

COPY 2

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, OCTOBER 8, 1979

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, October 9, 1979, in Room 106 of the Classroom Building.

Joseph Krislov, Chairman, presiding

Members absent: Michael Baer\*, Charles E. Barnhart, Janis L. Bellack\*, John J. Bernardo, Brack A. Bivins, Jack C. Blanton, Peter P. Bosomworth\*, Barbara Bryant, Joseph T. Burch, Joe B. Buttram\*, Bradley Canon\*, Michael D. Carpenter\*, W. Merle Carter\*, S. K. Chan\*, Linda Chen, Donald B. Clapp, D. Kay Clawson\*, Frank Colton, Samuel F. Conti, Emmett R. Costrich, Raymond H. Cox, John Crosby, M. Ward Crowe\*, Philip H. Crowley, Paul Davis, Guy M. Davenport\*, George W. Denemark\*, David E. Denton\*, Philip A. DeSimone\*, Ronald C. Dillehay, Joseph M. Dougherty, Herbert Drennon, Anthony Eardley, W. W. Ecton\*, Lee A. Elioseff\*, Kevin Ellis, Jane Emanuel\*, Joseph Engelberg, Paul G. Forand, Tom Francis, Art Gallaher\*, Joseph Hamburg, S. Zafar Hasan\*, Virgil W. Hays\*, Andrew J. Hiatt\*, Raymond R. Hornback, Alfred S. L. Hu, Clyde L. Irwin, Donald W. Ivey\*, H. Douglas Jameson, Wesley H. Jones\*, Richard I. Kermode, William B. Lacy\*, Gretchen LaGodna\*, James R. Lang, Thomas P. Lewis, William L. Matthews\*, Marion E. McKenna\*, Dorothy A. Miller, Philip J. Noffsinger, Elbert W. Ockerman\* Clayton Omvig, Doyle E. Peaslee, Antoinette Powell\*, Deborah E. Powell\*, Herbert G. Reid\*, Paul Roark\*, Robert W. Rudd, Pritam S. Sabharwal, John S. Scarborough, Paul G. Sears, Ronald J. Seymour\*, Gary Shenton\*, Timothy W. Sineath, Otis A. Singletary\*, John T. Smith, Tim Smith\*, Wade C. Smith, Lynn Spruill\*, Earl L. Steele\*, Ralph E. Steuer, Marjorie S. Stewart, Joseph V. Swintosky\*, Harold H. Traurig\*, David E. Upton\*, Relmond VanDaniker, M. Stanley Wall, Marc J. Wallace\*, Alfred D. Winer,

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

Chairman Krislov recognized Professor Richard Wynn who presented the following Memorial Resolution on the death of Dr. Susan Anne McFarland.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

Susan Anne McFarland, 1946-1979

Dr. Susan Anne McFarland, a good friend of the University and of the Commonwealth, died in Jackson, Mississippi on May 15, 1979, after a long struggle with diabetes. She was my colleague and a close personal friend and it was with great sadness that I prepared this memorial resolution. Suzanne, as she was known to her friends, served the University well from 1972 to 1976 as a faculty member in the Departments of Oral Biology and Pediatrics and as a public servant in the counseling of diabetics. Because of this disease, she left us so very early in her career.

Suzanne was born in Jasper, Texas on November 28, 1946, and lived in Mississippi most of her life. She received a B.S. degree in biology at the Mississippi State College for Women at Columbus and went on to graduate work in pharmacology at the University of Mississippi, where she received her Ph.D. degree in 1972. Her honors at that time included a National Institutes of Health Pre-doctoral Fellowship, and a Fellowship in the American Society of Pharmacology and Therapeutics to study molecular pharmacology.

\*Absence explained

Suzanne had a record of distinguished service to this University and to the Commonwealth. She joined the Department of Oral Biology in the College of Dentistry in 1972 to teach dental and dental hygiene students. She is recognized as one of the originators of self-instructional learning in the dental college and is remembered for her talents in teaching. In fact, her students on many occasions openly acknowledged her special skills and outstanding personal qualities. In terms of scholarship, her writings appeared in such prestigious publications as the Archives of International Pharmacodynamics and Therapeutics, the European Journal of Pharmacology, the Journal of Dental Education, and Pharmacology and Therapeutics in Dentistry; her scientific papers were concerned with the effects of cyclic AMP on gastrointestinal smooth muscle, the development of antagonists to overdoses of local anesthetics and the characterization of drug prescribing among Kentucky dentists.

