

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, FEBRUARY 14, 1994

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, February 14, 1994, in Room 115 of the Nursing Health Sciences Building.

Daniel L. Fulks, Chairperson of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent were: Stephanie Atcher*, Mark C. Berger, Suketu P. Bhavsar*, Antimony Bishop, Robert L. Blevins*, Rick Boland, Maria Boosalis*, Douglas A. Boyd, Joseph T. Burch, D. Allan Butterfield, Laretta Byars, Ben W. Carr, Edward A. Carter, Donald B. Clapp, Jane Clark, Jordan L. Cohen, Darby Cole, Melissa Cox, Nancy Custer, Randall W. Dahl*, Lance DeLong, Clarence Robert Dowdy, Richard Edwards, Michael B. Freeman*, Lorraine Garkovich, Thomas F. Garrity*, William Gibson, William S. Griffith*, John Harris, Zafar S. Hasan*, Christine Havice*, Floyd J. Holler, Chester A. Holmquist, Don A. Howard, Edward J. Kasarskis, Richard I. Kermodé, Kenneth K. Kubota Arthur Lieber*, C. Oran Little, Elizabeth P. Lorch, Erica McDonald, Sandra Miller, David Mohnéy*, James S. Mosbey, David A. Nash*, Anthony L. Newberry, Barbara Phillips, Thomas C. Robinson, Ellen B. Rosenman, David Shipley, Thomas J. Stipanowich, William J. Stober*, David H. Stockham, Michael Stover, Phillip A. Tibbs*, Henry J. Vasconez, Mary Walker, Greg T. Watkins, Chris Webb, Charles T. Wethington*, Brent White, Tommy E. Whittler, Carolyn A. Williams*, Eugene R. Williams, Emery A. Wilson.

The Chair welcomed everyone to the February meeting of the University Senate. He stated that for lack of a long agenda the December meeting had been canceled.

The Chair stated the first item was to approve the minutes from the November 8, 1994 meeting. There were no corrections to the minutes and they were approved as circulated. Professor Fulks said that the November minutes were now on View if you are Wang-based. If you are IBM-based they should be on in the next few days. The October minutes are in the process of going on to View.

The Chair made the following announcements:

The Governor's Higher Education Review Commission has finished its work for now. Their recommendations have been reported. Their final report is ready and if you would like to see a copy, it is available in the following places; the Dean's Offices, from

Senate Council Members, Dr. Juanita Fleming, the President's Office, or from Cindy Todd at the Senate Council Office. There are 14 recommendations in the report, the one that got perhaps the most attention is the performance based funding issue. The Commission did derive a list of criteria to be used for performance based funding. Many of these were developed as a result of Senate Bill 109 which was two years ago. These performance based funding criteria will be utilized in determining whether the various state schools will receive their appropriate share of the budget increase for the second year of this biennium and supposedly for years after that. If the Governor gets his way with 2% this year and 3% for next year, then the performance based funding would be used only for that 3% increase and any portion not earned by any state school would go back into general funds. Faculty input on that to date has been minimal. The criteria have been established for that reasonably. There is concern that these criteria tie in with the mission of the University. One result of the Governor's Commission was a revision of the various mission statements from the Universities. He feels there is wide spread concern that these criteria for funding are tied to the mission statements. There is some time between now and the time the criteria are actually utilized for funding for there to be some input. The President and Chancellors seem more than willing to listen.

*Absence Explained

The Chair would remind the Senate that the University has two mission statements as do all Universities in the State. There is an inside and outside mission statement. There is a mission statement that is developed essentially by the Council on Higher Education which is not quite as specific as what they have written for themselves internally, with various self-study projects they have been through in the past years. The mission statements that are referred to in the Governor's Commission Report are the CHE Mission Statements. His understanding is that the primary purpose of those mission statements is to make it as clear as possible what the mission of this University is relative to the other seven state Universities. They feel in the Senate Council that they came out well with the revision of the mission statement this year in terms of protecting themselves as the State's Flagship Institution.

There should be news on the Medical Center Chancellor's search in the next day or two according to the President's Office. The Chancellor's Search Committee has met

with seven different candidates. Those were selected from a pool of well over 100 candidates with the assistance of some consultants. Those were interviewed and the President plans to narrow that list to perhaps three. There will be a public statement on that shortly.

The plan from the President's Office is to defer the search for the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. The first reason for this is the President wants to wait until the Medical Center Chancellor position has been filled and that search is out of the way. Secondly, he wants to wait until the decision has been made in terms of what to do with Centers and Institutes. The President feels that is an important issue in terms of recruiting for the position. The position probably will not be filled before August and perhaps January 1995 is a more realistic date.

The Senate Council has discussed Health Care Reform at length. Chairman Fulks would encourage the Senate members to look into it and the impact it will have on faculty and staff. The bills in Frankfort now would perhaps place University faculty and staff into a much larger eastern Kentucky alliance than what we have now. The fate of the UK HMO would be unclear at that point, it may survive as a provider and it may not. He would encourage the Senate not to sit back and think that Health Care Reform will not impact them directly. Currently they have a good plan and need to do what they can to protect it.

