

Alveda

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

March 29, 1984

TO: Members, University Senate

This is a reminder that the next University Senate meeting has been scheduled for Monday, April 9, 1984, at 3:00 p.m. in the Classroom Building, 106.

AGENDA:

1. Minutes
2. Resolutions
3. Announcements
4. General Education Report: Professor John B. Stephenson
5. Action Item: Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I., 3.3.2 relative to the Composition of the Undergraduate Council. (Circulated under date of March 27, 1984)
6. Action Item: Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I., 3.3.1 and Section III., 2.0 relative to Review of Programs. (Circulated under date of March 29, 1984)
7. Action Item: Proposed addition to University Senate Rules, Section V., 3.1.2 Quality Point Deficit. (Circulated under date of March 28, 1984)
8. OPEN DISCUSSION: Research grant overhead and salary reimbursement--purpose and uses. Dr. William Ehmann and Dr. Fred Zechman, Associate Deans for Research. Questions and comments will be invited from the floor.

Note: All faculty, students and administrative officers are welcome to the Senate meeting and can participate in the discussion (except in rare instance of closed meeting). Of course, only members of the Senate may vote.

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

/cet

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, APRIL 9, 1984

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, April 9, 1984, in Room 106 of the Classroom Building.

E. Douglas Rees, Chairman of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent: James Applegate, James Bader, Charles E. Barnhart, Jack C. Blanton, Thomas O. Blues*, James A. Boling*, Peter P. Bosomworth*, David Bradford, James Buckholtz, Joseph T. Burch, Ellen Burnett, Henry Cole*, Glenn B. Collins*, Clifford J. Cremers*, M. Ward Crowe, Stephen DeMers, Donald F. Diedrich, Richard C. Domek*, Herbert Drennon, Nancy E. Dye, Paul M. Eakin, Anthony Eardley, William Ecton, Charles Ellinger, Nathan Floyd, Richard W. Furst, Art Gallaher, Jr.*, Jess Gardner, C. Michael Gray, Andrew J. Grimes*, Merlin Hackbart*, John Hall*, Joseph Hamburg, S. Z. Hasan, Raymond R. Hornback, Alfred S. L. Hu, John J. Just, James Kemp*, Richard I. Kermod*, Robert Lawson, B. J. Leon*, Julie Lien*, Thomas Lillich, Carol R. Lowery*, David Lowery, Edgar Maddon, Kenneth E. Marino*, Sally S. Mattingly, Mary Beth Messmer, Brad McDearman, Marion McKenna*, Martin J. McMahon, Jr.*, H. Brinton Milward*, Daniel N. Nelson*, Robert C. Nobel*, Clayton Omvig*, Merrill Packer, David C. Payne*, Leonard K. Peters*, Janet Pisaneschi*, Jean Pival, David J. Prior*, Robert Rabel*, Madhira D. Ram, Caryl E. Rusbult*, Charles Sachatello*, Edgar Sagan, Otis A. Singletary*, Jesse E. Sicken, John T. Smith, Stanford L. Smith, David A. Spaeth*, Marcia Stanhope*, Joseph V. Swintosky, Howard Sypher*, Phil Taylor, Kenneth Thompson, William C. Thornbury*, Enid S. Waldhart*, Marc J. Wallace, David Webster, O'Neil Weeks, Constance Wilson, Alfred D. Winer, Ralph Wiseman*, Steven Yates*, Scott Yocum

The Minutes of the Meeting of March 12, 1984, were approved as circulated.

Chairman Rees recognized Professor Gerald Janecek who presented the following Memorial Resolution on the death of Professor Paul Glidden Forand.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

Paul Glidden Forand 1933-1984

"Dr. Paul G. Forand, Associate Professor of Arabic in the Department of Slavic and Oriental Languages, died in the Good Samaritan Hospital on March 28 after a lengthy illness. His many friends and colleagues at the University deeply mourn his loss to the university community.

Paul was born on May 30, 1933 in New Bedford, Massachusetts and grew up there, receiving his A.B. Degree from Harvard College in 1955 in the field of Romance Languages. He then did graduate work at Princeton University, receiving his Ph.D. in 1962 in the field of Oriental Studies. In the process he was awarded a number of Fulbright and other fellowships under which he studied in Egypt (1955-56) and in London (1956-57). His dissertation was entitled: "Military Slavery in Ninth-Century Baghdad."

He came to the University of Kentucky in 1965 as Assistant Professor of Arabic, after he had served for two years as Instructor in History in Mundelein College, Chicago. He

*Absence explained

was promoted to Associate Professor in 1969. In 1972 he received a research grant from the U.S. Office of Education under which he did work in Cairo, January-July 1973. From 1977 to 1982 Paul served as Chairman of the Department of Slavic and Oriental and he had been Director of the Middle East Civilization Program for the past eleven years. In the summer of 1983 he was chosen to participate in an NEH Seminar at Harvard.

During his tenure at UK he published a number of scholarly articles in prestigious journals in Arabic Studies and served on University committees "too numerous to list." This last phrase, which has been drawn from his most recent curriculum vitae, gives a clue as to the character of a man who has served the university broadly and well for nearly twenty years and yet who has shied away from taking credit for the fact.

