

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, APRIL 13, 1998

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., April 13, 1998, in the Auditorium of the W. T. Young Library.

Professor Jim Applegate, Chairperson of the Senate Council presided.

Members absent were: Debra Aaron, Jim Albisetti, M. Mukhtar Ali, Kimberly Anderson*, Leon Assael, Ben Bogia, Douglas Boyd, Fitzgerald Bramwell, Scott Brown, Geza Bruckner, Joseph Burch, Johnny Cailleteau, Edward Carter, Jordan Cohen, Susan DeCarvalho, Philip DeSimone*, Anthony English*, Robert Farquhar, William Freehling, Richard Furst, Hans Gesund*, Jonathan Golding*, Philip Greasley*, Ellen Hahn, David Hamilton*, Patrick Herring*, James Holsinger, Patricia Howard, Rick Hoyle*, Raleigh Jones, Jamshed Kanga, Alan Kaplan, Edward Kasarskis, Craig Koontz, Thomas Lester, Jane Lindle*, C. Oran Little, Donald Madden, Mark Miller, Josh Mitchell, Wolfgang Natter, Anthony Newberry, Jacqueline Noonan, Rhoda-Gale Pollack, Thomas Pope, Shirley Raines, Randall Ratliff, Thomas Robinson, Edgar Sagan, Donald Sands, David Shipley, Gregory Smith, Edward Soltis, David Stockham, Louis Swift*, John Thelin*, Michael Tombllyn, Henry Vasconez, William Wagner, Enid Waldhart*, Thomas Waldhart*, Jesse Weil, Emery Wilson, Eugene Williams, Stephan Wilson*, Donald Witt*, William Witt.

* Absence Explained

The Chair said that the minutes for March 1998 had been distributed. There were no corrections or amendments. The minutes were approved as circulated. The full minutes will be on the WEB.

The Chair recognized Dean Mohney from the College of Architecture for the following memorial resolution.

Resolution for Associate Professor Paul Pinney, Jr., presented to the University of Kentucky Senate on Monday, April 13, 1998

Paul--"Pete"--Pinney defined the goals of the College of Architecture at the University of Kentucky for almost all of his adult life. He was one of the first graduates of the College, in 1965, and set a standard for the College's high aspirations when he left Lexington for a graduate degree in Historic Preservation at Columbia University. Upon completing that degree, he reinforced those high aspirations when he was awarded a Fellowship in Architecture at the American Academy in Rome.

But upon completion of his academic work, Pete came back to Kentucky. A native of Lexington, this commonwealth held a great place in his life, and the College in particular became the focus of his energies and attentions. Over the years, Pete served very ably in a variety of administrative posts, primarily as an Associate Dean of the College. In that capacity he improved the circumstances of many students and faculty members. I can attest personally to the high quality of the counsel that he provided, as I sought him out repeatedly for advice on issues.

But it was in his teaching that Pete found his true calling. He quickly became one of the great design studio professors, and many graduates of the College remember the keen anticipation they felt as his studio approached in the course sequence, and how they competed to be assigned to a place in it. Those who were selected found their high hopes rewarded. Pete's teaching method was spare, clear, focused; he knew when to offer criticism

and when to not say anything, allowing the student to work through a design issue on their own. More often than not, this led to a transcendent moment of enlightenment for cadres of students, and they remember him as a "teacher's teacher," in the words of one distinguished alumni. Pete had the gift of finding the underlying simplicity and elegance in a student project, and showing the student how to extract those virtues in their designs. Out of a confluence of theory, precedent and invention, Pete showed students how to make architecture as art.

Pete described architecture in this manner:

The architect begins his work, immersed in human history, guided by a sense of its continuity, and focused on the intent and hope of making place an embodiment of the past and future in the present. The landscape as found, by its structure, form, and scale, is given its own particular characteristics of place by time and the seasons, and is the first physical order for the receiving of man-made invention. Its boundaries are the horizon and the ever-changing plane of the sky. Therefore, a point located in that landscape is both fixed and transitory in the beginning. At that moment one is concerned with the simultaneous consideration of order and existence—horizontal and vertical; solid and void; inside; outside; and in between; as well as path and arrival, and the formal disposition of spaces which contain life and hold in them memory, speculation, illusion and wonder. The technical means is assumed and the perception of that possibility in every case predates the technical realization. The drawings and models by which this is studied stand for themselves but foremost to the maker is that they are the means to architecture.

The tragic violence of Pete's death on November 3, 1997 stands in complete contrast to the gentleness of his life. He is survived by two children, Antonia and David, a sister in Paducah, Patricia Flynn, and his former wife, Julia Smyth-Pinney.

The Chair asked the Senate to stand for a moment of silence.

The Chair recognized Professor Jim Knoblett from the Carol Martin Gatton College of Business and Economics for the following memorial resolution.

William W. Ecton, Arthur Andersen & Co. Professor of Accountancy

Professor William W. "Bill" Ecton 69, husband of Joan C. Ecton, for 44 years, died at home March 22, 1998. Bill was born in Winchester, Kentucky and graduated from Lafayette High School in Lexington in 1946. He served with the US Army in Korea from 1946-47. He received a BS in Commerce from the University of Kentucky in 1951, his MBA (also from UK) in 1960, and his Ph.D. from the University of Missouri in 1966.

Bill Ecton was a faculty member at UK from 1957 when he was first appointed as an Instructor until his recent retirement. He rose through the ranks and achieved the rank of Professor in 1970. He was the first Chairman of the Department of Accounting beginning in 1966 and served in that capacity until 1974 when he became Acting Dean of the College of Business and Economics. He became Dean in 1976 and served in that capacity through 1980. Bill returned to the Accounting Department to teach auditing in the Fall of 1981 after serving as a Visiting Distinguished Professor at the University of Hawaii. Back teaching, he was named the Outstanding Teacher of the Year by Beta Alpha Psi in 1983 and by Beta Gamma Sigma in 1984. Bill was honored in 1987 with the first professorship in the School of Accountancy when he was named the Arthur Andersen & Co. Professor of Accountancy, and Beta Alpha Psi honored him as an Outstanding Alumnus in 1992. His legacy was

also attested to by the fact that Bill was recently honored when he was inducted into the UK Carol Martin College of Business and Economics Alumni Hall of Fame.

