

Senate Council Meeting  
March 5, 2007

The Senate Council (SC) met at 3 pm on Monday, March 05, 2007 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were conducted via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 pm.

1. Minutes from February 26 and Announcements

Finkel and Thelin offered some revisions, which were incorporated. There being no additional changes, the minutes from February 26 were approved as amended.

The Chair said that prior to the meeting, the Office of the Senate Council was informed that Finkel would leave early and Piascik would be absent. He said there were a few announcements to make.

The Chair said that there had been no action taken at the previous meeting to decide if there would be a SC meeting during spring break. Finkel **moved** that the SC not meet on March 12. Harley **seconded**. In response to Lesnaw, the Chair said there were no pending items requiring action. After a brief discussion about the time at which such a vote would be appropriate, Randall **moved to table** the motion. Wood **seconded**. A **vote** was taken on the motion to table, which **passed** with four in favor and two against. It was agreed that the motion to not meet would be revisited before the end of the meeting. (Yanarella entered the meeting at this time.)

The Chair said that prior to the SC decision to take no action on the proposed joint resolution to support President Todd's position regarding pending UK-related legislations, he had communicated with President Todd about the matter. He received a response from Tom Harris in the Office of Governmental Relations that indicated such an action would be well received by President Todd. Finkel **moved** that the Senate Council endorse the language in the proposed letter and fully endorse President Todd's statement about proposed legislation regarding UK's relationships with its employees. Lesnaw **seconded**. The Chair asked if there were any comments.

Finkel said that while the SC could do nothing, or could wait on the Staff Senate, the legislature was in session for only a short period; any letter to Governor Fletcher should be sent sooner rather than later. Since President Todd had (at least informally) been supportive of such an action, it was an appropriate action for the SC to take. He added that support of UK offering domestic partnerships was overwhelmingly approved by the University Senate, so there would be no contradiction. The Chair asked for input as to how to proceed.

There was a brief discussion regarding interaction with the Board of Trustees (BoT), as it pertained to the letter. Yanarella said that he was unaware of any BoT discussion on the matter.

A discussion subsequently took place regarding the wording of the letter to send to Governor Fletcher, requesting he oppose any legislation hindering the relationship between UK and its employees. Finkel clarified that the references to the "Board of Trustees" would be removed and "endorse" would be used. Wood offered a **friendly amendment** to shorten the letter by removing the second paragraph. Finkel and Lesnaw both **accepted** the friendly amendment. The Chair clarified that the letter would be sent directly to the Governor, with a carbon copy going to President Todd. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

Lesnaw moved **that** the SC send a copy of the letter to Board of Trustees Chair James Hardyman and ask that the Board of Trustees lend their strong support to the issue. Finkel **seconded**. The Chair said he would send the letter to BoT Chair Hardyman to the listserv for approval before mailing. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair said that he was presenting a standard by which SC meeting agendas would be developed and posted in the future; he invited comments or suggestions. He said that, as was current practice, the agenda would normally be posted on the Wednesday preceding a SC meeting. The Chair said that beginning immediately, agenda items could be added or deleted as long as they were presented to him by noon on the Friday before the meeting. The Chair said for any changes to the agenda after noon on Friday, he would respect any individual's request during the meeting that discussion be postponed. The only exception would be if a SC member moved to review/address the agenda item and a majority of SC members voted in favor. The Chair then asked for comments. No SC members objected.

## 2. [Calendar Committee Report](#)

The Chair invited Yanarella, chair of the Senate Council's ad hoc Calendar Committee, to offer background information on the report. Yanarella said that a suggestion had been formally made by the Student Government Association (SGA) to expand the time between the end of class work and the beginning of exam week. This was in addition to other revisions originally suggested for the fall, spring and both summer semesters; eventually, the summer session revisions would have impinged on the fall semester revisions. As the changes expanded, so did associated constituencies involved, such as the Office of the Registrar and the Office of Student Affairs. Individuals from those areas raised serious concerns and objections to the original suggestions from the Calendar Committee (CC). (Odoi arrived at this point.)