In addition, Paul was an understanding teacher of Arabic and Islamic culture, sympathetic to students' problems in learning a difficult non-Indoeuropean language the script for which contains no vowels and looks, as he affectionately referred to it, like "chicken scratching," and the cultural milieu for which was very far from most native Kentuckians' experience. In this regard, Paul was a great broadener of students' outlooks, providing them with one of the few opportunities available at UK to savor non-Western thought patterns. Paul also served as an effective and personable liaison with the larger local community, both Arab and non-Arab. In these functions it would be hard to imagine a better person, and his absence leaves a large gap, one which we cannot hope to fill so well again.

Indeed, above and beyond his academic attainments and service to the university, it is the man himself that we will most miss. There can be few people who knew Paul even passingly who can have failed to be touched by his kindness and good humor in some important way. I recall, for instance, when I suddenly received a position at UK in mid-August of 1971 straight out of graduate school, and arrived at the Coliseum to fulfill my first official duty by sitting at pre-registration, that Paul was on duty ahead of me. Instead of hurrying off with relief, he stayed for nearly an hour to chat, to get to know me and fill me in on the university and its ways. I returned home that day feeling very welcomed. Others can recount innumerable similar or better examples. It is these things that are perhaps the highest measure of a man, who by his actions gave meaning to the words of the great Arabic poet Al-Maarri:

A church, a temple, or a Kaba Stone,
Koran or Bible or a martyr's bone--
All these and more my heart can tolerate
Since my religion now is Love alone.

(Prepared by Gerald Janecek, Slavic and Oriental Languages)

Professor Janecek requested that the Resolution be made a part of these minutes and copies be sent to the family. He also invited everyone to a Memorial Service in honor of Dr. Forand on Wednesday, April 11 at 4:00 p.m. in the University Library Gallery. Chairman Rees asked the senators to stand for a moment of silence in tribute and respect to Professor Forand.

The Chairman made the following announcements:

"At the last regular meeting of the University Senate, the ombudsman makes a report. Last year it did not seem wise to do so and this year we are faced with the same situation. Dr. Ellinger will give his ombudsman report at our September meeting. The ombudsman's term extends until the first of July. Consequently, there is ongoing business at this time and the statistics for the entire year cannot be available. I think the senate ought to consider changing the time for the annual report.

The second announcement is that Professor Constance Wilson has been reelected to the Board of Trustees. We congratulate her.

Because of unfinished business that should go into effect at the beginning of the academic year in August, it will be necessary to have a special meeting of the University Senate. Unless there is some overriding objection that meeting will be held on Wednesday, April 25 at 3:00 p.m. in this room. The items of business at that time will include a proposal for a new grading system which will be plus and minus. We will vote on that in two parts. One is whether or not we want to go for a plus and minus and if so, which particular system we would like to have. A specific system is proposed by the committee on Academic Admissions and Standards.

There is also an admissions policy for the College of Engineering. Also a proposal for probation and suspension rules in the College of Allied Health and similar rules for the College of Engineering will be on the agenda.

Those are the main items of business and the proposals are of such a nature that they must be implemented at the beginning of an academic year. Not to act on these at a special meeting would mean that implementation would have to wait for over a year."

Chairman Rees recognized Professor John Stephenson for a general education report. Professor Stephenson has been the Chairman of the General Education Committee. Other committee members are: William Y. Adams, Anthropology; Raymond Betts, Honors Program; Connie Bridge, Education; Lawrence Busch, Sociology; James Chapman, Academic Affairs; John Christopher, Arts and Sciences; Leo Demski, Biology; Joe Engelberg, Physiology; Juanita Fleming, Nursing; Wilbur Frye, Agronomy; Jesse Harris, Psychology; Robert Hemenway, English; Lini Kadaba, (student) Journalism; David Kao, Civil Engineering; Michael Kerwin, Community College System; Barbara Mabry, Arts and Sciences Special Programs; Daniel Reedy, Spanish, Graduate School; Craig Sanders, (student) Political Science; Donald Sands, Academic Affairs; and Louis Swift, Classics.

THE JOINT COMMITTEE TO REVIEW GENERAL EDUCATION AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY: A PROGRESS REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY
SENATE

April 6, 1984

John B. Stephenson, Chairperson of the Committee

PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

The purposes of this report are to inform the University Senate of the ongoing work of the Joint Committee to Review General Education at the University of Kentucky and to solicit further response to certain recommendations currently being formulated by the Committee. The Committee is pleased that it has been afforded this opportunity to share its work. I will confine my remarks to about 25 minutes and then will open the floor for as much discussion as Chairman Rees will permit.

The Committee to Review General Education at the University of Kentucky was established in the fall of 1982 at the initiative of the Senate Council and with the cooperation and cosponsorship of the Chancellor of the Lexington Campus. Members of the then Senate Council and the Chancellor felt that such a committee was needed for several reasons:

- (1) The General Studies Program had not been reviewed at all for several years and had not been subjected to thorough scrutiny since its inception in 1965, now some 19 years ago.
- (2) There was strong feeling that the General Studies Program had lost coherence over the years and that the number of options available had proliferated unduly.
- (3) In certain respects the time appeared auspicious for a major review of the General Studies Program, in view of the new policy of selective admissions and a renewed emphasis on excellence in undergraduate programs.