The career of Bill Ecton is noteworthy for several reasons. First, of course, are the legions of ex-students throughout the Commonwealth and far beyond. Countless professional accountants and accounting executives still share stories of the challenges they faced in his undergraduate auditing classes. Hundreds of Masters in Accountancy graduates are grateful for his contributions to their graduate education and over 100 doctorates at universities and colleges world-wide remember him fondly.

Second most noteworthy has to be the building of the original Department of Accounting at the University of Kentucky. When given the go-ahead to begin hiring faculty, Bill went out and recruited A. W. Patrick from the University of Michigan, Jim Knoblett from the University of Washington, Don Madden from the University of Texas, and P. Michael Davis from Illinois. Shortly after, he hired Levis McCullers from the University of Florida and Relmond VanDaniker from the University of Maryland. Seldom has anyone put together a group with such distinguished credentials in such a short period of time, and accomplishing the task given the supply and demand for accounting faculty at the time was an amazing feat. The new department was off to a good start due to Bill Ecton, and its accomplishments over the ensuing years have attested to the quality base of outstanding faculty that he established at that time.

Another milestone for Bill was his early interest in international efforts. He was one of the first to establish academic ties with the Republic of Indonesia, visiting there while dean in the late '70s - becoming a pioneer in what has become a major thrust of the modern-day Carol Martin Gatton College of Business and Economics and, more specifically, the School of Accountancy. The University of Kentucky, the Carol Martin Gatton College of Business and Economics, the School of Accountancy and its alumni owe much to Professor William W. Ecton.

The Chair asked the Senate to stand for a moment of silence.

Chairperson Applegate made the following announcements:

The Board of Trustees agreed to retain four members on the Presidential Search Committee, although they did designate one from the Lexington Community College, which was different than what had been suggested. There will be four faculty on the next Presidential Search Committee.

The Senate Council has suggested a change in the ARs. As you know, the portfolio already requires evaluation of advising, and the Council is suggesting that student evaluations of advising be a part of the portfolio.

The Chair introduced Paul Willis and thanked him for letting the Senate meet in the library.

Paul Willis made the following remarks:

This is the first serious meeting in this room. Mary Molinaro, if you would please stand? Mary will be outside after the meeting if anyone would like to take a look around. =20

I would like to thank the faculty and students for helping with this project. We had a lot of people who not only contributed to the building campaign but to the library endowment. Not only do we have the building in

place; there is also a \$5,000,000 book endowment. We anticipate that this is going to rise. I told the Chair of the Senate Library Committee, David Durant, that he and his committee could take credit for the building today.

They worked with us very carefully over the past few years, and we appreciate that.

The Chair made the following remarks:

I would like to remind the Senate of what has been done this year. Sometimes in the ongoing struggles of trying to achieve progress, the wheels of progress turn slowly and we forget.

First of all, in terms of our external work this year, there was more external work than usual because of the special session of the legislature and regular session of the legislature, which dealt with a lot of issues of deep concern to the faculty, students, and administration of the University of Kentucky. Working together with the Coalition of Senate Faculty Leaders in the state under the able leadership of Loys Mather, we worked to put a voting faculty member on the new Council on Postsecondary Education. I hope that Merl Hackbart might be here next year to speak to the Senate. He has been regularly meeting with COSFL. That certainly may be one of the most important things we did in terms of getting a strong faculty voice in the form of Merl as our first representative on that council.

We did succeed in having rescinded what I felt was an ill-advised form of post-tenure review. We met long hours with those involved and ultimately that was rescinded and pulled back, and there is no post-tenure review legislation at this session, although I think we still have some work to do in that area.

We worked hard to amend legislation to ensure this University would have an active role in the new virtual university that the Governor is excited about and also that our statewide mission was preserved.

We will be acting today, in one way or another on some beginning pieces of Senate Rules, to change and integrate Lexington Community College into this institution in a way somewhat different than it has been in the past. I am hopeful that after these initial changes are made today we will be in a position to create a really truly model partnership between LCC and this campus as is the case in Arizona and other parts of the country so that students are able to access the best of both campuses.

We worked very diligently to suggest changes in the Merit Scholarship Bill over which there was much debate. There was some concern initially that the bill was going to provide resources to those who needed it least and deny resources to those who needed it most. As the bill turned out, although not perfect, it does fully fund the needs based scholarship program in this state for those who are truly in need of support to go to college.

We also worked with the collective bargaining bill to ensure its fate.

We supported very strongly the creation of a staff trustee member on the Board of Trustees. We take no credit for that. It was totally done by staff at this University, but we did support that.

Internally, in addition to the normal raft of academic issues as you see on the agenda today that we need to deal with every session, in terms of program changes, academic and curriculum changes, and admission changes, all of which are important to us, we addressed in our October meeting the

plus/minus grading issue. We also worked very diligently with many of you on the faculty and the Senate Council met regularly with the President to bring what we think was the correct conclusion to what is now known as the "arena debate." We have worked with the Promotion and Tenure Task Force reports such that as of today we have eliminated the prior service provision. The Administration is working and supporting our recommendation for the interruption of service provision so that faculty that have family, medical, or professional crisis can in fact have that acknowledged during their probationary period. Today, hopefully we will have a discussion in what I hope will represent a change in the way we think about promotion and tenure on this campus, recognizing the multiple forms of scholarship that faculty must engage in during the '90s and beyond. Finally I think there were a lot of you as senators that were involved, and I certainly was, in the development of this University's Strategic Plan and a Graduate Education Task Force. At times I felt those initiatives were another job in addition to being Senate Chair. I think that we have come up with a strategic plan that is much more a product of the campus. I do appreciate the Senate Chairs who met with their committees on short notice and provided thoughtful multiple page responses to the plan in its current form. I met with Joan McCauley and will soon meet with the President and some of those changes are going to be effective. I think that we had a dramatic impact on the Strategic Plan.=20

As the philosopher Wittgenstein, I believe, said--there are two parts to what he said. He said "that there were two parts to what he said; that which he said and that which he did not say and it was the latter that was always the most important." In some ways I think that is always true of the Senate. This year has flown by for me. There are things we have done and things we have not yet done and it is probably the latter part that are equally important that we need to continue with. I am hopeful still that we will receive a grant from the American Association of Higher Education with matching money from the University to engage in a systematic effort next year to examine post-tenure review issues and career development issues for faculty. I am also hopeful that the Senate Council can revisit the faculty retirement issue and early retirement processes. We must continue with the work on Promotion and Tenure and we have another report on the Special Title Series faculty, which will be coming to you later.

