

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

April 22, 1980

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet on Monday, May 5, 1980, at 3:00 p.m., in Room CB 106.

AGENDA:

- 1) University Senate Minutes, March 14, 1980.
- 2) Memorial Resolutions
- 3) Action Items:
 - a) Proposed additions to University Senate Rules, Section IV, 2.0. Admission Requirements, (Landscape Architecture), circulated under date of April 18, 1980.
 - b) Proposed additions to University Senate Rules, Section IV, 2.0. Admission Requirements, (College of Business and Economics), circulated under date of April 22, 1980.

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

/gcc

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.

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, MAY 5, 1980

The University Senate met in a called session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, May 5, 1980, in Room 106 of the Classroom Building.

Joseph Krislov, Chairman, presiding

Members absent: Rusty Ashcraft*, Albert S. Bacdayan, Lyle Back, Charles E. Barnhart, James C. Beidleman, Janis L. Bellack*, John J. Bernardo, Brack A. Bivins, Jack C. Blanton, James A. Boling*, Peter P. Bosomworth*, Carolyn P. Brock, J. Michael Brooks*, Barbara Bryant, Joseph T. Burch, Joe B. Buttram, Michael D. Carpenter, W. Merle Carter, Patricia Cegelka*, Donald B. Clapp, Bob Clark, Charlotte Clark, D. Kay Clawson, Jane B. Clay, William Cohen, James S. Cole, Glenn B. Collins, William L. Conger, Samuel F. Conti, Margaret Cornell, Emmett R. Costich, Clifford J. Cremers*, James E. Criswell, Lynne Crutcher, Robert Culbertson, Scott Davis, George W. Denemark*, David E. Denton*, Philip A. DeSimone*, Ronald C. Dillehay, Richard C. Domek, Joseph M. Dougherty, Herbert Drennon, Roland Duell, Phillip Duncan, Anthony Eardley, Roger Eichhorn, Dave Elder, Lee A. Elioseff, Kevin Ellis, Jane Emanuel, Joseph Engelberg, Graeme Fairweather, Robin Farrar, Jana Floyd, Paul G. Forand, Edward G. Foree, Walter C. Foreman, Tom Francis, Joseph Fugate, Art Gallaher, Jess L. Gardner, John H. Garvey, Jon P. Gockerman, Steve Goldstein, Mitch Griffin, Andrew J. Grimes, George W. Gunther*, Robert D. Guthrie, Joseph Hamburg, S. Zafar Hasan*, Virgil W. Hays*, Carl E. Henrickson, Raymond R. Hornback, Alfred S. L. Hu, Freddie James, Dean Jaros, Keith H. Johnson*, Wesley H. Jones, John J. Just, Richard I. Kermode, Edward J. Kifer, Jane Kotchen, Gretchen LaGodna*, Stephen Langston, Donald C. Leigh, Thomas P. Lewis*, Paul Mandelstam*, William L. Matthews*, Marcus T. McEllistrem, Marion E. McKenna*, Mark Metcalf, Ernest Middleton, Phillip W. Miller, John M. Mitchell, Philip J. Noffsinger*, Merrill W. Packer*, Chester L. Parker, Alan R. Perreiah, Jean Pival, Anne Policastri, Deborah E. Powell*, E. Douglas Rees, Herbert G. Reid*, Frank J. Rizzo, Paul Roark, Charles Rowell, Robert W. Rudd, Pritam S. Sabharwal, Gerardo Saenz, John S. Scarborough, Robert G. Schwemm, George W. Schwert, Eugenie C. Scott*, Ronald J. Seymour*, Chris G. Shaw, Gary Shenton, D. Milton Shuffett*, Otis A. Singletary*, Julie Skaggs, John T. Smith, Gerald Slatin, Harry A. Smith, Tim Smith, Wade C. Smith, David A. Spaeth, Charles S. Spiegel*, Sheldon M. Steiner, Ralph E. Steuer, Marjorie S. Stewart*, Lee T. Todd, Harold H. Taurig, Kevin Vaughn, M. Stanley Wall, Marc J. Wallace*, Angene Wilson, M. O'Neal Weeks*, Kennard W. Wellons, H. David Wilson*, Ralph F. Wiseman*

The approval of the minutes for the meeting on April 14, 1980, was postponed until September 8, 1980.

Chairman Krislov recognized Professor Thomas Clark who presented the following Memorial Resolution on the death of Dr. Martin Marshall White.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

Martin Marshall White, 1904-1980

Each generation in a university's history owes its triumphs and shortcomings to human beings who comprise its faculty and administration. Always there are individuals who stand out from the crowd, and who go well beyond the mere call of duty in dedicating their lives to institutional welfare. The University of Kentucky stands deeply indebted to individuals who in the past have served it with faithfulness. It owes none greater appreciation than Martin

*Absence explained

Marshall White, who joined its faculty in 1930 as an assistant professor in psychology. For two years previous to that date he had held a comparable position in the University of Oklahoma.

At Kentucky young Professor White made rapid advancement into the rank of professor in the space of three years, and in 1941 he succeeded Professor H. B. Minor as Head of the Department of Psychology.

Martin Marshall White was a Texan, born in Kyle, September 23, 1904. He was the son of Judge Martin Mullins and Jane Carpenter White. He kept well concealed the fact that he was a direct descendant of the Marshall and Todd families of Virginia and Kentucky. He graduated from the Temple, Texas, High School in 1923, and was awarded both the bachelor of Arts and the Master of Arts degrees from the University of Texas in 1926 and 1928 respectively. He was awarded the doctorate in psychology by the University of Chicago in 1930. In his academic career he was elected membership into Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma Xi, and Omicron Delta Kappa.

In his personality Martin White reflected many of the influences of his Texas background. He had a keen sense of humor, at times bordering on puckishness, but he could at once be staunch and forthright in defense of what he conceived to be just and right. He abhorred social and political climbing, and most of all discrimination against individuals and social groups. In demeanor he was democratic, and at all times revealed a deep dedication to the puritanical ethic of work and promptitude.

