

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

30 September 1985

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet in regular session on Monday, October 14, 1985, at 3 p.m. in ROOM 116 of the THOMAS HUNT MORGAN BUILDING.

AGENDA:

1. Minutes of 9 September 1985.
2. Resolutions.
3. Chairman's Announcements.
4. Annual Report of Faculty Trustee (Professor Jim Kemp)
5. ACTION ITEMS:
 - a. Proposal to amend Section I, 2.2.3 of the University Senate Rules to add Director of Undergraduate Admissions to the list of ex officio, non-voting members of the University Senate. (Circulated under date of 27 September 1985.)
 - b. Proposal to amend Section I, 3.1.2 of the University Senate Rules to limit elected faculty membership on the Senate Council to no more than eight from any sector. (Circulated under date of 25 September 1985.)
 - c. Proposed changes in Section V, 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 of the University Senate Rules pertaining to class attendance, completion of course assignments, and excused absences. (Circulated under date of 26 SEptember 1985.)

Randall Dahl
Secretary

/cet
0761C

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, OCTOBER 14, 1985

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:05 p.m., Monday, October 14, 1985, in room 116 of the Thomas Hunt Morgan Building.

Bradley C. Canon, Chairman of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent: Frank Allana, R. A. Altenkirch*, Charles T. Ambrose, Charles E. Barnhart, Susan M. Belmore, Raymond F. Betts, Dibaker Bhattacharyya*, Tex Lee Boggs, Peter P. Bosomworth, Daniel J. Breazeale, D. Allan Butterfield*, Emmett Costich*, George F. Crewe*, Kenneth W. Davis, Stephen C. Deger*, Leo S. Demski*, Robert Dennis, Marcus Dillon, Richard C. Domek*, Herbert N. Drennen, Paul M. Eakin*, Anthony Eardley, Stanley Feldman, Wilbur W. Frye, Richard W. Furst, Fletcher Gabbard, Art Gallaher, Jr.*, Marilyn D. Hamann*, Robert E. Hemenway*, Donald Hochstrasser, Alison Hodges, Raymond R. Hornback, Gregg Hovious, Alfred S. L. Hu, Susan Johnson, John J. Just, Jay T. Kearney, Robin Lawson, Robert G. Lawson, Edgar D. Maddox, Paul Mandelstam*, Kenneth E. Marino*, Patrick J. McNamara, H. Brinton Milward*, Michael T. Nietzel, Robert C. Noble*, Merrill W. Packer*, Richard Perkins, Leonard K. Peters*, Robin D. Powell, Peter Purdue, Frank J. Rizzo*, Thomas C. Robinson, Gerald A. Rosenthal, Charles Sachatello, Edgar L. Sagan, Timothy Sineath, Otis A. Singletary, Marcia Stanhope*, Louis Straub*, Kenneth R. Thompson, Marc J. Wallace, Constance P. Wilson

Approval of the Minutes of September 9, 1985, was postponed until the meeting of November 11, 1985.

The Chairman made the following remarks:

"I want to make one announcement which concerns the results of the Senate Council Nominating Ballot. The senators who received sufficient votes to be on the second ballot are Charles T. Ambrose, Emmett Costich, Robert E. Hemenway, William E. Lyons, Loys T. Mather, Madhira D. Ram, and James H. Wells. There will be three elected to take office in January. The ballot will be distributed in the next week.

Let me make a few remarks on the progress of the Swift Committee Report. As you know, it recommended significant revisions in the General Studies Curriculum. The committee issued this report last April and it has received wide distribution around campus. Last month the Senate Council asked all persons wishing to comment on the Swift Committee recommendations to do so by early October. Nine faculty members as well as some members of the Swift Committee spoke to the Senate Council on October 2, and the Council has received another half dozen or so communications in writing. Most of these persons have suggested some changes in the Swift Committee proposals. Some are relatively minor and some are of major consequence. The major ones pertain to (1) reducing the number of hours in the general studies program, (2) eliminating the language requirement, (3) delaying the cross-disciplinary component and allowing for more technical and information courses to be put in the cross-disciplinary component and (4) delaying the cross-cultural course component.