This was my 21st year at the University of Kentucky. It is wonderful after that long period of time I can learn so much and meet so many good colleagues. I want to thank you for the help of the Senate, the Senate Chairs of the committees, the members of the committees. Some were very active and some not so active. I think what we have done is reaffirm the importance in Frankfort and in Lexington and in the Administration Building of shared governance at the University of Kentucky. You have read many articles that nationally this concept seems to be in a bit of trouble. I do not think that it is in trouble here. We can not let it become fatal or withered. Shared governance is a key part of what makes an academic culture academic. I appreciate your efforts with me this year to help keep that idea alive.

Chairperson Applegate was given a round of applause.

ACTION ITEM 1: Proposal to rescind action of the Senate taken February 10, 1997, to establish a plus/minus grading system for The Graduate School.

Proposal:

Motion to rescind the motion passed by the Senate on February 10, 1997 to establish a plus/minus grading system for The Graduate School.

Rationale:

After Senate passage of a plus/minus system of grading for the Graduate School including an A+, the Senate then later agreed to delay implementation of the system until Fall of 1998 at the request of the Graduate School. In light of developments since that time the Graduate Council and the Graduate Faculty have requested that the original motion be rescinded and the Graduate School be allowed to retain the current whole grade system. The Senate Council unanimously supports the motion to= rescind.

Implementation: Immediate

The Chair recognized Professor Lee Meyer for introduction of the item. Professor Meyer reviewed the background of the item and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

There was no discussion.

The motion passed in a unanimous voice vote.

ACTION ITEM 2: Rules changes related to new relationship between Lexington Community College and the University of Kentucky

PROPOSAL: [See attached]

RATIONALE:

The attached four proposals have been forwarded by a special transition team of faculty from the University Senate Council and the Lexington Community College to effect the minimum changes needed before July 1 to assure a smooth transition in altering the status of the Lexington Community College (LCC) in relation to the University of Kentucky. The Senate has already voted to alter its composition to accommodate integration of LCC faculty. These additional items are proposed with the understanding that more proposals will be forthcoming from the team during the 1998-99 academic year to enhance the partnership between the two campuses. The most detailed of the current proposals (item 4) establishes an Academic Council for LCC modeled after the current Academic Council in the Medical Center. Like the Medical Center Council, this one is designed to address special academic issues of the College but remains a Council of the Senate reporting to the Senate Council and the Senate. The four proposals come with the unanimous recommendation of the Senate Council.

The Senate Council requests waiver of the ten-day circulation for consideration of this proposal.

Note: If approved this exemption would take effect in the fall, 1998, semester.=20

Chairperson Applegate recognized Lee Meyer for introduction of the item. Professor Meyer reviewed the background of the item and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

There was no discussion.

=09

The motion passed in a unanimous voice vote.

* Contact Senate Council

=20

ACTION ITEM 3: Exemption to uniform grading system for Landscape Architecture and the College of Architecture

PROPOSAL:

The College of Architecture and the program in Landscape Architecture have requested exemption from the uniform whole grade system to be implemented for undergraduate students in Fall, 1998, for their 800 and 900 level courses so that they can continue with their current grading system employing plus/minus grades in those courses (only). The proposals were forwarded to the Senate Council by the Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee. No Committee member present voted against the proposals. This proposal comes from the Senate Council with no recommendation.=20

The Senate Council requests waiver of the ten-day circulation for consideration of this proposal.

RATIONALE:

The rationale from the Landscape Architecture program follows. It directly parallels the arguments made by the College of Architecture.

=B7 The design studios, which are the central focus of the curriculum, represent a six credit hour course per semester. With such a large number of quality points available for one course each semester, the plus/minus system allows for more accurate evaluation and reward for the student. While this may be difficult to quantify, the students recognize the benefit of the grading system.

=20

=B7 Landscape Architecture students are not allowed to advance to the next studio level unless they earn a "C" or better in any given studio or site engineering course. In practice, each student falling below this level is given an opportunity to appeal his or her suspension. Students present their cases before the faculty along with reasons why they should be allowed to continue in the program. This policy causes students with a "C-" to reevaluate their motivation and commitment to their academic pursuits. Should a student decide that this is not the appropriate major, they can exit with a "C-" in a 6 credit hour course without a serious loss of quality points. This type of close monitoring provides timely counseling and contributes to the 80-85% retention rate for this five year program.

=20

=B7 A significant role of the plus/minus grade is to encourage each student's

full participation throughout the semester. The studio semester is divided into a series of projects and exercises, which may last from 2-6 weeks in duration. Students need the incentive to continually strive for excellence throughout a project even if a project is the last one of the semester and would not have sufficient value to elevate the grade standing by a full letter grade. The plus/minus grading system allows the flexibility to more accurately evaluate the student's performance. Tied to this is the fact that many projects involve team efforts and may involve "real world" clients. Without the plus/minus grade, a student may choose to redirect his or her energy to other courses toward the end of the semester because there is no hope of elevating the grade to the next full letter which then places fellow teammates or the reputation of the program at risk. The plus/minus grading system offers the potential to recognize excellence in student work with much greater detail than the whole letter system and is essential in a program such as this which relies so heavily on student= output.

