

[University of Kentucky](#)**MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, December 14, 1998**

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, DECEMBER 14, 1998

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., December 14, 1998, in the auditorium of the W. T. Young Library.

Professor Roy Moore, Chairperson of the Senate Council presided.

Members absent were: Walter Abbott\*, Sammy Anderson, Leon Assael, Anthony Baxter\*, Jeffrey Bieber\*, Brian Biermann, Anibal biglieri, Deborah Blades, Rachel Bomberger, Sharon Brennan\*, Jayson Brittain, Joseph Burch, Lauletta Byars, Leo Cai, Joan Callahan, James Campbell, Brad Canon\*, Charles Carlson\*, Edward Carter, Jordan Cohen, Mary Davis\*, George DeBin, Henri DeHahn, Jeffrey Dembo, Eric Drake, Vincent Fields, Ray Forgue\*, Donald Frazier, Richard Furst, Hans Gesund\*, Philip Greasley, Howard Grotch, Ellen Hahn\*, David Hamilton, Issam Harik\*, Patrick Herring, James Holsinger, Craig Infanger, Mike Inman, Jamshed Kanga, Edward Kasarskis, Keith Kinderknecht, James Knoblett, Philipp Kraemer, Michael lach, Thomas Lester, C. Oran Little, Marianne Lorensen, Donald Madden\*, Douglas Michael, Jason Miller, David Mohny, Robert Molzon, Jacqueline Noonan, Miles Osland, James Parker, Thomas Pope, Thomas Robinson, Elizabeth Rompf\*, Katherine Sallee\*, Michael Schlossberg, Robert Schwemm, Robert Shay, David Stockham, Kaveh Tagavi, Henry Vasconez, William Wagner, Nick West, Charles Wethington\*, Paul Willis, Carolyn Williams, Eugene Williams, Lionell Williamson, Emery Wilson, Ernest Yanarella\*

The Chair welcomed everyone to the December 1998 meeting of the University Senate.

Chairperson Moore stated that the minutes of October 12, 1998 had been circulated. There were no corrections or revisions and the minutes were approved as circulated.

The Chair made the following announcements:

At the March 8, 1999 Senate meeting, Gordon Davies, the President of the Council on Postsecondary Education will be the guest speaker. There will be an opportunity for questions.

There are three new members of the Senate Council; Jane Wells, Charles Coulston, who is the first representative on the Council from Lexington Community College, and Kimberly Anderson. The new members were given a round of applause.

The Chair thanked the three members who are going off the Council: Doug Poe, Virginia Davis-Nordin, and John Thelin. The outgoing members were given a round of applause.

The next meeting will be on February 8, 1999.

The Chair recognized Lee Meyer, who has been re-elected vice chair of the Senate Council for the next year, to introduce the first action item.

Professor Meyer stated that Professor Moore had been re-elected as Chair of the Senate Council for another one-year term.

Absence Explained

**ACTION ITEM I** -Proposal to recommend individual health coverage benefits for all graduate and professional students who are funded full time as Teaching Assistants, Research Assistants, Graduate Assistants, and Fellows.

If approved, the proposal will be forwarded to the Administration for inclusion in the biennial budget.

Proposal:

The attached proposal to recommend individual health coverage benefits for all graduate and professional students who are funded full time as Teaching Assistants, Research Assistants, Graduate Assistants, and Fellows has been approved by the University Senate Council and is forwarded to the Senate for approval.

Attachment

Implementation: 1999

US Agenda Item: GrdStuHealthInsurance: 12.14.98

Proposal for Graduate Student Health Coverage

Presented to the UK University Senate Council

Susan P. Mains (Graduate School)

Proposal

The University Senate strongly recommends University of Kentucky action to cover 100% of the costs of individual health coverage benefits for all graduate and professional students who are funded full time as Teaching Assistants, Research Assistants, Graduate Assistants, and/or Fellows. This process should begin in 1999-2000 fiscal year and be completed no later than June 30, 2003.

Spouses and/or dependents of the groups identified above shall have the option of joining the UK health plan(s) at the subsidized and indexed rates.

In addition, the Senate supports allowing all graduate students to be permitted to purchase the same insurance available to full-time faculty and staff, beginning in the Fall, 1999.

Rationale

The rationale for proposing the availability of health benefits for graduate students consists of several key components:

1) One of the institution's key goals is to become a "Top 20" public research institution. In order to achieve such a goal it is necessary for the university to be able to attract a high caliber of graduate students; this group will be one of the key sections of the university that will be contributing to the increasing quality of UK research/teaching. In order to attract the best students, UK graduate programs have to be competitive with other schools, and one aspect of this competitiveness is the ability to provide an attractive funding package for prospective students. Several graduate programs throughout the US (including UK benchmark schools) include health benefits for graduate students as a key component of their funding package (see Table 1 on attached report). Unless UK provides a similar service it will be increasingly difficult for the school to attract students who have the opportunity to study at schools where health care is either largely subsidized or provided free of charge.

2) Graduate students at UK who are employed as Teaching Assistants (TAs), Research Assistants (RAs), or Graduate Assistants (GAs) have very limited incomes (with an average annual stipend of \$9,000 approx.). Although paying for health insurance may not appear to be a huge cost initially, it is a substantial burden for many students who have a fixed income. This is particularly problematic because assistants/fellows cannot work over 20 hours per week and, therefore cannot earn additional income during the school year or receive health benefits from another employer.

---

1 Graduate students who are fully funded as assistants or fellows, are

usually required to sign a contract with the Graduate School, which states they will not participate in additional paid employment.

