

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

August 31, 1984

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet in regular session on Monday, September 10, 1984 at 3:00 p.m. in room 110, Classroom Building.

AGENDA:

1. Minutes of April 9 and April 25, 1984.
2. Resolutions.
3. Report of the Academic Ombudsman: Dr. Charles Ellinger.
4. Chairman's Remarks.

5. ACTION ITEMS:

- a. Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I., 5.2, Election: Two Voting University System Faculty Members (circulated under date of August 30, 1984).
- b. Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section V., 4.1.5, Second Master's Degree (circulated under date of August 31, 1984).

George Dexter
Secretary, University Senate

/cet

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, SEPTEMBER 10, 1984

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, September 10, 1984, in Room 106 of the Classroom Building.

Robert Bostrom, Chairman of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent: Richard Angelo, Charles E. Barnhart, Jack C. Blanton, Thomas O. Blues*, James A. Boling*, Ray M. Bowen, Daniel J. Breazeale, Thomas D. Brower, George F. Crewe*, Ching Chow, Glenn B. Collins*, Emmett Costich, Philip Dare, Leo S. Demski, Herbert Drennon, Nancy E. Dye, Anthony Eardley, William Ecton*, Donald G. Ely*, Charles H. Fay, Carolyn Fore*, Ray Forgue*, Timothy Freudenberg, Richard W. Furst, Art Gallaher, Jr.*, Lester Goldstein, Andrew J. Grimes*, Gina Hall, Marilyn D. Hamann*, Leonard Heller, Taylor Hoover, Raymond Hornback, Alfred S. L. Hu, Chuck Huffman, John J. Just, David T. Kao, James O. King, Robert Lawson, David Lowery, Edgar Maddox, Paul Mandelstam*, Kenneth E. Marino*, Sally S. Mattingly*, Marcus T. McEllistrem, Martin J., McMahon, Jr., H. Brinton Milward, Kevin D. Moore*, Steven Nicholson, Robert C. Nobel*, Clayton Omvig, Merrill Packer*, Robin D. Powell, Peter Purdue, Madhira D. Ram*, E. Douglas Rees*, Thomas C. Robinson, Gerald A. Rosenthal, Charles Sachatello*, Edgar Sagan, John C. Snider, Tom Stephens, Joseph V. Swintosky*, Elizabeth Taylor*, Kenneth Thompson, Steve Thornbury, Marc J. Wallace, O'Neil Weeks, Jesse Weil, Charles T. Wethington, Bill White, Carolyn Williams*

The Minutes of the meetings of April 9 and April 25, 1984, were approved as circulated. Chairman Bostrom noted that on the Minutes of April 25 the date concerning the approval of the Minutes of April 19 should be changed to April 9. There was no objection.

Chairman Bostrom said he was not the President of the Senate but was Chairman of the Senate Council. The President of the Senate is Dr. Otis Singletary who gave the following remarks to the senate.

President Singletary welcomed the senators for another academic year and said it was extremely difficult to talk about the University in any serious way without keeping in front what is apparently the eternal and recurring fiscal problem. "It colors and conditions almost everything we do," he said. He added it was the most serious problem of the University and that in the biennial budget there was a 2.3 percent increase for this year and a 5 percent for next year in terms of general funds support. He felt that by the end of this year there would be a difference of \$2,000 to \$2,500 in salaries between UK and the benchmark institutions. President Singletary saw nothing in the immediate future to lead him to think that our basic financial problems are going to be fundamentally altered.

Another development which he wanted the senators to be aware of was the question of the possible merger between the University of Kentucky and University of Louisville. He said that the Council on Higher Education passed a resolution to the two presidents to work with their boards of trustees to see if such a merger is feasible. In his opinion the discussion of the advantages and disadvantages would go on for most of this year.

*Absence explained

He said another thing the senators would be hearing about was the legislative committee which has begun to meet. The committee has been given a broad agenda to evaluate the structure and organization of the system, the administrative structure of the eight major universities, the amount of unnecessary duplication, the funding, the impact of tuition and financial aid upon access and institutional quality.

President Singletary reported on the preliminary enrollment figures. He said it looked like the overall enrollment would be down about 1.8 percent. The biggest drop was the size of the freshman class. On the main campus there are about 21,300 students or a decrease of 3.4 percent. Community College enrollments are about 24,000. The freshman class will be about 2300 which is a 15 percent decline. He felt selective admissions would help to improve retention rates over the years. Graduate enrollments are up. Professional enrollments are down in dentistry and law, but this was planned. Nursing, Allied Health, Pharmacy, and Business and Economics have increased.

