

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

March 9, 1983

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet on Monday, March 21, 1983, at 3:00 pm in the Classroom Building, room 106.

AGENDA:

1. Minutes of February 14, 1983.
- 2) Revision in composition of the Graduate Council, Section I, 3.2.2, University Senate Rules. (Circulated under date of March 8, 1983.)
- 3) Proposed policy statement on sexual harassment for recommendation to the Administration. (Circulated under date of March 8, 1983.)
- 4) Action on the Selective Admissions Policy. (Policy statement circulated under date of January 28, 1983; proposed amendments circulated under date of March 8, 1983.)

/cet

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

Copy 1

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, MARCH 21, 1983

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, March 21, 1983, in Room 106 of the Classroom Building.

Donald W. Ivey, Chairman of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent: James Bader*, Susan M. Belmore*, Jacques Benninga*, Robert Bostrom*, Connie A. Bridge*, Lowell Bush*, Lois J. Campbell*, David Chalk*, Charlotte Clark*, D. Kay Clawson*, Henry Cole*. Andy Coiner*, Glenn B. Collins*, Gary L. Cromwell*, Donald F. Diedrich*, Richard C. Domek*, Paul M. Eakin*, William Ecton*, Ray Forgue*, Tim Freudenberg*, Zakkula Govindarajulu*, Andrew J. Grimes*, Anne T. Hahn*, Marilyn D. Hamann*, Robert Hemenway*, Michael Kennedy*, Peri Jean Kennedy*, Gwendolen Lee*, Gordon P. Liddle*, Paul Mandelstam*, Dominic Mudd*, Kenneth E. Marino*, Marion E. McKenna*, Nick Mudd*, Daniel N. Nelson*, Robert C. Nobel*, Clayton Omyig*, Janet Pisaneschi*, Daniel Reedy*, E. Douglas Rees*, Caryl E. Rusbult*, Charles Sachatello*, Timothy W. Sineath*, Marjorie Stewart*, Joseph V. Swintosky*, Glenn Terndrup*, Manuel A. Tipgos*, Enid S. Waldhart*, Marc J. Wallace*, David Webster*, Alfred D. Winer*

The Minutes of the Meeting of February 14, 1983, were approved as circulated.

The Chairman made the following announcements:

"On Saturday, March 26, in the Student Center Ballroom beginning with registration at 8:30 a.m. and the starting of the festivities at 9:00 a.m., there is going to be a conference on handicapped students, their problems, some of the solutions, and discussions of such. This has been an annual affair. Previously it has been at Carnahan House, but it has been moved to the Ballroom of the Old Student Center. They are hoping to get some participation from faculty. We need to expose ourselves to some of the problems of handicapped students and some things the faculty can do to accommodate some of the problems they have. Lunch will be served, which is free. That's a good reason for you to spend a Saturday, and we will be out about 3:15 p.m. There will be people from off campus, experts in this, and if you would like to participate, we would like for you to. You should call Bob Figg in the Conference Office and tell him that you will be there. There is no charge. I think you will find it very profitable. I have gone to the last three and have learned quite a bit I should have known and didn't."

Chairman Ivey recognized Professor Richard Angelo from the College of Education who presented the following Memorial Resolutions on the deaths of Professor W. Maurice Baker and Morris B. Cierley.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

Morris B. Cierley, 1908-1982

"The University Community was saddened recently to learn of the death on August 23, 1982 of Morris B. Cierley, an esteemed educator and Emeritus Professor of Education.

*Absence explained

Dr. Cierley joined the faculty of the College of Education in 1954 as Director of the University Laboratory School and served in a number of leadership roles until his retirement from full-time service in 1974. His assignments included Director of Student Teaching, Chairman of the Division of Curriculum and Instruction and later of the Division of Administration and Supervision, Associate Director of the Bureau of School Services, and Coordinator and later Associate Dean for Graduate Studies in Education.

Morris contributed much to the University through a variety of service activities, among them Director of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Institutional Self-Study and Chairman of the Steering Committee, membership on both the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils, Vice-chairman of the Senate Council, First Chairman of the Privilege and Tenure Committee, and numerous ad hoc committee memberships.

His contributions to the broader professional community were outstanding as well, as evidenced by service as Executive Secretary of the Kentucky Committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Chairman of the SACS Secondary Commission which accredits more than 2600 high schools in southern states, and President of both the Central Kentucky Education Association and the Northern Education Association of Kentucky.

A member of both Kappa Delta Pi and Phi Delta Kappa honorary societies, Morris received the latter's Distinguished Service Award as well as one from the Southern Association.

Dr. Cierley was a native of Adamsville, Tennessee and received his undergraduate degree from Memphis State University. He earned Master's degrees from both Teachers College, Columbia University and George Peabody College and his doctorate in Education from the University of Illinois, where he met and married his wife, the former Evalyn Reich.

Morris brought to his career in higher education a rich and varied background, including work experience as a steamboat deckhand, postal clerk, ranger-historian on a national battlefield site, teacher and principal at both elementary and secondary levels, and service as a Navy CB during World War II.

He was deeply committed to intercultural and international education and for a time administered the Southern Education Foundation grants which provided scholarships for deserving Black students. He and Mrs. Cierley travelled extensively in South and Central America, Western Europe and the Far East. In both Brazil and Venezuela Morris served as an AID consultant on higher education and graduate students. Foreign students found the Cierley home, as well as Morris' office, a friendly haven of understanding and support.

All who knew this gracious gentleman, though mourning his loss, recognize that his diligence, integrity, and human concern remain as examples for those who continue in the profession to which he devoted so much of his life.

