

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

March 31, 1980

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet in regular session on Monday, April 14, 1980 at 3:00 p. m. in Room 106 Classroom Building.

AGENDA:

- 1) Approval of the Minutes of March 10, 1980.
- 2) Memorial Resolutions
- 3) Chairman's Remarks
- 4) Ombudsman's Report - Professor Jean Pival

Action Items:

- a) Proposed addition to University Senate Rules, Section V, Scheduling of Common Exams, (Circulated under date of April 1, 1980).
- b) Proposed addition to University Senate Rules, Section VI, Violation of Behavioral Standards in Patient Care, (Circulated under date of April 1, 1980).
- c) Proposed recommendations to Administration - additional paragraph in ARII - 1.041, (Circulated under date of April 1, 1980).

/gcc

COPY 2

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, APRIL 14, 1980

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, April 14, 1980, in Room 106 of the Classroom Building.

Joseph Krislov, Chairman, presiding

Members absent: James Applegate, Rusty Ashcraft, Charles E. Barnhart, Janis L. Bellack, John J. Bernardo*, Brack A. Bivins, Jack C. Blanton, James A. Boling*, Peter P. Bosomworth, J. Michael Brooks, Barbara Bryant, Joseph T. Burch, Joe B. Buttram*, Patricia Cegelka, S. K. Chan, Linda Chen*, Donald B. Clapp, Bob Clark, Charlotte Clark, D. Kay Clawson, Jane B. Clay, Lewis W. Cochran*, James S. Cole, Clinton Collins, Glenn B. Collins, William L. Conger*, Samuel F. Conti, Margaret Cornell, Clifford J. Cremers, George F. Crewe, John Crosby*, M. Ward Crowe, Lynne Crutcher, Charles Cunningham*, Paul Davis, George W. Denemark*, David E. Denton*, Philip A. DeSimone, Ronald C. Dillehay*, Richard C. Domek, Joseph M. Dougherty, Herbert Drennon, Anthony Eardley, William D. Ehmann*, Dave Elder, Kevin Ellis, Jane Emanuel, Graeme Fairweather*, Robin Farrar, Jana Floyd, Paul G. Forand, Edward G. Foree, Tom Francis, Joseph Fugate, Art Gallaher*, Jess L. Gardner*, John H. Garvey*, Jon P. Gockerman*, Mitch Griffin, Andrew J. Grimes*, Robert D. Guthrie, Joseph Hamburg, Curtis E. Harvey*, Virgil W. Hays*, Andrew J. Hiatt*, Raymond R. Hornback, Alfred S. L. Hu, Clyde L. Irwin, Donald W. Ivey, Freddie James, H. Douglas Jameson, Dean Jaros, Keith H. Johnson*, Wesley H. Jones, John J. Just*, Richard I. Kermod*, Edward J. Kifer*, Jane Kotchen, James R. Lang, Thomas P. Lewis*, Carolyn G. Litchfield*, Paul Mandelstam*, Emanuel Mason*, Tony McAdams, Marcus T. McEllistrem, Marion E. McKenna*, Ernest Middleton, Phillip W. Miller, David S. Newburg, Elbert W. Ockerman*, Clayton Omvig*, Chester L. Parker, Dennis E. Parsons*, Alan R. Perreiah*, Anne Policastri, Antoinette Powell*, Deborah E. Powell, Anna K. Reed*, Daniel Reedy*, Paul Roark, Charles Rowell, Robert W. Rudd, John S. Scarborough, George W. Schwert, Ronald J. Seymour*, Gary Shenton, D. Milton Shuffett*, Otis A. Singletary*, Julie Skaggs, John T. Smith, Gerald Slatin*, Tim Smith*, Wade C. Smith, Charles S. Spiegel, Ralph E. Steuer, Marjorie S. Stewart*, Harold H. Traurig*, Relmond VanDaniker*, M. Stanley Wall, Marc J. Wallace, M. O'Neal Weeks, Kennard W. Wellons*, Bruce H. Westley, Wayne A. Wiegand, Alfred D. Winer*, Ralph F. Wiseman*, Patch G. Woolfolk

The minutes of the meeting of March 10, 1980, were approved as circulated.

Chairman Krislov made the following remarks:

"I have a number of announcements. The first is somewhat a lengthy one about the agenda for today and the agenda for the next meeting on May 5. Some of you have noticed that you did not receive the circulation listed as "B", the proposed addition to University Senate Rules on Violation of Behavioral Standards in Patient Care. Some of you may remember that we discussed this at the March meeting. On the 31st of March the representatives of the Medical Center came to the Council with an entirely different proposal.

The Chairman of the Council, as well as some of the members of the Council that he was able to contact, insisted that the Medical Center retrace its steps in presenting this proposal to you. We felt that a completely revised proposal had to be approved by the Council of the Medical Center and then by the Student Affairs Committee. The Medical Center began that process and apparently concluded it wanted to think through the entire propo-

*Absence Explained

sal so on Thursday of last week they withdrew their proposal. Consequently, there is nothing to that proposal and Item B on the agenda will not be brought before you. It is my understanding that the Medical Center is going to explore whether they can proceed internally and handle the problem of students and standards in that fashion. If they decide, however, that they cannot handle it internally, they will have to return whatever proposal they have to the Senate and perhaps those of you who are fortunate enough to be here next year will see a new proposal.