*Absence Explained

The Senate Council will consider these suggested amendments and other comments we have received and will meet this coming Wednesday, October 16. I doubt if we will finish our deliberations this Wednesday given the magnitude of the importance of the proposed changes in the Swift committee report and we will probably spend most of our scheduled meeting on October 30 also considering the comments and suggested changes in the Swift Committee proposed requirements. We will also need to consider the feasibility report which we have received from Chancellor Gallaher. Perhaps we can finish on the 30th and circulate the report to the Senate as an action item in time for the November 11 Senate Meeting. However, it is likely that other pressing Council business or delays in resolving some of our questions related to the general studies requirements will make it impossible to get the exact language of the Swift Committee Report and Senate Council suggested changes, if any, to the floor in time for the November Meeting. If that becomes the situation, we plan to have the Swift Committee revisions and some of the suggested alternatives put on the agenda for the November meeting as a "For Discussion Only" item. I know the Senate briefly discussed the Swift Committee Report last April, but at that time the report had been circulated only to Senators and only very recently. It had not yet been distributed to the faculty or to the students in general. Moreover, nearly all of this year's student senators and one-third of the faculty senators are newly elected and thus were not privy to last April's discussion. Beyond that, none of the suggested alternatives to the Swift Committee's recommendations had yet been formulated or advanced. For this reason a "For Discussion Only" session next month, if it comes to that, would make consideration of the proposal revisions as an action item in December much easier.

The Chairman recognized Professor James Kemp, one of the two faculty members serving on the Board of Trustees. It is traditional for an annual report to be given at the October Senate Meeting by one of the two trustees. The other faculty Board member is Professor Constance Wilson.

Professor Kemp's remarks follow:

"I appreciate this opportunity to report the activities of the faculty members, Connie Wilson and myself, on the University of Kentucky Board of Trustees. This has been a rather busy and interesting year for the Board.

As review I might state that Faculty Trustees have all the privileges of the non faculty trustees except to vote on salaries. Since individual salary figures for the faculty never come to the Board, although they would be available if we asked for them, this does not pose much of a restriction.

The Board meets either in full or in executive committee ten times a year with four meetings being statutory meetings. All members are invited to the Executive Committee meetings and may participate in discussions but only the Executive Committee has voting privileges. Occasionally, an Executive Board Meeting may be cancelled and occasionally an extra meeting of the full board or the Executive Committee may be called. This happened earlier this year when the Department of Energy decided to not renew its contract with the IMMR.

The Board has several standing committees and ad hoc special committees. Two special committees on which I have served this year were the so-called "Merger Committee" in which we studied the situation, conducted hearings and made a recommendation on the feasibility of merging the governing boards of the University of Kentucky and the University of Louisville. As you know, our recommendation was against the merger.

The second special committee in which I was involved dealt with an investigation of the reasons why the Department of Energy cancelled its contract with the University's Institute of Mining and Minerals Research (IMMR) to conduct research for the D.O.E. We interviewed various UK administrators, former administrators, D.O.E. personnel, etc., to get various viewpoints. The committee worked "after the fact" so we were not attempting to get the contract back for this year but were attempting to find reasons for the cancellation and to possibly recommend that guidelines be established that would help prevent such actions in the future. We delved into the reason for the management decision that Mr. George Evans made to sever the relationships between UK and the D.O.E. The report of this committee is part of the minutes of the September meeting of the Board of Trustees.

In addition to the regular meetings and committees of the Board, Connie and I are busy in other ways. We are on an advisory committee to the Council on Higher Education. The committee is more advisory in name than in function. We have had a few meetings at the Council's office in Frankfort. These usually consist of briefings by the staff of the CHE. Several meetings have been scheduled and then cancelled. We have the feeling that they don't really want advice.

We also are invited to and expected to attend various University and off-campus functions including ground breaking ceremonies (example - the Gluck Equine Research Center) dedication of buildings (example - the Sturgill Development Building), receiving of gifts (example - the Gaines gift for the Humanities and Honors Program), public meetings, such as the annual banquet of the conference on Christians and Jews, the Chamber of Commerce Banquet when UK was the honored "Business of the Year" and the pre-homecoming game banquet of the Alumni Association. We are also involved in pre-athletic events, such as helping host the members of the legislature, meetings with U of L trustees prior to UK - U of L basketball games.

We are asked to participate or are given the opportunity to express our opinion on various topics. For example, Connie recently appeared before and gave a report to the CHE at their public hearing when they were discussing the proposed strategic plan for higher education. Subsequent to the last board meeting I was on the "hot seat" when the Ag Student Council had a meeting to discuss the possible sale of Coldstream Farm and the effect it might have on the teaching program in the College of Agriculture. We get a lot of calls, questions and suggestions on various things - one of the latest is the effect of the proposed revision in the General Studies Component of the Curriculum on various academic programs. Since the faculty trustees are ex officio members of the Senate Council and the Senate, they are questioned on this from more than one angle.

One of the things I enjoyed when I was first on the Board was the pre-Board meeting luncheons where we looked at the agenda and had open and often controversial discussion on various issues. The press was not present so the discussion was open and off-the-record. Since the "Sunshine Law" requires that such meetings be open to the public the discussions now deal mostly with "small talk" and friendly banter.

As a faculty member of the Board I have been impressed by the dedication and loyalty of the various members of the Board. They take their work seriously and work for the good of the University. It is interesting to know that successful business people, who have slightly more financial resources than most faculty, still have worries and problems and still are good red-blooded Americans and Kentuckians just like the rest of us. I believe the University is in good hands with its trustees.