=20

=B7 The impact of the Landscape Architecture Program's reputation on a national level has to do with its graduates entering graduate school. Due

to the diverse nature of the subject matter, virtually no student excels in all areas with straight "As. The better students generally attain a 3.25-3.75 GPA. As a result, students applying to graduate schools do so in the "B" average range. It is critical to the reputation of this program that a distinction is made between the student attaining an 80 average versus the student who earned an 89 average.

Note: If approved this exemption would take effect in the fall, 1998 semester.=20

The Chair recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of the item. Professor Meyer reviewed the background of the item and stated this proposal comes from the Senate Council with no recommendation.

The Chair asked for a waiver for the ten-day circulation rule for consideration of the proposal and recognized a student for the following resolution.

RESOLUTION

The students of the College of Architecture and the Landscape Architecture Department resolve that the discussion of the plus/minus grading system used in these programs be heard today. If the Senate fails to hear this issue today the plus/minus grading system currently in use will be terminated as of Fall 1998. The overwhelming support of the students and faculty of these programs for the plus/minus grading system is evident by the number of students standing before you today. If our concerns are not recognized, we the students feel our quality of education will be jeopardized.

There was a motion to waive the ten-day circulation rule. The motion passed in a voice vote.

The Chair recognized Jed Porter from Architecture for the following remarks:

Let me explain the context for this request. Towards the end of spring semester 1997 nearly a year ago as the debate about grades drew to an end, Horst Schach and I addressed the Senate Council and sought exemptions from the uniform policy for grades from undergraduate programs. We were assured that both the program in Landscape Architecture and the College of Architecture were exempt because they offered professional degrees and were viewed as similar in status to professional schools, which have been allowed to determine their own policies about grades. Since we assumed that these programs were exempt we did not seek any clarification about policy from the Senate during the session when a uniform policy was adopted. The Rules Committee later determined that the Senate Council lacked the authority to grant an exemption and they found themselves obliged to renew our request for exemptions. We have neither the desire to revive the debate about the merits of plus/minus nor the intention to undo the Senate's efforts to formulate a uniform policy. We only seek permission to retain our policy that allows the faculty to award grades with pluses and minuses. We adopted a system with pluses and minuses during fall semester 1978 nearly twenty years ago because we believed that system would be the most effective way to evaluate our students' performance and indeed it has been. Our students and faculty alike have recognized its value. The Senate's approval of our request for an exemption would have a negligible impact elsewhere. Because our program is professional access to our courses is limited. Nearly all of our courses are 800 and 900 level courses and are available only to students who have been admitted to the College of Architecture. Your approval of our request

would allow us to enjoy the benefits of a system that has served us well. During the past twenty years our program has earned favorable reputation nationally for its excellence in architectural education. Our students have usually been hired by the most highly regarded firms and have been regularly admitted to the most prestigious programs for advanced studies in design and history and theory of architecture. We have retained over 80% of our students, approximately 30% higher than the University of Kentucky's own rate. Your approval would allow us to continue these efforts while relying on a system which has served us well for nearly two decades. This request has been approved by the majority of the faculty and students of the College of Architecture and I respectfully urge the Senate to grant its approval as it has done when faculty and students in professional programs have requested changes in policy. Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

The Chair recognized Professor Horst Schach for the following remarks:

Twenty years ago I came before this body and asked to initiate a plus/minus grading system at which time it was enthusiastically approved and as Jed pointed out we have been using it for twenty years and never do I recall a single complaint from any student about the plus/minus grading system.=20

You do have written justification in your packet. I would share some of the comments that Jed made about our retention rate. It is also 80-85% for our program. Design programs up until the 1970s had huge mortality rates. We are talking about 85% of the people being weeded out. Then dean of the College of Architecture, Dean Urdy worked on this whole system of student management. From selective mission to the professional course numbers and part of the package was the plus/minus grading system. With all that we turned it around to an 85% retention rate and I think that it has worked out very well.

I will be happy to answer any questions. But I would like to defer to the students. I would like for all the Architecture and Landscape Architecture students to please raise your hand. As far as Landscape Architecture students are concerned this is a very popular major for second career people or nontraditional students. I have heard rumors that we browbeat these folks into giving an 86% approval rate of this proposal. Roughly 65% of our students are either classified as seniors or already have previous degrees and I frankly do not think that you browbeat those folks into a whole lot.

Bill Fortune (Law) said that he was in favor of the proposal but wanted a point of clarification. The proposal states that this is only for 800 and 900 level courses. The Chair said that was all the Senate Council is recommending. There are a couple of courses that are not 800 and 900 level but they are not under when the Senate Council is recommending. Professor Fortune asked if they were satisfied with limited it to 800 and 900 level courses. It seemed logical it they have been doing this way for all these years and it has not caused any problems and the students and faculty want it that there is no good reason to deny them the right to have it.

Mark Ison (Student Senator - Fine Arts) would like to thank all the students who came out today. It is good they were willing to come and support their opinion on this issue. He would like to present another student's opinion on this. The Senate voted in the fall to have a uniform grading system for the University and while our distinguished professor here has assured us that he does not want to rock the boat and that is not what he is trying to change, what else is this? Nothing differentiates these two programs from any other programs in the University. In the rationale it talks about six hour studio courses and quality points. There

are four-hour courses in USP. There are physics courses for USP that are five hours. Social Work students have to take eight-hour practicum. There is nothing different about these things. It says it is a professional program, how many professional programs get their reputation from students going to graduate school. That is what undergraduate students do. That is not a professional program, whether it says it is or not. It is the spirit of the law versus the letter of the law. It says that plus/minus helps identify students who should not be in the program. Students who should not be in the program reveal themselves in plenty of other ways. Especially because of the real world experience that is talked about in the rationale. Students who have what it takes to succeed in another degree, to graduate and students who have what it takes to get into the Landscape Architecture or Architecture programs because they are very difficult do not need to be motivated by plus/minus to keep going down the stretch. There is a visible difference in students who make an 80 average and a student who makes an 89, you can see it in classes and in all their activities. You do not need plus/minus to tell these things. Identification of these students could be better achieved by better advising, especially if people in the program are willing to take note of what these students are doing and taking more of an active role in their studies. Fine Arts also had plus/minus for almost twenty years, but they are not asking for an exemption because they recognize the need for a uniform system that can be put on transcripts and tell other colleges that this is how all students are graded. Graduate schools look at other things besides the GPA when admitting. The level of the student is going to show, in work, extra curricular activities, and recommendations. These are the types of things that matter. The Senate voted in the fall to have a uniform grading system and he appeals to the members of the Senate to not change their decision now.