There are two changes in Administrative Regulations that are forthcoming. The Senate Council was asked for input for both of them, the Senate Council is satisfied with the changes the President is recommending. The first change concerns appointments for non-tenured and tenured faculty. These are appointments and reappointments for voluntary faculty. First, they will no longer require faculty letters of evaluation for voluntary faculty. Secondly, appointments and reappointments for voluntary faculty may be made for three years. Voluntary faculty are faculty who do not get paid. The second change concerns initial appointment, reappointment, or terminal reappointment at the rank of instructor or full, associate, and assistant professor level. If there is affirmative action coming through the deans office to the chancellor's office, it will continue to go to the President for approval or disapproval. That is not a change. The change is that if there is disapproval at the Chancellor or Vice-Presidential level then the pr

proposal is stopped. It does not go to the President. The other change in that AR would be that the Dean through the delegation from the Chancellor or Vice-President has the authority to give final approval to a proposal for terminal reappointment. That delegation previously had to come from the President.

Professor Davy Jones (Graduate School) stated that on the terminal reappointment there was a tradition in that if the terminal reappointment was not a tenure decision but a third or fourth year reappointment, if the Chair and the faculty so voted on it, it would go to an area committee beyond the level of the Dean to see whether the person should be reappointed rather than terminally reappointed. He asked if that had changed. Professor Fulks said there was not a change affecting that.

Professor Hans Gesund (Engineering) asked if there had been any discussion on the parking situation. Professor Fulks responded that the Senate Council had been surprised by that as well. He said that Joe Burch told him it is the result of two years of study and some input. The Senate Council has invited Joe Burch to come and speak with them on Wednesday, February 16, 1994.

The Chair then recognized the new members of the Senate Council for 1994. Professor Thomas Garrity, Medicine, Professor James Applegate, Communications and Information Studies, Professor Michael Nietzel, Psychology, and Greg Watkins, the new student representative. They are replacing Professor William Lyons, Professor Carolyn Berratt, and Antimony Bishop. Professor Gretchen LaGodna is filling in this semester for Professor Bradley Canon who is on sabbatical.

There have been some phone calls to the Senate Council office about excused absences. If you are not able to attend the Senate meeting, you need to make it known to Susan Caldwell in the Registrar's Office, 257-7155.

The Chair then recognized Professor Jim Hougland for the following resolution:

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION
JAMES M. GLADDEN

James W. Gladden (1912-1993), Professor Emeritus of Sociology at the University of Kentucky, died October 22, 1993, following a short illness.

Professor Gladden lived a full life characterized by two successful

careers -- first as a Methodist minister and then as a Professor of Sociology at the University of Kentucky. After earning his M.D.V. fro

m
n is
He
his
and
He entered the sociology program at the University of Pittsburgh, earning Ph.D. in 1945. He joined the University of Kentucky faculty in 1949, and he continued his service to the University and his students until he retired in 1978.

the
h
ton
nt,
f
Professor Gladden came to the University of Kentucky prepared to teach sociology of religion, and he developed a very popular and respected course in this area. After joining the faculty, he also discovered a strong demand for instruction in the sociology of the family. Although the sociology of the family was initially a secondary interest, this turned out to be the area in which he would be most widely known. For many years, he served as a member of the Executive Board of the Southeastern Council on Family Relations and as a member of the Lexington Planned Parenthood Advisory Board. Both before and after his retirement, he was in wide demand as a speaker to community and special interest groups in the area of family planning and changes in the institution of the family. His popularity as a speaker stemmed from his ability to challenge conventional wisdom but to do so with impressive humor and grace. This, his audiences viewed themselves as having a pleasant experience even when they were being challenged to re-examine their assumption.

Y
and
s a
These same characteristics made Professor Gladden a popular and widely respected instructor -- one whose students remembered him long after graduation. In 1972, he was honored both by the University of Kentucky Alumni Association (with a Great Teacher Award) and by the National Council on Family Relations (with the Ernest Osborne Award) for his outstanding teaching. His teaching was combined with a willingness to accept responsibility for leadership in the administration of his department's undergraduate programs. Both through his own instruction and his leadership, Professor Gladden contributed to the quality of the undergraduate education experience during a time when the University as a whole was putting additional resources into graduate education and research. The depth of his commitment to effective instruction is communicated by the title that he gave to his autobiography, "Some Are Called to Teach."

ch.
He is survived by his wife, Helen Baur Gladden, two children, five stepchildren, twenty-six grandchildren, and one great-granddaughter. Memorial Contributions may be made to the Lexington Parkinson's Disease

e

Support, Group, 1122 Providence Road, Lexington, KY 40502.

Professor Hougland asked that the resolution be included in the minutes.

Chairman Fulks then introduced Dr. Robert E. Hemenway, Chancellor, Lexington Campus for a Report on Freshman Statistics.

