

MINUTES
UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
October 2, 1979

The University Senate Council met in regular session at 3:00 p. m. in the Board Room, Administration Building, and took the following actions:

1) Minutes: University Senate Council, September 25, 1979

Approved as circulated the minutes of September 25, 1979.

2) Proposed additions to Administrative Regulations (AR II 1.0-1) relative to Research Title Series

Chairman Krislov suggested that for purposes of organization and clarity the Council consider each of the items (A through H) separately. The following comments and suggestions were made:

A. Introduction

No comment.

B. Definition

The phrase "other designated funds" was discussed. Concern was expressed that it was vague and perhaps should be made clearer what "other designated funds" might include. Two categories suggested were: gift grants and general fund monies designated as line items in the budget.

Other related comments included the following:

a) Up to six months, support monies for Research Title Series personnel could come out of the University budget.

b) Why should one want to designate or be specific if one is talking about "tide-over" money?

c) At present those kinds of funds are available from the Graduate Dean or UKRF.

d) Undoubtedly there will be gaps; the word approved is underlined which is a safeguard.

A second point discussed was the following: In the second sentence, ". . . regularly scheduled, conventional teaching or service assignments," what does the word conventional mean? Comments follow.

- a) I interpret it to mean that such an appointee could give lectures occasionally, but that the person would not be involved in teaching a regular course.
- b) The key phrase in the sentence is "regularly scheduled." Perhaps the word conventional is redundant.
- c) There was considerable discussion on this point in the Research Committee deliberations. The thrust of the recommendation to the Senate was to preclude regular teaching for such a position.

Suggestions approved on this item:

- 1) That the Senate Council recommend the removal of the word normally in the first sentence, item (2). The word suggests exceptions and other time periods.
- 2) That the Senate Council recommend the removal of the word conventional in the second sentence.

It was also suggested that the definition may be too restrictive and that some allowance be made for occasional service and non-regular teaching. For example: "This does not preclude that the person participate in a laboratory setting or seminar series."

- 3) It was also recommended that the third sentence (96 words) have additional punctuation. One suggestion was to put a period at the end of the phrase designated funds and begin a new sentence with "However, in such circumstances . . ."

C. Establishment of a Position

One Council member expressed concern that if an applicant for a grant had to wait for confirmation before actively seeking the personnel appointments (Research Professors) actual work on the research may be postponed as much as half a year. Considerable discussion followed on this during which the following comments were made:

- a) Why do we worry about appointments when money is available?
- b) The grant application and approval process involve the positions themselves. Why does the process need further approval?
- c) Should the appointments to Research Title Series have to be processed through channels as the Regular Title Series (i. e., through administrative channels to the Board) or would these appointments be processed as personnel is now in extramural grant/contract situations?
- d) I think the administration should have the "nay-say" on Research Title Series. I just think some adjustment could be made to speed the appointment process so that research time is not lost.
- e) Isn't this analogous to recruiting so far as procedure is concerned? i. e., you ask for permission to recruit through administrative channels and actual dollars are negotiated later?
- f) This is a Research Title Series whereas many people employed in a grant position are not going to be Research Title personnel.
- g) Different time factors in grant proposals were pointed out. Some are approved in January with a beginning date in July. This would allow sufficient time to recruit additional research personnel. On the other hand, if a grant is approved in June with a starting date of July 1, it is obvious that the recruiting process would postpone research activity on the grant.
- h) By the time one follows the affirmative action policy of the University for recruiting and advertises for the position, screens, interviews, and has an appointment processed through internal channels, one is dealing with as much as a six month lag time.
- i) One basis for the proposal from the Research Committee was to encourage and generate research in areas that are weak and need additional support.

Suggestions approved on this item:

- 1) To express concern about the time it takes to process appointment papers and to recommend that active recruiting of personnel (Research Title Series) be initiated prior to the actual awarding of the grant/contract.

2) It was agreed that the question of personnel involved in Graduate Centers and Institutes be raised and whether these people would be eligible for appointment in the Research Title Series, and if so, how would they be attached to an educational unit.