3 ) Currently, graduate students can purchase the UK Mega Life Health Insurance Policy, however, in addition to this extra expense, in a recent survey many students stated that the policy is inadequate, and has resulted in a deterioration in their health and financial situation. In particular, the UK Mega Life Policy is extraordinarily expensive for students with dependents. The current health insurance policy does not provide comprehensive health coverage (e.g., 80% of allergy testing costs, \$250 per year maximum on prescriptions) and is considered by many graduate students who are currently enrolled in the plan as inadequate "catastrophe insurance."

4) In order for any educational institution to function effectively it is imperative that all members of that community feel that their contributions are appropriately recognized and that a supportive work environment is created. Graduate students are an important part of the academic community, they undertake research, present papers at professional meetings, undertake community outreach, teach undergraduate classes, work in various research centers and generally, add to the dynamism of what is known as "UK." At the moment, however, many graduate students feel disillusioned and abandoned by their limited opportunities to ensure that they stay healthy enough to be able to contribute to, and benefit from their limited time at UK. Numerous graduate students feel they are "second class" citizens within the university because there appears to be little concern for their physical and mental well being. In addition, some students have had to withdraw from the university because of costs incurred due to accidents, illnesses or pregnancies, which have not been adequately covered by the existing health insurance policies. This could then potentially lead to a lowering of the university's retention rates, which works against the university's recruitment efforts and is in stark contrast to the key goals of the institution.

Note: If approved, this proposal will be forwarded to the Administration for inclusion in the budget and Strategic Plan.

Appendix 1

---

Table A: Number of Graduate Students Currently Funded as Assistants/Fellows by UK\*  
(Source: UK Graduate School Fall 1998)

| ENROLLMENT          | FULL TIME     | PART TIME    |
|---------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Fellowship          | 344           | 74           |
| Graduate Assistants | 53            | 2            |
| Research Assistants | 347           | 51           |
| TR. Assistants      | 229           | 10           |
| Teaching Assistants | 545           | 83           |
| Total               | 1518 (87.34%) | 220 (12.66%) |

Table B: Total Graduate Enrollment  
(Source: UK Graduate School Fall 1998)

|                          | FULL TIME | PART TIME | TOTAL       |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| Graduate School Students |           | 3,190     | 2,107 5,297 |

---

\*Numbers are not currently recorded or available for a breakdown of level of funding for RAs, TAs, GAs, TRAS, and Fellows, therefore, the numbers in Table A reflect the total number of lines that all the existing positions add up to IN TOTAL. This means that each of the full time funded lines above includes a number of full time, half-time, quarter time, etc., positions.

Table C: Estimated Maximum Costs of 100% Covered Health Benefits for UK Assistants/Fellows

(Based on existing coverage costs listed at:

---

| Health Plan       | Monthly Cost | Annual Cost       | Total Cost <sup>2</sup> |
|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
|                   |              | (x 1214 students) |                         |
| UKHMO             | \$151.50     | \$1818.00         | \$2,207,052             |
| United Healthcare | \$156.00     | \$1872.00         | \$2,272,608             |

---

US Agenda Item: Health BenefitsPro 12.14.98

2If approximate number of full time students who are funded on Assistantships/Fellowships for 20+hours/week is 80% of total number of graduate students who are funded as Assistants/Fellows.

Professor Meyer stated that the item was a proposal to recommend that individual health coverage benefits be provided to all graduate and professional students who are funded full-time as teaching assistants, research assistants, graduate assistants, and fellows. If approved, the proposal will be forwarded to the Administration for inclusion in the biennial budget. This has been approved by the Senate Council and is being forwarded to the full Senate for approval.

Susan Mains (Student Senator - Graduate School) made a friendly amendment to change the "maximum of twenty hours" to "twenty hours or more." Chairperson Moore said that this would be a clarification not an actual change to the proposal.

Mike Nietzel (Dean - Graduate School) said that is was actually more complicated than that because there were students who were full-time at eighteen hours. They need to be sure that they addressed full-time in a way that is fair to students in different circumstances. Certainly, twenty hours covers the vast majority of the cases, but there were some exceptions that they would definitely want to include under the coverage that would be missed if they stuck strictly with the twenty hour definition.

The Chair said that there was an amendment to delete the wording in the parathesis (maximum of twenty hours). The amendment passed in a unanimous voice vote.

Student Senator Susan Mains, Professor Mike Nietzel (Dean, Graduate School), Professor Doug Poe (Business and Economics), Professor Dan Reedy (Arts and Sciences), and Professor Mark Meier (Arts and Sciences) all spoke in favor of the proposal with the recurring theme of the need of this benefit to recruit and keep high quality students who play an integral and important part in the activities of the University. They also felt this was no longer a cutting edge benefit. The vast majorities of universities have this benefit and many have had it for a very long time. In terms of competitiveness, it is essential.

Professor Poe, as a member of the Budget and Finance and Institutional Resource Committee, said the funds were not available and probably would not be there in the near future.

Professor Meier asked if costs for students on assistantships would be paid by the grants thus reducing the total cost of the program. Professor Nietzel stated that a vast majority of the grants would reimburse the insurance.

The question was called. The vote to cut off debate passed in a unanimous voice vote.

The proposal passed in a unanimous voice vote.

Bill Fortune (Law) said that he would like to commend Susan Mains for all

the work she had done on the proposal. Ms. Mains was given a round of applause.

Chairperson Moore recognized Professor Jim Applegate, the past Chair of the Senate Council and the Chair of the American Association of Higher Education Steering Committee (AAHE) or Senior Faculty Development.

