

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL  
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

November 1, 1984

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet in regular session on Monday,  
November 12, 1984, at 3:00 p.m. in room 106, Classroom Building.

AGENDA:

1. Minutes of September 10, 1984.
2. Resolutions.
3. Progress Report of the ad hoc Committee on Evaluation of Administrators: Professor Wilbur Frye, Chairman.
4. Chairman's Remarks.
5. ACTION ITEMS:
  - a. Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I., 5.2. Election: Two Voting University System Faculty Members. (Circulated under date of 11 October 1984.)
  - b. Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section V., 4.3.1, English Requirement. (Circulated under date of 30 October 1984.)

George Dexter  
Secretary, University Senate

/cet

Copy 1

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, NOVEMBER 12, 1984

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, November 12, 1984, in Room 106 of the Classroom Building.

Robert Bostrom, Chairman of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent: Charles E. Barnhart, Susan M. Belmore, Jack C. Blanton, Peter P. Bosomworth, Thomas D. Brower, I. K. Chew\*, Henry Cole\*, Glenn B. Collins, Emmett Costich\*, Leo S. Demski, Marcus Dillon, Richard C. Domek, Jr., Herbert Drennon, William Ecton\*, Charles W. Ellinger\*, Donald G. Ely\*, Charles H. Fay, Stanley Feldman, Joseph L. Fink, Timothy Freudenberg, Richard W. Furst, Art Gallaher, Jr.\*, Andrew J. Grimes\*, Gina Hall, Marilyn D. Hamann\*, S. Z. Hasan\*, Leonard Heller, Stan Hoffman, Raymond Hornback, Alfred S. L. Hu\*, Chuck Huffman, Keith Johnson\*, John J. Just\*, James O. King, Laura L. Ladd, James R. Lang\*, Robert A. Lauderdale, Robert Lawson, Beth Lewis, O. J. Loewer\*, David Lowery, Edgar Maddox, Paul Mandelstam\*, Kenneth E. Marino\*, Sally S. Mattingly\*, Richard McDougall\*, Marcus T. McEllistrem, Kevin D. Moore, Steven Nicholson, Robert C. Nobel\*, Merrill Packer\*, Robin D. Powell, Madhira D. Ram, Thomas C. Robinson, Gerald A. Rosenthal, Wimberly Royster\*, Charles Sachatello\*, Edgar Sagan, Timothy Sineath, Otis A. Singletary\*, John C. Snider, David A. Spaeth\*, Marcia Stanhope\*, Tom Stephens, Elizabeth Taylor, Kenneth Thompson, Steve Thornbury, Luke Thornewill, Marc J. Wallace, O'Neal Weeks, Charles T. Wethington, Carolyn Williams\*

The Minutes of the meeting of September 10 were approved as circulated with the exception of adding the College of Social Work to the list of colleges that had enrollment increases for the Fall 1984. This was in President Singletary's remarks on page 2, paragraph 2, last sentence.

Chairman Bostrom recognized Professor Leonard Stoltz who presented the following Memorial Resolution on the death of Professor Carl Edward Chaplin.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

Carl Edward Chaplin 1916-1984

"Carl E. Chaplin, Professor Emeritus of the Department of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture, died at his home on April 26. He is survived by his wife, Pauline, two sons, Dr. Michael Chaplin, Associate Dean of Instruction, Pennsylvania State University, and Dr. Mark Chaplin, a pediatrician in Elizabethtown, Kentucky and three grandchildren.

He was born at Olney, Illinois on May 30, 1916 and received his B.S. and M.S. degrees from the University of Illinois in 1938 and 1947. In 1939 he taught at Smith Hughes Agricultural School in Campbellsburg, Indiana and that same year accepted the position as Superintendent, University of Illinois peach breeding station at Olney, Illinois. In 1949 he was appointed Assistant Professor of Horticulture, University of Kentucky and was promoted to Associate Professor in 1956. Professor Chaplin taught several courses on various aspects of fruit culture and served as Acting Head, Department of Horticulture, from 1960 to 1962. He retired from the Department of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture on June 30, 1981.

