

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

*University  
Senate  
3/13/78*

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL  
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

March 3, 1978

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet on Monday, March 13, 1978 at 3:00 p. m.  
in the Court Room of the Law Building.

AGENDA:

- 1) Approval of the minutes of the February 13, 1978 University Senate meeting.
- 2) Chairman's Remarks.
- 3) Action Items:
  - a) Recommendations dealing with administrative organization, funding, schedules, and studies of the University Summer School Program to be forwarded to the administration for appropriate action. (Circulated under date of March 3, 1978.)
  - b) Report and recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on Course Numbering. (Circulated under date of March 3, 1978.)

Elbert W. Ockerman  
Secretary

/cet



UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

*University  
Senate  
3/13/78*

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL  
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

March 3, 1978

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, March 13, 1978. Recommendations dealing with administrative organization, funding, schedules, and studies of the University Summer School Program to be forwarded to the administration for appropriate action.

On November 18, 1976 the then Chairman of the Senate Council established an Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Summer School Program under the Chairmanship of Dr. Stephen Langston. Members of the Committee included Michael E. Adelstein, Joseph Buttram, Philip Cottell, John Greenway, Joseph Gruber, Jean Pival, Wimberly Royster, Edgar Sagan, Warren Walton, and James Wells. The final report of the Committee was forwarded to Professor Constance Wilson, then Chairperson of the Senate Council on October 7, 1977, with a summary of nine major recommendations.

Dr. Langston made an oral report to the Senate on the Summer School Report at the December 12, 1977 meeting of the Senate. These nine recommendations are being forwarded to you for action at the March 13 meeting of the Senate. The recommendations deal with administrative organization, funding, schedules, and studies, all of which would require administrative action. The recommendations are being put to the Senate, therefore, as statements of policy for Senate approval, to be presented to the President for improvement of the Summer School Program. Please refer to the Minutes of the December 12, 1977 Senate meeting for additional background for your consideration of these nine proposals. [An excerpt of these Minutes follows.]

Abstract: The committee was appointed in the 1976 Fall Semester and charged to conduct a general review of the summer programs. In the course of its investigations the committee interviewed academic deans, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Director of Summer Sessions. Each of the benchmark institutions was contacted in an effort to compare UK's summer programs to those at comparable universities.



A student survey was devised and mailed to just under 1,000 students to solicit their views of summer activities. Finally, staff members in the Division of Student Affairs were asked to comment on the non-academic services and programs available during the summer.

Generally, the committee found widespread dissatisfaction with both the academic and extra curricular summer programs. Academic deans typically felt their programs are minimal at best and listed a variety of obstacles to more effective programming. Members of the Student Affairs staff, with the exception of those in the Counseling and Testing Center and the University Placement Service, reported decreased levels of programming and service in the summer.

Recommendations:

- 1) Regularize the administration of the academic programs of the summer session so that top administrators at each level are closely involved in the summer program.
- 2) Regularize the budget process so that academic deans and department chairpersons have greater control over summer funds and more timely notification of summer allocations.
- 3) Provide funding for experimental summer programming which is not necessarily tied to enrollments or tuition income.
- 4) Initiate, on an experimental basis, a procedure through which faculty members may exchange summer teaching for a reduced teaching load during the academic year. The committee recognizes that such a procedure will not be suitable in every department and that many faculty members will not wish to participate in such a plan.
- 5) Provide for systematic evaluation and review of summer programs in terms of academic quality, breadth of offerings, and the extent to which student needs are met.
- 6) If possible, publish the summer schedule of classes prior to advance registration for the spring semester. This recommendation is designed to facilitate planning by the student.
- 7) Provide funding for extra curricular activities and student services on a level commensurate with that during the academic year.



Page 3

Agenda Item: Summer School Programs; March 13, 1978  
March 3, 1978

- 8) Additional investigation into the needs of students for summer programs and services. Such investigations should be conducted by an administrative unit with the necessary resources.
- 9) Remove, or increase, the present maximums on faculty stipends. If the present limitations are retained, make provision for annual increases.

\*\*\*\*\*

Excerpt from University Senate Minutes: December 12, 1977:

Chairman Wilson presented Dr. Stephen Langston, Assistant Vice President for Continuing Education who gave a report on the Summer School Program.

Assistant Vice President Langston spoke to the Senate as follows:

The ad hoc committee to study summer programs began meeting last December, - December 18, I believe the last day of final exams. We met during the spring semester, the summer, and the early part of the fall semester to produce the report which has been forwarded to the Senate Council.

