

Reference copy

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, APRIL 9, 1979

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, April 9, 1979, in Room 106 of the Classroom Building.

Joseph A. Bryant, Chairman, presiding

Members absent: Michael A. Baer, Charles E. Barnhart, R. Paul Baumgartner*, Joanne Bell, Janis L. Bellack*, Mark Birkebak*, Brack A. Bivins, A. Edward Blackhurst*, Jack C. Blanton, Peter P. Bosomworth*, Judy Brown, Joseph T. Burch, S. K. Chan, Donald B. Clapp, Kenneth M. Coleman, Clinton Collins*, Glenn B. Collins, Ronda S. Connaway, John Crosby, Paul Davis, John A. Deacon, Patrick P. DeLuca*, George W. Denmark*, David E. Denton*, Ronald C. Dillehay, Joseph M. Dougherty, Louis Diamond, Anthony Eardley, Bruce S. Eastwood, Jane Emanuel*, Buzz English, Edward G. Foree, Wilbur W. Frye*, James E. Funk*, Art Gallaher, Joseph H. Gardner, John H. Garvey, Abner Golden*, Merlin Hackbart*, Joseph Hamburg, Virgil W. Hays*, Raymond R. Hornback, David Hurst*, H. Douglas Jameson, Dean Jaros, Margaret W. Jones*, Wesley H. Jones, Edward J. Kifer, Aimo J. Kiviniemi*, James A. Knoblett, Jane Kotchen*, Gretchen LaGodna*, Stephen Langston, Thomas P. Lewis*, Arthur Lieber, John Lihani, Paul Mandelstam*, William L. Matthews, Tony McAdams*, Betty W. McClaskey, Marcus T. McEllistrem, Susan A. McEvoy*, Lora McGuire, Dorothy A. Miller*, Phillip W. Miller, William G. Moody*, Catherine Morsink, Sid Neal*, Philip J. Noffsinger, Elbert W. Ockerman*, Merrill W. Packer, Leonard V. Packett*, Bobby C. Pass, Doyle E. Peaslee*, David Peck*, Jean Pival, Deborah E. Powell*, Walter Precourt, David H. Richardson, Ramona Rush*, Pritam S. Sabharwal, Stanley R. Saxe, Mike Schutte, Otis A. Singletary*, John T. Smith, Tim Smith*, Terry Squires, Marjorie S. Stewart, Louis J. Swift, Leonard Tipton, Lee T. Todd, M. Stanley Wall, Mike Whitlock*, H. David Wilson, Fred W. Zechman*,

The minutes of the meeting of March 12, 1979, were approved as circulated.

The Chairman made the following announcements. The first item concerned the retirement policy which has been reported by the press. The policy as announced is that persons who are scheduled to retire this year under the retirement rule in force have been given a one-year extension. The President made this a one-year action and no more. It is his hope that well before this time next year we will have a basis for a continuing policy about retirement.

The Chairman called the Senators' attention to the fact that it was imperative to schedule a meeting on April 30. He said he realized it was an imposition, but the Senate Council felt it was better to have the meeting April 30 rather than May 7 during examinations and particularly difficult after that. He added that there would be a full agenda at that time. One item will be a report from the Ombudsman's Office. The meeting will be April 30 at 3:00 p.m. in Room 118 of the Classroom Building.

The Chairman urged the Senators to attend Commencement Exercises on May 12 at 4:00 p.m. He said that Professor Reedy, University Marshal, would be sending out a letter. The Chairman suggested that the Senators should be reserving their hoods.

The Chairman said that there was to be a special report from Dean Ronda Connaway about a project that has been taking place off-campus that was of considerable interest to the Senate. She had a prepared statement which was read by Professor Zafar Hasan from Dean Connaway's Department.

*Absence explained

The statement follows:

COMMENTS TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE ON OFF-CAMPUS INSTRUCTION

I. Introduction

I am pleased to respond to Chairman Bryant's request to comment briefly on the design of off-campus instruction in the College of Social Professions. I will provide a short description of a program of off-campus instruction we have completed and comment on how the program was planned, monitored, and evaluated. If you have questions, either I or the senators from our College will attempt to clarify any points that may be of interest to you.

II. Program description

In the fall 1975, representatives from a number of social agencies and social service programs in eastern Kentucky requested that we consider offering our Master of Social Work degree program in Hazard to meet the needs of a large number of employees who were not free to move to the Lexington campus for such study.

Following the faculty's discussion of this request and their vote to establish the program, we engaged in several months of planning, recruiting applicants, and coordination with the Kentucky Bureau for Social Services which provided a major source of grant support for the program.

