

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

September 27, 1978

To: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet in regular session on Monday,
October 9, 1978 at 3:00 p.m. in the Court Room of the Law Building.

AGENDA:

- 1) Approval of minutes of September 11, 1978.
- 2) Memorial Resolution
- 3) Remarks: Joseph A. Bryant, Jr., Chairman
- 4) Action Items:
 - a) Proposed changes in and additions to the admissions requirements in the College of Pharmacy, University Senate Rules, IV, 2.2.2. (Circulated under date of September 27, 1978.)
 - b) Proposed "Academic Performance Policy" in the College of Allied Health Professions, if approved to be codified by the Senate Rules Committee. (Circulated under date of September 28, 1978.)

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

/cet

Copy 1

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, OCTOBER 9, 1978

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, October 9, 1978, in the Court Room of the Law Building.

Joseph A. Bryant, Chairman, presiding

Members absent: Michael Adelstein, C. Dwight Auvenshine*, Lyle N. Back*, Charles E. Barnhart, Janis L. Bellack*, John J. Bernardo*, Kathy Besing, Brack A. Bivins*, Jack C. Blanton, Sara Brumbaugh, C. Frank Buck*, Joseph T. Burch, Bradley Canon*, W. Merle Carter*, S. K. Chan*, Donald B. Clapp, Lewis W. Cochran*, Clinton Collins*, Ronda S. Connaway*, Raymond H. Cox, James E. Criswell*, George W. Denemark, David E. Denton*, Ronald C. Dillehay*, Carolton Doran, Joseph M. Dougherty, Anthony Eardley, Bruce S. Eastwood*, W. W. Ecton*, Roger Eichhorn*, Jane Emanuel*, Joseph Engelberg*, James E. Funk*, Hans Gesund*, Alexander Gilchrist*, Abner Golden*, Andrew J. Grimes*, George W. Gunther*, Joseph Hamburg, Raymond R. Hornback, Eugene Huff*, Charles W. Hultman*, David Hurst, Clyde L. Irwin*, Donald W. Ivey*, Gerald Janecek, Dean Jaros, Margaret W. Jones*, Edward J. Kifer, James A. Knoblett, Mark Koopman, Joseph Krislov*, Robert A. Kuehne, Gretchen LaGodna*, Arthur Lieber*, John Lihani*, Austin S. Litvak, Marion E. McKenna*, Phillip W. Miller, George E. Mitchell*, William G. Moody*, Sid Neal*, Robert C. Noble, Elbert W. Ockerman*, Clayton Omvig*, Merrill W. Packer*, Leonard V. Packett, Ronda S. Paul, Doyle E. Peaslee*, David Peck*, Alan R. Perreiah*, Deborah E. Powell*, David H. Richardson, Wimberly C. Royster*, Pritam S. Sabharwal, Stanley R. Saxe*, D. Milton Shuffett*, Timothy W. Sineath, Otis A. Singletary*, John T. Smith*, Wade C. Smith, Terry Squires, John B. Stephenson, Marjorie S. Stewart*, Lee T. Todd, William F. Wagner, John N. Walker, M. Stanley Wall, Richard L. Warren*, Constance P. Wilson, Leon Zolondek*, and Robert G. Zumwinkle*

The minutes of the regular meeting of September 11, 1978, were accepted as circulated.

Professor Malcolm E. Jewell, Department of Political Science, presented the following Memorial Resolution on the death of Professor John E. Reeves:

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

John E. Reeves 1902 - 1978

John E. Reeves, who died on May 19, 1978, at the age of 75, had a long record of distinguished service to this university and to the state. He was born in Owen County, Kentucky in 1902. He received the Bachelor of Arts degree in 1926 and the Master of Arts degree in 1938, both in political science, from the University of Kentucky. He joined the Political Science Department in 1940, and served in that department, with occasional interruptions for governmental service, until he retired in 1968 with the rank of associate professor. He served as acting head of the department in 1948.

During his teaching career, Jack Reeves trained a large number of those who have served in Kentucky state and local governments during the last thirty years. He brought to the classroom a vast store of knowledge about Kentucky government, which was reflected in the book on that topic that he published in several editions, and in other monographs and articles on state and local government. He also brought to the classroom a warm interest in students and a determination to inspire in them the same interest in politics and government that he shared.

*Absence explained

Jack was an active member of the University community. He was a member of the Senate and served on the Senate Council in 1962-64. He was an active member and office-holder in the AAUP. He served a term as president of the Kentucky Conference of Political Scientists. He was on the council of the Midwest Political Science Association (1948-49), and was a member of the American Political Science Association.

