

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0033

DEAN OF ADMISSIONS AND REGISTRAR
GILLIS BUILDING

April 17, 1985

Dr. Otis A. Singletary, President
University of Kentucky
Administration Building
0032

Dear President Singletary:

The University Senate at its meeting of April 8, 1985, approved the attached report of the Joint Faculty-Administration ad hoc Committee to Study Faculty Alternatives with the request that it be forwarded to the Administration for appropriate action.

Cordially,

Randall W. Dahl
Secretary, University Senate

s

Enclosure

cc: Senate Council
Chancellor Art Gallaher, Jr.

Page 2

US: Agenda Item: IV., 2.2.1 (a)
29 March 1985

Proposed:

Add to the current Rule the following paragraphs:

Applicants for admission to the University of Kentucky may submit either ACT or SAT scores to the Director of Admissions. If an applicant submits scores from both tests, the score which is most favorable to the applicant will be used for admission decisions.

The Director of Admissions will utilize a standard conversion table¹ between ACT and SAT scores, subject to the approval of the Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards. This conversion shall include one between subsection scores (ACT English-SAT Verbal and ACT Mathematics-SAT Quantitative).

¹ One such table is found in Ira W. Langstan & Thomas W. Watkins, SAT-ACT Equivalents. Research Memorandum 80-5, University Office of School and College Relations, University of Illinois-Champaign. Champaign, Illinois, July, 1980.

Implementation Date: Spring Semester, 1986.

Rationale: There are other measures of student potential that are at least as reliable as the ACT scores. Many students who are applying to out-of-state colleges take the SAT test. Our insistence that they take also the ACT is an imposition that many of them will reject. We cannot afford to lose outstanding potential students because of a rigid and inflexible requirement on a specific examination.

In cases where specific ACT scores are used for placement in courses or acceptance to certain programs, local placement examinations can be designed and administered.

/cet
0442C

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

29 March 1985

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, April 8,
1985. Proposal to alter the University Senate Rules, Section
IV., 2.1.1 (a), relative to admission to the University.

Current Rule:

- 2.1.1 (a) Criteria for automatic acceptance and automatic rejection
Performance in high school, as judged by the overall high
school grade point average (HSGPA), and on the American
College Test (ACT composition score) will be used to
accept or reject applicants automatically. First-year
freshmen grade point averages (EGPA) of previous UK
freshman students will 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 will 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 ≥ 2.0 will be
automatically accepted.

The above procedure for automatically accepting ap-
plicants 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 the first-year EGPA.

Criteria for determining which applicants are to be
rejected automatically are: those who do not have a
HSGPA ≥ 2.0 or an ACT ≥ 11 . (US: 3/21/83 & BofT 5/3/83)

Proposed:

1. Insert "(for example, chairpersons, deans, directors of schools, deans of instruction and research, and other appropriate administrative officers)" after "educational unit" in paragraph 1, line 2.
2. Delete "faculty" from line 4, paragraph 2, under A. Annual Review.
3. Add to the above-cited paragraph the following: "This annual review will normally utilize some formal evaluation by faculty in the affected unit as part of the review session. Units will be expected to develop their own evaluative procedure. Formal faculty input will be utilized at least every other year."

Rationale:

Persons performing in an administrative role are currently evaluated by their immediate supervisors once a year. Too often these evaluations take place without input from those who are affected most in the unit, the faculty who work in the unit each day. This proposal provides for a formal channel of evaluation of an administrator by faculty, and should form a part of the administrator's performance assessment. Since different units have different standards and interests, it is expected that faculty in all affected units would work out their own evaluation procedures. For example, faculty councils in each college might work out an evaluative instrument for college deans, while departments might choose to utilize an entirely different procedure.

Upward communication has always been a hallmark of institutions that have performed well; formal provision for this kind of communication ought to be very useful both for administrators and those who in turn evaluate them.

/cet
0412C

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

27 March 1985

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, April 8, 1985. Proposal to alter the Administrative Regulations, AR II-1.0-6, relative to evaluations of administrators. If approved, the proposal will be forwarded to the administration for consideration.

Current Regulation:

REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL UNITS

A. Annual Review

A regular annual review session with the chief administrative officer of each educational unit will be scheduled by the officer's immediate administrative supervisor. An appropriate time for this annual review will be just prior to the time of submission of any annual report or the annual budget request.

The annual review, although certainly not casual, will not reach the degree of formality nor the depth of analysis and study envisioned for the periodic evaluation, and there will be no requirement for the involvement of faculty, students, alumni, or persons external to the University for this review.

Instead, the annual review will provide a critique of achievements and areas requiring attention during the past year, of the current status of the unit, and of the development of plans and the identification of needs for the future. It should provide the administrative supervisor with the additional information and insights needed to effectively represent needs of this unit to the supervisor's next level of institutional management, as well as an opportunity for communicating the supervisor's assessment of the quality of the unit and individual performances, for identifying new goals and program performance objectives, for recommending priorities, and for making suggestions for improvement.

Though the Committee believes that this kind of academic experience is desirable for all students, it seems impractical at this time to make it a universal requirement. We recommend that such a program be initiated for approximately 400 students (20 sections) and that after a period of trial and evaluation a decision be made about expanding it.

Appendix C Cross-cultural Courses

The following is suggested as a scale of priorities for courses to meet the cross-cultural requirement. It must be borne in mind that (1) represents the minimum standard and (5) the ideal. The committee which initially certifies courses in this area may be obliged to accept any course that falls within priority (1); later the committee may be able to insist that courses satisfy some higher standard.

- (1) The culture studied should be one that is markedly different from that of the students and preferably outside the Western or Judaeo-Christian tradition. There are many Anthropology courses and a number of Geography, History, and Political Science courses that would meet this criterion.
- (2) The content of the course should be devoted largely or exclusively to the study of culture, rather than of politics, economics, or historical events. There are Anthropology and probably some History courses that would satisfy this criterion.
- (3) The course should expose students to many different aspects of a "foreign" culture, including folk as well as elite traditions, in order to make them aware of the interrelatedness of the different aspects of culture. For the time being this criterion seems to be most nearly met by Anthropology courses and possibly some Geography courses.
- (4) The course should expose students to a non-Western culture that has or had a significant recorded history and a well developed philosophical tradition of its own, to dispel any idea that ours is the only "civilized" mode of thought. For the time being there are no courses on the books that adequately satisfy this criterion, except for occasionally-taught Anthropology courses on Egyptian or Maya civilization.
- (5) The course should expose students to a cultural tradition that is still alive and viable in the present-day world; in other words, a culture that they are quite likely to meet face-to-face at some point in their future lives. For the time being there are no courses that meet this requirement.

- F. They should be taught in language that is free of jargon and (except in the case of basic skills and sequential courses) should normally assume no prior knowledge of the subject.
- G. Through a judicious selection of illustrative material and through the presentation of differing viewpoints they should seek to develop the students' spirit of inquiry and an appreciation of the joys of intellectual pursuits.
- H. Wherever appropriate they should raise questions of value and should explore the philosophical, ethical, and aesthetic consequences which are entailed in all human decisions.
- I. They should contain a writing component.
- J. Through a variety of teaching methods they should seek to promote active student involvement in the learning process.
- K. They should involve methods of evaluation that go beyond the objective (e.g., multiple choice) examination. Among the options here are shorter, written examinations or quizzes, essays within or outside the classroom, and oral presentations.

Appendix B Freshmen Seminars

The Freshmen Seminars are a two-semester sequence of courses focusing on some of the major intellectual, social, political, ethical, and aesthetic traditions and institutions of the Western world from Classical times to the twentieth century. In addition to introducing students to a substantial number of issues and answers that have shaped the Western tradition, these courses are designed to provide a stimulating environment in which individuals can develop an appreciation for the challenges and satisfactions of intellectual inquiry. The courses will be taught in sections of 20 students by experienced faculty, and the material will be organized around a theme, a principle, or a set of issues established beforehand by the individual instructor. Emphasis will be placed on the relevance of problems and issues in the western tradition to twentieth century culture.

Rationale: One common criticism of education at large universities is that students frequently do not have an opportunity to participate in a small class with experienced faculty until they become juniors or seniors. At a critical stage in their university career when they are just beginning to develop academic skills and are establishing their attitude toward learning, they have little opportunity to engage in extended classroom discussion, to share ideas with their peers and to experience in a personal way the challenges and satisfactions of intellectual pursuits. The Freshmen Seminars are designed to alleviate this problem in a limited way. Their purpose is threefold: a) to introduce students to some of the issues and answers which have shaped the western tradition and which have had an impact on modern ways of thought; b) to pursue this goal through integration of materials from a variety of disciplines; c) to stimulate the students' spirit of inquiry and to assist them in developing an appreciation for the values of the intellectual life.

reminders about what we all know. The first is that no format or structure is a guarantee of quality in instruction or learning. Quality comes from people, that is, from our faculty and students, not from structures. The success of University Studies will depend on the dedication and performance of those engaged in the process, not on the distribution of courses or the number of hours required in the program. For this reason we wish to reiterate the point made earlier about using our best faculty in University Studies courses and about promoting excellence in this area through an appropriate reward system.

Secondly, adequate time will be needed to implement and to evaluate the new system. In the initial stages there will inevitably be false starts, shortcomings, and perhaps some major blunders. That fact should not be surprising. It will be a time for initiative and forbearance, for vision and for criticism, for individual energy and joint action. We think that the process of putting the new program into effect can be as stimulating and productive for the faculty as for the students. Here is an opportunity, not just a task. After the University Studies Program has been firmly in place for some time, it will be appropriate to stop and take stock once again. The business of general education, like every other academic pursuit, should always be the object of periodic revision and timely new beginnings. We think the present moment is a time for such a beginning.

Appendix A University Studies Courses

Although University Studies courses may sometimes function as an introduction to particular disciplines, their primary purpose is quite different from that of the usual departmental offerings. Their principal aim is to help students to become familiar with the broad dimensions of human knowledge, to develop an appreciation for the great diversity of approaches in human inquiry, and to experience some of the satisfactions of the intellectual life. Since this aim should be pursued at every level of undergraduate education, upper division courses in University Studies are most desirable. Within the disciplinary areas, as well as the cross-disciplinary and the cross-cultural components of University Studies, courses should be designed with the following criteria in mind:

- A. They should provide a reasonably comprehensive coverage of the basic principles, concepts, and current state of knowledge of the area described in the course title and description.
- B. Without becoming bogged down in detail, they should provide a general understanding of the methods of study that are germane to a particular area of study.
- C. They should provide some sense of the historical developments that have led to the current body of knowledge in a particular field.
- D. They should demonstrate how a particular body of knowledge fits into the larger body of human knowledge as developed in related disciplines.
- E. They should indicate how the content or skills imparted in a particular course might be useful or important in the students' own life.

affected by several factors which are difficult to assess at the present time. These include the total enrollment at the University, which has been declining in recent years; the principle of double counting (i.e. using a course to apply both to one's major and to University Studies), which will decrease under the new system; and student interest, which is affected by many things. Amid all these considerations it is important to remember that some resources will be made available through the changes that are involved in the new program, and in the area of Basic Skills the need for additional resources will decline as students come to the University better prepared to bypass these requirements. Most importantly, however, we should be mindful that we are discussing changes that will significantly improve the education of the entire undergraduate student body for years to come. In that light the Committee believes that the estimated additional costs are most reasonable, and we are convinced that with sufficient lead time the University can initiate the proposed revisions without inordinately taxing the system as a whole.

Implementation and Oversight. Implementing the University Studies Program will require a considerable amount of planning, and for this reason the Committee recommends the Fall 1987 as a target date for initiating the new requirements. This arrangement will allow those responsible for the program to decide on appropriate courses and to meet staffing needs. The Committee believes that the success of the new program demands careful and continuous administrative oversight. Thus, we recommend that a particular individual be given the responsibility and the resources to coordinate the organization of University Studies and to monitor its academic quality on an ongoing basis. This person should be a faculty member actively involved in teaching in the program and should be an individual with good judgment, vision, and enthusiasm, as well as administrative ability, who can convey to the academic community the importance and challenge of University Studies. Such a director should be appointed by the Chancellor of the Lexington Campus and should be vested with the necessary authority (financial and administrative) to fulfill his or her responsibilities.

We also recommend that a permanent committee of knowledgeable, distinguished and interested faculty and students be appointed to advise the director on the implementation and maintenance of the program. This committee should be appointed in the same fashion and with the same care that the area committees are currently chosen. The first responsibility of the committee will be to work with the director in developing the new curriculum. We recommend that no course presently in the general education program be automatically included in University Studies, but that each offering be evaluated on the basis of the general guidelines outlined in Appendix A. Thereafter, it shall be the committee's responsibility to assist in maintaining the continuity and academic quality of the program.

AFTERWORD

The Committee believes that the proposed changes in the structure and content of general education at the University of Kentucky represent a substantial and significant improvement over what we have in the present system. The new program is more coherent and comprehensive, and it will, we are convinced, better prepare our students to meet the challenges they face in the coming decades. In that connection we would like to conclude with two

ADDENDA

Writing. There are several dimensions to the University Studies program which the Committee would like to underscore in its recommendations. The first of these has to do with writing skills. If our undergraduates are to continue to mature intellectually, writing must be integrated into the learning process; it must be a presence in the students' total educational experience. As a way of ensuring this presence, the Committee recommends that all University Studies courses, except for those in Basic Skills, include a writing component. The nature and extent of this component will vary from course to course, but we believe that writing is the single most effective means of developing an individual's critical, synthetic, and expressive abilities. It is worth noting in this connection that formal writing assignments (e.g. term papers and research reports) are by no means the only kind of writing that can be used to advantage. Summaries, syntheses, critiques, and exercises which compel students to write in response to what they read and hear can all contribute to the art of learning.

Ethical Dimension. The Committee recommends that the ethical dimension of education be an integral part of the University Studies program. Instructors should be encouraged to raise ethical issues wherever appropriate and to explore with their classes the moral arguments, criticisms, ideals, and consequences which are inevitably bound up with human decisions. The purpose here should not be to indoctrinate or to argue a particular point of view but to assist students in defining for themselves what is entailed in such concepts as valor, temperance, justice, and the like, and what it means to act responsibly in the public and private spheres.

Computer Literacy. It is a truism that in the future all students will have to possess some degree of computer literacy. However, the Committee feels that individual needs in this area are so diverse that it is inappropriate for us to establish a universal requirement. Individual departments should establish suitable levels of competency for their majors and should see to it that their students gain the necessary experience.

Active Learning. Finally, we believe that a special effort should be made in University Studies courses to promote active student engagement in the learning process. On this matter the Mortimer Committee ("Involvement in Learning...") has expressed the point very well: "To do a discipline means to speak it, to work with its primary methods, to follow its processes, and to adapt its perspectives. Active modes of teaching require that students be inquirers -- creators, as well as receivers, of knowledge." Through a variety of techniques, such as discussions, debates, simulations, oral presentations, and individual learning projects, instructors should assist students in developing intellectual initiative and creative habits of learning.