As a result, Yanarella asked the CC to take the objections into consideration. After meeting with representatives from the Offices of the Registrar and Student

Affairs, Yanarella said that the focus of the Calendar Committee (CC) ultimately became addressing the fall semester. Two options were presented for discussion. The representatives from the Registrar and Student Affairs said they could live with option #2 (#2), but it would raise significant problems with regard to revising pre-semester activities. They had a strong preference for option #1 (#1).

Yanarella said that a meeting could not be scheduled for the CC, so final deliberations were conducted via email. He ensured that he received input from all members. He said one member was concerned that no additional time was added to the time before dead week, an idea supported by many students.

Yanarella asked Odoi for insight into students' wishes. Odoi said that while it was difficult to get input on such issues from students in general, students in the SGA that he talked with preferred #1.

The Chair said that this was a serious issue. If approved by the SC, the Senate would see the proposed change to the calendar first as an item for discussion only, then as an action item at the next meeting. Finkel said that he thought both options were acceptable. He said that the Wednesday before Thanksgiving (TG) was usually a wasted day. Finkel said that while it was a minor issue, it was still problematic to decrease the number of teaching days.

The Chair invited Calendar Committee member Michael Kennedy to offer his input. Guest Kennedy said that he was in favor of #1. He said he had received comments that not only was the Wednesday before TG a wasted day, the Tuesday before TG was wasted, also. He said it did not effectively diminish the amount of teaching done in the fall semester, but would formally create an environment that currently existed, de facto. Kennedy said that students with families a long distance away would approve of the change.

Randall spoke against #1 and #2. He said that the proposals watered down teaching opportunities. The days prior to TG were lost only because faculty allowed them to be so; if students knew material taught on those days would be on an exam, they would attend. Randall said that it was inappropriate to increase tuition while decreasing the number of teaching days.

Yanarella said he appreciated Randall's comments. He acknowledged that there would be concern from some faculty over the decreased number of teaching days. He said that the revision aligned the number of teaching days in the fall semester with the number of days in the spring semester. Yanarella said that for the past six to eight years, there were a dissimilar number of teaching days in the fall and spring semesters. He said there were also faculty who felt that with regard to active learning, the quality of teaching ought not to be evaluated in terms of mechanical clock time.

Yanarella said, routinely, a significant amount of time was not genuinely devoted to teaching during TG break. He said that meaningful teaching time had also been eroded by the act of students not attending class; attendance on the Tuesday and Wednesday prior to TG normally decreased.

Aken said she stopped teaching courses in the spring semester, since she taught on Monday nights; she said it seemed like there was always a holiday on Monday, decreasing the number of days she could teach. She thought that not meeting at all during TG week could cause a loss of academic continuity. The Chair said there would always be a slippery slope; if the TG break began on Monday, would not students begin skipping the Friday before? He added that while researching the issue, he found an institution that required students who received an unexcused absence on the day before or after a holiday to earn one extra credit hour to be eligible to graduate.

Thelin said that one of the biggest changes to the university calendar occurred in the late 1960s in deference to the energy crisis, during which the semester ended in late January, after a two-week reading period. He said there was nothing sacred about reducing the teaching hours. Thelin wondered if students really needed a break in October, fairly soon after arriving on campus.

Lesnaw said she preferred #1. She said that faculty did not just gain one day from removing the one-day October fall break – they gained the Thursday prior to and the Monday after the October fall break, when students routinely skipped class. Grabau thought that parents would applaud the change. He said parents were paying the tuition and would still likely approve of an extended break at TG. Grabau said that he was also in favor of #1. Yanarella commented that the proposed change (if #1 were approved) would offer faculty a full week in the fall during which academic planning could take place.

Kennedy said that having a distinct week for a break was better than the current one-day fall break, during which some students routinely did not attend class on the days before and the Monday after. He said there would effectively be the same amount of teaching time.

Wood said that she preferred #1. However, she also expressed concern about losing a half week of classes. She said that most of the day's discussion had focused on undergraduate students; she never had a graduate student skip class around a holiday. She said graduate students could potentially lose up to 100 minutes of class time. Thelin sympathized with concerns about the erosion of the number of teaching days in the fall semester. He asked if there were any guidelines from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) regarding the number of teaching hours required per credit hour earned. Wood responded that SACS required 45 sessions of 50-minute teaching times. Yanarella opined that since the fall semester had more teaching days than

spring, and the spring semester was in compliance, shortening the fall semester by two teaching days to make it similar to spring would not be problematic.