In carrying out the charge assigned by former Senate Council chairperson, Dr. Malcolm Jewell, the committee relied to some extent on the knowledge of its members. In addition, we wrote benchmark institutions to ask them some of the same questions we were trying to answer here at UK. Various members of the committee interviewed academic deans in the Division of Colleges to determine what they saw as major obstacles to expanded and more imaginative summer programs. The committee interviewed Dean Ockerman, who serves as Director of Summer Sessions and Vice President Cochran who is ultimately responsible for these programs. We did attempt to survey student opinion but this effort was not successful because of problems with the questionnaire, its timing, and the sample of students chosen.

Let me briefly tell you what we found to be obstacles to expanded summer programming.

According to the academic deans the budget process for the summer and current policies on enrollment minimums for classes have a serious dampening effect on summer offerings. At present, classes at the lower division level must enroll 15 students to be taught. At the upper division and graduate levels the minimums are 10 and 5, respectively. In the view of the deans these limitations, in effect, prohibit the offering of experimental classes. I won't bore you with how the budget process works, but deans feel they have little or no control over the budgets allocated to their colleges.



Page 4

Agenda Item: Summer School Programs; March 13, 1978  
March 3, 1978

We asked Vice President Cochran his views on the matters of budget process and enrollment limitations. He was of the opinion that present procedures should not have an inhibiting effect on programming. There seems to be a basic disagreement or misunderstanding between the academic vice president and the academic deans on this point.

Another obstacle mentioned by some of the deans was unwillingness of faculty members to teach in the summer, particularly in those academic units where extramural funding, professional practice, or external consulting opportunities are abundant. To deal with this problem the committee recommends that the University initiate, on an experimental basis, a process through which faculty members may perform part of their academic year teaching assignment during the summer.

We checked with the Dean of the Graduate School to find out if such a practice would reduce a faculty member's eligibility for extramural research funding. Apparently it would not. We also asked Vice President Cochran whether University regulations would prohibit such "trade-offs." There could be difficulties in this area, but the obstacles are not insurmountable.

The committee uncovered a few other problems which impair summer programming, but, in our view, the primary reason the summer session has not grown is that it has been a low priority item in the university. The summer school has not been a topic of extended discussion among academic deans nor between the deans and the academic vice president. Compounding this problem is the fact that most department chairpersons are on academic year appointments and are not available during the summer.

The number one recommendation - or conclusion, of the committee is that concerted efforts by the academic vice president, the deans and department chairpersons are necessary if the University is to have summer programming commensurate with that of the academic year. Higher priority must be given to summer programs and budgetary and administrative procedures must be regularized.

Briefly, here are some of the other recommendations of the committee.

1. - Provide funding for experimental summer programming which is not necessarily tied to enrollments or tuition income.
2. - Provide for systematic evaluation and review of summer programs in terms of academic quality, breadth of offerings, and the extent to which student needs are met.
3. - If possible, publish the summer schedule of classes prior to advance registration for the spring semester. This recommendation is designed to facilitate planning by the student.



Page 5

Agenda Item: Summer School Programs: March 13, 1978  
March 3, 1978

4. - Provide funding for extra curricular activities and student services on a level commensurate with that during the academic year.
5. - Additional investigation into the needs of students for summer programs and services. Such investigations should be conducted by an administrative unit with the necessary resources.

The committee discussed the problem of faculty compensation for summer teaching because we had heard there was widespread dissatisfaction in this area. Basically, the present policy provides that a faculty member be paid 10% of the previous academic year salary for each three credit course, with an upper limit of \$1600 for lower division courses and \$2000 for upper division or graduate classes. The committee recommends that these upper limits be removed or increased to more realistic levels. If the limits are retained, provision should be made for annual increases.

With regard to the "10% rule" the committee recommends that strong consideration be given to increasing summer teaching stipends from 1/10 to 1/9 of the academic year salary if the limitation on income from research contracts is raised from the present 2/9 of the academic year salary.

Assistant Vice President Langston was given an enthusiastic round of applause.

/cet



MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, MARCH 13, 1978

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, March 13, 1978, in the Court Room of the Law Building.

