

C. Todd.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

March 1, 1979

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet in regular session on Monday, March 12, 1979 at 3:00 p.m. in the Classroom Building, Room 118. PLEASE NOTE THE CHANGE IN MEETING PLACE.

AGENDA:

- 1) Minutes: January 22, 1979 and February 12, 1979. (Circulated by mail.)
- 2) Chairman's Remarks.
- 3) Action Items:
 - a) Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I, 2.2.1 (c) Elected Faculty Membership to the University Senate. (Circulated under date of March 1, 1979.)
 - b) Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I, 3.3.2 Composition of the Undergraduate Council. (Circulated under date of March 1, 1979.)
 - c) For Discussion Only: Withdrawal Policy. (Circulated under date of February 21, 1979.)

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

Note: If you are unable to attend this meeting, please contact Ms. Martha Ferguson (7-2958). Thank you.

COPY 2

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, MARCH 12, 1979

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, March 12, 1979, in Room 118 of the Classroom Building.

Joseph A. Bryant, Chairman, presiding

Members absent: Charles E. Barnhart, Janis L. Bellack*, John J. Bernardo, Mark Birkebak*, Brack A. Bivins, Jack C. Blanton, Thomas O. Blues*, Robert N. Bostrom*, Judy Brown*, Sara Brumbaugh*, Joseph T. Burch, Joe B. Buttram*, W. Merle Carter*, S. K. Chan, Donald B. Clapp, D. Kay Clawson*, Lewis W. Cochran*, Clinton Collins*, Glenn B. Collins*, Frank Colton, Ronda S. Connaway*, Samuel F. Conti, James E. Criswell*, Paul Davis, John A. Deacon*, Patrick P. DeLuca*, George W. Denmark*, Ronald C. Dillehay*, Joseph M. Dougherty, Louis Diamond*, Anthony Eardley, Bruce S. Eastwood*, W. W. Ecton, Joseph Engelberg*, Richard A. Etlin, James E. Funk*, Art Gallaher*, Abner Golden*, Andrew J. Grimes, Gilbert Haertel, S. Zafar Hasan*, Virgil W. Hays, Roger W. Hemken*, Raymond R. Hornback, Eugene Huff*, Charles W. Hultman*, Clyde L. Irwin, Donald W. Ivey*, H. Douglas Jameson, Dean Jaros, Keith H. Johnson*, Margaret W. Jones*, Wesley H. Jones*, Aimo J. Kiviniemi, James A. Knoblett*, Mark Koopman, Linda Krefting*, Joseph Krislov*, William B. Lacy, Thomas P. Lewis, Arthur Lieber*, John Lihani*, William L. Matthews, Bettie W. McClaskey, Marcus T. McEllistrem, Marion E. McKenna*, Dorothy A. Miller*, Catherine Morsink*, Judith Mosher*, Phillip J. Noffsinger*, Clayton Omvig, Merrill W. Packer, Bobby C. Pass, Doyle E. Peaslee, David Peck*, Alan R. Perreiah*, Deborah E. Powell, David H. Richardson*, Robert W. Rudd*, Ramona Rush*, Pritam S. Sabharwal, Patrick J. Sammon*, Stanley R. Saxe*, Mike Schutte*, Ronald J. Seymour*, D. Milton Shuffett*, Timothy W. Sineath, Otis A. Singletary*, John T. Smith, Stanford L. Smith, Tim Smith, Lynn Spruill, Marjorie S. Stewart*, Anne Stiene-Martin*, Joseph P. Straley, Willis A. Sutton*, Louis J. Swift*, Rodney Tulloch*, William F. Wagner, John N. Walker*, M. Stanley Wall, Marc J. Wallace*, Richard L. Warren*, Mike Whitlock*, J. Robert Wills, Constance P. Wilson*, H. David Wilson, Fred W. Zechman*, Robert G. Zumwinkle*

The minutes of the special session of January 22, 1979, were approved as circulated. The minutes of the regular meeting of February 12, 1979, were approved as circulated with one change. Professor George Schwert moved that on page four (4) his remarks should read: "...are stated in such specific and fixed terms that they cannot conveniently be replaced by other course offerings. The motion was seconded and approved.