Dr. Hemenway thanked Professor Fulks. He stated the Senate asked him each year to come and talk about enrollment matters, specifically about the incoming freshman class for this year. This is a story of the University of Kentucky that is a good story, one of the best success stories we have to tell. The admissions policy is simple, basically they try to have an increase in the quality of the freshman class every year so they can say to each entering freshman class, you are the best class that has entered the University of Kentucky. Secondly the enrollment growth of that freshman class is somewhere in the one to two percent range. We are not in a huge growth pattern for the University of Kentucky as least as far as the freshman class for the simple reason that we are about at capacity. Particularly with the budget cuts that have occurred, if there were to be a huge enrollment increase in the freshman class UK would have a hard time providing the students with a quality education. The undergraduate enrollment growth is expected to be limited to the range of one to two percent. The graduate enrollment growth will be somewhere in the two to five percent range. UK does not want to go backwards, but does not want to enroll in such a way, that we would not be able to handle the students. The other piece of that admissions policy is to put emphasis upon the areas where there is some over capacity in the system. That is in the upper division level where there needs to be emphasis upon retaining students and moving them through to graduation. The graphs for Dr. Hemenway's Report is available upon request.

Student Enrollment - Here are the results of the policy in the Degree enrollments for this year. They are virtually the same as last year, though there is some movement from category to category.

Degrees Awarded - Basically it is the same enrollment from year to year with a slight increase.

Entering Freshmen Retention Rates - This is why retention and graduation is something

that needs to be focused upon. In 1983 the University went to selective admissions, the retention rate from freshman to sophomore in 1983 was only 58%. They were losing about 42% of the students between the freshman and sophomore year. After selective admissions, we are in the range of only losing around 23 to 24% of freshmen between the freshman and sophomore year. The question that should be relevant is that since 1984 there has been an increase in the quality of the student body as measured by ACT scores, yet we are still only at an average of 76% retention between freshman and sophomore years.

Graduation Rates of Entering Freshmen - Retention is reflected in the graduation rates. In 1983 the last year of open admission, there was a 39.4% graduation rate at the end of six years, and it has gone up every year since. For the class of 1987, 50.5% graduated in six years. The question is, are we satisfied with 50.5%? Is that what the graduation rate should be? Most would agree the graduation rate should be higher.

First-Time Freshmen Enrollment - Since 1989 enrollment has been in the range of 2,600 for the incoming freshman class. A target is identified with the Admission staff each year, in 1993 that target was 2,600 students, 1992 was slightly below, and 1993 slightly above. The target for 1994 is 2,650. This is not an exact science. It is very easy to be 150 students on one side or the other.

First-Time Freshmen by Residency - Overall about 19% of our undergraduates are from out-of state. 81% overall are Kentuckians. There has been a rise in out-of-state freshmen each year since 1989 and now about 27% of the freshman class is from out-of state. There are two reasons for that: (1) as there is significant improvement in the quality of the freshman class; and (2) the University of Kentucky appears in virtually every national publication as a place where a quality education can be received at a relatively low cost. Those publications look to facts such as enrollment of National Merit Scholars, average entering ACT, and tuition. Even with the tuition increases over the last two years, the University of Kentucky is still a very low tuition state in comparison to other states. We offer a quality education for that low tuition. Last year Money Magazine listed the University of Kentucky as the 15th best buy in education, dropping to 23rd this year because of the tuition increase. Every time one of those publications comes out there is a flood of out-of-state applications.

First-Time Freshmen Academic Accomplishments - The evidence of that national reputation is in the quality of the freshman class. The number of Governor's Scholars has increased every year since 1989. National Merit Scholars have gone from 12 in 1989 to 68 in 1993.

Fall 1993 National Merit Scholars U. K. and Benchmarks - In relation to our benchmarks, U.K. is only behind Ohio State in terms of National Merit Scholars enrolled. Among all U.S. Universities, the University of Kentucky is 22nd, and 7th among public institutions.

First Time Freshmen, National, and State Mean ACT-E - ACT scores rose dramatically right after selective admissions. They then leveled out at about 23.9 - 24 in the late 1980s. Beginning in 1991, partly because of adjustments made in the Admissions Management Policy, the score has risen to 24.6 for 1993. This is the most significant rise in ACT scores in some time.

First-Time Freshmen Mean ACT-E by Residency - The Kentuckians that were admitted during 1993 actually had higher ACT scores than those who were out-of state. Dr. Fink talked with the Senate Admissions Committee about that and this year there is in use a higher admissions requirement for out-of state students than for in-state students. For the simple reason that the average ACT score should not be dragged down by the out-of-state students admitted.

Fall 1992 & Fall 1993 First-Time Freshmen ACT-E Quartiles and Average - The significant thing about this chart, is that it shows that where we really picked up students this year was in the upper range, in the 75th percentile. In this freshman class, 263 students, 10% of the freshman class had an ACT-E of over 30. 29% of the freshman class have an ACT-E score of 27 or above. The point that can be drawn is that if this is the quality of the freshman class, and it is improving, why are not more students being retained from the freshman to the sophomore level?

