

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

November 28, 1983

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet at 3:00 p.m. on Monday, December 5, 1983 in the Classroom Building, 106. PLEASE NOTE THE CHANGE IN DATE OF THE MEETING.

- 1) Minutes of 14 November meeting.
- 2) Resolutions.
- 3) Announcements.
- 4) Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section VI., 1.3 regarding Academic Evaluation. (Circulated under date of November 22, 1983)
5. Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section V., 2.2.3, admission standards, College of Education. (Circulated under date of November 23, 1983)
6. Statistical Services for Faculty Research. A presentation for discussion by Dr. Joseph Gani, Chairman of the Department of Statistics, and Dr. Richard Kryscio, Director of Consulting Services.

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

/cet

Copy 1

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, DECEMBER 5, 1983

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, December 5, 1983, in Room 106 of the Classroom Building. The meeting was originally scheduled for Monday, December 12. Due to final examination conflicts, the meeting was re-scheduled.

E. Douglas Rees, Chairman of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent: R. A. Altenkirch*, Ann Amerson*, Roger B. Anderson, James Applegate*, James Bader*, Michael Baer, Charles E. Barnhart, Susan M. Belmore*, Jack C. Blanton, Peter P. Bosomworth*, David Bradford*, Thomas W. Brehm*, James Buckholtz, Joseph T. Burch, Ellen Burnett, Gary L. Cromwell, Philip Dare, Deepak Dhawan*, Donald F. Diedrich*, Gadis J. Dillon*, Richard C. Domek*, Herbert Drennon, Nancy E. Dye, Anthony Eardley, William Ecton*, Charles Ellinger, Charles F. Fay, Richard W. Furst, Art Gallaher, Jr.*, Lester Goldstein, Charles P. Graves*, C. Michael Gray, Andrew J. Grimes, Robert D. Guthrie, Joseph Hamburg, Marilyn D. Hamann*, Jesse G. Harris*, S. Z. Hasan, Penny Heaton, Robert Hemenway*, Brad Hobbs, Raymond R. Hornback, Donald W. Ivey*, John J. Just, Richard I. Kermod*, Theodore A. Kotchen*, Gurcharan Laumas, Robert Lawson, B. J. Leon*, Julie Lien*, Thomas Lillich, William E. Lyons, Edgar Maddox, Kenneth E. Marino*, Marcus T. McEllistrem, Mike McCauley, Marion McKenna*, Mary Beth Messmer, H. Brinton Milward*, Jeff Money Penny, William G. Moody*, Harold Nally, Daniel N. Nelson*, Robert C. Nobel*, Elbert W. Ockerman*, Clayton Omvig*, Merrill Packer*, David C. Payne*, Alan R. Perreiah, David J. Prior, Madhira Ram*, John A. Rea, Gerald A. Rosenthal, Wimberly Royster, Charles Sachatello*, Edgar Sagan, Timothy Sineath*, Otis A. Singletary*, Harry A. Smith, John T. Smith, Stanford L. Smith, Phil Taylor, Kenneth Tompson, Marc J. Wallace*, David Webster*, O'Neil Weeks, Paul A. Willis, Alfred D. Winer, Robert G. Zumwinkle

The Minutes of the Meeting of September 12, 1983, were approved as circulated.

The Chairman made the following announcements:

"On Tuesday, December 13 from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. in the King Alumni House will be the annual party for the Senate and the Board of Trustees. President Singletary will also be there. Spouses are invited, and we hope all of you can come.

The Committee on Organization and Structure, chaired by Professor Applegate, is beginning to broach some of the academic issues which would be involved were the University of Kentucky and University of Louisville to be brought in some form under a common governing board. I think the main concern is that the discussions, if they start, will involve faculty.

As mentioned before, there are two especially important committee reports which came in last spring. One was the committee chaired by Professor Lowery which dealt with financial exigency and another by Professor Hiatt which dealt with academic priorities. The Senate Council spent a good deal of time discussing these reports. One outgrowth which I would like to apprise you of is the assembling of a joint faculty and administrative officer committee to look into what is called alternative profes-

sional options for faculty. There will be four faculty members appointed by the Senate Council and there will be four administrative officers appointed by the President. The President has asked that we indicate to him the type of administrative areas that we would like to have covered. Our appointments will be taken up at the Senate Council meeting this Wednesday, and we will forward also to the President our feelings as to what type of administrative officers should be on that committee.

The Senate Council has been meeting with the chairmen of the various Senate Committees and in some cases with the entire committees. The point of this is to facilitate communication between the Senate Council and the committees.