Professor Applegate introduced the other members of the committee: Kim Anderson, College of Engineering; Professor Michael Kennedy, who is representing the AAUP on the committee; Professor Joseph Brill, representing the Arts and Sciences Council, which is in the process of reviewing their pilot project this year; Professor Nolen Embry, Vice-Chair of the faculty at Lexington Community College; Richard Greissman and Sue Rimmer from the College of Arts and Sciences; Roy Moore the Chair of the Senate Council, and Lois Nora from the College of Medicine.

Professor Applegate made the following remarks:

Many of you will remember during the year when I was Chair of the Senate Council, there was a special session and a regular session of the Kentucky Legislature. There were two different bills introduced to put in a mandated post-tenure review system for the entire state. Through the wisdom of the legislature and some encouragement from lobbying from the Council of Senate Faculty Leaders headed by Loys Mather, that was decided not to be done. At that point, the legislature asked the Council of Post-Secondary Education for the legislative session in 2000 to review the status of post-tenure review policies at all state institutions and report to the legislature on where everyone was. In light of that and looking around the country at what is happening in higher education, understanding that Kentucky is not unlike most institutions in the country in that by the year 2000 around fifty percent of our faculty will be age fifty or higher, we thought it would be a wise time to start a conversation on campus about what kind of things we need to be doing to really enhance, support, and facilitate tenured senior faculty development on this campus. Seeing post-tenure review as a part of that process the American Association for Higher Education implemented a program to provide money to institutions that wanted to have conversations and explore the issue. Given that we already had a pilot program going in Arts and Sciences that was up for being reviewed, we thought it would be an opportune time to get some money from AAHE and use that to fund our conversations. We wrote a grant and sent it in and received small funding. Some of the other institutions that were funded were the University of Massachusetts systems campuses, the University of Alaska state-wide system, the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Drexler University, Texas A&M College Station, and a variety of other institutions that cut across the types of schools and institutions in higher education. We received the money in October. We appointed a steering committee made up of the faculty I introduced earlier. This committee is working closely with the Senate Committee on Planning and Priorities, which Kim Anderson chairs. We will be using them as a sounding board, as we think through and try to come up with ideas of what ought to be done in terms of the senior faculty development policy. If we decide after a semester long or more conversation that something does need to be done, we will make the policy proposal to the Senate Council. They will debate and review it, and bring it to you in the Senate next fall. There is a lot of opportunity for conversation about this issue related to post-tenure review and senior faculty development.

One of the first things that we wanted to do, once we got the grant in October, was to begin to assemble data and information on this. Listed on the handout are websites of institutions that have been in the process of, already formulated, or at least considered and dealt with the issue of post-tenure review. We will be making those available through a direct link on the Senate web site. We want people to become aware of things going on around the country at different institutions. There are institutions that have this forced on them by legislators, other institutions that have had it created by system-wide boards, and some have generated it internally. If we end up with a good constructive senior faculty development policy, we would like for it to come from this body and

not from above. In a survey done by the American Association of Higher Education, forty states responded that over forty percent have a policy already in place. Those vary in degree of extensiveness. Another fifteen percent report that selective public institutions within the state system have it. In only six states is the policy derived from state legislative action. Thirteen states report that the policy is the result of system governing or coordinating body initiatives. The model followed in over eighty percent of these policies is a periodic mandatory review for all tenured faculty on a five-year cycle. There will be a meeting in San Diego of the liaisons that are working at the different institutions from these grants. There will be a lot of workshops on the issues sponsored by AAHE.

This is a national issue and we are hoping that we can come up with a policy that is not just about post-tenure review, but a constructive policy that talks about if there are faculty who for one reason or another, have gotten off track. How can we set a policy that will help them get back on track, provide them with support, and the plan that is needed to get them back where they want and need to be for all of us to be as productive as we can be? There are also policies for faculty who are going along just fine at different parts of their career to help them do better or to change direction or decide they want to move in another avenue. Those are the kinds of broad-based policy issue we are looking at. We are planning in the Spring a major kickoff event, in which we will have representatives in who have worked with community colleges, medical centers, Lexington campus type institutions with post-tenure review to talk about their experiences. We will have an open symposium for faculty and work with the Senate committees and department chair forums, and, hopefully, after the spring, we will have talked this thing to death and will decide whether we need to do nothing, a little bit, or a lot in order to do the best that we can for our faculty and also to assess the risk on the outside and see whether we need to do some things for ourselves before something is done to us.

Loys Mather (Agriculture Economics) said that he would like to second what Jim had said, particularly in the terms of the timeliness of this. There was a bill in the last session of the legislature that was a one size fits all and very punitive type of post-tenure review. It was one that we as faculty, not just at UK but also the other public universities, felt they simply could not live with. In talking with the legislators, we sensed there was not as much interest on the part of the legislator in providing it. As it was, they as faculty were in the process of providing some form of post-tenure review. The point is that they have some time to develop their own system, and there is an expectation on the part of the legislator that the schools are doing that, and at such time that they have a review and nothing has been done, you can likely expect some different kinds of consequences.

**ACTION ITEM 2 - Proposed Entrance and Progression Requirements for the Hospitality and Tourism Program, College of Human Environmental Sciences.**

**Proposal:**

The proposed entrance and progression standards (below) from the University of Kentucky College of Human Environmental Sciences, Hospitality and Tourism Program, have been approved by the Undergraduate Council, the Senate committee on Admissions and Academic Standards, the University Senate Council, and are forwarded to the Senate for approval. If approved they will be included in the University Senate Rules and the University Bulletin.

**Admission Requirement:**

The minimum grade point for entrance of all students into the Hospitality Management and Tourism program is: 2.30

**Progression Requirement**

Students must have completed the following pre-major courses with a C grade or better in order to progress to courses, which are major requirements:

CS 101 ACC 201 ACC 202 ECO 201 ECO 202  
HMT 120 HMT 270 HMT 208 NFS 204 NFS 241

**Graduation Requirement:**

Students must fulfill all pre-requisites and achieve a C grade or better in all NFS and HMT courses which are major requirements.

