

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

*University
Senate
5/8/78*

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

April 27, 1978

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet on Monday, May 8, 1978 at 3:00 p.m. in the Court Room of the Law Building.

AGENDA:

- 1) Approval of the minutes of the March 13, 1978 University Senate meeting.
- 2) Chairman's Remarks.
- 3) Proposal to alter the composition of the Graduate Council (see attached under date of April 27, 1978).
- 4) Proposal to change the grading policy in the College of Architecture (see attached under date of April 27, 1978).
- 5) Proposal to establish a new admission policy in the College of Engineering. (Circulated under date of April 21, 1978.)
- 6) For Discussion Only: Report from the Senate Committee on Organization and Structure recommending a University Senate Committee on the Analysis of Resource Allocations (circulated under date of April 11, 1978).

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

/cet

Attachments - 2

Copy 1

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, MAY 8, 1978

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, May 8, 1978, in the Court Room of the Law Building.

Paul Oberst, Chairman, presiding

Members absent: Roger B. Anderson*, C. Dwight Auvenshine, Lyle N. Back*, Harry H. Bailey*, Charles E. Barnhart, R. Paul Baumgartner*, Janis L. Bellack*, Jack C. Blanton, Thomas O. Blues*, Peter P. Bosomworth*, Joseph T. Burch, Gail Burrows, Charles Byers*, Patricia Cegelka, Linda Chen*, Donald B. Clapp, Craig Clark, D. Kay Clawson*, Ronda S. Connaway*, Raymond H. Cox, Marjorie A. Crandall, Donald P. Cross, Patrick P. DeLuca*, George W. Denemark*, William H. Dennen*, David E. Denton*, Donald F. Diedrich, Marcus L. Dillon*, Joseph M. Dougherty, Roland Duell*, Jane M. Emanuel*, Calvin Ernst, Donald A. Falace*, Rick Faust, Chris Fetter, Art Gallaher*, Joseph H. Gardner*, Abner Golden*, Carol Gordon, John L. Greenway, Joseph P. Guiltinan*, Joseph Hamburg, S. Zafar Hasan*, Raymond R. Hornback, Alfred S. L. Hu, Eugene Huff*, Donald W. Ivey*, Margaret W. Jones*, Mark Koopman, James A. Knoblett*, Richard S. Levine, Arthur Lieber*, Austin S. Litvak, Jim Lobb, Paul Mandelstam*, Donna March, Emanuel Mason, Susan A. McEvoy*, Marion E. McKenna*, Dorothy A. Miller*, Phillip W. Miller*, Ernest Middleton, William G. Moody, James H. Newberry, Jr., Jacqueline A. Noonan*, Elbert W. Ockerman*, Merrill W. Packer*, Ronda S. Paul, Bobbie G. Pedigo, Alan R. Perreiah, Jane S. Peters*, Steve Petrey, Phillip Phillips, Jean Pival*, Don Prather, Billy Renner, JoAnn Rogers, Michael Roloff*, Jim Rowe, Ramona Rush*, Kathryn Sallee*, Donald E. Sands*, Mark Sauer, John S. Scarborough*, Jo Schladale, Timothy W. Sineath, Otis A. Singletary*, Tim Skinner, John T. Smith*, Don M. Soule, Ralph E. Steuer*, Anne Stiene-Martin*, Jennifer Stiles, Willis A. Sutton*, Leonard Tipton*, Paula Totten, Harold H. Traurig, Pat Van Houten, M. Stanley Wall, John Wanat, Harry Wheeler, J. Robert Wills, William G. Winter, Judith Worell*, Fred W. Zechman

The minutes of the regular meeting of April 10, 1978, were accepted as circulated.

SUMMARY:

I. Action Items

- A. Proposal to Alter Composition of the Graduate Council
Motion passed.
- B. Proposal to Change Grading Policy--College of Architecture
Motion passed as amended.
- C. Proposal to Establish New Admissions Policy--College of Engineering
Motion passed.

*Absence explained

II. Senate Council Activities and Informational Items

- A. Report on Resolution Against Increase in Out-of-State Tuition
- B. Commencement Exercises, May 13, 1978, 4:00 p.m.
- C. Committee Chairmen Reports

III. Report: For Discussion Only

- A. Report From the Senate Committee on Organization and Structure
Recommending a University Senate Committee on the Analysis of
Resource Allocations

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

1. The item at the Senate meeting on April 10 concerning the out-of-state tuition policy was presented to the Council on Higher Education. The Council was sympathetic and reduced the increase to one-half for next year and said that they would determine later what to do about 1979-80.
2. Chairman Oberst urged the Senators to encourage members of the faculty to attend Commencement Exercises on May 13, 1978, at 4:00 p.m. The number of students and parents attending Commencement is increasing, and the faculty should be well represented.
3. Committee Chairmen should turn in their reports. Even if there is no business to be passed in the form of motions by the Senate, the Senate Council would like to know what the committees did. It would help the newly appointed ad hoc Senate Committee on Structure and Operation of Senate Committees which will study the business of various committees with the idea of determining whether or not some committee reorganization would be a good idea.

The first action item on the agenda was the proposal to alter the composition of the Graduate Council.

Motion was made, seconded and passed to suspend the ten-day circulation rule in order to take up the proposal to alter the composition of the Graduate Council.

Chairman Oberst recognized Professor Daniel Reedy. On behalf of the Senate Council Professor Reedy presented a motion to adopt the proposal to alter the composition of the Graduate Council. (This was circulated on the day of the meeting under date of April 27, 1978.) The proposal reads as follows:

There has been concern by the University Rules Committee and several Colleges within the University about the composition of the Graduate Council in that there are a number of Colleges which have no representation on the Council, nor do their faculty have a vote for representatives

on the Council. In attempting to address this problem, the Graduate Council assumed the present composition of the Council was effected on the basis of number of graduate faculty, number of graduate students, and the number of programs in the college.