The Committee, duly charged with the goal of reviewing the current General Studies Program and recommending whatever reforms deemed desirable, began meeting monthly in September, 1982, twice monthly in fall, 1983, and weekly in the current spring term. The membership has changed only slightly during that time. The present membership is listed in the material given you today.

In the course of our work, the Committee has undertaken the following activities:

*A review of the history of the present program.

**Reading and consultation with outside experts to gain an awareness of developments in the field of general education elsewhere.

**Interviews with all deans of colleges with undergraduate programs, and with selected departmental chairman, about strengths and weaknesses of the current program, and recommendations for improvement. (See list of 13 questions used as interview guide.)

**A study of a sample of transcripts of seniors who graduated from UK in May, 1983 for the purpose of determining exactly how--and whether--students satisfy requirements of the current program.

**Hearings held on three occasions and in three locations during one week in February, for the purpose of soliciting opinion on the current program and changes needed in it.

**Last and most importantly, discussion among ourselves about what is wrong and what is right and what is possible in the realm of general education curricula.

These activities have been reported with great frequency by the Kernel, to whom we are indebted for their serious efforts to keep the campus informed of our deliberations. Articles have also appeared in Communi-K, to whom we are equally grateful.

The process through which the Committee is taking itself is careful and deliberate. We realize that there is a certain degree of impatience among some of the University community to see a final product, or at least an architectural rendering which can be subjected to critique, modification, a vote, and implementation. Our understanding of the nature of such programs, and our sense of the appropriate strategy, is that the matter is so complex and important that it is best to make haste slowly.

We have come to understand that what we are dealing with is only in part a problem which is susceptible to technical solutions. If the problem were only a technical one of counting hours and juggling courses and fitting into degree requirements and assigning teaching personnel, it would be difficult enough to solve. But it is made even more troublesome by the fact that it is fundamentally a moral problem--that is, a problem of deciding what is right--as well as a technical problem--that is, a problem of deciding what will work. The moral nature of our assignment may be made clearer to you if you imagine collecting twenty faculty members and students in a room and locking the door until there is agreement on what is the knowledge most worth having.

Well, we have done this. It took a little time. You will have your turn, I presume. I hope you all remain friends, as we have managed to do.

ASSUMPTIONS

We are currently at a stage in our work which results in several positions which we would like to put before the Senate for your consideration and discussion. These are not action items, but more in the nature of recommendations in process. Our sense of strategy is that large-scale modifications of the curriculum are more likely if taken up in stages, each stage preparing the way for the next. This is such an intermediate stage.

Before describing the particular positions we are recommending, it is important that we share with you certain assumptions and premises on the basis of which we have been working. These assumptions include the following:

--That there are indeed problems with the current General Studies Program. These problems include:

(1) Proliferation of courses and options. The degree of choice now available among General Studies Areas and among courses within Areas has progressed to such a point that the coherence of the program is seriously compromised. Indeed, our study of transcripts reveals that the program is so flexible as to allow a number of de facto general studies programs to operate within the guidelines of what appears to be a single University program. Because each college has been allowed to stipulate its own requirements within these guidelines, the result is that to a certain extent the colleges can specify their own versions of General Studies. Whether the University has a single program now can be questioned.

(2) The absence of strong and consistent oversight of general education. The plain fact is that no one is in charge of general education at the University of Kentucky. It operates in much the same fashion as Ernest Boyer's metaphor of the spare room: the spare room is the room everyone wants to use but which no one wants to take care of. The result is a cluttered mess.

(3) The popularity of certain subject areas the value of which for general education can be questioned in comparison to other important subject areas which are less popular or absent altogether. For example, American History, which appears to us somewhat repetitive of high school requirements, is an exceedingly popular means of satisfying one of the General Studies areas. At the same time, we note that there is no Fine Arts area as such in the current program, and we note further that the Humanities Area is satisfied by fewer than one-third of our graduates. We also note the relatively low priority assigned to such areas as international or cross-cultural studies and foreign language study, and the total absence of required studies which involve integrative thinking across disciplines. For another example, we note that insufficient attention is given to upgrading writing skills in the present program.

(4) The absence of a clearly-stated and widely shared rationale for general education at the University of Kentucky. No doubt this shortcoming can be explained by the relatively low priority given to general education in a research-oriented and graduate institution. Whatever the explanation, the absence is noticeable and regrettable, and it contributes further to the fragmentation and disaggregation of a potentially coherent program into mere requirements and courses to be gotten through. The problem of priority is perhaps the most difficult to deal with--again, it is a moral, not a technical problem--but it must be addressed if the University is to achieve and maintain excellence in all its undergraduate programs.

