

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, APRIL 11, 1977

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, April 11, 1977, in the Court Room of the Law Building.

Constance P. Wilson, Chairman, presiding

Members absent: Michael E. Adelstein*, Ruth Assell*, Charles E. Barnhart, Ellen B. Baxter*, Robert P. Belin*, Juris Berzins, Norman F. Billups, Harold R. Binkley*, A. Edward A. Blackhurst*, Jack C. Blanton, Wilbur C. Blount, Russell H. Brannon*, Joseph T. Burch, Linda Chen*, Donald B. Clapp, Richard R. Clayton, Lewis W. Cockran*, Glenn B. Collins, Ronda S. Connaway, Bill Crosby, Donald P. Cross*, Nancy Daly, Robert J. DeAngelis*, Ronald C. Dillehay, Herbert N. Drennon, Anthony Eardley, Mike Easley, Bruce S. Eastwood*, W. W. Ecton*, Calvin B. Ernst*, James E. Funk*, R. Fletcher Gabbard, Art Gallaher, Claudine Gartner*, Kenneth B. Germain*, Joseph Hamburg, Bobby O. Hardin, Beth Hicks*, Jeffery Hoeck, Raymond R. Hornback, Alfred S. L. Hu, Eugene Huff*, Charles W. Hultman*, Steve Ibershaff, Gerald J. Janecek*, Dean Jaros, Raymon D. Johnson, Margaret W. Jones*, James A. Knoblett*, Theodore A. Kotchen, Robert A. Kuehne, Thomas P. Lewis, Arthur Lieber*, Samuel Lippincott, Austin S. Litvak*, Donald L. Madden, Donald R. March, Abby L. Marlatt*, James R. Marsden*, Levis D. McCullers*, Susan A. McEvoy, Gwen E. Mead, Bill Miracle, George E. Mitchell, Jacqueline A. Noonan*, Terry Norris, Elbert W. Ockerman*, James R. Ogletree*, Anne E. Patterson, Bobbie G. Pedigo, Paul M. Pinney, Anna K. Reed*, Robert W. Rudd*, Patrick J. Sammon*, Stanley R. Saxe, George W. Schwert, D. Milton Shuffelt, Otis A. Singletary*, A. H. Peter Skelland*, John T. Smith, Stanford L. Smith, J. Truman Stevens*, Emilie Steinhauer, Marjorie S. Stewart*, William J. Stober, Harold H. Traurig*, Lester Wahner, Thomas J. Waldhart, M. Stanley Wall, Richard L. Warren, William G. Winter*, Robert G. Zumwinkle*

The minutes of the meeting of March 21, 1977, were accepted as circulated with the correction of the word "Advisory" to "Admissions" at the top of page 15.

SUMMARY:

I. Action Items:

Motion to revise the 1977-1978 University Calendar, specifically to change the date of advance registration (Circulated under date of March 31, 1977).

Motion passed

Motion to amend Senate Rules, IV, 2.12, Admission to Advanced Standing, specifically concerning the "67 hour" rule.

Motion passed

*Absence explained

II. Senate Council Activities and Informational Items

- A. The Ombudsman Committee Report
- B. The Committee on Academic Structure Toxicology Program
- C. Word of Appreciation to Chairmen and Members of Committees of Senate Council
- D. Harry Snyder, Executive Director of the Council on Public Higher Education: Address AAUP
- E. Senate Election
- F. Senate Office - Open During Summer

III. Academic Ombudsman's Report: Dr. C. Frank Buck, Professor, College of Agriculture

Professor Wilson summarized Senate Council activities and informational items as follows:

1. The Ombudsman Committee should have a report ready for the President by April 15. If you have any last minute thoughts, please forward them to Professor Ogletree.
2. The Committee on Academic Structure has approved the Toxicology Program as a Center, and it will be discussed by the Senate Council at the next meeting and probably will be on the agenda for May 2.
3. Professor Wilson thanked all the Chairmen and members of Committees who have worked so hard on items to be given to the Senate.
4. Harry Snyder, Executive Director of the Council on Public Higher Education, is coming to the University to address the AAUP on Wednesday, April 13.
5. Professor Wilson urged the Senators to get their ballots in and to take part in the Senate Election.
6. Professor Wilson will be in the Senate Office this summer and welcomes any suggestions, ideas, or gripes. She invited the Senators to come by and visit.

Professor Wilson recognized Professor Paul Oberst. On behalf of the Senate Council Professor Oberst presented a motion to adopt the proposal to revise the 1977-78 University Calendar. This was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of March 31, 1977, and reads as follows:

According to University Senate Rules, "An adopted calendar can be changed only by action of the University Senate."
(Section II, 1.3)

In accordance with those Rules, the Registrar's Office has requested, and the Senate Council has approved for recommendation to the University Senate, the following changes in the

1977-78 University Calendar which was approved by the University Senate Council on June 5, 1974 and subsequently circulated to the University Senate for approval:

Advance Registration Dates:

<u>From:</u>	Fall, 1977	November 9-22
	Spring, 1978	April 10-21
<u>To:</u>	Fall, 1977	November 7-16
	Spring, 1978	April 10-19

Note: This proposal decreases the number of advance registration days from 10 to 8.