The only two action items we have today are A and C. As you would have suspected, we left considerable time for a discussion on B and consequently we have a void in the agenda. Since we do have another meeting and at least two proposals coming forward, it might be useful to have an oral presentation on the two proposals. The two proposals are remarkably similar. They involve enrollment restrictions--one in the Landscape Architecture Program and the other is in the College of Business and Economics. I contacted Professor Schach and Dean Ecton, and they indicated that they would make oral presentations on their proposals. I thought we would circulate them, but each is about four or five pages. I decided, however, that since we were circulating them formally for the May 5 meeting, it would be redundant to pass them out here.

Since my College is Business and Economics, I asked Professor Schwert to preside over the discussion on the Business and Economics proposal today and the voting when it takes place on May 5.

The Chair will go to a series of six items--actions taken by the Council, which we should report to you.

First, we received a response from President Singletary regarding the proposal we passed on February 11. The recommendations involved two changes in the Governing Regulations. In a letter dated March 26, President Singletary reported that he was going to support the recommended change concerning the phrase 'reappointment regarding tenured members participating formally in writing letters on the reconsideration of a Chairman.' The President, however, did not concur in the change regarding the election of faculty members to Search Committees. He said, 'I believe it to be the intent of the Board of Trustees that there be faculty participation in the selection of Heads of Academic Units. I also believe that the procedures now in existence provide that opportunity. I am not persuaded that the election of representatives will necessarily improve the selection process. I am convinced there are times when such representation might prove to be detrimental. I can recall at least two occasions in the recent past when conditions within a unit have deteriorated to a point where it was deemed essential to go beyond the unit for a solution in the leadership question.' That is the President's response and there are copies for you.

The second item is a request from President Singletary to the Council regarding a request from the College of Social Professions to change its name to the College of Social Work.

The President thought this might be interpreted as an alteration of the unit. The Council did not think that and simply responded that we approved the change and urge a speedy implementation.

The third item I want to report to you is a request the Student Government made to the Council. The Student Government requested that the faculty join them in an 'evaluation of teaching.' The proposal envisions a voluntary questionnaire which will be circulated by the faculty member. The results will be tabulated and then published. Some of you may remember there was such a publication in the late sixties at this University and there have been others at other universities. The Council agreed to suggest individuals to the Student Government who were skilled in the use of questionnaires. We have suggested several people to serve as advisers to the group, but the full responsibility for the questionnaire--the circulation, tabulating and printing would be the sole responsibility of Student Government.

Item five is a request from the Medical Center to establish a Cancer Center. This has been sent to the Committee on Organization and Structure. I am sure they will be holding hearings so those of you who are particularly interested in the establishment of the Cancer Center will want to talk to Professor Grimes.

Item six, I have a letter from Dean Sands indicating that he has talked again with the Registrar's Office about the relative transcript and the concluding sentence is 'The Registrar agreed to prepare a recommendation by May 5, 1980, to implement the relative transcript in the simplified form.' Those of you who are interested in that will be pleased to know there is some progress.

The last item, which is a very sad item and one I hope we may change next year, is a report from the Academic Programs Committee. It is very short and reads, 'The Academic Programs Committee received no program proposals during 1979-80. Consequently no action was taken.' I know there is very little money for new programs, and it takes a long time to get through the Senate and the President's Office, and they take even longer getting through Frankfort. Some of them sat there for four or five years, which seems astounding. On the other hand, it does strike me that somewhere in this institution we should be developing new programs. I hope all of you will carry that message back. It does seem we could have some activity in this area.

The Chair recognized Professor Jean Pival for the Ombudsman's Annual Report for 1979-80.

Professor Pival made the following remarks:

"This past year as Academic Ombudsman has given me the opportunity to see the University in a new way. From our narrow departmental perspective, we tend to view the University as a great, sprawling, diffuse mass. This year has proven to me that is rather an academic ecosystem--a living organism of complex and often delicate interrelationships, the chief among which is the one involving

the teacher and the students. This year has also taught me that maintaining a healthy balance in that relationship demands the cooperation of many people--not just students and faculty--but administrators, advisers, counseling services, the registrar's staff, and on occasion, the legal office. I am grateful for the cooperation received from the representatives from each of these groups with whom I have had contact. I especially value the patient efforts of Gay Elste for her legal advice, of Ken Germain and William Fortune who served as chairmen of the Appeals Board during my tenure, of Paul Sears in the President's office, and of Joseph Krislov and Cindy Todd in the Senate office. But especially I must thank my assistant, Frankie Garrison, whose knowledge of the Ombudsman's duties, whose familiarity with various University offices, and whose unflagging sense of fairness have made the year a smoother one than it might have been without her.

Like my predecessors, I have viewed the Ombudsman's office not simply as a complaint department--a place where students can come to voice a grievance and perhaps receive an academic "refund" or exchange, although the office certainly has that function. Rather, I have tried to see it as an important part of the academic ecosystem--a service available not only to students, but to faculty and administrators as well. This year in office has justified my conviction that the Ombudsman is made uniquely aware of many recurring problems--perennial issues that require more than ad hoc solutions; that demand changes in rules, policies, and often departmental or college practices. All of us who have shared the office agree that many of these problems would be better prevented, than cured. To this end, I addressed much of my time and energy. Thus, in addition to dealing with the day-to-day problems of individual students, I have:

- (1) Offered to conduct brief seminars for new faculty and teaching assistants on procedures involving student rights and faculty responsibilities. Several departments have arranged such meetings.
- (2) Sent notices reminding faculty to apprise students of course content and grading procedures. Another notice on the mysteries of the I grade will be sent at the end of the semester.
- (3) Met with groups of students--at Freshman Week-end, at advising conferences, and in residence halls.
- (4) Worked with the Senate Council, the Rules Committee, Student Government, the Dean of Students, and several academic deans to amend certain Senate Rules. These have included administrative as well as academic procedures and many originated as specific recommendations in Jane Emanuel's report last year before this body. These changes include the following:
 - a. Establishing a policy to cover common examinations--a mushrooming source of complaints.