(Prepared by Professor George Denmark, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education)

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

W. Maurice Baker 1900-1982

"Professor W. Maurice Baker, known affectionately to his friends as 'Bake' was born May 15, 1900 in Fulton, Missouri and died September 4, 1982. He graduated from Fulton High School in 1918. He was awarded an A.B. degree by Westminster College in 1922. On graduation from college he came to Kentucky as a public school teacher. He attended graduate school at the University of Kentucky and was awarded an M. A. degree in 1932. He later took additional graduate work at the University of Florida, George Peabody College and the University of Kentucky. He joined the faculty of the College of Education October 1, 1937 and retired July 1, 1970.

Before joining the faculty at the University of Kentucky he served as teacher and/or principal at Somerset, Paintsville, Betsy Layne and Olive Hill High Schools in Kentucky. At Paintsville he was both principal and coach.

During his 33 years at the University of Kentucky he provided in-service training for the distributive and trade and industrial teachers in Kentucky. He traveled through the State providing teachers relevant training in their respective schools and worked with them individually on problems related to their teaching.

He organized and conducted numerous supervisory development, safety, tourist promotion and management programs for a number of Kentucky organizations, governmental departments, business and industrial firms during his employment at the University. Among those serviced were the L & N Railroad, Inland Steel Corporation, Kentucky Chain Stores Council, Kentucky Chamber of Commerce, Kentucky Fireman's Association, Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation, Kentucky Department of Parks and Kentucky Department of Education.

Mr. Baker organized the Distributive Education Clubs in Kentucky in 1942 and served as their state adviser until retirement.

While employed by the University Mr. Baker was 'loaned' to the United States Office of Education for several months to develop new distributive education curriculum materials.

He was elected Secretary-Treasurer of the Kentucky Vocational Association in 1950 and was re-elected annually for 20 years. After retirement, Mr. Baker continued to provide leadership to the Association for nearly a decade, organizing and directing leadership training programs for the officers of the regional and state associations. He also, for a part of this period, served as the Executive Director of the Kentucky Vocational Association.

Mr. Baker was awarded the University of Kentucky Certificate of Service by President Frank Dickey in 1963.

He was awarded one of the first two honorary life memberships in the Kentucky Vocational Association, and was twice commissioned a Kentucky Colonel for service in the promotion of, and training others to promote tourism and industry by two separate Kentucky governors.

Mr. Baker held membership in the Kentucky Industrial Education Association, Kentucky Vocational Association, American Vocational Association, Kentucky Education Association, National Education Association and the National Association of Industrial and Technical Teacher Educators.

He was a member of Phi Beta Kappa, the Immanuel Baptist Church and Masonic Lodge #1.

To his friends and closest associates Mr. Baker was best known as a math teacher with a keen sense of humor and a humanitarian with compassion, love and understanding for each individual.

At his death he was survived by his wife, Evelyn Rice Baker; one daughter, Evelyn Louise Stroube (Mrs. Edward White Stroube), Columbus, Ohio; three grandchildren, Mark, Mary Ellen and Paul Stroube; and one sister, Irene Baker, St. Louis, Missouri."

(Prepared by Professor Herbert Bruce, Vocational Education, College of Education)

Chairman Ivey directed that the Resolutions be made a part of these minutes and that copies be sent to the families. The senators were asked to stand for a moment of silence in tribute and respect to Professor Morris B. Cierley and Professor W. Maurice Baker.

The first agenda item concerned the reorganization of the Graduate Council and Dean Royster was present to answer any questions. Professor Rees was not at the meeting; therefore, Chairman Ivey presented the recommendation on behalf of the Senate Council. The proposal was circulated to the University Senate on March 8, 1983. There were no questions, and the proposal which passed unanimously reads as follows:

PROPOSAL

Motion

The Graduate Council recommends for Graduate Faculty approval the following composition of the Graduate Council effective September 1, 1983.

The Graduate Council is composed of 18 members and the Dean of the Graduate School, who serves as the chair. There are 16 faculty representatives and two student representatives. Associate deans serve in a non-voting, ex officio capacity.

The composition of the Graduate Council is as follows: Two members from the College of Agriculture, three members from the College of Arts and Sciences, one member from the the College of Business and Economics, two members from the College of Education, one member from the College of Engineering, one member from the Colleges of Communications and Fine Arts, two members from the Colleges of Medicine and Pharmacy, one member from the Colleges of Allied Health Professions, Dentistry and Nursing, one member from the Colleges of Library Science, Home Economics, and Social Work, and two members appointed by the Dean of The Graduate School.

Members representing a college or a combination of colleges are elected by the Graduate Faculty in the respective colleges.

Data in tabular form pertaining to the proposal for the recommended composition follows:

Proposal for the New Composition

<u>College</u>	<u>Council Members</u>	<u>Full Graduate Faculty</u>	<u>Number of Programs</u>	<u>1982 Graduate Students</u>
Agriculture	2	113	9D 2M	175 FT 88 PT
Arts & Sciences	3	259	19D 6M	350 FT 416 PT
Business & Economics	1	42	2D 1M	176 FT 120 PT
Education	2	57	10D 3M	183 FT 505 PT
Engineering	1	59	7D 1M	104 FT 97 PT
Fine Arts Communications	1	30	3D 2M	56 FT 64 PT
Medicine Pharmacy	2	89	5D 0M	68 FT 31 PT
Allied Health Professions Nursing Dentistry	1	22	0D 4M	78 FT 39 PT
Library Science Home Economics Social Work	1	27	0D 6M	139 FT 134 PT

Appointees	2
TOTAL FACULTY	16
Students	2
Ex Officio	2 (Associate Deans)

D - Doctoral Students; M - Master's Students

The second item on the agenda dealt with a statement on sexual harassment. The Chair said if the policy were adopted, it would go to the Board of Trustees for approval and some changes would have to be made in the current University Senate Rules to accommodate the details.