Jack Reeves played a vital role in government and politics before, during, and after his years at the University. He served in several agencies of the federal government during World War Two. He served in the Kentucky Department of Revenue and the Legislative Council early in his career. For three years after his retirement (1974-77) he served as the first ombudsman of the Kentucky Department of Human Resources; he handled more than 3,000 cases a year, drawing on his extensive knowledge of state government and his deep concern for the needs of people. He played a valuable role in legislative reapportionment in 1963.

Probably Jack's deepest concern was the cause of the state constitutional revision. He played a major role in the 1947 effort to call a constitutional convention, served very effectively as a member of the 1964 Constitutional Revision Assembly, and continued his efforts during the 1977 campaign for a convention. He persisted in his belief that the people of Kentucky could be persuaded to see the need for a modern structure of government.

Jack never seemed happier than when he was involved in a political campaign. He ran for local and legislative offices, campaigned for a variety of candidates, served in political party offices, and helped to lead several campaigns for state constitutional reform. In politics, as in other phases of his life, he combined a strong belief in what he stood for with a courteous respect for those who disagreed with him.

Whether in the classroom, in government service, or in political campaigns, Jack Reeves persisted in his efforts to bring about honest, competent, modern government in this state. In these efforts he was always a political realist, but he never lost his vision of a better Kentucky. Some of his efforts fell short of success, but he contributed as much, and perhaps more, than any other private citizen over the last four decades to making politics and government work in this state.

He is survived by his wife, Nancy; a daughter, Caroline; and two sons, Robert and David. His first wife was the late Mary Knight.

(Prepared by Professor Malcolm E. Jewell, Department of Political Science)

Professor Jewell requested that the resolution be made a part of these minutes and that a copy be provided to the members of the family. Following Professor Jewell's presentation of the resolution, the Senators were asked to stand for a moment of silence in tribute and respect to Professor John E. Reeves.

The Chairman made the following remarks to the Senate:

This is not the time for an inaugural address even if one were appropriate and I were capable of giving you one; but I am told that it has been customary for the incoming chairperson to state briefly for fellow Senators his prejudices, predilections, and personal priorities so that you may have a chance to protest, support, or modify before you are caught unawares.

The work of my predecessors--particularly that of the last three--has placed the Senate in a position to do its work more efficiently than at anytime since it was first organized. We now operate on the assumptions that attendance at meetings of the Senate is obligatory unless circumstances absolutely prevent it and that all of us are obligated to participate actively in one of the fourteen standing committees, which implement the charges given to us as a body in the Senate Rules. My first concern this year therefore has been to explore all means of enhancing the efficiency of this potentially very efficient instrument of the university governance. Happily I have detected no lack of will or enthusiasm on the part of any of the committee chairmen appointed for this coming year, and I suspect that slackening on their part--if any should occur--will be due in large measure to the failure of the Senate Council and its Chairman to provide meaningful charges and the overall direction and planning that can make all committees work together in something resembling a coordinated whole. These committee chairmen (and I ask them to stand as I call their names so that you can see as well as hear who they are) are as follows: Louis Swift (Library Committee), William Plucknett (Rules Committee), James D. Kemp (Admissions and Academic Standards), Lee T. Todd (Student Affairs Committee), A. Edward Blackhurst (Teaching, Learning and Advising), Roger Eichhorn (Research Committee), Alan Perreiah (Academic Programs), Merlin Hackbart (Academic Planning and Priorities), Jesse Harris (Academic Organization and Structure), Don M. Soule (General Studies Committee), David Denton (Special Teaching Programs), Marc Wallace (Academic Facilities), Harwin Voss (Extended and Continuing Education Programs), and Doyle Peaslee (Special Teaching Technologies). During recent months we have heard suggestions about creating additional standing committees or modifying the general charges assigned to some of the existing ones. For the moment, however, I have to regard all such suggestions as premature. We now have a special committee at work reviewing our committee structure, and the report of that committee should contain recommendations based on better and broader information than most of us are likely to possess. Moreover, we would do well to let the machinery run at least one more year to see how it works under the best conditions that we as a body can provide. To discover what those conditions are and provide or create them, the Council will need your help. If you do not begin receiving specific requests from us shortly, let us hear from you, particularly in regard to projects and priorities that you yourselves feel are in need of attention.