- b. Amending Senate Rule VI - 1.1 and 1.2 to include an "in writing" clause.
- c. Developing a policy on holding final exams and term papers for at least one semester.
- d. Placing a statute of limitations on complaints.

The specific problems handled this year match with the ones my predecessors have encountered--dissatisfaction over grades, teaching practices, inaccessibility of teachers and administrators, personality conflicts with faculty, inability to understand foreign TA's, cheating and plagiarism, inadequate advising, registration problems--to mention the most frequent. The relative seriousness of the cases ranged from a request to reschedule the daily 5:00 A.M. visits to empty a Dempsey-Dumpster outside the windows of a women's dorm to charges of sexual harassment.

Since July 1, 1979, we have recorded 415 contacts, 161 of which were brief telephone conversations or drop-in visits, each requiring only a few minutes of our time. Of these 31 were informational queries from faculty. Those cases demanding a considerable amount of time number 243 and at least 20 of those required approximately fifteen hours each. Although the following totals are listed primarily by colleges, some departmental figures are given. The purpose of the latter is not to embarrass individual departments, but to illustrate how complaints cluster or pattern around particular problems. The 243 cases were distributed in the following way: Agriculture - 1, Allied Health - 2, Arts and Sciences - 116, Business and Economics - 64, Communications - 6, Dentistry - 1, Education - 10, Engineering - 18, Fine Arts - 5, Home Economics - 5, Law - 1, Medicine - 2, Pharmacy - 7, Social Professions - 4, and Graduate School - 1. Significant departmental totals are: Mathematics - 36, primarily complaints about non-native instructors; Business Administration - 33, 99% of which resulted from over-subscription in business courses required by seniors; Physics - 8, Chemistry - 11, Accounting - 12, Psychology 10, all of which shared the same complaint--the common examinations. One hundred and five cases involved full faculty members; 16 part-time instructors; 47 teaching assistants. The number of cases submitted to the Appeals Board was six; three others are pending appeal.

And what of the students who used our services this year? Contrary to popular mythology, the majority were bright, articulate students with GPA's of 2.8 or higher. Thirty-five of the cases were freshmen; 40 sophomores; 56 juniors; 98 seniors; 25 graduate students. The imbalance in the number of seniors can mainly be attributed to the Business Administration problems.

I would like at this point to put a personal conviction on record. I have often heard this year the rationalization that the number of complaints about a particular situation is statistically insignificant. True, thirty or forty complaints in a program serving several thousand students may seem statistically petty; but when those complaints demonstrate a pattern year after year,

then they as clearly define a problem as if all the students in the program had been involved. They demand at least a search for a solution. Remember, students come to the Academic Ombudsman after they have exhausted other routes of appeal; only the most determined or the most desperate make it that far.

To alleviate some of the most persistent and disturbing of these problems, I suggest the following recommendations. Some of these were cited by Frank Buck in his first Ombudsman's report and which are still with us. My recommendations fall into three categories. The first has to do with the Office of Academic Ombudsman. To achieve better continuity, the appointment should be extended to a two-year period and be considered a full-time position. This would probably mean a different approach in funding; departments should not be burdened with that kind of expenditure.

The second group of recommendations arise from the academic problems encountered this year:

- (1) Professional schools with codes of ethics should be required to develop procedural guidelines for ethical infractions. In addition, such codes should be subject to University approval and should include an appeals process.
- (2) Departments and colleges with large numbers of foreign students should search for ways to improve intercultural relationships between faculty and students.
- (3) The University should develop guidelines for appointing non-native teaching assistants and provide a facility for improving their oral English if so needed.
- (4) All departments utilizing large numbers of teaching assistants in multi-sectioned courses should appoint coordinators to be responsible for training those assistants and for negotiating with students. Some departments who now follow this practice could serve as a model for others.
- (5) Departments should develop programs or expand existing ones for faculty improvement in teaching, both for new and regular faculty. There is evidence that the programs to train new teaching assistants stimulated by the Freshman Year Committee recommendations are suffering from erosion.
- (6) Colleges and departments should develop ways to improve and award academic advising.

The last category of suggestions is not so much a recommendation as it is a charge to this body. This year I have on several occasions encountered unfair and arbitrary treatment of students made possible by ill-conceived rules that passed through the Senate with too little debate and concern. My plea to you is that in matters coming before this body that deal with academic policies and penalties, that you deliberate long and carefully, considering not only such issues as legalities and ambiguous language, but also the human consequences of each rule. That is the part that only the University Senate can perform for our academic community. Now if I could be allowed a bit of levity, I would like to make one last recommendation on amending a Senate rule--the one that describes the characteristics that an Ombudsman should have--those saintly traits that all of us have found intimidating. I propose that we substitute the words from a current popular song--words more befitting the tasks imposed by the office:

The Ombudsman must 'know when to hold 'em,
Know when to fold 'em,
Know when to walk away,
And know when to run.'