Professor Gesund wanted to know if all other harassment except sexual would be permitted. He wondered if an amendment should be inserted to the effect that all harassment such as verbal would be dealt with. The Chairman said the committee was asked to draft a statement on sexual harassment. He felt it would be appropriate to have a committee to work on other types of harassment, but he didn't think a policy could be written on the floor of the senate. He felt the suggestion was a good one. The policy statement was adopted unanimously and reads as follows:

POLICY STATEMENT ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT

The ad hoc Committee on Sexual Harassment recommends that the University adopt the following umbrella policy statement and definition of sexual harassment, adapted from the guidelines developed by the United States Equal Employment Opportunities Commission and subject to enforcement under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Because the EEOC policy definition has been upheld in the courts, the Committee agreed that any University policy should follow its wording as closely as possible. However, because the EEOC definition is limited to employees, the committee (following the practice in other institutions) has broadened the wording to accommodate the needs of an academic community. The Committee recommends that the following be incorporated into the Governing Regulations:

Policy and Definition: Sexual Harassment

It is the policy of the University of Kentucky that sexual harassment of students, faculty and staff is prohibited.

Sexual harassment is defined as follows:

Sexual harassment is one form of sex discrimination, unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal or physical actions of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when:

Submission to such conduct is made explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment or academic standing; or

Submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as a basis for employment or academic decision affecting an individual; or

Such conduct substantially interferes with an individual's work or academic performance or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or academic environment.

Complaints of sexual harassment will be treated and investigated with full regard for the University's due process requirements.

The Chairman presented the selective admissions policy which was circulated to the University Senate under date of January 28, 1983. The Chairman asked that the word "objective" be deleted on the first page. On page 2 "of the previous year(s)" should be added after "determined from the fit." On page 3, the second and third paragraphs should be changed to read as follows:

"...number admitted from the rank-order pool and by exception as explained below...."

Admission by exception:

"...Chancellor of the Lexington Campus...Any applicant not meeting the automatic acceptance criteria or not accepted as a result of the rank-ordering process may be considered for admission by exception."

The five amendments endorsed by the Senate Council were presented first. The Chairman said that the changes were for clarification or editorial purposes. Unless there was serious objection, he wanted the five considered as a unit. One change to the amendments as circulated on March 8 was presented: at the top of page 2, "would urge" was deleted and "recommend in addition" was substituted.

Professor Rea suggested adding "two or more years of a foreign language..." The committee accepted the change. Another senator suggested "at least" before "two years of a foreign language," and that suggestion was accepted. The five amendments passed unanimously.

The rest of the proposed amendments were considered individually. The Chairman recognized Professor Malcolm Jewell who gave the rationale for the modification he had suggested on provisions for student athletes. He said that one of the objections to the policy as circulated was that student-athletes who met NCAA and SEC requirements would represent a block of automatic acceptances, to all intents and purposes, regardless of whether they met UK requirements or not. Of that group, those who failed to meet our requirements would be placed in the rank-ordered pool where they would float to the top. They would thus squeeze out some of the rest of the applicants so that a smaller proportion of the latter would be accepted regardless of other criteria. The amendment was an attempt to reduce that problem. The recommendation was endorsed by the Senate Council.

Professor Blues asked how the athletes were accepted. Professor Jewell replied that when athletes did not meet the automatic admissions qualifications but did meet NCAA and SEC requirements, they would be admitted. Professor Altenkirch pointed out that of the entering class of 1982, about 75 would have been athletes who were not

automatically acceptable. Admitting them from the pool would reduce the size of the pool available to other applicants to about 17%.

Professor Weil wanted the athletes out of the pool. He felt that the factor of diversity would be greater without the athletes involved. Professor Altenkirch said that the amendment increased the percentage of students on campus who did not meet the academic standards set forth in the proposed admissions policy. In order to keep the exceptions at 20% he suggested the possibility of reducing the pool size to 17% if the athletes were withdrawn from it. Professor Weil asked what criteria would be applied to ascertain whether athletes were in fact athletes vital to the program. Dean Ockerman said that they would have to be certified by the Admissions and Registrar's Office and the Athletic Department as bona fide athletes.

A senator questioned the legality of the proposed amendment. The Chairman said that it was a policy used at many other universities and that the Legal Council Office at UK regards it as legal if dealt with openly and "up front."

Following extensive debate regarding the virtues of including or not including athletes in the rank-ordered pool, Professor Jewell moved the previous question. The recommendation to make athletes conform to NCAA and SEC admissions standards but keep them outside the 20% exceptions pool passed.

Professor Marsden was recognized to give his rationale on his amendment to entirely delete mention of student-athletes. He felt strongly that the Senate was an academic body considering academic issues, and in that context, it was the Senate's duty to treat all students alike. If the administration wished to impose a different policy, there was probably no alternative except to go along, but he felt that at this point the Senate had a duty and responsibility to look at the academic issue. Professor Blues confirmed the same position.

Professor Weil spoke against the amendment. He said that the proposal would give power back to the administration that has been given to the Senate. Professor Blues countered that if such rationale were followed, the Senate would be admitting at the outset that they were abiding by the administration's standards. Professor Weil replied that the Senate was saying, in effect, that for the overall good of the University, they believed it was wise to have the exceptions. One senator believed that following the amendment would not mean giving up a selective admissions policy in general. Another senator claimed that if the Senate did not address the issue of athletes, the administration would take over. Other discussion centered on the same issues and Professor Kemp moved the previous question. The amendment was defeated by a hand count of 65 to 31.