The President mentioned new appointments that have been made. In the Medical Center there are three new deans: Robin Powell, College of Medicine and Vice Chancellor for Professional Services; Thomas Robinson, Allied Health; and Carolyn Williams, Nursing. On the Lexington Campus they are Dr. William Parker, Vice Chancellor of Minority Affairs and Herbert Drennon, Dean of Communications. He added that the most important unfilled positions are the Registrar and the Director of Admissions.

There are three new Community College Directors: Sharon Jaggard, Lexington Community College; Dr. Richard Carpenter, Somerset Community College; and Dr. Vivian Blevins, Southeast Community College.

Dr. Singletary said he was pleased to report the accreditation of the departments of Journalism and Mining Engineering.

The President reported on the good news that in spite of the rather dismal financial picture from the point of view of the public and appropriated money, private contributions are playing a large role in our function. He added that a public University cannot be operated on private money.

President Singletary felt the UK Fellows' program was probably the most successful of the development programs in terms of growth and financial commitment. In 1969 the number was 55 and today there are approximately 1200. "These Fellows have made commitments in excess of \$27 million," he said. He added that UK is also doing better in deferred gifts and is now beginning to reap the rewards of a long-time program. He said there are now some 800 corporations and foundations giving money for one purpose or another. Last year that was in excess of \$5 million. There have been other large gifts from individuals. He felt there is going to be a significant announcement this fall that would be of special interest. "In the last academic year a new record was set for private giving to UK in excess of \$9 million," he said. This year there will be some-

where between \$13 and \$15 million. He said there were several substantial gifts for professorships.

The President also reported on the physical structure and renovation on campus. He said that UK has opened the ambulatory care facility and the Southwest Jefferson Auditorium. He also mentioned the \$2.2 million animal care facility. The Pharmacy Building is scheduled for completion next summer. The Cancer Center should open this year, and parking structure number 3 is being planned. He said there was literally no money for new capital construction projects in the budget.

President Singletary said there were more dollars for merit scholarships this year than ever before and UK was going to have to make it attractive for bright students to apply here.

The Board of Trustees has approved President Singletary's recommendation to create an excellence fund.

The President encouraged the senators to look toward better days. In the meantime he urged them to continue to teach well, be active in their research, and to provide that wide range of services which every state university is expected and required to do. He reminded the senate that a first-rate faculty is the bedrock upon which a first-rate university stands.

The senators applauded President Singletary and on behalf of the University Senate, Chairman Bostrom thanked him.

Chairman Bostrom recognized Professor Jesse Harris who presented the following Memorial Resolution on the death of Professor Betsy Worth Estes.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

Betsy Worth Estes

Dr. Betsy Worth Estes, who retired from the University of Kentucky on July 1, 1974, as Professor in the Department of Psychology, died on April 16, 1984, in Lexington. A native of Winchester, Kentucky, she earned the A.B. degree in 1929, the M.A. degree in 1945, and the Ph.D. degree in 1950, all at the University of Kentucky. She was one of the first women full professors if not the first, in the University of Kentucky, having served at a time when Deans believed, as was conveyed by her Department Head, that she did not need a pay raise because she had a husband to support her.

In the field of psychology, Betsy Estes studied mathematical and logical concepts in children and monetary reward and motivation in discrimination learning. She also conducted extensive studies of the application of intelligence tests and published in scientific and professional journals throughout her career. She was interested in child development and

intellectual evaluation, and it was somewhat unusual, though not irrelevant to her long term interests, that she chose for a dissertation topic a study of the relationship between temperament of thoroughbred broodmares and performance of offspring. An article based on her dissertation was published in the Journal of Genetic Psychology in 1952. As we all know, Betsy Estes was a dignified lady, but imagine the surprise for an aspiring young divinity student who discovered Dr. Estes shooting dice with the Department Head in the Department conference room--all in the name of science to establish probabilities for psychological experiments.

She was a consulting editor for the monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, and a member of the American Psychological Association, and of the Kentucky Psychological Association. She was also an active member of the Kentucky Academy of Science and the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology.

