

AUG 8 1990

copy 1

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, APRIL 9, 1990

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, April 9, 1990, in Room 106 of the Classroom Building.

Donald C. Leigh, Chairman of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent were: Ronald Atwood*, Michael Baer*, Harry V. Barnard, Raymond Betts, George E. Blandford, Michael W. Bowling*, Douglas Boyd, Carolyn S. Bratt, Stanley D. Brunn*, Joan C. Callahan, Rutheford B Campbell, Jr.*, Ben W. Carr, Edward A. Carter, Jordan L. Cohen*, Clifford J. Cremers*, Randall W. Dahl*, Ramona Dalton*, Frederick Danner*, Ann Davidson, Ronald Dillehay*, Richard C. Domek, Jr.*, Vincent Drnevich*, James Drummond*, Ronald D. Eller*, Charles W. Ellinger, Rob Followell*, Raymond E. Forgue, J. Brauch Fugate, Daniel L. Fulks, Richard W. Furst, Lester Goldstein*, Philip A. Greasley, Marilyn C. Hamann*, Zafar Hasan, Laurie R. Hatch*, Robert E. Hemenway, Micki King Hogue, Stephanie Howard, Alfred S. L. Hu, Bruce Hunt, David C. Johnson, John Paul Jones, Gerald Lemons, Linda Levstik*, Scott Lewis, C. Oran Little, Beth Loafman*, Robert Lohman, Ken Lovins, William E. Lyons, Martin McMahon*, Ernest Middleton*, William G. Moody*, Jim Musser*, Dennis T. Officer*, Clayton R. Paul, Deborah E. Powell*, Doug Reed, Thomas C. Robinson, Wimberly C. Royster, Edgar L. Sagan, Fred Schwendeman*, Michael C. Shannon*, Robert H. Spedding*, Jeffrey Stivers*, Louis J. Swift, Dennis M. TeKrony, Richard H. Underwood, Steven C. Weisenburger*, Charles T. Wethington, Carolyn A. Williams*, Eugene Williams, Paul A. Willis, Emery A. Wilson, and Thomas R. Zentall*.

The Minutes of the meetings of February 12, 1990, and March 5, 1990, were approved as circulated.

The Chairman made the following announcements:

There will be a special meeting of the Senate on Monday, April 23 in order to consider several action items which have recently been received from various Senate committees and most have been approved by the Senate Council. You should be receiving those items within the next day or two. At that meeting Interim President Wethington will make a few remarks on the budget for 1990-92.

You may recall that about a year ago we were considering the subject of plus/minus grading system which was precipitated by a proposal from the College of Fine Arts. A University-wide system was discussed at a meeting about a year ago and the Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards was charged with doing a further study. They have done a survey of faculty and students and have recommended against a University-wide system, and they have also recommended against the Fine Arts proposal. The Fine Arts proposal will come back to the Senate floor in two weeks at the April 23 meeting.

*Absence explained.

Minutes, University Senate, April 9, 1990

The Chair recognized Professor Loys Mather (Agriculture) for a report from the Presidential Search Committee.

A Summary of Professor Mather's remarks follow:

Professor Mather stated that there was little new information to report because the committee has not met since Professor Bratt's report at the March 5 meeting. The committee is receiving nominations at the present.

Professor Mather stated the committee has given unanimous approval for the statement of qualifications for the next president which is essentially the same statement which was adopted for the previous search. The committee has circulated through the Chronicle of Higher Education, through Black Issues and through Initiatives, which is a publication directed toward women in higher education, an announcement soliciting nominations. The alumni will be notified through the Kentucky Open Door. The Committee has also sent a letter to faculty inviting nominations.

Professor Mather stated that to date 39 nominations have been received, and the committee is in the process of following up to obtain applications from those individuals. Nine applications have been received.

Professor Mather urged the faculty to nominate candidates. He stated that most of the 39 nominations have come from the alumni or in response to the national advertisements. Only about ten nominations have come from the faculty. The committee will begin to review the applications in May.

