

10/5/92

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

29 September 1992

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet in regular session on Monday, October 12, 1992, at 3:00 P.M. in room 115 of the Nursing Building (CON/HSLC).

AGENDA:

1. Minutes: 14 September 1992
2. Chair's Announcements
3. Resolutions
4. Report by Faculty Board of Trustees Members: Deborah Powell and Carolyn Bratt
5. Remarks: Board of Trustees Chair, Edward T. Breathitt
6. Action Items:
 - a. Proposed Use of the Uniform Teaching Evaluation Instrument (UTEI). (Circulated under date of 27 August and 28 September 1992.)
 - b. Proposed Change in the University Calendar for Spring Semester, 1993 for the senior class in the B.S. program in the College of Pharmacy (circulated under date of 28 September 1992).

Randall Dahl
Secretary, University Senate

Note: If you are unable to attend this meeting, please contact Ms. Susan Caldwell in the Registrar's Office (7-7155). Thank you.

5772C

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, OCTOBER 12, 1992

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, October 12, 1992, in Room 115 of the Nursing Health Sciences Building.

John J. Piecoro, Jr., Chairperson of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent were: Reginald J. Alston, Richard Anderson, Virginia Atwood, Robert S. Baker*, John R. Ballantine, Robert L. Blevins, Glenn C. Blomquist*, Peter P. Bosomworth, Joseph T. Burch, D. Allan Butterfield*, Laretta Byars, Rutheford B. Campbell, Jr., Clyde R. Carpenter*, Ben W. Carr, Chris Carrico, Edward A. Carter, Shea Chaney, Louis C. Chow*, Donald B. Clapp, Charlie Clark, Jordan L. Cohen, Georgia C. Collins*, Audrey L. Companion, Sarah Coursey, Randall W. Dahl*, David S. Durant, Jr., Richard Edwards, Michael B. Freeman*, James E. Funk, Richard W. Furst, Stuart Gay, Robert D. Guthrie, Derek Gwinn, J. John Harris III, Zafar S. Hasan*, Christine Havice*, Robert E. Hemenway, Don A. Howard, Craig L. Infanger, Richard A. Jensen*, Richard I. Kermod, Kenneth K. Kubota, James M. Kuder*, Carl W. Lee*, Thomas W. Lester, Arthur Lieber*, C. Oran Little, William C. Lubawy, Linda J. Magid*, Justin Marriott, Peggy S. Meszaros*, Karen A. Mingst*, William G. Moody*, James S. Mosbey, Phyllis J. Nash, Anthony L. Newberry, Robert C. Noble*, Clayton P. Omvig*, Rhoda-Gale Pollack, Deborah E. Powell*, Daniel R. Reedy, Thomas C. Robinson, Ellen B. Roseman*, Arturo A. Sandoval, David Sanford, Michael C. Shannon, Timothy W. Sineath*, Candi Smith, Crystal Smith, Thomas Stipanowich, David H. Stockham, Louis J. Swift, Michael G. Tearney*, Phillip A. Tibbs*, Miroslaw Truszczynski, Henry C. Vasconez*, Carolyn A. Williams*, Eugene R. Williams, Emery A. Wilson, Mary L. Witt*, Peter Wong*.

The Chairperson welcomed everyone to the second University Senate meeting of the year.

The Chairperson stated that the Senate Minutes for September 14 have been sent to duplicating but have not been circulated. The approval of the minutes will be postponed until the November Senate meeting.

The Chair made the following announcements:

1. The Faculty Workload Committee has sent a mailing to all faculty and it should be received this week. The mailing is a draft of the Issue Statement dealing with faculty workload. In the statement there is an issue statement on teaching, research, and service and questions relating to each of those areas. The committee would like the faculty to review the draft of the Issue statement and then forward any remarks to the Committee Chair, Karl Raitz of Geography or submit them to the departmental chair, division director or designee in that particular area. The Ad Hoc Committee will then have a series of focus panels with the chairs, division directors or designees to go over the remarks brought forward. The statement will then be redrafted.

*Absence Explained

Minutes, University Senate, October 12, 1992

2. The Senate Council recently recommended to President Wethington a proposal for a Parental Leave Policy. The proposal is to suspend upon recommendation of the individual the tenure clock for a one year period for anyone who becomes a parent during his or her probationary period. This proposal initially comes from the College of Medicine and has the endorsement of the Academic Council of the Medical Center as well as the Senate Council. The Chair understands President Wethington is reviewing the proposal with the Chancellors and Vice Presidents and there soon should be some action on the proposal.
3. The University Studies Program is being reviewed this year by the University Studies Committee. The University Studies Committee is a standing committee of the University Senate.

The Chairperson stated that the agenda that was distributed had been put together approximately three weeks ago in order to get it printed and out for the ten day period called for in the Senate Rules. He would be making changes in the agenda.

The Chair recognized Doctor Michael McQuillen, Department of Neurology, to present a Memorial Resolution.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

DAVID B. CLARK, Ph.D., M.D.
November 1, 1913 - September 13, 1992

On Sunday, September 13, 1992, Dr. David Clark died at The University of Kentucky Medical Center. He is survived by his wife -- Dr. Barbara Kinyon Clark; his daughters -- Dr. Anne Barrett Clark and Lucinda Clark Knowles; his grandchildren -- Elizabeth Anne Knowles, John David Knowles, Jennifer Marie Knowles, Katherine Barrett Wilson, and Tamar Elise Wilson; and his brothers -- Dr. John Clark and Richard B. Clark.

David Clark is survived as well by a rich legacy in child neurology -- a discipline whose birth he attended after the second World War, and for whose growth and development he, more than any other single person, was truly responsible. He was introduced to this field by Douglas Buchanan at The University of Chicago, and later schooled in it by Frank Ford at The Johns Hopkins Hospital. Upon completion of an eclectic residency in paediatrics, medicine and neurology at Hopkins, he spent the year 1950-51 as a Fulbright Lecturer at The National Hospital at Queens Square. When he returned to Baltimore, he joined the faculty in paediatrics, medicine, and pathology, rising to the rank of Associate Professor in The Johns Hopkins School of Medicine over the next 14 years. In 1965 he was recruited to the new College of Medicine at the University of Kentucky as its first Professor and Chairman of Neurology -- a post which he held until 1979 when he became Chief of the Neurology Service at the Veterans Administration Medical

Minutes, University Senate, October 12, 1992

Center in Lexington. He achieved emeritus status in 1984, and moved to the Neurology Clinic at the University in 1990, remaining there as Director of the Memory Disorders Clinic until his death. During the 40-plus years of his academic career, he was directly responsible for the education of more than a hundred neurologists (and indirectly, for the education of most of us!) -- including many who are now chiefs of service or department chairmen themselves, in Australia, Canada, and England, as well as in this country.

More than anything, David Clark was the paradigm of the "good doctor" and of the academic physician as well -- one who mixed a sensitive concern (albeit with what, to some, was a gruff exterior) for the whole person and their family, with an enquiring mind that would challenge his colleagues and students to search for answers to pivotal questions that only such a mind could frame. Thus it was that at Hopkins, during the time that Blalock began to operate upon hearts malformed from birth, Dr. Clark described the cerebral vascular, infective, and other neurological complications of cyanotic congenital heart disease. He was one of the prime movers in the first multicenter study of cerebral palsy. He, with Frank Walsh and others, was the first to call attention to some of the neuro-ophthalmologic complications of oral progestational agents. During his time as Chairman of the Department of Neurology at Kentucky he was honored by being called to give a series of named lectures in England and Australia, including the Teal Lecture (on the syndrome of minimal brain damage) at the Royal College of Physicians, in 1973; the Sir Leonard Parsons Lecture in Birmingham, in 1973; the Douglas Reye Memorial Lecture, at the International Congress of Child Neurology in Sydney, in 1979; and the MacKeith Lecture before the British Society of Child Neurologists, in 1980. He received recognition for outstanding teaching at the University of Kentucky, in 1983 and 1988; was elected to The Johns Hopkins Society of Scholars in 1984; and was granted an honorary doctorate from The Medical College of Wisconsin, in 1985.