The program began in the fall 1976 and was completed at the end of the summer session, 1978. We received forty-six applications; thirty-six applications were approved, and thirty-three students enrolled. Five of these thirty-three dropped out at some point during the first year--either because they found they could not combine work and study or because of deficiencies in academic performance. One additional student who moved into the Hindman area with one year of graduate study in an accredited program in Florida was admitted to the second year of study. Of the twenty-nine students who completed the program of instruction, twenty-six have been awarded the degree; the three remaining students have an incomplete grade and do not qualify for the final comprehensive examination.

With the exception of offering the program over six semesters rather than the four semesters on campus, the program was the same as our on-campus program. The same standards were used for admission to the Graduate School and to our College; we used our regular faculty as instructors except for two additional, temporary faculty hired to teach the practicum course in eastern Kentucky; the course sequence was the same; similar texts and course materials were used following the standard course syllabi.

The majority of students were employees of the Kentucky Bureau for Social Services and located in Hazard, Jackson, London, Williamsburg, Booneville, Beattyville, and Hyden.

III. Program planning, coordination, monitoring, and evaluation

One of the most frequently raised questions/issues about off-campus instruction is how to maintain quality. Obviously, you cannot do it if you simply offer a series of courses on an ad hoc basis using part-time instructors who have little knowledge of or identification with the program. Furthermore, it must be designed in such a way as to meet all similar standards and basic requirements as on-campus instruction. Beyond that, however, additional steps must be taken and structures developed for adequate planning, coordination, monitoring, and evaluation. We set aside several months' planning time in which we tried to anticipate as many problems and difficulties as possible and plan for how they would be handled if they arose. This phase included, for example, working with the Commissioner of the Bureau for Social Services and his staff about program support, the procedures by which the Bureau would pay its employees' tuition, and how its employees would participate in practicum instruction.

One faculty member, Professor Joanne Bell, served as program coordinator. The tasks included the responsibility to serve as student advisor for all students in the program; liaison with University Extension, with the Graduate School admissions officer, with Hazard Community College staff for use of these facilities, and with the state agency; and identification of program needs and potential resources to meet them. The task of coordination turned out to be a time-consuming and difficult one which Professor Bell handled with great interest and care.

In addition to the coordinator's responsibility to monitor the program's progress, the curriculum subcommittee was established to assist in this process. When either students or faculty identified issues or problems within the program, these not only were brought to my attention but also were considered by this committee.

A final evaluation was conducted by the curriculum committee using a process of committee hearings to which all interested faculty and students were invited to share their observations and make recommendations about future off-campus programs. A number of well considered and thoughtful recommendations developed from this process which subsequently were adopted by the faculty and have guided our planning for the off-campus masters degree program which will begin at Northern Kentucky University in June, 1979. For example:

- 1) We now require a personal interview of all applicants to the program for the purpose of clarifying the special demands of graduate study while fully employed.

- 2) We have planned for more systematic means of socialization of students into the College and into the profession.
- 3) We have developed additional library resources.
- 4) We have expanded the planning time prior to the beginning of the program.
- 5) We have designed a more flexible arrangement for the practicum portion of instruction (which we also are planning for on-campus students).

Off-campus instruction is difficult to plan and deliver; however, it appears to be the only way to provide needed instruction to certain groups in Kentucky. We have found it to also be immensely rewarding. It can be a significant contribution to maintaining a positive image of the University in the Commonwealth.

The Chairman thanked Professor Hasan for reading the statement.

The Chairman recognized Professor Daniel Reedy for a motion from the Senate Council. Professor Reedy, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposed revision in the University Senate Rules, Section V, 1.8.1, "Withdrawal Policy." This proposal had been circulated to members of the University Senate under the date of March 22, 1979. The Chairman said that the Senate Council had attempted to incorporate the sentiments of the majority at the last meeting. The floor was opened for questions and discussion.

A Student Senator said that he strongly questioned the proposed change in number three and wanted to go on record as being in favor of if a student were going to drop after the half of a course for non-academic reasons, the instructor's approval on a petition was not needed. The Chairman said that the word "instructor" was not in the proposed change. Professor Lienhard said that an instructor had to sign the withdrawal card with a "WP" or "WF" and therefore the instructor could not be taken out of the process.

Professor Gesund said that he was still unhappy about the one-third and one-sixth business. He said there was one additional problem and that was withdrawing during the first third without leaving a mark of any kind. Professor Gesund proposed an amendment which was seconded that number one would read:

"During the first week of a course a student may withdraw without leaving a mark of any kind."