He noted there was a vacancy on the Search Committee due to the death of Nicholas Pisacano, and anticipates another trustee will be appointed prior to the committee's next meeting in May.

Professor Mather entertained questions from the floor. Professor Jo Ann Wever (Nursing) wanted to know if Dr. Wethington had applied. Professor Mather stated that he was not allowed to respond to the question.

There were no further questions and Professor Mather thanked the Senate and the Chairman expressed his thanks to Professor Mather.

The Chair welcomed Dr. Peter P. Bosomworth (Chancellor of the Medical Center).

A Summary of Chancellor Bosomworth's remarks follows:

Chancellor Bosomworth reported on the status of activities that have been going on in the Medical Center. He stated that this goes back to the Medical Center's interest in planning and has existed for a long period of time. They got intensely interested in planning in 1980 when the

Minutes, University Senate, April 9, 1990

orientation of the Medical Center and its financial structure were under some threat. In 1980 the hospital got into a position where the reserves in the hospital were \$180,000. The financial health and well-being of the hospital is very central to the health and well-being to the entire Medical Center. From that time forward a group from the Medical Center decided they had to do something to help themselves and they could not be dependent upon the state of Kentucky. In order to help medical administrators, faculty, and hospital administrators, Chancellor Bosomworth started a planning process and a prioritization process to get everybody working together because the health of all the units is tied together. He stated they have become more sophisticated and have moved in the direction of strategic planning. He stated that the difficulties in planning are that everybody cannot be involved so representative people have been used in the planning.

Chancellor Bosomworth reported on activities that are in place, contemplated or underway that are a result of strategic planning in the Medical Center. One is a move in primarily the College of Medicine toward problem based learning. He stated that conceptually problem based learning is a technique of teaching that the faculty member does very little lecturing. There is a patient situation and a group of students who come together to study, analyze, and identify the therapeutic and diagnostic problems of the case. The students study the economical, social, ethical, and cost problems that are associated with the care of that particular patient. He stated that it is an intense effort on the part of the faculty and a very intense effort on the part of the students. The experiment has been warmly endorsed by the student body. Chancellor Bosomworth does not know whether or not it will spread to the rest of the Medical Center, but there is push behind it because the accrediting bodies are beginning to look at whether the Medical Center is effective in utilizing some of the methodologies.

Chancellor Bosomworth stated there has been an emphasis on multidisciplinary research. The Medical Center has evolved a concept, approach, and process to the development of multidisciplinary research which he feels is working and hopes this is shared by the faculty of the Institution. His feeling is that multidisciplinary research cannot be developed as an island of its own. It has to be developed on the basis of strong discipline areas in each of the colleges. Most of the multidisciplinary programs that exist in the Medical Center and some of those that go beyond the Medical Center essentially have a very small core of people and funding. The principal resources are allocated to and based in the disciplines with an expectation on the part of leadership at both the dean's level and the departmental chairman's level that movement toward those centers will occur in terms of new faculty, direction of research, and that generally has been successful in keeping the Medical Center and particularly the College of Medicine effective in the competition for peer review funds at the next level.

Chancellor Bosomworth stated that the planning had tried to develop a consensus on where the principal focuses should be for center development so that hospital, college and external resources can be mobilized primar-

Minutes, University Senate, April 9, 1990

ily in these areas. The three areas are neurosciences, cancer and cardio respiratory diseases. Within those general priorities he stated there are centers in aging - alzheimers and stroke; cancer - basic, clinical, epidemiological; drugs and alcohol - behavioral, chemical, psychological, pharmacological; cardiovascular diseases - imaging, surgical, therapeutic. The Center for Pharmaceutical Sciences and Technology is principally concentrated within the College of Pharmacy but will grow beyond that to incorporate other elements of the University. An activity that is developing is an interesting combination in sports medicine with rehabilitation, fitness, physical therapy, and the surgical aspect of sports medicine.