RESOURCES

At every stage of drafting its recommendations for changes in general education at the University of Kentucky, the Committee considered the problem of resources. It is our best estimate that through the reallocation of existing resources and new monies the cost of implementing the University Studies Program will be approximately \$400,000. This estimate, which is based on enrollment figures for 1984/85 and on the class profile of 1982/83, can be

Rationale: The Committee views this requirement as a natural counterpart to its earlier recommendation (i.e. in the Humanities Requirement) that all students take a sequence of courses dealing with the traditions and institutions of the Western world. It is highly important that our undergraduates develop some appreciation for cultural heritages which are not part of the Western tradition but which nonetheless have impressive histories of their own. We concur with a suggestion made by the American Association of Colleges in its recent report on higher education that "colleges must create a curriculum in which the insights and understandings, the lives and aspirations of the distant and foreign, the different and the neglected, are more widely comprehended by their graduates." Such understanding, we believe, is valuable not only in its own right but as a way in which students can acquire a larger perspective on their own heritage. The ideal here is for all students to have experience with a culture outside the Judaeo-Christian tradition, and there are currently a good number of offerings in History, Geography, and Anthropology which meet this standard. However, the Committee recognizes that this ideal may be achieved only over a period of years, and in the interim some offerings within that tradition may be accepted as satisfying the Cross-Cultural component. If so, we recommend that courses included in this component meet the following criteria:

- 1) Courses dealing with cultures or sub-cultures that are markedly different from the students' experience are to be preferred to courses which are close to that experience.
- 2) Every effort should be made to emphasize those aspects of a culture or sub-culture which differentiate it from the traditional western outlook.
- 3) Where possible attention should be focused on different aspects of a culture including folk as well as elite traditions.

What must be remembered in the selection of courses for this requirement is that the benefit to students will be in direct proportion to the amount of "culture shock" involved, i.e. the degree to which students must initially struggle to comprehend how it is that people can think and act in different ways. For a discussion of the type of courses the Committee has in mind see Appendix C. The Committee feels that departments should be encouraged to design and submit new courses which will come closer to achieving the ideal than do most offerings which are currently on the books.

studies such courses, in addition to following the guidelines for University Studies courses, must meet the following criteria:

- 1) The courses must involve more than one discipline.
- 2) The content of cross-disciplinary courses must be broad in scope and must deal with such matters as philosophical dimensions, disciplinary assumptions, historical perspectives and issues of value rather than with technical or professional information.
- 3) The syllabi of these courses must reflect joint planning on the part of the participating departments and must indicate the nature of the overlap between the two courses (i.e. the assumptions, principles, goals, source materials, methodologies, etc. which will be compared and/or contrasted in the two offerings).
- 4) The paired courses must have some common readings.

Rationale: The major portion of general education at the University of Kentucky has been and will continue to be centered around individual disciplines. This arrangement has proved to be an effective and efficient method over the years. With such a system, however, we easily create the impression that knowledge can be nicely categorized and that what is learned in one discipline has little to do with what is learned in another. To counter this misconception the Committee feels that students should have some experience with courses which go beyond disciplinary distinctions and which seek to demonstrate the interrelated character of human knowledge. It is anticipated that, with only a modicum of revision, large numbers of courses already being taught at the University will serve this purpose. Many current offerings in literature, philosophy, history, and fine arts, as well as some in the social and natural sciences, will lend themselves to this kind of pairing. We wish also to encourage departments to develop new offerings which will effectively relate one area of study to another.

We suggest that these courses be taken within two consecutive semesters, and for this reason, only courses which are offered on a fairly regular basis should be included in the University Studies Program. Because we believe that general education courses should be spread throughout the four years of undergraduate study, a significant number of upper division offerings will be included in Cross-disciplinary studies as well as in the Cross-cultural component.

V. Cross-cultural Requirement.

The University Studies requirement in this area may be fulfilled by the completion of a three-hour course which deals primarily with the Third World or with a non-Western civilization (i.e. a civilization outside the Judaeo-Christian tradition).

C. Humanities. The University Studies requirement in this area may be fulfilled by choosing one of the following:

- a. A two-semester survey in one of the humanistic disciplines (e.g. English, Philosophy, History, Foreign Language in Translation, Art History, Theatre, Musicology) spanning the period from classical Greece to the twentieth century.
- b. Two courses in a single humanistic discipline, one of which deals with the period before 1700 A.D. and one with the period after 1700 A.D.
- c. Freshman Seminars (two)

Rationale: The Committee believes that the traditional division of learning into three distinct areas (natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities) retains its usefulness, and we are convinced that mandatory exposure to all three branches is essential if the students' undergraduate experience is to have adequate breadth. In the natural sciences we feel that a two-semester sequence in a single science is the only way to provide a proper introduction to the methods of scientific inquiry. In view of the diversity of social science methodologies, we believe that a single course in two different disciplines would provide a better introduction than two semesters in one discipline.

In the humanities our aim is to provide an introduction to some of the major intellectual, social, political, ethical and aesthetic traditions and institutions of the Western world in order that students may better understand their own cultural heritage. Students choosing option a. will take a sequence of courses, not unlike many of those presently offered in general studies, which extends from Classical times to the twentieth century. In option b. the two courses may be narrower in scope but must encompass more than a single author, genre, or monument. One of these courses must focus on a period of Western culture prior to 1700 A.D. and the other on a period subsequent to that date. Option c. is a special new program, which is described in Appendix B.

IV. Cross-disciplinary Requirement.

The University Studies requirement in this area may be fulfilled by the completion of two courses which have been specifically designated as paired offerings. Such courses may be within single a broad area of study (i.e. humanities, social sciences, natural sciences) or may cross over these areas. However, to be included within cross-disciplinary

secondary school courses be accepted as automatic fulfillment of this requirement. During that period competency examinations should be administered and the results used to assist the schools, wherever necessary, in strengthening their foreign language programs. At the end of the three-year period, incoming students will be required to pass a competency examination in order to fulfill the requirement. Foreign students, whose native language is not English, are not required to take an additional foreign language.

II. Inference and Writing Skills

- A. Calculus/Logic/Statistics. The University Studies requirement in this area may be satisfied through one of the following options:

Option 1: Completion of a course in calculus: MA 123 (Elementary Calculus and its Applications), or MA 113 (Calculus I), or MA 115 (Elementary Analysis I).

Option 2: Completion of the two following courses: PHI 120 (Introductory Logic) and STA 200 (Statistics: A Force in Human Judgment)

Rationale: For many students a knowledge of calculus is, if not mandatory, at least useful in the pursuit of their major discipline. Calculus is also essential for understanding a great deal of modern technical thought. For these reasons the Committee believes it ought to be part of the required curriculum for a large segment of the undergraduate student body. Other students, however, who have little need of calculus, will be better served through training in logical argument and statistical analysis.

- B. Writing Requirement: This requirement may be satisfied through completion of the stipulations outlined in the Writing Requirement endorsed by the University Senate in the Fall of 1984 (Senate Minutes, November 12, 1984, pp. 8-11).

III. Disciplinary Requirements

- A. Natural Sciences. The University Studies requirement in this area may be satisfied through completion of a two-semester sequence (totaling no less than 6 hours) in any of the physical or biological sciences.
- B. Social and Behavioral Sciences. The University Studies requirement in this area may be satisfied by completion of one three-hour course in each of two separate departments in the social and behavioral sciences (e.g. Anthropology, Economics, Geography, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology).

Description and Rationale

I. Basic Skills

- A. Mathematics. The University Studies requirement in this area may be satisfied through one of the following options:

- a) Completing MA 109, College Algebra and Analytic Geometry, or
- b) Passing a competency examination (without University credit), or
- c) Passing a course in calculus.

Rationale: The aim of this requirement is to ensure that all students possess some skill in symbol manipulation and graphic presentation of data. Frequently this skill is acquired in secondary school programs, and the Committee expects that before long all entering students will have achieved this level of competency before they come to the University.

- B. Foreign Language. The University Studies requirement in this area may be satisfied through one of the following options:

- a) Completion of two years of a foreign language (modern or ancient) at the secondary school level, or
- b) Completion of two semesters of a foreign language (modern or ancient) at the university level.

Rationale: Since language is the principal medium through which a culture is transmitted, the Committee feels that competency in a foreign language is one of the most useful means of increasing students' awareness of the diversity in human society and broadening their understanding of a complex world. What the Committee has in mind here is the ability to read a foreign language at a level that will provide access to a foreign culture (i.e. the ability to read newspapers, magazines, etc.). We are under no illusion that the above requirement constitutes adequate preparation for this purpose. But within the constraints of other pressing needs and of our resources, it is a step toward that goal and an affirmation of the role that language study should play in a university education. We anticipate that as this requirement becomes widely disseminated, more and more of the responsibility for elementary language instruction will be assumed by the secondary schools and that more and more entering students will be prepared to pursue additional language study in this area with confidence and for personal satisfaction. We propose that during the first three years of the new University Studies Program satisfactory completion of

In light of these aims, the requirements of the University Studies Program are as follows:

OUTLINE

- I. Basic Skills
 - A. Mathematics (College Algebra, or exam, or ACT 25, or Calculus)
 - B. Foreign Language (Two years of high school or one year of college)
- II. Inference and Writing Skills
 - A. Calculus/Logic/Statistics (Calculus, or PHI 120 plus STA 200) 3-6 hrs.
 - B. Writing (University Writing Requirement) 6 hrs.
- III. Disciplinary Requirements
 - A. Natural Sciences (Two-semester sequence in one discipline) 6 hrs.
 - B. Social Sciences (Single course in each of two separate disciplines) 6 hrs.
 - C. Humanities
 - a. Survey from Greece to the Present or
 - b. Two courses in a single humanistic discipline, one prior to 1700 A.D. and one after 1700 A.D. or
 - c. Freshman Seminars (two) 6 hrs.
- IV. Cross-disciplinary Requirement

Each student must take a pair of complementary courses which are designed to demonstrate the interrelationship of the disciplines. These courses may be from different departments in a single area (i.e. humanities, social sciences, natural sciences) or may couple two different areas. 6 hrs.
- V. Cross-cultural Requirement

Each student must take one course which deals primarily with the Third World or with a non-Western civilization. 3 hrs.

36-39 hrs.

NOTE: A course taken to satisfy a requirement in one area of general studies cannot be used to satisfy a requirement in another area.

the selection of such courses is a task better left to a representative group of faculty and students who have been vested with the authority to make decisions on the basis of the goals of the general education program and a careful scrutiny of the courses themselves. If the selection of courses is a matter of public debate, we think the result will be endless frustration for all concerned. Thus, the Committee foresees that if the proposed changes are adopted, there will be need for a committee to evaluate individual course offerings as appropriate or inappropriate to the new general studies program. To assist that committee's work we have set forth in Appendix A our conception of the criteria which should distinguish general education courses from other offerings in the curriculum.

One last but not insignificant point about the recommendations listed below: The Committee believes that the term "general education" has become a pejorative or, at least, an inadequate term for designating an important dimension of the University's responsibility. "University Studies" is, we think, a better title for conveying the idea that general education is an integral part of all students' academic experience and that the program, calling as it does upon the resources of more than one college or academic unit, represents a fundamental commitment of the entire institution.

The University Studies Program

The University Studies Program is designed to provide undergraduates with a broad liberal arts education in the expectation that such education will assist them in defining and pursuing goals which are important to themselves personally and which contribute to the well-being of society as a whole. The Program entails the development of certain skills, knowledge, and perspectives which will at once aid individuals in becoming both more self-confident and more self-critical, open to new developments in all areas of human experience, and sufficiently trained to evaluate these developments in an intelligent fashion.

More specifically, the intellectual skills which should be enhanced in the University Studies Program include the following:

- a) To communicate effectively in both spoken and written languages.
- b) To deal with data and with mathematical symbols.
- c) To think critically--to abstract, analyze, synthesize and evaluate, and to understand the nature of thought.
- d) To learn on one's own.
- e) To employ the scientific method.
- f) To create and to express creativity.
- g) To adapt to new circumstances (that is, to apply learning).

The Program seeks to introduce students to the traditional areas of the Humanities, the Sciences and the Fine Arts and to help them develop a perspective on their own culture and on that of others, on the issues and responsibilities of citizenship, on systems of personal and social values, and on time itself through study of the past and through analysis of possible futures. In all of these pursuits the most pervasive goal is the development of intellectual habits which will prepare students for the future and will promote lifelong learning.

education must occupy a more prominent position in institutional priorities than it now does. As citizens of the Commonwealth seeking to enrich their own personal lives and to become responsible members of the community, our students have a right to expect that we will provide them with the very best curriculum, the very best faculty and the very best resources in general education that we can muster. To do this will require both a change in outlook on the part of faculty and administrators and a reward system that reflects our seriousness of purpose in this regard.

6. The need for ongoing oversight of the General Education Program. If Ernest Boyer's metaphor of general education as a spare room which everyone wants to use but no one wants to take care of is apt, the Committee feels that a good "straightening up," however thorough or well executed such a reorganization might be, is not enough. A general educational program needs both to change and to remain the same; it needs to meet new exigencies and preserve essential values. This goal can be attained only through continual scrutiny and supervision by individuals who are charged with the authority and responsibility to maintain good academic standards in the program and to respond to new circumstances.

Over the past seven months the Committee has attempted to articulate the above concerns and assumptions in the form of specific recommendations for changes in the general education program at the University of Kentucky. In doing so we wrestled not only with the problem of existing and potential resources but with the role of the University as a very complex institution with multiple responsibilities and constituents. As is evident in the recommendations listed below, we struck a middle course between retaining the present system and suggesting a revision that would radically orient the institution's resources to general education. In the conviction both that the present program is inadequate to the current needs of undergraduate students and that the University will and should continue a very strong commitment to such functions as graduate education, research, and service, we opted for a series of changes which we believe is a substantial and significant improvement over the present system and which is consonant with the University's complex mission.

The existing program of general education is the product of about two decades of development, some of it through planned change and some through haphazard accretion, deletion, or revision. Working to alter such a system will take time and will involve rethinking many of the things we have taken for granted in general education over the years. We believe, however, that such a process must begin if we wish to provide students with a stronger, more coherent, and more timely undergraduate experience at the University of Kentucky.

In making recommendations for change, the Committee might have presented a list of existing or potential courses which could be used to satisfy the general studies requirements outlined below. However, except in the areas of basic skills - writing and mathematics - we chose to present a more general format for two reasons. The usefulness of a specific course list is predicated on the acceptance by the University community of the proposed revisions in general education. Prior to that decision the lengthy study required to establish such a list is premature. Furthermore, we believe that

selection becomes a matter of personal bent or is dictated by the requirements of one's major department. The Committee believes that although students should not be committed to a lock-step education, there are certain skills and certain educational experiences which are appropriate for all undergraduates.