Despite his years of service as an administrator Martin White was at heart a classroom teacher. He successfully challenged succeeding generations of students to shuck off old prejudices and provincial folk-ways to take a broader view of life. He provoked them into re-examining the old and fixed values which they and their parents had held sacred for generations, and to fully assessing any new ones they might adopt. He had the enviable capacity to shock many students out of their lethargy, to bring to the surface their inner strengths and resources, and to broaden their views and perspective of life.

No colleague knew the hours Martin White spent in counseling his own and the other fellows' students. By the same token they never knew how many trifling ones he forced, like the wandering Bedouins, to dismantle their tattered academic tents and wander back into the waste lands of abismal ignorance from which they had sprung. On a happier note there is not recorded how many laggard souls he helped to snatch back from the brink of failure and frustration.

Martin White was elected by his colleagues to succeed Paul Prentice Boyd as Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. In that year the University of Kentucky was in a period of deep-seated transition. Not only did the entry of World War II veterans demand that the institution offer instruction of a high order, it faced the even greater institutional challenge of raising itself to new and more productive qualitative levels. Every department in the University, and especially those in the College of Arts and Sciences,

cried out for material strengthening by the addition of scholarly and aggressive young staff members. These were years of constant searching for such talent. The Dean of the College became a central figure in this period of growth and solidification. In his quiet but persistent manner Dean Martin White stimulated many departmental heads to strengthen and revitalize both their teaching and research programs. He fiercely defended his college against administrative pressures and political interferences. Conversely he defended his colleagues against many of their acts of academic self-defeat.

Martin White was a self-effacing man who often stood in his own light behind a gruff manner. He opposed social and racial injustices without crying out in raucous attention-attracting crusades, a fact recognized by the outside public. He was active in the local affairs of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Fayette County Relief Fund, and the Kentucky Society for the Handicapped. He served as President of the Lexington Kiwanis Club in 1966, and worked assiduously in its fireworks program which collected funds for various social causes. He was a member, and president, of the Informal and Torch discussional clubs. In 1978 he was recipient of the University's prestigious Sullivan Medallion in recognition of his humanitarian contributions to the Commonwealth.

No member of the University Family was a more devoted husband and father. He was married in 1928 to Dorritt Stumburg of Missouri, a graduate of Smith College and recipient of the doctorate in psychology from the University of Chicago. Their children are Dorritt Jean White Reinsdorf of Dalgren, Virginia, and Martin Kurt White of Ashland, Kentucky. Their grandson is Marshall Reinsdorf of Richmond, Virginia.

As Dean of the mother college of the University Dean White had the courage and foresight to compare the University with other institutions of kindred purpose and status, and to acknowledge shortcomings. From his position as Dean he spotted and punctured the show of pomposity on the part of professors and administrators. He often directed attention to achievements of worth of modest colleagues, and search out the strengths of the institution. He agonized over the fact that many students of promise were forced to drift through the institution bored for lack of imaginative teaching. To him classroom performance took precedence over all other university responsibility.

The White era in the University of Kentucky was one of growth and changing institutional approaches. The Dean left subtle marks on the entire institutional program. His happiest monument, however, was the fact that thousands of Kentucky's graduates profited from his near fanatical belief that good teaching and an atmosphere of academic freedom of enquiry were primary institutional objectives.

(Prepared by Dr. Thomas D. Clark, Professor Emeritus, History Department)

Chairman Krislov directed that the Resolution be made a part of these minutes and that copies be provided to members of the family. The Senators were asked to stand for a moment of silence in tribute and respect to Professor Martin Marshall White.

The Chair recognized Professor William Wagner for a motion from the Senate Council. Professor Wagner, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposed additions to University Senate Rules, Section IV, 2.0, Admissions Requirements, Landscape Architecture. This proposal was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of April 18, 1980.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. There was no discussion and Professor Parsons moved the previous question, which was seconded and passed. The proposal to limit enrollment in the Landscape Architecture program passed and reads as follows:

Background:

On June 20, 1979, the College of Agriculture circulated the attached proposal to limit enrollment in the Landscape Architecture program.

The proposal was presented orally at the April meeting of the University Senate and has been approved by the College Faculty, the Undergraduate Council, the Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards and the Senate Council.

2.19 Admission to the College of Agriculture, Professional Program of Landscape Architecture.

Admission to the University and the College of Agriculture does not guarantee admission to the Landscape Architecture Program. All applicants must apply to the Landscape Architecture Program Chairman. The number of applicants ultimately admitted is determined by the resources available to provide high quality instruction. Applicants will be reviewed on a comparative basis. Determination of acceptability into the Program is based on the following.

A. ENTERING FRESHMEN

1. Entering freshmen must meet the minimum criteria for admission to the University as specified by the Senate Council.
2. The probability of their success in a professional program in Landscape Architecture shall be predicted by aptitude testing mechanisms. The following are informative tools with reliable forecasts of potential student success:
 - (a) "The Architectural School Aptitude Test"
(section II, III, IV, V, and VII)
 - (b) Watson Glaser "Critical Thinking Appraisal"
 - (c) Differential Aptitude Test "Spatial Relations"
and "Abstract Reasoning"

The faculty continually appraises reliability of these tests and may substitute others as necessary.

3. Students are required to submit statements as to their understanding of the profession of Landscape Architecture and reasons for pursuing this career. In cases of tied or very close scores on the above testing, these statements may be used to determine the greater level of potential success or an interview may be required.

Freshman candidates must submit a formal application to the Professional Program in Landscape Architecture by February 1, for admission to the program in the following fall semester.