I've enjoyed visiting with you and will respond to questions if you have them."

There were no questions from the floor and the Chairman thanked Professor Kemp.

The Chairman asked Professor Ward Crowe, a member of the Senate Council, to make the Senate Council motions for the Chairman-elect, Professor Wilbur Frye. The Chair recognized Professor Crowe for the first action item on the agenda which was the proposal to amend Section I, 2.2.3. Professor Crowe, on behalf of the Senate Council, moved to amend the University Senate Rules to add Director of Undergraduate Admissions to the list of ex officio, non-voting members of the University Senate. This proposal was circulated to members of the senate under date of September 27, 1985.

The Chairman indicated that this proposal would amend both the University Senate Rules and Part IV of the Governing Regulations which specifies the composition of the University Senate. Therefore, if passed, it would not be implemented until approved by the Board of Trustees.

Professor Rea pointed out that line eight under "Voting" should be "Deans" rather than "Dean." The Chairman agreed to the editorial change.

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

Proposal: [addition is capitalized and underlined]

2.2.3 Ex Officio Membership

Voting:

The ex officio voting members shall number 12. In academic years beginning with an even number (e.g., 1982-1983, 1984-1985), this group shall be composed of the following: Chancellor for the Medical Center, Vice Chancellor for Research and dean of the Graduate School, Director of Libraries, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for the Lexington Campus, and Deans of

the Colleges of Allied Health Professions, Architecture, Communications, Dentistry, Education, Engineering, Law, and Social Work. In academic years beginning with an odd number, the ex officio voting members shall be the following: Chancellor for the Lexington Campus, Chancellor for the Community College System, the President of the Student Government Association, and the Deans of the Colleges of Agriculture, Arts and Sciences, Business and Economics, Fine Arts, Home Economics, Library and Information Science, Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy. (US:10/12/81 and BofT:4/6/82)

Non-Voting:

The ex officio non-voting membership shall include the President, all other vice presidents, University System Registrar, DIRECTOR OF UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS, Dean of University Extension, Dean of Students, Professor of Military Science, Professor of Aerospace Studies, and, if they are not already elected members of the Senate, the University System faculty members of the Board of Trustees, the Academic Ombudsman, the Director of the Honors Program, and the chairmen of the University Senate Committees, including University Senate Advisory Committees. All officials mentioned in the preceding paragraph who are not voting ex officio members in any year shall be considered non-voting ex officio members. Other ex officio non-voting members may be added by the University Senate Council for the purpose of supplying information and viewpoints on problems considered by the Senate. Ex officio non-voting members shall enjoy all privileges of the elected membership except the right to vote. (US:10/12/81 and BofT:4/6/82) (US: 12/10/84)

Background:

The former office of Registrar and Dean of Admissions has been divided into two separate offices: Registrar and Director of Admissions. The Registrar continues to serve as the Secretary of the University Senate and as an ex officio non-voting member. The proposed addition will simply formalize the ex officio non-voting status of the Director of Admissions.

Implementation Date: Upon approval by the Board of Trustees.

The Chair recognized Professor Ward Crowe. Professor Crowe, on behalf of the Senate Council, moved to amend Section I, 3.1.2 of the University Senate Rules to limit elected faculty membership on the Senate Council to no more than eight from any sector. This proposal was circulated to members of the senate under date of September 25, 1985.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Professor Rea wanted to know if "sector" was defined. The chair said sector was defined in the Governing Regulations. A senator wanted an explanation of what the sectors were. The Chairman said the Lexington Campus was one sector and the Medical Center was the other sector and basically the proposal was to insure minimal

representation from both sectors. Professor Gesund wanted to know what an appointed member was. Chairman Canon said if a member resigned prior to the end of his/her term the chair of the Senate Council is obligated to appoint the person who got the next highest number of votes in the preceding election. The chair said there was no discretion involved in the appointment.

There was no further discussion and the motion to adopt the amendment to the Senate Rules passed unanimously and reads as follows:

Proposed addition is capitalized and underlined below

3.1.2 Composition

The Senate Council shall be composed as follows: the elected membership shall include nine (9) members chosen by and from the faculty membership of the University Senate and two (2) members elected by and from the newly elected student membership of the University Senate; the student and faculty members of the Board of Trustees, who, if they are not elected members of the Senate, and the immediate past Chairman of the Senate Council shall be ex officio non-voting members. Six elected members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. (US: 10/10/77)

(a) Elected Faculty Membership

Eligibility for Membership--Any elected member of the Senate (or person appointed to replace an elected member) whose term of office has not expired at the time of the election shall be eligible for election to the Senate Council, except that no more than three of the elected members of the Council shall be from any one college, NOR EIGHT FROM ANY ONE SECTOR. Council members are not eligible to succeed themselves until a lapse of one year from the expiration of their terms, except that appointed members who have served no more than one year, if otherwise eligible, may be eligible for election. The duration of the term of membership on the Council shall not be affected by the member's term on the Senate.