**Background and Rationale:** The faculty who teach in this program feel that the grade minimums for entrance and progression are necessary in order to build this program with student who are doing well enough, overall, in the university, and who are committed to continuing their studies in this area in a manner which will allow them to graduate with a complete and adequate body of knowledge in the area of hospitality and tourism and to assume positions of responsibility in highly respected business organizations. Similar highly respected programs (for example, Florida State University, Washington State University, and Cornell University) have strict admission and progression requirements. The higher standards are necessary for this program to become well known and respected, both nationally and within the academic community at the University of Kentucky.

**Implementation:** Fall Semester, 1999

The Chair recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of the item. Professor Meyer reviewed the background and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

The proposal passed in a unanimous voice vote.

**ACTION ITEM 3 - Proposed Technical Standards from the University of Kentucky College of Dentistry.**

**Proposal:**

The attached proposed technical standards from the University of Kentucky College of Dentistry have been approved by the Academic Council for the Medical Center, the Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards, the University Senate Council, and are forwarded to the Senate for approval.

**Implementation:** January 1, 1999

**Policy on Technical Standards  
For Dental Students**

**Miscellaneous academic Policies: Policy on Technical Standards for Dental Students**

**Policy Objective:** To define the non-academic criteria for admission into; continued enrollment in, and graduation from the Doctor of Dental Medicine program.

**Policy Statement:**

The University of Kentucky College of Dentistry is committed to ensuring that the opportunity to pursue oral health education is available to all qualified persons. In this spirit, all qualified individuals will be considered for admission. Moreover, the College will work to ensure that all qualified students, consistent with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with disabilities Act, will have the opportunity to succeed in the College's programs of study.

The College recognizes that the Doctor of Dental Medicine (D.M.D.) degree carries with it the full authority of the institution and communicates to those who might seek the services of the bearer that he or she is competent to practice dentistry. The D.M.D. degree is unique in that the graduate is prepared and, when licensed, is allowed to practice all disciplines of the dental profession. Therefore, the student must demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that the faculty has determined are essential for the practice of dentistry. The student must acquire both cognitive and technical skills to negotiate the curriculum.

The following technical standards describe the essential functions that students must demonstrate in order to fulfill the requirements of a general dental education, and thus are prerequisites for entrance, continuation, and graduation from the College. Students must possess the skills and

abilities that will allow them to successfully complete the course of study and receive the full benefit of dental education. While enrolled in dental school, students must direct and perform treatment of the College's patients. The College has the responsibility for ensuring the safety of the patients. Treatment must be completed safely and within an acceptable time.

The University of Kentucky College of Dentistry will consider for admission any applicant who demonstrates the ability to perform or to learn to perform the skills listed in this document. Continued enrollment and graduation will depend on the successful demonstration of both the knowledge and the skills listed in this document. The College's Academic Performance Committee will monitor each student's demonstration of such knowledge and skills. Applicants are not required to disclose the nature of their disability(ies) to the Admissions Committee; however, any applicant with questions about these technical standards is strongly encouraged to discuss the issue with the Admissions Committee chair before the interview. Upon the request of an applicant or a student, reasonable accommodations will be provided.

## Standards

### 1. Motor Skills

**GENERAL:** A student should have sufficient motor function to execute movements reasonably required to provide general care to patients.

**SPECIFIC:** A student must have sufficient motor skills to directly perform palpation, percussion, auscultation and other diagnostic maneuvers, basic laboratory tests, and diagnostic procedures. Such actions require coordination of gross and fine muscular movements, equilibrium, and functional uses of the senses of touch and vision.

**SPECIFIC:** A student must be able to perform basic life support including CPR, transfer and position disabled patients, physically restrain adults and children who lack motor control, and position and reposition himself or herself around patient and chair in a sitting or standing position. A student must not hinder the ability of co-workers to perform prompt care. A student must be able to operate controls, move high-speed or low-speed dental drills with precision of less than one millimeter, and use hand instrumentation including scalpels for surgical procedures.

### 2. Sensory/Observation

**GENERAL:** A student must be able to acquire a predetermined level of required information through demonstrations and experiences in basic and dental sciences courses.

**SPECIFIC:** Such information includes, but is not limited to, information conveyed through: 1) physiologic and pharmacological demonstration in animals; 2) microbiological cultures; 3) microscopic images in microorganisms and tissues in normal and pathologic states; and 4) demonstration of techniques using dental models. A student must be able to acquire information from written documents, and to evaluate information presented as images from paper, films, slides, or video. A student must be able to interpret x-ray and other graphic images. A student must be able to benefit from electronic and other instrumentation that enhances visual, auditory, and somatic sensations needed for examination or treatment.

**GENERAL:** A student must be able to accurately observe a patient, at a distance and close at hand, and observe and accurately interpret non-verbal communications when performing dental operations or administering medications.

**SPECIFIC:** A student must be able to perform dental examinations and treatment that requires the use of sight and touch. He or she must be able to see fine detail, focus at a variety of distances, and discern differences and variations in color, shape, and texture that are necessary to differentiate normal and abnormal soft and hard tissues. He or she must



be able to use tactile senses to diagnose directly by palpation and indirectly by sensations transited through instruments. A student must also possess the visual acuity to read charts, records, radiographs, small print and handwritten notation, and distinguish colors intro- and extra-orally.

### 3. Communication

GENERAL: A student must be able to: communicate effectively and sensitively with patients; convey or exchange information at a level allowing development of a health history; identify problems, explain alternative solutions; and give directions during treatment and post-treatment. Communication includes speech and writing. A student must be able to communicate effectively and efficiently in oral and written English with all members of the health care team.