In 1974 she accepted a joint appointment to the Department of Pediatrics in the College of Medicine, where she did much of her work with diabetics. Suzanne had an abiding interest in public service and believed that the University should exert itself in attempting to solve some of the problems of society. Thus, her efforts toward public education of diabetes reflected well on the University and had a positive impact on the community. At the University level she counseled diabetic children and their parents about the problems of growing up as a diabetic and the emotional and psychological aspects of this disease; worked with physicians in the diabetic clinic in the management of the outpatient diabetic; began a series of "Dinners For Moms Only" in an effort to counsel parents of juvenile diabetics, and formed a committee to provide structured educational programs for hospitalized adult-onset diabetics. At the State level she was a member of the Executive Committee of the Kentucky Diabetic Association; made numerous media appearances educating the public about this disease; participated in the fund raising for Camp Hendon to provide a camp for juvenile diabetics; was on the long-range planning committee for a permanent summer camp for diabetic children and traveled the far reaches of the Commonwealth speaking for the cause of the diabetic family. I sincerely believe that her participation in these programs concerning the problems of diabetes improved the quality of life and understanding for many of the citizens of Lexington and the Commonwealth.

Because of ill health, Suzanne left the University and returned to Jackson, Mississippi in 1976, where she taught part-time at Hinds Junior College the last few years of her life. She died at the age of 32 after a 20 year struggle with diabetes and was buried in Bay Springs, Mississippi on May 17, 1979. Her survivors include her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert F. McFarland, Bay Springs, Mississippi; two sisters, Mrs. Bobby Jo Wilkerson, Oxford, Mississippi and Mrs. Anna Hart Hazard, Jackson, Mississippi; and a brother, Burns McFarland, Bay Springs, Mississippi.

Suzanne was a highly competent pharmacologist, teacher par excellence, fighter of diabetes and a warm, caring human being. She had to alter her professional career because of this dread disease and certainly suffered more than her share of pain and disappointment.

Suzanne, for all you did for the University and our community, we thank you. We will always remember you with deep affection and our lives have been enriched by your presence.

The Departments of Oral Biology, College of Dentistry and Pediatrics, College of Medicine recommend that the University Senate incorporate this resolution in its official minutes and forward copies thereof to her family.

(Prepared by Richard L. Wynn, Department of Oral Biology)

Chairman Krislov directed that the Resolution be made a part of these minutes and that copies be provided to members of the immediate family. The Senators were asked to stand for a moment of silence in tribute and respect to Dr. Susan Anne McFarland.

Chairman Krislov made the following remarks:

"First, I want to tell you that we have replaced two Senate Council members who cannot attend meetings because of health problems. The replacements are Richard Warren and Robert Rudd. Professor Ivey has indicated that he will return in January, and he will resume his seat at that time. Professor Emanuel will be leaving the Council in December.

Second, the Senate Council elections are being held and I urge you to cast your ballot so that we have the widest participation.

The third announcement is to recognize Professor Adelstein in connection with another election."

Professor Adelstein spoke to the Senate as follows:

"Because an election will be held shortly for a faculty member to the Board of Trustees, I wish to announce that having served two terms, I have decided not to run again. To stop any rumors, such as that I am not physically well, or that my wife and mother would not give me permission to run, I wish to explain my decision. One reason for my withdrawal is that I believe in the principle of rotation, which we apply to most of our chairpersons. I think it is wise because usually it is beneficial to have someone new come in with fresh enthusiasm and ideas. Also, I believe that the position of trustee is a great honor, one that should be shared with others. I am not presumptuous enough to feel that I would be elected again, but I have been around here since 1958, my name starts with A, and for better or for worse, I have been conspicuous. To avoid the danger of being nominated, I have requested that my name be withdrawn from the eligibility list.

I want to report briefly on my term as a Board member, which has been a fine and enlightening experience. Professor Wilson and I have been treated like full and regular Trustees. We have been able to make suggestions, to provide information, to raise questions, and to partake of all the rights, privi-

leges, and responsibilities of members of the Board.

Serving as a Trustee has been a learning experience, making me keenly aware of what an empire this is with its numerous divisions and sub-divisions on the Lexington campus and on those of the Community Colleges, its thousands of employees, and its current operating budget of about \$250 million. Much wiser about University affairs, I have been converted from being critical of the Administration to being respectful and appreciative, particularly of its increasing responsibilities in compiling voluminous reports to state and federal agencies. In this regard, I have developed special admiration for the President although I am reluctant to praise publicly someone in a superior position to me. But in my role as trustee, I think that I should inform you that the Board's chief administrative officer, President Singletary, is highly respected by all its members, who have great confidence in his ability and judgment. He serves the University superbly, especially in his role as a cogent, eloquent, and persuasive spokesman during his public and private relationships with alumni, public officials, donors, citizens of the state, and visiting dignitaries. Most faculty members do not see him function in this capacity and perhaps do not know how well he represents us.