Dr. Clark's contributions to his beloved profession included service on a number of NIH Study Sections; membership on the Residency Review Committee for Psychiatry and Neurology (1966-74); a 12-year term as a Director of the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology (1967-79); and appointments as a Councillor of the American Neurological Association and as a member of the editorial boards of the Archives of Neurology and of Neuropaediatrics.

Such a sterile list cannot begin to convey a sense of the man -- and yet that must be done, to convey the enormity of the loss felt by those who were privileged to know and work with him. The hospital was his home, in more ways than one. He could be found there at any hour of the day or night. Indeed, he held his teaching rounds on Tuesday evenings, so that those who wanted to

Minutes, University Senate, October 12, 1992

come, would; and those who didn't, wouldn't feel obligated to attend. He would put any patient presented at those rounds -- even small children, whom he would hold on his lap, letting them pull at his moustache ("the best I.Q. test there is, for little ones!") -- completely at ease, as though they were in the privacy of his office; and then would proceed to tease out a sensible history and perform a complete neurological exam, in a masterful fashion. When he won the Great Teacher Award at the University of Kentucky in 1983, the nomination by the Medical Students' Association read in part that "above all, he makes learning enjoyable; his presence is electric." He held no brief for anything less than excellence, and yet he suffered fools with disarming kindness, no matter what their station in life. His departure from Baltimore left Johns Hopkins with a void that could only be filled by an entire Department of Neurology.

His departure from this world can be marked by a statement made in the House of Commons, the last time that Winston Churchill paid it a visit:

"The oldest member here present cannot remember having seen his like before; the youngest shall not see his like again."

The Chair requested that the resolution be spread upon the minutes and a copy sent to his family. He asked the Senate to stand for a moment of silence in recognition of Dr. Clark.

The Chair reminded the Senate that if they had any comments during the meeting to please identify themselves and their department or college when speaking in order to facilitate the accurate recording of the minutes.

The Chairperson then introduced to the Senate former Governor Edward T. Breathitt, the Chairperson of the Board of Trustees. The Chair said it was a great honor and a privilege for him to introduce Governor Breathitt. The Chair said it was the first time to his knowledge, in his 24 years at the University, that the Chair of the Board of Trustees had addressed the University Senate. In the Chair's opinion it is indicative of the continuing interest that Governor Breathitt has for this institution and this faculty. Governor Breathitt is a graduate of the University of Kentucky with a BS in Commerce and an LLB in Law, he also received an honorary Doctorate of Law. He was governor from 1963 to 1967 and during his term in office many significant things occurred that he had a hand in at the University of Kentucky. It has been said that during his term the University had the greatest number of changes it had ever had. Some of the changes were the first set of governing regulations for the University, the implementation of the Community College System, the construction of the Law Building, the Patterson Office Tower, and the Whitehall Classroom Building. The Chair thinks the Senate can see that the right person is the Chair of the Board of Trustees. He then introduced Governor Edward T. (Ned) Breathitt.

Governor Breathitt was given a round of applause.

Minutes, University Senate, October 12, 1992

Governor Breathitt thanked the Senate and said he appreciated the opportunity to be at the Senate meeting and assured the Chair that any time he or his successor asked him to come he would welcome the opportunity. He said he had no prepared remarks but would tell the Senate about his interest in the University and about his background in higher education. He would then open the floor for questions because he would like to hear from the Senate members. He said he was delighted to find that the makeup of the Senate is somewhat unusual in that there are members of the faculty, members of the administration and members of the student body. He thinks that is good because it provides a Senate that incorporates views and representation from all the University family.

I started at the University as a student during the Summer of 1942 in the Commerce College and spent a lot of time with Dean Cecil Carpenter and the professors at that time. I also took all the electives I could in the college of Arts and Sciences. I took courses in Political Science even though at that time I did not know that I was going to run for office.

My family had been involved in politics, my uncle was a Democratic Lieutenant Governor and my granddaddy was a Republican Attorney General. So I had heard some lively political discussions at the Sunday dining room table. As a result, I was interested.

Jack Reeves, Political Science, Jasper Shannon, Political Science, and Dr. Tom Clark, History had a great influence on me. I remember Dr. Clark made me write term papers on each of Kentucky's Constitutions. There was a big referendum in Kentucky on having a Constitutional Convention and Dr. Clark asked me if I would be the campus chairman and I said I would. That really got me started in politics. Dr. Clark had a wonderful influence on a lot of students, he was a great teacher.

I remember we had a formal debate on the subject of the Constitution at the library. The President Emeritus was Dr. Frank McVey; he moderated the debate. My partner was Ed Prichard on the affirmative side. All I had to do was hang on and let Prich carry the load. On the other side was Bill Townsend, the great historian, who loved all the constitutions of Kentucky, particularly the one we operated on and didn't want to change it. The other one was Cassius Marcellus Clay, the lawyer from Bourbon County, who very much was involved in the case in which Ed Prichard was sentenced for election fraud. Prich and I became good friends, he was a legend to me and he demolished everyone, he was a marvelous debater.

With that background I went on and became active in campus affairs. Dr. Donovan was president at that time; his wife was from my hometown, Pembroke, so there was a feeling there. I then went to Law School; the Law School was in the transition period at that time. The old time law professors were there, Dean Evans was the Dean, Moreland was there, Pinkie Roberts was there, and Frank

Minutes, University Senate, October 12, 1992

Murray was there. They had taught law students for two generations. I then had all the new ones, W.L. Mathews and Elvis Starr. Elvis had gotten his Law Degree at Oxford and the first class he had to teach us was Negotiable Instruments, he was one day ahead of us in class. We brought in an interesting group of very young and outstanding professors. Paul Oberst, who is still a presence there, Professor Whiteside and Professor Ham who are retired but still active at the Law School, Professor Ham still teaches a class or two. It was a wonderful experience for me. I was a small town boy from Hopkinsville and whatever I've been able to do in life is a direct relationship to the years I spent here. Because of the great influence that the people of the faculty, both in the Commerce College, the Arts and Sciences College and the Law School had on me, I've remained very close to them. In fact, when I was Governor, Paul Oberst was on the Human Relations Committee, he also was the faculty member on the University Board. In those days the Governor was Chairman of the Board.

Paul was my conscience. He and Prich. Prich would gig me and push me. Between the two of them probably the best thing we ever did during my administration was the passage of the Civil Rights Bill which was the first one south of the Mason Dixon Line. I worked very hard to see to it that we passed a resolution at the National Governors Conference to support the 1964 Act. Previous Governors had implemented the Brown Supreme Court Decision on school integration. Governor Laurence Wetherby had a simple answer when the press asked him what he was going to do about the Brown Decision. He answered in two words that solved it all "We'll comply". They went to the Attorney General, J.D. Buckman, and told him that the Governor said we would comply and asked what he was going to do. He said "He spoke for me, we'll comply". It was a great example of leadership.

While I was Governor, I served as the University Chairman of the Board of Trustees. We had a smaller board in those days and I came in a year after Dr. Oswald had been named as president. It was a period of great change on the campus. I felt that Dr. Oswald was on the right track and I strongly supported him. He needed the support because he was doing a lot of changing. He was moving so fast sometimes he didn't wait to pick up the wounded. He brought in a lot of people; there was an infusion, but there was a wonderful spirit at the University. It was divided. He started a rotation deal for the folks that had been department chairs and that created problems. I supported him and I think he made a great contribution to this University.

When I left I went into law practice again. I was out. Louie Nunn, Republican was elected as governor. I had defeated him narrowly and he turned around and beat my highway commissioner and I knew I was not going to be in the palace guard, so I went back to Hopkinsville to practice law.

Minutes, University Senate, October 12, 1992

I then served on a board that the President appointed me to that was very interesting, I chaired the Commission on Rural Poverty. I worked with the Department of Rural Sociology at the University and we wrote a report to the President called "The People Left Behind". The President of Berea College, Dr. Hutchinson, was also on that board. The Department Chair in Rural Sociology was on the board, appointed by the President. It was an interesting two year experience that I think gave me some insights in areas of concern in this country that were helpful to me and as a young man, a young lawyer and a young former governor.