SPECIFIC: A student must have sufficient facility with English to: retrieve information from texts and lectures and communicate concepts on written exams and patient charts; elicit patient backgrounds; describe patients changes in moods, activity, and posture; and coordinate patient care with all members of the health care team. A student must be able to communicate in lay language so that patients and their families can understand the patient's conditions and, thereby, be more likely to comply with treatment and preventive regimes.

SPECIFIC: In any case where the student's ability to communicate through these sensory modalities is compromised, he or she must demonstrate alternative means of communicating with instructors, patients, and other members of the health care team.

### 4. Cognitive

GENERAL: A student must be able to measure, calculate, reason, analyze, integrate, and synthesize.

SPECIFIC: A student must be able to comprehend three dimensional relationships and to understand the spatial relationships of structures. Problem solving, a critical skill demanded of dentists, requires all of these intellectual abilities. A student must be able to perform these problem solving skills in a timely fashion.

### 5. Behavioral

GENERAL: A student must possess the emotional health required for full use of his-/her intellectual abilities, the exercise of good judgment, the prompt completion of all responsibilities attendant to the diagnosis and care of patients, and the development of mature, sensitive, and effective relationships with patients.

SPECIFIC: A student must be able to tolerate physically-taxing workloads and to function effectively under stress. He or she must be able to adapt to changing environments, display flexibility, and learn to function in the face of uncertainties inherent in the clinical problems of patients. Compassion, integrity, concern for others, interpersonal skills, interests, and motivation are all personal qualities that will be assessed during the admissions and educational processes. A student must be able to manage apprehensive patients with a range of moods and behaviors in a tactful, congenial, personal manner so as not to alienate or antagonize them. A student must be able to accept criticism and respond by appropriate modification of behavior.

Responsible Agent: The Dean

Methods and Procedures: To be developed

Policy Approved by the Faculty: 3/24/98

Methods and procedures modified

By the Faculty Council: x/x/98

Chairperson Moore recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of the item. Professor Meyer reviewed the background of the item and recommended approval of the item.

The proposal passed in a unanimous voice vote.

ACTION ITEM 4 - For Discussion and Action: Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Title Series

Background:

In December 1997 the Senate Council ad hoc Committee on Faculty Titles Series (Co-Chaired by Professors Ann B. Amerson, Pharmacy, and Antoinette Powell, Agriculture) submitted its Final Report for consideration by the University Senate Council. The ad hoc Committee on Faculty Titles Series was charged with "a comprehensive review of the title series system, to identify strengths and weaknesses, and develop recommendations to simplify, clarify, improve the structure, and ultimately invigorate the spirit of the system." The committee began its work by gathering information about series at other institutions and the historical development of the Faculty Titles Series at the University of Kentucky. After reviewing the background information, the committee decided to focus its attention on the Special Title Series, Research Title Series, and the Clinical Titles Series. The Committee was later given responsibility to review the proposed Lecturer Series. To accomplish this, the committee divided into two task forces, Special Title Series and Non-Tenure Track series.

The Senate Council has since then held extensive discussions, including two sessions with the Committee Co-Chairs regarding the recommendations in the report. The Council voted on November 16, 1998, to recommend approval by the full Senate of the following revisions to the current Administrative Regulations for the Special Title Series.

Proposal: [Delete strikeouts; add bold sections]

Administrative Regulations [AR II 1.0-1; p. VII-1 and ff.]

A. Introduction

The University System requires the services of professionally competent individuals to meet teaching and service responsibilities in selected areas or positions in which assignments do not necessarily include research of creative work. To meet these responsibilities effectively and to be competitive in attracting and retaining needed professional personnel, a special title series has been established as defined below.

The University has established a Special Title Series to address needs of some departments for specialized functions in teaching, research/creative activity, and/or other services. An individual appointed in this series will be evaluated in teaching, professional status and activity, and University and public service, and scholarly and/or creative productivity. The level of scholarly and/or creative productivity which may be less than the faculty in the regular title series, should be reflective of the individual's distribution of effort and the type of position responsibilities required. This series is intended to provide flexibility for departments to meet responsibilities effectively and to be competitive in attracting and retaining needed professional personnel.

Rationale: The Task Force recommended, and the Senate Council concurs, that Ernest L. Boyer's expanded scope of scholarship -- discovery, integrating application and teaching -- be considered in determining the kind of activity expected. The Task Force and the Council also felt that there should be some expectation for creative or scholarly activity.

B. Definition

The academic ranks and titles in the special title series parallel those

in the regular title series (i.e. instructor\*, assistant professor\*, associate professor\* and professor\*). Examples of more specific special titles are Associate Professor of Applied Music and Assistant Professor of Medicine. Examples of more specific special titles are Associate Professor of Applied Music\* and Assistant Professor of Medicine\*. The asterisk, as a superscript immediately following a title, designates that the rank and title are associated with a position in the special title series. Each position will be defined by a job description that indicates the distribution of effort in the respective categories and outlines the appointment and promotion criteria for the person in the position. Rationale: As with Regular Title appointments, individuals in the Special Title Series deserve to know as clearly as possible from the outset what is expected of them in order to attain tenure and promotion.

#### C. Establishment of Positions and Criteria

In recommending the establishment of one or more new special title positions and related criteria for appointment and promotion, To establish a special title series position(s), the initiating educational unit shall prepare supporting material which will demonstrate the need for such positions, outline the position responsibilities, and propose criteria for appointment and promotion to each of the four ranks in the special title series. Where the applicable criteria for appointment and promotion have been approved previously for the same type of special title positions, a statement of this action shall be included in the supporting material along with the proposed job description. After review and approval, the dean of the college shall forward the educational unit's recommendation and supporting material to the appropriate chancellor.

