

STAFF CONGRESS

Special Meeting - February 26, 1982

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order
- II. Floor Discussion - House Bill No. 136
- III. Results of Constitution Ratification Vote
- IV. Adjournment

STAFF CONGRESS MINUTES
February 26, 1982

A special meeting of the Staff Congress was held on Friday, February 26, 1982 to discuss House Bill No. 136 and the results of the ratification vote for the Staff Congress Constitution. The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. Role was taken and a quorum was present.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Terry Andrews, Mike Baker, Tom Barlow, Bob Barnes, Dan Bayes, Gail Cato, Gary Eith, Shirley Gallicchio, Don Gammon, Dorinda Giles, Jerry Groeschen, Carol Guthier, Barb Herald, Dan Hoskins, Patti Jeffries, Mary Kelm, Bonnie King, Bill Lamb, Greg Muench, Nancy Perry, Steve Priestle, Ken Ramey, Linda Sanders, Dolores Thelen, and Nancy Utz.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Cindy Dunaway, Joyce Maegly, Pamm Taylor

Dorinda Giles opened the meeting and called on Mary Kelm, chairperson of the committee doing review work on the status of the bill, to give a report.

Mary Kelm said the committee felt its function was that of fact finding, and would make no recommendations. Legislators this time of year are extremely hard to reach. The committee called Terry Mann and Clyde Middleton in this area, and Freed Curd of Murray since he started the bill, but could not reach any of the three. Phone calls are still in to these people. The committee did contact the Council of Higher Education, the president of the University of Louisville's Congress, Morehead, and Barb Herald also contacted some friends she has at Murray. The committee also talked with people from the Faculty Senate and Student Government.

As basic background information, the bill was introduced by Freed Curd of Murray. It appears this bill was introduced because Murray is very unhappy with their president. Evidently, their president is very anti-staff, and the staff has asked Freed Curd to present the bill so the staff might have some representation.

The committee also found out that this bill had been introduced at the last legislative meeting and had been voted down. It did pass this time by a vote of 75 to 9 out of the Education Committee of the House, and was then sent to the State Government Committee. As of this date, no action has been taken and the bill is still in this committee.

Mary said that Murray seems to feel that once again the bill will become a dead issue, that it will not get out of the State Government Committee. There is the possibility that if Murray wants to, they could fight this issue in the courts, using the University of Louisville's staff regent as a precedent. The University of Louisville does have a staff regent guaranteed by law. The University of Louisville does support the bill in a rather passive way; they are supporting it by letting their opinion be known, but are taking no action. It should be noted that the administration of the University of Louisville supported the bill, but were surprised that it passed the House.

Carolyn Cochran, President of the University of Louisville's Congress, indicated they would be willing to take an active role should we decide to do so. She also said that the feeling she got from the University of Kentucky is that they are totally opposed to the bill, but the reason for this is unknown.

Morehead was also contacted, but they were not aware of the bill. The Faculty Senate has not addressed the issue. Student Government has about the same information we do, and appear to be supporting it on philosophical terms. This could possibly be to maintain credibility of their own regential seat.

The Council of Higher Education was contacted and they seemed unwilling to give much of an opinion. The question was posed to them why the bill was sent from the Education Committee of the House to the State Government Committee of the Senate, rather than the Education Committee of the Senate. It was felt that there were several senators in the Education Committee who were very opposed to the bill, and the bill would die in that committee because of their opposition. There was also some indication that often the State Government Committee is used as a "killer committee" and bills are sent there to be sat on. There is a general feeling among the people contacted that the bill will once again die as it won't be brought up again in this legislation.

Mary said the committee felt it should give its feelings in terms of what Dr. Scholes said about the ramifications of the precedence it might set. The committee felt that after a staff seat is sought, it is possible that seats for the alumni, counties, blacks, women, and even the City of Highland Heights might be sought. However, it is a slow process. It has taken ten years since the students were given a seat for this to come up, and it has been two years since the University of Kentucky established a staff regent.

Mary also said that Gary Eith wished the following be brought up and thought about; that if we take a stand for this now, it might initiate some sense of distrust by the staff toward the administration. There is also the very slight possibility that the Board of Regents would come down on us and not approve our Constitution. As a body, we should pick and choose our fights carefully, not to advocate an adversarial relationship with the administration, but it is important not to come to loggerheads over any and all issues. On the other hand, there is the need to indicate our willingness to look at issues of concern and show the administration and staff that we really wish to be a responsible working body. It would strengthen our position in terms of representation of staff. Even though we are a young body, we need to start somewhere.

Mary then listed the possible actions we could take: 1) take a very pro-active stance on this by writing letters, making phone calls, and physically lobbying in Frankfort, 2) we could give passive support of the concepts of the bill such as the University of Louisville has done, 3) we could continue to monitor the bill, 4) we could ignore it, 5) we could issue a statement against it.

In closing, Mary said that the committee members have a listing of the state representatives, their addresses, telephone numbers, and what committees they are part of.

Dorinda Giles thanked Mary and then opened the floor for discussion.

Don Gammon said that he is basically in favor of not taking a stand on this issue at this time, and gave his reasoning for this.

Gregg Schulte said he thought that some sort of active support for this has a very clear implication that we are not getting proper representation. He does not feel that a body of people who don't have a feel for whether we have been getting good or bad representation on the Board should cast any type of support for an action that clearly implies that we are not getting sufficient representation.

Mary Kelm said that it was brought up in the last meeting that it is not necessarily this administration we are worried about, but we have to think further down the line in terms of future administrations.

Gail Cato said she agrees with Don Gammon, and asked if this could be dealt with in the future. Mary Kelm answered that she felt it would be a shame to hamstring someone in the future when the issue is available to us now.

Dorinda Giles summarized the options for consideration: 1) do we want to come out and actively support the bill, 2) do we want to come out and be actively against the bill, 3) do we want to take no action at this time as we are satisfied with the situation as it is.

Bob Barnes moved to table this activity until the next legislative meeting, which will be in two years. Mike Baker seconded the motion.

Vote was taken, and the motion was approved.

Dorinda Giles then announced the results of the ratification vote for the Constitution. Over 96% of those voting were in favor of it and there was a voter turn out of 64%. A letter has been drafted and will be sent to Dr. Albright, asking him to approve the Constitution and to present it to the Board of Regents at their meeting on March 9. A copy of the by-laws will also be sent to him for informational purposes.

Pat Coleman asked what the reasons were for the three invalid votes. Terry Andrews answered, saying that she and Gail Cato had counted the votes, two of which were invalid as the personnel were ineligible, and the third was invalid as it had not been signed.

Don Gammon moved to adjourn the meeting. Gary Eith seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

February 23, 1982

RESULTS OF GENERAL ELECTION TO RATIFY STAFF CONGRESS CONSTITUTION

Total Support Staff: 460

Response: 295 64.1%

For: 284 96.3%

Against: 7 2.4%

Abstentions: 1 0.3%

Invalid Votes: 3 1.0%

TA/ta