

Senate Council Minutes
December 15, 2003

The Senate Council met on Monday, December 15, 2003 from 3:00 pm to 5:00 pm in the Gallery of the W.T. Young Library and took the following actions:

The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:05 pm.

1. Approval of the Minutes from December 1, 2003

Jones asked if Tagavi was satisfied with the changes to the minutes. Tagavi said he was. Ms. Scott said she had amended the section of the minutes pertaining to Tagavi's discussion with Watt about the need for faculty approval prior to academic reorganization verbatim from corrections provided to her by Tagavi via e-mail. The minutes stood approved as amended.

Announcements:

The Chair reported the Annual Board and Senates' Holiday Reception went well, despite modest attendance.

The Chair reported that there will soon be review of the Administrative Regulations, to be done in the same manner as the Governing Regulations. This will require Senate input, and the Chair asked the Council how the review should be assigned, that is, would the Council prefer to determine which Administrative Regulations should be assigned to certain Senate Committees or they would rather delegate that task to himself and Jones. The Council members asked the Chair and Jones to do so.

2. Winter Intersession:

The Chair noted the Senate's role in approving the academic calendar and proposed changes to the calendar. He expressed the need to have the academic calendars approved at the February meeting and opened the floor for discussion on this issue.

Saunier expressed concern regarding the limited time in which the class will be taught and wondered how students could study 2 to 3 hours for each hour they spend in class when they would potentially be in class 4 hours a day. She also expressed concern about allowing students who were not successful in 16-week courses to take those courses during a 2-week session.

Other Senate Council members expressed concern regarding the feasibility of having an add/drop period for the short session, while others wondered if the excused absence policy would be affected given the concentration of teaching days into the short time-frame. The Senate Council members offered a variety of suggestions on how to make the proposal more attractive, which the Chair agreed to detail in a letter to the Provost.

Tagavi **moved** to forward this item to the Senate at its February meeting with a negative recommendation, pending more information and input from the Provost. The motion was **seconded** by Kaalund. After further discussion by the Council members in which they provided more wording for the letter to the Provost, the motion **passed** with Edgerton opposed. He specified that his opposition was to the negative recommendation and not the motion.

Tagavi made a **motion** that the Senate Council should appoint a task force composed of faculty, students, administrators, advisors and a representative from the Registrar's Office to consider the issues of devising alternative academic calendars. Kaalund **seconded** the motion. Tagavi added the specification that this committee would be an ad hoc committee of the Senate and be appointed by the Senate Council. The Chair agreed to coordinate the formation of the committee through the Senate Council office. The motion **passed** without dissent. Tagavi and Kaalund agreed to serve as committee co-chairs.

3. Voluntary faculty:

Cibull moved to send the document forward as written. Debski seconded the motion. Discussion followed in which Jones suggested some changes to the document. Saunier offered some editorial suggestions to make the document more consistent with itself. Various Council members discussed the differences between departments and divisions. Cibull noted the documents applicability to only voluntary faculty and not regular faculty or special title series faculty. Cibull did express concern over Item #6 in the document and raised some questions to which the answers were not known. He volunteered to find the answers and forward them to the Chair. The Council members offered various substantive and editorial suggestions, which Jones will compile. A new draft will be linked to these minutes.

After further discussion Debski **moved** to table the item until the new draft can be seen and the questions raised by Cibull can be answered. Kaalund **seconded** the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

Other business:

The next meeting of the Senate Council will be Monday, January 12, 2004 in the Gallery of the W.T. Young Library.

Kaalund requested his motion be tabled until the January 12 meeting.

4. Course/Program approval:

The following academic actions were **approved** without dissent:

Suspension/Deletion of program: Business option for Kinesiology and Health Promotion

Dropping Course: KHP 280

Proposed Distance Learning course: CHE 107

Additional PhD Model Option: History's proposal to offer Model II

These items will be posted to the University Senate web site for the usual approval process.

5. Honorarium:

The Chair provided the background for this item and shared the e-mails he received from Brenda Teague and Dick Siemer regarding this issue. The Chair said he has expressed the concern of the faculty to Siemer, who previously thought this was a simple issue of codifying an existing policy. The Chair said he will discuss the issue with Siemer during their meeting on December 16, 2003 and will relay the results of that meeting to the Senate Council.

Jones provided additional history on this subject, including his communications with Henry Clay Owen. Jones said he expressed his concern to Owen that since this policy would potentially be housed in the Business Procedures Manual it does not currently have a mechanism by which it would be circulated to faculty for their input. He said Owen agreed with that assessment and said there was time available for faculty comment.

The Chair said he will speak with Siemer to determine how best to accomplish this process.