The Graduate Council, Graduate Faculty and University Senate Council recommend the following new composition for the Graduate Council:

<u>College:</u>	<u>Elected Members:</u>
Agriculture	1
Arts and Sciences (including Fine Arts)	3
Business and Economics	1
Education	2
Engineering	1
Medicine } Pharmacy } Dentistry }	1
Library Science } Social Professions } Nursing } Home Economics } Allied Health } Communications }	1

In addition, two members would be appointed by the Graduate Dean.

Rationale: The Council bases the new composition on the number of students (Fall, 1976), number of Graduate Faculty (Fall, 1977), and the number of doctoral programs. Doctoral programs were used since with practically each doctoral program there is an associated master's program. Thus, the inclusion of master's programs would have essentially no relative effect on a weighted average.

In order to give some numerical data for comparison, a weighted average is calculated,

$$W = \frac{2D+2F+S}{5} \quad \text{where}$$

D=number of doctoral programs in college

F=number of Graduate Faculty in programs in college

S=number of graduate students in programs in college

Since the University of Kentucky is the major doctoral degree-granting university in the State, D and F are assigned heavier weights.

Current Composition of Graduate Council

Colleges	Students	Grad. Faculty	Current Council Mems.	# of Doctoral Progs.*	Weighted Average
Agriculture	229	149	1	10	109.4
Arts and Sciences	873	303	2	19	303.4
Business and Economics	223	56	1	2	67.8
Education	697	77	2	7	173
Engineering	194	80	1	7	73.6
Medicine	47	93	1	6	
Pharmacy	24	16		2	70
Dentistry	7	19			
Library Science	124	5			
Social Professions	124	12			
Nursing	49	12			
Home Economics	60	19			108
Allied Health	33	2			
Communications	28	11			
Fine Arts	69	23		1	

In addition, three members are appointed by the Graduate Dean.

Implementation Date: Fall, 1978.

*Number of doctoral programs participated in, not actual number offered.

The floor was opened for discussion and questions.

Professor Thrailkill said that he had read the justification and it seemed very reasonable, but the arithmetic did not add up. Because the number of Ph.D. programs is so much smaller than the number of students and faculty, the number of programs has essentially no effect on the weighted average.

Chairman Oberst asked Dean Royster if he would like to speak concerning his arithmetic.

Dean Royster replied that there was an objection to the weights given. He said he didn't know anything to say about it except that the Graduate School and the Graduate Council looked at it and that they had taken the number of doctoral programs in which the various colleges participated and came up with a weighted average but all of it could be thrown out and just make a recommendation. He said there wasn't anything magical about the numbers.

Professor Thrailkill said that the weights don't mean much unless the three groups are normalized, and that the formula used doesn't really carry out the apparent intention of the rationale.

A question was asked about the programs in Fine Arts--whether there was one doctoral program or four.

Dean Royster replied that Fine Arts had been in with Arts and Sciences previously and Arts and Sciences was divided so consequently the Council decided it was best to assign the doctoral area in music.

The motion to adopt the proposed composition for the Graduate Council passed.

The motion was made, seconded and passed to suspend the ten-day circulation rule in order to consider the proposal to change the grading policy in the College of Architecture.

Chairman Oberst recognized Professor Daniel Reedy. Professor Reedy presented the motion to adopt the proposal to change the grading policy in the College of Architecture. This came without the recommendation of the Senate Council. (This proposal was circulated on the day of the meeting under date of April 27, 1978.) The proposal reads as follows:

Proposal: That the grading system employed by the College of Law be adopted by the College of Architecture.

Rationale: There would appear to exist an increasing incidence of frustration and discontent on the part of both the faculty and the student body with respect to the current University marking system in its application to the program in Architecture.

The chief recurring cause of discontent is obvious enough; the clumsiness of the grading system when applied to the core content of the professional program, namely the studio courses, these being large credit courses ranging from 4 to 7 semester hours per studio course whose sum (58 semester hours) is almost one half of the present professional requirements of the College (120) and one third of the credits required for the degree Bachelor of Architecture (176). The quality point value difference between any two letter grades in the prevailing system of marking is one entire grade point per credit hour. As a result, student performance which is somewhat better or somewhat poorer than is represented by an unqualified letter grade (a condition that is more frequently the case than not) simply cannot be acknowledged, being rounded out, upward or downward, in simple letters and translated, for purposes of grade point averaging, into the respective whole number quality point values. Because of the semester credits assigned to studio work such discrepancies in grading occur in rather large increments in Architecture. Their cumulative impact on a student's G.P.A. is too significant to continue to be ignored.

Similar, though less vehement, discontent is also frequently expressed with respect to the grading of the course work comprising the remaining half of the professional program.

The employment by this program of the marking system presently obtained in the College of Law would readily obviate both problems. The College of Law's grading system is set out below together with respective quality point values.

A+	4.3	B+	3.3	C+	2.3	D+	1.3
A	4.0	B	3.0	C	2.0	D	1.0
A-	3.7	B-	2.7	C-	1.7	D	0.7

As is the case with the system employed by all other academic units, a student's grade record is expressed as a G.P.A., computed by multiplying the semester hours of credit for each course by the quality point value of the grade received in the course, these products being added together and the sum divided by the total semester hours attempted.

According to the advice of the Dean of Admissions and Registrar, the adoption of this system for the grading of course work in the College of Architecture would create no significant procedural or computational problem once the proposed change had been initiated.

This proposal does not affect the use of interpretation of the other letter grades included in the University Marking System (i.e., F; I; P; and S), nor will it change the present College requirement that in all studio work in Architecture the minimum passing grade from level to level in the studio sequence shall be a grade of "C."

The floor was opened for questions and discussion.

A Senator asked why it came without the recommendation of the Senate Council and whether or not the Senate Council could agree.