I then after practicing law was appointed to the Southern Regional Education Board and served for years and years. I was appointed in 1980 and was not reappointed last year by Governor Wilkinson. I enjoyed that service and I had an opportunity to stay in touch with what was going on.

Then I was appointed to the Council on Higher Education and served there for a number of years. Governor Brown then appointed me for a two year term on the University of Kentucky Board. I served when Bill Sturgill was Chairman and Albert Clay was Chairman of the Finance Committee. Those were periods of growth and no great conflict, because it was after the time of student unrest on campus. I got plenty of that as Governor. That was certainly a period that many of us remember. I didn't have to bear the responsibilities of dealing with that as the Chairman of the Board, when I was Governor.

After that, I was asked to go back on the Council on Higher Education and served there. I was then asked to go to Morehead. They were having problems and the Governor asked the whole board to resign. I went there with my old nemesis and opponent Louie Nunn. Both of us were on the board and people wondered how that would work. They called us the Ghost Busters of Education when we arrived. It worked out and we wound up with a good program, a good chairman and a good new president. After that I was asked to go to the KSU Board and that was a real challenge. I was happy to have that experience.

The Committee, under the new law, named me as one of the three for this seat and Governor Jones appointed me and here I am. I'll try to outline for you a little bit about my basic philosophy as a Board of Trustees member and a chairman. Number one I don't think we want to do as I have seen some boards at some institutions try to get into the governing of the institution. That is not the role of a board member. Our role is oversight. You have a president who has been elected by the board. He has the responsibility of being the chief executive officer of this institution and it is not the chairman of the board, the committees of the board or the board as a whole. We have the responsibility of oversight. If the president does not do a good job then we will get a new president. But the president should be given a free hand to be the chief executive officer of this institution.

Minutes, University Senate, October 12, 1992

I for one made it very clear when I was sworn in that I strongly supported the President. I was not a part of the selection process and any of the divisions that may have gone on at that time. I was in Washington working for Norfolk Southern Corporation. I like the priorities that he set and I endorse them. He set three major priorities, (1) faculty and faculty salaries, (2) students and (3) a University Library. I don't think you could have three finer priorities for an institution. So I signed on for that and I think it is very important that all of us work together.

I also think it is important that we have a united Board and that the Board work together and we do not dissipate our energies. That doesn't mean we are going to have any gag rules and as long as we have Carolyn Bratt we won't have gag rules. She is going to be heard. You have a fine new member, Deborah Powell. She is the first Clinician from the Medical School to serve on the Board. I want myself to have a very open attitude toward the entire University Faculty, to be totally accessible. Anytime you want me to come I will be happy to see you. I will open the floor to questions. We won't always agree but at least you will know where I stand and we will have an opportunity for interchange and views about the campus.

I think we are really in a period where we can go forward in this University and really move this University ahead. I don't see divisions that are going to dissipate our energies, I don't see anything we can't solve by intelligent dedicated leadership and more money. I appreciate the fact that President Wethington and the Administration saw to it that any reductions were done through attrition and we didn't go through what some institutions did in cutting down. It was done intelligently. But we have gone as far as we can go. I think there isn't any way we can cut any more without really getting into muscle and bone and that means we will have to all stand and fight together. I have been meeting with the President and members of the Board who are in a position to help us on this. We are all going to fight a good hard fight to see to it that we get everything that we can. Not for any reason other than to see that this University can meet its mission and its mandate to serve the young people of this state and its students.

I did attend one other school. I had a wonderful experience in 1981, I had a semester at the Harvard Business School in the Advanced Management Program. We were selected from different corporations. Forty percent of the students were from other countries. Jim Batton, who is the President of Knight Ridder News and I are good friends. Jim and I would have two dinners a week in the Faculty Club including eight people. We would invite six people. They might be students, fellows from the Kennedy Center, or from Harvard University. It was a wonderful experience for someone with my background to do that.

Minutes, University Senate, October 12, 1992

I am thrilled with the opportunity to make this contribution at this stage in my life. I think this will be my last major effort for this University. I will support it as long as I am around, because I love this Institution and all parts of it.

Governor Breathitt opened the floor and responded to questions. Governor Breathitt was again given a round of applause.

Chairman Piccoro thanked Governor Breathitt for taking the time to visit with the Senate and said he appreciated his comments. He said Governor Breathitt was welcome to come anytime he liked.

The Chair then introduced Carolyn Bratt, the Senate Faculty Board of Trustees member for her remarks to the Senate.

Professor Bratt stated that she and Professor Powell were delighted when the Governor agreed to come and speak to the Senate because it was as far as they knew the first time that the Chairman of the Board had been willing to appear at a Senate Meeting. She said they went to him and asked him if he would accept an invitation to attend and he indicated that he was more than willing to do so and then the invitation was extended by Chairman John Piccoro.

Professor Bratt stated that Professor Deborah Powell could not attend today so the task of reporting to the Senate had fallen to her and she wanted to take the opportunity to thank Chairman Piccoro for giving them the opportunity to talk to the Senate about what had been going on and what they saw as issues that needed to be confronted in the future. Professor Bratt's Address to the University Senate is attached to the Minutes.

After her remarks, Professor Bratt was given a round of applause.

Professor Jesse Weil (Physics) stated he agreed whole heartedly with Professor Bratt's statement about the need for accountability. He said he thought there was something in the works.

Professor Bratt said that was the Administrative Regulation but it had now been put on hold. They were so many objections to it when it was circulated that it has not been implemented. It would have required at least as to deans and department chairs evaluation up and down. There would not have been in place something to handle higher ups, vice-presidents and chancellors.

Professor Weil asked if the objections were from administration.

Professor Bratt said as she understood them but she had not been party to the writing of that Administrative Regulation. She said it was written and circulated and there were significant objections.

Professor Weil also asked since Professor Bratt had brought up the subject of restructuring if the Board anticipates supporting restructuring and/or down-sizing of the administration at the same time they are working to restructure and down-size the faculty.

Minutes, University Senate, October 12, 1992

Professor Bratt stated she has not heard a board discussion about that. She pointed out that the President has consistently said that everything is on the table during this look at the University. She thinks that he should be taken at his word and insist that we look at administration as well as other parts of the University. She thinks that the Senate should implement something to begin to look at administration.

Professor Lance Delong (Physics) asked if there is a feeling for the relative size of our administration versus another typical university of our size. He also asked how many people in our administration are non-academics who do not have a background as a teacher or a researcher.

Professor Bratt stated she does not have personal knowledge of how our administrative size compares to other universities. Primarily because it is very hard to make the comparison. Different universities use different definitions of what is an administrator so you start out with a definitional problem. There is no reason to suppose that we are different than any other major research universities that have been burgeoning in their administrative structure over the last decade. Some of that is absolutely justifiable, with increased federal regulations and demands placed on universities for reporting more people had to be introduced, non-academics to fulfill that burden. There is not a handle on what else is being done that might be subject to being cut back or eliminated. She said she read an article that said there ought to be zero based planning and look at everything done at the university and asked if it weren't done would the sky fall in and if the answer is no then perhaps it ought not to be done. She thinks that type of look needs to be taken at the administrative structure.

In our University on the President's Cabinet the people who have academic training are Dr. Juanita Fleming who is Special Assistant to the President for Academic Affairs, Chancellor Hemenway for the Lexington Campus, Chancellor Bosomworth for the Medical Center, and the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, Lee Magid. The rest of the people, and there are more than there are academic administrators, do not have that kind of background.

A Senator stated that the new president at Stanford as his first act has cut the number of vice presidents at that institution by 60%, is there anyway we can make Stanford a benchmark?

Professor Bratt suggested if anyone would like to discuss this in more detail please ask either Deborah Powell or herself to come and talk with their department or college. They would be more than willing to do so.

The Chairman thanked Professor Bratt.

The Chair then stated that the Ombud Report would be held over to the November 9, 1992 Senate meeting.

The Chair recognized Professor Dan Fulks, Chair-elect of the Senate Council for the following resolutions.