(5) The inadequacy of resources devoted to general education. You will be thinking that every committee on campus can enumerate a list of problems which includes this one, and you will be absolutely right, and they will all be right, too. But let me mention just two areas in which the resource problem borders on negligence in the case of general education:

a. The extent to which we rely on graduate teaching assistants and part-time instructors for teaching courses in General Studies is estimated at between 80 and 90%. The quality of teaching by these hardworking men and women is generally high, and the University is indebted to them for carrying this burden for us. But the Committee believes that our dependence on these teachers is simultaneously a revelation of the degree to which regular faculty remain uninvolved with general education, and the degree to which we are restricted in the nature of course content which could be taught in a more sophisticated and coherent program. But then there is the question of resources: What would be required if regular faculty took over more of the work of TA's and part-time faculty? And what source of support would we find to replace the stipends we now pay graduate students for teaching? We have built ourselves an interlocking resource system. It works so well that we cannot change part of it without altering the whole structure.

b. Another resource issue concerns research and monitoring of general education. Questions such as: How much does it cost? How well does it work? and Is it worth it? cannot now be answered, although it is technically possible. It is difficult enough to answer the question Who takes what and when? although no one had sought answers to that question for almost 20 years until this Committee went to work with the help of John Christopher and Barbara Mabry. Some colleges and universities show the extent of their concern with general education by regularly conducting research on the impact of their programs on students. The state of Tennessee now puts more money in the budgets of those public institutions which can demonstrate the value added by their instruction. The technology is now available for answering such questions; we no longer have to take

it on faith that the curriculum is working. And it requires no sophisticated methodology to track students through programs so that we can know who is taking what. We can do this important research whenever the resources are made available.

(6) Another problem is that of double-counting, or the inclusion of courses to satisfy two sets of requirements, which results in a number of courses in General Studies which are highly major-oriented and not suited for general education.

(7) Another is the absence of any common, or core courses which would be required of all students.

These are some of the more important problems the Committee has uncovered and borne in mind as it went about its work.

--Another assumption made by the Committee is that there are reasons why the General Studies Program has evolved into what we now see reprinted in the catalog every year and the Schedule Book every semester, and that these reasons are primarily political and economic--and secondarily reasons which bear on curricular philosophy. This assumption is important to make clear; it means that we understand that it will require more than philosophic argument to bring about change. We have not become cynics, but we do recognize the difference between reason and self-interest.

--A corollary assumption is that existing structures do not give way easily, even when confronted by sound argument and virtuous motives. As has been noted many times, changing the curriculum is much like moving a graveyard.

--We also assume that it is the function of this committee to create a climate of receptivity for change in UK's general education program, to set forth a model built on sound principles, to set out a guide to the future, a goal toward which to work in phases and as resources permit. We understand fully that approval and implementation cannot and should come quickly. There are numerous resource issues which follow from almost any recommendation. There are adjustments required by many departments which must be considered. Implications for the community colleges must likewise be considered. And in some instances the effects of recommendations on secondary schools must be taken into account.

For these reasons, we assume that the least effective strategy for change would be to announce a full-blown, detailed plan for a new program of general education. That is why we have chosen what may appear to be a slower, but what we feel will be an ultimately more effective and efficient strategy of phased recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION

Having presented these thoughts to you as background, let me proceed to share with you some of the recommendations which the Committee is formulating. We invite your responses. Your comments will be useful to us as we continue to work.

(1) The Committee has adopted for further consideration a clear set of outcomes-oriented goals for general education at the University of Kentucky. This statement has been circulated among various segments of the campus, and has been discussed by the Undergraduate Council and the Senate Council. Further discussion and refinement is sought; eventually it should come before the Senate for endorsement. Such a statement as this sets forth a clear framework of purpose for a program of general education, a framework which is not easily discoverable among the various publications by means of which we now orient and inform our students. This statement you now have in your hands.

(2) We have adopted as a next step a statement, in list form, of what we feel are the components of knowledge, perspective, and skill most essential to the attainment of the above goals. This statement represents what we as a committee feel is, in Professor Wayne Booth's words, "the knowledge most worth having," or, in Ernest Boyer's terms, "the core of common learning." These components are considered by the Committee to be so essential that university-level competencies should be expected of all graduates. (It is important to point out that while the Committee concludes that these components are essential and should be required in some form, the precise formulation of the requirement is, in most cases, still under discussion.)

The Committee commends to your attention the list circulated among you today. It includes:

Under the subcategory of Knowledge:

I. Civilizations. This essential component of knowledge is seen by the Committee as inclusive of major philosophic, literary, historical, and artistic elements of civilization, with the primary emphasis placed on Western traditions but with the inclusion of significant non-western material as well. The rationale is that knowledge of the western heritage is of fundamental importance and that the passing on of our cultural inheritance is an essential obligation of a university. In addition, the Committee concludes that it is also essential that students learn from the study of other cultures that ours is not the only civilization.

II. Cross-cultural Perspectives. The Committee concludes that it is essential for students to understand that there are cultural premises and systems of thought and custom different from our own, and for them to learn the important lessons which comparative cultural studies have to teach.

III. Knowledge of the Natural World. The Committee concludes that it is essential that students understand the ideology and methods of science generally, and that they appreciate its current commanding influence throughout the world. We also feel strongly that all University of Kentucky graduates should possess some knowledge of the natural world as revealed through study of the natural and life sciences.

IV. Knowledge of the Individual and Social World. The Committee concludes that all students should understand how the ideology and methods of science find expression in the behavioral and social sciences, and that they should possess some knowledge of the individual and society generated through study of the social and behavioral sciences. A knowledge of economic, political, and social frameworks, as well as of the internal psychological makeup of the individual is an essential component of an undergraduate education at the University of Kentucky.

V. Fine Arts. The Committee agrees that Fine Arts is a fundamental component of knowledge for all students, to be presented essentially as art appreciation dealing with broad perspectives and historical development of the arts, to include art, music, theatre, and architecture.