Chancellor Bosomworth reported that last year the Medical Center provided 350,000 outpatient visits with patients being from every county in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Last year there were 35,000 emergency room visits and 17,000 inpatient visits. The faculty, primarily in the College of Medicine, operate some 600 subspecialty clinics on a state-wide basis. Last year almost 40,000 patients were seen away from the campus of the University of Kentucky.

Chancellor Bosomworth reported on the rural health initiative that was contained in Senator Bailey's Bill and supported by Senator Maloney. There is a piece of that legislation that focuses on the development of the rural health initiative, an activity which will take place primarily in Eastern Kentucky. It has multiple components to it. One is a residency in family practice in Eastern Kentucky and another is a mobile dental health care program. Also contained in that legislation is funding for the Area Health Education Center. The legislation would also fund a Center in Rural Health Services Research which focuses on policy, epidemiology, data development and will provide some remarkable opportunities for faculty who are interested in that particular aspect of health care delivery. It also funds a nursing fast-track program into the masters degree. In Eastern Kentucky there are many more applicants for nursing than there are teachers. Another element is medical technology - a bachelor's program which would be offered away from the campus in toto with the cooperation with the Community College System and perhaps other universities. Chancellor Bosomworth hopes that a bachelor's program in physical therapy offered away from the campus to non-traditional students will remain in the regions. He stated that this flowed out of interaction with the rural health leadership group of citizens that numbers about 80 people. These people decided what they wanted rather than the University telling them what they needed.

Chancellor Bosomworth stated that part of the strategic planning calls for improvement in service management. He stated that the University has a large number of constituents in the students, faculty, families of patients, patients, members of the legislature, executive branch of the government, the Board of Trustees, and each other in the Medical Center who must be concerned about serving one and another as they try to serve these constituencies. He stated they are developing a Medical Center-wide initiative to put them in a position of being the best service providers for health science education and patient care in

Minutes, University Senate, April 9, 1990

Kentucky. He said that was quite a goal and they feel they are doing a good job but think they can do better.

Chancellor Bosomworth stated that the Medical Center has been involved in the construction of a Magnetic Resonance Imaging Facility, the hospital addition, parking structure, the Kentucky Medical Services Foundation, the physicians practice plan is building a ten or eleven million dollar facility from revenue that they generate from patient care, and an addition for ambulatory patient care that is going on the third floor of the Medical Center. He reported that all of these projects were built without any state appropriated dollars. Chancellor Bosomworth stated the Medical Center is working on aging research and a patient care facility. Part of that will be private money and he hopes that will leverage into state dollars in the future cycle for funding. He stated that a research building is desperately needed in the Medical Center and they could justify one twice as large as they are likely to get. The Medical Center is also looking toward the future with regard to new library and information capabilities, but there is no financial game plan in place at this time.

Chancellor Bosomworth stated that the Medical Center is funded at a little less than 30% state appropriation. The remaining 70% is generated from the faculty, patient care, research grants and contracts or private money. Last year the private funding in the Medical Center was about 8 million dollars.

Chancellor Bosomworth feels the Medical Center has an outstanding group of faculty and students. In looking at the many different perimeters; research productivity, dollars in research, patient volume, success in the patient care program, and success in the teaching program, Chancellor Bosomworth feels the Medical Center is doing quite well considering the limitation of resources that exist at this Institution. He stated that people care about each other. The academic performance of the students is high, and there are good students coming to the Medical Center. The GPA for dental students has never been compromised, but it is starting to go up again. Programs such as physical therapy have entering standards with a GPA of 3.0 or better. There have been similar kinds of progress made in pharmacy with the average GPA of 3.3 for entering students.

Chancellor Bosomworth's report gave a summary of where the Medical Center is in terms of moving on some elements of strategic planning. He stated they will continue the process and are doing it in the context of the University's Strategic Plan but the Medical Center has brought a lot of specificity in terms of prioritization and program development.

