

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

March 24, 1978

U.S.
4/10/78

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet on Monday, April 10, 1978
at 3:00 p.m. in the Court Room, Law Building.

AGENDA:

- 1) Approval of the minutes of the March 13, 1978 University Senate meeting.
- 2) Chairman's Remarks
- 3) Report from ad hoc Committee to Study Ethics and Academic Responsibilities: Dr. Nicholas Pisacano, Chairman.
- 4) Report from Academic Ombudsman: Dr. Frank Buck.
- 5) Action Item:
 - a) Recommendations from the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure. (To be circulated under date of March 29, 1978.)

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

/cet

Reference copy

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, APRIL 10, 1978

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, April 10, 1978, in the Court Room of the Law Building.

Paul Oberst, Chairman, presiding

Members absent: Roger B. Anderson, C. Dwight Auvenshine*, Lyle N. Back*, Michael A. Baer*, Charles E. Barnhart, R. Paul Baumgartner*, Brad Beck, Jack C. Blanton, Thomas O. Blues*, Peter P. Bosomworth*, Joseph T. Burch, Gail Burrows, Joe B. Buttram*, Charles Byers*, Bradley Canon, Linda Chen*, Donald B. Clapp, Craig Clark, Lewis W. Cochran*, Glenn B. Collins*, Ronda S. Connaway, Samuel F. Conti, Raymond H. Cox, Marjorie A. Crandall, Donald P. Cross*, M. Ward Crowe, Patrick P. DeLuca*, David E. Denton*, Donald F. Diedrich, Ronald C. Dillehay*, Marcus L. Dillon*, Joseph M. Dougherty, Anthony Eardley, W. W. Ecton*, Roger Eichhorn, Jim Elder*, Jane M. Emanuel*, Donald A. Falace*, Rick Faust, Chris Fetter*, James E. Funk, R. Fletcher Gabbard, Art Gallaher*, Joseph H. Gardner, Abner Golden*, Andrew J. Grimes, Joseph P. Guiltinan*, Merlin Hackbart, Joseph Hamburg, Andrew J. Hiatt, Raymond R. Hornback, Eugene Huff*, Charles W. Hultman*, Donald W. Ivey*, Malcolm E. Jewell, Michael Kennedy, James A. Knoblett*, Mark Koopman, Stephen Langston, Richard S. Levine, Thomas P. Lewis, Austin S. Litvak*, Jim Lobb, Rey M. Longyear*, Donna March, Marcus T. McEllistrem*, Susan A. McEvoy*, Marion E. McKenna*, William G. Moody*, Jacqueline A. Noonan*, Ronda S. Paul*, Bobbie G. Pedigo, Alan R. Perreiah*, Phillip Phillips, Jean Pival, William K. Plucknett, Billy Renner, JoAnn Rogers, Jim Rowe, Wimberly C. Royster*, Robert W. Rudd*, Ramona Rush*, Pritam S. Sabharwal*, Patrick J. Sammon*, Mark Saurer, John S. Scarborough*, Jo Schladale, Rudolph Schriels*, John Serkland, D. Milton Shuffett*, Gerard E. Silberstein, Otis A. Singletary*, John T. Smith*, Stanford L. Smith, Marjorie S. Stewart*, Jennifer Stiles, John P. Strickland, Willis A. Sutton, Joseph V. Swintosky*, Leonard Tipton, Paula Totten*, Harwin L. Voss, John N. Walker*, M. Stanley Wall, Marc J. Wallace, Harry Wheeler, Constance P. Wilson*, William G. Winter*, Judith Worell*, Fred W. Zechman*, Robert G. Zumwinkle

The minutes of the regular meeting of March 13, 1978, were accepted as circulated.

SUMMARY:

I. Action Item

- A. Resolution Against Increase in Out-of-State Tuition
Motion passed.