Professor Pival was given an enthusiastic applause.

The next order of business was not on the agenda, but the Chairman said that he felt it was appropriate at this time and had to do with role functioning of the Trustees. He said that there had been remarkable change which had taken place in the past year informally in the relationship of the faculty trustee to the Council on Higher Education. There is a statute passed, signed by the Governor which will change the term of office.

The Chairman recognized Professor Constance Wilson for a report.

Professor Wilson spoke to the Senate as follows:

"The faculty Trustee with a vote on the Board as a regular Trustee is a relatively recent phenomenon. Faculty did not have a representative on the Board until about 1959 when the AAUP lobbied hard and successfully to place a non-voting faculty member on the Board. Two voting Trustees on the Board did not come about until 1972 with a change in the Statute. Faculty serve for three years and can be reelected.

Ten members appointed by the Governor served for four years until this past legislative session when the statute was amended to extend the term to six years. The faculty term of three years remains unchanged.

Another change affecting faculty at this last legislative session was in HB 118 which added a Community College faculty trustee. The word added is important since there was some suggestion that one of the two faculty trustee positions be allocated to the Community College System.

In summary, the statute provides for three faculty trustees. Two will be elected by faculty from the main campus; one will be elected by faculty in the Community College System.

I would like to briefly mention some other activities that are faculty trustee responsibilities. In addition to attending regular Board meetings, the faculty also attend the meetings of the Executive Committee since important business related to faculty takes place at these meetings. Also, the Council on Higher Education calls a meeting of all University faculty trustees bi-monthly. Items such as budget, faculty salaries, retirement, etc. are examples of the agenda. Periodically, one of the faculty trustees will make a report to the Senate. I will be glad to answer any questions."

The Chairman recognized Professor William Wagner for a motion from the Senate Council. Professor Wagner, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposed addition to the University Senate Rules, Scheduling of Common Examinations. This proposal was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of April 1, 1980.

The Chair recognized Dean Donald Sands for any comments on the proposal. Dean Sands thought there was confusion at the last meeting because the Senators were not aware of the Committee's first recommendation date and time for common examinations. He said that the proposal on the floor now resolved the problem.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Professor Adelstein was curious as to whether or not the Committee had considered the conflict between a regular class exam and the common examination. Dean Sands responded that the Committee did consider it, and he had thought about it himself. In a situation when a student had a class that met from 5:00 to 6:00 p.m. and also had a common examination scheduled from 5:00 to 6:00, then that's the sort of thing the Common Examination Schedule in the Schedule Book should prevent. The student would know in advance if he/she had two exams for the same hour.

There was no more discussion, and the proposed addition passed unanimously. The proposal for Scheduling of Common Examinations reads as follows:

Background:

On March 14, 1980, this topic was discussed in the Senate. A question was raised about the proposed addition to the Senate Rules, and the issue was referred back to the Council. The problem was basically how a student would know about the Scheduling of common examinations in order to avoid conflicts.

The Council has re-examined the background of the proposal, and finds that it has already required that the Schedule Book announce the date and the time of all common examinations. Hence, all students will be informed of the exams and potential conflicts. We believe that with a minor change in the last sentence, the proposal should be adopted.

Proposal: (delete portion in brackets; add underlined portion)

A student for whom two examinations have been scheduled for the same time shall be entitled to have the examination for the class with the higher catalog number rescheduled. In case both classes have the same number, the one whose departmental prefix is alphabetically first will be rescheduled. This rescheduling must be requested of the appropriate instructor in writing at least two weeks prior to [the last class meeting] the scheduled examination.

NOTE: This item will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

The Chair again recognized Professor William Wagner for a motion from the Senate Council. Professor Wagner, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposed recommendations to the Administration as an addition to AR II-1.0-1. This proposal was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of April 1, 1980.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Professor Jewell asked if it would help for someone to tell the Senators what the procedure was at the present time and what was being changed. Professor Sears responded that procedures had varied through the years and several Deans had proceeded that way in the past. For the past two or three years, the decision was made that this should not be done. If the recommendation goes through from the department, then the Dean considers it. If the Dean turns down the recommendation, that's it. It is now recommended to go one step further if the individual requests his file be sent to the Area Committee for further consideration. Professor Jewell asked if the procedures were changing by requiring the Dean to consult the Advisory Committee on every recommendation. Professor Sears responded in the affirmative. Professor Jewell said that there were two changes. Professor Sears said that there were really three changes. The first one was in the first sentence where it was mandatory for a person to be considered for promotion. The second change was the mandatory use of an Advisory Committee within the College by the Dean. The third change was the permissiveness or option of the faculty person after a discussion with the Dean to request an evaluation of the recommendation.

Professor Canon asked how many more cases the proposal might feed into the Academic Area Advisory Committee of those people turned down by the Dean. He said that he assumed faculty turned down would take advantage of the proposal. Professor Wagner responded that the feeling was they would not. Professor Sears said that there was no way to predict in advance the outcome. In all likelihood all individuals not recommended for promotion would not request a review.

Professor Mitchell, Chairman of the Privilege and Tenure Committee, said that the merits or demerits of the case, in his view, had nothing to do with the amount of work the Area Committee had to do. He felt it was a matter of importance to the University and the individual concerned. Professor Gesund asked if the proposal also applied to people who are appointed as associate professor and who made the decision on tenure for them. Professor Sears responded that they would have to go to the Area Committee. Professor Sabharwal said that the chances were there would not be too many borderline cases.

