

Notes on Senate Council Meeting on March 31, 2008

1. The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:15 pm. Members present: Aken (SA), Chappell (JC), Finkel (RF), Randall (DR), Tagavi (KT, chair), Wood (CW) and Yanarella (EY). Richard Greissman also attended on behalf of the Provost. Debra Anderson (DA), Jeff Dembo (JD) and Peggy Piascik (PP) informed the chair in advance that they would be unable to attend.
2. The minutes of the SC meeting of March 24, 2008 were approved, as amended.
3. Guest, Jacquie Hager, Associate Registrar attended to assist the SC with issues that might have arisen with respect to the lists of candidates for May and August degrees from the University of Kentucky (see lists in SC Agenda for 3/31/2008 for May and August degrees). One misspelling of a candidate's name was duly noted by Ms. Hager. CW noted that no changes should be allowed from the University Senate floor when the issue comes to vote. M (JC) / S (EY) and Carried (6-0-0) to forward the lists to the University Senate with favorable recommendation. The Chair noted that the lists would be entered on the Web for 6 days prior to the next meeting of the University Senate.
4. Consideration of the revised language for appointment to full graduate faculty was tabled until next meeting of SC so that SC members could consider the revised wording carefully.
5. The members of SC considered at length the wording of Item 1 of the Provost's "[Faculty Policies](#)" white paper in light of comments received from various colleges of the University of Kentucky, from various individual faculty members and the thoughts presented by KT, the individual previously assigned formal responsibility for synthesizing responses to Item 1. There was general agreement among all of SC members present with the Provost's position that every faculty member was entitled to "at least" one "full and comprehensive review" as part of the tenure process. While it appeared implicit in Item 1 that this full and comprehensive review referred to a review conducted during the sixth appointment year, broad concern was evident among the members of the group that there were circumstances where a second such review would be appropriate. Particular discussion focused on the possible situation where an Associate Professor was put forward for "early" promotion (e.g., during his/her fourth year), and was refused promotion. Under what circumstances would that member be allowed a second "full and comprehensive review?"

DR moved the following: "That the Provost be informed that Senate Council is generally receptive to Item 1, but that Senate Council would like some provision inserted that would allow a second comprehensive review if an early decision were negative." Motion was seconded (EY), and engendered discussion. CW moved to amend the motion to read "That the Provost be informed that Senate Council is generally receptive to Item 1, but that Senate Council would like some provision inserted that would allow a second comprehensive review at all levels, without prejudice, if an early decision were negative." The proposed amendment was seconded (SA) and passed (6-0-0). CW moved to amend the motion to read as follows: "Relative to the sixth year review, that the Provost be informed that Senate Council is generally receptive to Item 1, but that Senate Council would like some provision inserted that would allow a second comprehensive review at all levels, without prejudice, if an early decision were negative." The motion died for want of second.

The revised motion "That the Provost be informed that Senate Council is generally receptive to Item 1, but that Senate Council would like some provision inserted that would allow a second comprehensive review at all levels, without prejudice, if an early decision were negative" was called to a vote, and passed (5-0-1).

Members of the Senate Council then discussed Item 4 of the Provost's "Faculty Policies" white paper in light of comments received from various colleges of the University of Kentucky, from various individual faculty members and the thoughts presented by email by PP, the member of SC assigned responsibility for this item. CW stated that it was not appropriate to exclude the Dean of the Graduate School from contributing to the tenure process, particularly in cases where the candidate had a significant research and graduate education component in his/her DOE. Discussion on this point ensued, which discussion revealed that the perception of the SC members present was that the Dean was by no means excluded where his/her input was appropriate. It was M (RF), S (SA) "That Senate Council report to the Provost that we are in general agreement with Item 4." Motion carried (5-1-0).

RG asked that the Chair forward a summary of the discussion regarding Items 1 and 4. It was decided that a copy of the notes of this session of SC should be sent to the Provost as soon as possible.

5. SC adjourned at 4:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted

David C. Randall