Chairman Oberst replied that the Council could not agree.

Professor Lienhard said that as a member of the Council the reason he voted to pass it on to the Senate was that although he personally disliked it he did not care what the College of Architecture did.

Professor Kemp said that the proposal came before the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, and the Committee approved it in essence but recommended that the A+ be a 4.0 rather than a 4.3. Dr. Kemp's concern was that each college might get a different type of grading system.

Dean Eardley said that the problem first came to his attention two years ago, when he noticed that in almost all cases routine letters to students in architectural studio would refer to their semester grade in plus or minus terms. Conversations with studio faculty resulted in the proposition that the College should adopt either a simple 'Pass/Fail and Distinction' grade for studio work or, since that seemed impractical from a number of points of view, a more elaborate and accurate version of the existing grading system.

Dean Eardley added that the Law School precedent seemed entirely appropriate to the need, and on the advice of the Dean of Admissions and Registrar, the Law School grading system is proposed for all course work taken in the College of Architecture to facilitate administrative clarity and efficiency.

Professor Colton said that it seemed to him that the 4.3 associated with the A+ created a problem and could be avoided if the college were willing to sacrifice that.

Dean Eardley reminded members of the Senate that the overall G.P.A. for the enrollment in the College of Architecture never rises above 2.80, competing with that of the College of Nursing for lowest overall G.P.A. in the undergraduate program. He assured them that the A+ grade would not be used with prodigality, but reserved for those special occasions when a student has not only produced everything that could possibly be expected of him but poetry in addition.

Professor Skelland asked how the proposed grading policy compared with other systems throughout the country.

Dean Eardley replied that the only other system of grading that he was personally familiar with, other than the Pass/Fail/Distinction system, was that used at Princeton, which resembled the Law School system, except that, at Princeton there is a first and a second class "A" grade and each of these can be qualified by plus and minus.

A Senator asked about the University-wide competition such as fellowships where the student would be penalized for getting a minus.

Professor Kemp said that idea had been discussed in the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee and if this were adopted, there probably would be some problems in interpretation among colleges and universities.

Professor Hiatt moved an amendment that the "A+" be deleted from the proposed motion.

The amendment was seconded.

Dean Eardley said that he would reluctantly accept the amended motion.

Professor Adelstein supported the original proposal because it was reasonable and logical, and if it made sense to the faculty of that college, then the college should be given the privilege of having its own grading system, especially in view of the creative nature and small number of students involved in Architecture.

Professor Jewell said that he totally agreed with Professor Adelstein, but he preferred approval of the amendment as a feasible way of getting the motion passed.

Motion was made and seconded to vote on the amendment.

On the vote the motion to delete the "A+" from the proposal passed.

Professor Gabbard asked how it had worked in the College of Law, and the Chairman responded that the working of the A+ grade in Law was irrelevant to the amended motion.

Professor Reedy said that he felt the question Professor Gabbard asked was an appropriate one: that is how the system had worked in the College of Law. He said he was somewhat reluctant to have the system foisted upon another college without knowing how it worked in the College of Law.

Dean Matthews said that he did not know what the incidence of the use of the "A+" was in the College of Law, but he suspected it was quite low. It was his impression that the grading system as a whole has worked very well in the College of Law.

Student Senator Benson asked how it would affect the grade point average of the students already in Architecture and if the previous grades would be adjusted or would they continue on the old system. He also asked if students not enrolled in the college, but taking architecture courses, would be graded according to the proposed new system or the University-wide system.

Dean Eardley replied that the new system would apply to all students receiving grades in all courses in the College commencing Fall 1978, and that it would not be retroactive.

Professor Wilson moved that the proposed grading system be applicable only to the beginning students in Architecture.

The motion was seconded.

A Senator asked if the professor would have to be selective and know what students were beginning students. Dean Eardley responded that each class was different and thus it might apply only year by year.

Vice President Cochran said that he was not sure that the computer could handle a dual grading system. He said that if this action were taken it should be contingent upon this question.

Chairman Oberst asked Dean Matthews if he knew how the numerical grading system had been phased in at the Law School.

Dean Matthews responded that there was an effective date for the change from the numerical system to the letter grade and for an interim period the college operated with two sets of grading systems until those who had begun college before the given date were graduated.

Professor Diachun said that it seemed to him that the computer would be smart enough to figure the grade point standing with or without the plus and minus.

Professor Weil said that he didn't see any particular injustice in having two grading systems on the transcript.

Professor Wilson said there was an injustice because under the proposed system a new student's grade point average has the advantage of being higher.

On the vote, the motion that the grading system go into effect only for the entering class in the Fall 1978 failed to pass.

The vote on the original motion as amended passed.

Chairman Oberst recognized Professor Daniel Reedy. On behalf of the Senate Council Professor Reedy presented a motion to adopt the proposal to establish a new admissions policy in the College of Engineering. The proposal was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of April 21, 1978, and reads as follows:

ADMISSION TO THE COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Admission to the University of Kentucky does not guarantee admission to one of the degree programs in the College of Engineering. In addition to the requirements for admission to the University, all applicants seeking admission to one of the engineering degree programs 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 admission criteria listed below are the minimum requirements common for all engineering degree programs. However, certain engineering programs have admission requirements in addition to the ones common to all programs. These additional requirements are listed separately at the end of the common criteria for admission. Admission recommendations based on these criteria will be made to the Dean by the faculty of the department administering the degree 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 specified 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 to 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.)

In the admission considerations, when personal, academic, professional, or intellectual circumstances tend to discount low academic or ACT scores, admission may be granted if there is other persuasive evidence of both the capability and motivation to undertake successfully an engineering program.

I. Lower Division Admission¹

- A. High School applicants or transfer applicants not covered in
- B. below must meet all the following minimum admission criteria:

¹The lower division of an engineering program leading to a baccalaureate degree is broadly defined as the first two years of the program.

