

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, DECEMBER 11, 1995

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, December 11, 1995 in Room 115 of the Nursing Health Sciences Building.

Professor Gretchen LaGodna, Chairperson of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent were: Debra Aaron*, Gary Anglin, Patricia Arnold, Benny Ray Bailey, John Ballantine, Michael Bardo, Terry Birdwhistell, Thomas Blues, Douglas Boyd, Bill Brassine, Joseph Burch, Allan Butterfield, Johnny Cailleteau, Joan Callahan, Berry Campbell*, Dennis Carpenter, Ben Carr, Edward Carter, Louis Chow, Jordan Cohen*, Scott Coovert, Raymond Cox, Carla Craycraft, Charles Davis, Virginia Davis-Nordin, Philip DeSimone, Larry Dickson*, Richard Edwards, Robert Farquhar, Joseph Fink, Donald Frazier, Richard Furst, Hans Gesund, J. Russell Groves, Lynne Hall, Issam Harik*, S. Zafar Hasan*, Christine Havice, James Holsinger, Raleigh Jones, Craig Koontz, Thomas Lester, Thomas Lillich, C. Oran Little, Jeff Lowe, Jan McCulloch, M. Pinar Menguc*, A. Lee Meyer, David Mohny, Maurice Morrison, Wolfgang Natter*, Anthony Newberry, Michael Nietzel*, William O'Connor, Rhoda-Gale Pollack*, Tom Pratt, Shirley Raines, Karl Raitz, Elaine Reed, Daniel Reedy, Thomas Robinson, John Rogers, Michael Rohmiller, Scott Safford, Rosetta Sandidage*, David Shipley, Todd Shock, Sheldon Steiner, William Stober*, David Stockham, Michael Thomlin, Michael Uyhelji, Retia Walker*, Craig Wallace, Charles Wethington*, Chad Willet, Carolyn Williams*, Eugene Williams, Paul Willis, Emery Wilson, Mary Witt*, Linda Worley, Arthur Wrobel.

* Absence Explained

Chairperson Gretchen LaGodna made the following announcements:

The third person to join Tom Blues and Dan Fulks as the newly elected Senate Council member is Virginia Davis-Nordin from the College of Education.

You are aware of the charge and ongoing activities of the Ad Hoc Graduate Education Committee chaired by Professor Jim Boling. The Senate Council's representative on the committee, Jim Applegate, has kept the Senate Council regularly informed of what the committee is doing. Most of you have provided input to the committee. In addition the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the status of Women met with the committee to discuss issues of representation, distribution, retention, success, and support of women. That committee is continuing its work and should be completed sometime in the Spring.

The Senate Council between meetings has met with Connie Christian of the University's Institutional Planning and Budget Office to discuss accountability reporting for the Council on Higher Education, in particular problems related to faculty/student contact hours. They are working on a system that will systematically report contact hours across campus. This goes into a lot of different areas one of which is the way in which courses are described and the type of format used when introducing new courses.

There is some concern about the level of activity of elected senate members in regard to faculty involvement and attendance at Senate Meetings. We hoped that we would raise the level of dialogue by instituting the FACGO list serve, but to date there are only ten people that have signed up, which says that there is not much dialogue going on. I bring that to your attention because I feel that is a valuable method for discussion of ideas about some of the academic issues coming up. The attendance at Senate

Meeting by elected faculty was only 60% at the November meeting and only 24% of the student senators were present. If we are going to accomplish what we set out to accomplish we are going to have to turn this around in the Spring and take this problem seriously.

There was a very productive breakfast meeting that the Senate Council hosted for the local legislative delegation last week. It was well attended by Senators Moloney and Philpot and Representatives Scorsone, Fletcher, Brandtetter, and Cave which is almost the entire delegation. It was a wonderful opportunity to share our concerns and opinions regarding health care, funding issues, impact of decreasing resources on students, facilities, teaching and research. We were really able to bring up a lot of things that we believe faculty are concerned about and had an open and productive discussion. Senator Moloney suggested that we do this again in January. If you have any input please let us know.