Dr. Estes was a member of the University Senate and a Faculty Advisor to Mortar Board. She was also known for her many contributions to the larger community of Lexington. As a member of the Lexington Junior League, she helped to organize the Graham B. Dimmick Child Guidance Service. She was President of the Board of the Fayette County Children's Bureau, President of the Board of the Comprehensive Care Center for Mental Health-Mental Retardation and helped to initiate services in maternal and child health. Dr. Estes also helped to establish classes for the gifted at the Lincoln School and served as President of the Board of Trustees of the Lexington Public Library, and as a member of the Advisory Committee to the Lexington-Fayette City-County Planning Commission. She was an affiliate of garden clubs in Lexington for many years.

Her husband, Joseph A. Estes, former editor of one of the major thoroughbred racing journals, died a number of years ago. She is survived by a son, Dr. Joseph Worth Estes, a physician in Boston, Massachusetts; a daughter, Phoebe Bryan of Williston, Vermont; two brothers, and two grandchildren; and her devoted first cousin, Marie Kittrell of Lexington.

The Betsy Worth Estes Endowment has been established for the Graham B. Dimmick Child Guidance Service.

(Prepared by Professor Jesse G. Harris, Jr., Chairman of Department of Psychology)

Professor Harris directed that the Resolution be made a part of these minutes and that copies be sent to the family. Chairman Bostrom asked the senators to stand for a moment of silence in tribute and respect to Professor Betsy Worth Estes.

Chairman Bostrom announced that Dr. Charles Ellinger would serve as Academic Ombudsman for the next year. Professor Ellinger was recognized and gave the following remarks and showed slides concerning the Ombudsman's Office for the 1983-84 academic year.

Professor Ellinger made the following presentation:

"It's with a great deal of pride and satisfaction that I present to the University Senate the Annual Report of the Office of Academic Ombudsman. Approximately fourteen months ago, I embarked upon a new adventure. The role I was about to assume was somewhat a mystery to me. I was, like many of you, aware of the office but not very well informed. I was at that time, and still am, a Prosthodontist. Added to that I was now an Ombudsman. I now had not one, but two titles that few people understood, nor for that matter, could correctly pronounce.

The year has come and gone. I feel very proud and honored to have served in this role. The office of Academic Ombudsman is a much more important office than I visualized. This office provides a neutral ground for problems to be mediated and hopefully solved. This office has given me the opportunity to meet many new individuals on this campus - administrators, faculty and students.

I must confess to you that shortly after my appointment was announced I received from my colleagues and friends many comments. Interestingly, most of the comments were those of condolence not congratulations. When it was announced this year that I was to continue in the position for another year, these same friends and colleagues began a collection fund for me so that I might begin treatment for what they perceived to be a lack of emotional stability. Seriously, I can tell you that I have found the faculty of this University, with the possible exception of one or two individuals, to be extremely cooperative. Further, I am impressed with the sincerity of most of the students that come to our office. For the most part, the students have legitimate grievances. You will note that I call them grievances instead of complaints. I personally do not wish the office to be a complaint department, but rather an office that strives for mediation and solution.

At this time I would like to introduce Ms. Garrison, who is affectionately referred to by all of her friends and colleagues, as Frankie. Frankie has been with the office for approximately nine years. Her experience is very valuable to a new Ombudsman. Her expertise concerning the rules and regulations of this University is surpassed by few people on this campus. I include her in all my conferences. She is a friend of the students but at the same time has excellent rapport with the faculty and administration.

Others I wish to thank are my immediate predecessors - Bill Lacy, Mike Brooks, and Jean Pival. All have provided advice and encouragement. Doug Rees, Bob Bostrom, and Cindy Todd of the Student Council Office have been extremely helpful. Ann Garrity, Paul Sears, George Dexter and Linda Hensley have been readily available for consultations. Bill Fortune, Hearing Officer of the University Appeals Board, has given me continual advice in regard to the Appeals Board. I would like to thank Dr. Gallaher, Chancellor of the Lexington Campus, and Dr. Bosomworth, Chancellor of the Medical Center. Both have been extremely supportive of our office. Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Singletary. The efficiency of this office is directly proportional to the support

of the President and I'm pleased to say that this President does indeed support this office.

From July 1, 1983, to June 30, 1984, this office handled 407 multiple contact cases. There were 1,421 shorter cases which required only information, referral, or brief advice. The most frequently occurring grievances included dissatisfaction over grades - 210; teaching practices and personality conflicts - 30; finals - 24; add/drop - 24; cheating - 22; repeat option - 15; illness - 15; plagiarism - 11; common exams - 8; disputes with departments - 4.