II. Senate Council Activities and Informational Items

- A. Action Item for April 10 Senate Meeting Postponed
- B. Committee on Review of Senate Committee Structure and Operations Appointed
- C. May 1978 Graduation List

*Absence explained

D. Senate Committee Chairmen Reports for Spring 1978

E. Item of New Business

III. Reports to the University Senate

A. Report from Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Ethical Climate: Dr. Nicholas J. Pisacano, Associate Dean for Allied Health, Education and Research

B. Report from Academic Ombudsman: Dr. C. Frank Buck

Chairman Oberst summarized the Senate Council activities and informational items as follows:

1. The action item for the meeting of April 10 was to be recommendations from the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure. The Council decided to hold the item and put it on the agenda for the May 8 meeting. It is a report proposing a Senate Committee on the analysis of resource allocations. It has to do with questions of impact of budget allocation on education.
2. The Committee on Review of Senate Committee Structure and Operations has been appointed. The members are: Robert Ogletree, Chairman; Richard Hanau, John Lienhard, William Plucknett, Jesse Harris, another faculty member and a student.
3. Copies of the May 1978 Graduation List are in the Senate Council Office for your perusal.
4. The Seventh Annual Recognition Dinner for retirees is April 10 with 150 guests planning to attend. The reception is at 5:30 p.m. and dinner at 7:30 p.m.
5. The Senate Committee Chairmen should submit any written reports they plan for this Spring by April 17. The Senate Council will meet on April 19 and if any of the reports demand Senate Council action and require circulation, they will have to be sent by April 24.
6. There was an item of new business which was circulated at the beginning of the meeting. It was taken up following the two reports.

Chairman Oberst asked Dr. Nicholas J. Pisacano, Associate Dean for Allied Health, Education and Research, for his Report of the Senate Council Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Ethical Climate.

Dr. Pisacano spoke to the Senate as follows:

Before giving you the actual report of this ad hoc Committee, I would ask your indulgence in order that some background information might be presented.

From the very outset of the creation of this Committee, the chairman has been very reluctant to accept this task for several reasons. The most important factor which weighed heavily against my chairing this Committee was my ability--or the lack of ability--to perform effectively, not so much for lack of interest in the topic, but because of time constraints. Secondly, such a report, whether good or bad, posed the question in my mind that the hours devoted to this would be in vain and would be better spent in productive pursuits, or better, in total relaxation. I say "in vain" because we are all aware of the history of such ad hoc reports; they, at best are most often relegated to the archives with no palpable effect on the community.

It turned out, however, that I assumed the chairmanship of this ad hoc Committee only out of my deep respect and affection for Mrs. Connie Wilson, who, at the time, was chairman of the Senate, and Drs. John Stephenson and Frank Buck, all of whom felt that such a report should be presented to the Senate. Her sincerity of purpose and dogged idealism resulted in my submission. A committee of some of the finest people I have ever worked with was constituted, most of whom I have never worked with before or even had met.

The Committee's first question was what would happen to such a report. Their misgivings were about the same as mine. They were presented with the charge and were assured that regardless of the final disposition of the report, it would represent an attempt to present some principles of ethics or moral behavior that needed to be said, and that we would meet only a few times, devoting no more than one hour for each meeting in order that committee members' precious time not be wasted.

The result was that each member submitted his or her ideas in writing and we discussed the commonalities among them. At times, we had to remind ourselves that we were not a grievance committee when gripes about such things as parking or athletic ticket distribution were put forth, and there were occasions when we had to remind ourselves that we were not a group replacement for the Ombudsman. We wish to differentiate our mission from that of producing another faculty or student code. We in no way were about to suggest that another booklet be published concerning what the minimal level of expected behavior should be, which is all that codes really are. In dealing with ethics, we transcend the minimum. For example, one should not steal; if one does and is caught, one is punished. That's code. We submit that the ethical person just won't steal; there is no rule for him nor is there any punishment or reward. Stealing for the ethical one just doesn't exist as a possibility. To paraphrase Marcus Aurelius, one should be upright, not kept upright.

Eventually, after everyone ventilated, the ideas were collated, and utilizing the ex officio license of a chairman, some philosophical narrative was added.

I want to thank the members, each and every one, for their efforts. My pleasure in meeting them and talking together with them made the effort worthwhile in terms of time spent; but lest you be deluded, a minimum of time was actually spent, and should this report suffer the same fate as most reports of this nature, we shan't complain.