Minutes, University Senate, October 12, 1992

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE COUNCIL RESOLUTION
(Adopted Unanimously on October 5, 1992)

Whereas, the Commonwealth of Kentucky is experiencing a substantial shortfall in state tax revenue which has increased the possibility of further budget cuts to higher education, and

Whereas, further cuts to higher education would severely inhibit the University of Kentucky's ability to perform its tri-part mission, teaching, research and service, and

Whereas, the ability of the University of Kentucky to perform its tri-part mission is important to the future of Kentucky and to the faculty, staff and students of the University of Kentucky.

Therefore be it Resolved that the University of Kentucky, on behalf of the faculty and administration of the University of Kentucky, is in support of the student rally on October 14, 1992. The purpose of this rally is to emphasize the importance of higher education in Kentucky and to highlight the negative effects that further cuts would have on institutions of higher learning throughout the Commonwealth.

Professor Fulks added that although the Senate Council did not see fit to render a student absence to attend the rally necessarily an excused absence, they are hopeful that faculty will choose to excuse the absence and show their support as faculty members.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
SENATE COUNCIL RESOLUTION
(Adopted Unanimously on October 5, 1992)

Whereas, the University of Kentucky Board of Trustees is charged with the responsibility of ensuring that the University successfully fulfills its mission as the flagship institution of higher education in the Commonwealth;

Whereas, the tripartite mission of the University of Kentucky to educate students, to conduct research, and to provide public service is accomplished through the labors of the Faculty;

Whereas, the Faculty's essential role in the work of the University endows its Faculty with knowledge indispensable to successful decision-making by the Board of Trustees;

Whereas, the Senate Council, on behalf of the Faculty of the University of Kentucky, affirms the right of the Faculty, through its elected Faculty Trustees, to participate fully and equally in the Board of Trustees' decision-making processes and objects to the exclusion of its Faculty Trustees from service on the Executive, Finance, Hearing and Nominating Committees of the Board of Trustees;

Minutes, University Senate, October 12, 1992

Whereas, this exclusion not only deprives the Faculty of a meaningful forum in which to express its ideas and opinions, but, more importantly, such exclusion needlessly deprives the aforementioned committees of the Board of Trustees of the knowledge and expertise of those who are most intimately involved in the work of the University of Kentucky.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that a Faculty Trustee should serve this year as a non-voting member of the Executive Committee and a Faculty Trustee should be appointed to serve as a member of the Finance Committee.

The Chair said the resolution will be presented by Professor Carolyn Bratt at the next Board of Trustees Meeting.

Professor Bratt said the resolution will be presented by Dr. Powell, herself and John Sistarenik who is the Community College Trustee, because he too has been excluded from service on these committees.

The Chair recognized Professor Dan Fulks, Chair-elect of the Senate Council, for the first action item on the agenda. Professor Fulks, on behalf of the Senate Council, moved approval of the proposed change in the University Calendar for Spring Semester, 1993 for the senior class in the Bachelor of Science Program in the College of Pharmacy. The proposal was circulated under the date of 28 September 1992.

The Chair stated that the motion was on the floor and since it came from the Senate Council it required no second. The floor was opened for discussion.

There was no discussion. In a unanimous voice vote the Senate approved the proposed change in the University Calendar for Spring Semester, 1993 for the senior class in the Bachelor of Science Program in the College of Pharmacy. It reads as follows:

Background and Rationale:

The College of Pharmacy has requested a change in the University Calendar for Spring semester, 1993, for the senior class in the Bachelor of Science program. The change is to begin the Spring Semester on Monday, January 4, 1993, and end the semester on Friday, April 23, 1993. The week of April 26 to 30, 1993, will be designated spring break. Finals week is unnecessary since the semester course offerings are solely experiential and do not require final examinations.

The College of Pharmacy had a major curricular change three years ago and the present senior class in the Bachelor's program is the first class to complete the new curriculum. In the new curriculum the students take only experiential classes during the

Minutes, University Senate, October 12, 1992

Spring semester. In the previous program, both the Fall and Spring semesters were used for those types of courses. Also, previously one of the courses, PHR 870, Clinical Orientation Clerkship was taught half-time for the entire semester and in the new curriculum, it is taught full-time for eight weeks. The students will spend the same amount of time in the course.

The Clerkship course is taught primarily on campus with half of the class in the first part of the semester and the other half in the second half of the semester. The Clerkship course is meshed with existing programs in the University Hospital and rotating clinical service teams. Changing the calendar will enable the Pharmacy students to join those groups at the appropriate time.

At the beginning of the Fall semester, the students were notified that the Spring semester would start early pending Senate approval.

The College of Pharmacy will need to bring a similar request to revise the calendar to the Senate each year.

The Senate Council recommends that the University Calendar for Spring Semester, 1993 for the senior class in the Bachelor of Science Program in the College of Pharmacy be changed to begin January 4 and end April 23, 1993.

The Chair then stated there was an action item postponed from the September 12, 1992 meeting. The proposed use of the Uniform Teaching Evaluation Instrument. He recognized Professor Wilbur Frye who was chair of the committee which developed the evaluation form.

Professor Frye thanked the Chair and said he appreciated the opportunity to visit with the Senate and give some background about the teacher course evaluation system that was developed a couple of years ago and pre-tested last year. He would like to give an overview of the instrument, how they arrived where they are now and some results of the statistical analysis from Dr. Roseann Hogan's office.

Professor Frye thanked the committee members who worked on the instrument. Following are the committee members.

Virginia Blum	English
Amy Cooper	Student Government
Bob Crovo	Computer Science
Larry Harris	Mathematics
Roseann Hogan	Chancellor's Office
Jim Knoblett	Business and Economics
Jane Peters	Art
Bill Pfeiffle	Allied Health
Fred Trutt	Engineering

Minutes, University Senate, October 12, 1992

He stated he would like to single out a couple of people who really did yeoman's work in getting the job done; Bob Crovo, Computing Center and Roseann Hogan, Chancellor's Office. He said there was good representation from across the University community.

Professor Frye said that their charge was two things; (1) to develop a questionnaire, an instrument for doing the evaluation and, (2) to pretest the instrument. Attached to the minutes is a copy of the questionnaire they came up with, the questionnaire used in the first pretest was a little differently organized, but the questions were essentially the same. There are a few characteristics of the questionnaire he would like to point out. On the first page is the student information, then the course items, the instructor items, the learning outcomes and finally some summary questions. On the back page is some built-in flexibility: a place for University Studies Courses only, part G for seminar courses only and a place for the laboratory and discussion courses to be evaluated. Two other important characteristics of the questionnaire are; (1) a place for comments (if that is not enough space for comments, the students can provide comments on a separate sheet, which the instructor may need to provide so the students do not feel they have to restrict their comments to the space provided), (2) the optional questions the instructor can design to fit a particular course. This flexibility was built into the questionnaire so it would be adaptable to a wide variety of different subject areas and disciplines.

In the pretest during the Fall of 1991, the first draft was pilot-tested involving courses from the following colleges and departments;

- College of Agriculture
- College of Communications
- College of Engineering
- College of Fine Arts
- College of Arts and Sciences departments:
 - School of Biological Sciences
 - Philosophy
 - Sociology
- College of Allied Health Professions

A total of 601 courses were included in the pilot and 11,158 students completed a useable Teacher Course Evaluation (TCE) questionnaire. He said they thought they did a fair pretest of the system. From the results received, some of the statistical analyses and results, compiled by Dr. Hogan and her staff, are attached.

The first chart is the Pearson correlations of overall value of the course and overall quality of teaching versus course items, instructor items and learning outcomes. Correlated against the two summary questions at the end, (1) the overall value of the course and (2) the overall quality of teaching. The correlation values range from 0.31 up to about 0.6. All are highly significant.

The next chart shows the same correlation against instructor items and learning-outcome items. The correlation is higher than the other which involved course items only.

Minutes, University Senate, October 12, 1992

The next chart for undergraduate courses only shows the reliability statistics for the major sections, the number of cases considered and two different reliability statistics. The reliability statistics are quite high from each of the determinations.