\*Absence explained

His work primarily involved peach, apple, and strawberry research. Recognizing the need to select for disease and insect resistance in addition to quality factors he developed and introduced the 'Citation' strawberry in 1965. Many of his strawberry breeding lines, especially those selected for mite resistance, have been disseminated and utilized nationally in mite resistance breeding programs. In 1968 he was awarded the L. M. Ware Award for his research based on the inheritance of mite resistance in strawberries. He was highly respected for his knowledge of fruit culture and was a frequent speaker at fruit grower meetings.

Carl was a soft spoken, genteel man whose counsel was regularly sought and highly respected by his colleagues and his students. As the epitome of the erudite man, he never sought self-aggrandizement but was always ready and willing to provide encouragement and help so that others might attain their fullest potential. He will be sadly missed and fondly remembered."

(Prepared by Professor Leonard Stoltz, Department of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture.)

Professor Stoltz requested that the Resolution be entered into these minutes and that copies be sent to the Chaplin family. Chairman Bostrom asked the senators to stand for a moment of silence in tribute and respect to Professor Carl Edward Chaplin.

Chairman Bostrom recognized Professor Bradley Canon for a Resolution of Appreciation to Earl Douglas Rees, Past Chairman of the Senate Council.

#### RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION

Earl Douglas Rees

"Earl Douglas Rees--known as Doug to one and all--has just completed the 1983-84 year as Chairman of the Senate Council. Doug was the first M.D. to hold this position in modern times. As such he was the first Council Chairman to have one of those ubiquitous beepers attached to him wherever he went. While I do not recall a Senate meeting being so interrupted, in several meetings of the Council, Doug skillfully balanced his attention between agenda items and dispensing advice or prescriptions to an ailing patient. For that matter, it was not unknown for Doug to dispense a bit of medical advice to his fellow Senators. However, stories that the Senate Council Office had become the north annex of the Medical Center are somewhat exaggerated.

Doug's chairmanship was a busy and varied one. He spent all year keeping track of the merger negotiations between the UK and U of L dental schools and of the nas-

cent proposals to merge UK and U of L in toto. Implementing the details of the newly adopted selective admission policy was another year long concern. Reorganizing and revitalizing the Senate's committee system was also a time-consuming project. But perhaps Doug will be most remembered for his efforts to enhance research capabilities at the University of Kentucky. Through his efforts, the Senate and the academic community were made more fully aware of the campus' research facilities and support services, including their strengths, weaknesses and future plans. Likewise, through Senate discussion and a series of resolutions, the administration was more fully informed about the faculty's research problems, concerns and desires.

Like all who preside over the Senate, Doug had to grin and bear it through discussions that got bogged down in semantics or arguments over unclear issues. Will he ever forget the half hour the Senate devoted to determining whether its rules should prohibit sex discrimination or gender discrimination? Will he ever remember what the main issue was when the Senate debated over two meetings how the suspension or termination of programs was to be processed?

We are sure we can continue to count on Doug for sage advice, given in a low-key and accompanied by a touch of humor. And we wish him all the best as he returns to treating patients and searching for the causes of cancer on a full-time basis. Would you please join me in giving Doug a big round of applause in appreciation of his service."

Dr. Rees was given an enthusiastic applause.

Chairman Bostrom recognized Professor Wilbur Frye for a progress report of the ad hoc Committee on Evaluation of Administrators. Professor Frye is the Chairman of that committee and his report follows:

#### Rationale

University regulations provide for an evaluation of departments every four years (except in the College of Agriculture, College of Home Economics, and the Medical Center, which are evaluated every six years.) Colleges are to be evaluated every six years. Administrator evaluations are an integral part of the unit evaluations. The various units conduct these evaluations in different ways but always, so far as I know, a committee with faculty representation is appointed to conduct the evaluation. I say this to point out that the system, as it now exists, provides for a certain amount of faculty input.