In a question and answer period Professor Raymond Cox (Mathematics) wanted to know how it would affect the Medical Center if the Legislature appropriated \$300,000,000 to Humana Hospital. Chancellor Bosomworth stated it would put all the hospitals outside of Jefferson County at a competitive disadvantage to the extent that we would jump through hoops that they won't have to jump through. He added that Humana has essentially an open easy pathway to make

Minutes, University Senate, April 9, 1990

major investments, including making investments here in Lexington. They are proposing to build a neo-natal intensive care unit at Humana-Lexington. Chancellor Bosomworth stated that the health-care environment is changing rapidly. The Medical Center is providing more than 70% of the health care to faculty and staff of the University.

A Senator asked where new facilities might be built. Chancellor Bosomworth stated that the Medical Center had about 5,000 employees. They are located on 2% of the University's campus land in terms of physical use of land. He added that they are in the process of trying to acquire and are indeed acquiring land across Limestone all the way to the railroad tracks. The Medical Center is gradually acquiring pieces of property which is a very slow and expensive process. He stated there are land-use consultants on campus that are looking campus-wide at land use, traffic flow, placement of buildings, aggregation of buildings, where should research buildings go, where should patient care facilities go, and where should hospital expansion take place in the future. He stated that even though a \$50,000,000 addition to the hospital is being finished, if the hospital continues to be successful, it will continue to have growth. Those questions are being addressed on a campus-wide basis and the Medical Center administration is actively engaged with consultants in that area.

Chancellor Bosomworth was given a round of applause. Chairman Leigh stated that the last question led into the next item. The Chair recognized Professor Russ Groves (Architecture), Chair of the Senate Committee on Academic Facilities, to present a report on "Campus Planning." Professor Groves stated that for the last year the Academic Facilities Committee has concentrated on monitoring the on-going campus planning process which was undertaken in earnest about a year ago. Much has happened during that period. He stated that planning exercises have occurred on the campus over a period of years going back to the days of Presidents Patterson and McVey. He feels that few have met with a great deal of success. The committee hopes that the present planning initiative underway will meet with a great deal of success. The committee recently met with Mr. Warren Denny who is the University Architect and Director of the Office of University Design and Construction. He has been working with a Master Planning Consultant that has been charged with developing specific plans for the Medical Center Sector and the main campus. The committee, in the process of receiving a presentation, was told by Mr. Denny that he was willing to bring the consultants to the Senate to present, not a plan, but a summary of the process that has taken place with two goals in mind. One is to acquaint the Senate with what has taken place and secondly, to give each and every member of the Senate and faculty an opportunity to have direct input into the process. Professor Groves feels that is something that has not happened over the years and is essential for a successful plan. He encouraged the Senate to submit through the department, dean or directly to Mr. Denny their concerns, issues, and observations so that they might be incorporated into the planning process. The planners assured the committee that all issues would be considered.

Professor Groves introduced Mr. Warren Denny, the campus architect. Mr. Denny thanked the Senate for letting him be a part of the agenda. He stated that he had never had the opportunity to reach out to so many faculty people

Minutes, University Senate, April 9, 1990

on the issue of planning. His hope is that this would not be the last kind of interaction but one of many. He emphasized that the planning process is not revisiting strategic planning but taking the University's strategic planning and building from it. He stated that there are two tracks being followed. He stated that Chancellor Bosomworth alluded to the rapid growth in the Medical Center area. Two steering committees have been established to work with the planners, one for the Medical Center and one for the Lexington Campus. The steering committees are primarily made up of the deans in each of the sectors. They are the principal interactors with the Chancellors and planners. Mr. Denny stated that President Roselle in looking at the growth potential allowed to be funded a plan. For the last three and a half months data has been gathered in meeting with people on campus. Mr. Denny stated that the planners were ready to embark on a process to look into the alternatives. In December several national firms were interviewed and Hansen Lind Meyer were hired. Mr. Denny introduced Mr. Chris Liakakos and Ralph Lotito who are with the firm of Hansen Lind Meyer.

Mr. Ralph Lotito gave a presentation on the process which the consultants are working on at the present. He showed the Senators a diagram of the process which is divided into three different phases: analysis, development and implementation. He thanked both the Medical Center and Lexington Campus for the amount of support given in gathering the tremendous amount of data. There have been interviews, meetings with the facilities people and with students, and retreats with the steering committees and deans.