Finally, I would like to say to my colleagues here at the University and in the Community Colleges that I sincerely appreciate and am grateful for the opportunity I have had during these past years, and I thank you all very much for it. "

Dr. Adelstein was given a hand of applause.

The Chairman had two further announcements. One involved the Research Title series. He said that President Singletary presented the Council with the proposed Administrative Regulations. The Council had a meeting with the Chairman of the Research Committee and the Council has sent a response to the President on those proposed changes.

The Second item concerned the approval of the proposals for the Ph.D. program in Computer Science, Philosophy, and Communications by a Committee of the Council on Higher Education. Hopefully the Council will approve the programs and they will be implemented soon.

The Chairman recognized Professor William Wagner for a motion from the Senate Council. Professor Wagner, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposal to recommend definitions for the terms "Center" and "Graduate Center" to the Administration for inclusion in the Governing Regulations. This proposal was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of September 20, 1979. The Chair recognized Professor Grimes and asked him to answer any questions. The floor was opened for questions and discussion.

Dean Royster wanted to know about the division in the two paragraphs concerning the Governing Regulations. Professor Grimes responded that his understanding was that the paragraph under recommendation 1) beginning "A Graduate Center" would be included in the regulation of the University Organization and the second sentence under 2) beginning "The term" constituted the change. Professor Grimes said that the proposal from the

Senate Council was slightly modified from the proposal that was submitted to the Council by the Committee on Academic Organization and Structure. The change occurs under Recommendation 1) in the last sentence. He said he wondered what the logic was in the change. Professor Bryant said he could explain how the change came about, if not the logic. The proposal came about because of the lack of a clear definition of "Center." He said that as he recalled Dean Royster had suggested changing the word "exceptional" to "some." The rationale for it was that "some" acknowledges the possibility of "exceptions."

Professor Grimes moved, and it was seconded, an amendment that the first recommendation, last sentence be changed from:

"Its faculty have primary appointments within a college, or in some cases within the Center"

Amend to read:

"...or in exceptional cases..."

Chairman Krislov asked Professor Grimes to indicate the logic. He responded that the logic was basically in the notion that a Center is a multidisciplinary interdisciplinary unit which is equivalent to a department. He added that it was the belief of the committee that they did not want to recommend language which would permit primary appointments of faculty to be within the Center. He said that a Center was equivalent to a department.

Dean Royster wanted to know if this proposal was what was agreed upon when the Senate and Board of Trustees approved the concept of the Center. Professor Grimes said that his guess was that the documents were vague about this issue which led the committee to try to define what a "Center" was.

After further discussion the previous question was moved and passed. The adoption of the amendment failed with a hand count of 65 to 51.

The previous question was moved and passed. The motion to adopt the proposal to recommend definitions for the terms "Center" and "Graduate Center" to the Administration passed and reads as follows:

Background:

On March 22, 1979 the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure sent to the Senate Council two proposals for modifying the Governing Regulations of the University, Part VII, A-1. These recommendations have to do with the definition of the term "center" which has recently been a source of some confusion among faculty, and particularly those charged with academic planning. At this date the University Senate and/or Senate Council has recommended eight centers for establishment:

- a) The Fort Knox Center
- b) The Appalachian Center
- c) The Northern Center
- d) The Center for Developmental Change
- e) The Graduate Center for Public Administration
- f) The Graduate Center for Toxicology
- g) The Multidisciplinary Center for Gerontology
- h) The Sanders-Brown Research Center

The Committee on Academic Organization and Structure has examined these units and, considering them as models, propose that the definition given below becomes the official definition of "center" to be used hereafter. The Senate Council considered the Committee's proposal, asked the Graduate Dean to review it, made one minor modification at his suggestion and voted to transmit it to the Senate with a recommendation to approve and forward to the Administration for implementation.

The Senate Council makes the two following recommendations:

- 1) It is recommended that a new paragraph be inserted as paragraph 5 in Part VII, University Organization, Section A-1, of the Governing Regulations, defining the Center. The paragraph should read as follows:

A Graduate Center\* is an educational (academic) unit of an interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary nature, which is equivalent to a department, and is located administratively in the Graduate School. It is associated exclusively with graduate programs and their attendant courses and research. Its faculty have primary appointments within a college, or in some cases, within the Center.