Les Olson (Student Senator - Architecture) said that in response to the comment about the studios and six-hour credit classes. He realizes that other courses have the courses, but they have them every year and for Architecture they make up one-third of the major. It is not about studios, it is about the fact that 800 and 900 level courses are described in the schedule of classes as open to professional colleges and to students in other colleges offering professional degrees. In LA and Architecture there are only three courses available in the fall that are not 800 or 900 level.

Doug Poe (Business and Economics) said that they spent a lot of time in the Senate Council debating this issue and he has been on both sides of the issue at different times. While he recognizes the tradition, the arguments they are hearing are the same arguments they heard in the plus/minus debate. What finally lead the Senate Council to bring this without a recommendation was that they could not bring the exemption in such a way that they could prohibit other colleges from coming in with a majority of their students and they could not prohibit other colleges from coming and changing their courses to 800 and 900 level, they can not prohibit them from saying they are professional programs. They named several in the Senate Council that could make as good an argument for that as Architecture and Landscape Architecture. The sentiment in the Senate Council was that in this whole plus/minus debate someone is going to be hurt and unless the argument could be framed in some terms other than a popularity contest then they were simply opening the door to spend all next year listening to other colleges coming in and wanting an exemption.

Tom Blues (English) said that the Senate took up the question of whether there should be grade system mixing and it was decided that they did not want that. They wanted a system across the board where people who would be cutting across colleges and in various units should be graded by the same

system. They went on to decide what would be the best system and agreed on one. It seems that the proposal coming from Architecture and Landscape Architecture is perfectly consistent with what they did before. They are saying they have professional programs and are asking for a system for students who are not going to be in other programs, they are going to be in these 800 and 900 level courses and they propose the following system. It seems presumptuous of people outside that system to judge it; it is their decision. The Senate should be consistent and go ahead and approve their request.

The question was asked if during the twenty years if the six year reviews had ever sighted the plus/minus and whether or not it is important or not?

Kaveh Tagavi (Engineering) said that he agreed with the senator who said if they wanted plus/minus why not give it to them. The last time they had action about plus/minus the most important driving force was uniformity. In the past there were differences between colleges, now this is going to create a different system in the same college.

The question was moved and seconded. The motion to call the question passed in a voice vote.

The item passed in a hand count vote.

ACTION ITEM 4: Proposed changes to University Senate Rules, Section IV - 4.2.2.10 College of Engineering Admissions, specifically Civil Engineering.

Proposal

4.2.2.10 College of Engineering: {Delete bracketed sections; add bold, underlined sections}

Civil Engineering - [Completion of] Applicants must have completed at least [50] 45 semester hours acceptable towards the degree [with a minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.5]. [Completion of] Furthermore, applicants must have completed ENG 101 and ENG 102 or ENG 105 or the Honors Program; CHE 105, CHE 107, PHY 231, [PHY 232,] PHY 241, [PHY 242], MA 113, MA 114, MA 213, [and MA 214] CE 106, CE 120 and CE 211 or equivalent with a minimum cumulative grade-point-average (GPA) of [2.50] 2.75 in these courses. [A grade of C or better must also be earned in all civil engineering courses which have been attempted if these courses are to be credited towards meeting degree requirements.] University repeat options may be utilized [as appropriate] by both on-campus and transfer students. Students who do not meet this [these] GPA requirement[s] may request consideration based on a departmental review if [both of these] this GPA['s] is 2.25 or better. A student may not apply for engineering standing more than twice.

Rationale

The current criteria used to evaluate admission into Engineering Standing are sometimes not met until the second semester of junior year. This can occur since engineering standing is only a prerequisite for the 400 and 500 level CE courses. This is very late for those students not accepted into the program. A fairness issue arises since most civil engineering junior year courses are not acceptable in any other degree program. Consequently, the civil engineering department has decided to hasten the decision process by including only the first three semesters of coursework. This should result in an earlier evaluation and response to potential civil engineering students. A student who is denied admission to Engineering Standing will have fewer excess courses from the perspective of other degree programs. If this proposal is approved, the civil engineering department will extend

engineering standing prerequisite to several 300 level courses, which should enhance student learning in these classes.

These changes have been approved by the Engineering Faculty, the Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee and the Senate Council and are forwarded to the Senate for final consideration.

Implementation Date: Fall, 1998

The Chair recognized Professor Lee Meyer for introduction of the item. Professor Meyer reviewed the background of the item and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

George Blandford (Engineering) said that they wanted to move the decision process from the junior year to the first semester sophomore year. A large number of courses students end up being almost seniors by the time they get to that status. The 300 level courses will do them no good in any other major. This is a student friendly proposal. They are trying to make the decision process sooner and quicker for the students, so they know their status in the program and can move on to other programs if they are not going to be successful.

The motion was approved in a unanimous voice vote.

ACTION ITEM 5: Proposed Technical Standards from the University of Kentucky Colleges of Allied Health Professions, Nursing, and Pharmacy.

Proposal:

The attached proposed technical standards from the University of Kentucky Colleges of Allied Health Profession: Nursing, and Pharmacy have been approved by the Academic Council for the Medical Center, the Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards, the University Senate Council, and are forwarded to the Senate for approval.

Attachments

Implementation: July 1, 1998

The Chair recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of the item. Professor Meyer reviewed the background of the item and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

The proposal passed in a unanimous voice vote.