Professor Chalk made a motion to decrease the size of the pool to 17%; the motion was seconded. Dean Ockerman suggested that since action had been taken to remove the athletes from the pool, the Senate should stick with 20% until it is seen what will happen to the freshman class in the fall of 1984. He suggested that reducing the pool to 17% might result in an even more significant reduction in the freshman class size than might be expected from the selective admissions policy itself. Debate followed on the question of whether a selective admissions policy could be considered selective at all if so many exceptions were proposed. Professor Angelo countered that the size of the pool should not be viewed in terms of a purely pedagogic principle and that selective admissions simply meant having a policy with certain standards and such a policy would still be operative regardless of the size of the pool.

Professor Hasan moved the previous question. The motion to reduce the pool size to 17% was defeated.

Professor Weil recommended the adoption of his amendment to change the policy on transfer students as circulated in the proposal. He suggested that a 2.0 GPA be accepted for transfers from the UKCC system with 24 semester hours of credit, and that the same criterion be applied to all transfers from other colleges and universities. The original proposal called for a 2.3 from colleges other than those in the UKCC system. The rationale was that it would be foolish to turn down a transfer from Harvard, for instance, with a GPA of 2.28 while at the same time accepting a student from one of our community colleges with a 2.0. Following discussion about the general trend toward raising admissions GPA requirements in several colleges, already in place at UK, and the question of transfers from service academies where low GPA's might well be based on non-academic questions, the previous question was moved by Professor Marsden. The amendment that all students who would not have been automatically accepted at the time of their freshman enrollment elsewhere would have to have completed 24 hours with a 2.0 standing passed.

Professor Jewell was recognized and gave his rationale for the amendment changing personal achievement to 0.2 and academic achievement to 0.3 as opposed to the originally proposed 0.2 for academic and 0.3 for personal achievement. One fear was that since personal achievement is reported on the ACT forms by the individuals taking the test, the information would not be sufficiently accurate to warrant such heavy weighting. Professor Altenkirch replied that the original weighting was in keeping with the charge to the committee appointed by President Singletary and chaired by Chancellor Gallaher, where non-academic factors were to be given the greatest consideration in the rank-ordered pool.

The motion in favor of the amendment to change the percentages as proposed by Professor Jewell passed.

Chairman Ivey said that the Senate Council with the concurrence of the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee was proposing to delete reference to those applicants not meeting the suggested pre-college curriculum requirements. The reason was that the Council on Higher Education was allowing all public institutions a 20% exceptions pool for such students. The University needs to decide whether or not to establish exceptions in addition to the rank-ordered pool or simply place such exceptions in that pool. He felt that the matter merited further study, and proposed that recommendations be brought to the Senate as soon as possible in the fall semester. The motion to follow the suggested revision in the original proposal was passed unanimously.

In response to a question from Professor Gesund about exceptions for transfers, the Chairman responded that the Admissions Committee is empowered to deal with exceptions of any sort. In addition, the Dean of Admissions and Registrar has the authority to make exception on transfers and report them annually to the Senate.

Professor Rea asked whether the GPA referred to in the admission of transfers concerned all subjects or only academic subjects. Professor Altenkirch replied that it meant all subjects. Professor Rea wanted to know if the Senate realized that regional universities such as Western had adopted a higher ACT than the University as an admissions requirement. Chairman Ivey said that this was not true. He pointed out that the University does not have an ACT score as a cut-off point, but instead utilizes a sliding scale that takes into account both ACT and high school grade-point average. Thus, as Chairman Ivey emphasized, ACT is used in combination with HSGPA to predict achievement; this is a decidedly different policy than is being proposed elsewhere in the state.

The motion to adopt the selective admissions policy as amended passed unanimously and reads as follows:

SELECTIVE ADMISSIONS POLICY FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

Introduction

Presented here are specific criteria that the Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards proposes be used to judge the suitability of first-time freshmen for admission to the University of Kentucky. These criteria were developed in response to the policy statement on selective admissions that was adopted by the Board of Trustees of the University [1]. That policy recognized that because of the University's mission in Kentucky's public, higher education system the University must, on the undergraduate level, attach special importance to its upper division programs. As a result, the University should admit those students whose academic credentials indicate that they have the ability to participate effectively in upper division programs and not admit those who would not be well served by such programs. With this in mind, specific criteria were developed for categorizing applicants as ones who should be automatically accepted or automatically rejected.

In addition to accounting in the admission process for the academic qualifications of applicants, the University is obligated to recognize personal accomplishments that cannot be measured against academic standards alone and to maintain a diverse student body in order to provide to all students a meaningful life experience. Diversity can be achieved by admitting applicants who are members of groups whose representation at the University has in the past been far below their representation in society. It is unreasonable, though, to believe that maintenance of the desired diversity will result from requiring all to be admitted to meet particular, academic criteria. Consequently, the University must admit as students those from a pool of applicants who would not be automatically accepted or rejected but would bring to the University characteristics that the University desires a portion of its students to possess.

The proposed admission scheme is a refinement and extension of one that we reported earlier [2]. Supporting data and documentation that accompanied the earlier version, which will not be reproduced here, provide background for the current proposal. Although before we only considered procedures by which first-time freshmen would be admitted to the University, the current proposal addresses other categories of applicants insofar as students admitted from these applicant categories impact the University's ability to carry out its mission.

The policy as it is proposed here should be seen as a beginning point from which refinements will be made as a result of continuing review in the future.