CHARGE: Senate Council ad hoc Study Group on Academic Ethical Climate

To study the climate regarding academic ethics in the University as it involves the various constituencies: students, faculty and administration; and to report its conclusions and recommendations to the Senate on ways to encourage the acceptance of greater personal responsibility to enhance an academic ethical climate on campus.

Members of the Committee:

Ken Davis, English; Herbert Drennon, Arts and Sciences; Bruce Eastwood, History; William Ecton, Business and Economics; Ed Foree, Engineering; Holman Hamilton, History; Michael Kirkhorn, Journalism; James Marsden, Business and Economics; Janet McCarty, Student; James Newberry, Student; Lynn Williamson, Student Affairs; Kathy Welch, Student, Debi Young, Student; and Nicholas J. Pisacano, Medical Center, Chairman.

"The night is far spent, the day is at hand: Let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light." ROMANS 13:12.

Any civilized group, be it an institution or large society of people in a state or nation, must live by a set of general principles that help govern behavior. Such guidelines are concerned with what is good or bad, or right or wrong. The branch of philosophy that deals with such questions is known as Ethics. It is interesting to note that the word ethics from the Greek "ethos" is etymologically similar to the word morals from the Latin "mores", in that both words mean "customs or habits."

Man is endowed with instincts. That means that man has an innate sensitivity to pain, hunger, sexual drive, and so forth--no different than that of any animal. This may be termed, after Freud, the Id, a quality in all animals, including man. Higher orders have learning capabilities. They can learn that stimulus produces response. This secondary level in man suppresses the Id, but man is not much better than his animal counterparts in that it can be learned that if an action is taken or performed, that action may be rewarded or punished. There is no moral judgment here. But man is uniquely capable of a third or highest level, and that is one of moral judgment--to judge right from wrong--not merely in the sense of reward or punishment but a special human quality that deals with distinctive and qualitative attributes such as "justice," "equity," "caring," "love," "mercy," etc.

Such high qualities are developed through the maturation process in man (habits) and only man. As T. H. Huxley puts it, "Social process means a checking of the cosmic process at every step, and the substitution for it of another, which may be called the ethical process; the end of which is not the survival of those who happen to be the fittest, in respect of the whole of the conditions which obtain, but those who are ethically the best."

Mankind, in its societal development, developed behavior codes which were indeed humanizing, distinct from and beyond his juridical laws. This development of moral law, as opposed to juridical laws, frees man, and his freedom derives from those humane actions we call ethical.

Although this is merely a review of things known to us all, we believe there are times, periodically, for a restatement of values and ethical codes. It seems that as people become distracted by the world-- ("the world is too much with us") and as they fill out the wrinkles with fat; as exterior demands on us begin to govern our actions; as we obtain more material goals--money for ourselves or in the form of grants for our self-aggrandizement; then we see the effects of these in the form of stresses which mar our image that boasted of lofty values fundamental to the liberated homo sapiens.

It seems not foolhardy, or a waste of time, to occasionally disen-
thrall ourselves, shake off the earthly shroud, and stand on the
periphery and look in at ourselves.

As members of a university community, we forget or perhaps fail to realize that we enjoy a unique position of responsibility. To accept the title of "professor" at one time meant just what it etymologically says: "to declare aloud, make a public avowal"--from the Latin, "profiteri." Such an avowal bound one to a moral obligation to teach, and bore a heavy responsibility on the one who professed to his students. He was indeed "in loco parentis." But with this came the obligation to the student, much as father to his children, again an attribute which transcended legal duty. The relationship of a teacher to student was a moral engagement which facilitated learning. The professor also sensed a feeling for the institution which gave him the facility to exercise his intellectual pursuits and dispensations with a rather wide freedom. This freedom which we term "academic freedom" is a rare privilege bestowed upon us. It is not to be accepted as one would any material equivalent. It is an awesome freedom that one enjoys with the tacit but firm understanding that the faculty person behave in a highly ethical manner. But the professor also had a sense of duty to himself. The phrase "minimal performance" was unknown to him, and his personal code of ethics made it distasteful to accept mediocrity. There was no need for a faculty code, for such a code is superfluous for the ethical people.