B. STUDENTS SEEKING TO TRANSFER FROM DEGREE PROGRAMS OTHER THAN LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Applicants from other programs will be evaluated in order of priority on the following criteria:

1. Candidates must be eligible for admission or readmission to the University according to the specified standards set forth by the Senate Council. The Landscape Architecture program will require a minimum of a 2.0 grade point average (on a 4.0 scale) for eligibility to transfer into the program.
2. The probability of their success in a professional program in Landscape Architecture shall be predicted by aptitude testing mechanisms. The following are informative tools with reliable forecasts of potential student success:
 - (a) "The Architectural School Aptitude Test" (sections II, III, IV, V, and VII)
 - (b) Watson Glaser "Critical Thinking Appraisal"
 - (c) Differential Aptitude Test "Spatial Relations" and "Abstract Reasoning"

The faculty continually appraises reliability and validity of these tests and may substitute others as necessary.

3. Students with a background in related design fields may submit available work such as a portfolio or other work examples as an indication of potential success.
4. Students are required to submit statements as to their understanding of the profession of Landscape Architecture and reasons for pursuing this career. In cases of tied or very close scores on the above testing, these statements may be used to determine the greater level of potential success.

Transfer students must submit a formal application to the Landscape Architecture Program by February 1, for admission to the program in the following semester.

C. STUDENTS SEEKING TO TRANSFER FROM DEGREE PROGRAMS IN LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS

Students in this category will be considered, in order of priority, on the basis of the following criteria:

1. The student must be eligible for admission into the University according to the standards specified by the Senate Council. The Landscape Architecture Program requires a minimum of a 2.0 grade point average (on a 4.0 scale) for eligibility to transfer into the program.
2. A review of the student's portfolio will determine acceptance into the program as well as the level to which they will be accepted.

The combined review of courses completed and the portfolio will determine acceptance into the program as well as the level to which they will be accepted.

Transfer students in this category must make formal application to the Landscape Architecture Program no later than April 15, for admission in the following fall, and not later than September 15, for admission in the following spring semester.

Rationale

Historic Retrospect

Since its inception, the Landscape Architecture Program has been faced with ever increasing enrollment requests. Initial interviews with prospective students, however, have revealed a wide variety of misunderstanding about the difference between Ornamental Horticulture, "Landscaping" (the popular definition for the placement of trees and shrubs) and the profession of Landscape Architecture. Approximately 50% of the interviewees are reoriented during these interviews. The success of those students entering the Landscape Architecture Program is then determined by aptitude and personal motivation.

Architecture 201 and 202 have been used by the Landscape Architecture Program as an introductory design sequence. When the College of Architecture established its limited enrollment status, 25 students per year were accepted from the Landscape Architecture Program. With the help of the Testing and Counseling Center, a series of aptitude testing measures

were implemented to competitively select the 25 students to be accepted into the Program. Those testing mechanisms have been very accurate in predicting the potential success of students in the Landscape Architecture Program. Academic expulsion from the program has been greatly reduced. More important, the personal frustrations and hardships of a highly motivated student with serious aptitudinal deficiencies have been eliminated. Not only has the quality of students steadily increased; so has classroom morale and overall academic achievement.

General

While the greater role of the University is that of extending its educational offerings to as many people as possible; the Landscape Architecture Program must also respond to the ethical and professional roles which its graduates will assume in their relationship with society. As in medicine and other professional fields the qualifications of the graduate are again evaluated by a state licensing procedure to determine eligibility to practice that profession.

The role of the Landscape Architect today is a mixture of the form giving designer a wide array of planning functions involving environmental concerns related to man's stewardship of the land. The University training needed to prepare for this role involves the acquisition of a broad spectrum of knowledge which then focuses on a very intensive studio/project/jury experience where the decision making process and design synthesis are evaluated.

The curriculum typically involves several years of pre-professional training for the acquisition of skills and information needed before the design process can begin. Consequently, a shortcoming in certain aptitudes which may eventually prevent the student from successfully engaging the task of design, may not be detected until the student is well into the third year of the program. Prior to the use of the afore mentioned aptitude screening method, there were a number of students annually faced with the dilemma of changing majors at the beginning of their senior year. It is with the spirit of eliminating these kinds of personal hardships that the faculty of this program recommends the adoption of a restricted enrollment policy utilizing aptitudinal-type testing mechanisms.

The actual number of students to be accepted into the program will be a function of available resources. The studio experience is a very intensive tutorial-type interaction between student and faculty. While there are a number of recommended standards for student/faculty ratios, a studio instructor must be able to spend a minimum of 15 minutes with each student during every class meeting. This guideline limits the number of students which an instructor can assist to 12 during a typical 3 hour studio. Ratios of

more than 12 students per instructor very quickly destroy the studio experience.

Another aspect of resource limits is that of physical space. Studio class time represents approximately one fourth of the actual time spent by students on their design projects. It is therefore critical that each design student have a permanent work station which is available during and after normal class time. In fact, the most recent revision of the American Society of Landscape Architects accreditation standards have made a permanent work station mandatory for all studios beginning with the sophomore year.

As the role of the profession of Landscape Architecture continues to grow in the areas of environmental planning and natural resource management, it is essential that the educational base becomes more comprehensive and technical in nature. The Landscape Architect of the future will have less involvement with a single client and more responsibility in the public arena of environmental manipulation. This change will somewhat diminish the intuitive aspects of the design profession and will emphasize the need for a broader yet specialized knowledge base.

The effectiveness of Landscape Architects in the future will be a reflector of the quality of today's academic program. Ultimately the quality of this Program will be determined by its graduates. It is essential that the resources of the University be made available to those students showing the greatest promise of success. To insure high quality, the availability of resources should govern the growth of the Program. It should be a direct response to student demand. In a recent article in U.S. News & World Report, Landscape Architecture was listed as one of the ten most promising professions. Publicity such as this generally produces a substantial increase in inquiries by prospective students. Over a period of time the demand may generate additional educational resources and program expansion. However, the only short positive effect to be realized is an increase in the quality of students through the use of a selective admissions mechanism.