- 1) An ACT composite score at or above the 50th percentile on national (college bound) norms. (However, if the ACT composite is between 35-50 percentile, admission may be considered if the sum of the mathematics and science ACT scores totals 100 or more using national norms.)
 - 2) AN ACT mathematics score at or above the 50th percentile on national (college bound) norms. (High School preparation recommended: 2 units of algebra, 1 unit of geometry, 1/2 unit of trigonometry and 1 or more units of chemistry and physics.)
- B. Transfer applicants with at least 24 college semester credit hours including at least 9 semester hours of mathematics, chemistry, and/or physics applicable to an applicant's degree program must meet the following minimum admission criteria:
- 1) Students from U.K. Community Colleges and other U.K. programs:
 - a) Cumulative GPA \geq 2.0.
 - b) GPA \geq 2.0 in the group of courses made up of the mathematics, chemistry, physics, and English applicable to the degree program.
 - 2) Transfer applicants from other universities and colleges will be evaluated for admission on an individual basis. Evaluation will be based on an applicant's cumulative grade point average on all college work attempted and upon individual grades in English, mathematics, chemistry, physics, and engineering related courses which the applicant may have completed at the time application is made.

II. Upper Division Admission:

Students must be accepted into the upper division of their degree program to be granted an engineering baccalaureate degree from the College of Engineering. Furthermore, students must complete a minimum of 30 of the last 36 credit hours required in their specific degree program after being admitted to the upper division.

² The upper division of an engineering program leading to a baccalaureate degree is broadly defined as the last two years of the program.

A. Admission From Lower Division:

Students enrolled in the lower division of a degree program will progress to the upper division upon meeting the criteria listed below:

- 1) Completion of a minimum of 60 semester hours acceptable toward the degree program with a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.0.
- 2) Completion of the following degree program requirements with a minimum grade point average of 2.0 in;

Freshman English
Freshman Chemistry Course Sequence
Physics Course Sequence
Calculus Course Sequence

B. University of Kentucky Transfer Admissions:

Students in other degree program areas within the College, students identified as being enrolled in a pre-engineering program in a U.K. Community College, and students in other on-campus U.K. Colleges, will be admitted to the upper division on the same basis as II (A) above.

C. Dual Degree Transfer Admission:

Students who have been identified as being officially enrolled in a formal dual degree program (3-2 program) in an institution having such program agreement with the College of Engineering will be admitted to the upper division on the same basis as II (A) above if they are recommended by the program director at their first institution.

D. General Transfer Admission:

A student from outside the University of Kentucky who wishes to transfer to the College of Engineering and be accepted directly into the upper division of a degree program must submit application along with official transcripts showing all college work attempted. Each applicant will be considered on an individual basis and will be admitted based on his or her qualifications and available space in the specific upper division engineering program for which application is made.

Additional Specific Program Admission Requirements:

Civil Engineering and Mining Engineering

- I. B. 2) Space available in the program will also be considered.
- II. A. 2) Include Statics (EM 221) in addition to other already listed required program courses.
 - 3) Earn a grade of C or better in any civil engineering or mining engineering (or equivalent) course used to satisfy a degree requirement.

Electrical Engineering

- II. A. 3) Completion of EE 211, EE 221, and EE 222 with a grade of C or better in each course.

Metallurgical Engineering

- II. A. 2) Include all required courses listed in the first two years of the program, General Studies excepted.

Proposed Implementation Date: Fall Semester, 1978.

The floor was opened for discussion and questions.

Dean Funk said that the objective of this policy was to maintain and improve the quality of the program. He said that the need had become acute, and the enrollment in the College would be higher in the Fall than it had ever been and that the research activity had increased. The faculty, space, and resources have remained constant and are in a serious situation with respect to lab space. The College feels it is important that their students have the proper training. The College's accrediting agency has recommended that the College consider an admissions policy. In a survey of other engineering schools it was found that 2 out of 20 have open enrollment, 13 have restricted enrollments and 5 are limited enrollments. The policy is designed to allow a number of ways of entering the College. The policy has been considered by the faculty of the College of Engineering and they accepted it overwhelmingly.

Professor Weil asked for the distinction between restricted and limited enrollment.

Professor Robe responded that restricted enrollment was where there was a minimum standard for admission and limited enrollment was where there was a limit on the number of students admitted.

Professor Adelstein said that the Council supported the proposal.

Professor Robe said that the College had looked at the past several years to see what the history would have been on the students eliminated from the freshman enrollment by the new policy. Approximately 15 percent of the freshmen, presently admitted, would have been disqualified under the new policy. Furthermore, 85 percent in that category did not remain in the Engineering programs.

Professor Irwin said that he could agree with what the College of Engineering was saying but asked what would happen to the students in that 15 percent category.

Professor Robe said that they might go into another professional college, Arts and Sciences, a Community College or another university.

Professor Lienhard said that the basic advice given to those students was not to go to Arts and Sciences but perhaps to go to Counseling and Testing or some other appropriate place for advice as to what they would be better suited to do.

Professor Longyear said he was told by a former colleague that at some institutions there were math courses designed specifically to eliminate prospective engineers whose I.Q.'s were 90. Professor Longyear felt that this was quite a waste.

Professor Jewell wanted clarification on Page 2, B 1 whether or not the GPA from Community Colleges have to be 2.0 in each of the courses listed, or was the GPA figured collectively. The same question applied to the requirement on Page 3, A 2.

Professor Robe said that the average would be figured collectively.

On the vote, the motion to adopt the proposed admissions policy for the College of Engineering passed.

The last item on the agenda was for discussion only.