Today the very duties and activities outside the classroom have made many faculty members entrepreneurs or quasi-administrators, lusterless pedagogues, and panderers of all sorts. The loss is greater than the sum of the individuals. It brings a deficit of those exalted values that make us civilized; the individual dehumanization becomes institutional, and then the institution loses, and in turn, society loses.

This is then reflected into the rising generation of students and faculty. They, in turn, assume this mantle, once a mantle of pristine, natural ethical cloth, now ersatz. We eventually find ourselves with a race of dehumanized but technically proficient golems. Academic freedom gives way to academic "freakdom."

Is it superfluous then, to remind ourselves, in the academic institutions that we have a stewardship--frail as it may be--with privileges and freedoms that we still can enjoy? Is it old-fashioned to attempt to profess once again that we have an obligation or moral engagement with the students that means not relegating this responsibility to teaching assistants? Is it not unethical for the teachers to use yellowed notes, standardized tests, curved grading scales whereby a certain percentage must flunk, graduate assistants, and sleepy slide shows to replace the learned professor who loved his discipline and enjoyed teaching, and who knew not necessarily the taxonomy of educationists, but how to excite, to stimulate and arouse the students.

Is it ethical for a faculty person automatically to assume an adversary attitude toward the institution that employs him? Is it ethical for him to neglect his full-time duties of scholarly pursuit while he scurries off on various consultations, television shows, women's clubs (for money, of course), and says what these publics want to hear without the constraints of veracity which would be demanded by his peers in a university arena?

But perhaps more importantly, isn't it unethical when one cannot to himself be true, when one puts aside pride for material gain? Academic freedom and integrity do not come cheaply--one must pay dearly for these values.

At the same time, students need to be taught values constantly. The student who cheats or plagiarizes or lies to his professor is undoubtedly unethical. But isn't it also unethical for the student to place blame for his indecent, immoral and sometimes illegal conduct of himself or his peers on parents or the "older generation?" Is the student so blinkered from any decent values that he is totally unaware? Why should the student's demeanor, when it involves a breach of ethics, not be called that and nothing else, simply because of their youth and inexperience?

The administrators of the universities are not without taint. In some ways, their guilt is greater, for they bear the burden for all faculty and

students. They, like some faculty, often assume an adversary role, when in fact their job is to facilitate the jobs of others. This adversary stance comes naturally to them, but often is defensive due to the faculty and students who shoot at them. It is difficult, after all, for anyone to flick a peace sign and flash a bonny smile when missiles are being hurled in his face. However, there is no panderer like the administrator who, at the mere sight of a legislator or "important alumnus," humbles himself in the most servile or demeaning manner, otherwise known as "groveling." It does strain the humanity of faculty when they see a Pecksniff of this type making decisions for them. Again, this is the result of the times. But until faculty and students can show some high type behavior themselves, let them not criticize their administrators.

One of the most dehumanizing of all things seen in universities is the anthropomorphizing of the university. This has come about through the administrators presenting the institution as a sacred object. The fact is that it is grossly unethical to subvert individual decency in the name of "institutional loyalty." Anecdotes abound about promotional and employment tactics. They need not be exemplified here. Suffice it to say it is time to question the ethics of these practices. Likewise, there have been dismissals of personnel sometimes for purely vindictive or personality factors. In any event, the deposed is told that it is for the "good of the institution." The university uber alles. Ironically, all too often when an administrator is the target of another administrator for dismissal, and is told, "I am sorry, you will have to go," the victim "understands," even though his dismissal, by any standard of judgment, might have been unfair. But, alas, he accepts his fate, a la Nuremberg Trials. This is what is alarming--the morality issue here is really one of amorality. Again we see the golems rear their ugly heads.

Is this not a propitious time for us in the university to look at our daily lives and practices as they relate to ethical behavior?

Our committee listed many other concerns, most of which are familiar to all. We questioned the unethical practices as they relate to:

- a) the mis-use of grants;
- b) the mis-use of grant funds;
- c) the mis-use of publications;
- d) personal advancement at the expense of commitment to students and institutions;
- e) the dehumanization of teaching, registration procedures, etc;
- f) the lack of concern for quality advising;
- g) the general attitude of disdain about intellectual-academic excellence;
- h) abuse of tenure to perpetuate mediocrity, or even incompetence;
- i) administrators who disregard fair play--often the net common-good gain is lost to the strict conformity of rules among a growing list of rules;

- j) the attitude of indifference between and among faculty-students-administration;
- k) disregard for medical-dental schools applicants' feelings in the long and tedious waiting period for those on the so-called "hold" list. There is also a question of the possibility of arbitrary and capricious decisions of admissions committees of so-called professional schools.