Arts and Sciences accounted for the highest number of grievances - 233; Business and Economics - 19; Engineering - 18; Fine Arts - 13; Education - 12; Graduate School - 10; Architecture - 6; Allied Health - 5; Pharmacy - 3; Communications and Agriculture - 4 each; Dentistry, Law, Medicine, Nursing and Social Work - 1 each.

The characteristics of the students involved in the multiple contact cases are as follows: Freshmen - 98; Sophomores - 91; Juniors - 83; Seniors - 73; graduates - 20; professional students - 18. We have also broken down the multiple contact cases into the months the students first came into our office: July - 12; August - 28; September - 44; October - 27; November - 14; December - 38; January - 42; February - 29; March - 68; April - 29; May - 41 and June - 15.

Many of my colleagues in the dental profession, feel that a Prosthodontist must perform miracles when treating patients with dentures. It is not surprising that I thought I could perform similar miracles in this office. Boy! Was I surprised.

I would like to switch my direction and report to you my feelings, experiences and recommendations for possible change.

ACADEMIC OMBUDSMAN

What is it? On my desk is a sign that I inherited from the previous Ombudsmen. It states: Academic Ombudsman - Helping to bridge the gap between the students, faculty and administration at U.K. I have used this statement as a goal that I wish to achieve during my tenure as Academic Ombudsman. To this point it has worked reasonably well.

MEDIATION, EDUCATION, PREVENTION

I would like to present to you the three basic objectives I've used while I have been in office. These are Mediation, Education, and Prevention. I feel my past experience as father, professor, and dentist makes me reasonably well qualified for all three.

Mediation is a word that has become very important to me in the past fourteen months. I found that our best results have come from mediation. Meetings with both parties collectively have

brought excellent results. I recall one instance when a meeting was arranged between a student and faculty member concerning a grade. The student presented the case and then the professor. The Professor had, in my opinion, been fair and just in the grade.. I told the student of my opinion. The student thanked both the professor and myself for our time and concern. The student complimented the professor for a very fine course, stood up, shook hands with the professor, and started to leave. The professor overwhelmed with the professionalism of the student, told the student that a reevaluation of the grade would be made. Both left happy! Not all cases end like this, but mediation has been very successful.

Education is a word used often by all of us at U.K. I am using the word in a different context. It has been our desire to make available to everyone on campus, information that will make them better informed about not only our office, but all the academic rights and responsibilities of the faculty, students and administrators.

If we achieve the above objective, that of education, then the third objective can be achieved. This is something that I have had a keen interest in achieving as a dentist - that is prevention. I have a phrase I use in my continuing education course that I present to practicing dentists. This phrase is: Tell the patient the problem before it occurs and it's scientific knowledge; tell the patient the problem after it occurs and it's an excuse.

I feel that we, collectively, as faculty, students and administrators, with proper education and effort, can prevent problems from occurring. I ask that all of you work toward that objective!

PROBLEMS AND CONCERNS

The next area that I wish to discuss does not necessarily need change, possibly only better implementation. I have called this problems and concerns.

REPEAT OPTION

There is a large number of faculty, students and administrators who do not understand this rule.

First, I ask all of you present to educate your colleagues to the rule that states the student must notify in writing the dean of the college in which the student is enrolled and the student's advisor no later than the last day for dropping the course without a grade of any kind appearing on the transcript (this is three weeks). I cannot and will not ask my colleagues in administrative positions to bend on the time period again.

Secondly, there is much misconception about the rule itself. Students and faculty must be aware that the first grade does remain on the transcript with a letter R beside the course. Contrary to

some belief, there is no method to "wipe off" the first grade.

Finally, the letter grade that is received on the second completion is the grade of record and is used for academic standing and credit. I am told, however, that most professional and graduate colleges do use both grades in their evaluation process.

SYLLABUS

The syllabus should be given at the first or second class meeting and inform the student about the nature of the course. It should be in writing. It becomes a contract between the student and the professor. A well written syllabus makes our job much easier. It is more difficult to defend a professor if the syllabus is not descriptive. It should include a reasonable description about the grading practice. A well defined description of cheating and plagiarism policies is well advised. A photocopy of the page from the Students Rights and Responsibilities is used by some. (The wide variance of penalties for cheating and plagiarism will be discussed later.) A description of the absence policy should be included when attendance is required. Be specific in regard to the penalty. If class participation is a part of the course, be specific. Further discussion on class participation will follow.