There seems to be a feeling by a substantial number of faculty members that the faculty should have greater participation than we now have in the evaluation of deans and departmental chairmen. Such an evaluation would allow participation by all faculty in an academic unit, be con-

ducted regularly at some predetermined interval, be somewhat different in format than the present evaluation, and be based on the duties and responsibilities as outlined in the University Regulations for those positions being evaluated.

The overall purpose of such an evaluation would be to improve the performance of the academic units. Important benefits would include (1) increasing faculty input into the evaluation process, (2) improving communication between faculty and the administration, (3) educating all concerned with regard to the duties and responsibilities of administrators, and (4) providing deans and chancellors with more information on which to base their evaluations of departmental chairmen and deans, respectively.

#### Background

In 1983, Senate Council Chairman, Professor Donald Ivey, appointed a committee composed of Professors Donald Hochstrasser, Robert Bostrom and Wilbur Frye (chairman) to make a recommendation to the Council regarding the feasibility of faculty evaluation of administrators. That committee's report was affirmative and recommended that a larger committee composed of faculty from outside the Senate Council be appointed to prepare a recommendation, with Senate approval, to the University administration. The recommendation would include a further feasibility study, evaluation instrument, and procedures.

The committee appointed by Professor Douglas Rees, 1983-84 chairman of the Senate Council, was composed of Professors Michael Adelstein, Donald Diedrich, Ben Leon, Leslie Martin, and Wilbur Frye (chairman).

The committee concluded that, with some revisions, the University Regulations in providing for periodic unit evaluations, adequately provide for faculty evaluation of administrators, but that the process should be improved to ensure a satisfactory level of faculty input and to ensure that significant findings of the evaluations are made available to the faculty of the units concerned. The committee suggested that the chairman meet with the central administration to determine the needed regulation changes and the feasibility and acceptability of a more highly structured form of evaluation. I have conferred with President Singletary, Chancellor Gallaher, Chancellor Bosomworth, Dr. Sears, three deans, and, informally with some departmental chairmen.

#### Findings and Conclusions

The following findings and conclusions can be summarized from the committee's work to date:

- (1) While cautioning about some of the pitfalls of faculty evaluation of administrators, the central administration would not oppose a well-designed system of evaluating the performance of deans and departmental chairmen that allows participation of all faculty members of a particular academic unit, provided the process is structured within a positive framework.
- (2) There are distinct benefits derived from the present system of unit evaluations, and the central administration would not like to abandon that process. Therefore, any new form of evaluation probably would not substitute for, but supplement the present system.
- (3) The evaluation should be limited to deans and departmental chairmen of academic units.
- (4) Every two years, as initially proposed, is probably too frequent to conduct an evaluation, especially of deans.
- (5) President Singletary would agree to the minor changes in the University Regulations necessary to provide for regular evaluation of units and their administrators but would like to have a degree of administrative flexibility built into the system to allow some delay or advance of evaluation of deans, if conditions dictate a need to do so.
- (6) The concerns mentioned most often were the potential misuse of results causing unjustified professional damage, in small units a few faculty members could unduly influence the evaluation, and too much faculty time may be spent in evaluations.
- (7) The deans interviewed showed the strongest support of any group of administrators for the proposal. They felt that such an evaluation would help them improve their performance and help them assess the performance of their departmental chairman.
- (8) Some units conduct their own administrator evaluation but most would favor replacing it with a suitable university-wide evaluation.
- (9) Similar evaluations are conducted at other institutions and instruments to use as models are available.

#### Summary and Recommendation

Faculty evaluation of deans and departmental chairmen that supplements the present system of unit evaluations would

be feasible at the University of Kentucky in the new future. Obviously, much more work is needed to develop an evaluation that would be acceptable to all concerned. Special attention must be given to three areas: (1) Developing an evaluation instrument based on the duties and responsibilities of deans and departmental chairmen as outlined in the University Regulations, (2) developing the evaluation procedures and establishing guidelines, and (3) determining how the results will be used.

I have recommended to the Senate Council that the committee be continued, with additional members and replacements appointed, under the direction of a new chairman. Work of the committee should include interviews of other deans and departmental chairmen to ascertain their acceptance and obtain their input, development of a suitable instrument, and determine procedures and guidelines for conducting the evaluations."