Professor Sears asked to correct the statement he made about the case of an associate professor without tenure. This case was not covered in the document on the floor. It would be permissive under the current regulations for a Dean to give the terminal year reappointment to an associate professor without tenure and without direction from the Area Committee. Professor Adelstein wondered if the proposal might be amended so that if a faculty member did not want to be reviewed, it would not be mandatory. Dean Cox asked if the proposal would not affect people who were put on terminal contract before the end of the probationary period. Professor Wagner said that was the intention of the document. It was only through the sixth year which was the critical year. Dean Cox said that being terminated after the third year was just as critical for the faculty member.

The Chairman reminded the Senators the proposal was only a recommendation to the Administration, and he felt there seemed to be a fear of the tremendous number of cases that might be generated.

Professor Gesund moved to amend the proposal as follows:

"A faculty member who is in the next to last year of his/her probationary period must be considered...."

The Chair asked Professor Sears if the amendment would accomplish what Professor Gesund hoped to accomplish. Professor Sears said that he never believed in editing a document on the floor. The motion was seconded.

Professor Gesund said that the probationary period was defined as six years. Professor Kemp said that the probationary period was based on prior service. It could be two, three, or more years up to six. Professor Gesund said that the intent was for anyone who had reached the end of the probationary period was entitled to a full review. Professor Wagner asked Professor Sears if the amendment passed, could the proposal be drafted to include the intent. Professor Sears said that it could. The Chair said that he would provide Professor Sears with the opportunity to write what Professor Gesund wanted. Professor Gesund agreed to let Professor Sears edit the amendment. There was no further discussion and the amendment passed. Professor Adelstein added a clause to the amendment to read:

"unless the individual does not wish to be...."

Professor Gesund seconded the amendment, and it passed unanimously. Professor Jewell moved to amend the proposal to change the next to the last sentence after the phrase, "Within 30 days of notification..." to insert:

"if the Department Chairperson's recommendations were positive"

Professor Jewell said that the Senate was opening up the possibility of a Department's decision being overruled by Area Committees. The amendment was seconded. Professor Wagner said that he was opposed to the amendment on the basis that there were going to be few cases when the Department Chairman or Dean of the College would make a recommendation the Area Advisory Committee would have to overrule. Professor Mitchell said that from his viewpoint this would negate half of the protective element. Professor Sabharwal felt faculty members should have another chance if turned down for tenure by Department Chairman and Dean. The amendment failed. The proposal as amended passed in principle with the stipulation that Professor Sears would edit and present to the Senate Council a proposal with the intent of the amendments included. The proposal as rewritten by Professor Sears follows:

Background:

This proposal, to permit a faculty member in the sixth or next-to-last year of his probationary period to request that his file be reviewed by the appropriate Academic Area Advisory Committee, has a long history. It was first suggested by last year's Privilege and Tenure Committee. After some discussion the Council decided to approve it, and requested Professor Paul Sears to draft a proposal. Professor Sears drafted the proposal and it was approved by the Council. It is now before you for approval. If adopted, it will be sent to the Administration for consideration of adoption.

Proposal:

A faculty member who is on appointment at the rank of assistant professor in the sixth or next-to-last year of his/her probationary period must be considered for promotion and granting of tenure, unless the individual requests in writing that such not be done on the basis of resignation or willingness to accept a terminal reappointment. A promotion file for the individual shall be prepared according to established guidelines and a recommendation, either affirmative or negative, shall be made by the department chairperson and forwarded with the promotion file to the dean of the college. After checking the file for completeness, the dean next shall obtain advisory input or a recommendation from the college's advisory committee concerned with faculty appointment, termination, promotion and tenure. If the dean decides to recommend the faculty member for promotion and tenure, the dean shall add his/her recommendation to the promotion file which is then forwarded to the appropriate academic vice president for further consideration by established procedure. If the dean makes a decision not to recommend the faculty member for promotion and tenure but to offer the individual a terminal reappointment instead, the dean shall notify the individual of this action in writing normally by February 1 or five months before the end of the sixth or next-to-last year of the individual's probationary period. Within 30 days of notification, after discussing the matter with the dean, the faculty member may request that his/her promotion file be sent to the relevant Academic Area Advisory Committee for an evaluation and a recommendation to the appropriate academic vice president. On receiving such a request in writing, the dean shall forward the individual's promotion file to the academic vice president for further evaluation.

A faculty member who is on appointment at the rank of associate professor in the next-to-last year of his/her probationary period, or at the rank of professor in the first half of his/her one-year probationary period, must be considered for granting of tenure, unless the individual requests in writing that such not be done on the basis of resignation or willingness to accept either a terminal reappointment or notice of non-renewal of appointment. A file relative to considering the individual for tenure shall be prepared according to established guidelines and a recommendation, either affirmative or negative, shall be made by the department chairperson and forwarded with the file to the dean of the college.

After checking the file for completeness, the dean next shall obtain advisory input or a recommendation from the college's advisory committee concerned with faculty appointment, termination, promotion and tenure. If the dean decides to recommend the faculty member for tenure, the dean shall add his/her recommendation to the file which is then forwarded to the appropriate academic vice president for further consideration by established procedure. If the dean makes a decision not to recommend the faculty member for tenure but to offer the individual a terminal reappointment instead, the dean shall notify the individual of this action in writing normally by February 1 or five months before the end of the next-to-last year of the individual's probationary period. Within 30 days of notification, after discussing the matter with the dean, the faculty member may request that his/her file be sent to the relevant Academic Area Advisory Committee for an evaluation and a recommendation to the appropriate academic vice president. On receiving such a request in writing, the dean shall forward the individual's promotion file to the academic vice president for further evaluation.