We realize that this report does not shed any light but it does admit to pointing out areas of darkness. We realize that preconceived notions and attitudes affect behavior. We do not expect that a mere account of the state of behavior as it exists will force or enhance positive behavior or actions. However, it is our sincere hope that we have pricked a few consciences. If not, then it may be that our needle was not sharp enough or there were no consciences to prick.

In any event, we believe, rather idealistically perhaps, that unethical behavior can be brought to a minimum or perhaps eradicated. We believe that the faculty, students and administrators of the university can work together in a highly ethical manner. We believe that ethical behavior can be recognized as such, and is its own reward. We likewise believe that unethical behavior should be recognized as such and exposed as undesirable, nay, intolerable in our institution. We do not believe that to act unselfishly and for the good of others is old-fashioned. We believe that qualities such as justice, honor, integrity, love and caring are eternal values and NOT weaknesses, but, in fact, show strength. We believe that these attributes can be practiced by all and that students, faculty and administrators can be habituated to those attributes if exposed over a period of time to faculty, administrators and students who themselves demonstrate such qualities. We believe with the philosopher Hegel that "The habitual practice of ethical living appears as second nature, which put in the place of the initial, purely natural will, is the soul of custom permeating it through and through."

We believe that all of us who wish to live the ethical life must internalize high standards rather than list them in some fashion of a code, with its do's and don'ts. We believe the Faculty Senate, with students and administrators, should openly and unashamedly profess the ideals of high ethical standards and encourage the practice of these ideals through whatever mechanism suits their judgment. We believe that the winter is gone and the voice of the turtle should be heard once again in our land. We should issue a recall for those virtues which will reinvest us with the academic and personal freedom which we have slowly but ever so surely let slip from our grasps.

Dr. Pisacano was given an enthusiastic applause.

Chairman Oberst asked if there were any questions or comments concerning the report. Also, he asked if the Senate should continue the committee for further consideration or accept the report and file it.

The question was asked about the mechanism by which the report could be implemented.

Chairman Oberst said that would be the work of the committee. He said that he assumed that one shot statements do not end the committee's interest in ethical and academic responsibilities.

Professor Lienhard said that Professor Pisacano had issued a call for an ethic to be practiced but he had also indicated that that call could not be translated into rules. The report has now been heard; it should next be received and filed.

Chairman Oberst said that the question was whether it should be filed as an interim report and the committee continued, or filed as a final report and the committee discontinued. He added that he had not had the advantage of seeing the report until that very hour.

Professor Crosby said that perhaps the question could be better answered by knowing the charge. He asked how the committee had been organized and what the goals were.

Chairman Oberst replied that it was an ad hoc committee appointed by the Senate Council when Professor Wilson was Chairman. He added that concern was over questions of ethical conduct on campus, particularly plagiarism and cheating. [The actual charge to the committee on March 1977 was much broader: See Page 4 of Minutes.]

Professor Lienhard moved that the report be received and filed.

Professor Stephenson said that he concurred with Professor Lienhard that the report be received but hoped it would not merely be filed. He stated that the content of the report was of such importance that the Senate Council should find ways to see that it comes to the attention of the entire campus community.

Chairman Oberst asked Professor Buck if he had any observations to make on the report.

Professor Buck said that he felt the ad hoc committee should be continued and he had some observations to make in his own report.

It was suggested that the Senate defer voting on the motion until Professor Buck gave his report.

Chairman Oberst asked Professor C. Frank Buck, Academic Ombudsman, for his Annual Report of 1977-78.

Professor Buck spoke to the Senate as follows:

Chairman Oberst, members of the Senate, and guests, this opportunity to present my second annual Ombudsman's report is greatly appreciated. Also appreciated is the confidence displayed by President Singletary and the Ombudsman Search Committee in providing me the opportunity for an additional year of service. The challenges and the personal experiences were once again fulfilling.