The senators had no questions for Professor Frye.

Chairman Bostrom made the following announcements. He said that the new Senate Council members are Professors Richard Angelo, Education; E. Douglas Rees, Medicine; and Jesse Weil, Physics. They will begin work the second semester. He asked the senators to put on their calendars for Tuesday, December 11 from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. the party for the Board of Trustees in the Alumni House. Spouses are cordially invited. The Chairman's last announcement concerned the Jean Pival Committee. He said the committee had done an outstanding job in preparing an outline of some of the options available for early retirement. The committee is thinking of alternatives for faculty in the coming 80's and 90's. The Pival Committee Report has been sent to the administration. The President and his staff received the report in a very positive light. The Chairman was happy to report there are plans to have some open meetings for faculty with members of the administration and Senate Council to get suggestions and general faculty input. Basically what has been proposed is some kind of early retirement procedure to be instituted so it would be financially attractive for faculty to retire at some point prior to age 65. There have been alternatives raised such as part-time appointments and additional research opportunities. He hoped this was something the senate would get to do early next year.

Chairman Bostrom recognized Professor Bradley Canon, Secretary of the Senate Council, for a motion. Professor Canon, on behalf of the Senate Council, recommended the approval of the proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I., 5.2. Election: Two Voting University System Faculty Members. This proposal was circulated to members of the senate under date of October 11, 1984. Professor Canon said the basic purpose of the amendment was to limit eligibility for voting and serving on the Board of Trustees to those professors who are in tenured positions.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Professor Olshewsky said he was going to vote against the proposal on grounds that he felt the senate was unduly and unnecessarily separating the transitory faculty members.

There was no further discussion and the proposed change passed and reads as follows:

Proposal: (underlined portion is new)

I. 5.2 Election: Two Voting University System Faculty Members, Board of Trustees

As specified in the Governing Regulations (Part II.A.2) there shall be two voting University System faculty members of the Board of Trustees. Faculty members who may vote in the election of the University System Faculty members to the Board of Trustees shall be those in the University System who:

- a. have an actual or equivalent rank of Assistant Professor or higher;
- b. hold a tenured position or one in which tenure may be acquired, except that untenured members of the faculty whose appointment is specified as ending on a certain date without further notice or as not leading to consideration for tenure shall not be eligible: and
- c. are included in the faculty T.I.A.A.-C.R.E.F. retirement program (or eligible for such inclusion after one year of University service) or other retirement program approved by the Board of Trustees.

Faculty members eligible to serve as an elected member of the Board of Trustees shall be those who meet the voting qualifications and who have a primary assignment in a faculty role at the time of election and service (50% or more involvement in teaching, research, and/or service). For purposes of this section, assignment as chairman of a department shall not exclude one who holds such a position from eligibility to serve as an elected member of the Board of Trustees. Faculty members of Board of Trustees shall be eligible for re-election. Eligibility under paragraphs a. and b. above shall be certified in the same manner as for elections to the University Senate.

Background and Rationale:

Recently the University administration has stopped classifying transitory faculty members as visiting professors unless they have a home institution. Faculty members who have no home institution (usually recent Ph.D.s replacing someone on leave or assignment, etc.) are now classified as regular faculty members by the administration. Such persons are eligible for TIAA-CREF on the same basis as permanent faculty and would have to be considered for tenure if they were to remain at UK for six years. The only thing differentiating such appointees from other regular faculty is that their contracts indicate in the section on conditions of appointment, assignment or tenure, that the appointment expires on a particular date without further notice or that the appointment may be renewed on a year-to-



year basis by mutual agreement, but will not be continued beyond five years (including applicable prior service) and will not lead to consideration for tenure.

The original intent of Rule I-5.2(b) was to limit eligibility for voting for or serving on the Board of Trustees to tenured or tenure track faculty. Transitory faculty members who have no home institution are now being certified to eligibility. The proposed change is designed to restore the rule to its original intent by limiting eligibility for voting or serving on the Board to faculty members whose interest in UK is more than transitory.