In addition to these components of knowledge, the Committee has formulated the following list of essential Skills:

I. Writing. The Committee feels strongly that university-level writing skills should be expected of every graduate. To this end, the Committee endorses the forthcoming proposal from the Department of English regarding a new "University Writing Requirement." This proposal would require every entering freshman with an ACT score below 25 to take two semesters of Freshman Composition (two semesters are currently required only of those with ACT's below 22). Further, students with ACT's of 25 and higher would be required to take a writing examination which, if passed, would allow them to take an accelerated ENG 105 writing course.

In addition, the Committee strongly endorses the program of Writing Across the Curriculum which has already been begun by the Department of English. It also would especially require the inclusion of a significant component of writing in courses included in any new program of general education. And last, the Committee would like to require that every student take at least two courses a year which contain a significant component of writing after he or she has completed Freshman Composition requirements, if such courses can be identified.

II. Mathematics. The Committee agrees that a university-level competency in mathematics should be required of all students. The formulation of such a requirement is still under discussion.

III. Foreign Language. The Committee concludes that some level of competency in a foreign language is essential and should be expected of every graduate of the University of Kentucky. What level of competency should be expected and what form any specific requirement should take are still under consideration. "Foreign language" is taken to include classical as well as modern foreign languages.

IV. Oral Communication. The Committee agrees that speaking, listening and related communication skills are important but should not at this time be regarded as so essential as to be required of all University of Kentucky students through common, institution-wide requirements. It is recommended, however, that every degree program revise its requirements to include at least one course experience in which speaking and listening skills are a significant component for every student. This recommendation is intended to allow and encourage each program to incorporate the kind of communication skills training and experience appropriate for its students.

This completes the list of components of knowledge and skill regarded by the Committee for the Review of General Education as essential. In one form or another, some level of mastery of these components should, we feel, be required of every student.

The Committee has taken the further step of drawing up a "blueprint" for an overall program structure. This framework can be stated briefly. It says that we advocate four elements for such a program, as follows:

1. A required orientation to university studies which would introduce to new students a level of expectation and a style of learning appropriate for a university education, and which would orient and motivate them for serious study at the very earliest time in their University experience.
2. One or more required integrative courses common to all students.
3. Other required components or categories (perhaps similar to the current General Studies Areas) which might be satisfied by optional courses contained within each.
4. Capstone integrative course requirements for the senior level.

Of these four elements, number 2. (required, common integrative courses) has occupied most of our discussion time so far. We are formulating a recommendation that a four-semester sequence in "civilizations" be created, as described above.

As you might imagine, the Committee began this undertaking with some trepidation. General education is a matter about which everyone has an opinion, and most people are not shy about sharing their convictions. At the same time, most people have relatively superficial and uninformed opinions about general education. We have had to spend considerable time informing ourselves and arriving at a shared realm of discourse. We have felt encouraged by many of you, and we feel a sense of readiness in the University community for some kind of program which is coherent, challenging, and worthy of offering at a strong university such as this.

There is much work remaining to be done and, as indicated earlier, there are numerous resource issues to be addressed. Any new program will almost of necessity involve shifts of teaching assignment, and, if implemented properly, should also require a sizeable investment in faculty development and retraining. Additionally, the Committee feels strongly that firmer administrative oversight of general education is essential to its success. It is, at present, a program adrift.

We are pleased to have had this opportunity to share our work with you, and we invite your comments now and at any time in the future.

Thank you.

Chairman Rees thanked Professor Stephenson and asked for questions and discussion from the floor. Professor Gesund felt that engineering and technology were dominate forces in our civilization these days, and there was nothing in the report about engineering technology or how students could be brought into the world of these modern fields. He felt the well rounded university graduate ought to be relatively familiar with engineering and technology processes and how new technology is designed and brought into being. Professor Stephenson said it was hard to see what was in the categories from the way they were presented because they were basically labels at this point. He said the committee's intention was to examine the role of technology and its influence on civilization. Professor Gesund said that with physics and other sciences the students were exposed to a couple of courses in those fields. He would like to see all students exposed to courses taught by engineers as introductory engineering courses so that students would get some idea of what the thought processes involved. Professor Stephenson agreed there was an important role for the discussion and knowledge of technology and engineering. He was not sure of the best way to do it but invited Professor Gesund's input. Professor Rea thought there was a course a few years ago in the history of technology taught by Professor Lienhard.

Professor McEllistrem endorsed strongly the concept of providing some scheme for having an integrated approach to general education. He was not persuaded that the resources were here. He found that the teaching assistants provided a very valuable input to the young students in those service courses and they related more effectively than the regular faculty. Professor Stephenson said Professor McEllistrem was exactly right about the resources, not the absence of them but the way they were allocated. He added it was hard to imagine a general education program that did not make good use of all the good teaching talent the University has--not only with TAs but with part-time faculty as well.

Professor Perreiah wanted to know how broadly the committee conceived of the mathematical skill requirement. He wanted to know if the committee wanted strictly mathematical courses which are directly related to computation skills or in a broader framework. Professor Stephenson said the committee's inclination was directed toward fairly specific kinds of quantitative reasoning as mathematical and algebraic skills.

Chairman Rees said a specific proposal on general education would be coming before the senate, probably in parts so that discussion could be focussed.