The chart for the graduate courses only shows the same determinations, same data, different set of courses. Again there were quite high reliability statistics.

At the end of the pretest in the Fall of 1991, a survey form was sent to each of the departments and units that had participated. As a part of the survey, we asked a couple of opinion questions of the people who had used the questionnaire. One question was, if this system was available, would you use it? The second question was, should these results be made available to students in an overall summary form? The responses received from the departments were positive about the use of the evaluation system in all of the departments but one, who said they would not use it; it did not suit their courses. All of the others were positive about the potential use of the evaluation forms provided there were some modifications and improvements. There was a clear no in making the results of the evaluations available to students.

The committee went back to the Senate Council and recommended that the evaluation system be adopted in the University community on a volunteer basis, and that is where we are today. The Committee is not recommending adoption of the instrument on a mandatory basis but rather recommending that it be provided for those units who wish to adopt it. At this time, there are seven colleges scheduled to use the evaluation in the fall semester. For the spring semester, all of the departments in eight colleges are scheduled to use it. In Arts and Sciences and Education more than 60% of the departments are scheduled to use it.

The Chair stated that, when this was postponed at the last meeting, there was a motion on the floor to pass the instrument and an amendment to drop Question 21.

Professor Mark Berger (Business and Economics) asked for clarification on the motion. He said the original piece of paper did not have a motion listed.

The Chair stated that the motion was for the Senate to endorse the use of the instrument on an optional basis during this academic year.

Professor Berger asked if it were not true that it can be used on an optional basis whether or not the Senate votes yes or no. The Chair stated that was correct.

Professor Lance Delong (Physics) asked for the Pearson correlation to be explained.

Professor Frye explained that the significance value on the correlation has a lot to do with the number of samples. They had a large number of samples; therefore, the seemingly low correlation coefficients are statistically highly significant.

Dr. Roseann Hogan said that research shows that teacher-course evaluations should not have a reliability coefficient under 0.69. Ours were all well above that. The correlations were also higher than some research that was done related to student learning with individual items. Their correlations were around 0.3 or 0.4 and; ours were in the 0.5 and 0.6 range.

Minutes, University Senate, October 12, 1992

A Senator asked if the correlation coefficients were the Pearson correlations? He also asked what was the criterion for correlation coefficients?

Dr. Hogan said in the first part of the presentation they saw Pearson correlations. She stated there were really no criterion for correlation coefficients.

Professor Frye made the comment that correlation coefficients and probability should not be confused.

The Chair recognized Professor John Bernardo who presented his Criterion for a Summary of the University Teaching Evaluation Instrument (attached to the minutes).

Professor Bernardo thanked the Chair. He said he felt it was necessary to speak after reading some quotes from Professor Frye and Professor Louis Swift in the September 15th Kernel. He felt there had been a misunderstanding as to the reasons for the amendment and for the reasons Question 21 should be eliminated.

His records in the Business School go back to 1983, where they have used the bubble sheet for student evaluation of instruction. He sees no difficulty in it. He felt there were a number of issues the committee addressed and that they did a very good job. He said when you go through merit evaluations there are numerous inputs. This number is just one item that goes into merit evaluation of teaching. It should also go in over a number of time periods. Although the Business School has a long list of student evaluations, they dropped Question 21 two years ago. Two months ago when the colleges were requested to use the evaluations, the Business School Deans and Department Chairs rejected this form. One of the reasons it was rejected was Question 21.

He thinks that in order to do anything, you must step back and say "what do we want to accomplish, what is our criterion" The basic criterion is to improve instruction. Although this is just one number in the teacher evaluation, this number should strictly be student dependent. At the September meeting, Lou Swift made the statement that all he was interested in was the bottom line, the bottom line shouldn't be anymore unreliable that it has to be or needs to be, but should be strictly student dependent (Criterion #1).

The bottom line should be used to improve education. If a junior faculty member, or anyone, goes to their department chairperson and the chair says the instructor didn't do very well this semester, if you improve on these dimensions you will be a better instructor. If during the next semester, the instructor has indeed improved, he would expect his overall measure to increase. That is consistency (Criterion #2). The measure should be consistent with the efforts the instructor puts forward.

In the College of Business and Economics there are a number of courses that have the same syllabus, same exams, and the same textbooks taught by faculty, not teaching assistants. If two instructors have the identical dimensions they should have the same overall rating. That is equity (Criterion #3).

This is an employee evaluation instrument. Employees can not be evaluated on dimensions over which they have no control. That is, the instrument should be representative (Criterion #4).

Minutes, University Senate, October 12, 1992

Any questions used as a summary measure violates consistency (the dimensions can actually be improved and the summary rating be lower), equity (two people can have the same ratings and the summary ratings can be disparate), and it is not representative unless the coefficient of determination between that question and the nineteen dimensions is equal to one. Professor Bernardo asked Dr. Hogan to calculate this and she had found 0.6934. Where does the other 30% of that number come from? It could be that there are other dimensions that are just not in the instrument. It could be what the students had for breakfast and that statement cannot be disproved. It could be intangibles.

Professor Bernardo then read the following quote by Professor Louis Swift from the September 15, 1992 Kernel "to be blunt about it, I think students can differentiate between a professor that they like or hate". Professor Bernardo said they did not necessarily want to teach to a love/hate dimension. That isn't exactly the correct thing to do. Professor Bernardo believes the students are being asked to perform an impossible task. He doesn't think the students are being nasty or that they are not honest in answering the questions.

Professor Bernardo thinks that administrators want the bottom line for evaluations. He believes the students are honest. Consequently the Business School uses the median and then calculates an average. There is a dispersion across instructors, but the three criteria; consistency, representativity, and equity are satisfied. They do not use Question 21 as a summary measure. They also calculate the mean. There can be a bottom line which satisfies the other three criteria.

Professor Bernardo thinks the basic question is: "is Question 21 a summary or is it just another question"? To convince him Question 21 is a summary, he would have to be convinced that the human mind can think consistently and logically in nineteen dimensions. If a statistical measure is used an employee would have to be convinced they can be evaluated on dimensions they cannot control. They would have to be convinced that two people can have the same evaluation on the dimensions but have different overall ratings. They would have to be convinced that it is acceptable to increase their dimension scores but decrease in their overall rating. If there is no logical answer, then Question 21 is just another question, not a summary.

Chairman Piccoro asked if anyone wanted to speak for or against the amendment to strike Question 21.

Professor Mark Berger (Business and Economics) would like to go stronger as far as Question 21 being just one other question. He said they could vote down the amendment, still include Question 21 as another question and calculate the median of all the dimensions. The problem is Question 21 is just too tempting for administrators to use as a single dimension of quality. He thinks there is a problem if it is included, because it will be used.

Professor Tom Blues (English) asked if there were the same objections standing for Question 20?

Professor Bernardo stated that Question 20 is not involved in faculty evaluations. Question 20 in the College of Business and Economics is handled differently, and does not enter into the instructors evaluation.

Minutes, University Senate, October 12, 1992

A voice vote as to whether to call for the question on the amendment passed.

Professor Piccoro said the amendment on the floor was to delete Question 21 from the evaluation form.

In a show of hands the amendment to delete Question 21 passed.

The Chair said the motion to endorse the questionnaire on an optional basis during the current academic year was on the floor.

Professor Mike Cibull (College of Medicine) asked why the Senate is considering the evaluation at all to be used with or without the endorsement of the Senate.

Professor Frye said the Committee was appointed by the Senate Council and they were asked to do the job. They reported back to the Senate Council.

Professor Cibull asked if the form was going to be used either way, whether the Senate approved or rejected the endorsement? Professor Piccoro stated that was correct.

Professor Frye said they were asked to develop a system that would eventually be a University wide evaluation system.

Professor Cibull stated they were not voting on that.

Professor Frye said they were not voting on that today. Professor Cibull asked if this vote would be used as evidence of that?

Professor Doug Poe (Business and Economics) said that at the last meeting it was said that the forms had already been printed and would be used in the current form. If the motion is now passed, they are endorsing a form which cannot be used during the fall or spring semester, because the old form has already been printed.