At present the primary function of the Landscape Architecture Program at the University of Kentucky is undergraduate education. Its success is measured by the effectiveness of graduates and must therefore dedicate its resources to insure standards of the highest quality. The proposed selective admissions policy seeks to use any available means to measure potential for student success in order to eliminate undue hardships evidenced by very high academic mortality rates of many similar programs.

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

The chair again recognized Professor William Wagner for a motion from the Senate Council. Professor Wagner, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposed additions to University Senate Rules, Section IV, 2.0. Admission Requirements, College of Business and Economics. This proposal was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of April 22, 1980.

The Chair recognized Dean W. W. Ecton for the five amendments to the proposal. Dean Ecton said that the proposal which was circulated under the date of April 22, somehow contained the admissions policy as was originally proposed to the faculty of the College of Business and Economics. During that meeting several amendments were made. The changes are as follows:

1. Page 2, under "Transfer applications including. . .", Item 2 should read "2.0 grade-point average of at least 2.5 in the English and pre-major component (see below) taken."
2. Page 2, under Upper Division Admission, the following sentence should be added to the first paragraph: "Admission to lower division does not automatically guarantee admission to upper division."
3. Page 3, Item 1, should read, "Completion of a minimum of 60 semester hours toward a degree program with a minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.5."
4. Page 3, Item 2, should read, "Completion of the English and pre-major component required of all students within the College of Business and Economics with a minimum grade-point average of 2.5 in the English and pre-major component."
5. Page 4, Item 27 under Requirements For Graduation, should read, "A grade-point average of 2.5 in English and pre-major component required by the College."

The Chair said that without objection the amendments would be accepted. There was no objection.

Professor Adelstein made the following amendment:

"This policy will conditionally take effect in the fall semester, 1981. During that semester, the College of Business and Economics shall obtain final Senate approval or terminate its enrollment restriction program. To enable the Senate to decide on the wisdom of this program, the College shall provide such pertinent information about each of the three departments as their student FTE enrollments and faculty-student FTE ratios for the past five years, sophomore grades for the past several years, and recruiting accomplishments and prospects."

Professor Adelstein said that the purpose of the motion was to allow the College to take temporary action to meet its crisis. However, it would force the College to return to the Senate with additional and more recent information as it became available. The Chair asked Dean Ecton if he had any objection to the amendment. Dean Ecton accepted the Adelstein amendment.

The Chair recognized Dean Elbert Ockerman who spoke on the amendment. Dean Ockerman said that if he understood Professor Adelstein's amendment he didn't believe it would do the job that was presently needed. He said that the document which had been circulated quoted certain statistics which the Registrar's Office did not disagree with, and they were prepared to work out procedures whereby the policy could be implemented. However, as anyone could readily see, changing the requirements from a 2.0 to a 2.5 changed the whole ballgame. Therefore, the statistics in the proposal are invalid. Dean Ockerman's contention was that the document as originally proposed and circulated could not be carefully and fully considered by the Senate. Therefore, a new document needed to be prepared based on the proposed new criteria in the amendments submitted by Dean Ecton and the total package be brought back to the Senate at the appropriate time. The Registrar's Office would be glad to work with the College in putting the document together, he added. Dean Ockerman said that he was against the amendment as well as the document as amended by Dean Ecton.

In further discussion, Professor Irwin spoke against the Adelstein amendment. He said that postponing the 2.5 criteria would not postpone the effectiveness of the admissions policy for one year. He said there was no problem in the freshman and sophomore year but in the upper division courses. The 2.5 was aimed at giving the College some relief in the upper division courses.

Professor Jewell wanted clarification as to when the various rules would go into effect. He wanted to know if the proposal was passed immediately would the admissions for the Fall Semester 1981 take effect then and when would the admissions to upper division courses take effect. Dean Ecton responded that the freshman admissions would be effective Fall 1981 and restriction on juniors would be effective Fall 1983. The Chair asked what would be the effect of the Adelstein amendment. Dean Ecton said the College would take another look at the enrollment in the Fall 1981. Professor Jewell said that he still didn't know when the proposal would take effect if the implementation were delayed. Professor Adelstein responded that it would restrict the freshman class of 1981 and transfer students. The Chair said that he interpreted this as anyone on campus would be able to proceed under the old program. Dean Ockerman said that as he saw it the proposal would be implemented in the Fall 1981 unless there were proposals to stagger the implementation. Professor Adelstein said that permitting enrollment to be restricted for the freshman in the Fall 1981 did not allow restriction of juniors and seniors in the Spring 1982.

Dean Ockerman said that he felt the 2.0 would provide relief to the College as demonstrated in the document which was circulated. However, raising the requirements according to a sample of 200 out of 780 freshman applicants who have been cleared for admission for the Fall, would result in 26 percent of the class being denied admission. The figures on transfer students are even more drastic.

Professor Soule asked if the amendment were adopted and at a future date the Senate given an opportunity to reconsider, would the proposal still take effect with the new revised downward grade point average whereby students could select to use the lower g.p.a. The Chair responded that everyone agreed that students had the right to select the new program.

Dean Ecton said that the College faculty amended the proposal and made the g.p.a. 2.5. Before the document was submitted to the Senate Council, a complete study was made on all the existing juniors and on a sample of the Fall 1979 freshmen. They knew what the impact on the existing student body would have been. He added that the faculty

did not just pass the motion, but they had the statistics. There was no further discussion, and the Adelstein amendment failed.

The Chair recognized Student Senator Bolin for an amendment. Senator Bolin said that on the matter of the Business and Economics proposal the complexion of the University was being changed. He asked what the intent and effect of the requirements for graduation were in being added to the requirements for admission. The Chair said that Dean Ecton would have no objection to that part of the amendment.

Senator Bolin proposed the following amendment:

"This measure shall be in force for six years from the date on which it becomes effective."