Professor Weil asked if a foreign language would be required of all students. Professor Stephenson said a language would be required. He asked that comments, suggestions and questions be in writing or a phone call to anyone on the committee would do. He suggested also that anyone would be welcome to make an appearance before the committee. There are going to be three more meetings before the year ends. His wish was that the same committee would continue.

Professor Stephenson thanked the senate for letting him have the opportunity of being there on behalf of the committee. Chairman Rees thanked Professor Stephenson and the senate gave him an enthusiastic applause.

The first action item involved a change in the University Senate Rules. Chairman Rees recognized Professor Robert Bostrom. Professor Bostrom, on behalf of the Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I., 3.3.2 relative to the Composition of the Undergraduate Council. This change had been circulated to members of the senate under date of March 27, 1984.

Professor Rees said the proposal was to make sure there would be a voting member of the Community College System on the Undergraduate Council. There was no discussion or questions and the proposal, which passed unanimously, reads as follows:

Proposal: [add underlined portion; delete bracketed portion]

I., 3.3.2 Composition

It shall consist of fifteen (15) [fourteen (14)] members. Nine of the members shall be elected by the faculty of colleges, groups of colleges or parts of colleges as follows: (US: 10/12/81)

One member from the combined areas of Literature and Philosophy in the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Fine Arts, and the Honors Program. One member from the combined areas of Biological and Physical Sciences in the College of Arts and Sciences.

One member from the combined areas of the Social Sciences in the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Communications. One member from the College of Agriculture. One member from the College of Education. One member from the College of Business and Economics. One member from the combined Colleges of Architecture, Social Work, and Home Economics. One member from the combined Colleges of Allied Health, Nursing, and Pharmacy.

Of the six [five] remaining members, one shall be appointed by the Senate Council. One member shall be appointed by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for the Community College System to represent the needs and problems of the Community College System. Four members shall be appointed by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Lexington Campus, with the advice and consent of the Undergraduate Council. Of these four, two shall be faculty members from colleges eligible to have representation on the Undergraduate Council, and the remaining two shall be undergraduate students from eligible colleges. (US: 10/12/81)

Rationale

In the context of this proposal it should be noted that another Senate Rule (IV., 2.1.2) states "grades, credits, quality points and academic status from courses taken in the University of Kentucky Community College shall be transferred when the Community College student enrolls in the University System." This Rule makes obvious the need for Community College representation on the Undergraduate Council in order to assure that there exist as much compatibility as possible between similar courses in the Community College System and the University System.

Implementation Date: Fall, 1984.

Chairman Rees recognized Professor Robert Bostrom to present the proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I., 3.3.1 and Section III., 2.0 relative to Review of Programs. On behalf of the Senate Council Professor Bostrom recommended approval. This change had been circulated to the senate members under date of March 28, 1984. Professor Bostrom said that basically the proposal stemmed from the Undergraduate Council to bring their description of procedure and practice in line with those of the Graduate Council. The significant part was that the Council may recommend the suspension of a particular program. The second part was to add that such suspension must be approved by the Senate Council.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Professor Rea was curious about what would happen after five years when there was no provision for termination. Professor Bostrom said the proposal had been left deliberately ambiguous in that after five years a program could be repropoed or left to die. Professor Rea felt the proposal implied that after five years the program would automatically come to life.

Professor Gesund wanted to know what would happen to faculty if a program were suspended. If a program were terminated, presumably the faculty would be moved out. Chairman Rees said it would depend upon the program and sometimes the faculty could be used elsewhere. Professor Gesund felt the issue should be addressed at some time. Chairman Rees felt that meanwhile some procedural device was needed to handle suspension of programs; the proposal addresses that issue only.

Professor Canon felt there was confusion between departments, educational units, and programs. Suspension of a degree program does not in any way suspend the department in an educational unit. The unit may teach courses but simply not offer a degree. The proposal was trying to accommodate the College of Education where programs are numerous and the college is seeking to suspend a couple of programs. Chairman Rees said that some graduate programs had been suspended without a loss of faculty.

Professor Canon asked, on behalf of Dean Royster, about the statement under Section III., 2.0 "including suspension or termination of programs." It seemed to him that the rationale and background indicated that the thrust was for suspension and termination for undergraduate programs to be reviewed by the Senate Council. He wanted to know if it included graduate programs.

Chairman Rees asked that discussion presently be restricted to the first part of the proposal. He said faculty members were not assigned to programs but to an educational unit. Chairman Rees added that the question now was whether or not the senate was satisfied to add the change to the Undergraduate Council charge in order to give a mechanism for dealing with suspension of undergraduate programs.

The proposal on Section C Review of Programs passed and reads as follows:

Proposal: (to add a new section to Functions of the Undergraduate Council)

- (c) Review of Programs: It shall review the summary reports of undergraduate program reviews prepared by the academic unit review committees. It shall participate directly in the review of undergraduate programs upon the request of the Chancellor or Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs of the sector responsible for the program. Following either such review, it may recommend appropriate action to maintain acceptable levels of academic quality to the Vice Chancellor for academic affairs of the sector involved. Such a recommendation may include the suspension of a program to a maximum of five years and the lifting of such a suspension. All recommendations relating to imposing or lifting suspensions of programs shall be approved by the Senate Council.