CLASS PARTICIPATION

This topic has caused our office so many problems that I decided to include it as a special item. Generally, class participation is poorly defined in the syllabus. It seems to serve as a subjective "fudge factor". It creates no problem until the student is on the borderline. Then it becomes a hassle. If the professor is using class participation in its true sense, i.e. students responding in class to questions asked by the professor, then it is advisable for the professor to keep record of these responses. A common grievance from students concerning this matter is "the professor did not call on me." It is my opinion that fewer problems occur in the area of class participation, especially in larger classes, if class participation evaluation is confined to use in borderline cases and not be a part of the overall grade evaluation. Grades made by objective evaluation are much easier for us to support than subjective grades. I am fully aware that some courses are not conducive to objective evaluation. In these cases I ask your help in being as specific as you can.

AVAILABILITY OF EXAMS

According to University Senate Rules, Section VII - 2.3 f. the faculty shall return to, discuss with or make available to students all papers, quizzes and examinations within a reasonable period of time, unless the confidentiality of the examination precludes. This was further interpreted in 1979, to state that all final examinations and term papers that are not returned to students be retained by the instructor for at least one (1) semester. Our office would go one step further and recommend one (1)

year, since students have the right to appeal up to one year.

Professors who are retiring or leaving the University should be advised to give their exams and grade book to the Department Chairman. This provides for us the necessary documents should students appeal their grades.

FINAL EXAMINATIONS

Students must be educated early in their college careers that they can change the date of certain examinations providing that more than two examinations occur on any one date. Further, the students must remember that the rescheduling must be exercised in writing to the appropriate instructor two weeks prior to the last class meeting. (Senate Rule V - 2.4.5)

COMMON EXAMINATIONS

Many students are not aware that they can change a common examination date if two examinations have been scheduled for the same time. The important thing that the student must know is that the rescheduling must be requested of the appropriate instructor in writing at least two weeks prior to the scheduled examination. (Senate Rule V - 2.4.6)

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POSSIBLE CHANGE

I have listed only two areas that I am requesting further study. Both of these areas cause continual problems for our office.

CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM

Cheating and plagiarism is a continual concern for all educational institutions. In this morning's paper there was an article stating the concerns of cheating and plagiarism at various universities. All feel a deep concern. Many solutions and recommendations are discussed in this article. Several universities are including in their penalty a community service project. The article further discusses the reasons some professors do nothing about an alleged cheating. One reason stated was the fear of being sued by the student.

Our office has the same concerns stated in the article. I don't know all the reasons that students cheat. I would like to have the answer to that question. My immediate concern is the wide range of penalties that are given in this University. In a recent Senate meeting a proposal was made and defeated to give an "E" in a course if a student was accused of cheating or plagiarism.

The concern of students and some faculty seemed to be the rigidity of the penalty and the fact that it treated all degrees of cheating with the same penalty. Right or wrong it was defeated. The problem is that our office experiences a wide range of penalty by various departments and faculty. If you cheat in certain

classes it's OK. If you cheat in other classes, they will "throw the book at you."

It is my desire to organize a symposium for either this fall or spring to study the problem of cheating and plagiarism. The President of the Student Body has appointed an individual from the student body to assist me. Other volunteers are welcome.

In order that some type of recommendation be brought before this body, I am suggesting as a starter the following proposal. The student will automatically be given an "E" in a course if the examination or project is worth 25% or more of the course grade. Since the laws of the land provide the misdemeanor and felony, this seems appropriate. Further, if the student is currently failing the course at the time of the offense, then the student could be considered for suspension for one (1) semester.

EXAMINATIONS PRIOR TO FINALS WEEK

Examinations given the week prior to finals week has been a controversial issue. It is not my intention to throw new wood into the fire. However, I feel this body should be aware of the difficulties it creates. The Senate Rule (Section V - 2.4.5) states that if a final examination is to be given, it will be administered during the examination period as scheduled. These examination periods will utilize the last five days of each semester, and will be preceded by a study day or weekend on which no classes or examinations will be scheduled. Further, the Senate passed a policy on February 20, 1981, that made the suggestion "that no examination be permitted during the last week of classes." Many professors do not adhere to this policy. I'm reluctant to be very vocal on this issue because I do not wish to cause a handicap for the students. Many professors state the students prefer this and a vote is often taken. The problem is the one student who does not wish to take the examination early. My recommendation in this issue would be that those students not desiring to take the final early be given the opportunity at the scheduled time. Further, the issue is clouded by those who do not give "final" examinations. We have had students in our office who have had as many as four examinations on Friday, the day prior to finals week.