The amendment was seconded. Dean Ecton did not object to the amendment. The amendment failed to pass. The discussion reverted to the circulation of April 22 as amended by Dean Ecton. Professor Baer asked if the Senate Council in discussing the proposal looked at the impact on Colleges other than the College of Business and Economics. He said that it seemed to him the proposal went much further, and he would like to know what impact it had on Colleges that currently did not have restricted enrollment and wanted to know if the Senate Council had considered it. The Chair said that the answer was no.

Professor Kemp made a substitute motion that the proposal be sent back to the Council for study during the summer and brought back to the Senate in September. The motion was seconded. Professor Jewell said that the document did not state whether it was approved or recommended by the Senate Council or Undergraduate Council. The Chair responded that the procedure was a little different, because the Landscape Architecture program was erroneously sent to the Undergraduate Council. He added that the Senate Council had not considered the proposal and did not do so because the discussion on the Senate floor in April did not indicate any great difficulty and no member of the Senate Council showed any interest in having a meeting. Professor Ivey said that the Council did not have the conflicting statistics when the information was mailed to them. He did not support the motion and was in favor of sending the circulation back to the Senate Council.

There was no further discussion, and the motion passed to return the proposal to the Council.

The proposal as amended by Dean Ecton reads as follows:

ADMISSION POLICY

Admission to the College of Business and Economics

Admission to the University of Kentucky does not guarantee admission to one of the degree programs in the College of Business and Economics. In addition to the requirements for admission to the University, all applicants seeking admission to one of the degree programs within the College of Business and Economics will be considered on the basis of the criteria outlined below. In general, admission depends upon the qualifications and preparation of the applicant, as well as the availability of resources for maintaining quality instruction. The criteria listed below are the minimum requirements common

for all Business and Economics degree programs. Departmental degree programs within the College may have admission requirements in addition to those common for all Business and Economics programs.

In the admission considerations, when personal, academic, professional, or intellectual circumstances tend to discount low academic or American College Test (ACT) scores, admission may be granted if there is other persuasive evidence of both the capability and motivation to undertake successfully a Business and Economics program.

Application must be made for admission to a specific degree program. However, subsequent transfer between programs will be permitted and may be accomplished by applying and satisfying the appropriate degree program criteria.

In all admission categories, an applicant from a non-English speaking country is required to take the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) and must have a minimum score of 550 in order to be considered for admission. (An equivalent score from another English proficiency test similar to TOEFL may be allowed upon request.)

The requirements for all undergraduate degree programs in the College of Business and Economics are divided into an upper and a lower division. The lower division is broadly defined as the first two years of a program and the upper division, the last two years of the program.

Lower Division Admission

High school applicants or transfer applicants with less than 24 college semester credit hours must meet one of the two conditions:

1. An ACT composite score at or above the 50th percentile on national (college bound) norms.
2. An ACT composite score at or above the 35th percentile and an English ACT score at or above the 50th percentile or a Math ACT score at or above the 50th percentile.

Transfer applicants including those from U.K. Community Colleges, with 24 or more college semester hours must meet all of the following minimum admission criteria:

1. Cumulative grade-point average of at least 2.0
2. Grade-point average of at least 2.5 in the English and pre-major component (see below) taken.

Upper Division Admission

Admission to upper division is not conditioned upon being previously admitted to the lower division. However, whenever possible students should seek admission to the lower division because of the counselling and advice made available to lower division students within the College of Business and Economics. Admission to lower division does not automatically guarantee admission to upper division.

The following criteria must be met to obtain upper division admittance in the College of Business and Economics:

1. Completion of a minimum of 60 semester hours toward a degree program with a minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.5.
2. Completion of the English and pre-major component required of all students within the College of Business and Economics with a minimum grade-point average of 2.5 in the English and pre-major component.

Normally students would apply for upper division admission during the second semester of their sophomore year (the semester in which they will have completed the English and pre-major component.)

The English requirements of the College are the same as the University requirements plus English 203. The pre-major component requirements of the College are as follows:

Mathematics 122 and 123 or 113	4 - 6 hours
Accounting 201 and 202	6 hours
Economics 260 and 261	6 hours
Statistics 292, 293, 294	3 hours

19 - 21 hours

3. Submission of an application form which includes an official transcript and a list of courses planned indicating that the English and pre-major courses will be completed prior to taking upper division work.

The application for admission to the College of Business and Economics must be received by the University Office of Admissions no later than April 1 for the summer session, June 1 for the fall semester, and October 15 for the spring semester.

Those students seeking upper division admission who have not completed the minimum number of semester hours or all of the pre-major courses will be permitted to pre-register for upper division courses if they satisfy the minimum grade-point average standards at the time of application and if they are concurrently enrolled in the courses necessary to complete the English and pre-major requirements. But if they fail to meet

all requirements for admission prior to beginning upper division work, their acceptance will be revoked.

While students may defer seeking upper division admission, they should be aware that students who have been admitted will be given first preference in many of the upper division courses offered by the College of Business and Economics.

Requirements for Graduation

To be awarded a Bachelor's degree in any of the fields offered by the College of Business and Economics, a student must meet the following requirements:

1. Completion of the University and College requirements relating to English and General Studies
2. A grade-point average of 2.5 in English and pre-major component required by the College
3. Completion of a minimum of 120 credit hours with a 2.0 grade-point standing
4. Completion of the college core and departmental major with at least 24 credit hours taken in University of Kentucky residence
5. A grade-point average of 2.0 on University of Kentucky residence work in college core and departmental major combined.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary of the Senate

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

April 18, 1980

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday,
May 5, 1980. Proposed additions to University Senate
Rules, Section IV, 2.0. Admissions Requirements.

Background:

On June 20, 1979, the College of Agriculture circulated the attached proposal to limit enrollment in the Landscape Architecture program. The proposal is presented on the first two pages; the rationale follows on pages 3 and 4.

The proposal was presented orally at the April meeting of the University Senate and has been approved by the College Faculty, the Undergraduate Council, the Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards and the Senate Council.

NOTE: If approved, this item will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

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.