Applicant Categories for First-time Freshmen

Auto accept/auto reject

Performance in high school, as judged by the overall high school grade point average (HSGPA), and on the American College Test (ACT composite score)

would be used to accept or reject applicants automatically. First-year freshmen grade point averages (EGPA) of previous UK freshman students would be fit in a least-square-error sense to a function of ACT and HSGPA, e.g., $EGPA = C_1 + C_2ACT + C_3HSGPA$ where C_1 , C_2 , and C_3 are constants determined from the fit of the previous year(s). The EGPA equation would then be applied to applicants, using the ACT score and HSGPA available on the ACT report form, to yield a predicted GPA (PGPA) for each applicant. Those who predict a $PGPA \geq 2.0$ would be automatically accepted.

A first-year $EGPA \geq 2.0$ is an important step for all students toward remaining at the University a long enough period of time to participate in upper division programs [3], and it is these students on which the University must concentrate its efforts. For example, if the incoming freshman class of 1977 were considered to consist of 100 students, 66 achieved a 2.0 or greater EGPA the first year while 34 did not. Of the 66 with $EGPA \geq 2.0$, 46 enrolled in the fall of 1980, while only 10 of the 34 with $EGPA < 2.0$ enrolled that same fall.

The above procedure for automatically accepting applicants does not use absolute cutoffs on either ACT or HSGPA but reflects the contention that ACT and HSGPA used in concert are good predictors of first-year EGPA [4]. This approach is, in part, a departure from our earlier proposal [2], but would seem to be rational and defensible. For example, applying American College Testing Program prediction equations based on ACT score and HSGPA to the 1981 fall freshman class, 75% of those who had a $PGPA \geq 2.0$ had an $EGPA \geq 2.0$ after the first year while only 35% with a $PGPA < 2.0$ had an $EGPA \geq 2.0$.

Proposed criteria for determining which applicants are to be rejected automatically remain the same as in the previous proposal, i.e., those who do not have a $HSGPA \geq 2.0$ or an $ACT \geq 11$. Students who enrolled in fall 1981 who fit into this category had an average first-year EGPA of 1.02 with only 22% having an $EGPA \geq 2.0$.

Rank-order pool

Applicants who would be neither automatically accepted nor automatically rejected would be rank-ordered initially using the PGPA equation. This rank-ordering process is carried out to obtain a value for A for use in the following equation:

$$R = 0.5 D + 0.2 P + 0.3 A$$

where the value of R would be used to rank again those in the rank-order pool. In the formula for R, A is a measure of the quality of an applicant's academic credentials and is determined as follows:

Rank in top $\frac{1}{4}$ of pool using PGPA,	A = 100
Rank in next $\frac{1}{4}$ of pool using PGPA,	A = 50
Rank in bottom $\frac{1}{2}$ of pool using PGPA,	A = 0

The variables D and P are diversity and personal achievement factors, respectively. Their values are to be determined from the ACT assessment report (see sample appended to this report) as follows:

D value (add the D's listed; total not to exceed 100)

Caucasian American/White (CAW)	D = 0
Other ethnic background than CAW	D = 100
Home county in one of the 4 regions in KY from which UK gets most of its students (i.e., Lexington, Louisville, Cincinnati, Owensboro areas)	D = 0
Home county outside 4 major regions	D = 50
Age <25	D = 0
Age ≥ 25	D = 50

P value from nine "Out-Of-Class Accomplishments" categories
(add P's listed; total not to exceed 100)

VH rating	P = 20
HI rating	P = 10
AV rating	P = 0
N rating	P = 0

Admission to the University from the rank-order pool would be limited to those applicants ranking at the top of the R scale with the total number admitted from the rank-order pool and by exception as explained below not to exceed 20% of the incoming freshman class.

Admission by Exception

The above scheme is an attempt to allow applicants to be admitted in as orderly a manner as possible. Some exceptions will have to be made, for example, for truly superior personal achievement that cannot be measured on any objective scale. These exceptions should be dealt with on an individual basis by the committee that is to be appointed by the Chancellor of the Lexington Campus [1] and whose responsibility it is to decide on admissions by exception. Any applicant not meeting the automatic acceptance criteria or not accepted as a result of the rank-ordering process may be considered for admission by exception.

Policy Impact on 1981 and 1982 Freshman Classes

First-year EGPA's for the 1981 freshman class were fit as a linear function of ACT and HSGPA to obtain the relation*

* In the equation for 1981 EGPA, the HSGPA scale is from 1 to 7 where the relation to the usual 4.0 scale is:

HSGPA to be used above	HSGPA on 4.0 scale
1	0.5 - 0.9
2	1.0 - 1.4
3	1.5 - 1.9
4	2.0 - 2.4
5	2.5 - 2.9
6	3.0 - 3.4
7	3.5 - 4.0

$$\text{EGPA} = 0.443 + 0.0534 \text{ ACT} = 0.286 \text{ HSGPA}$$

The square of the correlation coefficient for the above is 0.325. In the proposed admission scheme, such an equation could have been used to calculate PGPA for the 1982 class to determine the applicants who would have been automatically accepted in fall 1982. Here we will apply it to the 1981 class as though it were a prediction equation even though it reflects their actual performance.

Using the above equation then as a PGPA relation, the two tables below show the categories into which the 1981 and 1982 applicants and students would have fit. Scores are those who took the ACT exam in the fall or spring prior to the fall of the indicated year and listed on the ACT form that they were interested in attending UK. Apply are those who indicated that UK was the university that they preferred to attend, and Enrolled are the ones who actually chose to attend UK.

1981			
	<u>Scores</u>	<u>Apply</u>	<u>Enroll</u>
Auto accept	9,036	4,559	2,052
Rank-order	5,616	2,474	1,033
Auto reject	215	76	37
Total	14,867	7,109	3,122

1982			
	<u>Scores</u>	<u>Apply</u>	<u>Enroll</u>
Auto accept	8,626	4,462	1,939
Rank-order	5,112	2,268	855
Auto reject	180	77	24
Total	13,918	6,807	2,818

Computed class sizes for the 1981 and 1982 classes using a 20% figure for applicants admitted from the rank-ordering process are compared to the actual class sizes below.