The Chairman made the following announcements. The first item concerned the COSFL which was proposed by Assistant Professor Tom Jones of Western Kentucky University. A group of persons interested in the project, which is a kind of Congress of the Senate, has met four times. At each meeting at least one representative of the University of Kentucky has been present. The meetings have been completely informal and are unofficial. Mr. Jones at one point designated the group as the Congress of University Senates. More recently he has been calling it the Congress of Senate Faculty Leaders, and he has proposed a variety of activities for this group in addition to the sharing of information and the discussion of common concerns. The main concern of most of the members is apparently economic. Things they have considered are the evaluation of the performance of the President of each respective institution, the interrogation of prospective gubernatorial candidates and most recently continued consultation with the Council on Higher Education. This group sent a resolution to the Senate Council which was discussed at the Council's meeting on Friday, March 9.

*Absence explained

The Council had reservations about the resolution, which they sent to Mr. Jones and to make it clear that the Council is not closing the door, invited him to suggest alternatives. The Chairman said that he hoped to have a response in order to make a full report at the April Senate meeting.

The second item had to do with a committee appointed by Vice President Cochran to consider the state of the catalog. The Chairman says that everybody agrees that the Senate is responsible for all approvals and that the Registrar is responsible for the physical preparation of the catalog. He noted that trouble with the catalog has arisen because decisions concerning its preparation have been made in a variety of places and that consequently contradictions have occurred. Everyone also agreed, he noted, that it is desirable to computerize the catalog to remove this kind of contradiction and confusion. He noted further, however, that computerization would come with certain costs. One would be the limit on data that could be included. Course titles might have to be limited to 120 spaces, prerequisites to 100 spaces, and descriptions to 600 spaces. Enforcement of the regulations of this kind would be the responsibility of the Registrar. Patience and forbearance would be the responsibility of all the rest.

The final item that the Chairman brought to the Senators' attention concerned the Retirement Dinner which had been announced for April 9 but has been cancelled. Just as soon as the Chairman knows something definite, he will notify the members of the Senate.

The Chairman recognized Professor Daniel Reedy for a motion from the Senate Council. Professor Reedy, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I, 2.2.1 (c) "Elected Faculty Membership to the University Senate." This proposal had been circulated to members of the University Senate under the date of March 1, 1979. The floor was opened for questions and discussion.

Professor Gesund said that he was not sure that the Senate had such a tremendous responsibility that each unit had to have the continuity that the proposal implied, and he was puzzled by it and didn't realize the Senate was doing anything which required such continuity. Professor Plucknett pointed out that having a wholly new slate of representatives at the same time would happen very rarely. Professor Lienhard said that he agreed with Professor Gesund but noted that wording of the proposal is permissive.

The motion in favor of the proposal was made, seconded and passed. It reads as follows:

Background:

In the beginning our Senate Rules governing the election of Senators to represent the various divisions of the University were devised to maintain a healthy degree of continuity of membership. The body would always be composed of new Senators and Senators with varying amounts of experience. For some time, however, it has been obvious that these rules do not always work. It now happens that in some divisions the entire complement of Senators is retiring at the same time, presumably to be followed by a wholly new and inexperienced slate of representatives. This past year, for example, six units found themselves in an "unstaggered situation," the entire contingent being eligible for replacement. The following proposal, originally made by Professor John Rea and subsequently considered by the Senate Council and the Rules Committee is now being presented as a remedy for this situation.

Proposal: (add underlined portions; delete bracketed materials)

- I. 2.2.1 (c) Elected Faculty Membership -- As specified in the Governing Regulations, each elected faculty member shall serve for a term of three years. Ideally, the terms of the representatives of each academic unit or sub-unit should be staggered so that one-third of them will be elected at each election. To this end the faculty of the academic unit represented, may, for any election, specify that a number of representatives be elected for two-year terms. If such action is taken, the dean of the academic unit involved shall notify the Secretary of the Senate of such intent in advance of the upcoming election. When more than one member is to be elected from a unit or sub-unit, those receiving the greater number of votes will serve three-year terms and those elected receiving the lesser number of votes will serve two-year terms. [and] Each elected representative shall be eligible for reelection for a second consecutive term, but . . .