/cet

2.19 Admission to the College of Agriculture, Professional Program of Landscape Architecture.

Admission to the University and the College of Agriculture does not guarantee admission to the Landscape Architecture Program. All applicants must apply to the Landscape Architecture Program Chairman. The number of applicants ultimately admitted is determined by the resources available to provide high quality instruction. Applicants will be reviewed on a comparative basis. Determination of acceptability into the Program is based on the following.

A. ENTERING FRESHMEN

1. Entering freshmen must meet the minimum criteria for admission to the University as specified by the Senate Council.

2. The probability of their success in a professional program in Landscape Architecture shall be predicted by aptitude testing mechanisms. The following are informative tools with reliable forecasts of potential student success:

(a) "The Architectural School Aptitude Test" (section II, III, IV, V, and VII)

(b) Watson Glaser "Critical Thinking Appraisal"

(c) Differential Aptitude Test "Spatial Relations" and "Abstract Reasoning"

The faculty continually appraises reliability of these tests and may substitute others as necessary.

3. Students are required to submit statements as to their understanding of the profession of Landscape Architecture and reasons for pursuing this career. In cases of tied or very close scores on the above testing, these statements may be used to determine the greater level of potential success or an interview may be required.

Freshman candidates must submit a formal application to the Professional Program in Landscape Architecture by February 1, for admission to the program in the following fall semester.

B. STUDENT SEEKING TO TRANSFER FROM DEGREE PROGRAMS OTHER THAN LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Applicants from other programs will be evaluated in order of priority on the following criteria:

1. Candidates must be eligible for admission or readmission to the University according to the specified standards set forth by the Senate Council. The Landscape Architecture program will require a minimum of a 2.0 grade point average (on a 4.0 scale) for eligibility to transfer into the program.

2. The probability of their success in a professional program in Landscape Architecture shall be predicted by aptitude testing mechanisms. The following are informative tools with reliable forecasts of potential student success:

(a) "The Architectural School Aptitude Test" (sections II, III, IV, V, and VII)

(b) Watson Glaser "Critical Thinking Appraisal"

(c) Differential Aptitude Test "Spatial Relations" and "Abstract Reasoning"

The faculty continually appraises reliability and validity of these tests and may substitute others as necessary.

3. Students with a background in related design fields may submit available work such as a portfolio or other work examples as an indication of potential success.

4. Students are required to submit statements as to their understanding of the profession of Landscape Architecture and reasons for pursuing this career. In cases of tied or very close scores on the above testing, these statements may be used to determine the greater level of potential success.

Transfer students must submit a formal application to the Landscape Architecture Program by February 1, for admission to the program in the following semester.

C. STUDENTS SEEKING TO TRANSFER FROM DEGREE PROGRAMS IN LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS

Students in this category will be considered, in order of priority, on the basis of the following criteria:

1. The student must be eligible for admission into the University according to the standards specified by the Senate Council. The

Landscape Architecture Program requires a minimum of a 2.0 grade point average (on a 4.0 scale) for eligibility to transfer into the program.

2. A review of the student's portfolio will determine acceptance into the program as well as the level to which they will be accepted.

The combined review of courses completed and the portfolio will determine acceptance into the program as well as the level to which they will be accepted.

Transfer students in this category must make formal application to the Landscape Architecture Program no later than April 15, for admission in the following fall, and not later than September 15, for admission in the following spring semester.

Rationale

Historic Retrospect

Since its inception, the Landscape Architecture Program has been faced with ever increasing enrollment requests. Initial interviews with prospective students, however, have revealed a wide variety of misunderstanding about the difference between Ornamental Horticulture, "Landscaping" (the popular definition for the placement of trees and shrubs) and the profession of Landscape Architecture. Approximately 50% of the interviewees are reoriented during these interviews. The success of those students entering the Landscape Architecture Program is then determined by aptitude and personal motivation.

Architecture 201 and 202 have been used by the Landscape Architecture Program as an introductory design sequence. When the College of Architecture established its limited enrollment status, 25 students per year were accepted from the Landscape Architecture Program. With the help of the Testing and Counseling Center, a series of aptitude testing measures were implemented to competitively select the 25 students to be accepted into the Program. Those testing mechanisms have been very accurate in predicting the potential success of students in the Landscape Architecture Program. Academic expulsion from the program has been greatly reduced. More important, the personal frustrations and hardships of a highly motivated student with serious aptitudinal deficiencies have been eliminated. Not only has the quality of students steadily increased; so has classroom morale and overall academic achievement.

General

While the greater role of the University is that of extending its educational offerings to as many people as possible; the Landscape Architecture Program must also respond to the ethical and professional roles which its graduates will assume in their relationship with society. As in medicine and other professional fields the qualifications of the graduate are again evaluated by a state licensing procedure to determine eligibility to practice that profession.

General: [continued]

The role of the Landscape Architect today is a mixture of the form giving designer and a wide array of planning functions involving environmental concerns related to man's stewardship of the land. The University training needed to prepare for this role involves the acquisition of a broad spectrum of knowledge which then focuses on a very intensive studio/project/jury experience where the decision making process and design synthesis are evaluated.

The curriculum typically involves several years of pre-professional training for the acquisition of skills and information needed before the design process can begin. Consequently, a shortcoming in certain aptitudes which may eventually prevent the student from successfully engaging the task of design, may not be detected until the student is well into the third year of the program. Prior to the use of the afore mentioned aptitude screening method, there were a number of students annually faced with the dilemma of changing majors at the beginning of their senior year. It is with the spirit of eliminating these kinds of personal hardships that the faculty of this program recommends the adoption of a restricted enrollment policy utilizing aptitudinal-type testing mechanisms.

The actual number of students to be accepted into the program will be a function of available resources. The studio experience is a very intensive tutorial-type interaction between student and faculty. While there are a number of recommended standards for student/faculty ratios, a studio instructor must be able to spend a minimum of 15 minutes with each student during every class meeting. This guideline limits the number of students which an instructor can assist to 12 during a typical 3 hour studio. Ratios of more than 12 students per instructor very quickly destroy the studio experience.