The chancellor shall, if such have not been previously approved, refer the pertinent criteria for appointment and promotion the job description to the appropriate Area Committee for evaluation, suggestions on desirable and/or necessary revision, and approval. The Area Committee reviews the job description for consistency between the criteria for appointment and promotion and the described responsibilities and their distribution. After approval of the appointment and promotion criteria by an Area Committee, the chancellor shall approve or disapprove the educational unit's recommendation for the establishment of new special title positions.

Rationale: This change makes it clear that the job description is the appropriate reference for ascertaining the expectations for appointment and promotion associated with that specific position. It also assigns the Area Committee the responsibility of making sure that there is consistency between the criteria associated with the position. The Area Committee is the appropriate body for carrying out this responsibility because it is the committee that makes a recommendation to the chancellor regarding creation of new special title positions and the committee that makes recommendations regarding promotion and/or tenure for individuals who are appointed to these positions.

#### D. Guidelines and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion and Granting of Tenure

Before an individual can be appointed or promoted to a position in the special title series, the position must have been approved by the appropriate chancellor. The individual responsible for hiring should assure that the job description is reviewed with the new faculty member at the time of hiring.

The special title series is not intended to serve as a means for appointing and promoting, in the regular disciplines, individuals who are unable to qualify for appointment or promotion because of demonstrated lack of research competence.

The procedures for handling recommendations for appointment, promotion and granting of tenure in the special title series are the same as those for processing similar recommendations related to the regular title series (refer or Sections II, III, IV, XIII, and XIV). However, the pertinent special criteria for appointment and promotion in special title position

shall be taken into consideration. A referral to and a recommendation from the Dean of the Graduate School shall not be required, however, unless the individual is or may be involved in research and/or a graduate program.

In developing the criteria for appointment or promotion, the following general criteria should be taken into consideration.

1. Assistant Professor

In order to qualify for appointment as assistant professor in the special title series, the candidate shall hold the terminal degree appropriate to the field of assignment and, where required, certification or eligibility for certification in the field. Further, the candidate shall possess the essential instructional, organizational, professional and/or other skills required by the job description with the potential for future growth and development.

2. Associate Professor

In addition to meeting the criteria for assistant professor, appointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor shall be based on:

- a. Demonstration of continuing growth and improvement in achieving excellence in teaching
- b. Significant contribution of service to both the College and University.
- c. Evidence of professional development on a state and regional basis as indicated by factors such as leadership, participation in professional organizations, requests to serve as consultant advisor, or expert participant and/or recognition for outstanding service in the field of specialization.
- d. Demonstration of scholarly and /or creative activity through publications, presentations, development of innovative instructional materials and/or other activities as defined by the job description and commensurate with the allocated distribution of effort.

3. Professor

Appointment or promotion to the rank of professor is based, in addition to meeting the criteria for the rank of associate professor, on continued broad professional growth and distinguished achievements by the individual in the particular field of assignment. The following criteria are considered:

- a. Excellence as a mature teacher and/or supervisor of students
- b. Increased contributions of service to the College, University and Community
- c. Outstanding leadership and service to the profession as evidence by national and perhaps, international recognition
- d. Continued growth in scholarly activity and /or creative productivity as defined by the job description.

Rationale: the changes effectively incorporate Ernest L. Boyer's expanded scope of scholarship, as described in his chapter in *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities on the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, pp. 15-25. They also reflect national trends in higher education toward expanding the boundaries and definitions of scholarship to include a broad range of creative activities. The changes also reinforce the high expectations for teaching, service and professional development.

E. Conditions of Employment

Employment in a special title position implies does not normally imply a

specific responsibility to engage in research to develop scholarly research and/or creative activity commensurate with the job description. Consequently, appointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor or professor in the special title series does not automatically qualify an individual for membership in the Graduate Faculty. In all other respects, the conditions and benefits of employment related to appointments in the special title series are the same as those related to appointments in the regular title series.

Rationale: This change reflects the Task Force's recommendation that there be some expectation for creative or scholarly activity, which will vary with the position, as specified in the job description. It also reflects Boyer's expanded scope of scholarship.

The Senate Council also recommends approval by the full Senate of the following recommendations regarding the Faculty title Series:

1. That the present categories in the Faculty Title Series be retained.
2. That two generic title series be created as umbrellas for all the current title series. The Committee recommends that the following umbrella terms be used. Tenure Track Faculty Lines to include the current Regular Title Faculty Series, Special Title Faculty Series, Librarians Title Series, and Extension Title Series. Contractual Faculty Lines to include Clinical Titles Series, Research Title Series, Lecturer, and Adjunct Faculty Titles Series.
3. The Special Title Series be retained as currently defined in the ARs. (as recommended in the Leigh Report) with a revision of the definition. It is the feeling of the Task Force that for any tenure track position there should be some expectation for creative or scholarly activity. (The Committee recommends that Boyer's expanded scope of scholarship discovery, integration, application and teaching be considered in determining the kind of activity expected.) The level of expectation and the kind of activity must be clearly stated in the job description that is approved by the appropriate Area Committee.

Note: At its meeting on November 16, 1998, the Senate Council voted to submit the following recommendations from the Task Force report to the full Senate for discussion only. The Senate Council will consider the feedback from the discussion in determining which recommendations to forward later to the full Senate for action.

Boldface indicates suggested wording added by the Council. Strikeovers indicate wording the Council recommends deleting. All items and changes are for discussion only.