2. The need for deepening all students' awareness both of their own cultural heritage and of non-western traditions. The shortcomings of our present general education program in this area were a frequent subject of criticism in our hearings and interviews, and many other institutions of higher learning are struggling with similar problems. The Committee feels strongly that the study of Western civilization should have a central place in the undergraduate curriculum for all undergraduates. It also seems clear that, amid the growing interdependence of nations and cultures, all students should be aware that the western way of structuring reality or manipulating symbolic forms is not the only way. Some experience with non-western traditions or with traditions that include non-western perspectives is a necessity.
3. The need for integrative thinking across disciplinary lines. For very solid academic reasons, individual disciplines have traditionally been a most effective and efficient mechanism for developing and transmitting knowledge. The Committee feels that blurring disciplinary lines in all areas of instruction is neither possible nor educationally desirable. At the same time, however, we believe that much benefit would accrue to students and faculty alike from seeing that these divisions of knowledge are the product of human invention and that what is learned in and through the disciplines is necessarily limited in scope. Much is to be gained by paying attention to the interconnections of human knowledge and to the ways in which one area of knowledge impinges on another.
4. The need for ongoing development of writing skills. The nature of the problem here has been discussed at length on this campus, and the recent decision of the University Senate to strengthen the University writing requirement is one important step in alleviating the difficulty. However, if our students are to continue to mature intellectually, writing must be integrated into the learning process. For this reason we believe that all general education courses should include a writing component.
5. The need for placing a high value on general education within university priorities. The conflicting demands of career education and general education are well known. However, even in practical terms general education is an extremely valuable component of the students' undergraduate experience. In the rapidly changing world of work, specific training for a career or a profession quickly loses its usefulness, and the skills needed to meet new challenges (e.g. reasoning, writing, speaking) are precisely the ones promoted by the general education program. More importantly, if the University is to be faithful to its stated aim of producing "men and women of intellectual interest and achievement, men and women possessing character, ideas, ingenuity, moral responsibility and general competence" (University Bulletin, p. 11), the program in general

Committee on General Education
University of Kentucky
Final Report

The Committee on General Education was jointly appointed by the Chancellor of the Lexington Campus and the Senate Council in September 1982. It was charged with responsibility "for reviewing our current General Studies Program and, after study of current national trends and institutional opportunities and constraints, recommending modifications and improvements in the content and delivery of general education at the University of Kentucky." As indicated in the progress report issued by the Committee's initial chairman, Professor John Stephenson (University Senate Minutes, April 6, 1984), a considerable amount of time was spent in the first two years studying national trends and assessing the present state of general education at the University of Kentucky through interviews with deans and chairmen and through public hearings open to the entire academic community.

The process of re-examining general education at this institution is part of a nationwide trend in which we are neither pioneers nor the last in line. Indeed, within the last six months no less than three major reports have been issued on the current status of higher education in this country.* All of these reports are critical of recent developments in undergraduate instruction but not all make the same diagnosis of the problem, nor do they all prescribe the same cure. One argues for a stronger focus on traditional content or subject matter; another suggests that more attention be given to the "methods and processes, modes of access to understanding, and judgment that should inform all study." What is obvious to everyone is that no one curriculum, however wisely and imaginatively structured, is appropriate for all institutions. Differences in student body, faculty, institutional resources, and institutional missions necessarily affect the type of program that is most desirable, and the Committee has attempted to keep such factors in mind.

Professor Stephenson's progress report outlined some assumptions and concerns which preoccupied the Committee in its deliberations. It seems superfluous to repeat all of them here, but it might not be out of place to list those which loomed rather large as we developed specific recommendations for changes in the general education program at the University of Kentucky. These concerns were fairly widespread both among Committee members and among faculty, students and administrators who took part in the hearings and interviews. They include the following:

1. The need for greater coherence in the General Education Program. The present system of allowing individuals to choose five out of eight areas and to select a wide variety of courses in each discipline says little to students about the connected character of human knowledge and provides little insight into what kinds of knowledge an educated person ought to have. Under such conditions the rationale for course

*"Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education" by the study group on Conditions in Higher Education, (The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 24, 1984, 35-49); "To Reclaim a Legacy" by W. C. Bennett (Chronicle, November 28, 1984, 16-21); "Integrity in the College Curriculum; A Report to the Academic Community" by the Association of American Colleges (Chronicle, February 13, 1985, 12-30).

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

15 March 1985

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, April 8,
1985. Recommendation to the administration: Final report of
the Joint Faculty-Administration ad hoc Committee to Study
Faculty Alternatives.

Attached is the final report of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty
Alternatives, chaired by Professor Jean Pival. We will discuss and
take action on this report as a recommendation to the administration.

Attachment-1

/cet
0427C

Cost (Savings) Associated With Implementation of Various
Early Retirement Options - Non-Faculty
(Group III)

1. Early Retirement with Lump Sum and Fringe Annuities (retirement between 62 and 65 with lump sum TIAA/CREF for remaining years and continuation of group health and life insurance)	Assumptions	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	Entry Level		
						Salary	Retirement	Soc Sec
	Retiree Salary	\$26,500	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$22,000	\$1,760	\$1,550
	Retirement	2,120	6,360	--	--			
	Social Security	1,900	--	--	--			
	Health & Life	400	550	550	550			
	Retiree Comp.	\$30,920	\$ 6,910	\$ 550	\$ 550			
	Savings Available	-0-	\$24,010	\$30,370	\$30,370			
2. Early Retirement with Benefit Incentives		1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91
	Retiree Salary	\$26,500	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --
	Retirement	2,120	21,200	--	--	--	--	--
	Social Security	1,900	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Health & Life	400	550	550	550	550	550	550
	Retiree Comp.	\$30,920	\$21,750	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550
	Savings Available	-0-	\$ 9,170	\$30,370	\$30,370	\$30,370	\$30,370	\$30,370
		1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95			
	Retiree Salary	--	--	--	--			
	Retirement	--	--	--	--			
	Social Security	--	--	--	--			
	Health & Life	550	550	550	550			
	Retiree Comp.	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550			
	Savings Available	\$30,370	\$30,370	\$30,370	\$30,370			

Assumptions: (1) Any cost associated with an individual opting for early retirement would be absorbed at the sector level, either through (a) not filling the position, or (b) delaying the filling of the position for the period of time needed to support the initial cost of the early retirement. (2) Costs associated with the early retirement of an individual within the unfunded retirement plan would also be borne by the sector.

12/11/84

Cost (Savings) Associated with Implementation
of Various Early Retirement Options - Non-Faculty
(Group II)

1. Early Retirement with Lump Sum and Fringe Annuities (retirement between 62 and 65 with lump sum TIAA/CREF for remaining years and continuation of group health and life insurance)	Assumptions	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	Entry Level	
						Salary	
	Retiree Salary	\$14,000	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --		\$12,500
	Retirement	1,120	3,360	--	--		Retirement \$ 1,000
	Social Security	1,000	--	--	--		Soc Sec \$ 900
	Health & Life	400	550	550	550		Health&Life \$ 550
	Retiree Comp.	\$16,520	\$ 3,910	\$ 550	\$ 550		\$14,950
	Savings Available	-0-	\$12,610	\$15,970	\$15,970		

2. Early Retirement with Benefit Incentives		1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91
	Retiree Salary	\$14,000	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --
	Retirement	1,120	11,200	--	--	--	--	--
	Social Security	1,000	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Health & Life	400	550	550	550	550	550	550
	Retiree Comp.	\$16,520	\$11,750	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550
	Savings Available	-0-	\$ 4,770	\$15,970	\$15,970	\$15,970	\$15,970	\$15,970

	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95
Retiree Salary	--	--	--	--
Retirement	--	--	--	--
Social Security	--	--	--	--
Health & Life	550	550	550	550
Retiree Comp.	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550
Savings Available	\$15,970	\$15,970	\$15,970	\$15,970

Assumptions: (1) Any cost associated with an individual opting for early retirement would be absorbed at the sector level, either through (a) not filling the position, or (b) delaying the filling of the position for the period of time needed to support the initial cost of the early retirement. (2) Costs associated with the early retirement of an individual within the unfunded retirement plan would also be borne by the sector.

12/11/84

TABLE II

changes in the functions of higher education have demonstrated the necessity to provide various retirement and development options, not merely as stopgap emergency measures, but rather as ongoing programs in order to maintain the faculty flexibility and intellectual revitalization essential for academic excellence.

Recognizing these needs, the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Options has outlined a program of faculty alternatives that can be used either in fiscal exigency emergencies or as a permanent addition to faculty benefits. However, the Committee stresses that two principles undergird the program: 1) that faculty decisions to participate in any alternative plan must be voluntary, and 2) that the program must not violate the basic concept of tenure. Also, the Committee assumes that any alternative accepted by a faculty member will carry a contractual agreement so that the rights of the individual and the University are protected.

So that this program or one similar to it might be adopted within the next two years, the Committee recommends that the following steps be taken by the Senate and the Administration:

1. That the Senate Council place this plan on the agenda of the Senate in the 1984-85 academic year for debate and approval as a recommendation to the Administration.
2. That the President appoint a committee made up of staff members from the appropriate offices to determine how regulations must be amended and to develop more detailed versions of the recommended retirement options. These recommendations will be extended to non-faculty groups as well as to faculty.
3. That a committee be appointed to develop implementation guidelines for faculty development and renewal similar to those adopted by the University of Wisconsin in 1977. The committee should also suggest appropriate changes in Administrative Regulations to facilitate the implementation of some of the alternatives discussed as problems in the report.
4. That there be consultation with the Senate Council on both the determination of exigency and the University response to such fiscal emergencies.
5. That the University establish an Office of Faculty Development as described on page 15 of this report.

or when programs are being phased out. The cost of such a plan could be absorbed through University non-recurring funds. However, in the case that some of our recommended retirement alternatives are available, this plan need not be implemented.

- B. Tenured Faculty Termination Under the present Administrative Regulations, faculty members who face termination because of fiscal exigency "shall be given notice as soon as possible and never less than 12 months notice" (AR II-1.0-1, III C). This regulation, in essence, allows the faculty member a year's employment following the decision for termination. However, the committee recommends that this option be expanded so that a terminated faculty member could be given a year's severance pay instead-- when that alternative might be in the best interests of the university or the faculty member.

Recognizing that this flexibility would necessitate a change in the Administrative Regulations, the committee suggests the following addition to the rule:

However, if it is determined to be in the best interests of the faculty member or of the University, the University may, by mutual agreement with the faculty member, terminate with 12 months' severance pay with fringe benefits. In either case, the released faculty member's position shall not be filled within a period of two years unless the faculty member has been offered reappointment and given a reasonable time within which to accept or decline it.

Advantages

- a. A faculty member might prefer to take the severance pay and use the year for retraining.
- b. The University would profit in those situations when a unit or a program is to be immediately closed down. By not keeping faculty on the payroll in academic limbo, the university could save money on administrative and office personnel.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE PROGRAM SUGGESTIONS

As the Lowery Report pointed out, the University must make a number of crucial decisions before deciding upon faculty or academic units to be terminated and before choosing appropriate alternatives to termination. In recent years, the disastrous results of unilateral termination of tenured faculty have dramatized the need for careful, long-range planning that involves all sectors of the University community-- faculty, administrators, faculty bodies or committees, governing boards, and so on. The

- Develop for each academic unit a faculty profile that summarizes historical rates of appointment, termination, promotion, tenure granting, resignation, retirement, ratio of temporary to permanent faculty, distribution of rank and age, etc.,
- Facilitate the incentive arrangements for retraining,
- Identify appropriate options for individual faculty,
- Aid in the negotiation of transfers,
- Assist in removing economic barriers to the shifting of careers,
- Collect and disseminate information on exchange opportunities such as those offered by the National Faculty Exchange (see Appendix B, xii). Exchange programs offer universities opportunities for revitalizing individual faculty members and programs at little or no cost to the institution.
- Develop a list of private and government organizations that offer grants for academic upgrading or retraining.

III. SEVERANCE OPTIONS

Because of the professional and legal ramifications involved in terminating tenured faculty, all the authorities consulted in our study agreed that severance options must be voluntary in the sense that the faculty member is given a voice in considering the terms of the "buy-out" plan. Although recognizing emergency decisions must often be made within a period of days, the committee urges that such stringent measures generally be adopted only after careful study of the need for such action and after input from appropriate faculty groups. The committee also recognizes that severance pay decisions must be based on legal possibilities available in Kentucky.

The options considered by the committee as most appropriate for the University of Kentucky are as follows:

- A. Emergency Early Retirement By mutual agreement with the administration, the faculty member, if eligible, could retire with up to two years of severance pay at the salary level in effect at the time of the retirement decision. In addition, fringe benefits could be continued for the initial year of the two year agreement.

This plan --adopted by Michigan State University when serious short-falls forced the closing down of whole units-- would be especially useful in that situation

- For off-campus programs, the participating faculty would be expected to pay the tuition and fees.
- A time limit should be set for extensive retraining programs. For instance, the University might agree to subsidize a faculty member for a period of twenty-four months, after which participating faculty would not be eligible for additional financial assistance.
- For extensive retraining offered as part of a package for termination, the faculty must agree to leave the University's employ at the end of the subsidized training period.

Advantages

- a. If termination of faculty becomes necessary, this plan would give terminated faculty members a viable alternative to unemployment and immediate relocation. It would be especially valuable for faculty in fields where the academic job market is virtually closed.
- b. In normal times, faculty members who have developed new academic interests or who wish to gain expertise in a recently developed field within their academic discipline can pursue new knowledge without undue financial and academic hardship.

Disadvantages

- a. Because it is difficult to estimate how many faculty would take advantage of a development program, cost savings could not be accurately determined.
- b. Full-scale retraining would mean little immediate cost savings (perhaps even greater cost to the University for a few years), thus making it impractical for emergency situations.

2. Establishment of an Office of Faculty Development

Nearly all the institutions with faculty development programs have established a centralized office to manage them. Therefore, the Committee proposes that the University of Kentucky establish an Office of Faculty Development, initially staffed by one or two people-- perhaps shifted from a program scheduled for retrenchment or termination. As demand for the program grows and as new funds are generated, the office could be enlarged.

This centralized office could be responsible for gleaning the data necessary for long-range planning over the coming years. It could, for example;

While some new funding may be necessary to initiate a faculty development program, the costs should be more than offset by its potential savings and in the academic revitalization that it could provide. Thus, budgeting of University funds to this program should be considered a necessary investment for optimal use of faculty expertise.

Like the other plans offered in this report, participation in the program should be voluntary. However, the University might motivate the faculty to participate by offering small grants that would be awarded competitively to help defray tuition or travel costs.

For the purposes of the University of Kentucky, the Committee endorses Alternative 7 proposed by the Lowery Committee: That the University subsidize faculty participation in non-campus career institutes as described in the Chronicle on Higher Education of February 16, 1983 and/or provide funds for courses or training programs offered at the University of Kentucky.

When faculty retraining is used as a termination alternative or when it requires faculty to take extended leave for revitalizing academic expertise, a salary policy equitable to the University and to the faculty must be devised. The Committee offers the following suggestions:

- 1) The faculty might receive the salary (plus benefits) paid the year preceding entry into the program for the contracted period of University subsidizing of it;
- 2) A sliding scale might be worked out, particularly for those who would not return to the University and who might be offered part-time teaching opportunities at the retraining institution;
- 3) Changes in the fringe benefit package might be negotiated.

Recognizing that academic needs and objectives vary in different disciplines, the Committee suggests these general guidelines for an institutional plan:

- Any tenured faculty member would be eligible.
- Participation would be voluntary, but approval of the parent department and college would be mandatory.
- For extended retraining periods, the faculty would be required to apply for admission to a degree program.
- For short, on-campus retraining programs, the faculty would carry the teaching load typical of their department. However, participation would be facilitated by convenient class scheduling and reduction of non-teaching activities.

faculty member would be expected to develop sufficient contracts to become self-supporting.

- Under no circumstances would this plan commit the University to guarantee the contract portion of the faculty member's salary.

Advantages

- a. The faculty member could benefit from retaining a position in an academic setting with possible access to University facilities.
- b. The institute appointments could help the faculty member to pursue contract work.
- c. The gradual withdrawal of University support would enable former faculty member time to build a contract research program without financial duress.
- d. The service function of the University could be enhanced while at the same time benefitting from revenue in new research contracts.

Disadvantages

- a. The University would not benefit from immediate financial relief.
- b. The option would not be available to all faculty members. Many lack the up-dated knowledge and skills of research needed for such reappointment; others are in academic areas where there are few opportunities for contract work.