If at any time during the term of a member of the Council he or she should become ineligible for membership in the Senate, his or her position on the Council shall be declared vacant.

Rationale:

The Senate Council proposes that Section I-3.1.2(a) of the Senate Rules be amended to insure that at least one member of the Senate Council come from the Medical Center Campus and one from the Lexington Campus. There is some danger of the Medical Center not being represented on the Council at some future point, perhaps as early as next spring. There are currently two members from the Medical Center, however, one's term expires this fall and the other has indicated his intention to take leave from the University at the end of the fall.

For both symbolic and practical reasons, it is important to have Medical Center representation on the Council. Since roughly 30% to 40% of the Council's business relates to the Medical Center, the advice and counsel of members from that sector are needed. In addition, with the separation of UK into two sectors and with the CHE considering an option of completely separating the Medical Center from the UK system, arguments for a separate Medical Center Senate or even for complete detachment of the Center will be enhanced if it is not represented on the Council.

Generally, the Medical Center has had at least one member on the Council and at times even two or three. (However, in 1973, there was no Council member from the Medical Center.) To insure continued minimal representation, the Senate Council proposes amending Rule I-3.1.2 (a) to insert the wording: "nor eight from any one sector" in the eligibility paragraph. This language fits in with the existing spirit of the paragraph which encourages a diversity of representation on the Senate Council through limiting the membership from a particular college, but does not seek strict proportional representation.

Proposed Implementation: Immediately.

The Chair recognized Professor Ward Crowe. Professor Crowe, on behalf of the Senate Council, moved adoption of the proposed changes in Section V, 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 of the University Senate Rules pertaining to class attendance, completion of course assignments, and excused absences. This proposed change was circulated to members of the senate under date of September 26, 1985. Professor Crowe said that at the present time there is no rule which recognizes a student's illness or death in the immediate family as a reason for missing class. He felt that is the prime motivation behind the proposed change.

The Chair recognized Professor Charles Byers, the Ombudsman, who gave some background about the problems the Office of the Ombudsman has had with the student complaints about the lack of an absence policy.

Professor Byers' remarks follow:

Professor Byers said Frankie Garrison had done the work but he was the one that got to present the report. The Office has had a total of forty-six complaints from students over the last two years related to absences. He did not know how many were made to faculty or how many did not go to the Ombudsman's Office. Out of those forty-six the office classified twenty-four (24) into medical or emergency types of complaints. There were four (4) complaints that related in the area of death. There were ten where the instructor had a set absence policy, but still some difficulty arose even though there was in the syllabus a criteria. There were three where there was a University policy and those related to band and trips. There

were five (5) where the instructor had a policy but still difficulties arose. Five (5) were in the area of athletics. There was one complaint in the area of test conflict, one on a religious holiday and three (3) where there was no set policy on attendance by the instructor of any kind, yet the instructor attempted to penalize the student for having missed class. He said a lot of variations could be found in attendance policies. He felt the problem many times was communications. He said out of the forty-six (46) cases in which his office was involved, twenty-one (21) of the students were allowed to make up the work that was in question. Professor Byers said that was a general summary of the past two years as the Ombudsman's Office indicated.

The Chairman thanked Professor Byers for his report and Frankie Garrison for compiling the figures.

The Chairman recognized Student Senator Kathleen Ashcraft for an amendment to the proposed absence policy. Senator Ashcraft moved to delete the word "required" in the third paragraph of 2.4.2. The amendment was seconded. The sentence would read:

"The student shall be given the opportunity to make up exams missed due to an excused absence during the semester in which the absence occurred."

Ms. Ashcraft urged the adoption of this amendment by pointing out that if the word "required" remained in the sentence, the provision would not apply to students who missed an examination because of an excused absence in a class in which students could drop the exam with the lowest grade from the final grade calculation. She said that Senate Rule V, 2.4.6, which applies to common examinations, permits students to make up all examinations missed because of an excused absence and that it is unfair to have one policy for common examinations and another for other examinations. There was no further discussion on the proposed amendment, and it carried on a voice vote.

Professor Gesund felt there was a problem in stating "The student shall be given the opportunity" when it was impossible to make up an exam. He felt the words "if feasible" should be inserted. Student Senator John Cain said that a professor could give an "I" so that the work could be made up anytime within the next year. Professor Gesund said as the proposal was presently worded, that would not work.

Professor Gesund moved an amendment to insert the words "if feasible" to the sentence which would then read:

"The student shall, if feasible, be given the opportunity to make up exams. . ."