* Contact Senate Council

ACTION ITEM 6: Proposed changes to University Senate Rules, Section IV - Undergraduate Admissions Criteria, College of Nursing.=20

Background and Rationale:

The College of Nursing Undergraduate Student Admission and Progressions Committee presented for approval of the College of Nursing faculty, the attached changes in admissions criteria on October 31, 1997. They were approved by the faculty and forwarded to the Academic Council for the Medical Center. =20

In the previous revision, the College added an essay to the admission requirements. The College found that it was helpful in identifying noncognitive factors that predict success in the nursing program. Based on input from current faculty, current students, and admissions experts in the University, the College proposes the addition of a reference to the

admission criteria to ascertain other pertinent noncognitive factors such as determination, leadership skills, realistic self-appraisal, social interest/compassion, social support, and coping and communication skills. By considering such factors in addition to quantitative factors such as ACT and GPA, the College hopes to create a student body that more closely mirrors the client populations they serve and which represents the total composite of characteristics that professional nurses should possess. Additionally, study of graduates indicates that students with less than a 2.5 and low grades in science related courses have difficulty with initial success on the national board exam. This is the reason for the 2.5 GPA for admission at the sophomore level.

The proposal has been approved by the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure and the Senate Council.

Implementation Date: Fall Semester, 1998

Note: If approved the proposal will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

The Chair recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of the item. Professor Meyer reviewed the background of the proposal and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

The proposal passed in a unanimous voice vote.

* See Senate Council

ACTION ITEM 7: Proposed changes to University Senate Rules, Section IV - 4.2.1.3 Non-Degree Students

Background and Rationale

The following rules changes for non-degree students were suggested by Mary Sue Hoskins, Director of Central Advising at the bequest of Vice-Chancellor David Watt. These changes were suggested to improve the advising process for non-degree students and to firmly enforce the maximum 24-semester credit hour rule in the non-degree status. The eight credit hour rule has been dropped since it is not enforced and it does prevent non-degree students from attending the university on a full-time basis. Furthermore, these rule changes are intended to send the strong message that non-degree students are enrolled at the University of Kentucky, they have not been accepted into the University of Kentucky. Suggestions have also been received by the Evening and Weekend program and the Colleges of Business and Economics and Education.=20

The changes are recommended by the Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee and the Senate Council.

Proposal: {Delete strikethrough words. Add the bolded words.}

Section IV 4.2.1.3 Non-Degree Students

4.2.1.3.1 Goal: (US: 10/11/93)=09

The goal of the University of Kentucky policy for non-degree students is to provide appropriate access to academic courses for students who would like to continue their education, but who do not wish to seek a degree.

Although degree seeking students should have top priority in terms of utilization of University resources, the University does wish to provide access to these resources on a space available basis for non-degree seeking students. This policy will provide reasonable access to a broader range of students without unnecessarily limiting University resources for degree

seeking students.

Non-degree status affords an opportunity for individuals to pursue lifelong learning without the structure of degree seeking status and is consistent with the educational mission of this University.

Most non-degree students are considered "Lifelong Learners" and include the following groups: Donovan Scholars, students who have already earned degrees and non-traditional students who wish to begin their studies as non-degree students in order to be considered for degree seeking status= later.

Other students eligible to enter the University in a non-degree status include visiting students from other colleges and universities, high school students of exceptional ability, and other students in special circumstances as determined by the Director of Admissions. (US: 10/11/93)

4.2.1.3.2 Rules Governing Admission of Non-Degree Seeking Students (US: 10/11/93)

A. To be admitted as a non-degree student, an applicant must meet the following criteria: the high school class of a non-degree applicant must have graduated at least two years prior to the applicant's anticipated semester of enrollment unless the applicant will be on active military duty during his/her tenure as a non-degree student or the applicant has been admitted by exception according to IV, 4.2.1.1. (US: 10/11/93)

B. Applicants who have been denied admission, as degree-seeking students may not in turn be enrolled as non-degree seeking students. (US: 10/11/93)

C. Former University degree seeking students generally will not be enrolled as non-degree students without having earned an undergraduate degree. (US: 10/11/93)

D. University students under academic or disciplinary suspension may not be enrolled as non-degree students. (US: 10/11/93)

E. Students currently under suspension at other institutions may not be enrolled as non-degree students at UK. Failure to disclose a current suspension may result in forfeiture of eligibility for future enrollment. (US: 10/11/93)

F. Students are strongly encouraged to submit transcripts of high school or prior colleges at the time of admission in order to facilitate advising about appropriate coursework.=20

4.2.1.3.3 Rules Governing Enrollment of Non-Degree Seeking Students (US: 10/11/93)

A. Non-degree students must meet course prerequisites or obtain the consent of the instructor to enroll in a course.

B. No student may continue to enroll as a non-degree student after earning 24 semester hours in this status without the special permission of the dean of the college in which the student is registered.

C. Credit earned, as a non-degree student will be evaluated for applicability toward a degree by the dean of the college in which the student will be enrolled. Most colleges provide administrative oversight of their non-degree students. Non-degree students whose registration status does not reflect affiliation with a particular college will come

under the purview of the Dean for Undergraduate Studies. Successful completion of course work as a non-degree student does not ensure admission as a degree-seeking student. No graduate or professional credit is awarded for courses taken while a student is enrolled as an undergraduate non-degree student. (US: 3/12/84; 10/11/93)

4.2.1.3.4 Changing Status from Non-Degree to Degree Seeking (US: 10/11/93)

Applicants who have earned fewer than 24 semester credit hours at this University must meet the University's standards for automatic acceptance as first-time freshmen. Students who have earned 24 semester hours at UK may apply for degree seeking status and will be considered as transfer students for admission purposes. (US: 10/11/93)

4.2.1.3.5 Procedures (US: 10/11/93)

A Evening-Weekend non-degree students may apply for enrollment until noon on the Saturday before classes begin each semester, although they are strongly encouraged to do so much earlier. It is preferable for students to submit applications no later than two weeks before the beginning of classes. This will provide students with maximum flexibility in making the decision to enter the University and allow sufficient time for advisors to provide appropriate and accurate advice to non-degree students and to ensure that course prerequisites have been met. (US: 10/11/93)

B Non-degree students who wish to take day classes must meet regular admission deadlines for each term. They are encouraged to participate in academic advising each semester. Advisors will be assigned to these students. (US: 10/11/93)