Paul Oberst, Chairman, presiding

Members absent: Michael E. Adelstein\*, Michael A. Baer, Harry H. Bailey\*, Charles E. Barnhart, John J. Bernardo, A. Edward Blackhurst\*, Jack C. Blanton, Joseph T. Burch, Gail Burrows\*, Charles Byers\*, W. Merle Carter, Patricia Cegelka\*, Donald B. Clapp, D. Kay Clawson\*, Ronda S. Connaway\*, Samuel F. Conti\*, Marjorie A. Crandall, Donald P. Cross\*, Patrick P. DeLuca\*, George W. Denmark\*, William H. Dennen\*, David E. Denton\*, Donald F. Diedrich\*, Ronald C. Dillehay\*, Roland Duell, Anthony Eardley, W. W. Ecton\*, Roger Eichhorn, Jane M. Emanuel\*, Calvin Ernst, Donald A. Falace\*, Chris Fetter, James E. Funk\*, R. Fletcher Gabbard\*, Art Gallaher\*, Alexander Gilchrist\*, Abner Golden, Andrew J. Grimes\*, Joseph P. Gultinan\*, Joseph Hamburg, Raymond R. Hornback, Margaret W. Jones\*, Michael Kennedy, Robert W. Kiser, William B. Lacy\*, Richard S. Levine\*, Thomas P. Lewis, Austin S. Litvak\*, William R. Markesbery\*, Kenneth M. Martin\*, Emanuel Mason, Marion E. McKenna\*, Ernest Middleton, Phillip W. Miller, George E. Mitchell\*, Arthur J. Nonneman\*, Jacqueline A. Noonan\*, Edward O'Hara\*, Clayton Omvig\*, Patti Owens, Merrill W. Packer, Ronda S. Paul\*, Alan R. Perreiah\*, Steve Petrey\*, Don Prather\*, Daniel R. Reedy\*, JoAnn Rogers, Jim Rowe, Robert W. Rudd\*, Ramona Rush\*, Stanley R. Saxe\*, John S. Scarborough\*, Rudolph Schriels, John Serkland\*, D. Milton Shuffett\*, Gerard E. Silberstein\*, Timothy W. Sineath, Otis A. Singletery\*, A. H. Peter Skelland, Tim Skinner, John T. Smith\*, Lynn Spruill\*, Anne Stiene-Martin\*, John P. Strickland, M. Stanley Wall, Marc J. Wallace\*, John Wanat, J. Robert Wills, Constance P. Wilson\*, William G. Winter\*

Motion was made, seconded and passed to suspend the ten-day circulation rule in order to consider the items on the agenda.

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

SUMMARY:

I. Action Items

- A. Recommendations dealing with administrative organization, funding, schedules, and studies of the University Summer School Program to be forwarded to the administration for appropriate action. (Circulated under date of March 3, 1978.)  
Motion passed.
- B. Report and recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on Course Numbering. (Circulated under date of March 3, 1978.)  
Motion passed.

II. Senate Council Activities and Informational Items

- A. Professor Constance P. Wilson Elected to Board of Trustees

\*Absence explained



- B. SAC (Student Advisory Council) Groups
- C. Student Evaluation of Teaching
- D. Meeting Concerning Hospitalization-Major Medical Benefits, March 14
- E. Faculty Recognition Dinner, April 10
- F. Consideration of Appointment of Ad Hoc Committee on Committee Structure

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

1. Professor Constance P. Wilson was elected for a three-year term beginning July 1, 1978, to the Board of Trustees.
2. The Senate Council has discussed the SAC (Student Advisory Council) Groups and has voted to ask the Senate Student Affairs Committee to proceed with their study and report to the Council and to the Senate as soon as possible.
3. The Senate Council has had under consideration the matter of student evaluation of teaching. The Council agreed that it would ask the Senate Committee on Teaching, Learning and Advising to take a new look at the student evaluation process as it is actually operating. The Chairman urged any Departments or Colleges who have something to add to get in touch with Donald Cross who is the Chairman of the Teaching, Learning and Advising Committee or with the Senate Council.
4. There is an open meeting concerning Hospitalization-Major Medical benefits, March 14, 3:30 p.m., Chemistry-Physics Building, Room 139.
5. The Faculty Recognition Dinner is April 10 at the Lafayette Club. Mr. Charles Atcher is the Chairman. There are 17 members of the faculty retiring. The Chairman urged the Senate members to participate, particularly if there were members of their departments retiring.
6. The Kernel reported that the Senate Council is considering the appointment of an Ad Hoc Committee on the committee structure of the Senate. The Council does propose to do that, but the committee has not yet been appointed.

The first action item on the agenda was the recommendations dealing with administrative organization, funding, schedules, and studies of the University Summer School Program.