The floor was opened for discussion and questions.

Professor Weil wanted to know why the change was being offered.

Professor Wilson said that the change was being made because the approved calendar had a ten-day advance registration period, and the Registrar's Office had requested the shortening of the advance registration period from ten to eight days. This change requires Senate action.

Associate Registrar Dexter said that in the Fall of 1976 the eight days of advance registration caused no procedural problems. When the ten-day period was approved, we were under an old system of registration. In the last three years the registration system has been improved and physically it does not take as long to get students registered.

Dean Denmark said that his concern for the change related to the evening student or those commuting to the campus for one class. These students may not have enough time to complete the registration process, and one solution might be to extend the office hours in the Registrar's Office, the Graduate School, and the advisors' offices.

Student Senator Wade said that students felt it cut down on the time to be advised. He suggested that the time for registration be eight days but that advisors be available a week before advance registration.

Associate Registrar Dexter made a point for clarification. Many people tie in the advising process with registration. They are related, but the registration process takes only about ten minutes. The evening class students are advance registering. All registration forms are accumulated in the academic units and forwarded to the Registrar's Office. If individual units wanted to meet the students' demands, the time flexibility is there.

Dean Royster said that much of the difficulty in the Graduate School is with those people attending late afternoon classes but who are not evening students. It does diminish the time a student can see an advisor.

There was no further discussion, and the motion carried.

The final item on the agenda concerning the "67 hour" rule did not have the required ten-day circulation.

Motion was made to suspend the ten-day circulation rule to take up the proposal, and the motion passed.

Professor Wilson recognized Professor Paul Oberst. On behalf of the Senate Council Professor Oberst presented a motion to adopt the proposed revision in the University Senate Rules (IV, 2.12) Admission to Advanced Standing, specifically concerning the "67 hour" rule. The proposal reads as follows:

2.12 Admission to Advanced Standing

- (1) Admission of University of Kentucky Community College Students Grades, credits, quality points and academic status from courses taken in a University of Kentucky Community College shall be transferred when the Community college student enrolls in the University System. [No more than 67 hours may be counted towards a baccalaureate degree.] The applicability of any given courses not offered in the University System towards a University degree shall be determined by the Dean of the College in which the student enrolls.

Note: The sentence in brackets is to be deleted.

Student Senator Wade seconded the motion.

Professor Wilson said that the Senate Council was requesting the Senate to eliminate the one sentence so that the Catalog, Student Code, Faculty Code and other publications that carry the rule would be legal. The Legislature has already passed a law that makes it illegal.

Professor Plucknett said that he did not see the conflict. He thought Community College hours were already University accepted hours.

Professor Wilson said that the intent of the Legislature was that all hours can or may be counted toward the baccalaureate degree, not just 67 hours.

Professor Diachun asked if we were changing it because we think it needs to be changed or to conform with the Legislature.

Professor Sears recommended that the Senate approve the change.

Professor Weil pointed out that the simple deletion would be doing more than the Legislature had ordered. The Legislature's wording is all lower division academic courses offered by Community Colleges shall be transferable. That would not be all the courses offered at a Community College.

Professor Sears said that all courses are transferable with grades and credits within the University. It is the rule that courses, credits, and quality points that satisfy degree requirements will be determined by the Dean of the College in which the student is enrolled.

Professor Wilson pointed out that the Committee on Academic Standards and Admissions is working on revised wording of the rule in order to clarify the intent.

Student Senator Benson moved the previous question.

The motion carried.

The vote on the original motion to delete the sentence, "No more than 67 hours may be counted towards a baccalaureate degree," carried.

The Chairman recognized Professor C. Frank Buck, the Academic Ombudsman, who presented the following annual report:

"Let me express appreciation--not only for myself, but for the University--to my six predecessors for performing the duties of Academic Ombudsman in a manner which has brought respect and cooperation to this office. I have found the Ombudsman receives the assistance needed from the administration, faculty, and students.

The Academic Ombudsman is concerned with all violations of academic rules between students, faculty, and administration; especially, if rights have been willfully ignored or violated. This concern is the same whether it is undergraduate, graduate, or professional. I have found that each group is approximately equal in defending their rights.

The independence of the Ombudsman's office is respected and supported in the University, particularly by President Singletary and all other University administration. All actions of the office are based solely on judgment of fairness and equity by the Ombudsman. The office is impartial in all disputes. It is not an advocate for any party; but after investigation, it often suggests and supports settlements. All contacts and communications with the Ombudsman's office are completely confidential and so are the records. The office does not use a complainant's name in investigating a complaint unless consent is given. Although the Ombudsman's office proceeds differently in various cases, it has a general procedure which seeks to guarantee fairness to all parties, reconcile differences, and eliminate problems leading to the complaints. The steps in the procedure are: (1) Listen to the complaint; (2) Investigate the facts; (3) Seek participation from all parties concerned; (4) Supervise the settlement; and (5) Review the case in order to eliminate the causes. This makes the University a more effective and just institution for its entire community.

