of the best collections of geological literature in the Southeast.

His dahlias (flowers which bloomed after the return from field camp), were another source of satisfaction. His garden was notable not only for the variety it contained, but also for the size of the flowers it produced, "some the size of dinner plates." Then there was the added enjoyment of trading root stocks with faculty colleagues and friends.

A. C. McFarlan was a big man, and in his younger days a shock of red hair topped off his six feet, five inches. It was thus to be expected that he could wield a geology hammer with the best, but it was perhaps surprising to find that few were his equal in the delicate task of grinding thin-sections down to an even few hundredths of a millimeter.

At the time of Dr. McFarlan's retirement, alumni and friends presented the Department with his portrait, which hangs today in the Geology Library. They also established the McFarlan Fund, as a token of their appreciation for the education and help that they had received from him. This fund continues to grow, enabling the Department to give financial help to students and student projects, so that it stands as a fitting memorial to Arthur C. McFarlan, for geology and students were an important part of his life.

Arthur Crane McFarlan was the son of the Reverend and Mrs. Frank C. McFarlan. He was born in Mansfield, Ohio, on May 7, 1897, but shortly thereafter the family moved to Cincinnati, Ohio. He received his bachelor's degree from the University of Cincinnati in 1919, and his doctorate from the University of Chicago in 1924.

He is survived by his wife, Gail Parker McFarlan; a daughter, Mary Beth Graves; one sister, a brother, three grandchildren and one-great grandchild.

*Mr. Chairman, I reg. that this resol
be entered into the Min. of the US
and that copies be sent to the McFarlan
family.*