This change was proposed by the University Senate Rules Committee and approved for Senate action by the Senate Council.

Implementation Date: Fall, 1985

NOTE: The proposal will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

Chairman Bostrom recognized Professor Bradley Canon, Secretary of the Senate Council, for the second action item. Professor Canon, on behalf of the Senate Council, recommended the approval of the proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section V., 4.3.1, English Requirement. This proposal was circulated to members of the senate under date of October 30, 1984.

The Chairman reminded the members of the Arts and Sciences College that the proposal was in two parts. The first is the senate rule regarding the English requirement. The specific course changes have not yet gone to the Senate Council.

Chairman Bostrom recognized Professor Robert Hemenway from the English Department. Professor Hemenway said Professor Blues, Director of Freshman Composition, had been doing a masterful job of shepharding the proposal through appropriate committees and councils. He said the proposal came to the senate from the English Department because they were the agency from the University that is empowered to implement the University's writing requirement. However, he said the English Department sees themselves as representing all those in the University who believe that the faculty can and should improve the quality of writing in the UK student body. What the proposal does is raise the standards for writing proficiency at the University of Kentucky. If adopted, fewer students will have the option of exempting themselves from one semester of writing courses. He pointed out it was part of an overall program of the English Department for the improvement of writing at all levels in the University. Professor Hemenway said he appreciated the opportunity to speak on the proposal.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. A senator asked if there would be any savings in resources. Professor Hemenway said there would be no savings but fairly complicated calculations had been made to see what the additional costs would be. It has been estimated the cost would be between \$17,000 to \$20,000 a year. A second question was how many students would be able to bypass the course with an ACT of 25. Professor Blues said 350 to 400 students come to the English Department each fall with an ACT of 25 or above. Professor Hemenway said there were 734 students who have an entering ACT in English between 22 and 24. Those students, under the present

system, have the option of taking only the second semester course in English. He said it had been discovered that the ACT test is a very poor predictor of success.

Professor Ivey wanted to know what the justification was for using the ACT at all. Professor Hemenway said it was assumed there was some relationship between reading and writing.

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

FROM:

V. 4.3.1 English Requirement

Two semesters of Freshman English or their equivalent are required of each student unless the student demonstrates competency according to the exemption plans specified in the Bulletin. Only in unusual circumstances will a student be permitted to withdraw (for reasons stated in Section V. 1.8.3) with the approval of the Dean of the student's college. A full-time student must enroll in Freshman English each semester until the student has satisfied this requirement unless:

- a. the student qualified for a one-semester option, in which case the student may enroll during either semester of his/her freshman year; or
- b. the program of the student's college or department requires postponement of the second course. (See patterns available in Part 2 of the Bulletin under Graduation Requirements.)

TO:

V. 4.3.1 Writing Requirement

Two semesters of writing courses (normally ENG 101, Writing I, and ENG 102, Writing II) or their equivalent are required of each student unless the student demonstrates competency according to the exemption plans specified in the Bulletin. Only in unusual circumstances will a student be permitted to withdraw (for reasons stated in Section V. 1.8.3); only the Dean of the student's college can authorize such a withdrawal, in consultation with the instructor. A full-time student must enroll in a writing course each semester until the student has satisfied this requirement unless the student qualifies for a one-semester option, in which case the student may enroll during either semester of his/her freshman year.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN BULLETIN ANNOUNCEMENT

FROM:

The University requires demonstrated competency in English composition. Competency may be demonstrated in the following ways--  
(1) Students who have a standard score of 21 and below on

the English section of the ACT must satisfactorily complete two semesters of composition: English 101 in their first semester at the University and either English 102, or English 103, or English 104, or English 105. (2) Students who have a standard score of 22 and above on the English section of the ACT must satisfactorily complete either English 102, or 103, or 104, or 105. If they receive a grade of B or better, they will have fulfilled the English composition requirements, but if they receive a grade of C, or D, they must complete one of the other second semester courses. Only in unusual circumstances (such as illness, injury, serious personal or family problems or serious financial difficulties) will a student be permitted to withdraw from a freshman English course. Full-time students must enroll in freshman English each semester until they have satisfied this requirement unless (1) they qualify for a one-semester option, in which case they may enroll during either semester of their freshman year; or (2) the program of their college or department requires postponement of the second course. Individual schools in the University may make additional requirements.