My recommendation to this body on this issue is to evaluate whether or not a "dead week" is desired. If so, a rule should be passed. Otherwise, our office has little influence.

My third and final recommendation is that all new Ombudsmen be required to watch a minimum of five programs of "Peoples Court!"

The Chairman introduced the parliamentarian, Professor Emeritus Gifford Blyton; the two Sargeants at Arms, Ms. Mary Mayhew and Professor Ronald Farrar; the new Secretary of the Senate, Acting Registrar, George M. Dexter; and the Recording Secretary, Martha Ferguson. The Chairman also introduced the Senate Council for 1984-85 who are: Professors Malcolm Jewell, political science; Andy Grimes, business and

economics, Susan Belmore, psychology; Donald Hochstrasser, allied health, Bradley Canon, political science and Secretary of the Senate Council; Wilbur Frye, agriculture; Donald Ivey, music; Glenn Collins, agriculture; and Robert Altenkirch, engineering. The Ex Officio members are: Professors James Kemp, animal sciences and Constance Wilson, social work who are faculty members of the Board of Trustees; E. Douglas Rees, medicine; Student Government President, Timothy Freudenberg; and student representatives Bill White and James Hourigan. Ms. Celinda Todd is the administrative assistant in the Senate Council Office.

The Chairman asked that the ten-day circulation rule be waived in order to take up the action items on the agenda. The motion was moved, seconded and passed. The first item was postponed because some of the wording in the proposal was technical and would cause problems in the University Senate Rules.

Chairman Bostrom recognized Professor Bradley Canon, Secretary of the Senate Council, for a motion. Professor Canon, on behalf of the Senate Council, recommended the proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section V., 4.1.3., Second Master's Degree. The proposal was circulated to members of the senate under date of August 3, 1984.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Professor Olshewsky's understanding was that the proposal would prohibit a student receiving a master's degree after receiving a Ph.D. Professor Canon said that was true when based on the same work.

There was no further discussion and the proposed change, which passed unanimously, reads as follows:

New Rule:

V. 4.1.3 Concurrent Degree Programs

Concurrent enrollment for degree purposes in more than one graduate program is permitted only with the approval of the student's Graduate Advisor(s), Directors of Graduate Studies in the programs, and the Dean of the Graduate School.

Subsequent to the receipt of a doctoral degree, a student is not eligible to receive a master's degree based on the work which led to the doctorate.

Rationale:

The present rule does not require consent from the Graduate School for simultaneous enrollment in two Master's programs. This can produce procedural and academic difficulties, both for the student and the Graduate School.

In addition, some students have felt that completion of a doctoral degree automatically qualified them for a Master's degree. Individual graduate programs and the Graduate School should have the right to control specific requirements for specific degrees and when they are awarded.

Implementation Date: Spring 1985

NOTE: The proposal will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

There was no further business and the meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

George M. Dexter
Secretary

| | | |
|--|------|--|
| C.L. Atcher Libraries 4 King Library Annex | 0039 | |
| | 1 | |

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

August 30, 1984

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, September 10, 1984. Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I., 5.2, Election: Two Voting University System Faculty Members.

Proposal: (underlined portion is new)

I. 5.2 Election: Two Voting University System Faculty Members, Board of Trustees

As specified in the Governing Regulations (Part II.A.2) there shall be two voting University System faculty members of the Board of Trustees. Faculty members who may vote in the election of the University System Faculty members to the Board of Trustees shall be those in the University System who:

- a. have an actual or equivalent rank of Assistant Professor or higher;
- b. hold a tenured position or one in which tenure may be acquired, except that untenured members of the faculty whose appointment is specified as temporary shall not be eligible; and
- c. are included in the faculty T.I.A.A.-C.R.E.F. retirement program (or eligible for such inclusion after one year of University service) or other retirement program approved by the Board of Trustees.

Faculty members eligible to serve as an elected member of the Board of Trustees shall be those who meet the voting qualifications and who are members of the teaching and research faculty at the time of election and service. Teaching and research faculty are those whose primary assignment is in those areas. For purposes of this section, assignment as chairman of a department shall not exclude one who holds such a position from eligibility to serve as an elected member of the Board of Trustees. Faculty members of the Board of Trustees shall be eligible for re-election. Eligibility under paragraphs a. and b. above shall be certified in the same manner as for elections to the University Senate.