The second year has been not only easier but more enjoyable, as well. For this, the following reasons are, no doubt, contributory: increased familiarity with rules and complaint procedures; greater awareness of which personages facilitate the process; refined ability to predict and prepare for those Colleges, departments, and teachers for which complaints are not precedent; and the now experienced and always capable help of Frankie Garrison, my Staff Assistant. Moreover, several of this office's most frequent first year visitors are no longer associated with the university.

Experience also resulted in increased emphasis on a complaint-prevention policy. The academic rights of students as written in Student Rights and Responsibilities, Part II, Sections 1.0 - 1.2, were circulated in order to circumvent noncompliance by certain teachers. An effort to be available to, and informative through, the radio, television, press, and personal speaking engagements was undertaken in order to clarify the functions of this office. The office also worked with Student Government Officers and recommended that they follow up on Section 1.7, Student Participation in Academic Affairs, to see why the Student Advisory Councils were not functioning more effectively.

Students at the University of Kentucky seem to regard the Office of the Academic Ombudsman in one of 3 ways: (1) The office is capable of solving all their academic problems; (2) the office is capable of solving none of their academic problems; or (3) The office exists to differentiate the academically soluble from the insoluble.

Therefore, the following is a list of the 18 categories voiced by complaining students this year, with some additional comments on each:

- (1) Grades are still the most prevalent complaint. Students are very grade oriented and are quick to cry for help when they feel they have been unfairly graded, or have not been informed properly about grade standards early in the course.
- (2) Some teachers whose native language is other than English have serious problems in communicating with students.
- (3) Students who have been slighted by their academic advisors have more problems and complaints.
- (4) Teachers who do not follow the University rules regarding drop-add; grades sent to the Registrar on time; keeping examinations to show students; and, incomplete and incorrect records. In fact, several students have not graduated on schedule because one teacher inexcusably failed to send their grades to the Registrar on time.
- (5) Teachers who leave the University at the end of a term and do not make available an accurate record of their students' work to the Chairman of the Department or some designated person.

- (6) Colleges that are required to teach service courses for non-majors but fail to attain the same excellence in teaching these courses as in the courses for their majors.
- (7) Cheating and Plagiarism. We are hopeful that the Senate Study Committee on Academic Ethics and Responsibilities will be effective in alleviating these problems.
- (8) Inconsistency in grading examinations, reports, term papers, and final grades. Teachers who use complicated statistical curves in allocation of course grades that are not fully understood.
- (9) Teachers who miss class without competent substitutes, or do not announce changes in teaching schedules. Teachers who are unavailable to aid students outside of class.
- (10) Admissions and Suspension procedures used by Graduate and Professional schools.
- (11) Chairmen who do not take an informed, active leadership role in the academic progress in their department.
- (12) Poorly conceived structuring and use of teacher evaluations.
- (13) People who serve the University in areas other than where they are the best qualified or most interested.
- (14) The selection process of TA's shows inadequacies regarding their promise as instructors, concern for their training, and a realistic pattern for assessing their performances.
- (15) The public relation effect on the University that students impart to their home communities if they have had bad academic experiences.
- (16) The often exorbitant time lag from when a major academic problem is recognized until it is solved.
- (17) Students who have deficient educational backgrounds, lack of motivation, and resultant poor class attendance.
- (18) Teachers who change the final examination date without authorization. Last fall a student called complaining about having three finals on the same day--this was a week before final exams were to start.

Even though we have listed several areas that have caused academic problems, we do not want to give the impression that the University of Kentucky is less than a high quality educational institution. The number of complaints were fewer this year than in any previous year, and were initiated by only approximately 1/2 of 1% of the student body.

This year we have compiled records on 159 academic complaints. Of this number 6 cases are still pending. (Moreover, there were 73 complaints between my first annual report and July 1.) The aforementioned 159 cases were from the following Colleges: Agriculture - 3; Allied Health Professions - 2; Architecture - 4; Arts and Sciences - 74; Business and Economics - 15; Communications - 4; Dentistry - 2; Education - 11; Graduate School - 10; Engineering - 16; Fine Arts - 2; Home Economics - 4; Law - 2; Library Science - 0; Medicine - 3; Nursing - 0; Pharmacy - 0; and Social Professions - 1. Six cases did not fit a particular College so we list them as miscellaneous.