Ethnic Background of Fall 1993 First-Time Freshmen - For the 1993-1994 entering freshman class there were 197 African American enrolled. That is 7.4% of the freshman class. There is now in the freshman class an African American enrollment that is comparable to the African American population in the state of Kentucky.

Age of First-Time Freshmen Fall 1993 - It is very significant that 98.7% of the first

time freshmen are 19 years of age or younger. This is a very traditional freshman class.

Status of First-Time Freshmen Fall 1993 - Further evidence that this is a very traditional class is that 99.6% are full-time students. The question becomes, are we sufficiently sensitive to these facts in our pedagogy and in our expectations for learning? As full-time students, a great deal should be expected from these students. As 19 year old adults are we expecting attitudes towards learning and work that they may not be ready for? If not, what can be done to help those attitudes be a part of our class?

Fall 1993 First-Time Freshmen County of Origin - Where do freshmen come from? Basically it spreads out across Kentucky. However, only 7.4% of the students are coming from Northern Kentucky. This should be higher if the University of Kentucky is the institution of choice for all Kentuckians.

Fall 1993 Admitted First-Time Freshmen Automatic vs. Delayed - Students are admitted under the Admissions requirements that the Senate and Faculty set. Students are automatically admitted if they meet certain qualifications according to the step scale used by Admissions. For Fall 1993, 92% of the admissions to the freshman class were automatic admits. The 8% is the only flexibility that is there. That can pose problems in the future. If it comes to the point that everyone who applies to the Institution is under the automatic admit category, they will be unable to make distinctions about ACT-E scores and other qualifications which give the flexibility necessary to enroll the very best class each year.

Admissions and Projections for Entering Classes - The projections are up in the terms of in-state applications, out-of-state applications, and the total is up. The projection is there will be about the same number of freshmen entering next year as in 1993. The projections from the Admissions Office are for about 2,060 in-state students enrolled, 590 out-of-state students enrolled, and somewhere in the range of 2,650 students projected for enrollment. Two things have been factored in; 1) there will be some price resistance, simply because some people are not able to pay the increased tuition, 2) the out-of-state policy will have some effect also, since they are deliberately making it more difficult for out-of-state students to enter the University of Kentucky.

In summary, Dr. Hemenway hopes the Senate feels that this is a considerable

success story for the University, one that is getting attention nationally. One reason it is a success story is there are very good people working in this area; Joe Fink, Randy Mills, Don Byers, Lana Dearing, and the people who work with and for them, the Merit Scholarship Office with Kate Johnson and Connie Hunt, the Registrar's Office and the way that Randy Dahl and his people feed into the whole process, and Roseann Hogan and the Office of Institutional Research. This is a good working team that has had considerable success over the last two or three years. Chancellor Hemenway asked that they receive a round of applause.

A Senator asked if it was known how many students transferred to other colleges and eventually graduate from the group that do not stay on. Dr. Hemenway answered that the Council on Higher Education was trying to track that with an index they call a persistence rate. When they do that they get in the range of 70%. It can be tracked within Kentucky. What they can not track is how many people leave the University of Kentucky and graduate from an out-of-state school.

The question was asked if there was any information about transfer students. Were the numbers up and was there any way of accessing the quality? Dr. Joe Fink answered that the numbers were up, both from Community College sources and non community college sources. The Admissions Advisory Committee is looking at standards used to apply to applicants as transfer students. The University of Kentucky has traditionally worked closely with the Community Colleges. Don Byers and his group have been on every community college campus during the fall and talked to potential transfer students, as well as advisors there. When talking with comparable institutions, one of the things different about UK as compared to other schools is the influx of transfer students. Dr. Hemenway stated that the University of Kentucky receives a significant portion of high ACTE transfer students.

Chairman Fulks asked Dr. Fink if there was an estimate of how many students UK receives from the community college system. Don Byers answered that for 1993 there were just under 700 students; the figure has gone up slightly the last few years.

The question was asked where do the students come from who are not from the community colleges. Dr. Fink answered that most of them were typically Kentuckians who have gone out-of-state to start their college careers and found they wanted to come back h

ome.

Professor Martin McMahon (Law) said that while the six year graduation rate was slowly increasing he noticed that the four year rate has been dropping and the five year rate was doing well until the entering class of 1988 and there was a dramatic drop for that group. He asked if there was any information on what is causing that. Dr. Hemenway said he did not have an explanation for the 1988 peculiarity but had a general explanation for four year graduation rates. More and more students either are not taking a full load or taking a full load and working at the same time. They may be taking 12 or 14 hours and working 20 or 30 hours a week. That clearly has something to do with costs. They are having to do that because of the cost of higher education. It is also becoming more of a tradition. His impression is that young people are accustomed to having more of the material evidences of adulthood: a car, the ability to go out. Probably as a sign of the general affluence of the country there is much more of an inclination to work. The data are overwhelming that there are many more students working now for whatever reasons than there were previously. The other effect is that there are some curricula in which you have to be a person of extraordinary discipline and concentration to complete in four years.