C All non-degree students who wish to continue after their first semester are expected to participate in advance registration for the following semester. (US: 10/11/93)

Implementation Date: Fall Semester, 1998

The Chair recognized Professor Lee Meyer for introduction of the item. Professor Meyer reviewed the background of the proposal and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

Mary Sue Hoskins (Central Advising) said they had asked for an adjustment of the rules because there are a multitude of non-degree students and she would call attention to the difference between non-degree and undeclared, they are not talking about the greater multitude of undeclared students, but just those who are registered as non-degree. They propose to drop the eight-hour rule, formally students were confined to taking only eight hours per term. They propose to change all the wording in the Senate rules that say students should apply as non-degree and change apply to enroll. Indicating to students that they are not accepted as degree seeking students they are merely enrolled. In addition to the enforcement of the twenty-four hour rule, they rule always was there it was just not enforced, so that is not a change. The statement that the Dean of Undergraduate Studies will be the dean of record for any students who would have been enrolled as non-degree in a college. In the colleges of Arts and Sciences and Engineering students can not be enrolled as non-degree. In that case the Dean of Undergraduate Studies would be their dean for the purpose of suspending or reinstating those students. =20

The proposal passed in a unanimous voice vote.

ACTION ITEM 8: 1998. Undergraduate Program Changes in the College of Communications and Information Studies

PROPOSAL: [See attached]

RATIONALE:

The two recommended changes are intended to clarify graduation requirements as originally intended by the College. The proposals come with the unanimous recommendation of the Senate Council.

The Senate Council requests waiver of the ten-day circulation for consideration of this proposal.

Note: If approved this exemption would take effect in the Fall, 1998 semester.=20

The Chair recognized Professor Lee Meyer for introduction of the proposal.

Professor Meyer reviewed the background of the item and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

The proposal passed in a unanimous voice vote.

* Contact Senate Council

=20

ACTION ITEM 9: Proposed changes to AR II-1.0-1 S. Lecturers

Proposal: {Delete bracketed sections; add bold underlined sections}

AR II-1.0-1 (Page II-13)\

S. Lecturers

Lecturers are professionally qualified individuals whose services are contracted primarily for teaching purposes, [normally] on a part-time or full-time basis, subject to renewal. The appointment of a lecturer is made by the appropriate chancellor/vice president upon recommendation of the department chairperson and the dean and without reference to an Area Committee[,]. [may be for one year or other stated period not to exceed one year, subject to renewal. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure, membership in the University Senate, sabbatical leave, or participation in the University's Retirement Plan. However, 1] Lecturers with full-time appointments [are eligible for health insurance coverage] may be offered contracts not to exceed three years, subject to renewal. Full time lecturers on multi-year contracts receive full UK employee benefits, except that lecturers are not eligible for tenure, membership in the University Senate, or sabbatical leave. Faculty membership, with or without voting privileges, may be extended to lecturers by the educational units to which they are assigned.

Background and Rationale

This proposal is supported by both the Senate Task Force on Special Title Faculty Series and the Senate Council. The University, like most, currently relies heavily on full and part time lecturers to fulfill its teaching obligations. Currently, these individuals have no job security or benefits and no hope of same regardless of their level of performance. This is an attempt to enhance the quality and accountability of the teaching that is provided by non-tenure tract staff and to treat this important part of the teaching staff as professionals. The proposal allows for continuity in appointment and benefits. Departments can hire good people, keep them, and hold them accountable for good teaching more easily under this system.

Current analyses suggest there are forty to fifty individuals currently employed who could fall within this category.

Note: If approved, this proposal will be forwarded to the Administration for inclusion in the Administrative Regulations

The Chair recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of the item. Professor Meyer reviewed the background of the item and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

David Durant (English) said that he was strongly in favor of the proposal. He would like to offer an amendment that the number of lecturers would not exceed 10% of the faculty in a college and any increase in the number of lecturers in a department must be based on the written recommendation of the tenured faculty of that department.

The amendment was seconded.

Roy Moore (Communications and Information Studies) asked for clarification of written recommendation. Does that mean approved by or part of the decision? Professor Moore made a friendly amendment that the number of lecturers in a department must be approved by written recommendation of the tenured faculty of that department.

Dan Reedy said that the amendment, while very well intentioned is an attempt to protect the professor without having an excessive number of persons who are not tenured within that unit. If they get into the issue, if it is going to be defined on a 10% of department, if they are headed in that direction it will not meet the needs to which this was addressed. The needs were clearly defined. They are speaking here in the broadest sense of the dignity of many of their colleagues within the university, particularly in colleges such as the College of Arts and Sciences who have been treated without dignity over the many years that he has been here. These are persons who are anxious and willing to serve the university but without the dignity that is granted to the rest of them of consideration of benefits or knowing that you have a position year after year. If they are to approve the amendment let them not move in the direction of tightening that so much that in a department of fourteen people they would be eligible for 1.4 lecturers. Ten percent of the college in some environments would also be somewhat curtailing. He would prefer that this amendment not be attached to the legislation. The legislation is as meaningful and important as anything they have done in this body in the last few years. From the standpoint of their reaching out as regular tenured faculty members within their units to embrace their colleagues who are there are 7:30 in the morning and late in the afternoon and carrying on many of those same duties that in most institutions would be tenurable line positions.

Jim Campbell (Fine Arts) asked if it were ten percent FTE or ten percent of warm bodies. The chair answered FTE.

Brad Canon asked if Professor Durant would accept a friendly amendment changing it to 20% FTE. Professor Durant answered that was not a necessary change in that 10 percent is well beyond the numbers that are included.

Mike Cibull said that another way to do that would be to allow the faculty of the college to make an exception to the ten percent rule themselves. Was that not a reasonable thing to do?

Fred Danner (Education) asked why have a percentage at all? It seems that the second sentence takes care of it, faculty input on any increase. The

Chair stated that this was an amendment to the amendment which is to delete the first sentence and also any increase. It would say the number of lecturers in a department must be approved based on written recommendation of the tenured faculty of the department.