- 2) In view of the common research focus of four of the Centers (Appalachian, Center for Developmental Change, Sanders-Brown Research Center for the Aging, and the Multidisciplinary Center for Gerontology), it is recommended that the following statement be added to the definition of a Research Institute which now appears in existing Paragraph 5 of Part VII, University Organization, Section A-1.

The term "Center" may, in some cases, be used as a synonym for Research Institute

Note: This paragraph will become paragraph 6 after insertion of the new paragraph described in recommendation 1.

---

\*See the minutes of the meeting of the Board of Trustees, July 19, 1977, for the original recommendation to establish graduate centers at the University of Kentucky.

The Chairman recognized Professor William Wagner for a motion from the Senate Council. Professor Wagner, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I, 4.1.12-- specifically the charge to the subcommittee on Resource Allocations. This proposed change had been circulated to members of the University Senate under date of September 19, 1979. The Chair asked Professor Grimes to answer any questions. The floor was opened for questions and discussion.

Professor Grimes said that specifically what the proposal did was to facilitate acquiring a chairman for the subcommittee on Resource Allocations. There was no discussion and the motion passed. The proposed change reads as follows:

Background:

Last September the Senate approved a proposal made by the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure to set up a subcommittee on resource allocations, which would consist of six (6) persons, including a chairman designated from the membership of the parent committee and five (5) additional members appointed by the committee. The only restriction on these five (5) was that they should be appointed from those eligible to vote in elections to the Senate. Both the Committee on Academic Organization and Structure and the Senate Council have had considerable difficulty this year in finding people to serve as chairman of the subcommittee. Accordingly the committee itself proposes the following rule change as a solution to the problem.

Approved Change: (brackets indicate deletion and additional sentence is underlined)

That the Senate Council shall [designate a member of the Committee on Academic Organization and Structure as ] appoint a Chairman of the subcommittee and that five (5) additional members of the subcommittee shall be appointed by the Committee on Academic Organization and Structure to serve on the subcommittee for staggered terms of three (3) years. The subcommittee members should be appointed from those eligible to vote in elections for membership in the Senate and should not be representative of any constituency. At least one member of the subcommittee, not necessarily the Chairman, shall be a member of the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure.

The Chairman recognized Professor William Wagner for a motion from the Senate Council. Professor Wagner, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I, 2.2.2 (c) relative to student senators' terms and vacancies. This proposed change had been circulated to members of the University Senate under date of September 28, 1979. The floor was opened for questions and discussion.

Student Senator Yeh said that the problem came about last year when students would lose interest. They would not be purged from the University Senate until they had accumulated three (3) unexcused absences. Therefore, it would be three months before that Senator could be replaced. The previous question was moved and passed. The motion passed unanimously and reads as follows:

Background:

The proposal for a change in the Senate Rules was presented by the Student Government and has received the endorsement of the Student Senate.

Proposal: (add underlined portion)

I, 2.2.2 (c) Terms: Vacancies -- As specified in the Governing Regulations, each elected student member shall serve for a term of one year and shall be eligible for reelection as long as he or she remains a full-time undergraduate, graduate, or professional student in the University System. If a student should at any time become ineligible to serve (e.g., by relinquishing his or her position as a full-time student, being placed on academic probation or violating the Senate attendance regulations), the administrative head of the group represented shall declare a vacancy and designate that member from the eligible student body who at the last election received the next highest vote to serve for the duration of the elected student member's ineligibility. The secretary of the Senate shall maintain attendance records and shall notify the administrative head of the college represented when the representative of that college has been absent without explanation from three meetings of the Senate during the academic year. A student member shall become ineligible to serve on purgation from the Student Senate.....

Note: The proposed addition will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification. Implementation Date: Spring, 1980.

The Chairman recognized Professor William Wagner for a motion from the Senate Council. Professor Wagner, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section VI, 1.1 and 1.2 relative to informing students of course content and criteria. This proposed change had been circulated to members of the University Senate under date of September 27, 1979. The floor was opened for questions and discussion.