For Discussion Only:

1 ) In view of the proposal for the Lecturer Title Series we propose all title series in which tenure is not granted as part of the promotion process (research, clinical, lecturer) be referred to as contractual title series. The definition of contractual faculty does not include visiting faculty.

Rationale: We feel the term nontenure denotes a secondary status.

2) After six years at the rank of Assistant Professor (6 successive one year term contracts or single and/or multi-year term contracts totaling 6 years) a faculty member in a contractual title series must be considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and if promoted all subsequent appointments will be on 3 to 5 year revolving contracts. If the individual is not promoted a one-year terminal contract will be offered. The same process will be used to consider promotion as is currently used for tenure and promotion.

Rationale: Any faculty member who is employed by the University of Kentucky for greater than six years must be a valuable asset to the

University and appointment beyond the sixth year should be on a 3 to 5 year revolving contract as a reward for being successful. This will provide a moderate amount of job security to the individual and would facilitate productivity and growth. Continual one-year contracts encourage faculty to keep an eye on the job market.

3) Contractual faculty must be notified at least one year in advance if their contracts will not be renewed the following year.

Rationale: All faculty need the time to find suitable employment. Twelve months is not an unusual amount of time needed to find another academic position.

4) All faculty in the contractual title series should be provided all of the same rights as faculty in tenure tracks within the respective Colleges. These rights include are eligibility eligible for all committees except committees deciding tenure decisions for special and regular title series and shall be eligible as well as eligibility for voting in all elections and the opportunity to participate in all other decision-making processes within the University.

Rationale: This has to be done or a second class status results because we are not providing, all faculty the opportunity to participate in the governance of the University. Times have changed, and a much larger percentage of the faculty are in one of the contractual title series than in the past.

5) The number of faculty within the contractual series (research and clinical and lecturer) will not exceed 50% of the total number of faculty in any one department.

Rationale: In order to maintain the integrity of the tenure process and to ensure academic continuity, we must not allow any department within the University to systematically eliminate positions in tenure tracks.

The Chair recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of the item. Professor Meyer stated that the first part was a proposal and the second part was an area where there was not strong agreement within the Council, and they wanted the full Senate to discuss those points. He reviewed the background of the proposal and recommended approval by the Senate Council.

Mike Cibull (Medicine) and Alan Kaplan (Medicine) asked for clarification of the part of the proposal where the job description is being passed to the area committee

Lee Meyer said that, from the deliberations in the Senate Council, whenever the job description is changed, it would have to be reviewed at those various levels. The attempt here is that if the area committee is going to act upon promotion of someone, there should be consistency over time.

Chancellor Elisabeth Zinser said that she did not read anything in the proposed changes that contemplates a change in those procedures in that interpretation. She assumed that it was intended to continue as it is now.

The intent is if there is a master job description, it is specific enough to cover a variety of different appointments and it can be used and not reviewed over and over. It does not have to be done position by position, unless there is a significant difference in the expectations of the individuals work.

Phyllis Nash (Medical Center) said that the current process in the Medical Center is that if there is a new special title series position created, the area committee reviews the promotion criteria and actually has approval of the promotion criteria. They do not have approval of the job description. They look at the promotion criteria in order to make sure that people at the assistant, associate, and full professor level are evaluated some what consistently across positions. The change she sees in this is now the area committee would not only be reviewing the promotion criteria but also reviewing the job description.

Professor Cibull made the motion to send Section C back to the committee for some clarifying language that better defines the role of the area committee in the appointment of faculty in the special title series.

Claire Pomeroy (Medicine) supported the proposal to send back to committee because in the Department of Medicine, the vast majority of new appointments are in special title series. This is the norm, and the amount of time it takes to get a new person is already long, adding another layer on could be potentially disastrous.

Bill Fortune (Law) asked if the people from the Medical Center rather than send the proposal back to the committee could propose an amendment instead. Would keeping the existing language be better?

Professor Kaplan said that would actually work because it is more consistent from job to job.

The motion to send back to committee was withdrawn.

Professor Fortune proposed that Section C, paragraph 2, read as it did in the original.

Geza Bruckner (Allied Health) said that the question is still what is the intent of the proposal?

Alan Kaplan said that the problem is that the criteria for appointment and promotion are generic. They need to be consistent.

Doug Poe (Business and Economics) said they had talked about this in the Senate Council for a year and a half, and one issue that kept coming back was the number of faculty complaints that what was on their job description and the criteria they are held to when it gets to the area committee for promotion are not the same.

Mike Cibull said many people were hired to do one thing and told to do another and have very little recourse. This document makes it very clear that their job description is what they are going to be expected to be doing. A lot of that particular criticism is just removed by this. He is very much in favor of this redefinition, but not in favor of increasing the layers of bureaucracy that are needed to get a job in place.

The amendment to restore Section C to the original language passed in a show of hands; 26 for and 12 against.

The amended proposal passed in a unanimous voice vote.

The Chair said that the next part of the proposal was for discussion only, not for a vote and recognized Professor Meyer for introduction. Professor Meyer stated that members of the Senate Council would lead the discussion of the five items.

1 ) In view of the proposal for the Lecturer Title Series we propose all title series in which tenure is not granted as part of the promotion process (research, clinical, lecturer) be referred to as contractual title series. The definition of contractual faculty does not include visiting faculty.

Rationale: We feel the term nontenure denotes a secondary status.

The following issues and questions were raised to take back to the Senate Council:

Volunteer faculty do have have a contract so therefore are not considered contractual faculty.

Is an additional label beyond the title series needed? If regular and special title series are eligible for tenure and the others are not, why do

they have to be labeled as tenured versus nontenured for contractual?