C. Faculty Development and Renewal

The most impressive program for faculty development and renewal studied by the Committee was that approved by the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents in May, 1975 (see Appendix B, xiii). Primarily designed as an ongoing program rather than as a stop-gap measure in periods of fiscal shortages, it was based on the premise that although faculty have a professional commitment to upgrade their knowledge and skills, the University should "seek further ways to enable individual faculty members to renew their intellectual vitality and further their professional growth...." This claim was based on the emerging needs facing higher education, such as shifts in programmatic and student requirements and the development of new fields of technology and knowledge, thereby often necessitating extensive faculty retraining -- a costly burden if university leave is required.

1. Retraining Aspects

a. It might not result in immediate savings to the University, unless the shift could be combined with faculty attrition.

b. It would require clear and sharp career changes.

c. It would penalize faculty members without easily transferable skills.

B. Shifting Faculty to University Based Contract Work

As with most of the other options suggested in this report, this research reassignment could become an ongoing alternative for faculty more interested in research than in teaching but who wish to remain close to an academic setting or for faculty members who desire to take an extended leave from teaching to concentrate on research.

In cases of termination, many faculty members with special research skills might prefer to stay in the Lexington area and within the academic setting of the University, even though there was no opportunity for reassignment to another academic unit. When feasible, the displaced faculty member could be reassigned to an appropriately modified research professor series.

Depending upon individual situations, many approaches might be used and particulars tailored to individual needs. The committee, however, recommends the following general guidelines:

- ① During the first term of reappointment, the University would provide continued fringe benefits and three fourths of the salary. (This would amount to a University savings of about \$7500 per year for a \$30,000 salary.)
- ② During the second term of reappointment, the University would provide continued fringe benefits and one half of the salary. (A University savings of about \$15,000 per year on a \$30,000 salary.)
- ③ During the third term of reappointment, the University would continue the fringe benefits and pay one fourth of the salary. (A University savings of about \$22,500 per year on a \$30,000 salary.)
- ④ During the fourth and fifth terms of the reappointment, the University would continue the fringe benefits. (A savings of \$30,000 per year.)
- ⑤ During the five year University subsidized period, the

Appendix B at the end of this report.

Because our further research uncovered no options more attractive than those outlined in the 1983 Lowery Committee report, our committee endorses those alternatives with some modifications.

A. Change of Faculty to Other Academic Units

This option permits a faculty member to shift from one department or discipline to another without change in salary or professional status. For possible conditions under which such shifts might take place, see page 9, Lowery Committee Report, Appendix C. Ideally, the faculty member should have: A secondary interest in the new discipline, previous training in it, or professional involvement in a closely related field. In determining the faculty member's acceptability to the new department or discipline, a process similar to that currently used in joint appointments should be followed.

Because many academic disciplines share basic skills that are potentially transferrable, some faculty members may request such a change as a feasible alternative to professional stagnation or to termination. In addition to benefitting the faculty member, this option might alleviate the pressures generated on some programs by changing student enrollments or faculty attrition.

When necessary, the faculty member should be given paid leave to upgrade skills or to change specialities.

If the move is offered as an alternative to termination, the faculty member should retain the right to refuse the reassignment and to appeal to a faculty committee or established investigative panel. Within a specified time (two years, three years) the faculty member should have the right of termination under a severance pay plan or an early retirement plan.

Advantages

- a. It provides faculty with an option to make a career change without seeking employment in another university, or in the case of impending termination, to retain a traditional academic role.
- b. It allows for shifts in program emphasis or changes in faculty attrition with the least faculty or program disruption.
- c. It allows programs to be terminated without dismissing valuable tenured faculty.

Disadvantages

- a. Because such assignments have a set fee at the University, the cost would be no more than hiring any other part-time teacher.

Disadvantages

- a. The faculty member's annuity would lose the benefits gained by the cost of living and merit increments normally accrued with full-time employment.
- c. Retirement Research The University could agree to make the services of the University of Kentucky Research Foundation available to an early retiree in obtaining research grants and to allow post retirement contracts in the research professor series -- full or part-time, according to the conditions of the grant.

Advantages

- a. It could prove an incentive for senior professors who wish to devote more time to research.
- b. The University could benefit from the grant money, the prestige, and the training of graduate students.

II. EXPANDING FACULTY OPTIONS

While our charge to consider alternatives to termination was motivated by concerns about financial emergencies, we strongly deem it desirable that the alternatives suggested in this report become a positive plan for providing faculty development opportunities beyond that driven by budget problems. Although our current sabbatical leave program is excellent, it will not suffice for future faculty development and will need expansion.

In researching what alternatives have been adopted by other universities, the Committee found one publication especially useful -- Expanding Faculty Options--published by the American Association for Higher Education in 1981. It describes in some detail the opportunities devised in several institutions for faculty members to shift professional interests in mid-career. Not necessarily related to periods of financial emergency, these shifts may also be motivated by such factors as career burnout, restricted mobility, shifting enrollments, and salary limitations.

Two programs that seem especially applicable to the needs and capabilities of the University of Kentucky are those instituted at California State University at Long Beach and at the University of Wisconsin. The Wisconsin program is broader in scope and not only deals with guidelines for implementation, but also identifies policies for faculty transfer and exchange. The documents obtained from these two sources are included in

Disadvantages

- a. The plan could not be used as an emergency measure in short-term emergencies.
- b. The faculty member's annuity would lose the benefits gained by the cost of living and merit increments normally accrued when employed.
- c. The University might lose its strongest faculty members who may welcome the opportunity of early retirement so that they may seek positions elsewhere.

3. Phased Retirement Plans

Phased retirement plans allow faculty members to continue working part time after the decision to retire. The retiree may continue teaching classes on a part-time basis or engaging in University-based research. Again, because of the cost of such a plan, the committee cautions the need for long-range planning. (See Table 1.3, page 6a.)

- a. Part-Time Tenure With this plan the University and the faculty member can agree on a contract for part-time employment (half or quarter time) until retirement, with fringe benefits retained at full-time salary level. Two possibilities might be offered:
 - 1) Retirees could receive half or one quarter salary and request an adjustment of their retirement pension annuity to make up the remainder;
 - 2) As an added incentive, they could receive their full pension annuity with a part-time stipend added.

Advantages

- a. It would encourage valuable senior faculty to continue serving on graduate students committees, to carry a limited teaching load, or to work on special research projects while allowing departments either to hire younger faculty or retrain existing faculty to replace the retiree.
- b. It should reduce the need for departments to hire advanced faculty as "younger faculty" could gain experience before the senior faculty takes full retirement.
- b. Guaranteed Extra Assignments When feasible, the faculty member can retire with full retirement pension and a contract to receive summer or evening class assignments for a specified period.

Advantages

Cost (Savings) Associated With Implementation
of Various Early Retirement Options - Faculty

1. Early Retirement with Lump Sum and Fringe Annuities (retirement between 62 and 65 with lump sum TIAA/CREF for remaining years and continuation of group health and life insurance)	<u>Assumptions</u>	<u>1984-85</u>	<u>1985-86</u>	<u>1986-87</u>	<u>1987-88</u>	<u>Entry Level Faculty</u>		
	Retiree Salary	\$40,000	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	Salary	\$21,000	
	Retirement	4,000	12,000	--	--	Retirement	\$ 2,100	
	Social Security	2,800	--	--	--	Soc Sec	\$ 1,200	
	Health & Life	400	550	550	550	Health&Life	\$ 550	
	Retiree Comp.	\$47,200	\$12,550	\$ 550	\$ 550		\$24,850	
	Savings Available	-0-	\$34,650	\$46,650	\$46,650			
2. Early Retirement with Benefit Incentives		<u>1984-85</u>	<u>1985-86</u>	<u>1986-87</u>	<u>1987-88</u>	<u>1988-89</u>	<u>1989-90</u>	<u>1990-91</u>
	Retiree Salary	\$40,000	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --
	Retirement	4,000	40,000	--	--	--	--	--
	Social Security	2,800	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Health & Life	400	550	550	550	550	550	550
	Retiree Comp.	\$47,200	\$40,550	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550
	Savings Available	-0-	\$ 6,650	\$46,650	\$46,650	\$46,650	\$46,650	\$46,650
		<u>1991-92</u>	<u>1992-93</u>	<u>1993-94</u>	<u>1994-95</u>			
	Retiree Salary	--	--	--	--			
	Retirement	--	--	--	--			
	Social Security	--	--	--	--			
	Health & Life	550	550	550	550			
	Retiree Comp.	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550			
	Savings Available	\$46,650	\$46,650	\$46,650	\$46,650			
3. Phased Retirement Plan - contract for part-time employment until retirement with fringe benefits retained at full-time salary level.		<u>1984-85</u>	<u>1985-86</u>	<u>1986-87</u>	<u>1987-88</u>			
	Retiree Salary	\$40,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500			
	Retirement	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000			
	Social Security	2,800	500	500	500			
	Health & Life	400	550	550	550			
	Retiree Comp.	\$47,200	\$12,550	\$12,550	\$12,550			
	Savings Available	-0-	\$34,650	\$34,650	\$34,650			

Assumptions: (1) Any cost associated with an individual opting for early retirement would be absorbed at the sector level, either through (a) not filling the position, or (b) delaying the filling of the position for the period of time needed to support the initial cost of the early retirement. (2) Costs associated with the early retirement of an individual within the unfunded retirement plan would also be borne by the sector.

12/11/84

to no more than 90% of the old salary to attain the break even point.

- b. The benefits to the retiree would be greater than is now possible for early retirement.

Disadvantages

- a. The retiree is penalized by losing the normal increase in TIAA-CREF premiums and the accrued interest on those payments.
- b. Certain tax implications might penalize the employee; for example, there is a possibility of taxation on TIAA-CREF premiums paid after retirement.

This plan could be made more advantageous to the retiree by including a lump sum equal to one year's salary at the salary rate at the time of retirement. Under this more equitable arrangement, the short term cost would be greater to the University than the fringe benefit plan, but a minimal potential savings of two years' salary could result. And in cases where the faculty member might otherwise elect to teach beyond age 65, the University could save up to seven years' salary.

B. Early Retirement with Benefit Incentives

Because benefit incentives are more costly to the institution, the committee recommends that this plan only be considered as a long-term one which will require considerable financial planning.

In this plan, TIAA-CREF premiums based on the salary at the time of retirement and the fringe health benefits would be continued for the years remaining to age 65 or up to a maximum of ten years. This plan might encourage faculty members to retire earlier than age 62 because they could benefit from annual interest accumulation and possible gains in CREF investments. Moreover, faculty members wishing to retire at ages between 55 and 65 could add to the annual premiums before retirement to help compensate for the loss of salary increments.

Advantages

- a. When the faculty member's line is to be dropped, the University would benefit from a complete salary savings for the remaining years of employment. (See Table 1.2, page 6a.)
- b. When the line is to be retained, the University could save on the lower salary paid to a junior faculty member.

(old change of assignment plan) which must be considered when the regulations are changed.

Any early retirement should result only by mutual consent of the University and the faculty member. The committee emphasizes that these plans are not an academic right, but an opportunity for both parties to benefit. The Committee also recognizes that (although not one of our charges) any adoption of an early retirement program should include non-faculty employees as well.

Despite the wide diversity of the retirement plans studied, we concluded that they fit three general classifications-- early retirement with a lump sum annuity, early retirement with benefit incentives, and phased retirement plans. Any of these could be adopted either as a short-term emergency measure or as part of a long-term retirement program.

Due to the cost implementations associated with the adoption of the various early retirement options, the Committee has included an assessment of the cost and the assumptions regarding how these costs would be borne (see pages 6a,17,18). The underlying assumptions are that any cost associated with opting for early retirement would be absorbed at the sector level, either through (a) not filling the position, or (b) delaying the filling of the position for the period of time needed to support the initial cost of the early retirement. These assumptions must be considered when developing University policies which implement the recommended early retirement options.

A. Early Retirement with Lump Sum and Fringe Annuities

If a faculty member retires between the ages of 62 to 65, the TIAA-CREF premiums for the remaining years until normal retirement age are paid by the University in a lump sum at the rate of the last full year of payment to TIAA-CREF at retirement. In addition, group health and life insurance are continued for the years remaining until normal retirement age.

Advantages

- a. The University would benefit from the three year salary cost and the savings in premium increments. For example, a faculty member with a basic annual salary of \$40,000 entails these additional institution costs: Retirement--\$4000; FICA--\$2800 (1985 cost); Health and life insurance-- \$400. Together with the \$40,000 salary, the total direct cost is \$47,200. If the position is not filled, then the annual savings to the University would be \$34,650, and \$46,650 in the ensuing years. (See Table I,1 on page 6a.)

However, if a new person is hired to replace the line, care must be taken to limit the new salary

toward complete or phased retirement.

The recommended options in this report could become a part of a total package of early retirement options offered on a permanent basis, serving as financial emergency measures or offering early retirement to a limited number of faculty members each year in normal times. In restricting the number of retirees, the Administration might follow the suggestion made several years ago by the Employee Benefits Committee of the local AAUP chapter to authorize twenty-five eligible employees each year for early retirement. Or the Administration might allow each sector or college to determine the number of retirements it could support, since some of the recommended plans provide an added flexibility which can benefit some units.

So that across-the-board early retirement does not result in the excessive loss of valuable senior faculty in a department, college, or program, further criteria should be established. In addition to the conditions set up in our definition of early retirement, the Administration might consider adopting some safeguard guidelines. The committee suggests these as possibilities:

- That the department chair or program director and the appropriate dean be involved in the granting of approval when a faculty member in the unit requests early retirement.
- That such factors as these might be considered in determining which faculty might choose full or phased retirement:
 - a Possible impact on the department or program involved,
 - b The need of a department to retain a senior faculty member on a part-time basis so that the quality of a graduate program is sustained,
 - c Whether or not the candidate for retirement is in a unit being eliminated or phased out,
 - d The candidate's professional or physical health (this would require careful consideration of the candidate with the department chair, the dean, and other qualified consultants).

Before early retirement can be implemented at the University of Kentucky, the following sections of the retirement regulations (AR II-1.6-1) will need amendment: II. A and D; III B.1.2.3 and 4. In section III faculty members who will reach 65 on or before June 30, 1989 and who currently have twenty or more years of service are given rights under the minimum benefit provisions

RECOMMENDATIONS

In compliance with the committee's charge not to limit ourselves to options exclusively for "hard times," we examined options implemented at other universities both for times of economic constraint and of economic stability. The recommendations made for early retirement and expanding faculty options are primarily designed as alternatives that may become a permanent part of the faculty benefit package. Although many might serve as short-term financial emergency measures, others will need considerable planning for implementation and funding. In all cases, the options should be determined only by mutual agreement between the participating faculty member and the administration. Recognizing that there may be instances when the administration might initiate an option and others when the faculty member requests it, the committee urges that procedures outlined in the appropriate regulations take the two situations into account.

The third set of suggestions--severance options-- are recommended only for short-term economic emergencies or when programs or departments are being phased out and no other alternatives are feasible.

I. EARLY RETIREMENT PLANS

Adapting a definition of early retirement suggested by Hans H. Jenny (Jenny, 1974) in an essay prepared for TIAA, the committee offers this definition for the purposes of this report and as a possible basis for early retirement plans developed by the University of Kentucky.

Early retirement is (1) retirement after continuing service of thirty years or more, or (2) up to ten years prior to the normal age of retirement (65) after a minimum of ten years of service.