Lesnaw commented that many graduate students carried heavy teaching assistant loads – she thought they would appreciate the TG break, also. In response to Randall, Yanarella said that while there was some discussion about keeping Monday and Tuesday as teaching days (and just using the Wednesday before TG as a “break”), it was thought that the whole week might as well be on the table, too. Liaison Greissman asked if individuals from Student Affairs were involved in the deliberations before the final report. Yanarella replied that he vetted both options with such representatives before taking it to CC members. The representatives all expressed a preference for #1, although #2 was doable.

Yanarella **moved** that option #1 (decrease fall teaching days by two, eliminate current fall break day and create new fall break during TG week) be sent to the Senate for discussion and then, subsequently, for a vote. Lesnaw **seconded**. Wood opined that it would be most appropriate to officially receive the CC report, before making any motions about it. The Chair then ruled that a motion to receive the report took precedence over discussing the report itself.

Yanarella **moved** that the Senate Council receive the final report of the Calendar Committee. Odoi **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair suggested that it was now appropriate to continue discussion about the motion to send #1 to the Senate. In response to Odoi, the Chair said that if the proposed revision to the university calendar were approved, the pertinent section of the *Senate Rules* would need to be changed. In response to Randall, Yanarella confirmed that #1 should go to the Senate with a positive recommendation. The Chair opined that it would be premature to offer a recommendation for a discussion-only agenda item; it would be better to offer the recommendation at the meeting during which the Senate would actually vote on the proposal.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to send Option #1 (decrease fall teaching days by two, eliminate current October fall break day and create new, weeklong fall break during TG week) to the Senate for discussion and then, subsequently, for a vote. The motion **passed** unanimously.

### 3. [Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 5.1.8.5.A.2 \(“Two-Year Window”\)](#)

The Chair explained that for several years, the SC had been receiving requests to waive *Senate Rule 5.1.8.5.A.2* (“two-year window”) for students whose retroactive withdrawal (RW) applications were submitted (either to their dean or to the Office of the Senate Council) within the two years, but could not be reviewed by the Senate’s Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee (SRWAC) within the two-year window. As a result of this situation, the Senate’s Rules and

Elections Committee (SREC) proposed revised language, which was recently reviewed positively by the SRWAC. The Chair invited Katherine McCormick, chair of the SRWAC, to offer additional information.

Guest McCormick said that the Chair's explanation was sufficient and she thanked the SC for reviewing the matter. She added that the SRWAC made some minor revisions to the language originally proposed by the SREC.

The Chair elaborated and said that the revised language would still keep intact the two-year window; it would strictly enforce the deadline of having a completed application submitted to the student's dean within the two-year window. Because it came from the SREC, no motion or second was needed.

Greissman wondered what would happen if a student thought they submitted a complete application, which was actually incomplete, within the two-year window. The Chair said that the RW appeal form and other resources explicitly described what documentation was required for the application to be considered "complete."

Odoi suggested that the website for the SRWAC include deadlines for the semesters that would be past the two-year window, to help students. After additional discussion, the Chair suggested that since the Office of the Senate Council was responsible for the maintenance of that website, McCormick could make that suggestion on behalf of the SRWAC.

A **vote** was taken on the motion from the SREC to change the language of *Senate Rule 5.1.8.5.A.2* as follows (and combine section B with A):

A (2) Requests for retroactive withdrawals ~~may not be granted after~~ shall be made of the Dean of the college in which the student was enrolled at the time the classes were taken. The complete request shall be made before a the student has graduated ~~or and beyond~~ not later than two calendar years from the last day of classes for the semester for which the withdrawal is requested. This fully complete request shall be submitted using the University Senate Retroactive Withdrawal Petition, along with the documentation required by the University Senate as described on that form (<http://www.uky.edu/eForms/forms/RWAform.pdf>).