2) After six years at the rank of Assistant Professor (6 successive one year term contracts or single and/or multi-year term contracts totaling 6 years) a faculty member in a contractual title series must be considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and if promoted all subsequent appointments will be on 3 to 5 year revolving contracts. If the individual is not promoted a one-year terminal contract will be offered. The same process will be used to consider promotion as is currently used for tenure and promotion.

Rationale: Any faculty member who is employed by the University of Kentucky for greater than six years must be a valuable asset to the University and appointment beyond the sixth year should be on a 3 to 5 year revolving contract as a reward for being successful. This will provide a moderate amount of job security to the individual and would facilitate productivity and growth. Continual one-year contracts encourage faculty to keep an eye on the job market.

The following issues and questions were raised to take back to the Senate Council:

Many research assistant professors are paid by grants, some might be at the University for many years and the expectation is frequently they would like them to stay. If a grant is terminated, they know a year in advance and give the maximum amount of warning, but there is no money to pay if the grant is terminated, so they can not extend to a three to five year period.

Has there been some thought that if people are kept on for a lengthy period of time, that the Medical Center has an obligation to find them a position if the event the grant fails.

This type of individual seems to find an alternative appointment within the Medical Center or elsewhere in the University more often than not.

The wording is such that these people would be dismissed prior to coming up for the three to five year promotion in order to protect the department or professor. In Pharmacy they are very careful about these appointments because of the salary obligation, if they are supported by grants and the grant ends, the college is then responsible for the salary for the term of the contract. The contracts are worded very carefully so when the grant runs out so does the appointment and the salary.

Physicians are often hired in the clinical title series and if for example they do not get an HMO contract or people start going to a different institution, if they do not generate their salary, there is no money to pay them.

Does this affect being able to attract the people they want with these short-term contracts? This is what they get in private practice. After two years at then end of the contract, they still get years notice.

The Administrative Regulations as they are allow them to give faculty in the research title or clinical title series a contract for the period of the funding.

3) Contractual faculty must be notified at least one year in advance of their contracts will not be renewed the following year.

Rationale: All faculty need the time to find suitable employment. Twelve months is not an unusual amount of time needed to find another academic position.

The following issues and questions were raised to take back to the Senate Council:

This has not always been the practice, the Administration forced the



one-year situation. There was a line on the contract that basically said if the funding were no longer available the person would be terminated. They were told they were in error and must give in the first year a three month notice, in the second year a six month notice, and after that they could only be given notice at the end of the contract period and that had to be a full year's notice. In this era of unsure funding, one way to get around that is to only guarantee the one year and then hope at the end of the year they will be able to give another contract, but in order to protect the departments from being obligated financially that is the route they went. The department did not have to do that, if they had funding and knew they could pay for one full year, then they did not have to have a terminal contract.

This does not necessarily work well and there are research faculty who feel insulted by getting revolving terminal appointments. This has to do with money and should be worked out by a committee of faculty and administration together.

4) All faculty in the contractual title series should be provided all of the same rights as faculty in tenure tracks within the respective Colleges. These rights include are eligibility eligible for all committees except committees deciding tenure decisions for special and regular title series and shall be eligible as well as eligibility for voting in all elections and the opportunity to participate in all other decision-making processes within the University.

Rationale: This has to be done or a second class status results because we are not providing, all faculty the opportunity to participate in the governance of the University. Times have changed, and a much larger percentage of the faculty are in one of the contractual title series than in the past.

The following issues and questions were raised to take back to the Senate Council:

This could be a place where lumping faculty in the contractual category creates a problem. Within research assistant professors, they should have the same rights as faculty, they are seldom ever going to be majority and this would not be a problem. In the case of clinical title series, it could become a problem.

The clinical title series faculty are teaching students and doing many of the same things that the rest of the regular title and special title series faculty are doing, getting them to give up private practice and do this and then telling them they can not be on a University committee, is negative in terms of attracting. They want to serve on committees. They do serve on departmental committees which allow that.

The issue is what is best for the University? In clinical departments where the goal is to make money for the department by practicing medicine, it becomes an overriding concern to the exclusion of research and even perhaps to some extent teaching. If people are hired who are just going to be practicing medicine than the whole tone of the department could be changed.

One of the issues that is interesting, that they have been discussing affects people who are not in attendance. They should be able to vote on some of these things that affect their careers and their place of employment and that argues to give them voting rights.

The United States Senate often talks about things that affect people lives that are not in the meeting. That is the nature of any elected body.

There are full-time faculty who have no intention of staying for the long haul. People in tenured faculty positions are usually planning on staying, in the one or two-year clinical positions there are quite a few people who are not planning on staying. Perhaps representatives from this group could be included in the debate or to the committees to discuss issues.

5) The number of faculty within the contractual series (research and clinical and lecturer) will not exceed 50% of the total number of faculty in any one department.

Rationale: In order to maintain the integrity of the tenure process and to ensure academic continuity, we must not allow any department within the University to systematically eliminate positions in tenure tracks.

The following issues and questions were raised to take back to the Senate Council:

Are there departments in the Medical Center for whom this would be a problem? There are not any now, but with the Medicare who knows what might happen next year. It might be necessary to have a group of people who are predominately practicing medicine in order to have enough money to survive. There is enough bureaucracy; there is no need to mandate every aspect of departmental life.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Donald Witt  
Secretary, University Senate

---

You are visitor

Unable to open config file for reading

since June 29, 1999

---

**Return to [University Senate Page](#)**

**Return to [University Senate Minutes](#)**

**Return to [Registrar's Home Page](#)**

---

This page was last updated on 29 June 1999.

If you have [questions or comments](#) about this web page, please use this [comment form](#)

URL: <http://www.uky.edu/USC/Minutes/sm121498.html>