

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

US
March 10

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

February 29, 1980

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet in regular session on Monday, March 10, 1980 at 3:00 p.m. in Room CB 106.

AGENDA:

- 1) University Senate Minutes, February 11, 1980.
- 2) Chairman's Remarks.
- 3) Action Items:
 - a) Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section III, Course Numbering Sequences. Circulated under date of February 26, 1980.
 - b) Proposed addition to University Senate Rules relative to Common Examinations, and proposed addition to University Senate Policy Statements relative to scheduling Common Examinations. Circulated under date of February 27, 1980.
 - c) Proposed addition to University Senate Rules concerning Behavioral Standards in Patient Care (Medical Center). FOR DISCUSSION ONLY. Circulated under date of February 28, 1980.

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

/cet

NOTE: Whenever possible, amendments or motions relative to agenda items on the floor of the Senate for action should be presented to the presiding officer in writing by the person(s) proposing said amendments or motions prior to the opening of the Senate meeting.

Reference copy

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, FEBRUARY 11, 1980

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, February 11, 1980, in Room 106 of the Classroom Building.

Joseph Krislov, Chairman, presiding

Members absent: M. I. H. Aleem*, C. Dwight Auvenshine, Michael Baer*, Harry H. Bailey*, Charles E. Barnhart, John L. Bernardo, Brack A. Bivins*, Jack C. Blanton, James A. Boling*, Peter P. Bosomworth*, Joseph Bryant, Joseph T. Burch, Joe B. Buttram*, Charles Byers, Patricia Cegelka*, Jean Charron, Donald B. Clapp, Bob Clark*, Charlotte Clark, D. Kay Clawson, Jane B. Clay, Lewis W. Cochran, William Cohen, James S. Cole, Samuel F. Conti*, Margaret Cornell, Emmett R. Costich*, Raymond H. Cox, James E. Criswell, Philip H. Crowley*, Paul Davis*, Guy M. Davenport*, George W. Denemark*, David E. Denton, Philip A. DeSimone*, Ronald C. Dillehay*, Joseph M. Dougherty, Herbert Drennon, Roland Duell*, Phillip Duncan*, Anthony Eadley, W. W. Ecton, Lee A. Eliosoff*, Kevin Ellis*, Jane Emanuel, Joseph Engelberg, Jana Floyd, Edward G. Foree, Tom Francis, Wilbur W. Frye*, Joseph Fugate*, Art Gallaher*, John H. Garvey*, Joseph Hamburg, Curtis E. Harvey*, S. Zafar Hasan*, Vigil W. Hays*, Raymond R. Hornback, Clyde L. Irwin, H. Douglas Jameson, Keith H. Johnson*, Wesley H. Jones, John J. Just*, Thomas P. Lewis, Marcus T. McEllistrem, Marion E. McKenna*, Ernest Middleton, Dorothy A. Miller, John M. Mitchell, Elbert W. Ockerman*, Merrill W. Packer, Doyle E. Peaslee*, Alan R. Perreiah*, John J. Picoro*, Deborah E. Powell, Herbert G. Reid*, Joseph M. Ripley*, Paul Roark, Charles Rowell, Wimberly C. Royster*, Robert W. Rudd*, Gerardo Saenz*, John S. Scarborough*, Robert G. Schwemm, Paul G. Sears*, Ronald J. Seymour, Gary Shenton, D. Milton Shuffett*, Otis A. Singletary*, Julie Skaggs, John T. Smith, Harry A. Smith, Tim Smith, Wade C. Smith, Sheldon M. Steiner, Ralph E. Steuer, Marjorie S. Stewart*, Anne Stiene-Martin, Jon Shephard, Joseph V. Swintosky, Lee T. Todd, Harold H. Traurig, Relmond VanDaniker*, William F. Wagner, M. Stanley Wall, Marc J. Wallace, Kennard W. Wellons, J. Robert Wills*, Patch G. Woolfolk*, Robert C. Zumwinkle*

The minutes of the meeting of December 10, 1979, were approved as circulated.

Chairman Krislov made the following remarks:

"I have six comments to make. The first item is to thank you for your suggestions for the Academic Area Advisory Committees. We know that our memo came late but some of you have responded. Because Professor Wagner has been ill, we haven't made our nominations. If any of you want to avail yourself of the opportunity to make suggestions, please do so. The Committee will be meeting the latter part of this week. If you still want to make nominations for the Academic Area Advisory Committee, we solicit you and we thank you for your suggestions.