D. Areas of Activity

There was little comment and no recommendations were forthcoming on this item.

E. Academic Ranks, Special Titles and Criteria

Chairman Krislov expressed concern that these people will have to have the Ph.D. to be employed, when in fact many areas appoint personnel in the Regular Title Series ABD. Would such a requirement hinder recruiting efforts? Is there any reason for such a requirement?

One Council member pointed out that the word "should" is used, which is permissive and should cover exceptions.

Chairman Krislov asked Professor Grieves how many of the people in IMMR have Ph.D.'s, to which Professor Grieves responded "approximately 15 of the 40."

Professor Grieves said that he would like to see the entire section made analogous to the Regular Title Series as it applies to research (criteria-wise).

In reference to this suggestion, it was pointed out that the section is analogous to the Special Title Series appointments except as it applies to research.

Suggestions on this item

1) At first it was affirmed that Professor Grieves' suggestion be recommended, but this was withdrawn after subsequent discussion. No recommendation on this.

F. Procedures for Appointment and Promotion

Chairman Krislov expressed concern about the additional burden that would be placed on the Academic Area Advisory Committees as a result of this section.

One Council member indicated that he did not see a big burden in numbers--that we would not be dealing with that many people.

The suggestion of a campus-wide committee was rejected in favor of the current system.

Chairman Krislov raised a second issue. He indicated his dubiousness about permitting these people to supervise theses and dissertations. Grants run out and the Research Professor may disappear. Who will complete supervision of the student's thesis? Moreover, there may be some resentment of the regular faculty about their non-involvement and the student will suffer. Perhaps the difficulty can be solved by providing that they may "co-direct" theses and dissertations.

The Council agreed generally with this point, but suggested the concern be resolved by indicating that the appointee be approved as an associate member and not a full member of the Graduate Faculty. This would preclude his eligibility to direct theses and dissertations.

Suggestions on this item:

- 1) That the appointee be recommended and approved for associate membership in the Graduate Faculty rather than full membership.

G. Terms of Appointment

No comment. No recommendations.

H. Conditions of Employment

Professor Krislov indicated that he would prefer that the directive instruct educational units to establish a policy regarding participation in an educational unit rather than suggest, as the second paragraph does, that the decision be made on an ad hoc basis.

Most Council members disagreed.

Another Council member pointed out that the TIAA-CREF benefits do not necessarily do a foreign person any good. For those people who are in this country for a short-term research experience, they may not wish to have TIAA-CREF deducted from their salaries. Is it possible to make the retirement contribution optional?

It was pointed out that this suggestion is not possible because of the way the actual policy is written.

Suggestions on this item:

None.

One additional suggestion was made and affirmed by the Council, to wit: That a termination clause be added to Section F--one that addresses incompetence rather than the natural termination when a grant expires.

3) LAW 966 and LAW 826: Consideration of

Professor Kemp reported that in LAW 966, the only problem is with assigning the same number to a different course; this may cause confusion on students' transcripts. He consulted with Professor Fortune who suggested changing the number to LAW 970 in order to avoid any confusion.

With regard to LAW 826, some question was raised about the correct title, but no substantive objections were raised.

Pending clarification of course number (966) and title correction (826), motion was made to approve the proposed courses. Motion was seconded and passed.

4) PS 399: Pass/Fail

Without discussion, motion was made and seconded to approve the course PS 399 as a Pass/Fail only offering. Motion passed.

5) MS in Home Economics:

Without discussion motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the proposed changes in the MS degree in Home Economics.

6) New Business

Chairman Krislov indicated that he had received a letter from Professor Schwert which brought to his attention a problem that has come up. The problem is as follows: ". . . that the Personnel Division has recently interjected itself into the procedure of hiring postdoctoral research associates paid from extramural funds and has dictated salaries which may be paid to such people. . . . Intervention by the Personnel Division not only complicates hiring but it brings to bear on a recruiting problem a lack of expertise for which the University of Kentucky has few compensating recruiting advantages."