The amendment was seconded. In the discussion which followed, Professor Wood asked Professor Gesund if he would be willing to move "if feasible" to the end of the sentence. Professor Gesund agreed. Student Senator Todd Osborne felt an exam on the last day of finals would be taken care of in the proposal because the last paragraph stated that an instructor shall counsel the student about the options of an "I" grade or withdrawal from the course for that semester. Professor Shaw was concerned about the "if feasible"

phrase in whether or not it gave too much freedom to the faculty. Professor Crowe spoke against the amendment and felt adding "if feasible" allowed too much leeway. He said the Senate Council had deliberated in formulating the proposal and felt that with reasonable faculty and reasonable students there would be no problems. Professor Wood said the reason she wanted "if feasible" at the end of the sentence was exactly Professor Crowe's reason. She felt students should be allowed to make up the work. By moving "if feasible" to the end of the sentence it would apply to the semester. Her intent was to have the "if feasible" apply to the timing of a make up, not to the option of the instructor.

Professor Gesund felt that the last paragraph did not handle the problem of a last day exam because it simply stated "the instructor shall counsel the student about the options of an "I", but it does not say that the student must accept an "I" or withdrawal from the course which means if a student misses such an exam, the student could demand to have an exam on the day grades are due. Professor Gesund said he did not want to be in violation of Senate Rules when it was physically impossible to comply.

Professor McMahon said a solution to the various problems which were expressed might be to have a qualified right to make up a final exam sometime during the next semester with a mandatory "I" which might solve everyone's problem.

Professor Gesund moved to postpone action on the amendment. Parliamentary Blyton ruled that action could not be postponed on an amendment without postponing the entire package. Professor Gesund moved to postpone the proposal and amendment until the following meeting in November. The motion was seconded. A senator asked whether discussion of the absence policy would have to cease if the motion to table carried. The Chair ruled that discussion of the proposed policy could continue, but that no motions could be entertained. A consensus was reached to continue consideration of the absence policy on a discussion-only basis if the motion carried. In a hand count of 34 to 16 the motion carried.

In the discussion which followed Professor Barclay said she found a problem at the top of page 3, second paragraph, that stated "four or more excused absences." In some once a week classes four absences would be more than one-fourth of the semester. Professor Barclay did not know the answer, but she felt something better should be written. Professor Ram felt a policy should be established for students who were missing because of religious reasons or death in the family. He felt students should make arrangements in advance of absences.

Professor Germain agreed with Professor Ram and said he was pleased that the proposal had been postponed. He was concerned about the purposeful exclusion of the observance of religious holidays from the proposed absence policy. He felt exclusion was contrary to the philosophy of UK. His two main concerns were that faculty might not always be reasonable and sometimes minorities are treated insensitively. He hoped faculty would rarely rebuff students for missing classes for a religious holiday. Another problem he saw was intimidation. He felt it was difficult for students to approach faculty concerning an absence due to a religious reason. Professor Germain recommended that the Senate Council consider the proposal carefully, perhaps

with a stated policy that religious services were recognized excuses and that faculty members on the first day or two of classes enunciate that and invite students to let them know.

Professor Mather had a concern about the length of time a student had to notify an instructor about an absence. He said it was an inconvenience when a student might wait several weeks before telling an instructor why he/she was absent. He thought it would be helpful to have a specific period of time.

Professor Stelling supported the interest in adding religious holidays in the document. Her other area of concern was being too specific in Section 2.4.2 in listing exact relation of family or else "grandparent" should be added. She felt adding "grandparent" should definitely be considered.

Professor McMahon endorsed Professor Germain's suggestion to give serious consideration in including religious holidays in excused absences. He recognized there would be some administrative difficulty in formulating a rule, but he felt in the interest of fairness, it would be well worthwhile to face that administrative difficulty.

Chairman Canon, on behalf of the Senate Council, asked that someone proposing the religious holidays offer specific wording for consideration. Professor Crowe said in his opinion the Senate Council had a feeling of agreement that religious holidays should be included. The Council did not seem to know where to draw the line and noted that one Council member said it was like "opening a can of worms" to include religious holidays. Professor Crowe welcomed suggestions from anyone. Professor Leigh felt if religious holidays were included the student should notify the instructor the first few days of class which holidays he/she would have so the instructor can keep a record. That might solve some problems and give time to check the validity of the holiday.

Professor Gesund saw no reason why trips in Section 2.4.2.3 should not read: "Student shall notify the instructor prior to the absence." He felt the section should further state: "The instructor may require prior formal notification from appropriate University personnel....." He thought trips should be handled prior to the event. Chairman Canon said that paragraph was the current existing rule, and it was incorporated without major change. He stated the paragraph could be changed.