~~B (1) Requests for retroactive withdrawal shall be made of the Dean of the college in which the student was enrolled at the time the classes were taken, on the form and with the documentation required by the University Senate. Requests for retroactive withdrawals shall be made through the University Senate—Retroactive Withdrawal Petition [US: 4/12/99] [<http://www.uky.edu/Fiscal/Shared/Forms/RWAform.pdf>]~~

The motion **passed** unanimously, with a positive recommendation. It will be presented to the University Senate for final approval. The Chair said that the

Office of the Senate Council would make necessary modifications to the RW application.

#### 4. [Proposed DRAFT of New Policy: Tenure Clock Delay](#)

The Chair said that this item had been discussed briefly during the previous semester. The proposal originated in the College of Arts and Sciences, but was collegially assumed by UCAPP as a recommendation that could be implemented quickly. He said that there were possible ramifications with regard to *Administrative Regulations (AR)* and *Governing Regulations (GR)*, so the handout available for SC members was draft language. Final language would be provided by the Office of Legal Counsel, but it would not be significantly different from what was available for the day's meeting; when the final language was available, it would go directly to the Senate. The Chair invited Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Heidi Anderson to speak on the proposed new policy.

Guest Anderson applauded the College of Arts and Sciences for its work to make such a policy a reality. She said that College of Arts and Sciences Associate Dean of Faculty Phil Harling gave Anderson the proposal in September, when she entered her administrative position. Ultimately the Faculty Subcommittee of the University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities took it up. UCAPP felt this proposal to be so important that it wanted to move forward quickly. Provost Subbaswamy requested that Anderson shepherd it along. Anderson said that additional language would be inserted so that notifications of a tenure clock delay would come through her office so the entire process would be monitored at a central location, not just within individual colleges. She also said that Librarians would be added to the list of those faculty lines eligible; the omission was a clerical error.

The Chair noted that Anderson was present to receive input on the proposed new policy; the SC and Senate could not approve or reject the policy.

In response to Wood, Anderson said that the proposed delay of the tenure clock would be available to men and women. Anderson said that the American Association of University Professors (AA&P) had guidelines for the creation, implementation and monitoring of such a policy. That was where she found a lot of pertinent information that was ultimately included in the proposed policy.

Harley expressed concern that the policy could be perceived as ageist – it was aimed primarily at faculty who were becoming parents. She asked how it would be beneficial for a faculty member at the other end of the life spectrum, one who might wish for time off to care for an elderly parent. Anderson said that the policy refers to “guardianship,” but care was taken to not specifically describe who was involved in the guardianship – it could apply to a faculty member having guardianship of an elderly parent. She added that UK's Family Medical Leave (FML) policy supported guardianship as it related to caring for an elderly family member.

In response to a couple of questions, Anderson said that in discussions with T. Lynn Williamson in the Office of Legal Counsel, Williamson assured her that use of FML had always stopped the tenure clock, and would continue to do so. Grabau wondered how many assistant professors would take advantage of such a benefit, since such a delay could be seen as detrimental to seeking tenure. He wondered how a delay would be different from changing the tenure timeline so that it was eight years long (two years longer than the current six years), with the understanding that a faculty member could apply early for tenure, in year six. Thelin opined that such an extension would begin to spiral out of control.

Randall said that keeping the specific six-year limit on time spent working towards tenure was preferable and reasonable. He said it helped faculty members understand where they were in the process. He supported extending the tenure clock for specific individuals in certain situations, but not for an indefinite extension for all. Aken said that Dean Diedrichs rarely approved a faculty member going up for tenure a year early. Aken thought a faculty member could perceive "going early" as a penalty.

Harley said that the language regarding guardianship and care for elderly parents was not clear enough. She said that the language must be explicitly clear that taking care of elderly parents was also a sufficient reason to delay the tenure clock. Anderson said she would discuss the issue with Legal Counsel to make sure it was included, either in the new policy language or that it was already apparent in the *AR* and/or *GR*. (Grabau left the meeting at this point.)