Proposed Implementation Date: Fall, 1979.

The Chairman again recognized Professor Reedy for a motion from the Senate Council. Professor Reedy, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I, 3.3.2 "Composition of the Undergraduate Council." This proposed change had been circulated to members of the University Senate under date of March 1, 1979. Professor Reedy amended one line in the proposed change to delete the words "and the Arts" in the second paragraph of the proposal. The sentence reads as follows:

"...combined areas of Literature and Philosophy in the College of Arts and Sciences"

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. There was no discussion and the previous question was moved, seconded and passed. The motion on the proposal passed unanimously. It reads as follows:

Background:

Because of Administrative reorganization, current Senate Rules do not provide for representation on the Undergraduate Council by the College of Fine Arts, Honors Program and College of Communications. The Rules Committee has proposed the following changes, which the Senate Council now presents for consideration by the Senate as a whole.

Proposal: (add underlined portions; delete bracketed materials)

- I. 3.3.2 Composition -- It shall consist of fourteen (14) members. The chairman of the General Studies Committee shall serve ex officio. Nine of the members shall be elected by the faculty of Colleges, groups of Colleges or parts of Colleges as follows:

One member from the combined areas of Literature and Philosophy in the College of Arts and Sciences [.] , the College of Fine Arts, and the Honors Program.

One member from the combined areas of Biological and Physical Sciences in the College of Arts and Sciences.

One member from the combined areas of the Social Sciences in the College of Arts and Sciences [.] and the College of Communications.

Implementation Date: Fall, 1979.

The final item on the agenda was for discussion only. The Chairman said that the Senators had the circulation from the Senate Council dated February 21, 1979, which gave a brief background on the matter of the withdrawal policy and set forth in detail the proposal from the Rules Committee which was sent to the Senate Council. The Senate Council did not feel that it wanted to make a definite proposal without further discussion. The Undergraduate Council has considered the matter as circulated and has presented its own special modifications. The Chairman added that nothing would be resolved at this meeting but hoped that it might enable the Senate Council to present a proposal that would incorporate the wishes of most of the Senators. The floor was opened for discussion.

Professor Gesund said that the whole problem of withdrawing was becoming incredibly and needlessly complicated. He added that as one who believed in academic freedom he strongly opposed to being told what grade to give at what time to what student. He said he had no objection to a withdrawal policy, but the faculty member should have the prerogative to assign the grade the student had at the point of withdrawal.

Professor Plucknett said that he wanted to point out that the withdrawal policy was not a creature of the Rules Committee. He added that the Senate already had the one-half, one-third but in the administration of the rule there were certain difficulties and the Rules Committee was directing itself with only trying to simplify or address those difficulties.

The Chairman said that the point at issue was that the "W" now means two different things.

Professor Baer said that along with the proposed simplification he would like to suggest another one. He said that it was his understanding under the current rule for withdrawal and under the proposed change, the faculty member has no choice in terms of grades awarded prior to midterm. He added that it seemed to him that the signature of an advisor or instructor on a drop form was worthless. He suggested that a new withdrawal form be implemented that would not require the student to go through the procedure of getting signatures.

Student Senator English said one of the problems with the current policy was withdrawing during the last half of the semester. If a student had a valid reason for withdrawing but was failing at the time, the student would receive an "E" and that grade would be included in the grade point average. If the student were passing, the grade would be a "W". Mr. English did not think this was fair.

Professor Weil said that in response to Professor Baer's suggestion of advisors not signing the withdrawal form that many times the conscientious advisors wanted to know when the advisees dropped classes. As a faculty member, Professor Weil said that he wanted to know who was in his classes. As to the proposal, he felt it was a fairly good one. He said that he liked the idea of the different grade for those who withdrew early and those who withdrew late.