Number two would read:

"During the remainder of the first half of the course the withdrawing student must receive a mark of a "W."

Professor Gesund added that he thought it was part of the true academic spirit and if a student had attended a course for half a semester, some kind of record should be available.

Professor Adelstein said the withdrawal policy had been passed in December, 1977, and there had been a problem with implementation. He said he thought the Senate was meeting to discuss the Senate Council's decision on how to implement the policy. He added that Professor Gesund's amendment was contrary to the spirit of the implementation. He said he considered that out of order and added that he felt the proposed change number one could not be amended and should remain as passed by the Senate in 1977. The Chair ruled that the amendment was in order. Professor Weil said that when the Senate previously debated the subject of withdrawals there was an interpretation of the meaning of the grade of "W" which was now being changed. One of the reasons for adopting the one-third, one-sixth rule was the interpretation of the grade of "W" at that time and also to have some distinction between various time periods in which the student was dropping. The proposal now was what grade to assign the latter half of the semester to indicate what kind of "W" a student had such as "WP", "WF" or a letter grade of an "E." He said he felt it was quite appropriate since a new grade was being introduced. Professor Smith said that he had been offended with the idea of the one-sixth ever since it had been introduced but something no one ever pointed out was that one-sixth of the semester was approximately two weeks. He said the Senate instituted the time periods initially trying to make the "W" mean a lot of different things and attempted to use time at which the grade of "W" was assigned. He added the new proposal very clearly delineated that and he supported Professor Gesund's amendment. Professor Marlatt asked what the first week and half week meant. Professor Gesund said that basically he meant the first full week of classes. He added that it was a week on the calendar from the first day of classes.

Professor Stephenson said that he was sorry the amendment had been introduced so early in the discussion because he had hoped to hear some discussion about alternatives that were discussed at a previous meeting. He asked what consideration the Senate Council had given to the suggestions of Dean Royster and the Undergraduate Council. The Chairman said that the question was not germane to the amendment, but he responded that the suggestion receiving the overwhelming approval of the Senate was the proposal by Dean Royster and the proposal presented was essentially Dean Royster's proposal with a slight modification. The previous question was moved, seconded and passed. The amendment passed with a hand count of 49 to 45.

Professor Olszewsky made a substitute motion which was seconded to read:

1. Change the meaning of "W" from "withdrew passing" to "withdrew."
2. Make no change in Senate Rule V. 1.8.1.
3. Change Senate Rule V.1.8.2 to read:
 - (a) A student may withdraw from a class during the latter half of the term upon approval by the dean of the student's college of a petition certifying urgent non-academic reasons including but not limited to:
 - I. Illness or injury of the student;
 - II. Serious personal or family problems;
 - III. Serious financial difficulties.

If such a petition is approved by the dean of the student's college, the student is assigned a grade of "W."

Professor Olshewsky said that his understanding of the difference in the two proposals was that the Undergraduate Council's proposal kept the current pattern of one-third with no grade, one-sixth with a "W" grade and did not introduce the additional machinery outlined on page three of the original proposal. If a student withdrew from a class with approval of the Dean for non-academic reasons, the student would get the same grade as though he had withdrawn during the "grace period" before mid-term with a grade of "W." He added if his substitute motion passed, that would wipe out the Senate Council's proposal and the amendment. Professor Weil said that the way he read the proposal as circulated by the Senate Council he was not certain that interpretation was correct. The Chairman said that what the Senate Council did not want to do was take away from the instructor the right to award a grade except for urgent reasons approved by the Dean.

Professor Ivey said that there were three proposed changes. The first two pertained to one rule and the last one pertained to another rule, and the first part of Professor Gesund's amendment concerned V, 1.8.1 and the one Professor Olshewsky referred to was V, 1.8.2. He said that if they were to be divided, it should be recognized. The Chairman said that the answer to Professor Weil's question was that if the Dean assigned a "WP" or "WF" , he obviously was going to have to consult with someone.

Professor Smith said that the motion on the floor was out of order because the Senate had just voted to change the items covered by the Gesund amendment. The motion on the floor was to reverse that action. The Parliamentarian ruled the motion out of order. Professor Olshewsky said that his own preference was to have the whole package as presented by the Undergraduate Council, but if he could not have that simplification then he supported the other proposal as amended. The Chair ruled that the Parliamentarian's advice was correct, and the substitute motion was out of order. A Student Senator appealed the rule of the Chair for the substitute motion and the appeal was seconded. The Parliamentarian said that it was debatable and needed a majority vote to sustain the appeal. The previous question was moved, seconded and passed. The motion to reverse the ruling of the Chair failed.