Other Business:

The Chair asked Yanarella to discuss his committee's report and when he would like to send it forward. Yanarella requested this item be on the January 12, 2004 Senate Council agenda to discuss the particulars.

Cibull expressed concern that the committee report did not outline possible funding solutions. He requested concrete recommendations be made before the report leaves Senate Council.

Yanarella responded by outlining some of the challenges faced by his committee, including the various concerns expressed by the committee about becoming involved in budgetary issues. He said one of their concerns was that the budgetary process as it exists now is not transparent. Another was the committee's hesitance to offer generalized solutions, like suggesting more money be solicited from Frankfort. He said the committee also doubted its own expertise to make certain budgetary recommendations. He also suggested the committee might have been concerned about being seen as helping legitimize a distasteful budgetary solution during a time of budgetary austerity. He also cited

time constraints and end-of-semester timing issues as impediments to presenting actual budgetary solutions.

The Chair suggested using the committee's report as a starting point for further thought, and added that a new committee could be formed to investigate budgetary solutions. Cibull recommended some non-traditional funding ideas and expressed his concern for the lack of identified funding sources in the committee's report. Kennedy suggested contacting Merl Hackbart to solicit his participation if a new committee gets appointed to discuss this issue. He then provided an outline of how benchmark funding occurs from the Council on Post-Secondary Education.

Other Business:

Watts reported on the current work being done on the Honor Code and the Graduation Contract. Watts said the committee was currently working to iron the wrinkles out of the Graduation Contract and that PR for the program will begin in the Spring. Watts expressed her appreciation for the job being done by Richard Greissman to implement the Graduation Contract.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:12 pm.

Respectfully submitted by
Jeffrey Dembo, Chair

Members present: Cibull, Debski, Dembo, Edgerton, Jones, Kaalund, Kennedy, Saunier, Tagavi, Watts and Yanarella.

Prepared by Rebecca Scott on December 16, 2003.

Attachment:

Plain text is the existing Administrative Regulation AR II-1.0-11.II.R

Bold text is the Provost's suggested new language

Underlined italics is the Senate Council's suggested new language

~~Strikethrough~~ is the Senate Council's suggested deletion

R. Voluntary Faculty

Voluntary faculty members are those who have an official faculty appointment in ~~a college~~ an educational unit for which no salary is received and who devote part of their time to a program. Such faculty members usually are self-employed or hold full-time positions with other institutions and agencies. The procedures for appointment, reappointment and promotion of voluntary faculty at the various academic ranks generally parallel those for the regular or special title series, except for those prescribed below and that outside letters of evaluation, faculty letters of evaluation and reference to an Area Committee are not required for appointments, ~~and reappointments,~~ and promotions.

1. A chair/division will bring the name, C.V. and completed Voluntary Faculty Application form of a potential voluntary faculty member to a regularly scheduled meeting of the unit faculty or, upon delegation by the unit faculty, a meeting of the faculty of a division within the educational unit. The chair/division administrator chief will propose a suitable rank for the individual under consideration. The faculty will discuss the individual's background and credentials, and will vote on the candidate's suitability for the appointment at a specific rank.

2. If a three quarters majority of the faculty of the unit or division support the appointment, the chair, or as appropriate the division administrator, will notify the dean.

3. The dean will appoint, by letter, the individual as a Voluntary Faculty member. The appointments ~~would be automatically~~ will be annually renewable by the dean up to a five-year period, ~~unless the voluntary faculty member had any licensure or malpractice issue, unless the dean received an unfavorable report, or unless a majority of the voting the faculty of the department/division votes that the appointment not be renewed. The faculty of the department/division may at any time consider the qualifications of wishes to consider a voluntary faculty member for promotion to higher rank. Reappointment beyond five years shall be reinitiated as described in steps 1 and 2, above.~~

4. The chair or division administrator will review the records and participation of the voluntary faculty on an annual basis to assess the level of involvement and any licensure or malpractice issues and will bring any individuals who the chair considers merit promotion to the attention of the faculty for consideration.

5. The dean will report ~~a summary~~ of all voluntary faculty appointments to the Board of Trustees on an annual basis.

6. In rare cases where the proposed voluntary faculty requires attending privileges at the University of Kentucky Hospital, the dean will forward the nomination to the Hospital Chief of Staff. The Hospital Chief of Staff will confirm that the individual has the appropriate credentialing and will initiate the internal process to obtain approval by the Board of Trustees.

Criteria for academic ranks of voluntary faculty shall be approved by the Provost, acting on the recommendation of the faculty of the initiating educational unit. ~~Appointments/reappointments may be made for three years.~~ Voluntary faculty are not eligible for tenure, usual faculty benefits, or membership in the University Senate. However, faculty membership, with or without voting privileges, may be extended to voluntary faculty by the educational units to which they are assigned.