The Chairman said that under the present rule a student withdrawing during the first third of the course there would be no record of enrollment. At the end of the first half the student would receive a "W" and after that a student would automatically receive an "E" unless by petition a student would receive a "W." In Professor Plucknett's proposal this would be removed and an "X" replace the "W" and "WP" and "WF" added. Dean Ockerman said that it had not been too long since the "X" had been used to signify "not in class" and this might be confusing.

Professor Gesund moved that the withdrawal policy be sent back to the appropriate committee in order not to have the one-third, one-half, etc. and submit a coherent withdrawal policy to the Senate. The Chairman ruled him out of order.

Professor Kemp said that the withdrawal proposal had been considered by the Senate for several years. It had been through the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee numerous times. He said that he agreed there was confusion but he did not believe the policy should be junked. He added that he felt if the policy were rewritten there would be adverse reaction from the student body because he thought the policy was rather equitable.

Professor Schrils passed out a recommendation from the Undergraduate Council which reads as follows:

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

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

Professor Lienhard wanted an explanation why the proposal was not a substitutive change. The Chairman replied that strictly speaking the proposal was a substitutive change in that it involved approval by the Dean only and not the advisor. A Student Senator asked if there was any difference in the computation of the grade point average in a "WP" and "WF." Dean Ockerman said that would have to be determined if any penalty value were attached to the "WF" because there is a penalty attached to the "E" grade.

Professor Gesund said that since he could not make a motion he would like to make a plea for someone to reexamine the necessity of having two different things happening two weeks apart. He added that why after the first third one thing is done and after the first half a different thing. He urged the various Councils to consider the poor faculty member, the poor student and the poor advisor who would be much happier with only two different categories rather than three.

A Senator said that he thought the proposal from the Undergraduate Council was the best thing that had come along in a long time. He said it had been his experience with legitimate late withdrawals they were more deteriorative rather than catastrophic. He said he was supportive of the Undergraduate Council's recommendation. Professor Bosomworth asked if the rules prohibited the recommendation being presented as a substitute motion. The Chairman said that there was no motion on the floor.

One Senator said that he would like for the Senate Council to consider the Undergraduate Council's recommendation. He said that the discussion had been on item number three, and the value of item number one should not be overlooked. He added that number one greatly simplified the grading procedure and made the withdrawal grade a much more honest one.

Professor Westley said that presumably there was a withdrawal policy, but no determination has been made as to what penalties are attached to "withdrew failing." The Chairman said that there was a policy now, but it has not been determined what value the "WF" has.

Professor Lienhard moved that the Senate recommend the Undergraduate Council's proposal to the attention of the Senate Council and ask the Council to return it as an action item. The motion was seconded. The Chairman said that no action would be taken; that the proposal would simply be sent to the Senate Council.

Professor Plucknett spoke against the Undergraduate Council's proposal. He said he believed if he were a student failing most of his courses he could manufacture dire circumstances and probably convince many of the Deans. He said that he was afraid it would put a premium on students trying to do that sort of thing. He said the "WF" would mean the same as an "E."

Professor Marlatt pointed out that on page three of the original proposal the Rules Committee suggested that the recommendation of the student's advisor and instructor be omitted so there really was no difference between the proposal by the Undergraduate Council and the Rules Committee so far as who approves. She asked if she were correct and the Chairman answered in the affirmative.

Dean Sands spoke in favor of the Rules Committee's proposal if the "X" grade were changed to a "W." He was in favor of the "WP" and "WF" adding that it would be to the student's advantage to have a "WP" rather than a "W" that doesn't give any information at all. He said that students who were passing needed to have that shown.

Professor Reedy said that it seemed to him entirely appropriate in keeping with the responsibility of the faculty members in an institution that section (a) of number three have attached to it a statement that "approval by the dean of the student's college and with the concurrence of the faculty member" so that there would be some kind of consultation between the dean, the administrative action, and the faculty member.