I have no grand overall agenda in mind for the coming year, but I do have one or two special concerns that have been engendered partly by my own observation and partly by some of the reports that you wrote last spring, and I should like to mention them briefly now and comment on them as time will allow.

The first is a concern for the quality of teaching, which manifests itself as a kind of latent uneasiness in several of the final reports that came to the Senate Council Office last May. One report called attention to the need to make more imaginative and more aggressive use of special teaching techniques and technologies, and it suggested a campus-wide integrated service for drafting, graphic aids, and photography. Another report deplored the increasing use of poorly paid part-time teachers, some of whom happen to be quite skilled and important to the success of our lower-division instruction; it implicitly asked that we take note of a staffing need that we have never met ourselves and have not adequately rewarded in those who meet it for us. Still another report remarked on our indefensible ignorance about what really happens in the General Studies Program--that gesture on our part towards affirming that all our students begin with the basics, or some of the basics, of a liberal education. This report suggested a study to determine what general studies courses students actually take and why. One imagines that the conclusions of such study might not be flattering, but we need to have them, whatever they happen to be. Two reports contained a strong recommendation that we look carefully at our evaluation of teaching. This is an old story. We all know that our evaluation--and the students' evaluation--of teaching leaves much to be desired; and our evaluation process itself has been evaluated many times with few positive results. Nevertheless, we need to keep trying to find useful answers. We simply do not know, aside from a few peaks and abysses where the good teaching is and what it is like, and we need to know. The Senate Council can encourage those who are willing to undertake this task, and it will encourage them--with charges, directions, and means insofar as it is able.

A second area of concern is research. As a university we should consider this our determinative and primary concern. One reason that it gets less attention than other things is that research is by its nature a lonely quest, undertaken usually by individual faculty members whenever they can be released from other duties. Yet research, investigation, or creative participation in our respective disciplines, is what we are here to do; and without research or its equivalent we are no different from our sibling institutions at Louisville, Richmond, Bowling Green, Murray, Morehead, and elsewhere. It is not pleasant to record that of our fourteen standing committees, the least active has been the Research Committee. I do not for a moment suggest that blame for that should fall on the people who have been members of that committee during the past few years. The blame is upon all of us and the atmosphere we generate and find comfortable to live in. It's no wonder that some of our younger faculty members get the impression that instruction is our primary concern here and that appealing instruction is the blossom that should always carry away the prize. We need by means of our activities here in the Senate to say to our younger colleagues and to the world outside that our first concern at the University of Kentucky is to discover truth, in as many of its forms as possible, and that our teaching derives its special character from our commitment to that aim. I very much hope that this year's activity of the Senate can reflect a renewed commitment to the encouragement and fostering of research.

A third area is one that President Singletary expressed beautifully in a public presentation some months ago. The University of Kentucky, he said, "is a place clearly to which large numbers come for their education. They come and they take up residence and they go to class X numbers of hours a week and so forth, but that's only one kind of university. The other one is the university that reaches out to the people and that's becoming more and more a function of higher education, because this rapidly changing, highly industrialized society just requires a great deal of instruction out there of one kind or another" Thirty years ago the university was primarily a place where scholars asked questions and sought answers and to which the elite were permitted to come for instruction. The democratic impulse in America needed that, and the university has now become a place to which all are invited. Some feel that the results of this shift are unfortunate, but the end is not yet. Times continue to change. Researchers tell us that the age of the average college student has advanced appreciably since 1967, when 31% of all college students were between 22 and 34 years of age, and 5% were over 35. Now 51% of our student body is over 22, and 11% are over 35. This means, according to some knowledgeable observers, that the University may well become, even in our own time, a place where more adults than adolescents seek experiences in learning.

It is already happening. Even within the last decade the University of Kentucky--or more accurately the undergraduate part of it--has lost much of the advanced playschool character that it had developed during the years between the wars and had maintained until the revolts of the 60's made us all earnest and purposeful in ways we had not anticipated being. Nowadays, as a consequence, our young people are more and more inclined to be impatient with what we used to call a liberal education and seek training that will guarantee the jobs and careers that an elitist student body of two generations ago could almost take for granted. Our older undergraduate population, mainly enrolled for the moment in such "peripheral" activities as Extension, the Evening Program, and the Donovan Scholarship Program, have proved to be serious in another way; for these are the students who are rapidly bringing the ideal of liberal education back into fashion. The ferment that results from such changes is exciting, to be sure, but it makes imperative a degree of flexibility in academic programming that only a few years ago we had never dreamed it would be necessary to provide. In short we must begin to devise strategies to make education meaningful for many kinds of people. Some of these kinds are liberated housewives, some are men in business, some are retired persons, and many are simply people who are willing to sacrifice a very great deal in order to pursue a career or a dream that was denied them during their normal college days. Most of these people are good students, and some are at the peak of their powers; but whether good or bad they are as much a part of our clientele as their children are, and we in fairness are bound to recognize their needs and our responsibility to meet those needs.