Page 2

Senate Agenda Item: I., 5.2

August 30, 1984

Background and Rationale:

Recently the university administration has stopped classifying visiting professors as such unless they have a home institution. Visiting professors who have no home institution (usually new Ph.D.'s who are temporarily replacing someone on sabbatical or on a grant for a year or two) are now classified as regular faculty members by the administration. These persons could be termed "temporary appointees." Temporary appointees are eligible for TIAA-CREF after a year's service and could be considered for tenure if they were to remain at UK for six years. The formal demarcation of tenure track lines, in fact, no longer exists. The only thing that differentiates the temporary appointees from regular faculty appointments is that the contracts of the former almost always indicate in some fashion that the appointment is temporary and that there is no expectation that it will be considered for renewal.

Because temporary appointees are in a position in which tenure may be acquired, they were certified as eligible to vote for (and be elected to) the Board of Trustees. Eligibility for election to the Board of Trustees should be limited to those faculty members who have a long term interest in UK.

The change was proposed by the University Senate Rules Committee and approved for Senate action by the Senate Council.

/cet

9/6/84

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

August 31, 1984

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, September 10, 1984. Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section V., 4.1.5, Second Master's Degree.

Current Rule:

V. 4.1.3 Second Master's Degree

A student may receive two master's degrees. However, simultaneous enrollment in two or more programs and the granting of two or more master's degrees at the same time is not permitted, unless approved by the student's advisors and the Directors of Graduate Studies in the programs.
(US: 3/8/82)

Proposed Rule:

V. 4.1.3 Concurrent Degree Programs

Concurrent enrollment for degree purposes in more than one graduate program is permitted only with the approval of the student's Graduate Advisor(s), Directors of Graduate Studies in the programs, and the Dean of the Graduate School.

Subsequent to the receipt of a doctoral degree, a student is not eligible to receive a master's degree based on the work which led to the doctorate.

Rationale:

The present rule does not require consent from the Graduate School for simultaneous enrollment in two Master's programs. This can produce procedural and academic difficulties, both for the student and the Graduate School.

In addition, some students have felt that completion of a doctoral degree automatically qualifies them for a Master's degree. Individual graduate programs and the Graduate School should have the right to control specific requirements for specific degrees and when they are awarded.

/cet

Ms. Celinda Todd
Senate Council
10 Administration Bldg.

0032

EF

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0033

DEAN OF ADMISSIONS AND REGISTRAR
GILLIS BUILDING

September 24, 1984

Mrs. Alden Bryan
280 North Williston Road
Williston, Vermont 05495

Dear Mrs. Bryan:

At the meeting of the University Senate on September 10, 1984, Dr. Jesse Harris, Jr. read the enclosed Memorial Resolution on the death of Dr. Betsy Worth Estes. He directed that the Resolution be made a part of the minutes of that meeting and copies be sent to the family.

We express our sympathy to you and other members of the family in the loss of Dr. Estes.

Cordially,

George M. Dexter
Secretary of the Senate

f

Enclosure

cc: Chairman, Senate Council

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0033

DEAN OF ADMISSIONS AND REGISTRAR
GILLIS BUILDING

September 24, 1984

Dr. Worth Estes
68 Greenaire Road
Westwood, Massachusetts 02090

Dear Dr. Estes:

At the meeting of the University Senate on September 10, 1984, Dr. Jesse Harris, Jr. read the enclosed Memorial Resolution on the death of Dr. Betsy Worth Estes. He directed that the Resolution be made a part of the minutes of that meeting and copies be sent to the family.

We express our sympathy to you and other members of the family in the loss of Dr. Estes.

Cordially,

George M. Dexter
Secretary of the Senate

f

Enclosure

cc: Chairman, Senate Council

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

Betsy Worth Estes

Dr. Betsy Worth Estes, who retired from the University of Kentucky on July 1, 1974, as Professor in the Department of Psychology, died on April 16, 1984, in Lexington. A native of Winchester, Kentucky, she earned the A.B. degree in 1929, the M.A. degree in 1945, and the Ph.D. degree in 1950, all at the University of Kentucky. She was one of the first women full professors if not the first, in the University of Kentucky, having served at a time when Deans believed, as was conveyed by her Department Head, that she did not need a pay raise because she had a husband to support her.