The second item has to do with the General Studies Committee. We have been at work on a specific charge to that committee, and we drafted a tentative charge. We solicit your comments. For those of you who are particularly interested, we have about twenty-five copies here. You may secure one after the meeting or wait until the minutes come out. Let me read to you the five questions which we will be presenting to the General Studies Committee.

*Absence Explained

University Archives
Margaret I. King Library - North
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

- 1) Should all baccalaureate degree programs have some common core requirements? Why?
- 2) If "yes," what shall the objectives of such a common core be?
- 3) Do our existing general studies requirements fulfill these objectives? How?
- 4) What changes would the committee recommend to fulfill these objectives? Why?
- 5) If the answer to question (1) is "no," do we simply allow each college to establish its own academic requirements? Are there other alternatives?

Item three is that we have an Ombudsman Search Committee functioning. It is chaired by Professor DeLuca in Pharmacy. He will be soliciting you for suggestions, and we invite you to be thinking about that.

Item four is another search committee. The President asked the Senate Council for suggestions for the Undergraduate Dean Search Committee. We compiled a list on Friday, and will be sending it to the President. He will be naming this committee, which will be soliciting names for Undergraduate Dean. We invite you to think about that and make recommendations.

Item five has to do with the rules interpretation. As you know, under our rules the Rules Committee is the final arbiter of differences in opinion about the rules. The Rules Committee functions daily and has been making a number of rulings and, of course these rulings become precedents for future situations. Unfortunately, they are not largely publicized. We have been thinking about how to publicize them and Professor Canon of the Rules Committee this year called our attention to a particularly important rule interpretation. The Council thought we should make some effort to acquaint you with the rule. Perhaps both this oral presentation and a memo which will go to the Chairmen and the Deans on this will be the mechanism.

In this particular case an instructor alleged that a student cheated. The instructor was leaving the campus and was not too acquainted with our procedures. He read the rules and decided the simplest way to handle the problem would be to delegate to the Chairman of the Department the task of recommending the penalty. He then left campus. When the chairman received the delegation, he recommended a penalty and the student appealed. The Rules Committee held that the instructor cannot delegate to a Chairman the responsibility in this situation. We suspect that this will be a guideline for many classes and courses in which there are several instructors, part-time instructors and graduate students. Chairmen and Deans should be aware of this ruling because if there is any delegation, obviously there will be no way of upholding any kind of punishment.

The last item which will probably warm the hearts of the Medical Center is that we will be putting on the Senate floor in March and April the long-awaited standards for patient care. Because this involves many substantive matters, we plan to present it in March for discussion and for a vote in April or May. The Student Affairs Committee will be meeting in an extraordinary session at the end of February in order to get on the floor in March or April.

Those are the six items I have. If there are any questions or comments, I will be happy to respond to anything that isn't clear."

The first order of business was the honorary degree candidates. The Senate recommends to the Board of Trustees the Candidates for an honorary degree. The Chair said that the names were a secret because the awarding came from the Board of Trustees. The Chair recognized Dean Margaret Jones from the Graduate School who presented the candidates. Following Dean Jones' presentation, the Senators voted to accept the two candidates for recommendation to the President.

The Chairman recognized Professor Daniel Reedy for a motion from the Senate Council. Professor Reedy, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposed addition to the University Senate Rules, Section VI, 2.0, The Academic Ombudsman. This proposal was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of January 29, 1980. The Chair recognized Professor McAdams for a presentation on the proposal. Professor McAdams said that the proposal seemed self explanatory, but he would answer any questions. The Chair then recognized Ombudswoman Jean Pival.

Professor Pival spoke to the Senate as follows:

"This proposal came originally from Jane Emanuel, my predecessor. It is a problem in the Ombudsman's Office if we get cases for appeals after a year has passed. Sometimes we have cases that go back several years, and it is almost impossible to track down people involved in the cases. Under the present rule we have no way of saying to a student that we cannot investigate this. With the new rule we could say 'you have passed the Statute of Limitations.' I am very much in favor of the amendment."

A question was asked concerning the year in which to hear grievances rather than a semester. Professor Pival said that there was a question as to what would constitute a semester. Some professors might interpret summer to be a semester. Also, if a student went the departmental channels first, sometimes it took a whole semester.