I am told that there was some sentiment here last year for abandoning our Evening Program. If that meant serving that part of our new clientele in an expanded and modified regular program, well and good.

If it meant ignoring the people now served by the Evening Program, I would urge us to take another look at our inclination. Our rules, our programs, our courses, our standards, are all means to one end, which is the enlightenment of our people and the enrichment of their lives and the lives of those whom they serve. We have certainly been called upon to hold fast to that which is good in our various disciplines, but the good is not locked into our means of holding. These may be the times that call for unusual alertness, perception, and certainly flexibility. We have at our disposal a machine that has already proved equal to numerous challenges, some of them serious. With good will and help from all of us it may prove equal to others and move us along faster than we thought possible to the fulfillment of our role as a university serving all the people of this state and elsewhere in the unique ways proper to a true university, which is our mission and our excuse for being.

Chairman Bryant was given a very enthusiastic applause.

Chairman Bryant recognized Professor Daniel Reedy. On recommendation of the College of Pharmacy and on behalf of the Senate Council, Professor Reedy moved approval of the proposed changes and additions to the admissions requirements in the College of Pharmacy, University Senate Rules, IV, 2.2.2. This was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of September 27, 1978.

Professor Lesshafft said that the changes were instigated by the Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Affairs. About 18 months ago the colleges who had more applicants than spaces were requested to have a more definitive statement for their admissions criteria. As a result the Admissions Committee of the College of Pharmacy made the current revisions in the proposal.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion.

Professor Hanau suggested that on page 2, the last paragraph, first sentence be changed from:

"...program in the College of Pharmacy will be limited to no more than 10%."

to:

"...program in the College of Pharmacy generally will be limited to no more than 10%."

The Chair asked Professor Lesshafft if he would accept the modification, and Professor Lesshafft accepted the change.

Dean Sands asked if the College of Pharmacy were omitting organic chemistry.

Professor Lesshafft said it was omitted in error because there should be two semesters of organic chemistry.

The Chair asked Professor Lesshafft if he would accept the modification that the revised proposal read:

"two semesters of general chemistry--with laboratory, including qualitative analysis; two semesters of organic chemistry--with laboratory..."

Professor Lesshafft said that should have been in the revised as well as the current requirements.

Professor Smith asked for clarification which stated that a number of students admitted depended upon the availability of space, etc. and said that he presumed the Senate was endorsing the limited admissions program, which was not legal at the present time according to the Senate Rules.

Professor Lesshafft responded that the current admissions requirements as printed on the first page of the proposal have been in existence for years. He added that when they were adopted there was no problem in admitting anyone that applied. The Proposed Admissions Requirements have been made on a comparative and competitive basis.

The previous question was moved and passed.

The motion on the proposal, with two editorial changes, passed. The proposal as modified is as follows:

Proposed Admissions Requirements:

IV, 2.2.2. College of Pharmacy - - The College offers two degree programs, the Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy (B.S.) and the Doctor of Pharmacy (Pharm. D.). Each program has its own admission requirements.

a. Requirements for Admission to the B.S. Program -- In order to be considered for admission to the B.S. program, the applicant must have achieved a grade point average of at least 2.50 in at least 66 credit hours of acceptable college work, including: two semesters of general chemistry - with laboratory, including qualitative analysis; two semesters of organic chemistry - with laboratory; two semesters of general physics - with laboratory; two semesters of English composition (or otherwise have met the University English requirement); two semesters of biology - with laboratory; one semester of microbiology - with laboratory; one semester of mathematics (analytics and calculus); one semester of principles of economics; and additional courses needed to complete the University's General Area Studies requirement.

Applications for admission to the B.S. program are reviewed and evaluated by the College of Pharmacy's B.S. Admission Committee on a comparative and competitive basis. Criteria used by the Committee in judging the applicant's qualifications for admission are: 1) the applicant's previous academic record; 2) the applicant's potential for academic achievement; and 3) an assessment of the applicant's communicative skills, integrity, commitment, dedication, motivation, character, maturity and emotional stability as determined by letters of recommendation, and applicant's formal motivation letter and by personal interviews.