Professor Weil said that his reason for separating the recommendation to the Senate Council and suggesting the Senate Council come back to the Senate with an action item was so that the Council could discuss and propose some specific response to that point.

Professor Soule raised the question as to when a student experienced severe non-academic difficulties was he required to drop all his courses or just one of his courses. He asked what kind of extreme non-academic problems could justify dropping just one course. The Chairman responded that the Senate could not address that question because the rule simply stated "withdrawal from a class," and it would be the problem of the Dean of the College.

Dean Royster said that he agreed that uniformity was needed, and he suggested giving a "W" up to half way through the semester, "WP" or "WF" after the midterm. He said everyone could understand that, and it was essentially the current rule and a simple system.

Professor Jewell said that he would like an interpretation of what the resolution meant. He said that it seemed to him the consensus of the Senate was that before the Council votes it should take a good hard look at the Undergraduate Council's proposal but was the motion to urge the Council to do that or was the motion endorsing the Undergraduate Council's proposal. The Chairman responded that his interpretation was that it was a motion urging the Council to look at the proposal or not look at it depending upon the strength of the vote.

Professor Skelland said that it seemed to him if a student were failing a course in the first twelve weeks the situation would not change in the last half of the semester. He said that students should become responsible for their actions even as undergraduates. He suggested using Dean Royster's suggestion of one-half and one-half or one-third and two-thirds.

A Senator said that he hoped the Council would take a look at all the discussion because the policy should be looked at thoroughly. He suggested no mark at all during the first third of the semester, drop the one-sixth, go to the second third where there would be a "W" standing alone, and the last one-third have "WP" or "WF."

Professor Westley said that perhaps two different concepts should be considered and process once instead of five times every time a student withdrew and having a different criteria allowing a student to drop one course while continuing in others.

The Chairman stated that the Senate Council would be grateful for a count on all proposals. The motion for the Senate Council to take a look at the proposal presented by the Undergraduate Council failed with a hand count of 39 to 26. In a show of hands for the guidance of the Council on the proposal from the Rules Committee there were 40 who opposed and 18 in favor of the proposal.

The proposal which the Rules Committee presented reads as follows:

Background:

At its meeting on December 12, 1977, the Senate passed the withdrawal policy under which the University now operates. This policy permits a student to withdraw without record and without prejudice during the first third of any course, to withdraw from that point to mid-term with a mark of "W", and to withdraw during the last half of the term upon approval of a petition certifying urgent reasons of a personal nature. Implementation of this policy unavoidably caused confusion in some quarters, and the Rules Committee of the Senate was asked to submit an interpretation of the rule for the guidance of the Senate and the academic community as a whole. On December 14, 1978 the Rules Committee recommended the following:

- 1) That the dean, advisor and instructor in the course must all agree on the appropriateness of the reasons for a student's withdrawal during the last half of the term and specified that the reasons must involve circumstances over which the student has little or no control.

- 2) That the "appropriate grade" to be awarded a student upon his withdrawal during the second half of the term be either W or E and determined solely by the instructor.

The Rules Committee also found, however, that the "W" rule as passed continues to have a serious and as yet unaddressed source of confusion: the student who withdraws between the end of the first third and the mid-point of the term must in all circumstances be given a "W." This mark is in no sense a grade or a report on the student's performance; such a "W" under the rule must be awarded indiscriminately to all students--good, bad and indifferent. The "W" awarded as "an appropriate grade" after mid-term, by contrast, is a report that satisfactory work has been done in the course up to that point. In short, under the present rule, the mark of "W" may mean very different things depending upon when it was awarded, and yet it must appear only as an unexplained "W" on the student's transcript. To rectify this inconsistency the Rules Committee has submitted the following proposal to the Senate Council which now forwards it to the Senate as a whole for discussion.

Proposal:

The Senate Rules Committee recommends the following changes in the Senate Rules to the Senate Council relative to the "drop" policy.