Students with ACT standard scores of 25 or above may complete the requirement by earning an A or B on a special examination. Students earning an A or B on the examination will receive three hours credit for ENG 102. Students who take the examination and do not make an A or B must complete the requirement as specified in (2) above. (Note: Some programs generally outside the College of Arts and Sciences, may require ENG 102 or may require a substitute for it, such as ENG 103, or 104; students should check with an adviser in their program. For complete information on the special examination, contact the Freshman Composition Office, 1221 Patterson Office Tower.)

TO:

The University requires competency in writing which is usually demonstrated in one of the following ways:

- (1) Students who have a standard score of 24 or below on the English section of the ACT must satisfactorily complete English 101 (Writing I) and English 102 (Writing II).
- (2) Students who have a standard score of 25 or above on the English section of the ACT may elect to take a special writing proficiency examination, administered by the English Department Writing Program. Students who pass this examination are eligible to fulfill the University Writing Requirements by successfully completing English 105 (Writing: An Accelerated Course). Students who do not pass this examination are required to take the normal sequence of ENG 101-102. (For complete information on the writing proficiency examination, contact the Writing Program Office, 1221 Patterson Office Tower, 257-7002.)

Full-time students must enroll in either ENG 101 or ENG 102 each semester until they have satisfied the Writing Requirement, unless they qualify for ENG 105, in which case they may enroll during either semester of their freshman year.

Only in unusual circumstances (such as illness, injury, serious financial difficulties, serious personal or family problems) will a student be permitted to withdraw from a course needed to fulfill the University Writing Requirement. Only the Dean of the student's college can authorize such withdrawals, in consultation with the instructor and the Director of the Writing Program.

Implementation Date: Fall Semester, 1985.

NOTES: The proposal will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification. See attached pages for background and rationale.

The Chairman moved to adjourn at 3:40 p.m.

George M. Dexter  
Secretary

## RATIONALE

- I Student Writing Proficiency The primary purpose of this proposal is to meet a need widely recognized by faculty at this and other universities--the need to improve our students' ability to communicate in written English.

In 1980 the Arts and Sciences Faculty Council surveyed 1,000 UK faculty members on their assessments of student writing proficiency. According to the report of the Review Committee on University Writing Programs (submitted to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, June 19, 1981), a full 90% of respondents said that "their students had writing problems that prevented them from effectively handling essay questions; some professors claiming 15-35% of their students had such difficulty. The respondents listed the most persistent problems in the area of sentence structure and grammar, spelling, organization, and limited vocabulary."

Student writing problems are not unique, of course, to this institution. A 1981 survey conducted by the City University of New York reveals that 97% of responding institutions (about half the colleges and universities in the United States) regard the skills (reading, writing, mathematics) level of entering freshmen to be a significant problem. In short, our own experience and the experience of other institutions tells us that most incoming freshmen need extensive, systematic training and practice in writing.

Some students have trouble composing syntactically coherent or grammatically correct sentences. Many more have never been taught to generate, explore, and develop ideas in writing. Very few incoming students possess the basic writing skills necessary to carry on their own educations. They cannot summarize reading material or synthesize two or more written documents. They cannot compose a critique or construct an argument. They have not yet learned the vital connections between writing and reading, and they are not prepared to use writing in the learning process.

- II Academic Sense In ENG 101 we teach the writing process-- from generating ideas, to revising, to final editing and preparation of the manuscript. And we provide practice in writing interpretative and opinion papers. The course also contains a review of grammar, mechanics, usage, and punctuation. In the second-semester course, ENG 102, we provide intensive instruction and practice in the kinds of writing that students--as students-- need to do: summary, synthesis, critique, and argumentation. In short, we train students to write in the contexts of written texts. We also include a unit on the essay examination.

