

Senate Council
January 26, 2009

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, January 26, 2009 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a voice vote unless indicated otherwise.

Chair David Randall called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:06 pm. He suggested that all those present introduce themselves, for the benefit of new members and invited guests.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair said that he would accept motions for approval of the three sets of minutes, assuming no changes were needed.

Swanson **moved** to approve the minutes from December 1. Piascik **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the minutes from December 1 were **approved** as distributed, without dissent.

Wood **moved** to approve the minutes from December 15. Chappell **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the minutes from December 15 were **approved** as distributed, without dissent.

Kelly **moved** to approve the minutes from January 12. Ford **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the minutes from January 12 were **approved** as distributed, without dissent.

The Chair informed SC members of the recent death of a faculty member in the College of Design, and that a memorial resolution would be read at a future University Senate (Senate) meeting.

Regarding absences, the Chair reported that Aken, Anderson, and Yanarella would be absent. The Chair let SC members know that the lunch with the President on Wednesday the 28th would be held at the Boone Center.

Turning to curricular matters, the Chair explained that there was an effort underway to create a shared database among the council (Graduate Council, Health Care Colleges Council, Undergraduate Council and Senate Council) coordinators. He stated that a shared database would be a responsibility of the Senate, and within the purview of the SC. There was brief discussion, and SC members agreed that prior to the shared database being used for day-to-day business, its use must be approved by the SC.

2. Discussion on [The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics](#) (Invited Guests - Bruce Walcott and Scott Kelley, Faculty Representatives to the Athletics Association Board of Directors)

The Chair reminded SC members about the impetus behind his interest in The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA). As a member of the Southeastern Conference Academic Consortium, the Chair met a co-founder of COIA, a faculty member from Vanderbilt University. The goal of the COIA

is to try and help develop academic standards for collegiate athletics. During the course of their conversations, the Chair thought it might be a good idea for UK's Senate to join the COIA.

The Chair said that he had mentioned that only two SEC schools were not involved with COIA – Louisiana State University and University of Florida. The two schools had not joined because of a perception that either further reform was not needed at that institution, or the institution did not fully support the goals of COIA.

The Chair said he hoped the SC could engage in an open discussion as to whether or not the Senate should pursue membership with the COIA. He invited Guest Bruce Walcott and Guest Scott Kelley to share their thoughts and opinions as they saw fit.

SC members engaged in a lively discussion regarding COIA and possible issues with membership. After about 15 minutes, the Chair stated that he was hearing little, if any, support for further discussion on joining COIA. Due to a lack of support, he suggested that discussion cease and the SC could move to the next agenda item. He thanked Kelley and Walcott for attending.

[3. Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure Report on Combined Administrative Regulations](#)

The Chair asked Swanson, chair of the Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure, to explain the report. Swanson said that the Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT) met a few times to discuss viewpoints, decisions and craft wording for a few sections of [Administrative Regulations II-1.0-1 \(Parts I - III\)](#). Swanson said that the SACPT identified two issues of particular concern: 1. while the SACPT supports the comprehensive tenure review, it wondered what would occur if the faculty member went up for tenure review in the third year but received a negative decision; and 2. a seventh-year review is not currently practiced in all colleges (some colleges routinely engage in a seventh-year review, while others rarely do), and language to clarify the process is still needed.

Provost's Liaison Greissman said that the Provost supported only one comprehensive review, a review which could not be stopped until it reached the desk of the President, at which time the President could reject it or sent it on to the Board of Trustees (BoT) for final approval. The Provost had asked Greissman to catalog items for which the SC and/or deans disagreed or supported. He added that all consulted constituencies (deans, SC, Senate, faculty councils) were uncomfortable with the elimination of individual faculty letters at the departmental level, so that suggestion had been dropped.

Those present engaged in a lengthy discussion; a variety of comments and concerns were mentioned, some of which are listed below.

- In the event that only one comprehensive tenure review is allowed, if a faculty member makes a poor decision to go early for tenure and does not succeed, that faculty member would simply be out of luck regarding tenure and would receive a terminal appointment. SC members thought this to be an overly harsh ramification of what could just be one poor decision.

- If a faculty member going up early for review realizes that colleagues within the department or college, or the dean, do not support the tenure dossier, the faculty member should be allowed to pull their dossier back from review without having the aborted application be considered the one comprehensive review. In other words, a faculty member should be able to pull back their dossier without prejudice from early review up until the time when the dossier would leave the college, if there are issues of non-support in the department or college.
- If the consequence for failing to earn tenure in an early review is that a terminal appointment is awarded, it would effectively dissuade any attempt for an early tenure review.
- There is a timing issue regarding the appeal process – a final tenure decision is usually made late in the semester of the faculty member’s final year, after which the faculty member has 60 days to appeal. It often happens that the faculty member then is separated from UK at the end of the semester, so the faculty member is left to appeal as a non-employee.
- SC members like the current practice of allowing a second review in the terminal year if the dean supports it.
- The process for reconsideration of tenure during a terminal year review is not spelled out, but it would be logical to follow the steps of the comprehensive tenure review.
- It might not be clear from the existing revised language as to what exactly the role of faculty is in the tenure process, i.e., some language might be misinterpreted to mean that an educational unit’s administrator could initiate a tenure review without agreement from the faculty member.

As discussion wound down, SC members agreed with the Chair’s suggestion that Greissman bring revised text back to the SC for further deliberation. At that time, the SC could make a recommendation to the Senate regarding implementation (phased, immediate, etc.)

4. Undergraduate College

The Chair asked Greissman to offer an update. Greissman shared that the Provost had received many comments about the possible formation of an undergraduate college; the idea was not well received. Greissman opined that the Provost did not necessarily agree with those viewpoints, but recognized that it might not be the best time to implement such a change. Greissman said the Provost would not create an undergraduate college without further discussion, although he did plan on preparing a proposal to address other tangential issues.

Moving to another issue of importance, Greissman gave a brief update about the curricular teams. One hundred thirty faculty members were contacted about serving on a curricular team, and one hundred twenty-six individuals agreed to serve. Provost Subbaswamy also created an eleventh team, a co-

curricular team which will look at the co-curricular elements of a new Gen Ed, which will include members of the Advising Network and others involved co-curricular aspects of students' lives.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted by David Randall,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Chappell, Ford, Jensen, Kelly, Piascik, Steiner, Swanson, Tagavi, and Wood.

Invited guests present: Scott Kelley, Joe Quinn, and Bruce Walcott.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, February 6, 2009.