Many degree programs require up to 135 to 140 hours. That is something that will need to be addressed in all of higher education, because as more and more focus on the cost of education, people are saying not only is the price going up it is also extending out over a longer period of time.

Dr. Phil Greasley commented that two statistics had been given, 98.7% of entering first time freshman are under 19 and 99.6% of those entering for the first are full-time. He asked what the percentages are in terms of students in freshman status. Dr. Hemenway said there are many people who do not fall in that 19 years and younger age category who are also listed as freshmen. There are numbers on that which can be supplied.

Chairman Fulks then recognized Professor Ray Cox, Chair-elect of the Senate Council for the first action item. Professor Cox on behalf of the Senate Council moved approval of the proposed amendment to the University Senate Rules, Section I, The University Senate, circulated under the date of January 24, 1994, concerning apportionment of faculty members elected to the Senate.

Professor Fulks read the following letter addressed to the Senate Council.

February 8, 1994

MEMORANDUM

To: Dan Fulks
Chair, University Senate Council

From: David Puleo
Center for Biomedical Engineering

Re: Amendment to University Senate Rules, Section I, The University Senate

I would like to express my objection to the recommendation of the Senate Rules Committee regarding representation of faculty members with primary appoints in Research and Graduate Studies (RGS). As I understand this amendment, faculty members in RGS would have to choose some other college to participate in election of Senate members and, thus, to be represented in the Senate. The stated rationale is that only a small number of faculty members would fall into this category. An unwritten reason is that some believe the Graduate Centers under RGS do not have common interests, that this would be an artificial grouping. Therefore, the Graduate Centers should be disbanded, for voting purposes at least. I disagree. Graduate Centers within the RGS sector e.g., Biomedical Engineering and Toxicology, have as much, if not more, in common than do departments in other colleges, e.g., Linguistics and Physics & Astronomy in the College of Arts & Sciences. The Graduate Centers bring together faculty members who have different expertise and who complement each other for the benefit of teaching and research in a common field, e.g., biomedical engineering. Graduate Centers do have common interests, such as promoting multidisciplinary approaches to advance graduate education. As research projects become more complex, they may require multidisciplinary approaches. This trend is recognized at the state and federal levels and in both academia and industry, as evidence by the creation and funding of multidisciplinary research centers. This is just one reason why faculty members in RGS should be represented as a group and should not be disbanded for voting.

Professor Dan Reedy (Graduate School) stated he was speaking against the proposal, not because faculty members in the Graduate Centers should not be represented. He proposed that it be a principle of representation but without transmigration. In the Governing Regulations part IV, Section 8.1 it reads, a graduate center is defined as an education unit equivalent to a department. Graduate Centers, multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary

centers report to the dean of the Graduate School administratively as departments within a college report to the dean of that college. The Dean of the Graduate School has the same authority and responsibilities as those of the dean of a college in the administration of educational units that might be transferred to or developed under the office of the Dean of the Graduate School. If these things are true, that the graduate center is the same as a department, that a graduate center reports administratively through a dean who has academic responsibilities as defined in that section on educational units then faculty with primary appointment in Biomedical Engineering, the Martin School, the Patterson School, and in Toxicology should be considered as department faculty in a college for purposes of representation in the University Senate. They should not have to choose an affiliation with some other unit. There is the argument that there is no commonality among these units. Indeed there is; they are identified as being multidisciplinary graduate centers only, without undergraduate programs and the very aspect of the multidisciplinary is their singularity. That they are too small, there are 20 faculty members in these units right now. How many regular professors are there in the College of Social Work? Today's count is 17. Architecture has 23 and Allied Health has 26. What is too small? He would like to offer a substitute motion, that the Senate Council be directed to provide for apportionment of faculty members in centers and institutes for election to the Senate under guidelines currently available for such appointment of faculty in other colleges and departments within the University. That prerogative has been available to the Senate all along and the necessity to treat the Center and Institute Faculty is one of singling them out as being different but is not a necessity under the Governing Regulations of the University not existing.

Chairman Fulks stated there was a substitute motion on the floor. The motion was seconded. Having attended the meeting of the Rules Committee when the proposal was offered, the intent does not differ. This is not adversarial, everyone wants to see to it that these faculty are represented, it is a matter of how they are represented.

Professor Roy Moore said the consensus of the committee was they wanted these individuals to have representation. They felt there was not a lot of commonality, it is a relatively small group and it would be more appropriate for those individuals to choose a unit to affiliate with.

Professor Davy Jones (Toxicology) said none of them were asked by the Rules Committee during the process whether they felt they had anything in common with the other people in the other research centers. They feel they do very strongly and they support Professor Reedy's position.

Professor Fulks added that the number of faculty involved was never an issue. The Rules Committee was not concerned that this was too small a group of people.

Professor Charles Knapp (Director of Biomedical Engineering) would like to also second Professor Reedy's motion. Their faculty was unanimously in favor of not having to make a decision as such and would recommend the approval of his motion.