The Student Rights and Responsibilities are very helpful in giving the "Correct Code of Conduct." However, many people interpret this as though it is a "loveless code." They are so concerned in defining and keeping to the letter of the code that they totally ignore the spirit of the code and its underlying principles. We cannot really move to deal with students' problems if we are bound too strictly to a code of rules. Neither do I agree that a "codeless love" is the answer. Just or unjust complaints against student rights must be dealt with by the Academic Ombudsman-- and with special care regarding the individual. People are important.

The complaints this year are a repetition of complaints experienced by the past six Ombudsmen. This year the office has received 268 academic complaints of which 168 cases required detailed work. My judgment is that 150 of the 168 cases were resolved to the best interest of all the people involved; 4 cases were unresolved or pending solution. The 168 cases were from the following colleges: Allied Health Professions - 4, Architecture - 2, Arts and Sciences - 81, Business and Economics - 7, Communications - 6, Dentistry - 2, Education - 18, Engineering - 4, Evening Class Program - 2, Fine Arts - 3, Home Economics - 6, Honors Program - 3, Law - 4, Library Science - 3, Medicine - 2, Nursing - 3, Pharmacy - 5, Social Professions - 3, and Graduate School - 6. With pride, I call your attention to the fact that this office has not had a complaint this year against the College of Agriculture; the only college in this category. I also want to give a departmental breakdown for the 81 cases in the College of Arts and Sciences. They are as follows: Anthropology - 1, Biological Sciences - 8, Chemistry - 8, Classical Languages - 2, Computer Science - 3, English - 8, French - 2, Geography - 1, Geology - 4, German - 2, History - 7, Mathematics - 10, Military Science - 2, Physics and Astronomy - 5, Political Science - 5, Psychology - 6, Sociology - 1, and Statistics - 6. This puts the above statistics in perspective, since many departments in Arts and Sciences have a larger teaching load than some colleges. There were many departments in the College of Arts and Sciences free of complaints.

The 168 cases fell into three basic areas: complaints against teaching, complaints which hamper learning, and complaints against administering rules. A further breakdown of the 168 cases is as follows: grades - 48, teaching faults - 30, drop-add - 16, cheating - 5, plagiarism - 3, and miscellaneous administration - 66.

The greatest concern of this office is to improve the quality of teaching and learning at the University of Kentucky and retain a personal concern. The University of Kentucky Biennial Report 1967-1969 addressing "Teaching: The First Function: said it best, "...considered the primary role, it would be teaching. And, at the heart of the teaching function lies the student, not just the student body but the individual student, each with separate needs and separate goals." When addressing "The Faculty", the report stated, "Although scholarly research goes hand in hand with effective teaching, the primary responsibility of the University's faculty - as of the University itself - is to teach and to teach well." I like this.

If this were totally true, it would leave only one major function of the Academic Ombudsman: a person to listen. Maybe, this is the students' greatest need. With these concerns in mind, we have proposed a new Senate Study Committee on Academic Ethics and Responsibilities. We have hopes that this committee can address itself to all facets of quality teaching and learning, especially in two areas: academic cheating and its ramifications--whether faculty or student; and the training and supervision of the TA to insure high quality teaching and learning. Our recommendations are simplistic in conception, but difficult in adherence. Nevertheless, they have the following objectives: (1) Strive for quality teaching University wide; (2) Implement an even better intellectual learning situation at the University of Kentucky; (3) Be aware of the administration's role to provide a favorable supporting role for quality teaching and learning; (4) Implement a comprehensive program to improve teaching by TA's; and (5) Study ways and means that could prevent or discourage cheating and plagiarism.

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 Administrative Secretary, 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."

The Senate gave Professor Buck an ovation, and the Senate Chairman thanked him for all his work this past year.

The next meeting of the Senate will be May 2.

The Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Martha M. Ferguson
Recording Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

4/11/77

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

March 31, 1977

TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE:

The University Senate will meet in regular session at 3:00 p. m. on Monday, April 11, 1977 in the Court Room of the Law Building.

AGENDA:

- 1) Approval of the Minutes of the March 21 meeting.
- 2) Information Items and a Summary of Senate Council Activities.
- 3) Action Items:
 - a) Consideration of the proposal to revise the 1977-1979 University Calendar, specifically to change the dates for pre-registration. (Circulated under date of March 31, 1977)
 - b) Proposed revision in the University Senate Rules (IV, 2.12) Admission to Advanced Standing, specifically concerning the "67 hour" rule. (To be circulated)
 - c) Ombudsman's Report: Dr. Frank Buck.

Elbert W. Ockerman

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

/cet