To be congratulated are the three Colleges which received no complaints. However, for those which did, the breakdown by student classification is as follows: Freshman - 25; Sophomore - 28; Junior - 42; Senior - 33; Graduate School - 10; 2nd year Law Student - 1; 3rd year Law Student - 1; and 3rd year Dental Student - 1.

A further monthly analysis shows: July - 11; August - 14; September - 19; October - 20; November - 20; December - 28; January - 25; February - 12; and March - 10. We did require the assistance of the University Appeals Board on seven cases this year.

We are ending this annual report with the same recommendations and conclusions as last year. Our recommendations are simplistic in conception, but difficult in adherence. Nevertheless, these recommendations have the following objectives: (1) To strive for quality teaching University wide; (2) To implement an even better learning environment at the University of Kentucky; (3) To be aware of the administration's role in providing support for quality teaching and learning; (4) To implement a comprehensive program to improve teaching by TA's; and (5) To study ways and means that could prevent or discourage cheating and plagiarism.

Finally, this year has been most enjoyable in that we have been able to help others. Problems were solved; frustrations were alleviated; and, conflicts were resolved. In short, there are people in this academic community today whose lives have been improved because of the existence of the Office of the Academic Ombudsman. The work has been demanding--and at times trying--but, it has also been rewarding. The success of the office is due largely to the support of the University Administration; and to the professional work of my Staff Assistant, Frankie Garrison. I have found the University to be an exciting, healthy, and basically sound academic community. Once again, I am appreciative for the opportunities of the past year.

Professor Buck was given an enthusiastic applause.

Chairman Oberst asked if there were any questions or comments on the Ombudsman's report.

Dean Packer asked if there was any information on the 159 complaints in regard to those that were valid and invalid.

Professor Buck said that the 159 were valid cases, had been looked at, and had merit.

Dean Packer said that the College of Dentistry had two. His understanding was that the College felt the judgments were not sound judgments and that was what he was trying to determine.

Professor Buck said that because the Ombudsman's Office had a complaint, it did not mean that the College was at fault. He said that one of the cases in Dentistry was on procedures in admissions.

Dean Packer said that if there were situations that needed to be corrected, he wanted to be aware of them. He wanted to know if there was any solid information to cause the College to alter their performance in any way.

Professor Buck said that was good because after last year's report he received calls from Colleges that wanted the cases documented. He added that the office could document them.

Professor Zegeer said that she was not sure of the nature of the 159 complaints. She asked if they were valid in terms of taking some action within the Colleges.

Professor Buck said that all 159 cases were valid in that some action was taken and all except the six pending had been resolved either favorably or unfavorably.

Dean Packer said that Professor Buck had indicated that there were 18 problem areas. He asked how many of the 159 cases fell in those problem areas in which the College or system was at fault.

Professor Buck said that as far as he knew the 159 cases came from the 18 categories.

At the conclusion of Dr. Buck's report the Senate returned to Dr. Pisacano's Ethics Report.

Professor Lienhard said that he would like to stand on his motion to accept the report and file it, and if the Senate wanted a problem solving committee, then one could be named.

The motion was seconded.

The vote on the motion passed.

Dean Packer asked if the Senate as an academic organization should look at itself and be self-critical. He said he personally had that kind of an interest in having communication go beyond the Senate and wondered if the Senate Council would consider some kind of educational process. He suggested the possibility of exploring the communication of those concerns on a broader arena than just the Senate.

Chairman Oberst replied that the Senate Council would look into it further. He pointed out that the report would go to every member of the faculty as part of the minutes.

The last item on the agenda was new business. It was Student Senator Benson's motion that the Senate adopt a resolution on the proposed increase in out-of-state tuition.

Chairman Oberst said that it was not directly germane to the academic business of the University Senate, but he ruled that it was sufficiently enough related for the Senate to express its concern. However, it did not meet the ten-day circulation rule.

Motion was made and seconded to suspend the ten-day circulation rule.

The vote passed with a hand count of 54 to 10.