Obviously, adopting such a broad definition would require the University to offer some of the options only after some careful long-range planning, both on the part of the administration and the faculty member seeking an early retirement plan. Because of this, the committee urges the Administration to begin such planning as soon as it becomes feasible to do so. In addition, the committee suggests that the Administration follow the pattern implemented in other institutions by first formulating a general mechanism for early retirement and then setting up several plans, one of which would be highly flexible and would thus permit faculty members to develop an early retirement plan peculiar to their professional needs and financial situations. For example, faculty members interested in outside activities such as free-lance writing or consulting for private firms might welcome an opportunity to plan far in advance of the normal retirement age, perhaps even contributing part of their salary

BACKGROUND

Within the last decade, the University of Kentucky, like many other institutions of higher learning in the United States, has suffered serious fiscal shortages on several occasions. In addition, we have experienced the same changes common to other institutions: changing patterns in student mix, declining enrollments, shifting emphases on careers pursued by students, increasing numbers of non-traditional students. As a result, we have found ourselves overstaffed in some areas and woefully understaffed in others, with shrinking financial resources to provide the flexibility of resources needed to meet the demands growing out of these changes.

Because of this financial and academic crisis, we must meet the challenges recognized by other institutions: how to attain adequate flexibility in the allocation of existing faculty; how to find ways of nurturing the intellectual vitality of existing faculty in order to maintain high quality programs; how to create opportunities for training faculty for new academic roles; and how to open avenues of revenue for hiring the new faculty members who are so important a catalyst in maintaining a stimulating intellectual environment.

To meet these challenges, many institutions are implementing a number of career alternatives for faculty. In times of extreme fiscal shortages, some, such as Michigan State University, have been forced to adopt severance options. Others, like the University of California system, the University of Minnesota, and Purdue University have created a number of early retirement plans, designed both to serve as alternatives to termination and as a procedure for providing opportunities for hiring new faculty. In addition to early retirement options, other institutions (the University of Wisconsin, for example), have set up a formal, on-going mechanism for faculty development and renewal.

Because the problems of the University of Kentucky which arose in the late 1970's appear likely to continue for the next decade or so, the Committee recommends that faculty alternatives be adopted with the intent of making them a permanent part of the of the faculty benefit package, rather than as ad hoc responses to fiscal shortages. This Committee agrees with the assessment of the Lowery Committee that continuing to depend on natural faculty attrition and on freezing positions will result in some departments and colleges carrying " a disproportionate share of the University's response" to fiscal shortfalls with the result that "faculty mix may match very poorly the University's relative emphasis on academic disciplines."

The Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Alternatives was jointly appointed in January 1984 by the Chair of the Senate Council and the President of the University. Stemming from two prior committee reports to the University Senate Council in 1983, both offering recommendations for procedures to deal with possible termination of faculty members in case of fiscal emergency, the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Alternatives was given these charges:

1. The major task of the Committee is to identify alternative procedures for utilizing faculty resources and to analyze their administrative feasibility and acceptability to faculty.
2. The Committee should examine the options suggested by the Lowery Committee and other options that the Committee considers pertinent. It should gather information on the advantages and disadvantages, and the costs of such options.
3. The Committee should recommend those options that it considers most desirable and feasible, in two categories:
 - a. Those options that it believes should be implemented.
 - b. Those options that might be put into effect if the university's financial situation worsens.

The Committee began work in January, 1984, splitting into two subcommittees -- one to investigate severance options and early retirement plans; the other to study faculty development and renewal alternatives. As a point of departure, we used the guidelines and recommendations made in the 1983 Senate Council report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Alternatives to Termination in Cases of Fiscal Exigency. We then developed a bibliography and solicited information from other universities, including our own benchmark institutions. (These materials are provided in the Appendix accompanying this report.)

Like the Fiscal Exigency Committee, we found many plans that either were not applicable to the situation at this university or unacceptable to our faculty and/or the administration. This report, then, concentrates on those alternatives that we feel are possible and workable in the University of Kentucky system. Also, the options recommended are limited to those most advantageous to both faculty and administrative needs.

ABSTRACT

After studying a variety of early retirement, faculty development, and severance plans, the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Alternatives elected to include in its report only those options most applicable to the University of Kentucky situation. Some of our suggested plans are intended exclusively for fiscal emergencies; others could become permanent additions to the benefit package.

Three types of early retirement plans are presented in the report: 1) Early retirement with lump sum annuities and continued fringe benefits; 2) early retirement with benefit incentives; and 3) phased retirement plans.

A second area studied by the Committee involved ways to expand faculty options other than by termination or retirement. The plans outlined in this report offer faculty members an opportunity to shift professional interests in mid-career, either because of the individual's desire to pursue a new field or because an academic unit is eliminated or reduced. Not restricted to emergency periods, these shifts can also be motivated by career burnout, restricted mobility, changing enrollments, or salary limitations. The report includes plans for the reassignment of faculty to other academic units, for shifting faculty to University-based contract work, and for faculty development and renewal.

The Committee suggests two severance options for use in short-term emergencies: 1) emergency early retirement with up to two years severance pay and fringe benefits continued for the first year of the two year agreement; 2) termination of tenured faculty with the added option of receiving one year's severance pay in lieu of the presently stipulated one year's notice. The latter would require a change in Administrative Regulation II-1.0-1, III C.; suggested rewording is included in this report.

Finally, the report contains recommendations for implementing the program suggestions made by the Committee.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE

Academic Year 1985-86

1985

August 5	Monday -- Fourth-year students begin rotations Last day for fourth-year students to withdraw from the College of Medicine for a full refund of fees.
August 5-6	Monday-Tuesday -- Third-year registration & orientation
August 7	Wednesday -- Third-year students begin classes Last day for third-year students to withdraw from the College of Medicine for a full refund of fees.
August 12	Monday -- Last day for fourth year students to officially withdraw from the College of Medicine and receive an 80 percent refund
August 14	Wednesday -- Last day for third year students to officially withdraw from the College of Medicine and receive an 80 percent refund
August 19	Monday -- First-year students registration & orientation
August 20	Tuesday -- First-year students begin classes Last day for first-year students to withdraw from the College of Medicine for a full refund of fees.
August 26	Monday -- Second-year students register & begin classes Last day for second-year students to withdraw from the College of Medicine for a full refund of fees.
August 26	Monday -- Last day for first year students to officially withdraw from the College of Medicine and receive an 80 percent refund
September 2	Monday -- First & Second-year students--LABOR DAY HOLIDAY
September 3	Tuesday -- Last day for second year students to officially withdraw from the College of Medicine and receive an 80 percent refund
September 20	Friday -- Last day for fourth year students to withdraw from the College of Medicine and receive any refund
September 25	Wednesday -- Last day for third year students to withdraw from the College of Medicine and receive any refund
October 8	Tuesday -- Last day for first year students to withdraw from the College of Medicine and receive any refund
October 14	Monday -- Last day for second year students to withdraw from the College of Medicine and receive any refund

happiest about the committee trying to provide a set of criteria that would make sense out of whatever courses could be added.

Professor Jewell asked how much change would be made in the existing courses if two faculty members in two departments found they had courses that might be paired. Professor Swift said there would be a committee to set the criteria.

Professor Swift thanked the senate for its kind attention and said if they had any comments to contact any of the committee members and share their thoughts. Professor Jewell suggested it was important to have the report circulated to every faculty member.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Randall W. Dahl
Secretary

The revised 1985-86 calendars for the College of Medicine are attached for your information.

Fifty percent of students enrolling have two years of a foreign language in their high school experience. Professor Kemp also wanted to know if the requirements would be phased in. Professor Swift said that was a decision the subsequent committee would have to make.

Professor Rizzo wanted to know how much of an adjustment was involved in getting senior faculty to teach the courses. Professor Swift said the significant thing which had to happen was that everyone would have to take this dimension of the University's responsibility very seriously.

Professor Applegate felt there was nothing in the report to insure any instruction that might enhance students to communicate effectively in spoken and written language. Professor Swift's answer was that every committee report and every decision made by more than one person is a compromise. In the formal recommendation Professor Swift said everything could not be included in a formal sense. He said the committee felt that was an important dimension and tried to incorporate it in the general education courses. Professor Applegate felt what was basically being said was that writing was more important than spoken communication. He felt oral communication skills warranted formal instruction. Professor Swift said judgments in the general education program would have to be made. He said the faculty would be making the final decisions. He said the committee did not devalue one over another. He stressed the point there was no system which could be written that would guarantee that every class would be taught as it ought to be taught.

Professor Rea said one of the problems for the freshman seminars was the dependence on individuals who propose the seminars. Professor Swift felt one of the difficulties was that students were not stimulated their freshman year to have some feel for intellectual gain. Professor Chapman said there was a lot of enthusiasm during the first years of the freshman seminars but topics dwindled as far as new ideas. The same people started teaching the seminars, and there was a lack of direction. Barbara Mabry said the problem was the seminars were not counted as a requirement.

Professor Rees wanted to know how the courses were going to be implemented into the cross-disciplinary requirements. Professor Swift said this was an opportunity to rethink what was being done now and see in what way one person's course could enhance another's course. He hoped the departments would work together to create the coupled offerings.

Professor Swift said the committee had come up with a program that would increase the required hours for some students if they did not have algebra or a foreign language, but within those confines the committee had stayed in the present system with the total number of hours. He said an important thing to remember was that in some colleges this program would be an automatic step for a student getting a degree. Professor Frye emphasized that it was going to be necessary for every unit to take the program and see the acceptability in their own program.

Professor Swift asked the senators to ask themselves one question. "Is this program better than what we have now?" If it is not, then the University will stay with its present program. Professor Swift said it was important to distinguish between the Arts and Sciences requirement and the University's requirement. Professor Olschewsky wanted to know if there was anything in the conception of the plan to preclude the College of Arts and Sciences. Professor Swift said every Arts and Sciences graduate would pick up every requirement. He said a foundation was being created which the committee did not feel was now in the curriculum. He was the

activity will we think produce results not just in the classroom, but in our own professional lives as researchers.

We would like to make only two recommendations about the method of proceeding. The first is that an effort be made to share the report with as many people in the academic community as possible. Strong faculty support based on a clear understanding of the recommendations is a sine qua non for the success of the new program. Secondly we ask that you treat the recommendations as a seamless garment to be accepted or rejected with only minor changes. Tearing a piece out here or attaching another there can only weaken or destroy the threads that run through the proposal and the result may be even less valuable than the present system. Going back to the drawing table is a thought none of the committee relishes, but it would be better to do that than to amend the proposal from the floor.

I cannot close without paying tribute to all the committee and sub-committee members who worked so assiduously for months on end. The list at the end of this report includes current members but not those who rendered yeoman service for a time and those on sub-committees who were not part of the larger committee. To all of these I express my deep gratitude. To the regular members who sat around the conference table in the Student Center week after week hammering out the proposal I can only say that I have never worked with a more devoted, industrious, disputatious and accommodating group of people. Disagreements abounded--how they abounded! But I can say without exaggeration that compromise and charity prevailed. I am certainly in their debt and I think the University is as well.

Finally in suggesting that time and opportunity be provided throughout the academic community for discussion and comment we are not proposing endless time or endless opportunity. We think the moment has come for a new beginning and whatever we decide we need to do it with despatch. Edward Prichard, of happy memory, expressed our sentiments very well when he said, 'The best way to commence is to commence.' We think it is time to commence."

The committee members were William Adams, Anthropology; Kathlene Ashcraft, student; Raymond Betts, Honors Program; Connie Bridge, Education; James Chapman, Resource Management; John Christopher, Arts and Sciences; Nancy Dye, Arts and Sciences; Joseph Engelberg, Physiology; Juanita Fleming, Nursing; Wilbur Frye, Agronomy; Thomas Gray, Biological Sciences; Steve Greenwell, student; Jesse Harris, Psychology; Robert Hemenway, English; David Johnson, Mathematics; David Kao, Civil Engineering; Michael Kerwin, Community College System; Barbara Mabry, Arts and Sciences; Craigie Sanders, student; Donald Sands, Academic Affairs; Patricia Smith, Philosophy; and Louis Swift, Classics, Chairman.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Professor Kemp wanted to know why there were no hours attached to mathematics and language requirement. Professor Swift said they were skills which a large percentage of students presently possess.

students, experience in the three major areas of learning (natural sciences, social sciences and humanities); experience in relating one discipline with another, and contact with non Western ways of thinking. This design involves both the revival of earlier patterns and the fashioning of new ones. In the area of skills and in the disciplinary requirements we are saying, in effect, that some abandoned practices never did lose their value and that a return to them is a necessary step in adequately preparing students to understand their world to cope with it in the decades to come.

The cross-disciplinary requirement is a new dimension to undergraduate education at U.K. The committee is convinced that somewhere in their academic career students must have the experience of consciously relating what they learn in one field to what they learn in another. We see this requirement not just as a means of broadening the students' experience but as an incentive as well for faculty and departments. To look at traditional classroom materials in new ways, to expand their perspective and to provide more enriched and enriching courses from a purely organizational point of view the requirement also enlarges the franchise in general education. Departments and individuals heretofore not involved in this area of the University curriculum now have an opportunity to make a contribution.

The cross cultural requirement is a very modest, but we think, very important new dimension. Kentucky students have no monopoly on provincialism but the fact that a short coming is shared by others makes it no less debilitating and the truism about a shrinkin world becomes truer every day. Whatever be the difficulties of implementing this recommendation, we simply have to make a start.

I think we ought to realize that by strengthening the general education requirements at the University we automatically lend support to the efforts at improvement in the secondary schools. Higher levels of expectation on our part stimulate higher levels of performance among potential applicants. By demanding quality we also enhance the value of the U.K. experience and we give assurance to the parents of students across the Commonwealth that their sons and daughters are getting the very best that we can offer.

I would like to underscore the point made in the report that we are faced not with just a task but a precious opportunity. The value of a comprehensive revision such as the one we have proposed, is mostly dependent on the enthusiasm and conviction with which we undertake its implementation. There is much detailed work to be done, but there is much satisfaction to be gained from reexamining what we are doing in specific courses, what our aims are and how effectively we are achieving them. The discourse entailed in that

Professor Rea said much of the discussion was against the annual review, but the proposal did not address that issue. Professor Bostrom asked Professor Frye the feeling of the deans which he had polled. Professor Frye said as a general principle the deans were in favor of the proposal. One of the questions raised by all the administrators was the frequency which was not resolved.

The motion failed.

Chairman Bostrom recognized Professor David Lowery to present the final report of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Alternatives, chaired by Professor Jean Pival. Professor Lowery said one of the yeoman recommendations was the establishment of an office for faculty development. The office would be charged with developing potentially a set of programs for faculty development. These programs might include retraining options for faculty, shifting faculty from one academic unit to another and involve faculty choosing part-time teaching. Professor Lowery said the specific options available are discussed in the report. He advised the senators to look at a full set of options to choose the advantages and disadvantages. He felt the key thing to remember is that the options be made a voluntary agreement between faculty and the administration on an individual basis. Professor Lowery said he would be happy to answer any questions. (The total report is attached to these minutes.)

There were no questions, and the senate voted unanimously to recommend the report to the administration.

Chairman Bostrom recognized Professor Louis Swift for a report from the ad hoc Committee on General Education. Professor Swift's report follows:

"Thank you Bob. It's a distinct pleasure to be here today not the least because the report you have in hand represents what we hope is the end of this committee's work. There were times during the last seven months when many of us thought that the Second Coming would predate the appearance of our recommendations. Happily that is not the case and I am pleased to say that the report has the unanimous support of the committee.

We had no knowledge when we began work two and a half years ago that 1985 would be a time when interest in curricular reform was cresting in colleges and universities across the nation and when education was a matter of intense concern within the Commonwealth. In that context at least we feel that the report is most timely, and we believe it represents a contribution to the betterment of undergraduate education at UK. In terms of the institution it is perhaps long overdue, but that fact has, I believe, increased our sense of urgency and sharpened our own thinking.