Are there any questions any of you might have about what the Senate Council has been doing this year?"

In response to Chairman Rees' question, Professor Weil asked about a joint board for the University of Louisville and the University of Kentucky. Professor Rees responded that the papers had been reporting about the possible positioning of the two universities under a common board. He said that faculty at the University of Louisville seemed to feel that discussion on this matter was more advanced than we do. Chairman Rees thought it was important to have faculty input into discussions on this matter and that would be addressed by the committee on Organization and Structure. Professor Weil's second question concerned the Committee on Alternate Professional Employment and asked if it dealt with the situation of exigency. Professor Rees' response was that basically the Council felt that probably there would not be any acute exigency but there could be a long firm readjustment of resources including faculty assignments within the University. The Council felt the Senate should be informed on alternative approaches. Also, the Senate Council felt that the Administration should be jointly involved in exploring possibilities. It was proposed that a joint committee be formed with eight members from the faculty and administration. They would report to the Senate Council and the President.

Chairman Rees asked if there were any problems that the senators felt the Senate Council should be addressing. There were no questions or comments.

The first action item was the proposed change regarding Academic Evaluation. The Chairman recognized Professor Robert Bostrom. On behalf of the Senate Council, Professor Bostrom recommended approval in the University Senate Rules, Section VI, 1.3, Academic Evaluation. Professor Bostrom said the proposal extended the fair and just evaluation principle from courses to entire programs. This proposed change was circulated to members of the senate under date of November 22, 1983.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Professor Gesund suggested an editorial change on the second page under "C" in the last two lines to delete the word "outside" and add "or program requirements" at the end of the sentence. There were no objections. The sentence then reads:

"....and political affiliation, or any activities outside the classroom that are unrelated to the course work or program requirements."

The Chairman said the question had also been raised about departmental qualifying examinations. There was a suggestion that departmental be deleted. There was no disagreement, and the Chairman ruled that would also be an editorial change.

Professor Weil moved an amendment to change the word "sex" to "gender" and that in the first paragraph "C" to delete "or" and add "any type of sexual behavior or harassment." The sentence would read:

"...and political affiliation, any activities outside the classroom that are unrelated to the course work or program requirements, or any type of sexual behavior or harassment."

Professor Gesund seconded the motion to amend. After debate the senate defeated the amendment to change the wording in the proposal.

The senate voted in favor of stopping debate on the second part of the amendment, and the motion to amend failed.

The proposal, as editorially amended, passed unanimously and reads as follows:

Proposal:

VI. 1.3 Academic Evaluation

- a) Students have the right to receive grades based only upon fair and just evaluation of their performance in a course as measured by the standards announced by their instructor(s) at the first or second class meeting.
- b) Students have the right to receive a fair and just academic evaluation of their performance in a program. In addition to the students' overall academic record, evaluation may include the assessment of such activities as research and/or laboratory performance, qualifying examinations, professional board examinations, studio work or performance activities, behavior in professional situation, or interviews to determine continuation in a program. The program faculty and/or relevant administrative officer must inform the student as to which activities will be included in the academic assessment no later than the beginning of the activity to be evaluated.
- c) Evaluations determined by anything other than a good faith judgment based on explicit statements of the above standards are improper. Among irrelevant considerations are race, color, religion, sex, national origin, and political affiliations, or any activities outside the classroom that are unrelated to the course work or program requirements.

One form of sex discrimination is sexual harassment. It is defined as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal and physical conduct or written communications of an intimidating,

hostile, or offensive sexual nature, when submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of the student's status in a course, program, or activity, as a basis for academic or other decisions affecting such student, or substantially interferes with a student's academic performance, or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or academic environment.

Implementation Date: Spring Semester, 1984.

The second action item concerned the Admission Standards from the College of Education. Chairman Rees recognized Professor Robert Bostrom for a motion from the Senate Council. Professor Bostrom, on behalf of the Senate Council, moved the proposed change in University Senate Rules, IV., 2.2.3, Admission Standards, College of Education. Professor Bostrom said the proposal simply brought the College of Education into conformity with recent state regulations. This proposed change was circulated to members of the senate under date of November 23, 1983.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Professor Gesund said he had trouble with the English in the sixth line of the proposal and wanted to know who would be doing the interviews and what was the program faculty doing with the interviews. Chairman Rees responded that for admission into certain programs interviews were required by the departmental faculty.

Chairman Rees recognized Dean Barnard. Professor Barnard said interviews were conducted by the committees of the program faculties and reviewed by the program faculties. Chairman Rees asked Professor Gesund if he would be willing for the Rules Committee to codify and make the necessary writing changes. Professor Gesund agreed.