There were no further questions or discussion, and the proposed change passed unanimously and reads as follows:

Background:

It is desirable to have a statute of limitations so that records and information be available. The proposal has been reviewed and approved by the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Dean of Students, the Academic Ombudsman, the Student Government President, the Senate Student Affairs Committee and the University Senate Council.

Proposed Addition: Section VI, 2.0

Statute of Limitations - The Academic Ombudsman is empowered to hear only those grievances directed to his/her attention within 365 days subsequent to the conclusion of the academic term in which the problem occurred. However, the Ombudsman may agree to hear a grievance otherwise barred by the Statute of Limitations in those instances where (1) the Ombudsman believes that extreme hardship including but not limited to illness, injury, and serious financial or personal problems gave rise to the delay or (2) all parties to the dispute agree to proceed.

Implementation Date: Summer, 1980.

Note: The proposed addition will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

The Chair again recognized Professor Daniel Reedy for a motion. On the recommendation of the Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards with the approval of the Senate Council, Professor Reedy moved the approval of the proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section VI, 1.1 and 1.2, Information about Course Content and Standards. This proposal was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of January 29, 1980.

The Chair recognized Professor Reed who was Chairman of the Committee that made the changes. Professor Reed recognized Ombudswoman Pival for an amendment. Professor Pival moved to add a sentence to the Rule VI, 1.1 to read:

"Whenever factors such as absences or late papers will be weighed heavily in determining grades, a student shall be so informed."

The Chairman said that the amendment had been accepted by the Committee and asked Professor Reed to give the rationale of the proposal. Professor Reed said that the students favored the rule and the faculty felt something was needed but there were problems with the terminology such as standards and criteria. The Committee hoped this proposed change would get rid of the difficulty that might arise, and at the same time allow the faculty sufficient freedom, particularly in graduate courses.

Professor Gesund said that he didn't understand what grading practice meant and wasn't sure that grading practice had any meaning at all that anyone could understand in the legal sense. He added that if the Rule VI, 1.2 were deleted then the instructor did not have to follow the grading system described in the catalog. Professor Pival said that there had been a lot of confusion on the part of both faculty and students about the catalog description on grades. She added that there was a general description of what the letter grade meant. Professor Ivey said that he could not understand what the debate was about because the rule had been on the books, and all the students were asking for was to have the information in writing. He said that the faculty had been required to give the information for a number of years so why was there a sudden fear of putting it in writing.

Dean Langston spoke against the amendment and said that he had been opposed to the "in writing" rule but now the Senate had gotten away from that and back to things that he felt were important. Then the Senate wanted to tack a sentence on that trivialized the proposal. He felt students should be expected to attend classes and get papers and work in on time without having to be told. Professor Pival said that the reason she asked that the statement be put back was that many appeals involved borderline grades. She said that she felt if the decision were whether or not a student got a higher or lower grade, then the student had a right to know.

Professor Gesund requested that the two parts of the recommendation be separated so that a vote could be taken separately amending Rule 1.1 and whether or not Rule 1.2 should be deleted. He said he had strong reservations about deleting all references to the grading system in the catalog.

The Chair ruled to divide the motion. Professor Ivey moved the previous question, it was seconded, and passed. The first part of the recommendation passed. The Chair said that the second part would be Professor Gesund's request to change Rule VI, 1.2 to retain the first sentence which was in 1.1 and that would be redundant, so it would not be necessary. Professor Gesund moved that Rule VI, 1.2 be amended to read:

"A student has the right to expect that the grading system described in the University Catalog will be followed."

The motion was seconded.

The Chair reminded the Senate that the grading system which the faculty adopted was in the Senate Rules under Section V, 1.0 and those rules are reflected in the catalog. The Chairman said that he was not certain what the effect of the amendment would be. Professor Schwert said that he didn't think the description of the general grading system would be removed from the catalog and no matter how vague the information might be it wasn't going to disappear so he felt the change was redundant.

The previous question was moved, seconded and passed. The amendment failed to pass. After further discussion the previous question was moved, seconded and passed. The second part of the recommendation to delete Rule VI, 1.2 passed. The proposed change reads as follows:

Background:

At the September Senate meeting, 1979, this matter was referred to the Committee of Admissions and Academic Standards.