In the field of psychology, Betsy Estes studied mathematical and logical concepts in children and monetary reward and motivation in discrimination learning. She also conducted extensive studies of the application of intelligence tests and published in scientific and professional journals throughout her career. She was interested in child development and intellectual evaluation, and it was somewhat unusual, though not irrelevant to her long term interests, that she chose for a dissertation topic a study of the relationship between temperament of thoroughbred broodmares and performance of offspring. An article based on her dissertation was published in the Journal of Genetic Psychology in 1952. As we all know, Betsy Estes was a dignified lady, but imagine the surprise for an aspiring young divinity student who discovered Dr. Estes shooting dice with the Department Head in the Department conference room--all in the name of science to establish probabilities for psychological experiments.

She was a consulting editor for the monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, and a member of the American Psychological Association, and of the Kentucky Psychological Association. She was also an active member of the Kentucky Academy of Science and the Southern Society for Philosophy and psychology.

Dr. Estes was a member of the University Senate and a Faculty Advisor to Mortar Board. She was also known for her many contributions to the larger community of Lexington. As a member of the Lexington Junior League, she helped to organize the Graham B. Dimmick Child Guidance Service. She was President of the Board of the Fayette County Children's Bureau, President of the Board of the Comprehensive Care Center for Mental Health-Mental Retardation and helped to initiate services in maternal and child health. Dr. Estes also helped to establish classes for the gifted at the Lincoln School and served as President of the Board of Trustees of the Lexington Public Library, and as a member of the Advisory Committee to the Lexington-Fayette City-County Planning Commission. She was an affiliate of garden clubs in Lexington for many years.

Her husband, Joseph A. Estes, former editor of one of the major thoroughbred racing journals, died a number of years ago. She is survived by a son, Dr. Joseph Worth Estes, a physician in Boston, Massachusetts; a daughter, Phoebe Bryan of Williston, Vermont; two brothers, and two grandchildren; and her devoted first cousin, Marie Kittrell of Lexington.

The Betsy Worth Estes Endowment has been established for the Graham B. Dimmick Child Guidance Service.

(Prepared by Professor Jesse G. Harris, Jr., Chairman of Department of Psychology)

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

August 30, 1984

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, September 10, 1984. Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I., 5.2, Election: Two Voting University System Faculty Members.

Proposal: (underlined portion is new)

I. 5.2 Election: Two Voting University System Faculty Members, Board of Trustees

As specified in the Governing Regulations (Part II.A.2) there shall be two voting University System faculty members of the Board of Trustees. Faculty members who may vote in the election of the University System Faculty members to the Board of Trustees shall be those in the University System who:

- a. have an actual or equivalent rank of Assistant Professor or higher;
- b. hold a tenured position or one in which tenure may be acquired, except that untenured members of the faculty whose appointment is specified as temporary shall not be eligible; and
- c. are included in the faculty T.I.A.A.-C.R.E.F. retirement program (or eligible for such inclusion after one year of University service) or other retirement program approved by the Board of Trustees.

Faculty members eligible to serve as an elected member of the Board of Trustees shall be those who meet the voting qualifications and who are members of the teaching and research faculty at the time of election and service. Teaching and research faculty are those whose primary assignment is in those areas. For purposes of this section, assignment as chairman of a department shall not exclude one who holds such a position from eligibility to serve as an elected member of the Board of Trustees. Faculty members of the Board of Trustees shall be eligible for re-election. Eligibility under paragraphs a. and b. above shall be certified in the same manner as for elections to the University Senate.

Page 2
Senate Agenda Item: I., 5.2
August 30, 1984

Background and Rationale:

Recently the university administration has stopped classifying visiting professors as such unless they have a home institution. Visiting professors who have no home institution (usually new Ph.D.'s who are temporarily replacing someone on sabbatical or on a grant for a year or two) are now classified as regular faculty members by the administration. These persons could be termed "temporary appointees." Temporary appointees are eligible for TIAA-CREF after a year's service and could be considered for tenure if they were to remain at UK for six years. The formal demarcation of tenure track lines, in fact, no longer exists. The only thing that differentiates the temporary appointees from regular faculty appointments is that the contracts of the former almost always indicate in some fashion that the appointment is temporary and that there is no expectation that it will be considered for renewal.

Because temporary appointees are in a position in which tenure may be acquired, they were certified as eligible to vote for (and be elected to) the Board of Trustees. Eligibility for election to the Board of Trustees should be limited to those faculty members who have a long term interest in UK.

The change was proposed by the University Senate Rules Committee and approved for Senate action by the Senate Council.

/cet