I will not attempt to summarize the results of that thinking which are fairly well delineated in the document, but let me for a few moments highlight some of the report's dimensions and implications. One of the most persistent complaints that surfaced about our present system was that it contained too many courses and that it lacked coherence. In short it was not so much a program as a collage. We believe that the proposed University Studies does have coherence. It is based on a set of organizing principles or criteria which we think are essential to a sound undergraduate education. These can be reduced to four: training in writing language and mathematical sciences for all

Chairman Bostrom recognized Professor Ellinger for an announcement. Professor Ellinger invited everyone to a symposium on cheating and plagiarism on Wednesday, April 17 from 4:00 to 9:00 p.m. Those participating will be Jean Pival, Bill Fortune, an individual from the University of Cincinnati, and possibly a student. There is a limited amount of space so Professor Ellinger requested that everyone call the Office of the Ombudsman at 7-3737 and verify attendance.

The Chairman announced a called Senate Meeting for May 6 and asked the senators to keep the afternoon open at 3:00 p.m.

Chairman Bostrom recognized Professor Bradley Canon, Secretary of the Senate Council, for a motion. Professor Canon, on behalf of the Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposal to alter the Administrative Regulations, AR II-1.0-6, relative to evaluations of administrators. Professor Canon said the proposal was before the senate last month and was referred to the Senate Council for revision. The Senate Council made two revisions. The proposal will be forwarded to the administration for consideration. This proposal was circulated to members of the senate under date of March 27, 1985.

Professor Jesse Harris gave statements from chairmen of their reactions to review and evaluation. One favored all evaluations of all administrative personnel on campus. A second person from a small department said, "Let them review all they want. I don't care." The rest were negative. One said, "Every four years is enough. Every year is too much." Another said, "Every two years is enough." "Evaluations consume an enormous amount of time and energy." It seemed to Professor Harris the faculty made judgments and then would have to live with their errors for a few years. He felt the departments the proposal could help were most likely those that could be stabilized by an annual review. He felt there was a need for a uniformed procedure within academic units and moved that item be considered.

Student Senator Ashcraft moved an amendment to add "students" to the list of examples such as "...chairpersons, deans, directors of schools, deans of instruction and research, students, and other appropriate administrative officers." The amendment was seconded.

Student Senator Freudenberg said it seemed to him if students wanted to be involved in the process of decision making in selection and evaluation of chairmen, the amendment would guarantee the students would have that opportunity. Professor Eakin said it was hard to get student input so it would add to the administrative burden as well as to the cost. Professor Rea clarified the proposal was a review of the unit and not just the chairman so the students would be evaluating the whole department.

Professor Gilmore moved the previous question which was seconded and passed. The motion to amend failed.

Dean Royster agreed with Professor Harris. He felt the senate should be thinking of ways in which the chairmen could be working in the programs rather than handling paperwork. Professor Marino said Business and Economics had an annual review and felt four years was too long between reviews. Professor Rees felt that more complex the evaluation was the more unsuccessful it was. Perhaps something could be worked out with less paperwork. Professor Applegate spoke in favor of the proposal. He did not feel it was unmanageable and felt the benefits would outweigh the disadvantages.

Professor Eakin said if there were problems in a department, the faculty would not wait a year without letting the dean know. He did not know what kind of communication the proposal was going to open up, but basically he regarded it as a waste of time.

The Chairman said the motion to substitute was only debatable on whether or not there was a desirability to substitute and not the substance of the motion.

In a hand count the substitute motion carried.

Professor Altenkirch reminded the senators that admission by exception was not determined by the Admissions Office but by the Exceptions Committee appointed by the Chancellor. Yet, the last sentence of the substitute motion stated "...this table shall be used by the Admissions Office in judging the acceptability of otherwise qualified applicants." He said the Admissions Office could not accept the exceptions. Dr. Sands said perhaps the amendment could be put in a different section of the Senate Rules and the committee could use it as a guide. Professor Altenkirch said if the amendment remained in the category of "admission by exception" then the responsibility of making the decision was for the committee appointed by the Chancellor and not by the Admissions Office.

Professor Jewell asked if the Rules Committee could put the amendment in the proper place in the University Senate Rules. Chairman Bostrom said the substitute motion would go to the Rules Committee for codification. The routine senate procedure is that the Rules Committee oversees the writing of the new rule.

There was no further debate, and the motion passed unanimously. The proposal as amended follows:

Proposal:

Add the following paragraph to the section on Admission by Exception:

The University of Kentucky prefers that applicants for admission shall have taken the ACT examination. Applicants may be considered for admission, however, on the basis of Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores. The Director of Admissions shall establish annually an appropriate equivalency table of total SAT and ACT composite scores to be used with the established lower division selective admissions criteria. After approval by the Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards, this table shall be used by the Admissions Office in judging the acceptability of otherwise qualified applicants.

Implementation Date: Spring Semester, 1986.

Rationale:

There are other measures of student potential that are at least as reliable as the ACT scores. Many students who are applying to out-of-state colleges take the SAT test. Our insistence that they take also the ACT is an imposition that many of them will reject. We cannot afford to lose outstanding potential students because of a rigid and inflexible requirement on a specific examination.

In cases where specific ACT scores are used for placement in courses or acceptance to certain programs, local placement examinations can be designed and administered.

The amendment to the Senate Rules, Section 2.1.1 (d) as presented by Dr. Sands reads as follows:

The University of Kentucky prefers that applicants for admission shall have taken the ACT examination. Applicants may be considered for admission, however, on the basis of Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores. The Director of Admissions shall establish annually an appropriate equivalency table of total SAT and ACT composite scores to be used with the established lower division selective admissions criteria. After approval by the Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards, this table shall be used by the Admissions Office in judging the acceptability of otherwise qualified applicants.

The parliamentarian pointed out the Senate would first vote on whether to substitute. If the Senate voted to substitute, the motion presented would be the only item considered.

In the discussion on the motion to substitute Professor Rees wanted to know if the substitute motion was an amendment. The Chair said in amending the motion it became the substitute proposal. Professor Hochstrasser wanted to know if the current rule 2.1.1 (a) would stay as it was. The Chair said it would because the amendment was 2.1.1 (d).

Professor McMahan asked if the substitution contemplated that the applicant must designate which score would be used and if so, did the applicant designate in advance which score he/she would use or after they had taken the test. Dr. Sands' response was that the admissions office would do its best to determine if the student was qualified for admission and would consider both scores. He added it would essentially leave it to the Admissions Office.

Professor Altenkirch did not see how the substitute motion was different in substance from the original motion. Dr. Sands said they were trying to avoid trouble with the Council on Higher Education. It was felt the substitute motion would be acceptable to the Council. Professor Altenkirch said he did not understand the rationale. Dr. Dahl, the University Registrar, said the Council on Higher Education was charged by statute to establish the minimum requirements for admission to the public institutions. It has specified the ACT as the admissions test to be utilized. By placing this provision under the exceptions category it allows the University the flexibility to consider applicants from other states and remain clearly within the provisions of the guidelines for undergraduate admissions promulgated by the Council.

Professor Altenkirch said the information was not needed in the exceptions category and that information could be put in the Bulletin and not in the Senate Rules. Dr. Sands said in the past the Admissions Office had not felt free to consider students on the basis of the SAT. Students were told they had to take the ACT. The purpose of the proposal was to get away from that and reassure the Admissions Office they do have the authority to consider students who had the SAT.

Dean Royster wanted to know if there were very many students from Kentucky who had taken the SAT that were required to also take the ACT. Dr. Rice, Director of Admissions, said the use of the SAT would give UK access to students who had taken the SAT with plans to go out-of-state. Secondly, over 16,000 students in the state of Kentucky are taking the preliminary SAT which could be used as a screening tool. Thirdly, SAT is the preferred test in many states. Right now the University is receiving over 14,000 SAT tests which cannot be used.

Miss Blanding was born in 1898 on a small farm near Lexington, Ky., to an internal revenue officer and his wife. She attended the New Haven (Conn.) Normal School of Gymnastics and upon graduating agreed to teach at the University of Kentucky, on the condition that she could attend classes in the mornings and leave teaching to the afternoons.

After she graduated in 1923, she remained at the university as acting dean of women. At 24, she was the youngest person in the country to hold such a post. She earned a master's degree at Columbia University in 1926 and studied at the London School of Economics, under Harold Laski, who later became Deputy Prime Minister to Winston Churchill.

In 1928, she returned to the University of Kentucky, serving as dean of women and teaching political science.

In 1941, she became dean of the New York State College of Home Economics at Cornell University, where she remained until Vassar asked her to assume its presidency.

At her retirement in 1964, the Vassar faculty presented her with a tractor, evoking both the practical effects of her tenure and her Kentucky childhood.

Miss Blanding is survived by "a few distant relatives in Kentucky," according to a Vassar spokesman, Dixie Sheridan. Miss Blanding asked that there be no funeral or memorial service."

Chairman Bostrom asked the senators to stand for a moment of silence in tribute and respect to Sarah G. Blanding.

Chairman Bostrom recognized Professor Bradley Canon, Secretary of the Senate Council, for a motion on a proposal to include SAT scores as part of the admissions process. Professor Canon, on behalf of the Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposal to alter the University Senate Rules, Section IV., 2.1.1 (a). This proposal was circulated to members of the senate under date of March 29, 1985.

The Chair recognized Dr. Donald Sands, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, for a motion. Dr. Sands said since the proposal had been circulated, there had been complications. Dr. Randall Dahl, the new University Registrar, learned from the Council on Higher Education that it is talking about enforcing specific guidelines on the use of the ACT. The University has not been violating these guidelines. There are some institutions in the state that have been rather careless in this. It is not a matter that the Council would not let us use the SAT for qualified applicants, but we felt this would be an inopportune time to put the SAT on equal basis with the ACT. Therefore, Dr. Dahl, Dr. Rice and Dr. Sands composed the substitute motion which was distributed at the beginning of the meeting. Dr. Sands moved that the Senate approve the substitute motion to be placed in the Senate Rules for admission by exception.

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, APRIL 8, 1985

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, April 8, 1985, in Room 106 of the Classroom Building.

Robert Bostrom, Chairman of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent: Richard Angelo, Charles E. Barnhart, Jack C. Blanton, Tex Lee Boggs, Ray M. Bowen, Daniel J. Breazeale, Ching Chow*, Henry Cole, Glenn B. Collins*, Emmett Costich*, George F. Crewe*, Stephen DeMers, Richard C. Domek, Jr., Herbert Drennon, Nancy E. Dye, Anthony Eardley, William Ecton, Donald G. Ely*, Gerald Ferretti*, Joseph L. Fink, Carolyn Fore, Ray Forgue*, Richard W. Furst, Art Gallaher, Jr.*, Andrew J. Grimes, Marilyn D. Hamann, Lawrence Harris*, Leonard Heller, Raymond Hornback, James Hourigan*, John J. Just, Gail Kennedy, James O. King, Laura L. Ladd*, James R. Lang*, Robert Lawson, O. J. Loewer, Edgar Maddox, Paul Mandelstam*, Sally S. Mattingly*, H. Brinton Milward, Clayton Omvig*, Merrill Packer*, Madhira D. Ram*, Thomas C. Robinson, Gerald A. Rosenthal, Charles Sachatello, Edgar Sagan, Timothy Sineath, Karen Scaff*, Otis A. Singletary*, Joseph V. Swintosky, Howard Sypher, Kenneth Thompson, John Thrailkill*, O'Neil Weeks, Jesse Weil, Charles T. Wethington, Bill White, Carolyn Williams*, Paul A. Willis, Constance Wilson, Robert G. Zumwinkle

The approval of the minutes for the meeting of March 11, 1985, was postponed until May 6, 1985.

Chairman Bostrom read a Memorial Resolution on Sarah G. Blanding that was written by Edward A. Gargan which appeared in The New York Times on March 4, 1985.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

Sarah G. Blanding 1898-1985

"Sarah Gibson Blanding, the first female president of Vassar College, died Sunday, March 3, 1985, at a retirement home in Newtown, Pa., where she had lived since 1980. She was 86 years old.

Miss Blanding, the sixth president of Vassar, led the college from 1946 to 1964. She made major changes in the school's curriculum, emphasizing independent work, and oversaw significant growth in the investment portfolio of the college, which was founded in 1861 in Poughkeepsie, N.Y.

She also pioneered basic research into the psychological changes of students during their college years.

While she was fundamentally concerned with the education of women and their role in society, in 1961 she accurately forecast the gradual disappearance of women's colleges in this country. Vassar began admitting men in 1969.

Miss Blanding was a vigorous and vocal exponent for women. "I have never been conscious of obstacles raised because I am a woman," she said in one of her first interviews as president. "I have no patience with women who are always talking about 'a man's world,' because they are the ones who make it so."

*Absence explained

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

29 March 1985

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet in regular session on Monday, April 8, 1985 at 3:00 p.m. in room 106, Whitehall Classroom Building.

AGENDA:

1. Minutes, March 11, 1985.
2. Announcements and Resolutions.
3. Action Items:
 - a) Proposal to include SAT scores as part of admissions criteria, University Senate Rules, Section IV, 2.1.1 (a). (Circulated under date of 29 March 1985.)
 - b. Proposal to alter the Administrative Regulations, AR II-1.0-6, relative to evaluations of administrators. If approved, the proposal will be forward to the administration for consideration. (Circulated under date of 27 March.)
 - c. Recommendation to the administration: Final report of the Joint Faculty-Administration ad hoc Committee to Study Faculty Alternatives. (Circulated under date of 15 March 1985.)
4. Discussion Item:
 - a. Report from the ad hoc Committee on General Education: L. Swift, Chairman.

George Dexter
Secretary

/cet
0441C

REPORT

OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE
ON FACULTY ALTERNATIVES

Abstract

Charge of committee

Background

Recommendations

1. Early Retirement

University of Kentucky
September 10, 1984

Definition of early retirement

Early Retirement with Loss of
and Fringe Annuitant

Early Retirement with
Incentives

Phased Retirement Plan

Leading Faculty

Jean G. Pival, Chair
Michael Baer
Joseph Burch
A. J. Hiatt
David Lowery
Joan E. McCauley
G. Bruce Miller
Miroslava N. Winer

Change of Faculty
Academic

Shifting Faculty

Based on

Faculty Development

Office of Faculty Development

Insurance Options

Emergency Early Retirement

Tenured Faculty Termination

Recommendations for Implementation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	Page ii
Charge of committee:	Page 1
Background	Page 2
Recommendations	Page 3
I. Early Retirement Plans	Pages 3-8
Definition of early retirement	Page 3
Early Retirement with Lump Sum and Fringe Annuities	Pages 5-6
Early Retirement with Benefit Incentives	Pages 6-7
Phased Retirement Plans	Pages 7-8
Expanding Faculty Options	Pages 8-14
Change of Faculty to Other Academic Units	Pages 9-10
Shifting Faculty to University Based Contract Work	Pages 10-11
Faculty Development and Renewal	Pages 11-13
Office of Faculty Development	Pages 13-14
Severance Options	Pages 14-15
Emergency Early Retirement	Pages 14-15
Tenured Faculty Termination	Page 15
Recommendations for Implementation	Pages 15-16

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	Page ii
Charge of committee:	Page 1
Background	Page 2
Recommendations	Page 3
I. Early Retirement Plans	Pages 3-8
Definition of early retirement	Page 3
Early Retirement with Lump Sum and Fringe Annuities	Pages 5-6
Early Retirement with Benefit Incentives	Pages 6-7
Phased Retirement Plans	Pages 7-8
Expanding Faculty Options	Pages 8-14
Change of Faculty to Other Academic Units	Pages 9-10
Shifting Faculty to University Based Contract Work	Pages 10-11
Faculty Development and Renewal	Pages 11-13
Office of Faculty Development	Pages 13-14
Severance Options	Pages 14-15
Emergency Early Retirement	Pages 14-15
Tenured Faculty Termination	Page 15
Recommendations for Implementation	Pages 15-16

ABSTRACT

After studying a variety of early retirement, faculty development, and severance plans, the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Alternatives elected to include in its report only those options most applicable to the University of Kentucky situation. Some of our suggested plans are intended exclusively for fiscal emergencies; others could become permanent additions to the benefit package.