The number of students admitted to the B.S. program in the College of Pharmacy each year is dependent upon the availability of resources (faculty, clinical facilities, space) for implementation of a quality educational program. Therefore, previous admission to the University does not guarantee admission to the College of Pharmacy.

Priority for admission will be awarded to those applicants who complete all pre-pharmacy requisities by the end of the spring (or quarter) semester preceding the fall admissions.

The admission of non-residents of Kentucky to the B.S. program in the College of Pharmacy generally will be limited to no more than 10%. Priority for the admission of non-residents will be given to those who have completed their pre-pharmacy course work on the Lexington campus and/or to those who have exceptional qualifications of academic excellence.

The B.S. Admission Committee cannot consider applications for transfer from other colleges of pharmacy when the applicant has previously been denied admission to this College's B.S. program or when the maximum number of students are already enrolled in the program.

b. Requirements for Admission to the Pharm. D. Program -- Admission to the Pharm. D. degree program is available to selected highly qualified individuals holding a Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy degree from a college of pharmacy accredited by the American Council on Pharmaceutical Education, or to selected highly qualified students who are currently enrolled in the University of Kentucky College of Pharmacy and have completed the fourth year of the B.S. in Pharmacy curriculum.

The number of students admitted to the Pharm. D. degree program is limited, and depends upon the availability of resources (faculty, clinical facilities, space) for the implementation of a quality educational program.

Applications for admission to the Pharm. D. degree program are reviewed and evaluated by the College of Pharmacy Pharm. D. Admission Committee on a comparative and competitive basis. The Committee ordinarily denies admission if the cumulative pharmacy grade point average is less than 3.0. The applicants who are judged by the Committee to be the most qualified are invited for personal interviews after which the final selections are made. Criteria used by the Committee in judging the applicant's demonstrated academic and professional achievements; and 2) an assessment of the applicant's communicative skills, integrity, commitment, dedication, motivation, character, maturity and emotional stability as determined by letters of recommendation, the applicant's formal letter of application and personal interviews.

Proposed Implementation Date: Spring, 1979.

The Chairman again recognized Professor Reedy, who on behalf of the Senate Council recommended approval of the proposed "Academic Performance Policy" for the College of Allied Health. This had been circulated to members of the University Senate under date of September 28, 1978.

Chairman Bryant asked Professor Anne Stiene-Martin to come forward for any comments she might care to make and to answer questions.

Professor Stiene-Martin's remarks follow:

The Faculty of the College of Allied Health Professions has always believed that there must be some means by which a failing student can be suspended from the professional curriculum. The reasons are several:

1. Our moral obligation to the future consumer of our graduate's skills (that is, the patient).
2. The economic factor involved when there is limited enrollment. This has been addressed within the introduction of the proposed policy you have before you.
3. The realization that the student selection process is still a crude science (at best) and that grade-point average based on pre-professional courses does not always indicate potential professional ability.
4. The realization that we are actually performing a disservice to the flunking student by allowing that student to cycle back through the professional curriculum once or twice in order to graduate, because the chances are quite high that such a graduate will be unable to master the external certifying or licensing examination which most of our graduates must face.

Up until 1976, our College operated under the assumption that should such a case arise, action could be taken based on Senate Rules Section V, Article 3.13, sub-section (d) which addresses student suspension and states "A student who demonstrates that he cannot or will not do satisfactory work."

In Spring of 1976, our College was informed that suspension of a student from the professional curriculum is not possible unless there exists some stated and approved policy which defines the phrase "...cannot or will not do satisfactory work." Otherwise, it was felt that 'due process' might be compromised.

Consequently, the College's Standards Committee undertook the task of formulating such a policy. It turned out to be a massive project. Input from the College's Student Advisory Council was obtained through the two student representatives who have been members of the Standards Committee between 1976 and 1978. Input was also sought and obtained from the Medical Center Academic Council and from the Senate's Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards.

What you have before you is the result of at least three major re-writes based on the comments and suggestions received. We feel that this policy is fair and equitable and that the proposed means of administering the policy negates the possibility of arbitrary action.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion.

Professor Ford said that he did not know what the statement "student shall be subject to review for dismissal from the program by the Dean of the College" meant. Did this mean they would be reviewed or not be reviewed--who would make the decision?

Professor Stiene-Martin responded that the records would be sent to the Academic Performance Committee for review. Following the APC's decision, the recommendation would be sent to the Dean for action.