There was no further discussion and the meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Randall W. Dahl
Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

753

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

5 September 1985

#135

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, University Senate Council

FROM: Bradley C. Canon, Chairman *BCC*

RE: Change in Senate Rules to Guarantee Medical Center Campus Representation on Senate Council

I am proposing that Section I-3.1.2 (a) of the Senate Rules be amended to insure that at least one member of the Senate Council come from the Medical Center Campus and one from the Lexington Campus. I think there is some danger of the Medical Center not being represented on the Council at some future point, perhaps as early as next spring. We currently have two members from the Medical Center, but Don Hochstrasser's term expires this fall and Doug Rees has indicated that he intends to take leave from the university at the end of the fall.

For both symbolic and practical reasons, it is important to have Medical Center representation on the Council. Roughly 30% to 40% of our business relates to the Medical Center and we need the advice and counsel of members from that sector. In addition, with the separation of UK into two sectors and with the CHE considering an option of completely separating the Medical Center from the UK system, arguments for a separate Medical Center Senate or even for complete detachment of the Center will be enhanced if it is not represented on the Council.

Generally, the Medical Center has had at least one member on the Council and at times even two or three. However, in 1973, there was no Council member from the Medical Center. For safety's sake, I propose amending Rule I-3.1.2 (a) to insert wording such as "nor eight from any one sector." in the eligibility paragraph. (Insertion location is shown on the attached copy of page 10 of the Rules.) I think this language fits in with the existing spirit of the paragraph which encourages a diversity of representation on the Senate Council through limiting the membership from a particular college, but does not seek strict proportioned representation.

Attachment-1

/cet
0704C

DRAFT

Proposed addition is capitalized and underlined below:

3.1.2 Composition

The Senate Council shall be composed as follows: the elected membership shall include nine (9) members chosen by and from the faculty membership of the University Senate and two (2) members elected by and from the newly elected student membership of the University Senate; the student and faculty members of the Board of Trustees, who, if they are not elected members of the Senate, and the immediate past Chairman of the Senate Council shall be ex officio non-voting members. Six elected members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.
(US:10/10/77)

(a) Elected Faculty Membership

(1) Eligibility for Membership--Any elected member of the Senate (or person appointed to replace an elected member) whose term of office has not expired at the time of the election shall be eligible for election to the Senate Council, except that no more than three of the elected members of the Council shall be from any one college, NOR EIGHT FROM ANY ONE SECTOR. Council members are not eligible to succeed themselves until a lapse of one year from the expiration of their terms, except that appointed members who have served no more than one year, if otherwise eligible, may be eligible for election. The duration of the term of membership on the Council shall not be affected by the member's term on the Senate.

If at any time during the term of a member of the Council he or she should become ineligible for membership in the Senate, his or her position on the Council shall be declared vacant.

Senate Council
September 11, 1985
0705C

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

25 September 1985

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, October 14, 1985. Proposed addition to University Senate Rules, Section I, 3.1.2, to guarantee Medical Center representation on the Senate Council.

Proposed addition is capitalized and underlined below:

3.1.2 Composition

The Senate Council shall be composed as follows: the elected membership shall include nine (9) members chosen by and from the faculty membership of the University Senate and two (2) members elected by and from the newly elected student membership of the University Senate; the student and faculty members of the Board of Trustees, who, if they are not elected members of the Senate, and the immediate past Chairman of the Senate Council shall be ex officio non-voting members. Six elected members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. (US:10/10/77)

(a) Elected Faculty Membership

(1) Eligibility for Membership--Any elected member of the Senate (or person appointed to replace an elected member) whose term of office has not expired at the time of the election shall be eligible for election to the Senate Council, except that no more than three of the elected members of the Council shall be from any one college, NOR EIGHT FROM ANY ONE SECTOR. Council members are not eligible to succeed themselves until a lapse of one year from the expiration of their terms, except that appointed members who have served no more than one year, if otherwise eligible, may be eligible for election. The duration of the term of membership on the Council shall not be affected by the member's term on the Senate.

If at any time during the term of a member of the Council he or she should become ineligible for membership in the Senate, his or her position on the Council shall be declared vacant.

Page 2

University Senate Agenda Item: Section I., 3.1.2
25 September 1985

Rationale:

The Senate Council proposes that Section I-3.1.2 (a) of the Senate Rules be amended to insure that at least one member of the Senate Council come from the Medical Center Campus and one from the Lexington Campus. There is some danger of the Medical Center not being represented on the Council at some future point, perhaps as early as next spring. There are currently two members from the Medical Center, however, one's term expires this fall and the other has indicated his intention to take leave from the University at the end of the fall.

For both symbolic and practical reasons, it is important to have Medical Center representation on the Council. Since roughly 30% to 40% of the Council's business relates to the Medical Center, the advice and counsel of members from that sector are needed. In addition, with the separation of UK into two sectors and with the CHE considering an option of completely separating the Medical Center from the UK system, arguments for a separate Medical Center Senate or even for complete detachment of the Center will be enhanced if it is not represented on the Council.