Professor Bradley Canon (Political Science) said he wanted to speak against Senate endorsement of the form, either the printed or amended form. He thought the issue should come to the Senate only when there is a movement to make it mandatory and he is fearful that if it is endorsed now, at some future time they will be told they had previously endorsed it and it could then be made mandatory. He thinks it should only be brought before the Senate when they are ready to make it mandatory.

The Chair stated the use of the instrument is not mandatory, it is optional.

Professor Bernardo thinks that even though he spoke against Question 21, something should be done to improve education. He thinks there should be a concept and a goal of a common procedure.

Professor Mark Berger asked if they chose not to endorse the form, will Question 21 be on the form or not.

Professor Piccoro said the use of the form is optional whether it is endorsed by the Senate or not and the next time it is printed Question 21 will not be on the form.

Minutes, University Senate, October 12, 1992

Professor Louise Zegeer (Nursing) stated there was another alternative, since the forms are already printed and if it is endorsed by the Senate, then the data on Question 21 should just not be used in the calculation of the mean. She also stated that this is a sort of retroactive endorsement and what they would like if the form comes up for mandatory use is proactive endorsement.

Doctor Hogan said she thought that was fine, there seemed to be hard feelings about going ahead with it before the endorsement. She explained there had been four or five colleges that had used the form last year and they asked to continue again this year. In order to do that, they went ahead and had the form printed so those colleges could have some continuity in their evaluation system.

Professor Lance Delong (Physics) stated that he had an amendment which reads as follows:

While the Senate recognizes that the Uniform Teaching Evaluation is a useful measure of the quality of instruction at the University, the Senate does not endorse the Uniform Teaching Evaluation as the sole or primary instrument of instructional evaluation.

The Senate further urges that the content, technical validity and objectivity of the Evaluation be continually investigated in order to better define the relevance of the Evaluation data to the quality of teaching and the changing instructional needs of the University and its students.

The amendment was seconded.

Professor Delong then stated that this does not, of course, guarantee that the statistics would not be misused at a future date, that cannot be prevented. He thinks that some form of evaluation that is uniform across campus is probably a reasonable thing and he doesn't think a student evaluation is an unreasonable thing. His faculty is not against the uniform evaluation. He thinks there is a reasonable worry about how the data can be used in a bean counting exercise and he would not like the Senate to be on record endorsing this type of evaluation instrument as a sole figure of merit instruction.

The Chairman asked if there was any discussion to the motion?

Professor Richard Ausness (Law) said he was concerned about the idea that the Senate is endorsing uniformity. The amendment assumes the Senate thinks uniformity is a good idea. He thinks it is a terrible idea and certainly would not want it endorsed by the Senate in this form without any debate.

Professor Delong said he did not think he was endorsing uniformity in the sense when he said the Senate does not endorse the Uniform Teaching Evaluation as the sole or primary instrument. He is leaving the door open for any other mechanisms or evaluations that the departments or colleges might want to use.

Professor Ausness said it was the uniform instrument that he was talking about, he doesn't think that idea has been endorsed other than through Professor Delong's amendment.

Minutes, University Senate, October 12, 1992

Professor DeLong said that may be so. According to his faculty, he and they would feel better, if it passed in its present form that at least it be amended to the language, so they are not giving a blanket endorsement to the use of the numbers.

In a voice vote the amendment passed.

Professor Mark Berger asked if there was any wording in the motion that this is an optional form and if it is endorsed that it is only endorsed for its optional use. He still does not feel the Senate should endorse the evaluation.

The Chair called for a vote on the amended motion to optionally endorse the use of the amended Uniform Teaching Evaluation. A voice vote failed to endorse the amendment. By a show of hands the motion failed.

The Chair thanked everyone for staying. The meeting was adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

Address to University Senate
as
Faculty Trustee
October 12, 1992

I want to thank John Piccoro, as chair of the Senate Council, for providing us with the opportunity to deliver a report to the University Senate. Both Dr. Powell and I agree that in order to be effective representatives of the faculty on the Board of Trustees, we must know what our faculty colleagues want, we must act consistently with those desires, and we must report to the faculty on how we are trying to accomplish its agenda.

Addressing the University Senate is just one mechanism we use to assess faculty opinion and to report to our constituency. For example, last year Ray Betts, who was then a faculty trustee, and I ran a series of three faculty forums at the Medical Center and on the Lexington Campus. Every member of the faculty was sent an invitation announcing the time and place of the meetings. Those forums were rightfully dominated by concerns about the impact of the budget cuts on curriculum and programs, but we also discussed other issues of concern to the faculty and answered numerous questions about the administrative structure and decision-making processes of the University.

You also should know that in the two years I have been on the Board, more than 75 individual faculty member or department problems have been brought to my attention and addressed.

In keeping with this tradition of listening, acting and reporting, Professor Powell and I circulated a letter at the beginning of this

semester to the 17 College Deans asking to meet with their college's faculty. To date, we had a very effective forum with the faculty of the College of Human Environmental Sciences. We are scheduled to speak next week with the faculties of the Colleges of Dentistry and Engineering. The College of Agriculture has forwarded our request to its Faculty Council for its consideration, the Dean of Pharmacy has alerted his departments to our request, and the Dean of Arts and Sciences suggested waiting until later in the semester for such a gathering. We are awaiting the responses of the other 11 deans.

I believe college-based and discipline-based meetings are important because they create a forum in which the more particularize concerns of faculty can be aired and in which questions about the purpose and function of the Board of Trustees can be explored in depth. If your college or department is interested in meeting with us, please feel free to contact either Dr. Powell or me and we will arrange a time.

I want to take just a moment to update you on perhaps one of the hottest topics to emerge this year at the University of Kentucky - free football and basketball tickets for legislators and other elected officeholders. As you know, the Athletics Board, not the Board of Trustees, determines the University's policy and practices on athletics issues. Recently, the Athletics Board voted to charge officeholders and legislators the face value of the tickets. Although the attention has rightfully focused on University's practice of providing free tickets to legislators because of the ethical considerations it raises, you should know that members of the Board of Trustees, including your faculty trustees, receive complimentary football and basketball tickets.

Since joining the Board, my practice has been to make those tickets available to members of the UK community rather than to use them for purposes of my own private entertainment. To date faculty, staff and students from the Lexington Campus, Medical Center and Research and Graduate Studies as well as from Information Systems and Central Administration have used my tickets. This year, Dr. Powell and the faculty trustee from the Community College System have also agreed to join in this practice.

I do want to touch on a few more important issues facing us as faculty members at the University of Kentucky. As you all know, there is a national debate raging about the effectiveness of, and accountability in, higher education. That debate was brought home to us during the spring semester in a series of inflammatory and inaccurate statements by certain members of the University's Board of Trustees who chose to launch a wholesale attack on the faculty of this University. We were accused of everything from ineptitude and incompetency to self-aggrandizing and indolent behavior. Your faculty trustees publicly refuted those charges and tangled with our accusers at a number of Board meetings and in the media.

With the passage of legislation which reformed the method by which trustees are selected, with the appointment of many new trustees by Governor Jones, and with the election of new chair of the Board, the false accusations and inflammatory rhetoric of last spring has stopped. However, it is important to remember that the debate about institutional effectiveness and accountability will not, and, in fact, should not, go away.

As faculty, we must be open enough to recognize and change those things which need to be changed to enhance our ability to provide excellence in teaching, research and public service. We also need to be strong enough to vigorously defend those things which are essential to the integrity of our work as teachers, scholars and public servants. And, of course, we need the wisdom to know the difference.

The current review of the University's Strategic Plan can become an important focal point for an institution-wide debate about what we are and what our aspirations for ourselves should be in light of our own commitment to excellence, legitimate public expectations, a changing economy, and reduced financial support from the state. The Chancellors of the Lexington Campus and Medical Center as well as the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies have all put in place this semester sector mechanisms for investigating realignment and restructuring issues. Ultimately, the various recommendations will be combined into a University Strategic Plan and a series of realignment and restructuring proposals which will be submitted for approval to the Board of Trustees.