The following report from the Senate Committee on Organization and Structure was presented to the Senate as a "discussion" item. This was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of April 11, 1978, and reads as follows:

The Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure recommends the establishment of a Senate Committee on the Analysis of Resource Allocations, effective July 1, 1978. The function of the Committee is to inform the Senate and its Committees of the allocation of resources by examining and analyzing matters concerning budget, space, and services. The Committee should not serve as a policy making body, but will study, when appropriate, such matters as salaries, faculty size and strength, student enrollment, space (including classrooms), equipment, and renovations of space or equipment relevant to academic programs and functions. Members of the Committee should be appointed by the Senate Council from those eligible to vote in elections for membership to the Senate, and should not be representative of any constituency. The Committee should consist of from six to eight members appointed to staggered terms of at least three years.

Rationale: Members of the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure are in unanimous agreement that a need exists for a special Senate Committee to analyze and to interpret for the faculty objective and complete data on the allocation of resources which are relevant to the academic functions of the University.

It is proposed that the membership consist of from six to eight members in order to maintain a committee size which is both small and adequate in number to permit careful study of the several topical areas listed above. The limited membership is recommended in order to provide conditions favorable for personal commitment to the work of the Committee and for group cohesion. In addition, it is considered important that the Committee, as a nonrepresentational body, maintain strict confidentiality of its proceedings until the presentation of its final annual report to the Senate and faculty, at which time its report should be complete, candid, and public.

The staggered three-year terms are recommended in consideration of the need for an extensive period of familiarization with matters of budget by each new member, and in consideration of the obvious benefit to the faculty of the knowledge and judgment acquired over a reasonable period of service to the Committee.

Members of the Committee should be appointed by the Senate Council with a concern for balance among academic units of the University, in order to provide expertise in special areas, and should not represent the needs or interests of any specific academic unit; nor should members make proposals or recommendations pertaining to specific academic units of the University.

It should be emphasized that service on this Committee should involve a major commitment of time, that persons who serve on the Committee should be well established members of the faculty, and that they should have minimal additional service commitment to the University or to a College during the period of service on the Committee.

Professor Jesse Harris gave the following report from the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure.

I wish to present to you today a product of study by the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure. The topic was submitted to the Committee by the Chairman of the Senate Council in March, 1977--more than one year ago. This Senate Committee is the same Committee which reviewed the proposals for an Appalachian Center and for administrative reorganization of the College of Home Economics in 1977.

After considering alternative approaches to the study of the relation of faculty to administration on matters of budget, the Chairman of the

sixteen member Committee appointed, in October 1977, a subcommittee to develop an initial proposal for more intensive study by the full committee.

Members of the Subcommittee on budgetary matters were as follows:

William Wagner, Chemistry, Chairman of the Subcommittee
Donald Leigh, Engineering
William Matthews, Law
Harold Traurig, Anatomy, Medical Center

Additional members of the full Committee are as follows:

Ellen Baxter, Chemistry Library
Alexander Gilchrist, King Library
Andrew Grimes, Business Administration
Rey Longyear, Music
Clayton Omvig, Vocational Education
Patrick Sammon, Oral Biology
Jesse Weil, Physics
William Winter, Orthopedic Surgery
Louise Zegeer, Nursing
Jesse Harris, Psychology, Chairman of the Committee

Although the two student representatives, Eddie Leach and Steve Petrey, participated in the discussions of previous proposals of the Committee, they felt that this topic was essentially faculty business and did not attend the meetings or participate in the vote on the proposal. However, copies of all matters of business pertaining to this proposal were sent to the two student representatives.

During the period of study of the issue, Dr. Leonard Curry, Professor of History at the University of Louisville, was invited to present the five-year history and experience of the Senate Committee on Allocation of Resources at the University of Louisville. Members of the Senate Council were also invited to this presentation on November 7, 1977.

On January 9, 1978, a modified one paragraph statement of the proposal was discussed and approved by the full committee. The rationale, which the Chairman of the Committee was asked to develop, as well as the tentative proposal, were unanimously approved by the fourteen member faculty Committee on January 16.

It was agreed that William Wagner and Jesse Harris should jointly visit the President and each of the five Vice-Presidents, to discuss the proposal, to deliver a copy of the proposal, and to invite each administrator to have an interview with the full Committee in order to convey reactions to the proposal.

In addition to the President, the following Vice-Presidents, whose functions are directly relevant to budgetary matters, appeared before the Committee and provided candid statements of their viewpoints on the proposal during February and March.

Dr. Lewis Cochran, Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dr. Donald Clapp, Vice President for Administration
Mr. Jack Blanton, Vice President for Business Affairs
Dr. Stanley Wall, Vice President for Community Colleges
Dr. Peter Bosomworth, Vice President for the Medical Center

The individual reactions of this total of six administrators of the University of Kentucky ranged from one of cautious, conservative reluctance to endorse the proposal to moderately positive reactions, assuming that the Committee would function in future years as intended in the statements of the proposal. All administrators agreed that it was the right of the faculty to establish such a Senate Committee, and no one questioned the good intentions stated in the proposal or the structural details of the proposed Committee. The concerns expressed by some of the administrators were whether the Committee would maintain the functions intended in the proposal, or would shift through a gradual change of membership to a more representational advocacy body, more intent on participating directly in the budgetary process, and whether the present public communication of the budget was not already adequate.

The positive views of some of the administrators were that such a committee could improve the communication of the budget to the faculty, that it could, in some areas, be helpful to the administration, and that if it functioned as intended, it could strengthen the relationship of mutual support between faculty and administration in the budgetary area.

In addition, four present or former administrative interns, John Stephenson, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Juanita Fleming, Nursing, Daniel Reedy, Spanish, and Richard Robe, Engineering, were invited to a joint interview with the Committee. These four persons had each spent one year in the various administrative offices on campus. Also, Dr. Thomas Brower, Chairman of the Physicians Services Committee concerned with budgetary matters in the Medical Center appeared before the Committee.