Another aspect of resource limits is that of physical space. Studio class time represents approximately one fourth of the actual time spent by students on their design projects. It is therefore critical that each design student have a permanent work station which is available during and after normal class time. In fact, the most recent revision of the American Society of Landscape Architects accreditation standards have made a permanent work station mandatory for all studios beginning with the sophomore year.

As the role of the profession of Landscape Architecture continues to grow in the areas of environmental planning and natural resource management, it is essential that the educational base becomes more comprehensive and technical in nature. The Landscape Architect of the future will have less involvement with a single client and more responsibility in the public arena of environmental manipulation. This change will somewhat diminish the intuitive aspects of the design profession and will emphasize the need for a broader yet specialized knowledge base.

The effectiveness of Landscape Architects in the future will be a reflector of the quality of today's academic program. Ultimately the quality of this Program will be determined by its graduates. It is essential that the resources of the University be made available to those students showing the greatest promise of success. To insure high quality, the availability of resources should govern the growth of the Program. It should be a direct response to student demand. In a recent article in U.S. News & World Report, Landscape Architecture was listed as one of the ten most promising professions. Publicity such as this generally produces a substantial increase in inquiries by prospective students. Over a period of time the demand may generate additional educational resources and program expansion. However, the only short term positive effect to be realized is an increase in the quality of students through the use of a selective admissions mechanism.

General: [continued]

At present the primary function of the Landscape Architecture Program at the University of Kentucky is undergraduate education. Its success is measured by the effectiveness of graduates and must therefore dedicate its resources to insure standards of the highest quality. The proposed selective admissions policy seeks to use any available means to measure potential for student success in order to eliminate undue hardships evidenced by very high academic mortality rates of many similar programs.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

April 22, 1980

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday,
May 5, 1980. Proposed additions to University Senate
Rules, Section IV, 2.0. Admissions Requirements.

Background:

The College of Business and Economics requests the adoption of the enrollment restriction program on pages 1-4. The rationale follows.

NOTE: If approved, this item will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

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.

/gcc

ADMISSION POLICY

Admission to the College of Business and Economics

Admission to the University of Kentucky does not guarantee admission to one of the degree programs in the College of Business and Economics. In addition to the requirements for admission to the University, all applicants seeking admission to one of the degree programs within the College of Business and Economics will be considered on the basis of the criteria outlined below. In general, admission depends upon the qualifications and preparation of the applicant, as well as the availability of resources for maintaining quality instruction. The criteria listed below are the minimum requirements common for all Business and Economics degree programs. Departmental degree programs within the College may have admission requirements in addition to those common for all Business and Economics programs.

In the admission considerations, when personal, academic, professional, or intellectual circumstances tend to discount low academic or American College Test (ACT) scores, admission may be granted if there is other persuasive evidence of both the capability and motivation to undertake successfully a Business and Economics program.

Application must be made for admission to a specific degree program. However, subsequent transfer between programs will be permitted and may be accomplished by applying and satisfying the appropriate degree program criteria.

In all admission categories, an applicant from a non-English speaking country is required to take the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) and must have a minimum score of 550 in order to be considered for admission.

(An equivalent score from another English proficiency test similar to TOEFL may be allowed upon request.)

The requirements for all undergraduate degree programs in the College of Business and Economics are divided into an upper and a lower division. The lower division is broadly defined as the first two years of a program and the upper division, the last two years of the program.

Lower Division Admission

High school applicants or transfer applicants with less than 24 college semester credit hours must meet one of the two conditions:

1. An ACT composite score at or above the 50th percentile on national (college bound) norms.
2. An ACT composite score at or above the 35th percentile and an English ACT score at or above the 50th percentile or a Math ACT score at or above the 50th percentile.

Transfer applicants including those from U.K. Community Colleges, with 24 or more college semester hours must meet all of the following minimum admission criteria:

1. Cumulative grade-point average of at least 2.0
2. Grade-point average of at least 2.0 in the English and pre-major component (see below) taken.

Upper Division Admission

Admission to upper division is not conditioned upon being previously admitted to the lower division. However, whenever possible students should seek admission to the lower division because of the counselling and advice made available to lower division students within the College of Business and Economics.

The following criteria must be met to obtain upper division admittance in the College of Business and Economics:

1. Completion of a minimum of 60 semester hours toward a degree program with a minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.0
2. Completion of the English and pre-major component required of all students within the College of Business and Economics with a minimum grade-point average of 2.0 in the English and pre-major component

Normally students would apply for upper division admission during the second semester of their sophomore year (the semester in which they will have completed the English and pre-major component.)

The English requirements of the College are the same as the University requirements plus English 203. The pre-major component requirements of the College are as follows:

Mathematics 122 and 123 or 113	4 - 6 hours
Accounting 201 and 202	6 hours
Economics 260 and 261	6 hours
Statistics 292, 293, 294	<u>3 hours</u>
	19 - 21 hours

3. Submission of an application form which includes an official transcript and a list of courses planned indicating that the English and pre-major courses will be completed prior to taking upper division work.

The application for admission to the College of Business and Economics must be received by the University Office of Admissions no later than April 1st for the summer session, June 1st for the fall semester, and October 15 for the spring semester.

Those students seeking upper division admission who have not completed the minimum number of semester hours or all of the pre-major courses will be permitted to pre-register for upper division courses if

they satisfy the minimum grade-point average standards at the time of application and if they are concurrently enrolled in the courses necessary to complete the English and pre-major requirements. But if they fail to meet all requirements for admission prior to beginning upper division work, their acceptance will be revoked.

While students may defer seeking upper division admission, they should be aware that students who have been admitted will be given first preference in many of the upper division courses offered by the College of Business and Economics.