I have two concerns about this process I want to share with you. First, no overarching mechanism has been put in place to permit and to encourage us to look horizontally across sectors. The primary institutional focus is vertical - that is we are looking at restructuring and realignment within, not across, sectors. Now, I know that the Chancellors and Vice Presidents have told their committees to take a horizontal look. But, I believe that unless a group with representation from all sectors in the University is formed, the need for horizontally

realignment and restructuring will not receive the focused attention it deserves.

My second concern is that whatever is actually undertaken by these various R & R committees in the sectors, the Faculty Senate is not directly involved. Sure individual faculty members have been selected to serve on their sector's R&R committee, but the Faculty Senate and the Senate Council, the chosen representatives of the faculty at this University, are in a totally reactive position. Once the work of these committees is completed, their recommendations will be sifted and selected by the Chancellors and Vice Presidents and then forwarded to the President and his Cabinet for further sorting and sifting. Only when the process is complete will those matters which require University Senate approval be submitted to us.

I am convinced that the faculty through its Senate and the Senate Council must become involved now, not later, in this process. The Senate and the Senate Council, because they are representative of the entire academic community, are in the best position to take a horizontal look at the University and to propose restructuring and realignment initiatives which address everything from administrative structure to curricular coherence.

I will tell you that as your representative of the Board, I prefer voting on the restructuring and realignment proposals which need Board approval if the faculty through its Senate and Senate Council has been intimately involved in the formulation of those initiatives.

Although there are a myriad of other issues which are important, I want to focus on just one more. The issue arises from this on-going,

public debate about the effectiveness of American higher education. It is the issue of accountability.

Since joining the Board of Trustees two years ago, I have been very concerned that accountability is only understood at this institution to mean measuring, monitoring and metering faculty performance. I hear incessant demands for everything from faculty workload formulas to mechanisms for weeding out faculty who are engaged in "unimportant" research or publish in "itsy bitsy" journals.

I am not in anyway opposed to the concept of accountability in higher education. I am an ardent supporter of the concept. I do, however, categorically reject those so-called accountability measures which intrude upon academic freedom or which impede our work as transmitters of that which is known and as the discoverers and creators of new knowledge. What I find wrong in the current accountability movement that I have not heard a single, official utterance by this University about the need for measuring and assessing the performance of all of UK's administrators including the President.

If you stop and think about it, the focus of this accountability debate is really skewed. Among all the constituent parts of the university community, the faculty is the group which traditionally and historically has been subject to the closest, most exacting scrutiny. For example, our teaching is regularly and systematically evaluated by our students, department chairs, and deans. Also, our research is subject to intensive review by peers in our departments, colleges and disciplines as well as by administrators within our colleges and sectors.

Where are the mechanisms for reviewing the performance of university administrators? A department chair and dean's performance may be reviewed by those higher up the administrative structure, but where is the input from those of us who occupy a lower rung in the organizational ladder. Faculty are evaluated by their students. Why aren't academic administrators evaluated by their faculty?

And, just as importantly, where is the systematic and comprehensive review of those at the very top of the administrative pyramid? Who evaluates the work of the Chancellors, Vice Presidents and the President? Certainly not the Board of Trustees since I have been a member. If accountability is a "good", why is it only good for faculty, students, professional and hourly staff?

Such an expansion of the concept of "accountability" will be viewed by some as very a radical idea and it will not be accomplished merely through the actions of the faculty trustees. The impetus will have to come from the collective efforts of the faculty through its Senate and Senate Council.

Administration at UK as well as in other institutions of higher education has been the fastest growing segment of the university community in the past decade. It is time to insist upon the development and the implementation of formal procedures to assess the performance of even the highest level administrator. Such a system of administrative evaluation must include formal, systematic in-put from those (such as faculty) who are forced to deal daily with the effects of administrative decision-making.

Thank you for this opportunity to share some ruminations and reflections on being one of your two representatives on the Board of

Trustees. If you have any questions now, Dr. Powell and I will be glad to try to answer them. Otherwise, I hope you will encourage your departments and colleges to arrange a time for us to meet with you.

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

University of Kentucky Teacher and Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Directions: Fill in bubbles with No. 2 pencil. Mark only one response.

A. Student Information

Classification <input type="radio"/> Freshman <input type="radio"/> Sophomore <input type="radio"/> Junior <input type="radio"/> Senior <input type="radio"/> Graduate <input type="radio"/> Professional <input type="radio"/> Other	Main reason for taking this course <input type="radio"/> Required by University Studies <input type="radio"/> Required by my major <input type="radio"/> Other (e.g., elective)	Hours per week spent on the course (excluding class time)? <input type="radio"/> less than 1 <input type="radio"/> 1-3 <input type="radio"/> 4-6 <input type="radio"/> 7-10 <input type="radio"/> over 10	Expected grade in this course <input type="radio"/> Pass or unit <input type="radio"/> I <input type="radio"/> E/Fail <input type="radio"/> D <input type="radio"/> C <input type="radio"/> B <input type="radio"/> A
---	---	---	---

B. Course Items

- At the beginning of the course, the instructor outlined in reasonable detail course material and grading procedures.
- The textbook(s) contributed to my understanding of the subject.
- The assignments (supplemental reading, homework, reports, etc.) helped me to understand the subject.
- Examinations reflected what was taught in the course.
- Grading in the course was fair and consistent.
- Assignments were distributed fairly throughout the semester.
- Graded assignments, tests, etc., were returned promptly.
- Graded assignments included helpful comments from the instructor.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

Not Applicable

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

C. Instructor Items

- The instructor presented course material in an effective manner.
- The instructor had a good knowledge of the subject matter.
- The instructor was available for consultation outside of class during office hours.
- The instructor satisfactorily answered questions raised in class.
- The instructor stimulated my interest in the subject.
- The instructor encouraged student participation in class.

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

D. Learning Outcomes

- I learned to respect viewpoints different from my own.
- The course strengthened my ability to analyze and evaluate information.
- The course helped me to develop the ability to solve problems.
- I gained an understanding of concepts and principles in this field.
- The course stimulated me to read further in the area.

Poor Fair Good Excellent

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

E. Summary Items

- Rate the overall value of this course.
- Rate the overall quality of teaching by the primary instructor in this course.

Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Agree
Strongly Agree
Not Applicable

F. Complete for University Studies Courses Only

- 22. (For University Studies Science Courses) The course helped me to understand the general methods of scientific inquiry.
- 23. I learned how this discipline relates to other areas of study.
- 24. The writing assignments in this course (e.g. essay questions, exams, papers) helped me understand the subject.
- 25. (For Cross-Cultural Courses) The course increased my understanding of thinking and behavior in other cultures.
- 26. (For Cross-Disciplinary Courses) The cross-disciplinary links between this course and the one it is paired with were evident.

G. Complete for Seminars Only

- 27. The instructor provided helpful feedback on oral presentations.
- 28. The instructor effectively guided the preparation of student reports/oral presentations.
- 29. Students in this course were free to express their opinions.
- 30. The class discussions broadened my knowledge of the subject area beyond what I learned from the readings.
- 31. I developed the ability to conduct research in this area.

H. Complete for Laboratory and Discussion Sections Only

- 32. The laboratory/discussion clarified lecture material.
- 33. The amount of work required was a realistic expectation for this laboratory/discussion section.
- 34. The laboratory/discussion instructor adequately explained what was expected each session.
- 35. The laboratory/discussion instructor helped me with my problem areas.
- 36. The use of laboratory equipment was satisfactorily explained.

I. Optional Questions

- 37. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 38. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 39. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 40. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 41. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 42. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 43. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 44. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 45. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 46. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 47. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 48. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- 49. 0 1 2 3 4 5

Comments

Below, or on a separate sheet of paper, please comment on the strengths and/or weaknesses of this course and suggest ways to improve it.

**UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
 SPRING 1992 TEACHER COURSE EVALUATION STATISTICS
 PEARSON CORRELATIONS OF OVERALL VALUE OF THE COURSE AND
 OVERALL QUALITY OF TEACHING VS. COURSE ITEMS,
 INSTRUCTOR ITEMS AND LEARNING OUTCOMES**

	Overall Value of Course*	Overall Quality of Teaching by Primary Instructor*
COURSE ITEMS		
At the beginning of the course, the instructor outlined in reasonable detail course material and grading procedures.	0.52	0.53
The textbook(s) contributed to my understanding of the subject.	0.38	0.31
The assignments (supplemental reading, homework, reports, etc.) helped me to understand the subject.	0.54	0.48
Examinations reflected what was taught in the course.	0.56	0.57
Grading in the course was fair and consistent.	0.54	0.57
Assignments were distributed fairly throughout the semester.	0.43	0.41
Graded assignments, tests, etc., were returned promptly.	0.41	0.42
Graded assignments included helpful comments from the instructor.	0.50	0.53

- 31 -

	Overall Value of Course*	Overall Quality of Teaching by Primary Instructor*
INSTRUCTOR ITEMS		
The instructor presented course material in an effective manner.	0.68	0.79
The instructor had a good knowledge of the subject matter.	0.51	0.60
The instructor was available for consultation outside of class during office hours.	0.48	0.54
The instructor satisfactorily answered questions raised in class.	0.60	0.69
The instructor stimulated my interest in the subject.	0.74	0.75
The instructor encouraged student participation in class.	0.56	0.62
LEARNING OUTCOMES		
I learned to respect viewpoints different from my own.	0.53	0.49
The course strengthened my ability to analyze and evaluate information.	0.65	0.58
The course helped me to develop the ability to solve problems.	0.63	0.57
I gained an understanding of concepts and principles in this field.	0.67	0.61
The course stimulated me to read further in the area.	0.64	0.54

Note: *Significant at the .0001 level.

**TABLE 3
TCE ORIGINAL ITEMS
UNDERGRADUATE COURSES ONLY
FALL 1991**

RELIABILITY STATISTICS

ORIGINAL ITEMS	NUMBER OF CASES	CRONBACH'S ALPHA	GUTTMAN SPLIT HALF
Course Items (1-9)	6558	.8784	.8544
Instructor Items (10-15)	8256	.8959	.8910
Learning Outcomes (16-21)	7526	.8941	.8836
USP (22-26)	1087	.9193	.8831
Lab/Discussion (32-36)	1051	.8746	.8293

**TABLE 4
TCE ORIGINAL ITEMS
GRADUATE COURSES ONLY
FALL 1991**

RELIABILITY STATISTICS

FACTOR SCALES	NUMBER OF CASES	CRONBACH'S ALPHA	GUTTMAN SPLIT HALF
Learning Outcomes (14, 16-21, 37)	989	.9287	.9075
Course Grading Characteristics (1, 3-8, 10, 12, 38)	994	.9074	.8847
Class Management and Discussions (11, 13, 14, 29-30)	211	.8450	.8504
ORIGINAL ITEMS			
Course Items	1018	.8815	.8567
Instructor Items	1426	.9065	.9003
Learning Outcomes	1160	.8995	.8825
Seminar Items	163	.7981	.7672
Laboratory Items	160	.8670	.8378

- 34 -

CRITERIA FOR A SUMMARY MEASURE
OF THE UTEI

1. STUDENT DEPENDENT
2. CONSISTENCY
3. EQUITY
4. REPRESENTATIVE

ANY QUESTION USED AS A SUMMARY
MEASURE ALWAYS VIOLATES CRITERIA 2, 3,
AND 4 UNLESS $r^2 = 1$.

10/5/92

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

28 September 1992

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, October 12, 1992. Proposed Use of Uniform Teaching Evaluation Instrument (UTEI).

Background and Rationale:

At the Senate meeting of September 14, 1992, the Senate Council recommended that the Senate endorse the use of of the UTEI [attached] on an optional basis during the 1992-93 academic year. A lengthy discussion ensued and an amendment to the original recommendation was made and seconded to delete item Number 21 on the UTEI. After much discussion, another motion was made and seconded to postpone consideration on the motion and amendment on the floor until the next meeting.

Much of the discussion dealt with statistical analyses of the previous use of UTEI. At the time the original circulation was issued, it was not commonly known that the analyses were available on View and this contributed to the confusion. The analyses are available on View under LC INFO. The analyses will also be presented at the Senate meeting when UTEI is taken up again.

The UTEI will be used during the Fall semester and then reviewed and possibly modified for the Spring semester. The ultimate objective would be to have an acceptable UTEI that would be used throughout the University and one which would be dynamic in nature and reviewed and modified as needed.

Attachment

5763C

Strongly Disagree Disagree Strongly Agree
 Not Applicable

F. Complete for University Studies Courses Only

- 22. (For University Studies Science Courses) The course helped me to understand the general methods of scientific inquiry. 1 2 3 4
- 23. I learned how this discipline relates to other areas of study. 1 2 3 4
- 24. The writing assignments in this course (e.g. essay questions, exams, papers) helped me understand the subject. 1 2 3 4
- 25. (For Cross-Cultural Courses) The course increased my understanding of thinking and behavior in other cultures. 1 2 3 4
- 26. (For Cross-Disciplinary Courses) The cross-disciplinary links between this course and the one it is paired with were evident. 1 2 3 4

G. Complete for Seminars Only

- 27. The instructor provided helpful feedback on oral presentations. 1 2 3 4
- 28. The instructor effectively guided the preparation of student reports/oral presentations. 1 2 3 4
- 29. Students in this course were free to express their opinions. 1 2 3 4
- 30. The class discussions broadened my knowledge of the subject area beyond what I learned from the readings. 1 2 3 4
- 31. I developed the ability to conduct research in this area. 1 2 3 4

H. Complete for Laboratory and Discussion Sections Only

- 32. The laboratory/discussion clarified lecture material. 1 2 3 4
- 33. The amount of work required was a realistic expectation for this laboratory/discussion section. 1 2 3 4
- 34. The laboratory/discussion instructor adequately explained what was expected each session. 1 2 3 4
- 35. The laboratory/discussion instructor helped me with my problem areas. 1 2 3 4
- 36. The use of laboratory equipment was satisfactorily explained. 1 2 3 4

I. Optional Questions

- 37. 1 2 3 4 5
- 38. 1 2 3 4 5
- 39. 1 2 3 4 5
- 40. 1 2 3 4 5
- 41. 1 2 3 4 5
- 42. 1 2 3 4 5
- 43. 1 2 3 4 5
- 44. 1 2 3 4 5
- 45. 1 2 3 4 5
- 46. 1 2 3 4 5
- 47. 1 2 3 4 5
- 48. 1 2 3 4 5
- 49. 1 2 3 4 5

Comments

Below, or on a separate sheet of paper, please comment on the strengths and/or weaknesses of this course and suggest ways to improve it.

10/5/92

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

28 September 1992

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate meeting, Monday, October 12, 1992. Proposed change in the University Calendar for Spring Semester, 1993 for the senior class in the Bachelor of Science Program in the College of Pharmacy.

Background and Rationale:

The College of Pharmacy has requested a change in the University Calendar for Spring semester, 1993, for the senior class in the Bachelor of Science program. The change is to begin the Spring semester on Monday, January 4, 1993, and end the semester on Friday, April 23, 1993. The week of April 26 to 30, 1993, will be designated Spring Break. Finals week is unnecessary since the semester course offerings are solely experiential and do not require final examinations.

The College of Pharmacy had a major curricular change three years ago and the present senior class in the Bachelor's program is the first class to complete the new curriculum. In the new curriculum the students take only experiential classes during the Spring semester. In the previous program, both the Fall and Spring semesters were used for those types of courses. Also, previously one of the courses, PHR 870, Clinical Orientation Clerkship was taught half-time for the entire semester and in the new curriculum, it is taught full-time for eight weeks. The students will spend the same amount of time in the course.

The Clerkship course is taught primarily on campus with half of the class in the first part of the semester and the other half in the second half of the semester. The Clerkship course is meshed with existing programs in the University Hospital and rotating clinical service teams. Changing the calendar will enable the Pharmacy students to join those groups at the appropriate time.