Finally, Professors Paul Oberst and Constance Wilson, present and past Chairmen of the Senate Council, were invited to the final review session of the proposal. Professors Oberst and Wilson not only participated in the discussion, but also suggested changes in wording in the proposal, before the final unanimous vote of approval was recorded on March 20, 1978.

As Chairman of the Committee, I was asked to present the proposal to the Senate Council on March 29, 1978. It was decided at a subsequent meeting of the Senate Council to place the item on the agenda for discussion only on May 8, 1978.

The essential features of the proposal are that the small Committee of from six to eight members would analyze and interpret for the faculty the allocations of resources in the areas of budget, space and services. It would not be a policy making body and would not participate directly in the planning of the budget.

Members should not be representational of any constituency. Confidentiality of procedures should be maintained until the annual report is prepared for distribution to the Senate. The President should have an opportunity to review the report before it is published.

Members, appointed by the Senate Council from among persons eligible to vote in elections for membership to the Senate, should have three-year staggered terms-- and, in consideration of the commitment of time, should have minimal additional service commitment to the University or to a College during the period of service on the Committee.

Now that I have completed this formal presentation of the proposal, I wish to add that I, as an individual faculty member, endorse this proposal. When I was first given the topic for study by the Senate Council, I, like some of you who may be sitting in the Senate body today, was neutral. As far as I know, the members of our Committee have felt well treated by the University, and we have regarded ourselves as basically friends and supporters of the administration--not as adversaries. As the study proceeded, however, and as we engaged in lengthy interviews with each of the administrators, it became clear-- as one of the administrators and as the interviewee from the Medical Center stated--that this budget is too complex for any one person to grasp fully. It is very nearly impossible to find out under what rock or stone any single stream of the budget disappears or reappears. If credible individuals have described such complexity of the budget, it seems reasonable and appropriate for credible members of the faculty to attempt to improve the communication of such complexity of the budget.

There is no clear simple way in which an improved communication of budgetary matters can be weighed by cost analysis against the investment of time and study of the six to eight persons who might serve on the Committee. Members of our present Committee include persons in present or past administrative roles, at either the chairmanship or deanship level, and these individuals are well aware of the significance of commitment of faculty time for service on the proposed Committee.

It is not intended to suggest in this proposal that the budget is not well conceived, well portrayed, or well defended. The members of the Committee appreciate the existing commitment to defend the interests of the University. The position of this Senate Committee is that the communication links are not as good as one might suggest, despite the extensive effort and expenditure of energy on the budget. There is still much that is not known and much that deserves analysis and interpretation by a faculty Senate body.

Finally, let me add, on a philosophical note, that this proposal is submitted with the hope and expectation that the Committee will be established in a spirit of collegiality, openness, and mutual trust among faculty and relevant members of the administration, and with relative freedom from concerns with territoriality, or with technical delineation of roles for faculty and administration which might be interpreted as adversary in nature. The proposal has been developed during a period of relative absence of critical issues or of major conflicts of interest on campus. It is believed that the present positive atmosphere is conducive to the creation and mutual support of a Senate Committee which might interpret for the faculty the allocation of resources of the University, and through its intermediary role, provide for effective resolution of more serious problems pertaining to this function should they arise at some unanticipated time in the future.

The proposal is endorsed unanimously by the fourteen faculty members of the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure.

The floor was opened for discussion and questions.

The question was asked about the vehicle that would be used to implement this proposal.

Professor Harris responded that it would be in the form of an annual report after study throughout the year and that the President would have an opportunity to read, review, and be able to react informally before it was published for the Senate and faculty.

The question was asked about the cost.

Professor Harris responded that it would be the cost of the manpower of the six to eight members plus any additional time that the members of the administration would contribute. He added that it would be hard to conduct a cost analysis. No reduction in teaching load and no salary increment would be involved for the committee members.

A question was asked about the three-year term.

Professor Harris said that the reason for the three-year term was that it would require at least one year to become familiar with the budget.

Dean Royster asked what format the report would have and what kind of information would be given to the faculty.

Professor Harris said that it would be general but to some extent would deal with disaggregated data pertaining to budget, including salaries, space, and services which would be broken down by colleges and possibly by departments. Percentages of change, year by year, would be presented for separate categories.

Dean Royster asked if a committee were needed to calculate that.

Professor Smith said that budgets were very complex and the faculty ordinarily would not know to ask questions that should be asked. He didn't feel that the faculty could effectively address academic problems and plan for future enrollment unless they knew something about the money side. He did not feel it was an adversary position.

Professor Harris said that one relevant point is that the Senate is asked to review programs, and when it recommends approval of programs, it must do so, at present, solely on the basis of academic merit.

Professor Zegeer spoke in favor of the proposal. She said that in talking with the administration her impression was that no one felt it was easy but it would give continuity. She said that she did not see it as an adversary function but a worthwhile project.

Chairman Oberst added that the Senate Council had asked him to see Don Clapp, who said that he could give any information asked. Chairman Oberst said that the real question was who was going to focus on questions that needed to be answered.

Dean Royster said that wasn't what he was talking about. Who was going to try to analyze the budget? He felt it would be six times more confusing.

Professor Lienhard said that he was still struggling with the notion that the committee was to have no adversary role; and the whole thing was hard to comprehend if the committee were to have no clear cut adversary role.

Vice President Cochran said there were budgetary requirements in any proposed new academic program.

Professor Diachun said that his impression was that there was no adversary position. He said it was a matter of six or eight people giving up golf, bridge, the comics or whatever to discuss an interest in the financial view of the University. He said that he couldn't possibly see how that would hurt.

Professor Jewell asked for a clarification of the time-table for the committee.

Chairman Oberst said that the committee would not have to be appointed until next Fall. The Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure just wanted to see what the Senate thought some of the problems were.