Professor Weil asked about numbers four and seven. Professor Barnard said what was intended was a commitment to the profession based on the realistic understanding of employment conditions and demands. He said many people were coming to the College of Education who had no notion of what the supply and demand in education was today. "They think they are going to be able to go out and get a job," he said. He felt it was an obligation of the college to let the students understand that is not the case. Also, many students thought teachers worked from 8:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. The purpose was to help students to have a realistic understanding of what is expected of them. Number seven was an effort to try to help the College of Education to discuss with the students their willingness to provide an adequate education for all children, even the slow learners.

Professor Weil suggested both points be put into the Advisor's Guide rather than the University Senate Rules. Professor Barnard said they were part of the state law.

The previous question was moved and passed. The motion, which carried unanimously, reads as follows:

Proposal:

IV., 2.2.3 College of Education
A student must apply and be admitted to a Teacher Education Program in order to receive a teaching certificate. Applications are accepted for review

by the Program Faculty from students who have completed, or will complete during the semester in which they apply, sixty semester hours of work, which must include EDP 202 completed with a grade of C or better. Program Faculties shall review applications and interviews, which shall be required of all students admitted, and recommend to the Dean of the College that an applicant be accepted, accepted provisionally, or rejected. A student's education advisor, academic advisor, and the Admission Coordinator also may make recommendations concerning the disposition of an application. Information considered during the review process shall include but not be limited to an applicant's

1. total academic record. A minimum, overall grade point average 2.0 is required for admission.
2. performance on required tests of skills in written and oral communication, reading, and mathematics. A demonstrated skill level equal to or greater than the minimum, acceptable level mandated by the State Department of Education is required for admission.
3. record of preprofessional curricula experiences.
4. commitment to the profession based on a realistic understanding of employment conditions and demands.
5. proficiency in human relation skills.
6. recommendations from at least three persons familiar with the student's qualifications.
7. willingness to help provide an adequate education for children and youth.

Rationale:

The statement proposed here would replace the present statement in Senate Rules IV., 2.2.3 concerning admission to the Teacher Education program in the College of Education. The proposal brings the statement into conformity with recent state regulations and otherwise updates requirements for admission into the program.

Implementation Date: Spring Semester, 1984.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Martha M. Ferguson
Recording Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY


LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

October 27, 1983

MEMORANDUM

TO: Joe Burch, Dean of Students
Brad Canon, Chairman of Senate Rules Committee
Bill Lacy, Past Ombudsman
Jean Pival, Past Ombudsman

FROM: Douglas Rees, Chairman 

As each of you know, the Senate Council is preparing a proposed change in Senate Rules VI., 1.3 which pertains to academic evaluations. The enclosed draft was circulated to the Senate Council members, academic deans, and recent ombudsmen, then discussed again in the Senate Council. Problems with respect to clarity and substance remain. Therefore, I am asking each of you to read this draft and to propose changes in wording and substance.

Section VI., 1.3 constitutes one of the most important parts of the Senate Rules and additions are needed. To expedite Senate discussion and action, the proposal submitted to the Senate must be in good order. The goal of this ad hoc committee (which I will chair) is to put it in good order.

In about two weeks, I will call each of you so that we can arrange a meeting. Please assess this draft by then and have your recommendations ready. No more than one meeting should be necessary--but you never know! If there are any questions, please call me at 7-5871 or 7-5872.

Many thanks for your willingness to contribute to this important matter.

/cet

Enclosure-1

Current Rule:

VI 1.3 Academic Evaluation

Students have the right to receive grades based only upon fair and just evaluation of their performance in a course as measured by the standards announced by their instructors at the first or second class meeting. Grades determined by anything other than their instructor's good faith judgment based on such standards are improper. Among irrelevant considerations are race, color, religion, sex, national origin, political affiliation, or activities outside the classroom that are unrelated to the course work.

One form of sex discrimination is sexual harassment. It is defined as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal and physical conduct or written communications of an intimidating, hostile, or offensive sexual nature, when submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of the student's status in a course, program, or activity, as a basis for academic or other decisions affecting such student, or substantially interferes with a student's academic performance, or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or academic environment. (US: 3.21.83)

Proposed Rule:

VI 1.3 Academic Evaluation

a) Students have the right to receive grades based only upon fair and just evaluation of their performance in a course as measured by the standards announced by their instructor(s) at the first or second class meeting.

b) Academic evaluation of a student's performance may include a wider range of activities ("in addition to those in the usual discussion setting") such as research and/or laboratory performance, departmental qualifying examinations, professional board examinations, studio work or performance activities, and behavior in professional situations. ("total academic record"; "student's overall academic record") The instructor(s) must inform the student, as in a) above, that performance will be evaluated in each of these activities which apply.

c) Evaluations determined by anything other than a good faith judgment based on explicit statements of the above standards are improper. Among irrelevant considerations are race, color, religion, sex, national origin, and political affiliation, or any activities outside the classroom that are unrelated to the course work.