Three types of early retirement plans are presented in the report: 1) Early retirement with lump sum annuities and continued fringe benefits; 2) early retirement with benefit incentives; and 3) phased retirement plans.

A second area studied by the Committee involved ways to expand faculty options other than by termination or retirement. The plans outlined in this report offer faculty members an opportunity to shift professional interests in mid-career, either because of the individual's desire to pursue a new field or because an academic unit is eliminated or reduced. Not restricted to emergency periods, these shifts can also be motivated by career burnout, restricted mobility, changing enrollments, or salary limitations. The report includes plans for the reassignment of faculty to other academic units, for shifting faculty to University-based contract work, and for faculty development and renewal.

The Committee suggests two severance options for use in short-term emergencies: 1) emergency early retirement with up to two years severance pay and fringe benefits continued for the first year of the two year agreement; 2) termination of tenured faculty with the added option of receiving one year's severance pay in lieu of the presently stipulated one year's notice. The latter would require a change in Administrative Regulation II-1.0-1, III C.; suggested rewording is included in this report.

Finally, the report contains recommendations for implementing the program suggestions made by the Committee.

BACKGROUND

The Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Alternatives was jointly appointed in January 1984 by the Chair of the Senate Council and the President of the University. Stemming from two prior committee reports to the University Senate Council in 1983, both offering recommendations for procedures to deal with possible termination of faculty members in case of fiscal emergency, the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Alternatives was given these charges:

1. The major task of the Committee is to identify alternative procedures for utilizing faculty resources and to analyze their administrative feasibility and acceptability to faculty.
2. The Committee should examine the options suggested by the Lowery Committee and other options that the Committee considers pertinent. It should gather information on the advantages and disadvantages, and the costs of such options.
3. The Committee should recommend those options that it considers most desirable and feasible, in two categories:
 - a. Those options that it believes should be implemented.
 - b. Those options that might be put into effect if the university's financial situation worsens.

The Committee began work in January, 1984, splitting into two subcommittees -- one to investigate severance options and early retirement plans; the other to study faculty development and renewal alternatives. As a point of departure, we used the guidelines and recommendations made in the 1983 Senate Council report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Alternatives to Termination in Cases of Fiscal Exigency. We then developed a bibliography and solicited information from other universities, including our own benchmark institutions. (These materials are provided in the Appendix accompanying this report.)

Like the Fiscal Exigency Committee, we found many plans that either were not applicable to the situation at this university or unacceptable to our faculty and/or the administration. This report, then, concentrates on those alternatives that we feel are possible and workable in the University of Kentucky system. Also, the options recommended are limited to those most advantageous to both faculty and administrative needs.

BACKGROUND

Within the last decade, the University of Kentucky, like many other institutions of higher learning in the United States, has suffered serious fiscal shortages on several occasions. In addition, we have experienced the same changes common to other institutions: changing patterns in student mix, declining enrollments, shifting emphases on careers pursued by students, increasing numbers of non-traditional students. As a result, we have found ourselves overstaffed in some areas and woefully understaffed in others, with shrinking financial resources to provide the flexibility of resources needed to meet the demands growing out of these changes.

Because of this financial and academic crisis, we must meet the challenges recognized by other institutions: how to attain adequate flexibility in the allocation of existing faculty; how to find ways of nurturing the intellectual vitality of existing faculty in order to maintain high quality programs; how to create opportunities for training faculty for new academic roles; and how to open avenues of revenue for hiring the new faculty members who are so important a catalyst in maintaining a stimulating intellectual environment.

To meet these challenges, many institutions are implementing a number of career alternatives for faculty. In times of extreme fiscal shortages, some, such as Michigan State University, have been forced to adopt severance options. Others, like the University of California system, the University of Minnesota, and Purdue University have created a number of early retirement plans, designed both to serve as alternatives to termination and as a procedure for providing opportunities for hiring new faculty. In addition to early retirement options, other institutions (the University of Wisconsin, for example), have set up a formal, on-going mechanism for faculty development and renewal.

Because the problems of the University of Kentucky which arose in the late 1970's appear likely to continue for the next decade or so, the Committee recommends that faculty alternatives be adopted with the intent of making them a permanent part of the of the faculty benefit package, rather than as ad hoc responses to fiscal shortages. This Committee agrees with the assessment of the Lowery Committee that continuing to depend on natural faculty attrition and on freezing positions will result in some departments and colleges carrying "a disproportionate share of the University's response" to fiscal shortfalls with the result that "faculty mix may match very poorly the University's relative emphasis on academic disciplines."

RECOMMENDATIONS

In compliance with the committee's charge not to limit ourselves to options exclusively for "hard times," we examined options implemented at other universities both for times of economic constraint and of economic stability. The recommendations made for early retirement and expanding faculty options are primarily designed as alternatives that may become a permanent part of the faculty benefit package. Although many might serve as short-term financial emergency measures, others will need considerable planning for implementation and funding. In all cases, the options should be determined only by mutual agreement between the participating faculty member and the administration. Recognizing that there may be instances when the administration might initiate an option and others when the faculty member requests it, the committee urges that procedures outlined in the appropriate regulations take the two situations into account.

The third set of suggestions--severance options-- are recommended only for short-term economic emergencies or when programs or departments are being phased out and no other alternatives are feasible.

I. EARLY RETIREMENT PLANS

Adapting a definition of early retirement suggested by Hans H. Jenny (Jenny, 1974) in an essay prepared for TIAA, the committee offers this definition for the purposes of this report and as a possible basis for early retirement plans developed by the University of Kentucky.

Early retirement is (1) retirement after continuing service of thirty years or more, or (2) up to ten years prior to the normal age of retirement (65) after a minimum of ten years of service.

Obviously, adopting such a broad definition would require the University to offer some of the options only after some careful long-range planning, both on the part of the administration and the faculty member seeking an early retirement plan. Because of this, the committee urges the Administration to begin such planning as soon as it becomes feasible to do so. In addition, the committee suggests that the Administration follow the pattern implemented in other institutions by first formulating a general mechanism for early retirement and then setting up several plans, one of which would be highly flexible and would thus permit faculty members to develop an early retirement plan peculiar to their professional needs and financial situations. For example, faculty members interested in outside activities such as free-lance writing or consulting for private firms might welcome an opportunity to plan far in advance of the normal retirement age, perhaps even contributing part of their salary

toward complete or phased retirement.

The recommended options in this report could become a part of a total package of early retirement options offered on a permanent basis, serving as financial emergency measures or offering early retirement to a limited number of faculty members each year in normal times. In restricting the number of retirees, the Administration might follow the suggestion made several years ago by the Employee Benefits Committee of the local AAUP chapter to authorize twenty-five eligible employees each year for early retirement. Or the Administration might allow each sector or college to determine the number of retirements it could support, since some of the recommended plans provide an added flexibility which can benefit some units.

So that across-the-board early retirement does not result in the excessive loss of valuable senior faculty in a department, college, or program, further criteria should be established. In addition to the conditions set up in our definition of early retirement, the Administration might consider adopting some safeguard guidelines. The committee suggests these as possibilities:

- That the department chair or program director and the appropriate dean be involved in the granting of approval when a faculty member in the unit requests early retirement.
- That such factors as these might be considered in determining which faculty might choose full or phased retirement:
 - a Possible impact on the department or program involved,
 - b The need of a department to retain a senior faculty member on a part-time basis so that the quality of a graduate program is sustained,
 - c Whether or not the candidate for retirement is in a unit being eliminated or phased out,
 - d The candidate's professional or physical health (this would require careful consideration of the candidate with the department chair, the dean, and other qualified consultants).

Before early retirement can be implemented at the University of Kentucky, the following sections of the retirement regulations (AR II-1.6-1) will need amendment: II. A and D; III B.1.2.3 and 4. In section III faculty members who will reach 65 on or before June 30, 1989 and who currently have twenty or more years of service are given rights under the minimum benefit provisions

(old change of assignment plan) which must be considered when the regulations are changed.

Any early retirement should result only by mutual consent of the University and the faculty member. The committee emphasizes that these plans are not an academic right, but an opportunity for both parties to benefit. The Committee also recognizes that (although not one of our charges) any adoption of an early retirement program should include non-faculty employees as well.

Despite the wide diversity of the retirement plans studied, we concluded that they fit three general classifications-- early retirement with a lump sum annuity, early retirement with benefit incentives, and phased retirement plans. Any of these could be adopted either as a short-term emergency measure or as part of a long-term retirement program.

Due to the cost implementations associated with the adoption of the various early retirement options, the Committee has included an assessment of the cost and the assumptions regarding how these costs would be borne (see pages 6a,17,18). The underlying assumptions are that any cost associated with opting for early retirement would be absorbed at the sector level, either through (a) not filling the position, or (b) delaying the filling of the position for the period of time needed to support the initial cost of the early retirement. These assumptions must be considered when developing University policies which implement the recommended early retirement options.

A. Early Retirement with Lump Sum and Fringe Annuities

If a faculty member retires between the ages of 62 to 65, the TIAA-CREF premiums for the remaining years until normal retirement age are paid by the University in a lump sum at the rate of the last full year of payment to TIAA-CREF at retirement. In addition, group health and life insurance are continued for the years remaining until normal retirement age.

Advantages

- a. The University would benefit from the three year salary cost and the savings in premium increments. For example, a faculty member with a basic annual salary of \$40,000 entails these additional institution costs: Retirement--\$4000; FICA--\$2800 (1985 cost); Health and life insurance-- \$400. Together with the \$40,000 salary, the total direct cost is \$47,200. If the position is not filled, then the annual savings to the University would be \$34,650, and \$46,650 in the ensuing years. (See Table I,1 on page 6a.)

However, if a new person is hired to replace the line, care must be taken to limit the new salary

to no more than 90% of the old salary to attain the break even point.

- b. The benefits to the retiree would be greater than is now possible for early retirement.

Disadvantages

- a. The retiree is penalized by losing the normal increase in TIAA-CREF premiums and the accrued interest on those payments.
- b. Certain tax implications might penalize the employee; for example, there is a possibility of taxation on TIAA-CREF premiums paid after retirement.

This plan could be made more advantageous to the retiree by including a lump sum equal to one year's salary at the salary rate at the time of retirement. Under this more equitable arrangement, the short term cost would be greater to the University than the fringe benefit plan, but a minimal potential savings of two years' salary could result. And in cases where the faculty member might otherwise elect to teach beyond age 65, the University could save up to seven years' salary.

B. Early Retirement with Benefit Incentives

Because benefit incentives are more costly to the institution, the committee recommends that this plan only be considered as a long-term one which will require considerable financial planning.

In this plan, TIAA-CREF premiums based on the salary at the time of retirement and the fringe health benefits would be continued for the years remaining to age 65 or up to a maximum of ten years. This plan might encourage faculty members to retire earlier than age 62 because they could benefit from annual interest accumulation and possible gains in CREF investments. Moreover, faculty members wishing to retire at ages between 55 and 65 could add to the annual premiums before retirement to help compensate for the loss of salary increments.

Advantages

- a. When the faculty member's line is to be dropped, the University would benefit from a complete salary savings for the remaining years of employment. (See Table 1.2, page 6a.)
- b. When the line is to be retained, the University could save on the lower salary paid to a junior faculty member.

TABLE I

Cost (Savings) Associated With Implementation
of Various Early Retirement Options - Faculty

1. Early Retirement with Lump Sum and Fringe Annuities (retirement between 62 and 65 with lump sum TIAA/CREF for remaining years and continuation of group health and life insurance)	Assumptions	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	Entry Level Faculty		
						Salary	Retirement	Soc Sec
	Retiree Salary	\$40,000	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$21,000		
	Retirement	4,000	12,000	--	--		\$ 2,100	
	Social Security	2,800	--	--	--			\$ 1,200
	Health & Life	400	550	550	550			\$ 550
	Retiree Comp.	\$47,200	\$12,550	\$ 550	\$ 550			\$24,850
	Savings Available	-0-	\$34,650	\$46,650	\$46,650			

2. Early Retirement with Benefit Incentives	Assumptions	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91
	Retiree Salary	\$40,000	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --
	Retirement	4,000	40,000	--	--	--	--	--
	Social Security	2,800	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Health & Life	400	550	550	550	550	550	550
	Retiree Comp.	\$47,200	\$40,550	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550
	Savings Available	-0-	\$ 6,650	\$46,650	\$46,650	\$46,650	\$46,650	\$46,650

3. Phased Retirement Plan - contract for part-time employment until retirement with fringe benefits retained at full-time salary level.	Assumptions	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88
	Retiree Salary	\$40,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500
	Retirement	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
	Social Security	2,800	500	500	500
	Health & Life	400	550	550	550
	Retiree Comp.	\$47,200	\$12,550	\$12,550	\$12,550
	Savings Available	-0-	\$34,650	\$34,650	\$34,650

Assumptions: (1) Any cost associated with an individual opting for early retirement would be absorbed at the sector level, either through (a) not filling the position, or (b) delaying the filling of the position for the period of time needed to support the initial cost of the early retirement. (2) Costs associated with the early retirement of an individual within the unfunded retirement plan would also be borne by the sector.

12/11/84

Disadvantages

- a. The plan could not be used as an emergency measure in short-term emergencies.
- b. The faculty member's annuity would lose the benefits gained by the cost of living and merit increments normally accrued when employed.
- c. The University might lose its strongest faculty members who may welcome the opportunity of early retirement so that they may seek positions elsewhere.

3. Phased Retirement Plans

Phased retirement plans allow faculty members to continue working part time after the decision to retire. The retiree may continue teaching classes on a part-time basis or engaging in University-based research. Again, because of the cost of such a plan, the committee cautions the need for long-range planning. (See Table 1.3, page 6a.)

- a. Part-Time Tenure With this plan the University and the faculty member can agree on a contract for part-time employment (half or quarter time) until retirement, with fringe benefits retained at full-time salary level. Two possibilities might be offered:
 - 1) Retirees could receive half or one quarter salary and request an adjustment of their retirement pension annuity to make up the remainder;
 - 2) As an added incentive, they could receive their full pension annuity with a part-time stipend added.

Advantages

- a. It would encourage valuable senior faculty to continue serving on graduate students committees, to carry a limited teaching load, or to work on special research projects while allowing departments either to hire younger faculty or retrain existing faculty to replace the retiree.
- b. It should reduce the need for departments to hire advanced faculty as "younger faculty" could gain experience before the senior faculty takes full retirement.
- b. Guaranteed Extra Assignments When feasible, the faculty member can retire with full retirement pension and a contract to receive summer or evening class assignments for a specified period.

Advantages

- a. Because such assignments have a set fee at the University, the cost would be no more than hiring any other part-time teacher.