An undergraduate program, through its chairman or other appropriate administrative officer, may appeal a decision to suspend the undergraduate program to the Chancellor of its sector, who shall then appoint a committee of faculty members, including a member of the Senate Council, to review the case. In appointing the committee, the Chancellor shall consult with the Chancellor of the other sector when the program is

significantly involved in that sector. The Committee shall limit its review to the materials submitted by academic unit review committees, by the Undergraduate Council, and by the program making the appeal. The Chancellor shall discuss the recommendation of the committee with his or her Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Chairman of the Senate Council, and the Chancellor of the other sector where appropriate, and shall then recommend final action to the President.

Implementation Date: Fall, 1984.

The Chair placed on the floor Senate Rule III., 2.0 Procedures for Processing Programs and Changes in Programs. He said that the present rule and what was stated in the rationale applied to both graduate and undergraduate programs.

Professor Canon moved an amendment, which was seconded, that the word "undergraduate" be added. The sentence would read:

"...including suspension or termination of undergraduate programs...."

Professor Jewell stated about five years ago the senate approved a process for handling graduate school suspensions. About three years ago Dean Royster and the Graduate Council requested the suspension be for five years instead of two. At that time the plan for handling suspension was modified. Therefore, suspension of graduate programs will be made by the Graduate Council. When the graduate program is reinstated after five years, then the reinstatement would have to be approved by the Senate Council. Professor Jewell felt the procedures for the graduate programs should be left alone and spoke in favor of the amendment. Professor Bostrom argued against the amendment. First of all, there was substantial sentiment on the part of the Undergraduate Council that there be parallelism in procedures. Secondly, the Senate Council did not see that much difference between the graduate and undergraduate programs. Professor McEllistrem spoke in favor of the amendment. It seemed to him that the proposal had been conceived in the context of undergraduate programs. The question of reviewing or cancelling graduate school procedures has been addressed at some length over the past several years. He recommended, just for clarity, that the amendment be adopted and if one wished to review the methods for handling graduate programs it would be brought for study under a separate issue.

Professor Gesund spoke against the amendment. He pointed out there were several colleges that were only graduate colleges. He wanted to know if the professional schools were also included. Chairman Rees was not sure how to answer the question, but he felt professional programs were considered graduate programs.

Professor Belmore spoke against the amendment. She did not believe the rule contradicted any graduate rules or review policy which had been worked out. It just explicitly placed the Senate Council into the prescribed process.

The amendment failed with a hand count of 23 to 10.

There was a call for a quorum. After determining that a quorum was not present, no further business was conducted. The Chairman said the agenda items would be delayed until the next meeting.

In an open discussion period Professors William Ehmann and Fred Zechman, Associate

Deans for Research, spoke to the senate on research grant overhead and salary reimbursement--purpose and uses.

In the question and answer period following the remarks, a question was asked concerning the difference in figures quoted. Professor Ehmann said when working with indirect costs it was a floating budget. Professor Hochstrasser wanted to know if there was a fixed overhead amount the University charges on grants outside generated grants and who decided how the indirect costs were returned to various components of the University. Professor Ehmann's understanding was that it was a fixed dollar amount and some of the money was used to support the library system.

The question was asked who decided what percentage was allocated to each category on the Lexington campus. Professor Ehmann said Dean Royster was willing to get input so anyone interested should put their request in writing. Dean Royster makes the decision.

Professor Dillon asked about the faculty travel and wanted to know if he could use some of the money. Professor Ehmann said it was open.

Professor Jewell asked about the incentive program. He said obviously it was to encourage departments to get more grants. He was interested in the general philosophy and thinking of the program. Professor Ehmann would personally like to see the incentive program distribution increased.

Professor Dillon felt it would be good management for the University to encourage people to bring in extra money. Professor Goldstein wanted to know why the Medical Center and the Lexington Campus were separated. Professor Zechman said it was due to the reorganization. Professor Ehmann said when all the money was in one "pocket", then a large percentage of the money was being put into graduate student fellowships. The Medical Center does not use graduate student fellowships. Therefore, they were not getting their share in the distribution.

Professor Zechman said the Lexington campus estimated income was 2.1 million. Professor Ehmann said the Lexington Campus next year would have an advisory committee which would be somewhat similar to the Medical campus.

Professor Zechman said he saw a lot of interim funding requests from faculty which resulted from lack of adequate budget preparation. He asked faculty to look carefully at their proposals. Oftentimes there has not been sufficient care in the way the budget was initially prepared--inadequate justifications.

Professor Rees thanked Professors Ehmann and Zechman for their reports.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary of the Senate

Frank B. Stanger Jr.
University Archive
4 King Library Annex

0039

1

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

March 27, 1984

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, April 9, 1984.
Proposed addition to University Senate Rules, Section I, 3.3.2
relative to the Composition of the Undergraduate Council.

Proposal: [add underlined portion; delete bracketed portion]

I., 3.3.2 Composition

It shall consist of fifteen (15) [fourteen (14)] members. Nine of the members shall be elected by the faculty of colleges, groups of colleges or parts of colleges as follows: (US: 10/12/81)

One member from the combined areas of Literature and Philosophy in the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Fine Arts, and the Honors Program. One member from the combined areas of Biological and Physical Sciences in the College of Arts and Sciences. One member from the combined areas of the Social Sciences in the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Communications. One member from the College of Agriculture. One member from the College of Education. One member from the College of Business and Economics. One member from the combined Colleges of Architecture, Social Work, and Home Economics. One member from the combined Colleges of Allied Health, Nursing, and Pharmacy.