The Chair recognized the Ombudsman, Professor Jean Pival. Professor Pival made the following remarks:

"As the current occupant of the Ombudsman's Office, I join my predecessors in supporting the move to amend the rules to inform students in writing about the criteria for evaluation. I think two advantages to this amendment for you as teachers and the students is that under the present withdrawal system students can decide early in the course to drop. Secondly, with new students coming in and out during the week of add-drop and with the present Senate Rule requiring that the course content be given to the students on either the first or second day of the course, it's very easy to forget to inform a student who comes in on the third day.

Another advantage is that if a student complains about a grade and has a written document about course content and criteria that complaint will usually stop at the Ombudsman Office. "

The Chair added that the Council considered the question of some sort of exception or modification for advanced classes. The Council felt that the problem had never come



up before and referred the question to the Academic Standards Committee to investigate if any modification should be made for advanced courses.

Professor Just said that he could argue strenuously against adopting the motion until all courses had been looked at to see what the implications were. He said he was not arguing against the proposal for lower division courses. He said he gave handouts himself. He warned the faculty about taking away their own academic freedom. Professor Lienhard said that at this point he supported such a proposal but Professor Just's call for exceptions was the reason the proposal went back to the Senate Council. He felt the proposal should have exceptions. Professor Engelberg asked Professor Pival how many complaints the Ombudsman's Office had last year. Mrs. Pival said there were 100 to 150 complaints. Professor Engelberg said that with 100 complaints per year it meant that for every 2,000 encounters between student and course there was one complaint for the Ombudsman's Office. He said there might be a problem in that area but putting pieces of paper out every year could not be the most efficient way to solve the problem. Professor Schwert said that if a professor spent thirty seconds with each of the students explaining the grading system he would have invested a large amount of time. Student Senator Yeh said that the students the Ombudsman's Office saw represented only a fraction of the student body that had complaints. He said that students would like to know what the professors used to calculate grades such as midterm grades, exams, term papers or classroom participation. Professor Bostrom said that he was in agreement with the students that the type and amount of work should be specified, but the proposal spoke of standards and criteria. Professor Pival said that the whole business of standards and criteria was not the issue, but it was the amendment brought to the floor at the last meeting and this meeting. She added that the rule being amended had been on the books for at least eight years and being concerned about the meaning of standards and criteria was avoiding the issue.

The Chairman said that the English professors on the Council had assured them that "criteria" was a better word than "standards." Professor Just pointed out that everyone was free to put the information about course content in writing. He also pointed out that it would save time in certain courses, but that the syllabus was also a legal document. Professor Bryant said there had to be a kind of unwritten contract of good faith and it seemed to him a written contract across the board would have a legitimate effect on what the University was supposed to do. Student Senator Metcalf moved, and the motion was seconded, to refer the proposal to an appropriate committee for further discussion. The Chairman defended the Senate Council by saying that the issue of graduate courses had not arisen before. The motion was made in the Council to exclude them but not seconded. The Council felt that the absence of problems suggested there were no serious problems. He said that it appeared from the discussion there was a great deal more coming to the surface. He said he felt the proper committee would be the Academic Standards Committee.

The motion to send the proposal to the Academic Standards Committee passed with a hand count of 80 to 41.

The Chairman recognized Professor William Wagner for a motion from the Senate Council. Professor Wagner, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposed change in University Senate Rules, V, 1.8.1, the withdrawal rule. This proposed change had been circulated to members of the University Senate under date of September 28, 1979. The floor was opened for questions and discussion.

Student Senator Breen said that in January, 1980, the withdrawal period would be for one week. He said that the students felt there were disadvantages to having only one week. One was advising, adequate time to make changes to schedules, several W's on a record would put students at a disadvantage in the job market, graduate schools, and scholarships. He said that the students felt a three-week period would give them adequate time to arrange and evaluate his or her academic schedule. Professor Gesund said that we have a problem of oversubscribed classes. If students dropped the first week, then other students could be accommodated for those classes. He added that he felt the transcript should reflect the truth of a student's academic career.

Professor Reedy said that he felt the students' suggestion was indeed a very reasonable one, and the demonstration of their good judgment should receive the approval of the Senate, and he urged his colleagues to vote approval of the policy. Professor Just said that if the withdrawal policy went to three weeks a number of students would be unable to get into certain classes.

Professor Lienhard said that for many years the faculty Senators had voted their conscience on issues and he could not remember when student Senators were divided. He said that the students were representing some sort of constituency. He added that he knew issues had two sides and when a group was uniformly for something he knew that an opposing view was not being represented.