Professor Ford said that it seemed ambiguous to him because in the statement it was as though the Dean would be doing the reviewing but, in fact, it was the Academic Performance Committee.

Chairman Bryant said that dismissal was not automatic if a student made below a 2.0 but that review was. He asked if the statement "shall be reviewed for dismissal" could be accepted. Professor Stiene-Martin accepted the revision.

Professor Ford asked what would happen in a situation when there would be no documented evidence.

Professor Stiene-Martin accepted the editorial change of deleting "documented." Number 4 would read:

"...recommendation of dismissal there shall be evidence that the student..."

and:

"For a recommendation of retention there shall be evidence of a temporary condition such as an ..."

Student Senator Ratcliff moved that the statement under Academic Performance Policy be:

"Any student making a G.P.A. below 2.0 in required courses for any semester after admission to a professional program..."

The motion was seconded.

Professor Weil asked if the consensus was that there were electives in the program or electives that had nothing to do with the program.

Professor Stoner replied that in the Community Health Program there were a number of electives that were not required courses for graduation.

The previous question was moved and passed.

The motion to amend the proposal failed.

Professor Kemp recommended the retention of the word "documented" for dismissal but not necessarily for retention.

Professor Weil moved that the words "cannot" and "will not" be changed to "does not" and to retain the word "documented." The motion thus amended would read:

"For a recommendation of dismissal there shall be documented evidence that the student does not perform at an acceptable level."

The motion was seconded and passed.

Dr. Langston asked what would happen to a student who was not suspended from the University but was suspended from the professional program.

Professor Stiene-Martin said that the student could go into another program. She added that a student's inability to perform in a professional school did not reflect a student's ability to perform in another profession or another basic science.

After further discussion concerning methods of appeal for the student, Professor Westley moved, and the motion was seconded, to return the proposal to the Senate Committee on Academic Standards for consideration of the appropriate appeal process.

The previous question was moved and passed.

The substitute motion that the proposal be returned to the Committee failed with a vote of 76 to 34.

Professor Baumgartner moved, and the motion was seconded, that the following be added to Item 6 of the proposal:

"A decision by the Dean for dismissal of a student from the program may be appealed by the student through existing University procedure."

The motion to amend the proposal passed.

The previous question was moved and passed.

The motion as amended passed. The proposal as amended is as follows:

Academic Performance Policy:

- 1) Any student making a G.P.A. below 2.0 for any semester after admission to a professional program, shall be reviewed for dismissal from the program by the Dean of the College.
- 2) Any student enrolled in a professional program of the College of Allied Health Professions making two (2) E's in one* or more courses required by the professional program shall be subject to review for dismissal from the program by the Dean of the College.

*The second E may result when repeating a course previously failed.

Implementation:

The fair and equitable administration of this policy will be a responsibility of the College of Allied Health Profession's Academic Performance Committee (APC). In the interest of its implementation the APC will establish specific procedures for the review process.

Conscious, directed effort will be made to avoid arbitrary action in cases where extenuating circumstances exist, as well as to avoid inconsistent treatment of any student. The APC will incorporate the following parameters as part of its operational guidelines.

- 1) A review will be undertaken prior to action by the Dean.
- 2) The College of Allied Health Professions' Office of Student Services shall have the responsibility for establishing a system for screening student records to determine those individuals who fail to meet the criteria of the Academic Performance Policy.
- 3) The records of students identified by the Office of Student Services, as failing to meet performance criteria will be sent to the APC for review. The APC shall notify the students of their opportunity to submit documents to the APC and to appear in person.
- 4) Recommendations for action shall be contingent upon supporting documentation from the department involved and/or from the student. For a recommendation of dismissal there shall be documented evidence that the student does not perform at an acceptable level. For a recommendation of retention there shall be evidence of a temporary condition such as an emotional or physical crisis which has resulted in poor performance.
- 5) Following the APC's decision, its advisory recommendation shall be sent to the Dean for action.
- 6) A decision by the Dean for dismissal of a student from the program may be appealed by the student through existing University procedure."

The APC functions as an advisory committee appointed by the Dean of the College of Allied Health Professions. Its membership is selected in a manner which strives to assure objective and equal treatment of all cases coming within its purview. The members are selected from the following areas:

two from CAHP programs having selective admissions,
one from the CAHP Standards Committee,
one from outside the CAHP faculty,
one from the Office of Student Services - non-voting
and a Chairperson.