Generally, the Medical Center has had at least one member on the Council and at times even two or three. (However, in 1973, there was no Council member from the Medical Center.) To insure continued minimal representation, the Senate Council proposes amending Rule I-3.1.2 (a) to insert the wording: "nor eight from any one sector" in the eligibility paragraph. This language fits in with the existing spirit of the paragraph which encourages a diversity of representation on the Senate Council through limiting the membership from a particular college, but does not seek strict proportional representation.

Proposed Implementation: Immediate.

/cet
0753C

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

#33 B/C

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

26 September 1985

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, October 14, 1985. Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section V., 2.4.1 Absence Policy.

Current Rule:

2.4.1 Absences

Attendance may or may not be required at the discretion of the instructor, who will announce his/her policy at the beginning of the course.

Trips for members of organizations (musical, oratorical, dramatic, etc.) and of University classes and the absences resulting from such trips must be authorized by the appropriate college dean if the trips result in the absence of students from regularly scheduled classes in which attendance is required.

Trips for participation in intercollegiate athletic events and the absence resulting from such trips must be authorized by the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.

In some appropriate manner, the faculty member in charge of an authorized trip shall notify instructors affected that the absence is authorized. The student shall be responsible for the work missed, and, in advance of the trip, should make arrangements to make up the work. The instructor shall, if feasible, give the student an opportunity to make up the work missed, and shall not, in any case, arbitrarily penalize the student for the absence. (See Section IV., 3.2)

REVISED ABSENCE POLICY

The revision below incorporates all suggestions for change made at the October Senate meeting, except for the one about religious holidays. That will be a separate paragraph added at the end. I hope to receive it prior to the Council meeting.

Proposed:

2.4.1 Attendance and Completion of Assignments

~~For each course enrolled in~~, the student shall be expected to carry out all required work including laboratories and studios, and to take all examinations at the class period designated by the instructor.

Each instructor shall determine his/her policy regarding completion of assigned work, attendance in class, absences at announced or unannounced examinations, and excused absences in excess of one-tenth of class contact hours (see Rule V-2.4.2 below). This policy shall be presented in writing to each class at its first or second meeting. Students' failure to complete assignments, attend class, or be present for examinations in accordance with the announced policies may result in appropriate reductions in grade as determined by the instructor except in the case of excused absences.

2.4.2 Excused Absences:

The following are defined as excused absences:

1. ~~Short-term illness of the student requiring professional medical treatment~~ or serious illness of a member of the student's immediate family. The instructor shall have the right to request appropriate verification ~~from the Student Health Service or other health provider.~~
2. The death of a member of the student's immediate family. The instructor shall have the right to request appropriate verification.
3. Trips for members of student organizations sponsored by an academic unit, trips for University classes, and trips for participation in intercollegiate athletic events. When feasible, the student must notify the instructor prior to the occurrence of such absences, but in no case shall such notification occur more than one week after the absence. Instructors may request formal notification from appropriate university personnel to document the student's participation in such trips.

*Add -
"For each
course in
which the student
is enrolled,
the student"*

Approved.

Students missing work due to an excused absence bear the responsibility of informing the instructor about their excused absence within one week following the period of the excused absence (except where prior notification is required), and of making up the missed work. The instructor shall, if feasible, give the student an opportunity to make up the work missed during the semester in which the absence occurred. The student shall, if feasible, be given the opportunity to make up exams missed due to an excused absence during the semester in which the absence occurred. In those instances where the nature of the course is such that classroom participation by the student is essential for evaluation, the instructor shall, if feasible, give the student an opportunity to make up the work missed during the semester in which the absence occurred.

If, in the opinion of the instructor, excused absences in excess of one-tenth of the class contact hours or the timing of excused absences prevents the student from satisfactorily completing work for the course, the instructor shall counsel the student about the options of an I grade or withdrawal from the course for that semester.

Background and Rationale:

For many years, the only excused absence recognized by the Senate Rules was one taken for a University-related trip. There is no rule recognizing a student's illness or the illness or death of a member of a student's immediate family as an excused absence. Many instructors have allowed students to make up work in illness or death situations, but some have not. The latter situation has caused a lot of problems and students have frequently complained to chairpersons, deans, the ombudsman, etc. However, because no rule lists illness and death as excused absences, chairs, deans, ombudsmen, etc. have no authority to compel instructors to allow students to make up missed work.