Dr. Langston said that students not withdrawing from classes the first week had little to do with whether or not they were going to get a "W" but had more to do with the long lines and the fact that the administration cannot devise a procedure that makes it convenient for a student to withdraw. Professor Gesund said that he could not see where four or five W's on a transcript was punishment, and he felt the transcript should reflect accurately a student's true record.

The motion in favor of the proposal to have three weeks after the beginning of classes to withdraw passed with a hand count of 57 to 32. The proposed change in University Senate Rules, V,1.8.1 reads as follows:

Approved Change:

V, 1.8.1            Students shall have three weeks after the beginning of classes to withdraw without receiving a mark on their transcripts.

Note: The proposed change will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification. Implementation Date: Spring, 1980.

With the above change the Withdrawal Rule now reads:

V, 1.8.1            Students who miss the first two class periods of a course without notifying the department of their intention to attend may be reported by the Department to the Dean who shall drop the student from the course and notify the Registrar that the student has been removed from the class roll. (Previously codified by the Rules Committee to be included as part of the Withdrawal Policy.)

Any student may withdraw from any class before the midpoint of the term. In order to withdraw, the

student must submit a completed withdrawal form to his or her dean. The dean shall report the withdrawal to the Registrar.

Students shall have three weeks after the beginning of classes to withdraw without receiving a mark on their transcripts.

During the remainder of the first half of the course the withdrawing student must receive a mark of a "W."

V, 1.8.2

A student may withdraw from a class during the latter half of the term upon approval by the dean of the student's college of a petition certifying urgent non-academic reasons including but not limited to:

- I. Illness or injury of the student;
- II. Serious personal or family problems;
- III. Serious financial difficulties.

If such a petition is approved by the dean of the student's college, the student is assigned a grade of "W."

Note: The proposal includes changing the definition of "W" from "withdrew passing" to "withdrew." This will be codified formally by the Rules Committee before implementation in January 1980.

Motion was made to adjourn at 4:45 p.m.

Martha M. Ferguson  
Recording Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL  
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

September 27, 1979

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday,  
October 08, 1979. Proposed change in University Senate  
Rules, VI, 1.1 and 1.2.

63  
7  
24  
7  
31  
MJS

Refer to Admissions and Standards and

Background:

The attached proposal for a change in the Senate Rules was referred to the Senate Rules Committee, which recommended approval. The Senate Council endorsed the proposal and presented it on the floor in September. The Senate referred the proposal back to the Council.

Proposals: (Add underlined portions; delete bracketed portions)

VI 1.1 Information About Course Content. A student has the right to be informed in reasonable detail in writing at the first or second class meeting about the nature of the course and to expect the course to correspond generally to its official description.

VI 1.2 Information About Course [Standards] Grading Criteria. A student has the right to be informed in writing at the first or second class meeting about the [standards] criteria to be used in evaluating his performance, and to expect that the grading system described in the University Catalog will be followed. Whenever factors such as absences or late papers will be weighed heavily in determining grades, a student shall be so informed in writing at the first or second class meeting.

Rationale:

Such a document will make clear course objectives and minimize conflicts between students and faculty. The revised proposal has the endorsement of the Ombudsman and the Senate Council.

/cet

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL  
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

September 28, 1979

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday,  
October 08, 1979. Proposed change in University Senate  
Rules, Section I, 2.2.2 (c), Elected Student Membership

Background:

The attached proposal for a change in the Senate Rules was presented by Student Government and has received the endorsement of the Student Senate. The Senate Council now likewise presents it for approval.

Proposal: (add underlined portion.)

I, 2.2.2 (c) Terms: Vacancies -- As specified in the Governing Regulations, each elected student member shall serve for a term of one year and shall be eligible for reelection as long as he or she remains a full-time undergraduate, graduate, or professional student in the University System. If a student should at any time become ineligible to serve (e.g., by relinquishing his or her position as a full-time student, being placed on academic probation or violating the Senate attendance regulations), the administrative head of the group represented shall declare a vacancy and designate that member from the eligible student body who at the last election received the next highest vote to serve for the duration of the elected student member's ineligibility. The secretary of the Senate shall maintain attendance records and shall notify the administrative head of the college represented when the representative of that college has been absent without explanation from three meetings of the Senate during the academic year. A student member shall become ineligible to serve on purgation from the Student Senate. . . .

Rationale:

A majority of the Student Senate are members of the University Senate. In order for the Student Senate to maintain a quorum, purgation is a necessary tool. However, a vacancy in the office of a college senatorship can not be filled unless the individual is also purged from the University Senate.

Note: If approved, the proposed addition will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification before implementation in the Spring, 1980.