Chairman Oberst recognized Professor John Lienhard. On behalf of the Senate Council Professor Lienhard presented a motion recommending that nine recommendations dealing with administrative organization, funding, schedules, and studies of the University Summer School Program to be forwarded to the administration for appropriate action. This was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of March 3, 1978, and reads as follows:



Abstract: The committee was appointed in the 1976 Fall Semester and charged to conduct a general review of the summer programs. In the course of its investigations the committee interviewed academic deans, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Director of Summer Sessions. Each of the benchmark institutions was contacted in an effort to compare UK's summer programs to those at comparable universities.

A student survey was devised and mailed to just under 1,000 students to solicit their views of summer activities. Finally, staff members in the Division of Student Affairs were asked to comment on the non-academic services and programs available during the summer.

Generally, the committee found widespread dissatisfaction with both the academic and extra curricular summer programs. Academic deans typically felt their programs are minimal at best and listed a variety of obstacles to more effective programming. Members of the Student Affairs staff, with the exception of those in the Counseling and Testing Center and the University Placement Service, reported decreased levels of programming and service in the summer.

Recommendations:

1. Regularize the administration of the academic programs of the summer session so that top administrators at each level are closely involved in the summer program.
2. Regularize the budget process so that academic deans and department chairpersons have greater control over summer funds and more timely notification of summer allocations.
3. Provide funding for experimental summer programming which is not necessarily tied to enrollments or tuition income.
4. Initiate, on an experimental basis, a procedure through which faculty members may exchange summer teaching for a reduced teaching load during the academic year. The committee recognizes that such a procedure will not be suitable in every department and that many faculty members will not wish to participate in such a plan.
5. Provide for systematic evaluation and review of summer programs in terms of academic quality, breadth of offerings, and the extent to which student needs are met.
6. If possible, publish the summer schedule of classes prior to advance registration for the spring semester. This recommendation is designed to facilitate planning by the student.
7. Provide funding for extra curricular activities and student services on a level commensurate with that during the academic year.



8. Additional investigation into the needs of students for summer programs and services. Such investigations should be conducted by an administrative unit with the necessary resources.
9. Remove, or increase, the present maximums on faculty stipends. If the present limitations are retained, make provision for annual increases.

Student Senator Benson moved to table the motion until the next Senate meeting.

The motion was defeated with a hand count of 52 to 30.

The floor was opened for discussion and questions.

Professor Diachun said that he was not clear about the motion. He asked if it was a recommendation from the Senate Council.

Chairman Oberst said that it came with the unanimous recommendation of the Senate Council.

Professor Kemp asked where the funds were coming from and if they were coming from other budgetary items.

Chairman Oberst said that he assumed that was a question only the administration could answer after the administration had decided to do any of those things.

Dr. Jewell said that he didn't want to read anything into what the Committee had said but that the proposal would give colleges more flexibility and the possibility of scheduling more of their courses in the summer.

Chairman Oberst said that he thought there were two other items that would bear on it. One was item two and the other was item three.

Professor Longyear said that there were two kinds of graduate students that would be favorably affected by the increase in the summer program--those who are teaching assistants and need to take courses and those who had already completed their residence and were holding teaching positions.

The vote on the motion passed.

Chairman Oberst recognized Professor John Lienhard. On behalf of the Senate Council Professor Lienhard presented a motion on the report and recommendation from the Ad Hoc Committee on Course Numbering. This was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of March 3, 1978, and reads as follows:

Background:

The ad hoc Committee on Course Numbering was set up March 29, 1977 by Chairman Constance Wilson. Professor Malcolm Jewell was named chair *per se*



of the committee and members were W. C. Royster, John Stephenson, T. Richard Robe, and John Robertson. The Committee decided to concentrate solely on the 400 and 500 level courses, but in the final report it suggested a slight change in the Rules regarding 200 level courses also.

The report was approved by the Senate Council in November, 1977 and is submitted to the Senate for approval of the report and of the changes in Senate Rules necessary to implement it, as set out in the report.