During the 1982-83 academic year, a University Senate ad hoc Committee chaired by Mike Brooks worked for six months (consulting with former Ombudsmen, Student Affairs Offices, the Athletics Department, etc.) to draft a proposed revision of the rule to remedy this problem. At the April, 1983, Senate meeting, the Senate voted to return the proposal to the Committee, largely because some Senate members felt that the revision would deprive instructors of the ability to establish some policy linking minimal attendance and grades. The ad hoc Committee never reconvened following the Senate action. The problems, however, have not gone away.

In the summer, 1985, the Senate Council reviewed the background materials and appointed an internal ad hoc Committee whose charge was to propose revisions to alleviate the existing problems, taking into account the objections raised at the April, 1983, Senate meeting. That committee produced the proposed revision. Essentially it defines a

Page 4

University Senate Agenda Item: Absence Policy
26 September 1985

student's illness and illness or death in the student's immediate family as excused absences, with the proviso that a student with four or more excused absences shall be counseled about the incomplete and withdrawal grade options if the instructor believes that the absences preclude the student from satisfactorily completing the course in a satisfactory manner by the semester's end. The Senate Council recommends approval.

Implementation Date: Spring Semester, 1986.

/cet
0754C

10/3/85

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

27 September 1985

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, October 14, 1985. Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I., 2.2.3, relative to Ex Officio Membership on the University Senate.

Proposal: [addition is capitalized and underlined]

2.2.3 Ex Officio Membership

Voting:

The ex officio voting members shall number 12. In academic years beginning with an even number (e.g., 1982-1983, 1984-1985), this group shall be composed of the following: Chancellor for the Medical Center, Vice Chancellor for Research and dean of the Graduate School, Director of Libraries, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for the Lexington Campus, and Dean of the Colleges of Allied Health Professions, Architecture, Communications, Dentistry, Education, Engineering, Law, and Social Work. In academic years beginning with an odd number, the ex officio voting members shall be the following: Chancellor for the Lexington Campus, Chancellor for the Community College System, the President of the Student Government Association, and the Deans of the Colleges of Agriculture, Arts and Sciences, Business and Economics, Fine Arts, Home Economics, Library and Information Science, Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy. (US:10/12/81 and BofT:4/6/82)

Non-Voting:

The ex officio non-voting membership shall include the President, all other vice presidents, University System Registrar, DIRECTOR OF UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS, Dean of University Extension, Dean of Students, Professor of Military Science, Professor of Aerospace Studies, and, if they are not already elected members of the Senate, the University System faculty members of the Board of Trustees, the Academic Ombudsman, the Director of the Honors

Page 2
Senate Agenda Item
27 September 1985

Program, and the chairmen of the University Senate Committees, including University Senate Advisory Committees. All officials mentioned in the preceding paragraph who are not voting ex officio members in any year shall be considered non-voting ex officio members. Other ex officio non-voting members may be added by the University Senate Council for the purpose of supplying information and viewpoints on problems considered by the Senate. Ex officio non-voting members shall enjoy all privileges of the elected membership except the right to vote.
(US:10/12/81 and BofT:4/6/82) (US: 12/10/84)

Background:

The former office of Registrar and Dean of Admissions has been divided into two separate offices: Registrar and Director of Admissions. The Registrar continues to serve as the Secretary of the University Senate and as an ex officio non-voting member. The proposed addition will simply formalize the ex officio non-voting status of the Director of Admissions.

Implementation Date: Immediate.

/cet
0755C

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0033

UNIVERSITY REGISTRAR
GILLIS BUILDING

16 October 1985

Dr. Otis A. Singletary
President
103 Administration Building
CAMPUS 0032

Dear President Singletary:

At its October 14, 1985, meeting, the University Senate voted to recommend to the Board of Trustees that Part IV, paragraph 6, (on page 14) of the Governing Regulations, pertaining to the ex officio, non-voting membership in the University Senate, be amended as follows:

Proposal: [addition is capitalized and underlined]

The ex officio non-voting membership shall include the President, all vice presidents, University System Registrar, DIRECTOR OF UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS, Dean of University Extension, Dean of Students, Professor of Military Science, Professor of Aerospace Studies, and, if they are not already elected members of the Senate, the University System faculty members of the Board of Trustees, the Academic Ombudsman, the Director of the Honors Program, and the chairmen of the University Senate Committees, including University Senate Advisory Committees. All officials mentioned in the preceding paragraph who are not voting ex officio members in any year shall be considered non-voting ex officio members. Other ex officio non-voting members may be added by the University Senate Council for the purpose of supplying information and viewpoints on problems considered by the Senate. Ex officio non-voting members shall enjoy all privileges of the elected membership except the right to vote.

Page 2
O.A.S.
16 October 1985

This is a housekeeping type request. It follows from the division of the position of Registrar and Director of admissions into two separate positions and gives the incumbent in the newly created position of Director of Undergraduate Admissions ex officio, non-voting membership in the University Senate.

Sincerely,

Randall Dahl
Secretary

cc: Bradley C. Canon

0790C