The Committee concluded that:

- 1) Rule VI, 1.2 in its present form is unclear and contains a number of specifications likely to create continuing problems of interpretation.
- 2) Rule VI, 1.1 as amended will allow the faculty sufficient freedom, particularly in graduate courses, while still serving students' needs.

Recommendation:

- 1) Rule VI, 1.1 should be amended to read:

Information about Course Content: A student has the right to expect the course to correspond generally to the description in the official catalog of the University of Kentucky and the right to be informed in writing at the first or second class meeting about the nature of the course--the content, the activities to be evaluated, and the grading practice to be followed. Whenever factors such as absences or late papers will be weighed heavily in determining grades, a student shall be informed.

2) Rule VI, 1.2 should be deleted.

Implementation Date: Summer, 1980.

Note: The proposed change will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

The Chair again recognized Professor Daniel Reedy. Professor Reedy, on the recommendation of the Committee on Academic Organization and Structure, moved approval of the agenda item, Recommendation to the Administration regarding appointment and retention of administrative officers at the college, school and department level. The Recommendation was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of January 31, 1980. Professor Reedy brought to the Chairman's attention that the Recommendation was submitted without action of the Senate Council.

The Chair recognized Professor Grimes who presented the proposal on behalf of his committee. Professor Grimes said that last year the Committee on Academic Organization and Structure under Professor Harris' leadership examined the issue and recommended to the Senate Council two recommendations that were circulated on January 31, 1980.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Professor Lienhard spoke strongly against the recommendation. He said that he felt a monster was being created. He suggested that if a problem existed in setting up a search committee then that problem should be solved within the college and suggested that the additional bureaucratic waste not be imposed on everyone. Professor Reedy said that it was difficult to speak in contrary to the motion without being placed in a position of being against democratization. He said there was concern expressed in the Senate Council that should be shared. There are units in the University that are so small in which the Chairman chairs a faculty of three people. There are questions not answered by the motion. There are some units who would not on their own attempt to better the quality of that unit. He said his most serious question was who would vote for the individuals and who would stand as a candidate. He felt there were issues that deserved consideration.

Professor Jewell said that he felt one responsibility the Dean had was to try to upgrade the department and to try to get an honest evaluation. He said that he was not enthusiastic about the first Recommendation, but he would be in favor of the second one so perhaps they could be voted on separately. He said that he would be interested in getting verification on whether or not it was the standard practice of the University for the Deans to get statements from tenured members before appointments are made.

The Chairman responded that he was not in a position to answer the question. Professor Grimes responded that he could not answer the question for the Committee, but he could speak in the position as a faculty member. He said that his experience suggested to him that when there were academic units that were marginal then there are academic units trying to change that statement.

After further discussion the previous question was moved, seconded, and passed. The Chairman said that the question was whether the Recommendation of the Committee should be adopted and recommended to the Administration. The Chair ruled to divide the Recommendation.

The first Recommendation passed with a hand count of 52 to 22. The second Recommendation passed with a hand count of 63 to 6. The Recommendations will be forwarded to the Administration for consideration and read as follows:

Background:

The Academic Organization and Structure Committee under Professor Harris' leadership developed these proposals during the academic year 1978-79. They were forwarded to the Senate Council, which solicited reactions from the deans. Four favored the proposals, four responded negatively and one was non-committal. The Council raised several questions with the Committee but the Committee felt that its proposal was basically sound. The proposal is brought to you without any action by the Senate Council.

Recommendations:

- 1) It is recommended that the following statements be incorporated in the Administrative Regulations of the University of Kentucky. (Sections AR II, 1.0-6, Review and Evaluation of Educational Units, and AR II, 1.0-8, Procedures for Search Committees for Chief Administrative Officers of Educational Units, as appropriate).

At least two members of any committee formed to review an educational unit and/or to search for a new administrative officer for the unit at the college, school, or departmental level shall be elected faculty members of the unit. The election shall be supervised by the Senate Council in the case of a college, and by the Dean in the case of a school or department. Additional faculty members may be appointed to the Committee.

- 2) In the Governing Regulations Part VIII, A-3, page 29, line 4, it is recommended that the phrase "or reappointment" be inserted to read as follows:

Recommendations on the appointment or reappointment of chairmen of academic departments or divisions shall be accompanied by written statements from at least the tenured members of the department or division.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Martha M. Ferguson
Recording Secretary

Charles L. Atcher
Archives
4 King Library

00391
1