Recommendations:

1. We recommend that the 400 category be changed by providing that the letter G be placed after the number of those 400 courses to carry graduate credit for non-majors. The remaining 400 level courses would be strictly undergraduate. This would permit departments to make a distinction between 300 and 400 courses. To implement this, each department with 400 level courses would be asked to notify the Graduate Council about which of these it wanted to place in the 400G category.
2. We do not recommend any change in the Senate rules concerning the 500 category of courses. We do recommend that departments that use the 500 category for courses that are taken primarily by undergraduates be asked to review these courses and determine whether they wish to change any of them to 300 or 400 level courses. Although such a change is not in the category of "minor changes," we suggest that departmental proposals for such changes be treated expeditiously.
3. Although our specific responsibilities were limited to the 400 and 500 level courses, the Committee discussed what it perceived to be another problem: a shortage of 100 level courses. It is our impression that some departments permit freshmen (particularly in the second semester) to take 200 level courses, but existing rules make this appear difficult. It seemed to the Committee that the instructor and the department involved should be able to judge when a freshman ought to be able to take a 200 level course, without the student having to get permission of his dean. If a department wanted to keep some or all of its 200 courses strictly limited to non-freshman, it could specify this to its instructors. Consequently we recommend changes in the rules to eliminate the requirement that a student's dean approve if a freshman enrolls in a 200 level course. This recommendation is made subject to clearance with the deans of the appropriate colleges.

Rules Changes:

These recommendations, if adopted, would lead to the following changes in Senate Rules (Section III):



1.0 Change course numbering system as follows--

400-499 Prerequisite junior classification; gives undergraduate credit; graduate credit for non-majors only if letter G appears after number.

200-299 Prerequisite sophomore classification or consent of instructor; gives undergraduate credit only.

1.1a. Should read - "Freshmen and sophomores may be admitted to courses numbered between 300-499 upon approval of the instructor and the dean of the student's college. Such approval . . ."

3.0 Change ft.\*\* at bottom of p. 34 to read: "The Graduate Council will have courses numbered 400G-499G routed to it . . ."

The floor was opened for discussion and questions.

Motion was made, seconded, and passed to consider the recommendations separately.

Professor Hanau said that under the present system the departments have five options in which to make a distinction in their courses, and he was not convinced that a sixth was needed.

Chairman Oberst asked Professor Jewell if he had any information as to what departments felt it was necessary.

Professor Jewell said that a survey was made of the departments to see how they handled the 400 and 500 level courses. Various departments have adjusted to fit their own needs.

Professor Thraikill said that it was cumbersome simply to add the "G" since now all 400 courses give graduate credit for students from other departments. He asked if it wouldn't be simpler and less confusing to add a "U" for the fewer non-graduate credit courses.

Professor Jewell said that he could see no difference between adding a "G" to those admitting graduate students or a "U" to those that do not.

Professor Thraikill asked if this meant that all 400 courses to add a "G" must now get renewed approval from the Graduate Council.

Professor Jewell said that he assumed it was up to the Graduate Council whether or not they want to review proposals by departments about classifying 400 courses as 400G.

Professor Lienhard said that we have a very workable existing system with our 400 and 500 level courses and that he hates to see it changed. He added, however, that this system has failed since the Councils have not enforced it, and too much present usage on campus is in violation of it. Therefore, he supports the change, even though it will result in a more cumbersome system.

Dean Royster said that the Graduate Council has had over the last couple of years a fairly sizeable number of 400 level courses which had been proposed to the Council and for



which the department wanted restricted to seniors. He said there is hardly any way to keep graduate students out of these courses unless there is some identification on the course number to this effect.

Professor Jewell said there were about twenty departments in that situation. He added that it does not necessarily mean they are bending the rule.

Dean Stephenson said that he agreed with John Lienhard that at this point we have an inconsistency in the use of 400 numbers. He said that a large number of precedents has been built up over the years for restricting that 400 level courses be for undergraduates only.

The vote on the first recommendation concerning the "G" category added to the 400 level courses passed.

Chairman Oberst presented recommendation number two and asked for any discussion.

Professor Jewell said that the Committee in reviewing 500 courses found that there was every conceivable interpretation of 500 level courses being used, whether one is talking about master's or Ph.D. programs. Professor Jewell added that a part of the point of the recommendation was that if departments wanted to do restructuring in numbering 500 courses primarily taken by undergraduates, this would facilitate the process.

The vote on the second item passed.

The vote on the third item passed.

Dean Ockerman asked when the implementation date would be. He raised that question because the schedule for the Summer Session has been printed since December, and the schedule for the Fall 1978 is in the process of being printed. He said that it could not be effectively implemented in terms of the publications until the Spring Semester.

Chairman Oberst said that the Implementation Date will be January 1979.

Chairman Oberst asked for any new business.

Professor Crosby requested that a supply of the Action Items be at the Senate Meeting when they did not have the required circulation time.

Chairman Oberst said that was a good idea.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Elbert W. Ockerman  
Secretary