Mr. Lotito stated that the University and Medical Center have to implement and continually update, review and monitor that plan to make it successful. He stated that the consultants would be out of the picture on campus but would like to continue working with the University.

Mr. Lotito reported that the main items covered in the retreats with both sectors were needs, images both in building and site image concerns, functional relationships and circulation. One of the needs for the Lexington Campus is a centralized student administrative services center - one place for the students to take care of all their needs such as records, financial aid, admissions, etc. Another was a need to accommodate research growth, recreation and housing needs for students, diversified kinds of housing and for additional athletics and recreation space adjacent to living areas.

Mr. Lotito reported that on the Medical Center side there are needs for potential enterprise zone where joint ventures might come into the campus area and work with the Medical Center in developing. Everyone is concerned with a humane environment and in maintaining and creating a more humane environment on the campus. There is a concern about cohesive and separate identity for the two sectors. The consultants kept hearing that this is Kentucky and the University does not want a Chicago campus. One of the Medical Center needs is a cohesive identity in joint ventures and how those have an identity and visibility and yet a part of the Institution.

Mr. Lotito reported on the boundaries of the different colleges and sectors and in fact, the University and the community. In image, the humane environment came up that there would be open space which is well developed and identified. The Medical Center had similar but slightly different issues

Minutes, University Senate, April 9, 1990

relating to building an image and that had to do with interesting buildings that are cohesive with the University and are transitional to allow for future flexibility.

The consultants and planners looked at functional relationships--how should housing and colleges be related--should they be spread throughout the land or should they be concentrated more as they are now. In the Medical Center Sector the relationship of research with animal care came up. Mr. Lotito reported on the strong relationship which the Veterans Administration has with the Medical Center. The last of the issues in Mr. Lotito's presentation was pedestrian circulation, access onto the campus, service and the needs that are generated. He stated that if vehicle circulation is removed, then the walk to campus must be pleasant and secure, perhaps the use of a tram service might be used. Parking in terms of how to manage it, such as exclusive visitor parking, was discussed. The Medical Center has similar issues.

Mr. Lotito encouraged comments to be forwarded to Mr. Denny and the deans to be incorporated into the planning process. The floor was then opened for questions. Professor Jonathan Glixon (Fine Arts) stated that he did not see from the presentation where there have been meetings with the faculty, and he did not see anything about instruction, classroom space, additional faculty research facilities, or a student center. Mr. Lotito apologized for the selection that was made in terms of what to present. He stated that a large issue of discussion was classrooms both in location and their relationship between the Medical Center and the Lexington Campus. He added that it is in the tremendous body of data. He told the Senators to put comments, questions and issues to the deans or department heads for the planning process. Chancellor Bosomworth stated that Mr. Lotito had covered a lot of information very rapidly and his feeling is that the faculty needs to be able to see what the considerations are because no decisions have been made. Mr. Lotito stated that is correct and felt perhaps the Retreat Books would be an excellent media of sharing a lot of the information that has been generated to date. Mr. Lotito stated this is not a terminal project and should be continued and one of the reasons for his being at the meeting is to stimulate the faculty and get involvement. Chancellor Bosomworth stated that in order to have a meaningful kind of interaction the faculty should be given more information. Professor Glixon is worried that the consultants will be gone and changes might not then be part of the organic plan. Professor Groves stated that the committee wants the faculty to have an opportunity to see what the alternatives are. Mr. Lotito stated that the most important part of the whole planning process is to establish a process with constant review and update with the implementation of each project done in an organized manner with each issue that comes up in each planning process.

There were no further questions and Chairman Leigh thanked Professor Groves, Mr. Denny and the consultants.

The Chair recognized Professor Marcus McEllistrem (Physics and Astronomy) for the first action item on the agenda. Professor McEllistrem, on behalf of the Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposal to amend University Senate Rules, Section V - 2.4.7, Common Examinations. The proposal was circulated under date of 23 March 1990.