Requirements for Graduation

To be awarded a Bachelor's degree in any of the fields offered by the College of Business and Economics, a student must meet the following requirements:

1. Completion of the University and College requirements relating to English and General Studies
2. A grade-point average of 2.0 in English and pre-major component required by the College
3. Completion of a minimum of 120 credit hours with a 2.0 grade-point standing
4. Completion of the college core and departmental major with at least 24 credit hours taken in University of Kentucky residence.
5. A grade-point average of 2.0 on University of Kentucky residence work in college core and departmental major combined.

Background Information for the
Proposed Admission Policy

The following proposed admission policy for the College of Business and Economics is based upon several student-faculty assumptions and statistical analysis. The main assumption is that if enrollment of undergraduate students in the future are unrestricted and continue at the same rate as in the past, the College will be unable to acquire sufficient faculty to meet the AACSB standard for overall adequacy.

The growth rate of student credit hours generated by the College of Business and Economics is a result of two factors. The first is that more students are electing majors in the College of Business and Economics which is reflected by the increasing percentage of the University total enrollment taking courses in the College of Business and Economics. The second factor is that a larger number of non-Business and Economics students are taking courses offered by the College in order to enhance their marketability upon graduation. The geometric growth rate of Business and Economics majors since 1974 has been a little less than 10% per year (984) for fall enrollments.

Another phenomenon that caused the increase in enrollments and student credit hours generated in the College of Business and Economics is the ever increasing presence of the female student. The number of female students has increased dramatically in recent years. The College of Business and Economics growth rate of female students has paralleled the growth rate of females entering the University and there is no apparent reason on the horizon that this will abate. In fact, it appears that

this growth rate will continue to the point that 50% of the students and student credit hours generated will be from the female population.

Another extremely important factor is the availability of new faculty. Even assuming that sufficient financial resources will be forthcoming from the University to acquire additional Business and Economics faculty to meet the increasing demand, it appears that the supply of new people entering the academic profession in the area of Business and Economics will be inadequate. Even when the number of new Business and Economics doctoral students entering the job market were increasing, the number of available positions were growing at a faster rate. Recently, a turn of events has further compounded the problem. Research surveys indicate that the actual number of new Business and Economics doctoral candidates and doctorates is declining. Also the number of new graduate students entering the Business and Economics doctoral programs is declining.

Given these two basic factors - increasing student demand and the diminishing pool of faculty resources available, the present policy of open admission to the College of Business and Economics must be changed in order to maintain accreditation. The course of action which gives the College the best control of the situation is to restrict student enrollment based on the faculty resources available.

The lower division admission standards and the upper division admission standards were developed based upon an analysis of 1979 fall enrollment of freshmen and a three year study of fall enrollments of juniors. Both studies were based upon a random selection process so that inferential estimates could be made.

There were 823 freshmen the 1979 fall semester that indicated that they were College of Business and Economics students. Every third student

was selected after a random start from a printout of fall semester grades. The printout started with those students with a G.P.A. of 4.00 and continued in a descending order. This file was chosen over others because it would allow proportional representation of all grade point averages of Business and Economics freshmen achieved for the semester. The proposal criteria of admission at the lower division level if in effect would have resulted in 45 out of 272 students sampled being rejected. At the 95 percent level of confidence the percentage of freshmen rejected would have been $16.54 \pm 3.61\%$. The proposed rejection criteria does identify rather well potential success. Success in this discussion means achieving a G.P.A. of 2.00 or greater and unsuccessful as less than 2.00 G.P.A. the first semester. Only 13 out of 174 students sampled with G.P.A.'s of 2.00 or greater would have been rejected or in statistical terms $7.47 \pm 3.19\%$ (all intervals are at 95% confidence level) of successful Fall, 1979 freshmen would have been rejected. However, 32 out of 98 or $32.65 \pm 7.61\%$ of the unsuccessful students would have been rejected admission to the College of Business and Economics as freshmen entrants. A point needs to be made here and that is that the students would have been accepted by the University but would not have been allowed to declare themselves as majors in the College of Business and Economics.

However, one must be careful when viewing lower division admission standards as a means of curtailing upper division enrollments and student credit hours generated by the College of Business and Economics. The College of Business and Economics is basically an upper division college. Only five courses are available to University students that have not achieved junior standing. The five courses are Accounting 201 and Accounting 202, Economics 160, Economics 260, and Economics 261.

The three economics courses are available as general study area

courses and are service courses. The Principles of Accounting courses (Acc 201 and Acc 202) are required in several programs within the University and are also service courses for students in other colleges. Also Acc 201 and 202 and Economics 260 and 261 are part of the pre-major course requirements for upper division admission to the College of Business and Economics. As a consequence the student credit hours of these courses will continue to rise even if upper division credit hours generated are held constant. This is based upon the assumption that the demand for admission to the upper division of the College of Business and Economics will continue to increase.

The question then becomes, what is the impact of the proposed admission criteria on upper division credit hours generated by the College of Business and Economics? The proposed criteria will permit acceptances to be held at the level of faculty resources available.

There are two basic criteria for admission to majoring in upper division work in the College of Business and Economics. The first is a general criterion of a 2.00 G.P.A. or higher of all course work taken. This general criterion would reduce the student population in the College of Business and Economics at the junior admission level by 9.48% \pm 4.98%. The second criteria of having a G.P.A. of 2.00 or higher in the pre-major would result in an additional 3.45% \pm 3.10%. The total number of students reduced would be 12.93% \pm 2.91%. In other words, an immediate reduction of 10 to 16% of students entering the College of Business and Economics.

The pre-major criterion is important because it identifies those students that are unlikely to complete programs within the College of Business and Economics. A total of 99 students were dropped the fall semester 1979 because of academic failure to achieve a sufficient G.P.A. of those 99 only 4 students would have met the pre-major criterion. In

other words, the requirement of obtaining a 2.00 or higher G.P.A. in the pre-major and English component prior to admission to the College, identified 95 out of 99 students that ultimately were dropped for academic reasons which is approximately 96 percent of the students that were academically suspended for the second time from the College of Business and Economics.