The Chair recognized Professor Horst Schach from the Department of Landscape Architecture for a report on enrollment limitations.

Professor Schach spoke to the Senate as follows:

"The Landscape Architecture program (Department of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture) is proposing a restricted enrollment policy to be officially adopted for the program, and I suppose you will be receiving the official statement and rationale accompanying that at some future date. Basically, what the proposal suggests is that we adopt a restricted enrollment policy based on availability of resources, faculty, work space and so on. At the present time we are suggesting a limit of 25 students per year being allowed into the program. This is based on faculty and physical space we have available to us at the present time that would meet the various standards such as accreditation. Originally, as you may recall, the School of Architecture established a restricted enrollment policy in the Fall of 1974. Since our students spend their sophomore year in the School of Architecture there was concern that our program could be used to gain entry into the Architecture program by students who had previously been rejected. Initially, we simply rode on the shirrtail of the College of Architecture's regulations and began to implement a restricted enrollment policy. We duplicated their selection procedures, but have since refined our testing mechanisms and have found them to be quite successful. Their procedure has also changed. The basic rationale we are using is to say that there are a number of skills which are teachable and there are those that relate more to aptitudinal things. At present we are trying our best to simply identify those which are aptitudinally related and assume the responsibility to administer the things that are teachable.

Since the adoption of the selective testing we have seen an increase in classroom participation, morale, and so on.

There was a time when students were giving every effort they had, but they simply could not cope with classroom demands; I think we have eliminated that problem. We request the Senate adopt our policy as part of the normal administrative policies of the University. There is nothing sacred about the number we accept into the program. It relates to an approximate ratio of 12 to 1 in design studio which allows for approximately 15 minutes per studio of tutorial time between instructor and student which is the basic minimum. None of these figures apply to lecture classes. I will respond to any questions you might have."

Dean Langston wanted to know if the proposal made provisions for the part-time student. Professor Schach said that at the present time they were sending everyone through the testing mechanism and at a given time a student was given a green light. If a student wished to wait a year before engaging in Design Studio, the department allowed that without sacrificing the student's position. Once the student was accepted, the department didn't care if the student were full-time or part-time.

Chairman Krislov recognized Dean W. W. Ecton from the College of Business and Economics for a report on limited admissions.

Dean Ecton spoke to the Senate as follows:

"The College of Business and Economics is in the process of seeking approval of a proposal to limit enrollment in the College. Three facts have led us to this recommendation. First of all, throughout the 1970's our enrollment has increased on an average of ten percent per year. We are not alone as every business school in the country is experiencing the same sort of enrollment trends caused primarily by the acceptance of females in the business world. Women now represent better than forty percent of our student body. We see no end in sight to the present enrollment trends. The second fact is that both the number of new doctorates in business and the number of candidates for doctorates in business have been declining rather rapidly over the years, especially in the last two years. This means, of course, that recruiting new faculty is becoming very difficult in the area of business. Reason three, the demand for courses in the College of Business and Economics is such that we have for years given first priority to business and economics students, second priority to students in other colleges and departments where their programs require our subjects, and if any space remains, other students. We are at a point now where we simply cannot accommodate all of the above. Our current scheduling policies call for our offering only those courses we can effectively handle with the faculty we have; allowing students to enroll based on GPA in the priority already mentioned; and when we reach our capacity, we simply close the course or section.

What we are proposing to do comes in two parts. First of all, at the freshman level our proposal is intended to refuse admission to students who, based on data we have collected, simply cannot successfully complete our programs of study. We would require that, for admission, students must have a composite ACT score at the 50th percentile or above or a score of 50 or better in either English or Math and a composite of 35 or better. We

randomly selected 272 students from our fall, 1979 freshman class of 823 and applied the above requirements. Had the requirements been in place at that time, 45 students would not have been admitted; 32 of them failed to achieve a 2.0 GPA after one semester; and 40 failed to achieve a 2.5 after one semester.

Failure to gain admission to the College at the freshman level would not, however, rule out the possibility for admission at the junior level--the second part of our proposal. Here we are trying to preclude entry at the junior level those students who have not completed our pre-major component of our program and the English and math requirements (which total approximately 30 hours) with a GPA on those courses of 2.5 or greater. We are not saying that success in our programs cannot be achieved with less than 2.5 after 60 hours, but for us to be as open, honest and up front with our students as we possibly can in terms of what they can expect in the Fall 1983 (the earliest this proposal could impact our junior class), we feel that this proposal is quite in order. I think it is safe to assume that with the two years of lead time provided everyone who had or would have had a 2.3 or 2.4 could work a little harder and achieve a 2.5. This may also encourage an earlier use of repeat options which can improve grade point standing rather dramatically sometimes. To test the impact of this part of our proposal, we studied the records of all of our May 1979 graduating class of 306. Of that total, assuming this proposal had been in place when these students became juniors, a total of 92 would not have been initially admitted. Of that 92, 35 had less than a 2.5 in the pre-major, English and math components of our program; 15 had less than a 2.5 overall; and 42 had less than 2.5 in both categories. From a different viewpoint, 23 of the 92 had a GPA of 2.4 but less than 2.5; 11 had a GPA of 2.3 but less than 2.4; and 58 had a GPA of less than 2.3. Given our enrollment trends and the limitations we are proposing, our data show that the student body in the College of Business and Economics will, in 1983, be approximately the same size it is now."