The Chairman introduced the two Sergeants-at-arms, Dr. David Stockham and Colonel James Alcorn; and Professor Alfred Crabb, Parliamentarian.

The Senate adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Martha M. Ferguson
Recording Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

September 27, 1978

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday,
October 9, 1978. Proposed changes and additions to
Pharadmissions requirements in the College of Pharmacy,
University Senate Rules, IV, 2.2.2.

Current Admissions Requirements:

IV, 2.2.2 College of Pharmacy -- In addition to meeting the general requirements for admission to the University, the applicant must have achieved a grade point average of at least 2.0 in at least 66 credit hours of acceptable college work, including: two semesters of general chemistry, with laboratory, including qualitative analysis; two semesters of organic chemistry, with laboratory; two semesters of general physics, with laboratory; two semesters of English composition (or otherwise have met the University English requirement); two semesters of biology with laboratory; one semester of mathematics (analytics and calculus); one semester of principles of economics.

Proposed Admissions Requirements:

IV, 2.2.2 College of Pharmacy -- The College offers two degree programs, the Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy (B.S.) and the Doctor of Pharmacy (Pharm.D.). Each program has its own admission requirements.

a. Requirements for Admission to the B.S. Program -- In order to be considered for admission to the B.S. program, the applicant must have achieved a grade point average of at least 2.50 in at least 66 credit hours of acceptable college work, including: two semesters of

general chemistry - with laboratory, including qualitative analysis; two semesters of general physics - with laboratory; two semesters of English composition (or otherwise have met the University English requirement); two semesters of biology - with laboratory; one semester of microbiology - with laboratory; one semester of mathematics (analytics and calculus); one semester of principles of economics; and additional courses needed to complete the University's General Area Studies requirement.

Applications for admission to the B.S. program are reviewed and evaluated by the College of Pharmacy's B.S. Admission Committee on a comparative and competitive basis. Criteria used by the Committee in judging the applicant's qualifications for admission are: 1) the applicant's previous academic record; 2) the applicant's potential for academic achievement; and 3) an assessment of the applicant's communicative skills, integrity, commitment, dedication, motivation, character, maturity and emotional stability as determined by letters of recommendation, and applicant's formal motivation letter and by personal interviews.

The number of students admitted to the B.S. program in the College of Pharmacy each year is dependent upon the availability of resources (faculty, clinical facilities, space) for implementation of a quality educational program. Therefore, previous admission to the University does not guarantee admission to the College of Pharmacy. m. D. degree program are reviewed and

Priority for admission will be awarded to those applicants who complete all prepharmacy requisites by the end of the spring (or quarter) semester preceding the fall admissions.

The admission of non-residents ^{usually} of Kentucky to the B.S. program in the College of Pharmacy will be limited to no more than 10%. Priority for the admission of non-residents will be given to those who have completed their prepharmacy course work on the Lexington campus and/or to those who have exceptional qualifications of academic excellence.

The B.S. Admission Committee cannot consider applications for transfer from other colleges of pharmacy when the applicant has previously been denied admission to this College's B.S. program or when the maximum number of students are already enrolled in the program.

b. Requirements for Admission to the Pharm.D. Program -- Admission to the Pharm.D. degree program is available to selected highly qualified individuals holding a Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy degree from a college of pharmacy accredited by the American Council on Pharmaceutical Education, or to selected highly qualified students who are currently enrolled in the University of Kentucky College of Pharmacy and have completed the fourth year of the B.S. in Pharmacy curriculum.

The number of students admitted to the Pharm.D. degree program is limited, and depends upon the availability of resources (faculty, clinical facilities, space) for the implementation of a quality educational program.

Applications for admission to the Pharm.D. degree program are reviewed and evaluated by the College of Pharmacy Pharm.D. Admission Committee on a comparative and competitive basis. The Committee ordinarily denies admission if the cumulative pharmacy grade point average is less than 3.0. The applicants who are judged by the Committee to be the most qualified are invited for personal interviews after which the final selections are made. Criteria used by the Committee in judging the applicant's qualifications for admission are: 1) The applicant's demonstrated academic and professional achievements; and 2) an assessment of the applicant's communicative skills, integrity, commitment, dedication, motivation, character, maturity and emotional stability as determined by letters of recommendation, the applicant's formal letter of application and personal interviews.

Background

The Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards requested the College of Pharmacy to prepare a more definitive statement concerning

Page 4

Senate Agenda Item: Pharmacy Admissions
September 27, 1978

its admission requirements. The reason for this request is because the College is receiving more requests for admission than it can accommodate.