Professor Zegeer said that when Professor Curry was on campus he said that it was a tremendous amount of work, but very worthwhile and very rewarding.

Professor Wilson said that she thought Professor Curry's committee at the University of Louisville was doing a service for the faculty and a committee here could provide the same service.

Professor Bryant said that he agreed the information was a good thing but he did not feel that this was the objective of the committee and did not feel that this was the best way to get the information to the faculty.

Dean Royster said that it concerned him that we would pattern after the University of Louisville; why didn't we look at some places that had a better organization than we had, and it might be worthwhile to look at other institutions, not just the University of Louisville.

Professor Adelstein said that the University of Michigan had a similar faculty committee and that he could think of no information more interesting and informative about the University than the budget. He said there were all kinds of questions that could be answered from a study of the budget and the faculty committee should analyze the budget and report to the Senate. Such an analysis would indicate the direction of University planning and serve to fulfill the University system of checks and balances.

Professor Colton said that no one could quarrel with the appropriateness of asking questions, but the key to the whole thing for success or failure would depend upon the relationship of the committee to organize with certain key administrators to participate and have certain ground rules for lay people to understand.

Professor Longyear pointed out that there were discrepancies in the way the press reported the budget and the way it actually went down. Secondly, ten or eleven years ago there were financial problems, morale was low, and such a committee would have been helpful then. Third, when such a committee is not present there are no checks and balances.

Vice President Cochran said that a great danger was whether or not the committee would understand the language of the auditors and the people who made budgets. There was a danger that the committee wouldn't have the time to draw the right conclusion and he cautioned the committee to find people who had the energy, time, ability and interest to cut through the maze.

Chairman Oberst said that the committee and the Council had been very well informed by the discussion of the Senate, and should submit a proposal for action by the Senate in the Fall.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Martha M. Ferguson
Recording Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

April 11, 1978

TO: Members, University Senate
FROM: University Senate Council
RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday,
May 8, 1978.

The enclosed report from the Senate Committee on Organization and Structure is forwarded to the Senate as a "discussion" item for the May meeting of the University Senate.

/cet

Enclosure-1

Proposal for a University Senate Committee
on the Analysis of Resource Allocations

The Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure recommends the establishment of a Senate Committee on the Analysis of Resource Allocations, effective July 1, 1978. The function of the Committee is to inform the Senate and its Committees of the allocation of resources by examining and analyzing matters concerning budget, space, and services. The Committee should not serve as a policy making body, but will study, when appropriate, such matters as salaries, faculty size and strength, student enrollment, space (including classrooms), equipment, and renovations of space or equipment relevant to academic programs and functions. Members of the Committee should be appointed by the Senate Council from those eligible to vote in elections for membership to the Senate, and should not be representational of any constituency. The Committee should consist of from six to eight members appointed to staggered terms of at least three years.

Rationale: Members of the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure are in unanimous agreement that a need exists for a special Senate Committee to analyze and to interpret for the faculty objective and complete data on the allocation of resources which are relevant to the academic functions of the University.

It is proposed that the membership consist of from six to eight members in order to maintain a committee size which is both small and adequate in number to permit careful study of the several topical areas listed above. The limited membership is recommended in order to provide conditions favorable for personal commitment to the work of the Committee and for group cohesion. In addition, it is considered important that the Committee, as a nonrepresentational body, maintain strict confidentiality of its proceedings until the presentation of its final annual report to the Senate and faculty, at which time its report should be complete, candid, and public.

The staggered three year terms are recommended in consideration of the need for an extensive period of familiarization with matters of budget by each new member, and in consideration of the obvious benefit to the faculty of the knowledge and judgment acquired over a reasonable period of service to the Committee.

Members of the Committee should be appointed by the Senate Council with a concern for balance among academic units of the University, in order to provide expertise in special areas, and should not represent the needs or interests of any specific academic unit; nor should members make proposals or recommendations pertaining to specific academic units of the University.

It should be emphasized that service on this Committee should involve a major commitment of time, that persons who serve on the Committee should be well established members of the faculty, and that they should have minimal additional service commitment to the University or to a College during the period of service on the Committee.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

*Univ.
Senate
5/8/78*

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

April 21, 1978

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting
Monday, May 8, 1978. Proposal to establish
a new admissions policy in the College of
Engineering.

The College of Engineering, the Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards and the University Senate Council recommend to the Senate the attached Admissions Policy for the College of Engineering.

Proposed Implementation Date: Fall Semester, 1978.

/cet

Attachment

ADMISSION POLICY

ADMISSION TO THE COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Admission to the University of Kentucky does not guarantee admission to one of the degree programs in the College of Engineering. In addition to the requirements for admission to the University, all applicants seeking admission to one of the engineering degree programs 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 admission criteria listed below are the minimum requirements common for all engineering degree programs. However, certain engineering programs have admission requirements in addition to the ones common to all programs. These additional requirements are listed separately at the end of the common criteria for admission. Admission recommendations based on these criteria will be made to the Dean by the faculty of the department administering the degree 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 specified 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 to 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.)

In the admission considerations, when personal, academic, professional, or intellectual circumstances tend to discount low academic or ACT scores, admission may be granted if there is other persuasive evidence of both the capability and motivation to undertake successfully an engineering program.

I. Lower Division Admission:¹

A. High School applicants or transfer applicants not covered in B. below must meet all the following minimum admission criteria:

¹The lower division of an engineering program leading to a baccalaureate degree is broadly defined as the first two years of the program.

- 1) An ACT composite score at or above the 50th percentile on national (college bound) norms. (However, if the ACT composite is between 35-50 percentile, admission may be considered if the sum of the mathematics and science ACT scores totals 100 or more using national norms.)
- 2) An ACT mathematics score at or above the 50th percentile on national (college bound) norms. (High School preparation recommended: 2 units of algebra, 1 unit of geometry, 1/2 unit of trigonometry and 1 or more units of chemistry and physics.)