Professor Ivey said that if the Olshewsky substitute motion on number three passed, then the action on the Gesund amendment would be rescinded. He added that the items voted on in the amendment of Professor Gesund applied to V, 1.8.1. If anything were done about number three it had nothing to do with V, 1.8.1, it only applied to V. 1.8.2. The mistake was running items one, two, and three together and assuming that if a change were made in three, it affected one and two. He added that V, 1.8.1 had been amended.

Professor Adelstein moved and the motion was seconded for a division of the two parts of the withdrawal rule. Professor Weil asked for an explanation from Professor Adelstein of the reasons for the proposed division. Professor Weil said that it seemed to him the proposal was presented as a package, and he saw reasons to support Professor Gesund's amendment on the grounds that it would be connected with the "WP" and "WF." Professor Adelstein said that he felt the two parts were separate rules. The first rule dealt with withdrawing the first half of the course, and the second rule dealt with urgent reasons for withdrawing.

The previous question was moved and passed. The motion to divide Items one and two passed with a hand count of 49 to 45.

Professor Thrailkill proposed an amendment which was seconded and reads as follows:

1. Change the meaning of "W" from "withdrew passing" to "withdrew."
2. Change Senate Rule V, 1.8.2 to read:

(a) A student may withdraw from a class during the latter half of the term upon approval by the dean of the student's college of a petition certifying urgent non-academic reasons including but not limited to:

- I. Illness or injury of the student;
- II. Serious personal or family problems;
- III. Serious financial difficulties.

If such a petition is approved by the dean of the student's college, the student is assigned a grade of "W."

After further discussion Professor Reedy moved to refer the second item, V. 1.8.2 of the withdrawal rule to the Senate Council for further consideration with the request that the Council present a proposal to the Senate at their meeting on April 30. The motion passed with a hand count of 40 to 34.

There was a call for a quorum. There were only 64 voting members present; therefore, the last two action items on the agenda could not be considered and were postponed until the April 30 meeting.

Motion was made to adjourn at 4:35 p.m.

Martha M. Ferguson
Recording Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

March 26, 1979

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday
April 9, 1979. Proposal from the College of Dentistry
to establish Academic Disciplinary Policies. If
approved, the proposal will be forwarded to the Rules
Committee for codification.

Background:

Last year the College of Dentistry formulated a set of academic disciplinary policies and forwarded them to the Senate Council for approval and inclusion in the Senate Rules. The Council sent the proposal to the Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards, which suggested several modifications. The Senate Council itself has subsequently made modifications in the proposal. All these have been accepted by the College of Dentistry. The Council now submits it to the Senate with a recommendation for approval.

The Proposal:

Academic Disciplinary Policy Number One: Basis for Academic Discipline

Objective of the Policy: To define the basis for academic discipline in the Professional Dental Education Program

Policy Statement: Disciplinary action for students in the Professional Dental Education Program will be initiated upon unsatisfactory academic performance.

Responsible Agent: The Dean.

Page 2

Senate Agenda Item: April 9, 1979

March 26, 1979

Methods and Procedures: Requests to alter academic disciplinary policy will be made in writing to the Academic Council. (Refer to the Rules of the Faculty, Section III, 6.1.)

Academic Disciplinary Policy Number Two: Academic Probation

Objective of the Policy: To define academic probation.

Policy Statement: A student who fails a course will be placed on academic probation. If a student is performing unsatisfactorily in one or more courses the Academic Performance Committee may recommend probation. The duration of academic probation will be at least one complete semester.

Responsible Agent: The Dean.

Methods and Procedures: The Assistant Dean for Student Affairs will notify the student who is subject to academic probation and will report this information to the Dean. The Academic Performance Committee will recommend the terms of probation. The terms of the academic probation will be stated in a letter from the Dean.

Academic Disciplinary Policy Number Three: Academic Suspension

Objective of the Policy: To define academic suspension.

Policy Statement: A student will be suspended from the College of Dentistry if the student:

- 1) fails to meet the terms of academic probation,
- 2) is placed on academic probation for a second time,
- 3) has been in residence in a dental curriculum for five academic years and has not been graduated,
- 4) has been admitted with advanced standing and has not been graduated within one year following the end of the time period agreed to upon admission,
- 5) fails two or more courses during an academic year.

Responsible Agent: The Dean.

Methods and Procedures: The Assistant Dean for Student Affairs will notify the student who is subject to academic suspension and will report this information to the Dean. The Dean may place a student on academic probation instead of suspension if the individual case justifies it.