In the discussion which followed a student asked if the University's enrollment dropped in 1984, would Dean Ecton see a continuation of the selective policy. Dean Ecton said that they were going to accommodate as many students as they could. If the question were whether or not the standards would be lowered if the bottom dropped out of enrollment, it would certainly be worthy of consideration at that time.

Professor Jewell asked if the proposal didn't logically mean that if the college had fewer majors several years from now, the college would be improving the chances of non-majors taking courses they needed in business and economics. Dean Ecton said that it would depend on what the student enrollment was at that date and how successful the college was in recruiting faculty.

Dean Cox said President Singletary's position had been for years that we are going to be an open admissions institution. What is happening now is we are becoming piece-meal selective admissions. This was hurting the College of Arts and Sciences because the students are enrolling there. He said that perhaps selective admissions should be University-wide. Dean Ecton said that he believed the University was not being honest,

open, and up front with our students presently. We know how many student credit hours we can generate, we know how many faculty we have, and we know what our student teaching load is. We will offer those courses and when we fill the classes, we simply stop. This is not really honest with the student who comes to this University expecting to get into a degree program in business and finds it impossible to do. We will guard against the loss of our accreditation by establishing and maintaining our enrollment policy and class schedule as described. Dean Cox said that he agreed, but the arguments were just as true for the College of Arts and Sciences. They, too, have over-filled classes in some areas. Arts and Sciences couldn't have a limited admissions policy. There was no more discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Martha M. Ferguson
Recording Secretary

DRAFT 3/26/80

RE: AGENDA ITEM; University Senate Meeting, Monday, April 14, 1980. Scheduling of Common Examinations.

Background:

On March ¹⁰/~~14~~, 1980 this topic was discussed in the Senate. A question was raised about the proposed addition to the Senate Rules, and the issue was referred back to the Council. The problem was basically how a student would know about the scheduling of common examinations in order to avoid conflicts.

The Council has re-examined the background of the proposal, and finds that it has already required that the Schedule Book announce the date and the time of all common examinations. Hence, all students will be informed of the exams and potential conflicts. We believe that with a minor change in the last sentence, the proposal should be adopted.

Proposal: (Delete portion in brackets; add underlined portion)

A student for whom two examinations have been scheduled for the same time shall be entitled to have the examination for the class with the higher catalog number rescheduled. In case both classes have the same number, the one whose departmental prefix is alphabetically first will be rescheduled. This rescheduling must be requested of the appropriate instructor in writing at least two weeks prior to [the last class meeting] the scheduled common examination.

Note: If approved, this item will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

Note: Whenever possible, amendments or motions relative to agenda items on the floor of the Senate for action should be presented to the presiding officer in writing by the person(s) proposing said amendments or motions prior to the opening of the Senate meeting.

8/29/80

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

August 28, 1980

Professor George W. Schwert
Chairman, Senate Council
10 Administration Building
Campus

Dear Professor Schwert:

This letter is in response to the recommendations forwarded to me from the University Senate meeting of April 14, 1980, concerning procedures involved in promotion, tenure and termination actions. After having given careful consideration to the matter, I am approving a change in the Administrative Regulations (AR II-1.0-1) as reflected in Attachment #1 to this letter.

It is my intention to accept most of the recommendations and to change the Administrative Regulations so as to specify that (1) an untenured faculty member on appointment in the sixth or next-to-last year of a probationary period, or (2) an untenured faculty member who is on full-time appointment at the rank of associate professor in the next-to-last year of a probationary period must be considered for promotion and tenure unless the individual appropriately requests in writing that such not be done. The change would further specify that an untenured faculty member at the rank of professor in the first half of a one-year probationary period must be considered for the granting of tenure.

The change in the Administrative Regulations also requires that in promotion and tenure cases the dean of the college, before making a final decision, shall obtain a recommendation on the matter from the college advisory committee on appointment, termination, promotion, and tenure.

You will also note that I have not accepted that portion of the recommendation which requires the involvement of the Academic Area Advisory Committee. My decision in this matter was based upon two general considerations:

1. I do not believe that this is an appropriate function for the area committees. These committees were not envisioned as decision-making groups who would consider and recommend upon all promotion and tenure decisions. Rather, they were created as points of "quality control" where the faculty voice could be officially heard in those cases where established university processes had led to the consideration of a tenured appointment in the University. I do not believe that it would be wise to alter the role of the area committees.

Professor Schwert
August 28, 1980
Page 2

2. I do not wish to lessen the authority or responsibility of the deans. By definition, a dean is the chief academic and administrative officer of the college and I do not want to see that officer's role diminished in such matters. The delegation to the deans of the authority to appoint non-tenured faculty members carries with it the corresponding authority to terminate those appointments, so long as they are terminated in conformity with the Governing and Administrative Regulations of the University.

While I know that there will be those who do not agree with my position on this last matter, I did think it appropriate to state to the Senate Council the views upon which my decision was based.