The question was called. In a voice vote the amended motion passed unanimously. Dr. Reedy's motion reads as follows:

The Senate Council be directed to provide for apportionment of Graduate Center faculty members elected to the Senate under guidelines currently available for such apportionment of faculty in other colleges and departments.

The Chair recognized Professor Cox for the next agenda item. Professor Cox on behalf of the Senate Council moved approval of the proposed change to the University Senate Rules, Section V, by the last day of classes before midterm all teachers must inform undergraduate students in their courses of their current grade based on criteria in the course syllabus. The item was circulated under the date of 31 January 1994. Chairman Fulks said the Senate would be resuming discussion of the proposal that was brought before the group at the November meeting. The proposal was tabled with instructions to return at the February meeting. The students are offering a revised edition of their proposal.

Professor Bill Lubawy (Pharmacy) asked if an instructor merely said the cutoff grades are 90 - 70 and you know what you have on the first two exams, is that sufficient, as opposed to sending out some type of form. The Chair answered yes, the wording was left intentionally vague. If the syllabus is clear as to what the cutoffs will be and exams have been given that is sufficient.

Professor Hans Gesund thought the students had amended the proposal to apply to only freshman and sophomore students. The Chair said the students were now asking that it

apply to all undergraduate students.

Professor Martin McMahon asked would happen in an upper level course where the grade is based on a paper and there is no paper turned in by midterm. Would it be acceptable to say there was no basis for evaluation? Chairman Fulks said that was the intent of the proposal, to force instructors to give the students some basis to make their withdrawal decision. Professor McMahon asked if this was a backhanded way of doing something to seminars? It would be very difficult to instruct a meaningful seminar paper requirement, to have a course where the bulk of the grade is a major research project. It is possibly forcing a paper to be turned in prematurely.

Steve Dawahare said it was left open to how the instructors wanted to construct it, as long as there was some communication between the student and the faculty to let them know where they stand in the class.

Professor Hans Gesund asked if it would apply to special project courses. For example, CE 395, Special Projects in which students turn in a project at the end of the semester and the grade is based on that. There is no way to judge their work at midterm. The Chair stated the proposal was tied to the syllabus and if the syllabus said the grade is based on a project turned in on the last day of class, then there is nothing to say at midterm. What is important is that the student has been notified up front on the first day of class that they will not know at midterm. At that point it becomes the student's responsibility, it is their decision whether to take the course or not.

Professor Louis Swift encouraged the Senate to pass the proposal, it addresses some of the concerns that were voiced at the November meeting. It is an issue that has long needed to be addressed and it achieves the student's purposes.

In a voice vote, the proposal passed and reads as follows:

Background and Rationale:

The proposal above is offered by the Student Government Association for amendment to the University Senate Rules, Section 5.1.0, concerning Grades and Marking Systems. The proposal was first introduced to the University Senate in October, 1993. The Senate referred the proposal back to Committee and tabled the motion to February, 1994. The revised proposal has been endorsed by the Senate Council, which recommends approval.

The attrition rate at the University of Kentucky is not only a concern to the

University but also to the student body. It is easy for a student to lose focus on his or her schoolwork. For whatever reason this lack of focus might be derived from, the outcome remains the same; a poorer grade evaluation than a student may expect. The reasoning behind unsatisfactory performance of the student may be the result of poor study skills and the lack of comprehension of how the grading system works. The result from any of these possibilities makes up a major portion of the 24 percent attrition rate at the University of Kentucky.

The proposal would grant undergraduate students the opportunity to evaluate their performance mid-way through the semester. This would be enough time for the teacher to prepare a proper evaluation of a student's performance thus far as well as allow the students time to make proper adjustments to improve current performance.

Effective Date: If approved, the recommended change would be effective with the 1994-1995 academic year.

Codification: If approved, this recommended change will be codified by the Senate Rules Committee.

Professor Bill Lubawy requested that an explanation go into the Senate Rules to indicate that this does not apply to seminars and independent study, there are things in Art and Music where the same type of thing could happen, where performance is judged on the final assignment. Something to clarify these unique circumstances other than regular classes.

Professor Enid Waldhart (Communications) feels no explanation is required. The idea is it is based on the syllabus. Whatever is agreed to before hand, if there is not a syllabus, the independent study contract or whatever, in those cases that means the same sense as a syllabus. Chairman Fulks said he was inclined to agree. It will force the instructors to look at the syllabus very closely.

Chairman Fulks asked for a waiver of the ten day circulation rule on the proposal concerning Computer Science. The motion was made and seconded and passed in a voice vote. Chairman Fulks recognized Professor Cox for the agenda item. Professor Cox on behalf of the Senate Council moved approval of the proposal to transfer the Department of

Computer Science from the College of Arts and Sciences to the College of Engineering. The proposal was circulated under the date of 10 February 1994.

Professor Joe Gardner (English) was concerned that when the Computer Science Department was created, it was created out of the College of Arts and Sciences by capitalizing lines from other departments. Has anything been taken into consideration of compensating the college for losing those lines out of the college altogether.