The B.S. Admissions Committee and the Pharm.D. Admissions Committee of the College of Pharmacy were asked to delineate and codify the admission requirements for each of the two programs. The resulting admission requirements were submitted to the College of Pharmacy Faculty by the respective committees, and the Faculty voted their approval on September 22, 1977.

The basic change in the B.S. admission requirements is the increase from 2.0 to 2.5 in the grade point average of the applicant's prepharmacy courses.

The faculty of the College of Pharmacy, the Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards, and the Senate recommend approval of the proposed changes in the Pharmacy Admissions Policy.

Proposed Implementation Date: Spring, 1979.

/cet

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

September 28, 1978

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, October 9, 1978. Proposed "Academic Performance Policy" for the College of Allied Health; if approved, the policy will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

The faculty in the College of Allied Health Professions, the Academic Council for the Medical Center, the Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards and the Senate Council recommend approval of the following proposal.

Background:

The programs in the College of Allied Health Professions are designed to prepare health professionals in areas such as Allied Health Education, Community Health, Dental Hygiene, Medical Technology and Physical Therapy. Students are admitted to these limited enrollment programs through competitive, selective admissions.

Extensive efforts are expended in trying to select students who are capable of competent professional performance of a wide variety of skills. These individuals should be able to provide quality services which are needed for preventive, diagnostic and therapeutic care of persons who are physically and/or mentally ill.

Experience in recent years has shown that periodically an individual who either can not or will not perform satisfactorily is admitted to the College. The College, student body, University and the general public have a vested interest in maintaining high standards of service by professionals trained at the University's Medical Center. The professionals who possess "marginally passing" skills may unnecessarily endanger the lives of persons receiving their services. Often individuals with marginal academic performance have to repeat course work and/or take course work out of sequence. In these instances another student may be prevented from participating in either a given course or even jeopardize a slot in an entering class of students.

Current University and College of Allied Health Professions regulations lack the specificity which is felt to be a necessary requirement before the College's programs can adequately respond to the problems which arise from poor academic performance.

In order to establish a policy which more explicitly defines the acceptable academic level of performance in the College of Allied Health Professions, the following is submitted for approval.

Academic Performance Policy:

- 1) Any student making a G. P. A. below 2.0 for any semester after admission to a professional program, shall be subject to review for dismissal from the program by the Dean of the College.
- 2) Any student enrolled in a professional program of the College of Allied Health Professions making two (2) E's in one* or more courses required by the professional program shall be subject to review for dismissal from the program by the Dean of the College.

*5 AC suggested
acknowledged
in required
courses*

Implementation:

? of Thomas Ford.

The fair and equitable administration of this policy will be a responsibility of the College of Allied Health Professions' Academic Performance Committee (APC). In the interest of its implementation the APC will establish specific procedures for the review process.

Conscious, directed effort will be made to avoid arbitrary action in cases where extenuating circumstances exist, as well as to avoid inconsistent treatment of any student. The APC will incorporate the following parameters as part of its operational guidelines.

- 1) A review will be undertaken prior to action by the Dean.
- 2) The College of Allied Health Professions' Office of Student Services shall have the responsibility for establishing a system for screening student records to determine those individuals who fail to meet the criteria of the Academic Performance Policy.

*The second E may result when repeating a course previously failed.

- 3) The records of students, identified by the Office of Student Services, as failing to meet performance criteria will be sent to the APC for review. The APC shall notify the students of their opportunity to submit documents to the APC and to appear in person.
- 4) Recommendations ^{evidence} for action shall be contingent upon supporting documentation from the department involved and/or from the student. For a recommendation of dismissal there shall be documented evidence that the student ~~will not or can not~~ ^{does not} perform at an acceptable level. For a recommendation of retention there shall be documented evidence of a temporary condition such as an emotional or physical crisis which has resulted in poor performance.
- 5) Following the APC's decision, its advisory recommendation shall be sent to the Dean for action.

The APC functions as an advisory committee appointed by the Dean of the College of Allied Health Professions. Its membership is selected in a manner which strives to assure objective and equal treatment of all cases coming within its purview. The members are selected from the following areas:

two from CAHP programs having selective admissions,
one from the CAHP Standards Committee,
one from outside the CAHP faculty,
one from the Office of Student Services - non-voting,
and a Chairperson.

/cet

6) a decision by ^{the} Dean for dismissal of a student from the program may be appealed by the student through existing union procedures.