Sincerely,



Otis A. Singletary
President

ef

Enclosure

ATTACHMENT 1

(Wording for two completely new paragraphs to be considered for addition as second and third paragraphs in Section II.D of AR II-1.0-1)

A non-tenured faculty member who is on appointment at the rank of assistant professor in the sixth or next-to-last year of a probationary period must be considered for promotion and granting of tenure, unless the individual requests in writing that such not be done on the basis of resignation or willingness to accept a terminal reappointment. A promotion file for the individual shall be prepared according to established guidelines and a recommendation, either affirmative or negative, shall be made by the department chairman and forwarded with the promotion file to the dean of the college. After checking the file for completeness, the dean shall obtain a recommendation from the college's advisory committee concerned with faculty appointment, termination, promotion, and tenure. If the dean decides to recommend the faculty member for promotion and tenure, the dean shall add such a recommendation to the individual's promotion file which then is forwarded to the appropriate academic vice president for further consideration by normal procedure. If the dean makes a decision not to recommend the faculty member for promotion and tenure but on the contrary to offer the individual a terminal reappointment, the dean shall notify the individual of this action in writing normally by February 1 or five months before the end of the sixth or next-to-last year of the individual's probationary period.

A non-tenured faculty member who is on appointment at the rank of associate professor in the next-to-last year of a probationary period, or at the rank of professor in the first half of a one-year probationary period, must be considered for granting of tenure, unless the individual requests in writing that such not be done on the basis of resignation or willingness to accept, as applicable, a terminal reappointment or a notice of non-renewal of appointment. A file relative to considering the individual for tenure shall be prepared according to established guidelines and a recommendation, either affirmative or negative, shall be made by the department chairman and forwarded with the file to the dean of the college. After checking the file for completeness, the dean next shall obtain a recommendation from the college's advisory committee concerned with faculty appointment, termination, promotion, and tenure. If the dean decides to recommend the faculty member for tenure, the dean shall add such a recommendation to the file which is then forwarded to the appropriate academic vice president for further consideration by normal procedure. If the dean makes a decision not to recommend an associate professor for tenure but on the contrary to offer the individual a terminal reappointment, the dean shall notify the individual of this action in writing normally by February 1 or five months before the end of the next-to-last year of the individual's probationary period. If the dean makes a decision not to recommend a professor for tenure but on the contrary to inform the individual about non-renewal of appointment, the dean shall notify the individual of this action in writing normally by February 1 or five months before the end of the individual's one-year probationary period.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

April 1, 1980

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, April 14, 1980.
Proposed recommendation to the Administration as an addition to
AR II-1.0-1

Background:

This proposal, to permit a faculty member in the sixth or next-to-last year of his probationary period to request that his file be reviewed by the appropriate Academic Area Advisory Committee, has a long history. It was first suggested by last year's Privilege and Tenure Committee. After some discussion the Council decided to approve it, and requested Professor Paul Sears to draft a proposal. Professor Sears drafted the proposal and it was approved by the Council. It is now before you for approval. If adopted, it will be sent to the Administration for consideration of adoption.

Proposal:

A faculty member who is on appointment at the rank of assistant professor in the sixth or next-to-last year of his/her probationary period must be considered for promotion and granting of tenure. A promotion file for the individual shall be prepared according to established guidelines and a recommendation, either affirmative or negative, shall be made by the department chairperson and forwarded with the promotion file to the dean of the college. After checking the file for completeness, the dean next shall obtain advisory input or a recommendation from the college's advisory committee concerned with faculty appointment, termination, promotion and tenure. If the dean decides to recommend the faculty member for promotion and tenure, the dean shall add his/her recommendation to the promotion file which is then forwarded to the appropriate academic vice president for further consideration by established procedure. If the dean makes a decision not to recommend the faculty member for promotion and tenure but to offer the individual a terminal reappointment instead, the dean shall notify the individual of this action in writing normally by February 1 or five months before the end of the sixth or next-to-last year of the individual's probationary period. Within 30 days of notification, after discussing the matter with the dean, the faculty member may request that his/her promotion file be sent to the relevant Academic Area Advisory Committee for an evaluation and a recommendation to the appropriate academic vice president. On receiving such a request in writing, the dean shall forward the individual's promotion file to the academic vice president for further evaluation.

sd

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

April 1, 1980

TO: Members, University Senate
FROM: University Senate Council
RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday,
April 14, 1980. Scheduling of Common Examinations.

Background:

On March 14, 1980, this topic was discussed in the Senate. A question was raised about the proposed addition to the Senate Rules, and the issue was referred back to the Council. The problem was basically how a student would know about the scheduling of common examinations in order to avoid conflicts.

The Council has re-examined the background of the proposal, and finds that it has already required that the Schedule Book announce the date and the time of all common examinations. Hence, all students will be informed of the exams and potential conflicts. We believe that with a minor change in the last sentence, the proposal should be adopted.

Proposal: (delete portion in brackets; add underlined portion)

A student for whom two examinations have been scheduled for the same time shall be entitled to have the examination for the class with the higher catalog number rescheduled. In case both classes have the same number, the one whose departmental prefix in alphabetically first will be rescheduled. This rescheduling must be requested of the appropriate instructor in writing at least two weeks prior to [the last class meeting] the scheduled examination.

* * *

NOTE: If approved, this item will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

NOTE: Whenever possible, amendments or motions relative to agenda items on the floor of the Senate for action should be presented to the presiding officer in writing by the person(s) proposing said amendments or motions prior to the opening of the Senate meeting.

sd