	<u>Class Size</u>		
	<u>Actual</u>	<u>With Policy</u>	<u>% Reduction</u>
1981	3,122	2,565	17.8
1982	2,818	2,424	14.0

The figures in the above three tables will not match those presented in our earlier version. Since the first version was written, data have been updated as new information became available. In addition, only those applicants and students for whom ACT's and HSGPA's could be assigned are included in the count. As a result, the totals and actual class sizes listed are too small; in fall 1981, 3268 freshman students enrolled while in fall 1982, 3066 enrolled.

It is obvious that any admissions policy aimed at improving the academic qualifications of the incoming freshmen applied to past classes will indicate a reduction in class size. But it should also be obvious that there are a substantial number of well-qualified applicants who indicate a preference for attending UK who do not enroll. Recruitment of these students rather than admission of academically unqualified students should be the goal of the University as it attempts to stabilize enrollment following institution of a selective admissions policy.

Student-Athletes

With regard to these students, we wish to state the educational principle that a liberal and professional education is the essential reason for every student's being at the university, and that entrance requirements should not be affected by an individual's choice to participate in intercollegiate athletics or any other extra-curricular activity. We disapprove of the type of emphasis that has been placed on intercollegiate athletics at major colleges and universities, and we feel that no institution of higher learning is well served by these developments. Ideally, entrance requirements for students should not be affected by their participation in intercollegiate athletics, but we realize that an immediate and unilateral application of this educational principle at the University of Kentucky would seriously alter the University's ability to meet existing commitments in intercollegiate athletics and may even impair the University's ability to achieve its academic goals and carry out its ultimate educational mission. Therefore we recommend that the University

1. Acknowledge the educational principle stated above.
2. Require student-athletes who do not meet standards for automatic acceptance, for the next two years, to meet only Southeastern Athletic Conference (SEC) and National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) academic requirements.* Student-athletes who are to be admitted according to these standards should be identified by the Athletic Director to the University Administration as being vital to the University's intercollegiate athletic program.
3. Request that the Administration work for the next two years with other SEC institutions to upgrade the academic standards that student-athletes are required to meet and report to the University Senate the results of the effort.

*There are indications, based on the fact that the NCAA recently voted to require scholarship-athletes in fall 1986 to achieve a HSGPA ≥ 2.0 and an ACT ≥ 15 , that the disparity that now exists between the academic standards that student-athletes are required to meet and the academic standards that we are recommending applicants meet for admission to UK may, in the future disappear.

4. Maintain records on the number and performance of those student-athletes admitted to the University who do not meet the standards for automatic acceptance.
5. Review, at the end of a two year period, the admissions policy in place at the time in light of the information obtained from recommendations 2, 3 and 4 with an eye toward implementing the educational principle enunciated above.

Pre-College Curriculum

The Council on Public Higher Education has established minimum high school course requirements for unconditional admission to public institutions of higher education in Kentucky. Those requirements, which would go into effect in fall 1987, are

Council's Requirements

<u>Area</u>	<u>Minimum Course Requirement</u>
Science	Biology I or Chemistry I or Physics I and another science course
English	English I, II, III and IV
Mathematics	Algebra I or Algebra II and Geometry I and another math course
Social Science	U.S. History and World Civilization
Total Units	20 or more

We recommend that for an applicant to be admitted automatically to the University of Kentucky in fall of 1987 under the admission policy outlined above he be required to have had the following high school courses as a minimum:

Proposal for U.K.

<u>Area</u>	<u>Minimum Course Requirement</u>
Science	Two of the following: Biology I, Chemistry I, Physics I
English	English I, II, III and IV
Mathematics	Algebra I, Geometry I and Algebra II
Social Science	U.S. History and World Civilization
Total Units	20 or more

We believe that this course sequence will bring to the University students that are better prepared academically than the sequence adopted by the Council.

Although the above course sequence proposal for UK is one that we advocate be instituted for fall 1987, we recommend that in addition high school students complete at least two years of a foreign language, one additional year of mathematics beyond Algebra II, and one year of fine arts.

It is recognized that at an early date, the University Senate will need to articulate some policy for dealing with applicants who do not meet the pre-college curriculum requirements.

Transfer Students

Community College students would be permitted to transfer to the University of Kentucky if they met one of the following criteria:

1. If the student would have been accepted automatically at UK at the time he entered a Community College, he would be allowed to transfer at any time to UK provided that he is in good standing at a Community College.
2. Students who would not have been automatically accepted but have completed 24 semester hours and achieved a cumulative GPA \geq 2.0 at a Community College would be allowed to transfer to UK.

Students at colleges and universities other than the Community Colleges would be required to meet the same transfer criteria as Community College transfers.

Foreign Students

We recommend that undergraduate foreign student applicants with a TOEFL score of 525 or above may be admitted. An applicant with a TOEFL score below 525 may be admitted if other factors such as previous academic record, interviews and other English tests indicate that the applicant will be academically successful. Decisions concerning admission of applicants with scores below 525 shall be made by the admissions committee appointed by the Chancellor for the Lexington Campus. Foreign students who are not admissible to the University due to their level of competency in English may apply to the University Center for English as a Second Language for instruction before applying to the University itself. Admission to the programs administered by this center does not guarantee future admission to the University.

Summary and Calendar

In an effort to summarize the main framework of the proposed admission policy and to indicate how it would be applied, the policy is outlined below in a "calendar of events" form. The calendar is written so that the fall semester for which the applicant is applying is 1984, the first time we anticipate that UK would institute selective admissions. The timetable employed follows the recommended policy of the Board of Trustees [1].