Minutes, University Senate, April 9, 1990

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Professor Hans Gesund (Engineering) wanted to know the form in which the notice must be given and if a casual mention by the student would be sufficient. He wanted to know if "written notice" could be added. His concern is that there is nothing that specifies the kind of notice the student must give. His feeling is that a written notice should be given so that the instructor has something in writing. Chairman Leigh feels there should be a written notice so an editorial change will be made by adding "written" before "notice". Professor Mark Berger (Economics), coordinator for Economics 201, wanted to let the Senate know where he stands on the issue of common exams. He opposed all four changes which the Senate Council recommended and believes this one is the most important of the changes. He stated that students know the common exams are going to be given because even the date is printed in the Schedule of Classes. He feels if students do register for other courses they do not have to be given excused exams especially when other options are given such as providing sections that do not have common exams. He does not feel that students are unduly burdened. He added that students are already given plenty of opportunity to work with the common exam. He does not see why the extra rule is needed and it will just burden the implementation of common exams. He urged the Senators to vote against the proposal. Professor Gesund stated that it becomes very difficult at the end of pre-registration to schedule students into the classes they need and want. He stated that anything which restricts enrollment for students is going to make it impossible for some of the engineering students who register late to take a certain course under the conditions Professor Berger was outlining. The proposed change would enable the students to take the course because the sections that may be available that do not conflict are probably closed. Professor Glixon stated that all the proposal is doing is giving the student a legitimate absence just as an illness would be a legitimate absence.

Professor Robert Guthrie's (Chemistry) perception is that in practice this proposal is something that has not been necessary. When there is no alternative time for a student to take a class, arrangements have been made for the student. His feeling is that the proposal invites a problem and says that the common exam does not have the same status as a class. He stated that common exams are important and give students the opportunity to take an exam evenly with all the other students in the same class. He feels having the problem formalized is unnecessary and overly complicates the process of common examinations.

Ms. Frankie Garrison (Ombudsman's Office) stated that the Ombudsman's Office has been arranging for students to come to class early or late and the problem is not going to go away. She stated that letters have to be written every semester to arrange for students to take the exams either early or late. This is causing problems and she feels the Senate needs to deal with it. Professor Harry Clarke (Fine Arts) stated there are ensembles, theatre productions and things they do in Fine Arts that have very limited opportunity for scheduling. What the college does conscientiously is try to schedule classes at a time when there is the least time conflict involved because Fine Arts crosses almost every college in the University. Professor Clarke's feeling is the proposal might be one solution for solving some of the problems.

Minutes, University Senate, April 9, 1990

Professor Raymond Cox (Mathematics) wanted an interpretation under 2.4.7 Option three concerning giving exams at widely disparate times. The Chair noted that was not the proposal on the floor at the present time and was a separate issue. Professor Constance Wilson (Social Work) called for the question. The motion was seconded. The Chair did not want to discontinue debate if there were further questions. Professor Wilson's feelings were to go to the issue first and then take up Professor Cox' question. The Chair asked if option three was relevant to the discussion on the floor. Professor Cox stated that evidently only number four was being finalized. The Chair stated that was true. Student Senator Mehran Jahed stated that this is an issue that has concerned students and faculty for a very long time, and he did not think it should be postponed. He added that the issue would be on the agenda until it was resolved.

There was no further discussion. In a hand count there were 34 in favor of the proposal and the Chair ruled that the motion carried and reads as following:

Current Rule

V 2.4.7 Common Examinations

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 scheduled examination. (US:4/14/80)

Departments electing to give exams, other than final exams, in a course to all sections of the course at a common time shall be required to do the following:

1. List the days of the month, week, and the time at which the exam will be given in the official Schedule of Classes. (US: 2/12/90)
2. Provide an opportunity for students missing such exams with a valid excuse to make up the missed work.