Professor Hans Gesund doesn't see what is meant by compensation. Not only the lines go, the students go as well. So there is no longer the responsibility for the Computer Science majors or the service courses taught by the Computer Science Department. Professor Gardner said if a line was taken from French and transferred to Computer Science that doesn't mean that all French students switched their majors to Computer Science. Professor Gesund replied that the students paid tuition and therefore the salaries do switch or there are new students who are taking Computer Science. In fact, the French students probably take some Computer Science service courses as do the English students.

In a voice vote the proposal to transfer the Department of Computer Science from the College of Arts and Sciences to the College of Engineering passed and reads as follows:

Proposal:

If approved, the Department of Computer Science would be transferred in its entirety from the College of Arts and Sciences to the College of Engineering. The department's budget, faculty, and staff would be moved without change, as would specific equipment currently being utilized by Computer Science faculty and staff. Degree and admission requirements would remain unchanged.

Background and Rationale:

A possible move of Computer Science to Engineering has been discussed for several years and was included in the recommendations of the recent report of the Lexington Campus Realignment and Restructuring Task Force. Discussions and negotiations have intensified during the past year with involvement of the deans and faculties of both colleges. The result is a comprehensive agreement between the two colleges, delineating the financial, academic, and logistics aspects of the move. The move should result in more effective, efficient, and financially sound research, instructional, and service efforts of the unit.

The proposal was submitted to Chancellor Hemenway on November 4, 1993, and was forwarded to the Senate Council soon thereafter. The Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure recommends approval, as does the Senate

Council. It should be noted that the senate committee members expressed some concern about issues involving the College of Engineering's commitment to providing the traditional service courses to the university community and its willingness to assume responsibility for sufficient teaching assistant support for the Department. These issues have been addressed by Dean Lester in the attached statement.

Effective Date: July 1, 1994

If approved, the recommended changes will be sent to the President for appropriate administrative action.

The Chair then asked for a waiver of the ten day rule for the next agenda item concerning the proposed reorganization of the College of Business and Economics.

The move for a waiver passed in a voice vote. Chairman Fulks then recognized Professor Cox introduction of the item. Professor Cox on behalf of the Senate Council moved a approval of the proposed change in the organization structure of the College of Business and Economics. The item was distributed under the date of 10 February, 1994.

The proposal passed in an unanimous voice vote and reads as follows:

Proposal:

If approved, four of the six current academic departments would be merged into a new School of Management. The College would then consist of the School of Accountancy, the School of Management, and the Department of Economics.

Background and Rationale:

This proposal is the result of continuing self-study and review by the faculty of the College. The formal proposal which is the basis for this recommendation was the result of the 1992-1993 B&E 2000 Planning Committee study. A subsequent faculty retreat and efforts of an ad hoc College Reorganization Committee further refined the proposal, which has near consensus support of the College faculty. It is the belief of the College faculty and administration that the recommended changes will result in enhanced quality of the academic programs, as well as cost savings.

The proposal was submitted to Chancellor Hemenway and the Senate Council in November of 1993. The Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure recommends approval, as does the Senate Council

Effective Date: July 1, 1994

If approved, the recommended changes will be sent to the President for appropriate administrative action.

Chairman Fulks recognized Professor Cox for the next agenda item. Professor Cox moved

approval on the behalf of the Senate Council to the proposed changes to the University Senate Rules, Section VI, Student Academic Affairs, concerning the length of time records are held in the Ombud's office. The proposal was circulated under the date of 18 January, 1994.

The question was asked if it should be limited to five years, since the statute of limitations is related to the student's period of matriculation. Chairman Fulks stated there was a tracking problem with that, the Ombud's office would have to pull every inactive file and try to track down the students. The Legal Counsel suggested that perhaps five years is adequate.

In a voice vote the proposal passed and reads as follows:

Proposed Change: (delete strikeouts; add underlined portion)

6.2.1.7 The Academic Ombud shall retain a record of all cases which are accepted. In cases involving discrimination (including sexual harassment), a summary of the case shall be sent to the Affirmative Action Officer. (US:4/11/83) The Ombud shall review all files at the end of the term of office and should destroy any file of a case which has been resolved which is
!?
!two years five years of age or older. If not destroyed, then all names should be removed. The decision not to destroy a file ought to be based on criteria such as resolution which might serve as a precedent for similar cases in the future. All unresolved cases which are more than one year old and which were never forwarded to the Appeals Board shall be destroyed.

Rationale:

It is the opinion of University Legal Counsel that such files should be maintained for at least five years, which is beyond a student's usual time of matriculation. This is the likely maximum time period for statute of limitation purposes for a breach of contract action.

The Senate Council recommends approval.

Effective Date:

If approved, this revision would become effective immediately.

Chairman Fulks recognized Dr. Cox for the next agenda item. Dr. Cox on behalf recommended approval of the proposed changes to the University Senate Rules, Section V - 5.2.4.7, concerning Common Examinations. The item was circulated under the date of 24

January, 1994.