- V.1.8.1 Any student may withdraw from any class before the midpoint of the term. In order to withdraw, the student must submit a completed withdrawal form to his or her dean. The dean shall report the withdrawal to the Registrar.
 - (a) Any student withdrawing during the first third of the course shall be removed from the class roll, and no grade or record of enrollment shall appear on the student's transcript.
 - (b) Any student withdrawing after the first third of the course but before midterm shall receive a grade of [W] X.
- V.1.8.2 (a) A student may withdraw from a class during the [last] latter half of the term upon approval of the petition certifying urgent non-academic reasons including but not limited to:
 - I. Illness or injury of the student;
 - II. Serious personal or family problems;
 - [III. Financial inability to continue at the University, or;
 - III. Serious financial difficulties.
 - [IV. Call to military service].

Such a petition [should be recommended by the student's advisor and instructor and] must be approved by the dean of the student's college. The instructor must assign [an appropriate grade] a grade of WP or WF. (For exception involving call to military service, see 2. 1.3 this section) [(See 1.3 this section) or a grade of P or W may be assigned by the University Appeals Board (see Section VI, 5.1.1b.)]

If these changes are adopted, W will have to be deleted from the list of grades and X, WP and WF added. In addition, the Rules will need changing relative to the grades available to be assigned by the Appeals Board. "W" will need to be replaced by "WP" or "X." The Rules Committee did not discuss this change.

Dean Royster made a motion to have a "W" up to the half of the semester and after that a "WP" or "WF." The motion was seconded. Professor Adelstein said that as he understood it that would be out of order. He said that the spirit of the rule that was passed last spring was one-third, one-sixth and one-half and his understanding was that nothing could be done about that rule. In a straw vote for Dean Royster's motion, there was a hand count in favor of the motion 47 to 9.

Motion was made to adjourn at 4:20 p.m.

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary of the Senate

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

February 21, 1979

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting,
Monday, March 12, 1979. Withdrawal Policy:
For Discussion Only.

Background:

At its meeting on December 12, 1977, the Senate passed the withdrawal policy under which the University now operates. This policy permits a student to withdraw without record and without prejudice during the first third of any course, to withdraw from that point to mid-term with a mark of "W", and to withdraw during the last half of the term upon approval of a petition certifying urgent reasons of a personal nature. Implementation of this policy unavoidably caused confusion in some quarters, and the Rules Committee of the Senate was asked to submit an interpretation of the rule for the guidance of the Senate and the academic community as a whole. On December 14, 1978 the Rules Committee recommended the following:

- 1) That the dean, advisor and instructor in the course must all agree on the appropriateness of the reasons for a student's withdrawal during the last half of the term and specified that the reasons must involve circumstances over which the student has little or no control.
- 2) That the "appropriate grade" to be awarded a student upon his withdrawal during the second half of the term be either W or E and determined solely by the instructor.

The Rules Committee also found, however, that the W rule as passed continues to have a serious and as yet unaddressed source of confusion:

the student who withdraws between the end of the first third and the mid-point of the term must in all circumstances be given a "W". This mark is in no sense a grade or a report on the student's performance; such a "W" under the rule must be awarded instances indiscriminately to all students--good, bad and indifferent. The W awarded as "an appropriate grade" after mid-term, by contrast, is a report that satisfactory work has been done in the course up to that point. In short, under the present rule, the mark of "W" may mean very different things depending upon when it was awarded, and yet it must appear only as an unexplained W on the student's transcript. To rectify this inconsistency the Rules Committee has submitted the following proposal to the Senate Council which now forwards it to the Senate as a whole for discussion.

Proposal:

The Senate Rules Committee recommends the following changes in the Senate Rules to the Senate Council relative to the "drop" policy.