Of the six [five] remaining members, one shall be appointed by the Senate Council. One member shall be appointed by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for the Community College System to represent the needs and problems of the Community College System. Four members shall be appointed by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Lexington Campus, with the advice and consent of the Undergraduate Council. Of these four, two shall be faculty members from colleges eligible to have representation on the Undergraduate Council, and the remaining two shall be undergraduate students from eligible colleges. (US: 10/12/81)

Background: The Undergraduate Council communicated to the Senate Council that for several years a Community College representative has been appointed to the Undergraduate Council. This member has been very valuable, since it is important to consider the needs and problems of the Community Colleges in reviewing curricular changes. Since Community College representation on the Undergraduate Council is not explicitly stated in the Senate Rules, it was felt that this representation might be overlooked sometime. It also seemed desirable to state

Page 2

Senate Agenda Item, Community College Representative, U.C.
March 27, 1984

directly that the Community College representative should have voting rights.

Rationale: In the context of this proposal it should be noted that another Senate Rule (IV., 2.1.2) states "grades, credits, quality points and academic status from courses taken in the University of Kentucky Community College shall be transferred when the Community College student enrolls in the University System." This Rule makes obvious the need for Community College representation on the Undergraduate Council in order to assure that there exist as much compatibility as possible between similar courses in the Community College System and the University System.

Implementation Date: Fall, 1984.

/cet

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

March 28, 1984

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, April 9, 1984.
Proposed addition to University Senate Rules, Section V., 3.1.2
Quality Point Deficit.

Current Rule:

V., 3.1.2 Quality Point Deficit

The scholastic probation and academic suspension systems are based on quality point deficit. The base for determining the deficit is the number of quality points which would result from multiplying the number of hours attempted by two. Deficit is the difference, if any, between this base and the number of quality points earned.

Proposed Rule:

V., 3.1.2 Academic Probation and Suspension

The academic probation and suspension systems that are used to determine a student's academic standing University-wide are based on quality point deficit. The base for determining the deficit is the number of quality points which would result from multiplying the number of hours attempted by two. Deficit is the difference, if any, between this base and the number of quality points earned. Individual colleges may establish policies regarding academic probation and suspension with regard to a student's academic standing within the college in addition to the University-wide policies given here. If a college establishes such a policy, the policy must be approved by the University Senate, and the policy shall be made available in writing to the students. [see this Section 3.1.3 and 3.1.5]

Background: This proposal originated in the Committee on Academic Admissions and Academic Standards. The Senate Rules presently address academic probation and suspension with regard to the student's standing at the University. Related to this Rule is V., 3.1.3 which addresses scholastic probation and V., 3.1.5 which addresses scholastic suspension. In part, these rules state: "If a student has demonstrated that he/she cannot or will not do satisfactory work, the student shall be subject to academic suspension from the University, but the dean may place the student on scholastic probation if the individual case justifies it." Thus, under present rules, unsatisfactory work in a particular college can be translated into suspension from the University. Such treatment seems rather harsh for a student who simply finds himself or herself in a field

Page 2

Senate Agenda Item: V., 3.1.2

March 28, 1984

of study for which he/she is not suited.

Rationale: The title change for USR V., 3.1.2 from "Quality Point Deficit" to the proposed "Academic Probation and Suspension" depicts more clearly the nature of the Rule. In addition it sets forth a principle based on the Governing Regulations that college faculties can adopt academic standards and requirements which can be no less than those required university-wide by the Senate Rules and these college standards and requirements must be approved by the University Senate and specified in the Senate Rules.

/cet

Implementation Date: Fall Semester, 1984.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

March 29, 1984

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, April 9, 1984
Proposed additions to USR, Section I., 3.3.1 Undergraduate Council
Functions and Section III., 2.0 Procedures for Processing Programs.

Proposal: (to add a new section to Functions of the Undergraduate Council)

- (c) Review of Programs. It shall review the summary reports of undergraduate program reviews prepared by the academic unit review committees. It shall participate directly in the review of undergraduate programs upon the request of the Chancellor or Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of the sector responsible for the program. Following either such review, it may recommend appropriate action to maintain acceptable levels of academic quality to the Vice Chancellor for academic affairs of the sector involved. Such a recommendation may include the suspension of a program to a maximum of five years and the lifting of such a suspension. All recommendations relating to imposing or lifting suspensions of programs shall be approved by the Senate Council.

An undergraduate program, through its chairman or other appropriate administrative officer, may appeal a decision to suspend the undergraduate program to the Chancellor of its sector, who shall then appoint a committee of faculty members, including a member of the Senate Council, to review the case. In appointing the committee, the Chancellor shall consult with the Chancellor of the other sector when the program is significantly involved in that sector. The Committee shall limit its review to the materials submitted by academic unit review committees, by the Undergraduate Council, and by the program making the appeal. The Chancellor shall discuss the recommendation of the committee with his or her Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Chairman of the Senate Council, and the Chancellor of the other sector where appropriate, and shall then recommend final action to the President.