Wood expressed concern that if an untenured faculty member's dossier went forward with substandard evaluations, the faculty member would be penalized. A faculty member who took advantage of the delay could be told that sufficient work had been performed, but that s/he had two additional years in which to do it. In response to Anderson asking if the language should be strengthened, Wood said she was not sure of the best way to address it. Wood just wanted to ensure that a faculty member was not punished for utilizing a delay of the tenure clock if their dean was influenced by rates of publications instead of the total amount of publications.

There was a brief discussion about whether or not delaying the tenure clock should be information that is part of the dossier. Greissman thought that referring to it in the chair's letter could help explain the reason for the extended tenure-seeking period to the tenure-decision committee. Anderson said that the AAU&P's guidelines specifically stated that such information should not be mentioned, in order to help create a culture change. Wood thought it was imperative to offer that information to external reviewers.

Due to there being only a small amount of time left in the meeting and more agenda items to discuss, the Chair asked that additional comments be sent to



him; he would forward them on to Anderson. Anderson thanked the Chair for the discussion and departed.

##### 5. [Proposed Resolution from the Senate's Library Committee](#)

The Chair invited Randall, chair of the Senate's Library Committee (SLC), to introduce the proposed resolution.

Randall said that the SLC looked at ways to support UK's library system, one of the few systems on campus used by almost all faculty and students. He added that it worked well, so it rarely received a lot of attention. The language preceding the resolution was background information for the SC; only the resolution itself needed to go to the Senate. Randall said that the library system needed more monographs and increased faculty and support staff. He added that he would leave it up to the Chair as to whether or not the "whereas" statements would be included in the resolution presented to the Senate. Randall readily acknowledged that the resolution requested preferential support of and resources for the library.

Randall then **moved** that the resolution from the Senate's Library Committee (minus the background information) be sent with a positive recommendation to the Senate for a vote of endorsement. Lesnaw **seconded**. Wood commented that the statement about a Science/Engineering library in the King Addition could be controversial. She said that faculty members in the math sciences had written to the Provost, protesting such an implementation. She offered a **friendly amendment** to remove that phrase. Randall and Lesnaw **accepted**.

A **vote** was taken to send the resolution below to the Senate with a positive recommendation:

Be it resolved that the University of Kentucky Faculty Senate endorses the following statements of support for the University Libraries, and that this endorsement be forwarded to the President and the Provost as they consider the priorities implicit in the current strategic planning process:

The University Senate supports the assertion that to be a Top 20 Institution, the University of Kentucky must have, and invest in, a Top 20 library, as measured by criteria agreed to by the Provost and the Dean of Libraries; and given the vital and holistic role of the libraries in achieving University goals and the acknowledgement in the Top 20 business plan that further investment in facilities is a prerequisite to accomplishing these goals, the University Faculty Senate recommends that in the current strategic planning process, the President and Provost explicitly consider:

- a. That the need for further facilities investment also extends to the library system, specifically as pertains to the construction of an off-site state-of-the-art storage facility to house library materials and

the collection, space, and personnel needed to fully support both new faculty and an expanding undergraduate student population.

b. That the library will need additional personnel 1) to support the needs of increasing numbers of teaching faculty and undergraduate students, and 2) to fulfill its instructional mission across the entire academic experience and moreso, to fully participate in the information literacy goals for undergraduate education as described in the UK-LEAP white paper.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

7. [Tentative March 19 Senate Agenda](#)

The Chair stated that the option put forth by the CC should be added to the tentative Senate agenda and SC members agreed. Lesnaw **moved** that the tentative Senate agenda for March 19 be approved as an ordered list, with the understanding that any additions would be vetted through the SC listserv. Odoi **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair said that the tabled motion from the beginning of the meeting should be voted on before adjournment. Wood **moved to untable** the motion about a SC meeting on March 12. Lesnaw **seconded**. A **vote** was taken on the **motion** that the Senate Council not meet on March 12. The motion **passed** unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi,  
Senate Council Chair

SC Members present: Aken, Finkel, Grabau, Harley, Lesnaw, Randall, Tagavi, Thelin, Wood, Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Non-SC members present: Heidi Anderson, Michael Kennedy, Katherine McCormick.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, March 07, 2007.