December 12, 1995 is the Senate Board of Trustees Social, it is going to be held from 4:00 - 6:00 pm at the Alumni House.

AGENDA ITEM 1: Consideration of and Action on Position Paper, Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership (COSFL)

Professor Jan Schach, Chair-elect of the Senate Council moved approval of the item on behalf of the Senate Council. Professor Schach reviewed the background of the proposal and asked Professor Mather, President of COSFL to comment.

Professor Loys Mather (Agriculture), President of COSFL, stated the primary reason for the statement goes back to the session that COSFL has with state legislators last spring when concerns about funding for higher education were being discussed. One of the prime messages was that when matters concerning higher education were on the table in the legislature, rarely if ever do they hear from faculty and faculty senates. This is a chance for Senates to express concerns about the funding for higher education.

The position paper reads as follows:

Statement of Support for Higher Education
by the Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership (COSFL)

Support for higher education in Kentucky has seriously eroded in the recent past. While state tax revenues have increased by 40% over the last decade and enrollment in state institutions has increased by 34%, state general funding for higher education has decreased by 3%. Faculty members at Kentucky's public institutions of higher education, speaking through their respective faculties/senates, endorse the position paper of the Kentucky Advocates for Higher Education and applaud their efforts. In addition, we endorse the Council on Higher Education's funding proposal for 1996-98.

We encourage consideration of the needs of higher education in any governmental discussion of budget surplus or restructuring of tax laws.

As faculty members of Kentucky's public institutions of higher education, we welcome the opportunity to work closely with the new administration in its efforts to gain broad support for higher education in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Background:

The above statement was developed by the Coalition of Senate and Faculty

Leadership (COSFL). The Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership for Higher Education in Kentucky (COSFL) is cooperating the Advocates for Higher Education in encouraging support for the revised formula for funding higher education in the 1996-98 biennium. Accordingly, COSFL is asking all faculty senates at public universities and community colleges in Kentucky to endorse the statement of support.

COSFL is composed of senate chairs, faculty trustees/regents, and other designated faculty leaders from Kentucky's public universities and community colleges. One of its functions is to serve as an advocacy body on behalf of its collective membership before the Council on Higher Education, the governor, the legislature, and the general public. This statement is but one part of COSFL's advocacy efforts.

The Senate Council approved the statement unanimously and recommends it to the Senate.

If approved, the statement will be forwarded to Professor Loys Mather, current President of COSFL.

Support of the position paper passed in an unanimous voice vote.

AGENDA ITEM 2: Proposal to amend University Senate Rules, Section V - 5.3.1.1 (Repeat Option).

Proposal: (add underlined section)
Section V - 5.3.1.1

- * A student may exercise a repeat option using a correspondence course taken at the University of Kentucky. For students previously matriculated at the University of Kentucky (UK) but who are now enrolled solely in UK correspondence courses, the repeat option may be applied for and approved by the Dean of University Extension, in coordination with the student's prior UK college. For students whose sole UK enrollments have been in UK correspondence coursework, the repeat option may be applied for and administered through the Dean of University Extension.

* Indicates a Rules Committee interpretation

Background:

The original proposal was submitted by the Academic Ombud last spring. The Admissions and Academic Standards Committee considered the proposed change to Senate Rule 5.3.1.1 (repeat option) at a meeting held April 28, 1995.

The committee decided to delay making a recommendation regarding the proposal until it had time to confer with University Extension on correspondence courses in general.

This year's committee met with Dr. Phil Greasley (Dean of University Extension) and Dr. Earl Pfanstiel (Independent Study Program) on October 16, 1995. Based on the discussions held, the Committee agreed with, in principle, the policy of permitting students to exercise the repeat option using a correspondence course, but felt that the working of the proposed statement did not describe accurately the two categories of students to which the policy would apply. The amended working (above) was approved by the Committee. At its meeting on November 27, the Senate Council approved the Committee's report.

Rationale:

Presently a student exercises a repeat option by notifying "in writing the dean of the college in which the student is enrolled". Thus a student who

has transferred to another institution and who does not have a major or direct involvement with a college needs an administrative unit to process the repeat option.