Professor Hans Gesund asked what the asterisk footnote in the copy of the item was referring to and also what the brackets in Item 2 mean? Chairman Fulks stated that the brackets mean to delete. Professor McMahon said the asterisk is the way the rules note a Rules Committee interpretation by letter.

The Chair said the proposal was offered by the David Durant Committee. There were several items the committee brought forth last fall.

There was no further discussion. The proposal passed in a voice vote and reads as follows:

Background and Rationale:

The following proposal was recommended by the ad hoc Committee to Review Section V of the Senate Rules, chaired by Dr. David Durant, and has been approved by the Senate Rules Committee. The proposed change involves the second of three options currently available to departments administering common examinations for providing alternative exam times. The objective of this section of the Senate Rules, as written in February 1990 was to mitigate the inconvenience caused by students who have classes scheduled during the designated time of the common exam. Dr. Durant's committee believed that the second alternative nullifies the intention of the remainder of the rule. The Rules Committee concurs.

Proposal: (Delete strike-over; add item in bold and underlined.)

5.2.4.7 Common Examinations

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 time at which the exam will be given in the official Schedule of Classes. (US: 1/12/90)

- 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 alternative 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.

- half 2. Spread each examination over a time block at least one and a
times the length of the examination. (US: 2/12/90)
- e 32. Give two examindations at widely disparate times, [but not th
morning after the evening examination.] (US: 9/13/82;
- p * Any department giving a common examination must give a make-u
sed exam or develop some other arrangement for students with excu
a absences to gain credit as if they had taken the common exam;
to department may not aply a "drop with the lowest score" policy
common exams missed with an excused absence. (RC: 11/24/82;
upheld by US: 2/13/83)

Implementation Date: Fall Semester 1994

Note: If approved, the proposed changes will be submitted to the Rules Commi
ttee for codification.

The Chair recognized Professor Cox for the last action item. Professor Cox
recommended on behalf of the Senate Council approval of the proposal to amend the University
Senate Rules, Section V - 5.3.1.1, Repeat Option. The proposal was circulated under th
e date of 25 January 1994.

Professor Dan Reedy stated that this did not change in anyway the rules rela
ting to the number of repeat options. Professor Fulks said there was a case where a student
had audited a course, then took the course for a grade, and then took the course for
the third time and wanted to exercise the repeat option. The way the Senate Rules read, t
he audit would have counted as the first time the student enrolled in the course, therefo
re the student perhaps would not have been allowed to exercise a repeat option, because
it would only be used the second time the course it taken. The question was did the audi
t count? The Rules Committee gave an interpretation and allowed the student to exercise t
he repeat option. The proposal is really codifying the interpretation of the Rules Commit
tee. It will not change the number of repeat options.

In a unanimous voice vote the proposal passed and reads as follows:

Proposal: (add underlined portion)

5.3.1.1 Repeat Option (US: 11/14/83; US: 4/13/87; US: 11/14/88; US: 4/23
/90)

A student shall have the option to repeat once as many as three differ

ent
 d
 's
 he
 e
 he
) is
 sed
 er

courses which have been completed with only the grade, credit hours and quality points for the second completion used in computing the student's academic standing and credit for graduation. A student also may use the repeat option when retaking a course on a Pass-Fail basis (provided the course meets the requirements for being taken Pass-Fail), even though the course was originally taken for a letter grade. If a failing grade (F) is earned on the second attempt, the original grade will continue to be used in calculating the grade point average and the second attempt shall constitute exhaustion of one of the student's three repeat options under this provision.

of
 y of

A student exercising the repeat option must notify in writing the dean of the college in which the student is enrolled no later than the last day of scheduled classes in the semester in which the repeat is exercised. Students may exercise the repeat option in summer session any time prior to the scheduled time for the final examination. (RC: 11/18/92)

e
 his
 n

If a student officially withdraws from the second attempt, then the grade, credit hours and quality points for the first completion shall constitute the grade in that course for official purposes, and the second attempt shall constitute exhaustion of one of the three options to repeat a course under this provision, unless at the time of withdrawal, permission to attempt again the same course shall be granted by the instructor and the dean of the college in which the student is enrolled.

s a

The repeat option may be exercised only the second time a student takes a course for a letter grade, not a subsequent time.

Background and Rationale:
 The Senate Rules Committee has interpreted the Repeat Option rules to indicate that "the repeat option may be exercised only the second time a student takes a course, not a subsequent time." (RC: 7/1/87) This proposal would codify that interpretation into the rules. In addition, this proposal would codify a more recent Rules Committee interpretation that an audit of a course does not preclude a student from exercising a repeat option at a later date. (RC: 1/20/94) Thus, upon recommendation of the Rules Committee, the words "for a letter grade" were added.

Implementation Date:

If approved, this revision would be effective with the Fall 1994 semester.

Chairman Fulks reminded the Senate the next meeting would be held March 7, 1994, a week earlier than originally scheduled.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:34 p.m.

Randall W. Dahl
Secretary, University Senate