Departments must adopt at least one of the following policies for administering common examinations or some alternate arrangement to be approved by the dean of the college in which the course is given:

1. Provide a prime time course section that does not participate in the common examinations.
2. Spread each examination session over a time block at least one and a half times the length of the examination. (US: 2/12/90)

Minutes, University Senate, April 9, 1990

3. Give two examinations at widely disparate times, but not the morning after the evening examination. (US: 9/13/82; 2/12/90)

- * Any department giving a common examination must give a make-up exam or develop some other arrangement for students with excused absences to gain credit as if they had taken the common exam; a department may not apply a "drop the lowest score" policy to common exams missed with an excused absence. (RC: 11/24/82; upheld by US: 2/13/83)

Proposal as approved:

1. Add the underlined portions as follows:

If a student has a course scheduled at the same time as a common exam and the student has given written notice of the conflict to the instructor at least two weeks prior to the common exam, the student shall be entitled to an excused absence from the conflicting common examination.

Rationale:

The provision allows students to schedule classes that conflict with the posted time of the common examinations. This is an extension of the rule, but it aims at the same spirit as the original: common examinations are unusual in the time demands they make on students, and should not unduly restrict the students' ability to take a full schedule. It also insures an excused absence.

The proposed change is recommended by the Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards and the University Senate Council.

Implementation Date: Spring, 1991

Note: The change as approved will be sent to the Rules Committee for codification.

Professor Cox wanted to know under option three if a department designates one of the two examinations as being a primary exam, and permits students to take the second examination only after an absence approval process, does that meet that option? He stated that the option is "Give two examinations at widely disparate times, but not the morning after the evening examination." The Chair stated that seemed reasonable to him, but the Rules Committee might have to be consulted to see what they think. He added that if they think it has to be more explicit, then a change would need to be made. The Chair stated that he would get a ruling.

Minutes, University Senate, April 9, 1990

Chairman Leigh recognized Professor McEllistrem for the second action item. On behalf of the Senate Council, Professor McEllistrem recommended approval of the proposal to amend University Senate Rules. Section VI - 2.2, Qualifications of the Academic Ombudsman to add "or an emeritus faculty". The proposal was circulated under date of 26 March 1990.

The floor was opened for discussion. Professor Hans Gesund wanted to know if the proposal meant an emeritus faculty member or a collective faculty. The Chair stated that collective faculty would be emeriti faculty. He added that an editorial correction could be made if necessary. Professor Wilson stated that she was told that "emeritus" was male only and if that is true, a change would need to be made. The Chair stated that the proposal would be fixed to include both male and female. Dr. Daniel Reedy (Dean of the Graduate School) wanted to know if the proposal took into account the question that a person may be past the age at which they are employable by the institution. Chairman Leigh stated that it is a paid position, but it is only possible for the University to negotiate with those eligible to be hired by the University. Professor Gesund stated that until 1994 the person would have to be less than 70 years of age.

There were no further comments. The proposal unanimously carried and reads as follows with editorial correction:

Proposal (proposed addition is underlined)

SECTION VI

2.2 Qualifications of the Academic Ombudsman

As established by the Rules of the University Senate the Academic Ombudsman must be a tenured member of the faculty or a member of the emeriti faculty. Beyond this the qualifications should be those which will permit the faculty member to perform the functions of the office with fairness, discretion and efficiency. It is important that the person be regarded by students as one who is genuinely interested in their welfare and sympathetic to their problems. It is equally important that the person be temperate in judgment, judicious in action, and persistent in seeking to achieve prompt and equitable solutions to the problems which are brought to him or her. Frequently the success of the Ombudsman depends upon his/her ability to utilize informal channels of communication and action; therefore, that person should be one able to develop and maintain cordial personal relations with a wide variety of students, faculty and members of the administrative staff. Above all, the person must be one of unquestionable integrity and resolute commitment to justice.

Rationale: Among the emeriti faculty of the University there are those who have both the qualifications and interest to assume the one year half-time position of Ombudsman. It therefore seems reasonable to add them to the pool of

Minutes, University Senate, April 9, 1990

candidates, particularly when the pool of interested and qualified candidates from the tenured faculty is apparently decreasing.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 4:20 p.m.

Martha M. Sutton

Martha M. Sutton
Recording Secretary