This would also include students who have transferred to another school but wish to repeat a course by UK correspondence for one taken earlier at UK.

Implementation Date: Spring Semester, 1996.

Note: If approved the proposed change will be sent to the Rules Committee for codification.

Professor Jan Schach introduced the proposal and reviewed the background, she moved approval of the item on behalf of the Senate Council.

Professor Dan Fulks (Business and Economics) asked what was meant by in coordination with the student's prior college?

Phil Greasley (University Extension) stated they felt each student should have recourse and access to the repeat option. They will handle that for the University, however in the event a prior UK student has been affiliated with a given college they will give that college the option at exercising jurisdiction, otherwise University Extension will handle it.

Professor Jess Weil (Physics) asked if University Extension would have access to the records of students concerning the number of repeat options a student had used? Professor Schach said if not that would be handled by the Registrar's Office.

The proposal passed unanimously in a voice vote.

AGENDA ITEM 3: Proposal to change the University calendar to designate two midterm reading days the first Monday and Tuesday of October.

Professor Jan Schach reviewed the background of the proposal and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council. The proposal reads as follows:

Proposal:

Change the University Calendar (University Senate Rules, SecitonII) to designate the first Monday and Tuesday of October as mid-term reading days. No classes will be held.

Background

On February 8, 1995, the Student Government Association (SGA) Senate overwhelmingly approved two resolutions requesting the University of Kentucky create two new reading periods in the calendar. The first was to be a mid-term reading period in the Fall Semester. The second was a proposed two-day addition to the current reading period preceding final examination week in both the Fall and Spring semesters. To accomodate the lost teaching days, it was proposed that classes begin on a Monday rather than a Wednesday. Following their approval by the SGA, the porposals were forwarded to the Senate Council with a request for consideration and action.

The Senate Council considered these proposals at several meetings, and on September 25, 1995, approved them on academic merit with a proviso that they be reconsidered after the students had contacted non-academic offices to determine the impact of the proposals on other areas of the University. The students contacted Dr. Jack Blanton, Vice Chancellor for Administration, Dr. James Kuder, Vice President for Student Services, and Ms. Betty J.Huff, University Registrar, with a request that they review the proposals

and "flag" problem areas. Blanton reported having no unresolvable difficulties with his schedule or the services his area provides if the calendar were changed: Kuder pointed out several problems, including effects on residence hall occupancy changes, earlier orientation scheduling, loss of some college orientation time, and changes in band and sorority rush. Huff cited similar issues. As a result of a subsequent meeting with Huff, Kuder and SGA representatives, a compromise was reached to withdraw the proposal for two additional reading days before final examinations and to go forward with the proposal for establishing two mid-term reading days in the Fall Semester. At its meeting on 20 November 1995, the Senate Council approved the proposed compromise. That proposal is before the Senate now.

Rationale

The members of SGA point out the following rationale for the proposed fall semester reading days: First, the fall semester currently has three more teaching days than the spring. They therefore do not find it unreasonable to request a two day break during the fall semester, particularly given the justifications that follow.

As the academic calendar stands, there are no breaks between Labor Day and Thanksgiving (12 weeks) in the Fall Semester. In contrast the spring semester has a break the ninth week of classes.

In addition, the students feel that the absence of a reading period prior to midterm exams during the fall semester is detrimental to both the students' psyche and grades. A midterm reading period would provide students with adequate study time prior to midterm exams and adequate reflection time prior to the midterm withdrawal date.

The SGA does not believe the students will use this time as a "party break" such as spring break. Given that the period includes only 2 weekdays, they feel that this time would be responsibly spent by students in either going home or preparing for midterms. Further, we do not believe that the University should shut down in any respect. Residence halls should remain open, as should the eating facilities, and other university buildings (e.g., libraries). These reading days would be quite worthwhile and a practical intermission.

And finally, there are numerous schools that have midterm breaks. Some examples include Transylvania University (3 days in October), Centre College (4 days in October), University of Virginia (4 days in October), Purdue (4 days in October), Duke University (6 days in October), and Washington and Lee University (4 days in October).