Carol Brock (Chemistry) said she was worried about the whole concept after reading the article in the Kernel today. She does not understand the economics. She knows how much part-time instructors are paid in Chemistry and even if they are teaching three or four courses a semester she does not see how this adds up to the minimum wage. It is clearly in the interest of some taxpayers, some administrators, and some legislators to decrease the cost of teaching undergraduates and one way to do that is to have increasing numbers of lecturers who are not responsible for staying up in their fields in the way they are. Are not responsible for seeing how the field is changing so that students ought to be educated in different ways. This is a dangerous idea.

Robert Molzon (Mathematics) said he was opposed to increasing the percentage beyond ten or removing that. There has been a lot of discussion about this being a top twenty university. He does not feel that at Princeton, Harvard, or any other top twenty university there are going to be a large percentage of lecturers. It is very unfair to the students who are paying tuition to not have the advantage of having instructors with absolutely top level of education. It is an invitation to the administration to cut costs of education.

The question was called and seconded. The motion to end discussion passed in a show of hands 36 for, 13 against.

The amendment to the amendment passed in a show of hands 28 for, 23 against.

The Chair said that the amendment now said the number of lecturers in a department must be based on the written approval of the tenured faculty of that department.

Loys Mather (Agriculture) asked Professor Durant if he intended that there must be a certain proportion of the faculty that must approve this? Professor Durant said that would be a majority.

Tom Blues said that there might be some misconception here. This whole proposal applies to full-time employees not part-time. Full-time employees who are at present denied benefits. So they are full-time employees, nonfaculty instructors who are denied benefits. The point of the proposal is to provide benefits to people who are already here. The amendment is designed as a type of precautionary note, saying they certainly do not want the teaching burden to be born by non faculty but at the same time they want to allow some possibility for full-time lecturers for some of the teaching in various programs.

Chancellor Zinser said that she was uncomfortable with the statement in the amendment because it refers to approval rather than recommendation. It basically confuses the picture in terms of the role of the department head and the dean. She would like to speak against having the amendment at all.

She does not believe that this basic proposal has anything to do with anything but giving benefits to people who are currently being employed on a full-time basis as lecturers. They are confusing the picture to assume that somehow giving people benefits is going to cause a great growth in the number of individuals who the administration or faculty would choose to hire in those positions. She is more concerned with benefits being provided to people who are serving as lecturers.

The amended amendment passed in a show of hands; 25 for, 15 against, and 2 abstentions.

Dave Durant said he hoped his amendment has not so messed up the conversation that they will miss the point that they are trying to give benefits to people who are now working full-time and not receiving benefits and not have the security of more than one year.

Mike Cibull asked how many people they were talking about? The Chair said that they did their best to get a full analysis across the university and the have a figure of 40-50 university-wide who would be potentially available for these positions.=20

Dan Reedy said he joined his distinguished colleague from the English department in supporting this proposal. He supports the approval as amended. These are not persons who are somehow second class in terms of their intellectual capacity, in terms of their professionalism, they are not. They have gone through searches as they would for faculty members and have some lecturers whose records are as distinguished as many tenured faculty members. They are not second class in any way except the benefits and the just desserts they should have as professional colleagues within the university. He is concerned about numbers, it is important that this not be used as a subterfuge, but he is aware that both Princeton and Harvard use lecturers on a regular basis and most certainly Oxford University does. It is an issue of good faith with employees who are giving their professional all and they should treat them with the same kind of response with which they would want to be treated.

Craig Infanger (Agriculture) asked the Chancellor that did the fact that they amended the proposal in any way endanger the administration's support of the main motion? Chancellor Zinser said that she could not speak for the whole administration only for herself. She remains concerned even thought that statement is not referring to an action on an individual, it is referring to the notion of increase. She is concerned that the department head and dean will not play the role she would expect and want them to play in the process. Because it does not have to do with action having to do with an individual being chosen or not being chosen as a lecturer, no it does not endanger her support because she believes very much in the proposal.

Chairperson Applegate said that one of the things to remember was that when something like this is passed in terms of a change in ARs it goes to the Administration for review and discussion.

Joan Callahan (Arts and Sciences) asked if there were any AAUP rules on these kinds of positions where they hire someone one year in time for multiple years? She thought that the AAUP said that after a while those people had to be tenured.

Richard Greissman (Arts and Sciences) said that the AAUP chapter at New Mexico State University supported just this proposal. The issue is that if you bring someone in with the chance of tenure and then do not offer the possibility of review but extend their contract past that six years you are in big trouble. But if you hired someone with the exclusive expectation that it is not tenurable it is very different type of thing. They have to be explicit about whether or not it is tenurable. Where there are no promises and explicit statements prohibiting tenure you are following AAUP guidelines. What they are trying to do here is bring more dignity to the position than heretofore has been given. His experience is watching

lecturers for about four years in English and French. Every year that these folks have assumed a lecturer position, at the end of the year before renewal they go through the same evaluation as any faculty goes through. It would be a disservice and as well as an insult to suggest that they are not scrutinized as least as carefully as any other faculty member. In Arts and Sciences they must go through a tenured review. The merit review at the end of the year is a review that determines their merit increase, they submit a teaching portfolio.=20

The amended proposal passed in a unanimous voice vote.

ACTION ITEM 10: Criteria for Privilege and Tenure.

The proposal was tabled until the next Senate Meeting with a vote of 25 for and 21 against.

See Attached

=20

ACTION ITEM 11: Proposed change to University Senate Rules.

Proposal:

Duplicate grades for courses in which a grade of B or better was originally earned will not be used to raise the student's GPA unless an official repeat option is exercised.

Rationale:

Duplicating a course, in which a grade of B or better has already been received, is against the prevailing academic philosophy that a GPA should be a true indication of one's academic ability. For example, as it stands a student who has received a grade of A in a certain course can retake that course indefinitely and increase his or her GPA. Passage of this proposal would close such a loophole.

The proposal is recommended by the Admissions and Academic Standards and the Senate Council.=20

Implementation Date: Fall Semester, 1998

The proposal passed in a unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Donald Witt
Secretary, University Senate

=20