January 1983

Least-square-error fit academic year 1981-82 EGPA's using ACT and HSGPA's to obtain a prediction equation $PGPA = C_1 + C_2ACT + C_3HSGPA$.

It may in the future be desirable to include earlier data in the fit also. This would be learned from experience.

- Spring 1983 Publish in tabular form ACT-HSGPA combinations that would allow applicants to be accepted automatically. Such a table using the 1981 equation presented earlier is appended. Begin accepting applications for fall 1984.
- 1 October 1983 Begin notifying those applicants automatically accepted or rejected.
- 15 February 1984 Applications deadline for applicants who are to be considered for admission from the rank-order pool. Begin the rank-ordering of the pool using the R equation.
- 15 March 1984 Automatic acceptances notified before 15 February of their acceptance must submit a confirmation fee. Notify those accepted from the rank-ordering process, the number being based on the number of auto accepts up to this time realizing the total number to be accepted from the rank-order pool is not to exceed 20% of the enrollment.
- 15 April 1984 Applicants accepted on 15 March must submit a confirmation fee. Notify additional applicants of acceptance from the rank-order pool as a result of additional automatic acceptances.
- 1 May 1984 Notify those applicants rejected as a result of the rank-ordering process.
- 1 June 1984 All accepted applicants must submit a confirmation fee. After this date only applicants meeting the automatic acceptance criteria or applicants accepted by the Admissions Committee to be appointed by the Chancellor would be accepted.

Throughout the above process, HSGPA will be checked by the registrar to ensure that the HSGPA's self-reported on the ACT form are correct.

The selective admissions policy proposed here was constructed under the assumption that the economic and political climate that now exists in Kentucky will persist. When, in the course of implementing this or any selective admissions policy, it is found that the above assumption is invalid and to implement the policy would place the University in a state of emergency with respect to funding, we recommend that, with agreement of the full University Senate and the Chancellor for the Lexington campus, the policy may be altered.

Acknowledgements

In the course of developing the selective admissions policy outlined here, the committee received helpful input and support from many on the

faculty and in the administration. And we can feel good about that because it shows that the University is concerned about the quality of the institution.

Three individuals, George Gaddie in Admissions, Skip Kifer in Education and Don Ivey of the Senate Council, proved to be invaluable to us. Gaddie provided data to us whenever we requested it, Kifer performed a large portion of the data reduction and interpretation, and Ivey retained his good sense of humor to provide moral support.

References

1. Board of Trustees policy recommendation circulated on 25 September 1982 to members of the University Senate.
2. Recommended Selective Admissions Policy for First-time Freshmen at the University of Kentucky circulated on 23 September 1982 to members of the University Senate.
3. Dunn, Keller (1981). Retention of Freshman Students at the University of Kentucky, An Update.
4. The American College Testing Program Research Bulletin on the Relationship Between Earned College Grades and Grade Predictions Based on the ACT Test Scores and High School Grades, 30 January 1978.

ACT-HSGPA Combinations Required for Automatic Acceptance
based on 1981 EGPA Equation

Find the HSGPA range (drop digits beyond the first decimal place) and read the minimum ACT that will result in automatic acceptance.

HSGPA	ACT
3.5 - 4.0	9
3.0 - 3.4	14
2.5 - 2.9	19
2.0 - 2.4	25
1.5 - 1.9	30

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

March 8, 1983

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, March 21, 1983. Proposed policy statement on sexual harassment for recommendation to the Administration.

The ad hoc Committee on Sexual Harassment recommends that the University adopt the following umbrella policy statement and definition of sexual harassment, adapted from the guidelines developed by the United States Equal Employment Opportunities Commission and subject to enforcement under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Because the EEOC policy definition has been upheld in the courts, the Committee agreed that any University policy should follow its wording as closely as possible. However, because the EEOC definition is limited to employees, the Committee (following the practice in other institutions) has broadened the wording to accommodate the needs of an academic community. The Committee recommends that the following be incorporated into the Governing Regulations:

Policy and Definition: Sexual Harassment

It is the policy of the University of Kentucky that sexual harassment of students, faculty and staff is prohibited.

Sexual harassment is defined as follows:

Sexual harassment is one form of sex discrimination. Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal or physical actions of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when:

Submission to such conduct is made explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment or academic standing; or

Submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as a basis for employment or academic decision affecting an individual; or

Such conduct substantially interferes with an individual's work or academic performance or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offense working or academic environment.

Page 2

University Senate Aenda Item: March 21, 1983

March 8, 1983

Complaints or sexual harassment will be treated and investigated with full regard for the University's due process requirements.

/cet

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

March 8, 1983

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, March 21, 1983. Proposed change in composition of the Graduate Council, Section I., 3.2.2, University Senate Rules.

Attached is a proposal submitted by the Graduate Council and approved by the Graduate Faculty and the Senate Council addressing a change in the composition of the Graduate Council to become effective September 1, 1983.

The reorganization was suggested in order to meet the following objectives:

1. To provide a single organizational unit for graduate education in the University.
2. To improve the representation on the Council by redistribution of existing membership and the addition of elected members to the Council.

/cet

Attachments

II. Proposal

MOTION

The Graduate Council recommends for Graduate Faculty approval the following composition of the Graduate Council effective September 1, 1983.

The Graduate Council is composed of 18 members and the Dean of the Graduate School, who serves as the chair. There are 16 faculty representatives and two student representatives. Associate deans serve in a non-voting ex officio capacity.