- V. 1. 8. 1 Any student may withdraw from any class before the midpoint of the term. In order to withdraw, the student must submit a completed withdrawal form to his or her dean. The dean shall report the withdrawal to the Registrar.
- (a) Any student withdrawing during the first third of the course shall be removed from the class roll, and no grade or record of enrollment shall appear on the student's transcript.
- (b) Any student withdrawing after the first third of the course but before midterm shall receive a grade of [W] X.
- V. 1. 8. 2 (a) A student may withdraw from a class during the [last] latter half of the term upon approval of a petition certifying urgent non-academic reasons including but not limited to:

Page 3

Senate Agenda Item: March 12, 1979 Withdrawal Policy
February 21, 1979

- I. Illness or injury of the student;
- II. Serious personal or family problems;
- [III. Financial inability to continue at the University, or;]
- III. Serious financial difficulties.
- [IV. Call to military service].

Such a petition [should be recommended by the student's advisor and instructor and] must be approved by the dean of the student's college. The instructor must assign [an appropriate grade] a grade of WP or WF. (For exception involving call to military service, see 2.1.3 this section) [(See 1.3 this section) or a grade of P or W may be assigned by the University Appeals Board (see Section VI, 5.1.1b.)]

If these changes are adopted, W will have to be deleted from the list of grades and X, WP and WF added. In addition, the Rules will need changing relative to the grades available to be assigned by the Appeals Board. "W" will need to be replaced by "WP" or "X." The Rules Committee did not discuss this change.

/cet

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

March 1, 1979

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday,
March 12, 1979. Proposed change in Senate Rules,
Section I, 3.3.2 Composition of the Undergraduate
Council.

Background:

Because of Administrative reorganization, current Senate Rules do not provide for representation on the Undergraduate Council by the College of Fine Arts, Honors Program and College of Communications. The Rules Committee has proposed the following changes, which the Senate Council now presents for consideration by the Senate as a whole.

Proposal: (add underlined portions; delete bracketed materials)

- I. 3.3.2 Composition -- It shall consist of fourteen (14) members. The chairman of the General Studies Committee shall serve ex officio. Nine of the members shall be elected by the faculty of Colleges, groups of Colleges or parts of Colleges as follows:

One member from the combined areas of Literature, ^{and} ~~Philosophy and the Arts~~ in the College of Arts and Sciences [.] the College of Fine Arts, and the Honors Program.

One member from the combined areas of Biological and Physical Sciences in the College of Arts and Sciences.

One member from the combined areas of the Social Sciences in the College of Arts and Sciences [.] and the College of Communications.

Implementation Date: Fall, 1979.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

March 1, 1979

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, March 12, 1979. Proposed change in Senate Rules, Section I, 2.2.1 (c) Elected Faculty Membership to the University Senate.
Note: If the proposed changes are adopted by the Senate, a subsequent change in the Governing Regulations (page 11) must be recommended to the Administration.

Background:

In the beginning our Senate Rules governing the election of Senators to represent the various divisions of the University were devised to maintain a healthy degree of continuity of membership. The body would always be composed of new Senators and Senators with varying amounts of experience. For some time, however, it has been obvious that these rules do not always work. It now happens that in some divisions the entire complement of Senators is retiring at the same time, presumably to be followed by a wholly new and inexperienced slate of representatives. This past year, for example, six units found themselves in an "unstaggered situation," the entire contingent being eligible for replacement. The following proposal, originally made by Professor John Rea and subsequently considered by the Senate Council and Rules Committee is now being presented as a remedy for this situation.

[continued]

Page 2
Agenda Item
March 1, 1979

Proposal: (add underlined portions; delete bracketed materials)

- I. 2.2.1 (c) Elected Faculty Membership -- As specified in the Governing Regulations, each elected faculty member shall serve for a term of three years. Ideally, the terms of the representatives of each academic unit or sub-unit should be staggered so that one-third of them will be elected at each election. To this end the faculty of the academic unit represented, may, for any election, specify that a number of representatives be elected for two year terms. If such action is taken, the dean of the academic unit involved shall notify the Secretary of the Senate of such intent in advance of the upcoming election. When more than one member is to be elected from a unit or sub-unit, those receiving the greater number of votes will serve three-year terms and those elected receiving the lesser number of votes will serve two-year terms. [and] Each elected representative shall be eligible for reelection for a second consecutive term, but . . .

Proposed Implementation Date: Fall, 1979.

/cet