

Senate Council
November 26, 2007

The Senate Council met at 3 pm on Monday, November 26, 2007 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Kaveh A. Tagavi called the meeting to order at 3:07 pm. The Chair said that the minutes from November 19 were not yet ready for review by Senate Council (SC) members, but would be available at the December 3 meeting. There were also some announcements.

Due to an administrative oversight, the Bluegrass Community and Technical Colleges September 2007 list of candidates for credentials was not submitted to the Senate Council (SC) to be placed on the agenda for a University Senate (Senate) meeting. Therefore, the Chair approved the list on behalf of the elected faculty senators.

With regard to absences, the Chair reported that Piascik would be absent, Lesnaw had to leave early and Finkel would be very late or absent.

The Chair invited Michael, the chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, to offer an update on SC officer nominations/elections. Michael noted that he had sent out a handout with eligible nominees to SC members earlier. He answered a few questions.

2. [Change Method of Appointment to Graduate Faculty](#)

The Chair invited Graduate School Dean Jeannine Blackwell to offer information on the proposal. Guest Blackwell said that it had been to the SC earlier in the year and had come back with revisions. She said that the Chair had offered a variety of editorial and grammatical corrections, all of which she accepted as friendly amendments.

Dean Blackwell said that she wanted to clarify memberships in section F, which could be primary or secondary. She said that it applied to a faculty member having met all the criteria for appointment to graduate faculty and was nominated and invited by a program. She said it also indicated that someone in a program that did not offer a graduate degree could be invited to be a graduate faculty member for another program, upon invitation.

In response to Lesnaw, Blackwell confirmed that such an individual could serve as a chair of a committee, so long as the person had a primary appointment in that program. As far as special circumstances were concerned, such as a committee needing a faculty member with special skills who did not have a primary appointment, Dean Blackwell said she would allow it and has in the past, so long as the faculty member was part of the graduate faculty.

Lesnaw asked Dean Blackwell to offer more information on term limits for appointments and how a program could remove someone who was not appropriately participating. Dean Blackwell replied that if someone was appointed to the graduate faculty at the associate level, the term would be for three years. Toward the end of the term, the Graduate School (GS) would contact the program and inquire as to whether or not the individual should continue. She said the GS relied on the program's faculty to determine criteria for promotion, etc. and to make related decisions. If a full member needed to be removed, she said the simplest way to do so would be to sit down with the faculty member and note that to be absolutely correct with respect to published responsibilities, it would be best for the faculty member to remove their name from the program and send a resignation to the dean of the GS. While that was the simplest way, the graduate faculty could hold a recorded vote about ending full membership, but she did not know of such an occurrence in recent memory. She said that language was not included in the section.

Lesnaw suggested that such language be incorporated, and a discussion on the matter followed. Dean Blackwell mildly objected, saying that having full graduate faculty status was intended to be permanent, similar to tenure. She said that it would be an exceptional case in which membership would be revoked, which would need to involve the GS dean, especially if removal of membership was not voluntary. She greatly preferred dealing with such situations on an ad hoc basis.

Theilin offered a suggestion that a student could simply be counseled not to invite a particular graduate faculty member, if there were problems with that person, but Aken noted that would not help if the advance knowledge of a problem was not had by the faculty member counseling the student. Lesnaw said that participation in the graduate faculty at the program level involved distribution of resources, how the program was advertised, and how rotations should best be dealt with.

Dean Blackwell said there were many instances where removal was the appropriate thing to do, but it should be a decision by the program. The program should establish criteria for admission, reappointment, continuation, etc. and should be codified at the programmatic level, which the GS dean could enforce. She said all past problems with members of the graduate faculty had been resolved informally through negotiations and without explicitly codified procedures.

Wood asked about the language for a terminal degree. After brief discussion with Dean Blackwell and other SC members, the Dean agreed to change¹ the wording in section A (that refers to the eligibility requirements) to "The ~~doctor's~~ doctoral degree or its equivalent in scholarly reputation."

¹ Strikethrough indicates deleted text and underlining denotes new text.

Thelin stated that there were a number of retired senior faculty members who were in graduate programs. He asked about how such faculty members were accommodated and whether they could chair a committee. Dean Blackwell replied that membership for one year after retirement was allowed for continuation and service on currently extant committees that were finishing up. She said she was very lenient and that such decisions were made on a case-by-case basis. She said that if a faculty member retired but was planning on remaining in Lexington, had a post-retirement appointment and was active in the program she would allow that individual to continue graduate faculty membership as long as they were associated with UK. If the person moved far away, it could be problematic for the student, although it very much depended on how engaged the faculty member was. She said she recalled one faculty member who paid their way to return to Lexington for defenses for years after retiring. She said that UK should want those types of faculty to continue their work. She said that those retiring faculty with many committee assignments were asked to go over their committee responsibilities with the GS dean prior to retiring, to see if there were any committees that the faculty member could retire from. She added that some faculty, however, did not wish to be involved whatsoever after retiring.

In response to Thelin's question about continuity concerns for a student who might be very close to finishing, Blackwell said that unless the faculty member was in town and had a post-retirement appointment, she would require that a local co-chair be appointed so the student would have continuity and the possibility of day-to-day contact with someone at UK.

In response to Lesnaw, Dean Blackwell said that she did not think such language was in the proposal currently being reviewed, but rather that it was in the director of graduate studies' policy and on the GS web site.

After a brief discussion about the effective date, Randall **moved** to send the change to the method of appointment to graduate faculty, with Wood and the Chair's changes, to the University Senate for approval with a positive recommendation, to be effective immediately. Michael **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously with seven in favor.

[3. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 3.2.0 & 3.3.0 \(Procedures for Processing Course and Program Changes\)](#)

There was a brief discussion. Mrs. Brothers handed out a memo from the Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC) regarding some concerns about the proposal in its present form. As a result, Wood **moved** to send the proposal back to the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee for further review. Yanarella **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously with six in favor.

The Chair then asked if SC were willing to discuss changes to the "Going Forward" document that was approved at the November 19 SC meeting that outlined future steps for creating and approving a reformed USP proposal. He

noted that it would be more concise if the language about how and when comments would be solicited were incorporated into "Going Forward." There was a brief discussion in which Wood suggested an editorial change for clarity, but there were no other suggested modifications.

Randall **moved** to approve the integrated document as revised by Wood. Aken **seconded**. The Chair asked SC members again to raise any objections if there were other suggestions. There being none, a **vote** was taken on the motion to approve the incorporated "Going Forward" document. The motion **passed** unanimously with seven in favor.

There being no further items to discuss, Wood **moved** to adjourn. Yanarella **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously with seven in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh A. Tagavi,
Senate Council Chair

Senate Council members present: Aken, Dembo, Harley, Michael, Lesnaw, Randall, Tagavi, Thelin, Yanarella and Wood.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guest present: Jeannine Blackwell.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on November 30, 2007.