The resolution as presented by Student Senator Benson reads as follows:

RESOLUTION AGAINST INCREASE IN OUT-OF-STATE TUITION

WHEREAS the Council on Public Higher-Education of the Commonwealth of Kentucky will consider a report and recommendation from its Finance Committee to increase out-of-state tuition at eight state-supported colleges and universities on Wednesday, April 12, 1978, and

WHEREAS the increase recommended for these students at the University of Kentucky shall be \$300 per year, and

WHEREAS many students will be affected by this measure by its tremendous size, and

WHEREAS the out-of-state tuition for U.K. students is three times that of the other state supported colleges and universities, and

WHEREAS this increase is the second in two years (1977-78 tuition was increased from \$625 to \$750), and

WHEREAS this increase will add to the already difficult financial situation which threatens these U.K. students (increase in Housing and Dining Fees, Increase in Health Fees, Increase in local housing rents) and

WHEREAS many students will be forced to reassess their financial ability to continue their education at this university,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the University of Kentucky Senate go on record as opposing this increase in out-of-state tuition, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the senate prefers an increase, if indeed one is necessary, which is more gradual, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the senate encourage every member of the university community to actively and persistently pursue this matter and make known their opinions and feelings to the Commonwealth of Kentucky Council on Public Higher Education.

Student Senator Benson said that the basic problem was that the Council on Higher Education would receive the report from the Finance Committee the following day regarding the increase. He said that this was the second increase in two years. He added that if the proposals were implemented, the number of students affected would be significant. He urged the Senate to support the resolution.

Professor Adelstein supported the motion, pointing out that the increased fees would deprive the University of many of its brightest students and campus leaders due to the fact that admission standards for out-of-state students are higher. He also spoke of the cultural and social advantages of having non-Kentuckians interact with Kentucky students. Finally, he predicted that the increase would have a rippling effect, causing comparable universities in surrounding states to raise their tuition for our students, thus making it more difficult for faculty and other Kentucky parents to send their children to these schools.

Student Senator Newberry moved the previous question.

The vote failed with a hand count of 46 to 25.

After further discussion a motion was moved to amend the fourth paragraph to read:

"WHEREAS the increase in out-of-state tuition for U.K. students..."

The motion was seconded.

Dean Packer moved to delete the last paragraph of the resolution.

The motion was seconded and Student Senator Benson accepted it.

Professor Sears said he assumed that if the Senate adopted the resolution as amended that it would be a recommendation to the President rather than to the Council on Higher Education.

Chairman Oberst replied that was the Senate's function.

Professor Schwert moved to delete the third paragraph and Student Senator Benson accepted it.

Professor Lienhard moved to amend the second paragraph to change "shall be" to "will be."

The motion was seconded.

Professor Diachun said that whereas everybody seemed to be in favor of the motion and he was not; whereas he was sympathetic with the plight of the students and whereas with such little information; therefore, he was against it.

Dean Ockerman pointed out that there were three things of concern: one, the size of the increase was substantial; secondly, the differential between the University of Kentucky and the regional universities; and third was that we might get increases in two years running so we are hitting a big blow at the out-of-state students.

The vote in favor of the resolution as amended passed.

The amended resolution reads as follows:

RESOLUTION AGAINST INCREASE IN OUT-OF-STATE TUITION

WHEREAS the Council on Public Higher Education of the Commonwealth of Kentucky will consider a report and recommendation from its Finance Committee to increase out-of-state tuition at eight state-supported colleges and universities on Wednesday, April 12, 1978, and

WHEREAS the increase recommended for these students at the University of Kentucky will be \$300 per year, and

WHEREAS the increase in the out-of-state tuition for U.K. students is three times that of the other state supported colleges and universities, and

WHEREAS this increase is the second in two years (1977-78 tuition was increased from \$625 to \$750), and

WHEREAS this increase will add to the already difficult financial situation which threatens these U.K. students (increase in Housing and Dining Fees, Increase in Health Fees, Increase in local Housing rents) and

WHEREAS many students will be forced to reassess their financial ability to continue their education at this university,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the University of Kentucky Senate go on record as opposing this increase in out-of-state tuition, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Senate prefers an increase, if indeed one is necessary, which is more gradual.

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary