

MINUTES  
UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL  
October 30, 1979

The University Senate Council met at 3:00 p.m. in room "F," 18th Floor, Patterson Office Tower, and took the following actions:

1) Privilege and Tenure Advisory Committee Report: George Mitchell

Chairman Krislov introduced Professor George Mitchell, former Chairman of Privilege and Tenure (1978-79) who made the following comments:

a) In the past, recommendations from the Privilege and Tenure Committee have been accepted by the administration. This past year, the recommendations from the committee, generally, were not accepted.

b) There were nine (9) cases before P&T this year--two of which were in progress at the beginning of the year. One recurred, so it became both years' case.

Of the nine cases, five (5) originally requested that their cases be referred to the appropriate Area Committee for further review. Of those five, three (3) were Assistant Professors in the position of "up or out" and two (2) were Associate Professors who were being considered for the rank of Full Professor. (Professor Mitchell added that in the latter two cases, there were non-academic factors involved.)

One case was a dismissal case. It was reasonably clear-cut. We considered and recommended on it, but there was an intervening resignation which superceded the P&T involvement.

One case was an Assistant Professor with a violation of "normal" privilege in office security. The parties involved who were "guilty" had left; those who remained tried to help in this situation as much as they were able.

There was one case that boiled down to a salary dispute and as far as I know, it is still in litigation.

One involved the credentials of a person and we recommended against and our recommendation was upheld by the administration.

c) Of most interest to us as a committee were the three cases of the Assistant Professors--"up or out." They were requesting that their credentials be forwarded out of the college to the Area Committee. We (as a committee) recognize this as being routine procedure and addressed ourselves to that. The administration declined to forward the credentials to the Area Committees. In two cases, special committees were appointed to review them.

- \*Recommendation from Committee: That unfavorable tenure cases at the Assistant Professor level be carried forward at the request of the professor. As far as the committee could determine, the six year rule for Associate Professors currently in the Regulations is the closest the Regulations come to enabling the appeal to be carried forward; the Associate Professor has the prerogative to ask for and receive Area Committee review. Assistant Professors do not.

When asked who turns down the request to forward, Professor Mitchell responded that it was the dean of the college.

Professor Mitchell went on to say that four (4) cases the P&T Committee recommended to be forwarded were not. My understanding is that up until several years ago, it was generally accepted policy to forward all cases; now the deans have been instructed not to forward those cases (with negative recommendations from the department and deans level) to the Area Committees. There is some ambiguity in the Regulations concerning these recent policies, because the flow chart outlining the channels through which the promotion and tenure process goes is based on everything going forward.

Professor Mitchell went on to say that he understands that Professor Sears is currently working on the flow chart to make clear what alternatives/options are available to the Assistant Professor; however, he does not know if the chart is being re-worked with the idea of a change in policy or whether the chart is being re-worked as a clarifying device.

Professor Krislov suggested that he ask Professor Sears about the chart and its status and whether it is being changed or clarified. The Council concurred with this suggestion. Professor Krislov will speak with Professor Sears.

Having no further questions, the Council thanked Professor Mitchell and he departed.

2) LAW 950

Professor Kemp reported briefly that the proposed change in LAW 950 involved a change of credits only and he recommended approval of the request.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40546

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE

RESIDENT INSTRUCTION  
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION  
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

DEPARTMENT OF ANIMAL SCIENCES  
907 Agricultural Science Building-South  
(606) 258-2686

December 6, 1979

Dr. Joseph Krislov  
Chairman  
University Senate Council  
10 Administration Bldg.  
Campus 00320

Dear Dr. Krislov:

During my 1978-79 tenure as chairman of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, I was contacted by 17 individual faculty members. Nine of these contacts resulted in formal requests to the full committee. Of these, one resulted in settlement by mutual consent, one received a negative recommendation from the committee, one was resolved by resignation while a negative result was in process and one case was pending on September 1. The other 5 complainants requested referral to area committees for review. In each of these cases forwarding credentials to committee was the recommendation. President Singletary declined to accept our recommendation in four cases and agreed on review by a special committee in the fifth case.

Three of the cases not forwarded to the area committee were up or out tenure cases. There is strong sentiment in the Committee on Privilege and Tenure that the importance of this decision to affected faculty members warrants assurance of careful and complete preparation and evaluation of credentials. An opportunity for review by faculty outside the unit would appear helpful in this regard. We suggest consideration of an option for area committee review such as that provided for tenured faculty who have not been considered for promotion for six years (AR II-1.0-1-III.C, page 6a).

Sincerely,



George E. Mitchell, Jr.  
Chairman  
Committee on Privilege and Tenure

GEMjr/jg