But our current policy diverts many students from this coherent and academically sound course sequence. For example, Engineering, B&E, and some Agriculture students who take ENG 101 normally take either the business or technical writing option as their second-semester course. In effect, these student take a professional writing course (see III below) before they have completed a program in the fundamentals of writing, and before they have had any significant training in the discipline to which their professional writing course is specifically related.

Those students who take only one composition course to complete the requirement are permitted to do so solely on the basis of English ACT score, a mechanism which--in itself--does not reliably reflect writing proficiency, as studies conducted at the University of Michigan and at Ohio State University indicate. Indeed, Dr. Ralph Tyler, in his Ford Doundation-supprrted study, found that "the correlations between the scores students make on such tests and the ratings given their written compositions usually range from .40 to .60. Correlations of this magnitude indicate that an individual student's skills in writing cannot safely be inferred from his or her objective test score." But under our current system, approximately 25% of entering freshmen are exempted because they have scored 22 or higher on the ACT test.

Therefore, we propose to exempt students from the two-semester sequence on the basis of a higher ACT score (25), combined with acceptable performance on a writing proficiency test. We have found that students with English ACT scores of 25 are usually more "correct" writers than those with lower scores, but they are not necessarily more proficient writers. That is, 25-level students are less likely to be troubled by grammatical and mechanical problems, but they often require training and practice in generating and developing ideas in writing, in the various forms of the essay, in revising. The test we intend to administer to the ACT-25 students (see Appendix A) should help us distinguish between those students prepared for the challenge of an accelerated course and those who require the two-semester sequence.

Our experience tells us that ACT-25 indicates students potentially qualified for exemption from the 101-102 sequence. But some students with lower scores might also qualify. That is why the English department is exploring the possibility of permitting any student to attempt the CLEP examination option. We expect to announce our policy on CLEP early in the fall semester, 1984.

III Basic Writing as Distinguished from Professional Writing Courses      The fact that students need to master the fundamentals of written communication is vitally related to our proposal that ENG 103 and 104 be removed from the writing requirement.

Writing for Business and Industry (ENG 103) and Technical Writing (ENG 104) are valuable to the College of Business and Economics and the College of Engineering for their specialized content. They teach business and engineering students to communicate professional information to audiences within and outside their special fields.

But we ask these courses to perform a very difficult double duty: to teach professional writing and basic writing simultaneously. Students would be much better served by courses that meet particular needs--the need for instruction and practice in basic writing during the freshman year, the need for instruction in writing for the discipline during the sophomore or junior year.

Business Writing and Technical Writing are courses in professional writing that concentrate on specialized content and skills. Students should take these courses when they are simultaneously taking courses within their disciplines, a fact Engineering acknowledges by requesting that Technical Writing be renumbered to the 200 level and that Engineering students take it in the junior year.

Likewise, the College of Business and Economics sees the need for its students to take the business writing course in addition to the University's composition requirement. The B&E undergraduate committee has endorsed a two-semester basic writing sequence and the renumbering of ENG 103 to 203, which will continue to be required of all B&E students.

IV Freshman Composition vs. Writing In this proposal we are asking that the term "Freshman Composition Requirement" be changed to "University Writing Requirement." In our course change proposals (see Appendix B) we are proposing to eliminate the term "freshman composition" from our course titles. And the English Department has recently decided to change the name of the Freshman Composition Program to the Writing Program.

The point of these name changes is that we teach writing, not something called freshman composition. Many of our students are conditioned to think of freshman composition as a course which they must survive, but which has no relation to their university education. In that context they generally think of writing as a formal, sterile exercise, something extra that you sometimes are made to do for arbitrary reasons. Faculty members know, however, that writing is not an irrelevant formality, but a critical act of thinking, central to any process of education.

We need to change our students' perception of what writing is and of the purpose of the writing courses they are required to take. We think the name change will contribute to that effort.