B. Transfer applicants with at least 24 college semester credit hours including at least 9 semester hours of mathematics, chemistry, and/or physics applicable to an applicant's degree program must meet the following minimum admission criteria:

- 1) Students from U.K. Community Colleges and other U.K. programs:
 - a) Cumulative GPA \geq 2.0.
 - b) GPA \geq 2.0 in the group of courses made up of the mathematics, chemistry, physics, and English applicable to the degree program.
- 2) Transfer applicants from other universities and colleges will be evaluated for admission on an individual basis. Evaluation will be based on an applicant's cumulative grade point average on all college work attempted and upon individual grades in English, mathematics, chemistry, physics, and engineering related courses which the applicant may have completed at the time application is made.

II. Upper Division Admission:²

Students must be accepted into the upper division of their degree program to be granted an engineering baccalaureate degree from the College of Engineering. Furthermore, students must complete a minimum of 30 of the last 36 credit hours required in their

²The upper division of an engineering program leading to a baccalaureate degree is broadly defined as the last two years of the program.

specific degree program after being admitted to the upper division.

A. Admission From Lower Division:

Students enrolled in the lower division of a degree program will progress to the upper division upon meeting the criteria listed below:

- 1) Completion of a minimum of 60 semester hours acceptable toward the degree program with a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.0.
- 2) Completion of the following degree program requirements with a minimum grade point average of 2.0 in:

Freshman English
Freshman Chemistry Course Sequence
Physics Course Sequence
Calculus Course Sequence.

B. University of Kentucky Transfer Admissions:

Students in other degree program areas within the College, students identified as being enrolled in a pre-engineering program in a U.K. Community College, and students in other on-campus U.K. Colleges, will be admitted to the upper division on the same basis as II (A) above.

C. Dual Degree Transfer Admission:

Students who have been identified as being officially enrolled in a formal dual degree program (3-2 program) in an institution having such program agreement with the College of Engineering will be admitted to the upper division on the same basis as II (A) above if they are recommended by the program director at their first institution.

D. General Transfer Admission:

A student from outside the University of Kentucky who wishes to transfer to the College of Engineering and be accepted directly into the upper division of a degree program must submit application along with official transcripts showing all

Page 4

Senate Agenda Item: Engineering Admissions Policy
April 21, 1978

college work attempted. Each applicant will be considered on an individual basis and will be admitted based on his or her qualifications and available space in the specific upper division engineering program for which application is made.

Additional Specific Program Admission Requirements:

Civil Engineering and Mining Engineering

- I. B. 2) Space available in the program will also be considered.
- II. A. 2) Include Statics (EM 221) in addition to other already listed required program courses.
 - 3) Earn a grade of C or better in any civil engineering or mining engineering (or equivalent) course used to satisfy a degree requirement.

Electrical Engineering

- II. A. 3) Completion of EE 211, EE 221, and EE 222 with a grade of C or better in each course.

Metallurgical Engineering

- II. A. 2) Include all required courses listed in the first two years of the program, General Studies excepted.

/cet

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

April 27, 1978

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday,
May 8, 1978. Proposal to change the grading policy
in the College of Architecture.

The attached proposal that the grading system employed in the College of Law be adopted by the College of Architecture was approved unanimously by the faculty and elected student representatives, and is forwarded by the Senate Council to the Senate "without recommendation."

/cet

Attachment

Attachment

Page 2

Agenda Item: University Senate Meeting, Architecture Grading Proposal
April 27, 1978

Proposal: That the grading system employed by the College of Law be adopted by the College of Architecture.

Rationale: There would appear to exist an increasing incidence of frustration and discontent on the part of both the faculty and the student body with respect to the current University marking system in its application to the program in Architecture.

The chief recurring cause of discontent is obvious enough; the clumsiness of the grading system when applied to the core content of the professional program, namely the studio courses, these being large credit courses ranging from 4 to 7 semester hours per studio, whose sum (58 semester hours) is almost one half of the present professional requirements of the College (120) and one third of the credits required for the degree Bachelor of Architecture (176). The quality point value difference between any two letter grades in the prevailing system of marking is one entire grade point per credit hour. As a result, student performance which is somewhat better or somewhat poorer than is represented by an unqualified letter grade (a condition that is more frequently the case than not) simply cannot be acknowledged, being rounded out, upward or downward, in simple letters and translated, for purposes of grade point averaging, into the respective whole number quality point values. Because of the semester credits assigned to studio work such discrepancies in grading occur in rather large increments in Architecture. Their cumulative impact on a student's G. P. A. is too significant to continue to be ignored.

Similar, though less vehement discontent is also frequently expressed with respect to the grading of the course work comprising the remaining half of the professional program.

The employment by this program of the marking system presently obtaining in the College of Law would readily obviate both problems. The College of Law's grading system is set out below together with respective quality point values.

A+	4.3	B+	3.3	C+	2.3	D+	1.3	E	0
A	4.0	B	3.0	C	2.0	D	1.0		
A-	3.7	B-	2.7	C-	1.7	D-	0.7		

As is the case with the system employed by all other academic units, a student's grade record is expressed as a G. P. A., computed by

Page 3

Agenda Item: University Senate Meeting, Architecture Grading Proposal
April 27, 1978

multiplying the semester hours of credit for each course by the quality point value of the grade received in the course, these products being added together and the sum divided by the total semester hours attempted.

According to the advice of the Dean of Admissions and Registrar, the adoption of this system for the grading of course work in the College of Architecture would create no significant procedural or computational problem once the proposed change had been initiated.

This proposal does not affect the use of interpretation of the other letter grades included in the University Marking System (i.e., F; I; P; W; and S), nor will it change the present College requirement that in all studio work in Architecture the minimum passing grade from level to level in the studio sequence shall be a grade of "C".

/cet