The composition of the Graduate Council is as follows: Two members from the College of Agriculture, three members from the College of Arts and Sciences, one member from the College of Business and Economics, two members from the College of Education, one member from the College of Engineering, one member from the Colleges of Communications and Fine Arts, two members from the Colleges of Medicine and Pharmacy, one member from the Colleges of Allied Health, Dentistry and Nursing, one member from the Colleges of Library Science, Home Economics, and Social Work, and two members appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School.

Members representing a college or a combination of colleges are elected by the Graduate Faculty in the respective colleges.

Data in tabular form pertaining to the proposal for the recommended composition is attached.

III. Proposal for the New Composition

College	Council Members	Full Graduate Faculty	Number of Programs	1982 Graduate Students
Agriculture	2	113	9D 2M	175 FT 88 PT
Arts & Sciences	3	259	19D 6M	350 FT 416 PT
Business & Economics	1	42	2D 1M	176 FT 120 PT
Education	2	57	10D 3M	183 FT 505 PT
Engineering	1	59	7D 1M	104 FT 97 PT
Fine Arts Communications	1	30	3D 2M	56 FT 64 PT
Medicine Pharmacy	2	89	5D 0M	68 FT 31 PT
Allied Health Nursing Dentistry	1	22	0D 4M	78 FT 39 PT
Library Science Home Economics Social Work	1	27	0D 6M	139 FT 134 PT
Appointees	<u>2</u>			
TOTAL FACULTY	16			
Students	2			
Ex Officio	2 (Associate Deans)			

D - Doctoral Students; M - Master's Students

iv. Current Distribution of Membership

College	Council Members	(Full) Graduate Faculty	Number of Programs	1982 Graduate Students
Agriculture	1	113	9D 2M	175 FT 88 PT
Arts & Sciences	3	278	21D 8M	387 FT 453 PT
Business & Economics	1	42	2D 1M	176 FT 120 PT
Education	2	57	10D 3M	183 FT 505 PT
Engineering	1	59	7D 1M	104 FT 97 PT
Medicine	1	102	5D 1M	77 FT 31 PT
Pharmacy				
Dentistry				
Allied Health				
Nursing				
Communications	1	47	1D 9M	227 FT 200 PT
Library Science				
Home Economics				
Social Work				
Appointees	2			
TOTAL FACULTY	12			
Students	2			

D - Doctoral Students; M - Master's Students

V. Program, Faculty and Student Data

College	(Full) Graduate Faculty	Number of Doctoral Programs	1982 Graduate Students	Other Master's Programs
Allied Health	5		17F/ 6P	2
Dentistry	13		9F/ 0P	1
Medicine	79	4	33F/ 20P	0
Nursing	4		52F/ 33P	1
Pharmacy	10	1	35F/ 11P	0
Agriculture	113	9	175F/ 88P	2
Arts & Sciences	259	19	350F/416P	6
Business & Economics	42	2	176F/120P	1
Communications	11	1	19F/ 27P	0
Education	57	10	183F/505P	3
Engineering	59	7	104F/ 97P	1
Fine Arts	19	2	37F/ 37P	2
Home Economics	14		34F/ 26P	4
Library Science	8		29F/ 60P	1
Social Work	5		76F/ 48P	1

F - Full Time; P - Part Time

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

March 8, 1983

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, University Senate
FROM: Don Ivey, Chairman, Senate Council

The following modifications in the selective admissions proposal have been submitted and will be acted upon at the March 21 Senate meeting:

The Admissions and Academic Standards Committee has made the following amendments in their policy statement:

- 1) Page 7, statement on foreign student applicants to replace the present statement:

We recommend that undergraduate foreign student applicants with a TOEFL score of 525 or above may be admitted. An applicant with a TOEFL score below 525 may be admitted if other factors such as previous academic record, interviews and other English tests indicate that the applicant will be academically successful. Decisions concerning admission of applicants with scores below 525 shall be made by the admission committee appointed by the appropriate chancellor. Foreign students who are not admissible to the University due to their level of competency in English may apply to the University Center for English as a Second Language for instruction before applying to the University itself. Admission to the programs administered by this center does not guarantee future admission to the University.

- 2) Bottom page 1 and top page 2: reference to first-semester grade point average to be removed.
- 3) Calendar on page 7, January 1983: Change "Least-square-error fit fall 1982 freshmen EGPA's" to "Least-square-error fit academic year 1981-82 EGPA's."
- 4) Page 6, Pre-College Curriculum: In the science area, change "Biology I and either Chemistry I or Physics I" to "Two of the following: Biology I, Chemistry I, Physics I."
- 5) Page 6, last paragraph. Change to read (changes underlined):

Page 2

University Senate Agenda Item: March 21, 1983
March 8, 1983

Although the above course sequence proposal for UK is one that we advocate be instituted for fall 1987, we would urge that high school students complete two years of a foreign language, one additional year of mathematics beyond Algebra II, and one year of fine arts.

Modifications suggested by faculty other than members of the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee are the following:

- 1) The report should be amended by deleting the Student-Athlete section on page 5. (This change was suggested by two members of the Senate.)
- 2) Change the policy on transfer of students to make a GPA of 2.0 acceptable from any student coming from the UKCC system or any four-year college. Also suggested: keep the 2.3GPA requirement from other junior colleges--possibly.
- 3) Page 2: formula for the rank-order pool: change to read: $R=0.5 D + 0.2 P + 0.3A$.
- 4) Page 5: student-athletes, point 2: omit the last sentence that says the student athletes will be part of the 20% pool. Rest of statement on athletes would remain the same.
- 5) Page 6, next to last sentence: clarify the point about treating those applicants who do not meet the pre-college curriculum requirements. Should they be part of the rank-ordered pool or handled in some different manner?

Although rationale was given for all the above amendments, it is not included in this memo. The persons who proposed the modifications will present the rationale on the Senate floor if the recommendation to modify receives a second.

/cet