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

Implementation: Fall, 1997

Professor Jesse Weil (Physics) made a motion to amend the proposal to one break day on the second Friday of October. The motion was seconded. Professor Bradley Canon said he felt the second Friday was too late, he made a motion to amend the amendment to the first Friday of October. The amendment passed - 24 yes, 22 no in a show of hands.

Professor Dan Fulks (Business and Economics) made a motion to amend the amendment to Thursday and Friday instead of just Friday. The motion failed

in a show of hands.

The proposal to have a fall academic break on the first Friday of October passed. 28 in favor of, 25 opposed.

AGENDA ITEM 4: Retirement Report and Recommendations - For Discussion Only.

Chairperson LaGodna invited the selected members of the Ad Hoc Retirement Committee to come to the podium for discussion and questions. Those present were; Chet Holmquist, Chair, T. Lynn Williamson, and Kathryn Moore. The Chair said with this particular issue the Senate Council is seeking general endorsement of the recommendations that were circulated. Allowing the Council the discretion to forward separate issues to the most appropriate groups or individuals for study and/or action. The Ad Hoc Committee was appointed in July 1994 by then Council Chair, Ray Cox and was composed of both faculty and staff, bringing a wealth of experience to the job. They are from a variety of backgrounds. Their charge was to review and evaluate the current program and study possibilities for new options. The Committee submitted its report to the Senate Council in April 1995 and it was accepted and endorsed by the Council. It was a very comprehensive and substantial report. Since this issue was identified as a priority by both the Senate Council and the Administration for the 1995-96 academic year they delayed bringing it to the full Senate hoping that they could work collaboratively and bring a joint proposal for consideration. Unfortunately they have not been able to realize that goal and agree that the importance of the issue dictated bringing these recommendations to the full Senate now for their consideration, suggestions, and hopefully endorsement. As they go through the recommendations, the members of the committee will speak to recommendations, answer questions, or take suggestions.

The proposal reads as follows:

Attached is the report of the Senate ad hoc Committee on Retirement, which was chaired by Professor Chet Holmquist. The recommendations were endorsed by the Senate Council on 10 July 1995.

The report and a summary of previous UK proposals (prepared by Robert Lawson) are enclosed for your information.

The intent of the Senate discussion is to elicit opinions and suggestions on key issues and needs of the academic community in response to the ad hoc Committee's recommendations. The Senate Council is seeking general endorsement (or not) of the recommendations, allowing the Council discretion to forward separate issues to the most appropriate groups or individuals for study and/or action.

Please urge other interested faculty to attend the meetings and to voice their opinions.

Ad Hoc Committee on Retirement
University of Kentucky Senate Council

Summary of Recommendations

1. At the time of appointment and throughout tenure, information about retirement policies, written in clear, easily understood language, should be readily available.
2. A skilled financial planner should be hired to replace Clay Maupin who has retired.

3. An additional retirement counselor should be hired for employees on the south side of the campus, the Agricultural Cooperative Extension offices and the Community Colleges.
4. Retirement counselors should be skilled in health care issues to clarify for the retirees the confusing patterns of health care services and costs.
5. A long-term care insurance program should be offered to employees and retirees on an employee paid, payroll deduction basis.
6. Individuals who retire before 65 under the "Rule of 75" program should be permitted to take courses at the University without cost.
7. The "Faculty Retirement Guide" and a Retiree Handbook should be published and distributed to all faculty approaching retirement.
8. The staff of the Benefits Office should develop an advocacy role and be skilled in relating to the many outside agencies that have dealings with the retiree.
9. The University should initiate an incentive phased retirement plan for faculty.
10. Retirees should have continuing contact with the University, in such areas as volunteer activities, fund raising, benefits and privileges, health care, financial planning, separation anxieties and leisure time activities.

A senator moved that the Senate adopt the Ad Hoc Committee's report and take the appropriate action. The motion passed in an unanimous voice vote.

Chairperson LaGodna said she hoped the Senate would think about each of the recommendations or any unanswered questions and either call, e-mail or get on the listserv and discuss the issue.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

Betty J. Huff
Secretary, University Senate