Academic Disciplinary Policy Number Four: Procedures for Consideration of Academic Suspension

Objective of the Policy: To define the review process in consideration of academic suspension.

Policy Statement: A student who is subject to academic suspension may request a review.

Responsible Agent: The Dean.

Methods and Procedures: The procedures for the review of academic suspension will include the following:

- 1) A review will be held if requested by the student subject to suspension. This request must be in writing and received by the Dean within five (5) school days of notification of suspension.
- 2) The student shall state the basis of the request for review.
- 3) The Dean will appoint an Ad Hoc Committee of faculty, with a student representative, to review the case.
- 4) A student for whom a review has been scheduled:
 - a) will be allowed to inspect any records relevant to the suspension procedure.
 - b) will be entitled to choose a member of the faculty and a classmate to be present at the review.
 - c) will have the right to hear and question any witnesses.
 - d) will be given the opportunity to present the basis for requesting a review.
- 5) The minutes and recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee will be forwarded to the Dean.

Page 4

Senate Agenda Item: April 9, 1979

March 26, 1979

- 6) The Dean will meet with the student to review the recommendations and solicit comments.
- 7) The decision of the Dean is final for the College.

Academic Disciplinary Policy Number Five: Participation in Curricular Privileges or Extracurricular Activities while on Academic Probation

Objective of the Policy: To define curricular and extracurricular restrictions for students on academic probation.

Policy Statement: A student who is on academic probation will be excluded from participation in curricular privileges or extracurricular activities of the College of Dentistry. Curricular and extracurricular exclusions consist of:

- 1) taking enrichment courses except as described in Curriculum Policy Number Eleven.
- 2) beginning a totally self-instructional course before the official starting date unless this course is part of a special curriculum developed by the Academic Performance Committee.
- 3) serving as an officer or committee member of any College of Dentistry organization or committee.
- 4) participating in any College of Dentistry extracurricular activity or in the activity of any College of Dentistry organization if the participation involves the expenditure of an appreciable amount of time.

Participation in these activities will be considered a violation of the terms of probation.

Responsible Agent: The Dean

Methods and Procedures: The Dean will include these restrictions in the terms of probation.

Academic Disciplinary Policy Number Six: Removal from Academic Probation

Page 5

Senate Agenda Item: April 9, 1979

March 26, 1979

Objective of the Policy: To define the conditions for removing a student from academic probation.

Responsible Agent: The Dean

Methods and Procedures: When a student has met the terms of probation, the Assistant Dean for Student Affairs will report the student's name to the Dean.

Academic Disciplinary Policy Number Seven: Reinstatement Following Academic Suspension

Objective of the Policy: To define the process for reinstatement following academic suspension.

Policy Statement: A student on academic suspension may apply for reinstatement under probation. The reinstatement may not become effective until at least one complete semester has passed from the time of suspension.

Responsible Agent: The Dean.

Methods and Procedures: A student may be considered for reinstatement upon submission of a written request to the Dean who shall make a decision. Upon reinstatement by the Dean, the student will be placed on academic probation, the terms of which will be recommended by the Academic Performance Committee.

Grade Review Policy

Objective of the Policy: To define the process for student grade review.

Policy Statement: A student has the right to request and receive a grade review.

Responsible Agent: The Dean.

Methods and Procedures: A student before requesting a grade review, will attempt to resolve the issues with the Course Director and the Department Chairman.

- 1) Should this meeting fail to resolve the issue, the student may submit a written request (which should include the basis for the grade review) to the Assistant Dean for Student Affairs for the formation of a Grade Review Committee.
- 2) The Grade Review Committee will consist of five (5) voting members (four faculty and one student) appointed by the Assistant Dean for Student Affairs. The Assistant Dean for Student Affairs will appoint the Chairperson of the Committee. The student requesting the grade review is entitled to disqualify, without cause, a total of two (2) of the five(5) voting members. The replacements will be chosen to maintain the composition as described previously.
- 3) The Assistant Dean for Student Affairs will designate the time and place for the meeting and assure that the issue is resolved within thirty (30) days of the formation of the Committee. The student, the advisor, the department chairperson, the course director, and any other persons having information relevant to the case in question will be requested to attend the meeting, at which time the situation will be fully discussed by all parties concerned. Following this open discussion, the Committee will make a recommendation to the department chairperson and the course director involved. The Committee will not have the prerogative of changing the grade.
- 4) In situations in which a failing grade subjects the student to possible suspension, the grade review shall become the responsibility of the Ad Hoc Review Committee considering suspension.

Joseph A. Bryant
Department of English
1215 Patterson Office Tower

02712

EF

/cet