One form of sex discrimination is sexual harassment. It is defined as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal and physical conduct or written communications of an intimidating, hostile, or offensive sexual nature, when submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of the student's status in a course, program, or activity, as a basis for academic or other decisions affecting such student, or substantially interferes with a student's academic performance, or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or academic environment.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

November 22, 1983

TO; Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, December 5, 1983.
Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section VI, 1.3,
Academic Evaluation.

Background:

Currently, Section VI., 1.3 of the Senate rules, covering the academic evaluation of students, addresses course performance only. However, academic evaluation of a student's performance in programs and in professional colleges frequently is based on activities beyond or other than those in the usual classroom situation. At the 11 April 1983 Senate meeting it was proposed that this Section be revised to include the other types of activities. The effect of the proposal on professional programs, however, seemed uncertain and the Senate referred the proposal back for further study.

An ad hoc committee of Senate Council members (Grimes, Rees, Yeh) considered and prepared a revised version of the proposal which was sent to all academic deans, present and recent ombudsmen, and others for review and comments. Several helpful suggestions were offered but no opposition was expressed. The present proposal is based on that revised version which was further refined after additional discussion with the ombudsmen, the Senate Rules Committee chairman, the Dean of Students and the Senate Council.

Present Rule:

VI. 1.3 Academic Evaluation

Students have the right to receive grades based only upon fair and just evaluations of their performance in a course as measured by the standards announced by their instructors at the first or second class meeting. Grades determined by anything other than their instructors' good faith judgment based on such standards are improper. Among irrelevant considerations are race, color, religion, sex, national origin, political affiliation, or activities outside the classroom that are unrelated to the course work.

One form of sex discrimination is sexual harassment. It is defined as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal and physical conduct or written communication of an intimidating, hostile, or offensive nature, when submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of the student's status in a course, program, or activity, as a basis for academic or other decisions affecting such student, or substantially interferes with a student's academic performance, or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or academic environment. (US: 4/11/83)

Proposed Rule:

VI. 1.3 Academic Evaluation

- a) Students have the right to receive grades based only upon fair and just evaluation of their performance in a course as measured by the standards announced by their instructor(s) at the first or second class meeting.
- b) Students have the right to receive a fair and just academic evaluation of their performance in a program. In addition to the students' overall academic record, evaluation may include the assessment of such activities as research and/or laboratory performance, departmental qualifying examinations, professional board examinations, studio work or performance activities, behavior in professional situations, or interviews to determine continuation in a program. The program faculty and/or relevant administrative officer must inform the student as to which activities will be included in the academic assessment no later than the beginning of the activity to be evaluated.
- c) Evaluations determined by anything other than a good faith judgment based on explicit statements of the above standards are improper. Among irrelevant considerations are race, color, religion, sex, national origin, and political affiliation, or any activities outside the classroom that are unrelated to the course work.

One form of sex discrimination is sexual harassment. It is defined as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal and physical conduct or written communications of an intimidating, hostile, or offensive sexual nature, when submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of the student's status in a course, program, or activity, as a basis for academic or other decisions affecting such student, or substantially interferes with a student's academic performance, or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or academic environment.

Rationale:

Evaluation of the academic performance of a student frequently is carried out with respect to entry or continuation in a program as well as for assigning a course grade. The present statement in the Senate Rules concerning academic evaluation addresses only performance in courses and not performance in programs. The proposed revision remedies that shortcoming. If adopted, the revised rule would legitimize present practices in many programs and would require that evaluations in the program area must be fair and just as in the case of course evaluation. Moreover, the proposal specifically designates that achievement in matters such as research and/or laboratory work, professional board examinations, studio work or performance activities, interviews, qualifying examinations, behavior in professional situations and overall academic record falls within the purview of academic

Page 3

Senate Agenda Item: USR, VI., 1.3

November 22, 1983

Rationale [continued]

evaluation and consideration--provided the student is adequately forewarned as to the particular points on which evaluation is to occur.

Implementation Date: Spring Semester, 1984.

/cet