APPENDIX A

The Writing Proficiency Test for  
Students with English ACT of 25 or above

Because ENG 105 as revised will be an accelerated course, demanding that students accomplish in one semester what would otherwise require two semesters, we want to make certain that only students qualified for the course be permitted to take it. So we intend to test them over certain skills and techniques that we concentrate on in ENG 101.

In addition to teaching writing as process (which we intend to include in ENG 105), the 101 course concentrates on the essay form (organizing ideas and specific information in relation to a thesis); on learning to critically read one's own work in progress (for unless you can "see" your own writing from an objective, critical point of view, you cannot revise it effectively); on the writing of sentences that are grammatically and mechanically correct and stylistically effective.

The 90 minute writing proficiency examination will therefore require the student to compose a paragraph on an assigned subject (the paragraph is the essence of the essay; if the student can develop and organize a paragraph he/she can write an entire essay); analyze a passage of incomplete writing from a writer's perspective (answer the question: what should the writer attend to in the next revision of the work?); correct and/or rewrite a series of sentences and brief passages that are grammatically, mechanically, or stylistically deficient.

We expect to administer this examination on the Monday before the first day of classes each semester, to evaluate it holistically, and to have the results to the students within 24 hours. Eligible students who attend the two-day Summer Advising Conference could take the test during their visit to campus. And we may be able to give the test once each semester for eligible high school students willing and able to come to campus on a Saturday morning.



C.L. Atcher  
Libraries  
4 King Library Annex

0039

1

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL  
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

October 11, 1984

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, November 12, 1984. Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I., 5.2, Election: Two Voting University System Faculty Members.

Proposal: (underlined portion is new)

I. 5.2 Election: Two Voting University System Faculty Members, Board of Trustees

As specified in the Governing Regulations (Part II.A.2) there shall be two voting University System faculty members of the Board of Trustees. Faculty members who may vote in the election of the University System Faculty members to the Board of Trustees shall be those in the University System who:

- a. have an actual or equivalent rank of Assistant Professor or higher;
- b. hold a tenured position or one in which tenure may be acquired, except that untenured members of the faculty whose appointment is specified as ending on a certain date without further notice or as not leading to consideration for tenure shall not be eligible; and
- c. are included in the faculty T.I.A.A.-C.R.E.F. retirement program (or eligible for such inclusion after one year of University service) or other retirement program approved by the Board of Trustees.

Faculty members eligible to serve as an elected member of the Board of Trustees shall be those who meet the voting qualifications and who have a primary assignment in a faculty role at the time of election and service (50% or more involvement in teaching, research, and/or service). For purposes of this section, assignment as chairman of a department shall not exclude one who holds such a position from eligibility to serve as an elected member of the Board of Trustees. Faculty members of the Board of Trustees shall be eligible for re-election. Eligibility under paragraphs a. and b. above shall be certified in the same manner as for elections to the University Senate.

Page 2  
Senate Agenda Item: I., 5.2  
October 11, 1984

Background and Rationale:

Recently the University administration has stopped classifying transitory faculty members as visiting professors unless they have a home institution. Faculty members who have no home institution (usually recent Ph.D.s replacing someone on leave or assignment, etc.) are now classified as regular faculty members by the administration. Such persons are eligible for TIAA-CREF on the same basis as permanent faculty and would have to be considered for tenure if they were to remain at UK for six years. The only thing differentiating such appointees from other regular faculty is that their contracts indicate in the section on conditions of appointment, assignment or tenure, that the appointment expires on a particular date without further notice or that the appointment may be renewed on a year-to-year basis by mutual agreement, but will not be continued beyond five years (including applicable prior service) and will not lead to consideration for tenure.

The original intent of Rule I-5.2(b) was to limit eligibility for voting for or serving on the Board of Trustees to tenured or tenure track faculty. Transitory faculty members who have no home institution are now being certified to eligibility. The proposed change is designed to restore the rule to its original intent by limiting eligibility for voting or serving on the Board to faculty members whose interest in UK is more than transitory.

This change was proposed by the University Senate Rules Committee and approved for Senate action by the Senate Council.

Implementation Date: Fall, 1985

/cet