Disadvantages

- a. The faculty member's annuity would lose the benefits gained by the cost of living and merit increments normally accrued with full-time employment.
- c. Retirement Research The University could agree to make the services of the University of Kentucky Research Foundation available to an early retiree in obtaining research grants and to allow post retirement contracts in the research professor series -- full or part-time, according to the conditions of the grant.

Advantages

- a. It could prove an incentive for senior professors who wish to devote more time to research.
- b. The University could benefit from the grant money, the prestige, and the training of graduate students.

II. EXPANDING FACULTY OPTIONS

While our charge to consider alternatives to termination was motivated by concerns about financial emergencies, we strongly deem it desirable that the alternatives suggested in this report become a positive plan for providing faculty development opportunities beyond that driven by budget problems. Although our current sabbatical leave program is excellent, it will not suffice for future faculty development and will need expansion.

In researching what alternatives have been adopted by other universities, the Committee found one publication especially useful -- Expanding Faculty Options--published by the American Association for Higher Education in 1981. It describes in some detail the opportunities devised in several institutions for faculty members to shift professional interests in mid-career. Not necessarily related to periods of financial emergency, these shifts may also be motivated by such factors as career burnout, restricted mobility, shifting enrollments, and salary limitations.

Two programs that seem especially applicable to the needs and capabilities of the University of Kentucky are those instituted at California State University at Long Beach and at the University of Wisconsin. The Wisconsin program is broader in scope and not only deals with guidelines for implementation, but also identifies policies for faculty transfer and exchange. The documents obtained from these two sources are included in

Appendix B at the end of this report.

Because our further research uncovered no options more attractive than those outlined in the 1983 Lowery Committee report, our committee endorses those alternatives with some modifications.

A. Change of Faculty to Other Academic Units

This option permits a faculty member to shift from one department or discipline to another without change in salary or professional status. For possible conditions under which such shifts might take place, see page 9, Lowery Committee Report, Appendix C. Ideally, the faculty member should have: A secondary interest in the new discipline, previous training in it, or professional involvement in a closely related field. In determining the faculty member's acceptability to the new department or discipline, a process similar to that currently used in joint appointments should be followed.

Because many academic disciplines share basic skills that are potentially transferrable, some faculty members may request such a change as a feasible alternative to professional stagnation or to termination. In addition to benefitting the faculty member, this option might alleviate the pressures generated on some programs by changing student enrollments or faculty attrition.

When necessary, the faculty member should be given paid leave to upgrade skills or to change specialties.

If the move is offered as an alternative to termination, the faculty member should retain the right to refuse the reassignment and to appeal to a faculty committee or established investigative panel. Within a specified time (two years, three years) the faculty member should have the right of termination under a severance pay plan or an early retirement plan.

Advantages

- a. It provides faculty with an option to make a career change without seeking employment in another university, or in the case of impending termination, to retain a traditional academic role.
- b. It allows for shifts in program emphasis or changes in faculty attrition with the least faculty or program disruption.
- c. It allows programs to be terminated without dismissing valuable tenured faculty.

Disadvantages

a. It might not result in immediate savings to the University, unless the shift could be combined with faculty attrition.

b. It would require clear and sharp career changes.

c. It would penalize faculty members without easily transferable skills.

B. Shifting Faculty to University Based Contract Work

As with most of the other options suggested in this report, this research reassignment could become an ongoing alternative for faculty more interested in research than in teaching but who wish to remain close to an academic setting or for faculty members who desire to take an extended leave from teaching to concentrate on research.

In cases of termination, many faculty members with special research skills might prefer to stay in the Lexington area and within the academic setting of the University, even though there was no opportunity for reassignment to another academic unit. When feasible, the displaced faculty member could be reassigned to an appropriately modified research professor series.

Depending upon individual situations, many approaches might be used and particulars tailored to individual needs. The committee, however, recommends the following general guidelines:

- During the first term of reappointment, the University would provide continued fringe benefits and three fourths of the salary. (This would amount to a University savings of about \$7500 per year for a \$30,000 salary.)
- During the second term of reappointment, the University would provide continued fringe benefits and one half of the salary. (A University savings of about \$15,000 per year on a \$30,000 salary.)
- During the third term of reappointment, the University would continue the fringe benefits and pay one fourth of the salary. (A University savings of about \$22,500 per year on a \$30,000 salary.)
- During the fourth and fifth terms of the reappointment, the University would continue the fringe benefits. (A savings of \$30,000 per year.)
- During the five year University subsidized period, the

faculty member would be expected to develop sufficient contracts to become self-supporting.

- Under no circumstances would this plan commit the University to guarantee the contract portion of the faculty member's salary.

Advantages

- a. The faculty member could benefit from retaining a position in an academic setting with possible access to University facilities.
- b. The institute appointments could help the faculty member to pursue contract work.
- c. The gradual withdrawal of University support would enable former faculty member time to build a contract research program without financial duress.
- d. The service function of the University could be enhanced while at the same time benefitting from revenue in new research contracts.

Disadvantages

- a. The University would not benefit from immediate financial relief.
- b. The option would not be available to all faculty members. Many lack the up-dated knowledge and skills of research needed for such reappointment; others are in academic areas where there are few opportunities for contract work.

C. Faculty Development and Renewal

The most impressive program for faculty development and renewal studied by the Committee was that approved by the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents in May, 1975 (see Appendix B, xiii). Primarily designed as an ongoing program rather than as a stop-gap measure in periods of fiscal shortages, it was based on the premise that although faculty have a professional commitment to upgrade their knowledge and skills, the University should "seek further ways to enable individual faculty members to renew their intellectual vitality and further their professional growth...." This claim was based on the emerging needs facing higher education, such as shifts in programmatic and student requirements and the development of new fields of technology and knowledge, thereby often necessitating extensive faculty retraining -- a costly burden if university leave is required.

1. Retraining Aspects

While some new funding may be necessary to initiate a faculty development program, the costs should be more than offset by its potential savings and in the academic revitalization that it could provide. Thus, budgeting of University funds to this program should be considered a necessary investment for optimal use of faculty expertise.

Like the other plans offered in this report, participation in the program should be voluntary. However, the University might motivate the faculty to participate by offering small grants that would be awarded competitively to help defray tuition or travel costs.

For the purposes of the University of Kentucky, the Committee endorses Alternative 7 proposed by the Lowery Committee: That the University subsidize faculty participation in non-campus career institutes as described in the Chronicle on Higher Education of February 16, 1983 and/or provide funds for courses or training programs offered at the University of Kentucky.

When faculty retraining is used as a termination alternative or when it requires faculty to take extended leave for revitalizing academic expertise, a salary policy equitable to the University and to the faculty must be devised. The Committee offers the following suggestions:

- 1) The faculty might receive the salary (plus benefits) paid the year pre- ceding entry into the program for the contracted period of University subsidizing of it;
- 2) A sliding scale might be worked out, particularly for those who would not return to the University and who might be offered part-time teaching opportunities at the retraining institution;
- 3) Changes in the fringe benefit package might be negotiated.

Recognizing that academic needs and objectives vary in different disciplines, the Committee suggests these general guidelines for an institutional plan:

- Any tenured faculty member would be eligible.
- Participation would be voluntary, but approval of the parent department and college would be mandatory.
- For extended retraining periods, the faculty would be required to apply for admission to a degree program.
- For short, on-campus retraining programs, the faculty would carry the teaching load typical of their department. However, participation would be facilitated by convenient class scheduling and reduction of non-teaching activities.

- For off-campus programs, the participating faculty would be expected to pay the tuition and fees.
- A time limit should be set for extensive retraining programs. For instance, the University might agree to subsidize a faculty member for a period of twenty-four months, after which participating faculty would not be eligible for additional financial assistance.
- For extensive retraining offered as part of a package for termination, the faculty must agree to leave the University's employ at the end of the subsidized training period.

Advantages

- a. If termination of faculty becomes necessary, this plan would give terminated faculty members a viable alternative to unemployment and immediate relocation. It would be especially valuable for faculty in fields where the academic job market is virtually closed.
- b. In normal times, faculty members who have developed new academic interests or who wish to gain expertise in a recently developed field within their academic discipline can pursue new knowledge without undue financial and academic hardship.

Disadvantages

- a. Because it is difficult to estimate how many faculty would take advantage of a development program, cost savings could not be accurately determined.
- b. Full-scale retraining would mean little immediate cost savings (perhaps even greater cost to the University for a few years), thus making it impractical for emergency situations.

2. Establishment of an Office of Faculty Development

Nearly all the institutions with faculty development programs have established a centralized office to manage them. Therefore, the Committee proposes that the University of Kentucky establish an Office of Faculty Development, initially staffed by one or two people-- perhaps shifted from a program scheduled for retrenchment or termination. As demand for the program grows and as new funds are generated, the office could be enlarged.

This centralized office could be responsible for gleaning the data necessary for long-range planning over the coming years. It could, for example;

- Develop for each academic unit a faculty profile that summarizes historical rates of appointment, termination, promotion, tenure granting, resignation, retirement, ratio of temporary to permanent faculty, distribution of rank and age, etc.,
- Facilitate the incentive arrangements for retraining,
- Identify appropriate options for individual faculty,
- Aid in the negotiation of transfers,
- Assist in removing economic barriers to the shifting of careers,
- Collect and disseminate information on exchange opportunities such as those offered by the National Faculty Exchange (see Appendix B, xii). Exchange programs offer universities opportunities for re-vitalizing individual faculty members and programs at little or no cost to the institution.
- Develop a list of private and government organizations that offer grants for academic upgrading or retraining.

III. SEVERANCE OPTIONS

Because of the professional and legal ramifications involved in terminating tenured faculty, all the authorities consulted in our study agreed that severance options must be voluntary in the sense that the faculty member is given a voice in considering the terms of the "buy-out" plan. Although recognizing emergency decisions must often be made within a period of days, the committee urges that such stringent measures generally be adopted only after careful study of the need for such action and after input from appropriate faculty groups. The committee also recognizes that severance pay decisions must be based on legal possibilities available in Kentucky.

The options considered by the committee as most appropriate for the University of Kentucky are as follows:

- A. Emergency Early Retirement By mutual agreement with the administration, the faculty member, if eligible, could retire with up to two years of severance pay at the salary level in effect at the time of the retirement decision. In addition, fringe benefits could be continued for the initial year of the two year agreement.

This plan --adopted by Michigan State University when serious short-falls forced the closing down of whole units-- would be especially useful in that situation

or when programs are being phased out. The cost of such a plan could be absorbed through University non-recurring funds. However, in the case that some of our recommended retirement alternatives are available, this plan need not be implemented.

- B. Tenured Faculty Termination Under the present Administrative Regulations, faculty members who face termination because of fiscal exigency "shall be given notice as soon as possible and never less than 12 months notice" (AR II-1.0-1, III C). This regulation, in essence, allows the faculty member a year's employment following the decision for termination. However, the committee recommends that this option be expanded so that a terminated faculty member could be given a year's severance pay instead-- when that alternative might be in the best interests of the university or the faculty member.

Recognizing that this flexibility would necessitate a change in the Administrative Regulations, the committee suggests the following addition to the rule:

However, if it is determined to be in the best interests of the faculty member or of the University, the University may, by mutual agreement with the faculty member, terminate with 12 months' severance pay with fringe benefits. In either case, the released faculty member's position shall not be filled within a period of two years unless the faculty member has been offered reappointment and given a reasonable time within which to accept or decline it.

Advantages

- a. A faculty member might prefer to take the severance pay and use the year for retraining.
- b. The University would profit in those situations when a unit or a program is to be immediately closed down. By not keeping faculty on the payroll in academic limbo, the university could save money on administrative and office personnel.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE PROGRAM SUGGESTIONS

As the Lowery Report pointed out, the University must make a number of crucial decisions before deciding upon faculty or academic units to be terminated and before choosing appropriate alternatives to termination. In recent years, the disastrous results of unilateral termination of tenured faculty have dramatized the need for careful, long-range planning that involves all sectors of the University community-- faculty, administrators, faculty bodies or committees, governing boards, and so on. The

changes in the functions of higher education have demonstrated the necessity to provide various retirement and development options, not merely as stopgap emergency measures. but rather as ongoing programs in order to maintain the faculty flexibility and intellectual revitalization essential for academic excellence.

Recognizing these needs, the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Options has outlined a program of faculty alternatives that can be used either in fiscal exigency emergencies or as a permanent addition to faculty benefits. However, the Committee stresses that two principles undergird the program: 1) that faculty decisions to participate in any alternative plan must be voluntary, and 2) that the program must not violate the basic concept of tenure. Also, the Committee assumes that any alternative accepted by a faculty member will carry a contractual agreement so that the rights of the individual and the University are protected.

So that this program or one similar to it might be adopted within the next two years, the Committee recommends that the following steps be taken by the Senate and the Administration:

1. That the Senate Council place this plan on the agenda of the Senate in the 1984-85 academic year for debate and approval as a recommendation to the Administration.
2. That the President appoint a committee made up of staff members from the appropriate offices to determine how regulations must be amended and to develop more detailed versions of the recommended retirement options. These recommendations will be extended to non-faculty groups as well as to faculty.
3. That a committee be appointed to develop implementation guidelines for faculty development and renewal similar to those adopted by the University of Wisconsin in 1977. The committee should also suggest appropriate changes in Administrative Regulations to facilitate the implementation of some of the alternatives discussed as problems in the report.
4. That there be consultation with the Senate Council on both the determination of exigency and the University response to such fiscal emergencies.
5. That the University establish an Office of Faculty Development as described on page 15 of this report.

Cost (Savings) Associated with Implementation
of Various Early Retirement Options - Non-Faculty
(Group II)

1. Early Retirement with Lump Sum and Fringe Annuities (retirement between 62 and 65 with lump sum TIAA/CREF for remaining years and continuation of group health and life insurance)	<u>Assumptions</u>	<u>1984-85</u>	<u>1985-86</u>	<u>1986-87</u>	<u>1987-88</u>	<u>Entry Level</u>	
						Salary	\$12,500
	Retiree Salary	\$14,000	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	Retirement	\$ 1,000
	Retirement	1,120	3,360	--	--	Soc Sec	\$ 900
	Social Security	1,000	--	--	--	Health&Life	\$ 550
	Health & Life	400	550	550	550		\$14,950
	Retiree Comp.	\$16,520	\$ 3,910	\$ 550	\$ 550		
	Savings Available	-0-	\$12,610	\$15,970	\$15,970		

2. Early Retirement with Benefit Incentives		<u>1984-85</u>	<u>1985-86</u>	<u>1986-87</u>	<u>1987-88</u>	<u>1988-89</u>	<u>1989-90</u>	<u>1990-91</u>
	Retiree Salary	\$14,000	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --
	Retirement	1,120	11,200	--	--	--	--	--
	Social Security	1,000	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Health & Life	400	550	550	550	550	550	550
	Retiree Comp.	\$16,520	\$11,750	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550
	Savings Available	-0-	\$ 4,770	\$15,970	\$15,970	\$15,970	\$15,970	\$15,970

	<u>1991-92</u>	<u>1992-93</u>	<u>1993-94</u>	<u>1994-95</u>
Retiree Salary	--	--	--	--
Retirement	--	--	--	--
Social Security	--	--	--	--
Health & Life	550	550	550	550
Retiree Comp.	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550
Savings Available	\$15,970	\$15,970	\$15,970	\$15,970

Assumptions: (1) Any cost associated with an individual opting for early retirement would be absorbed at the sector level, either through (a) not filling the position, or (b) delaying the filling of the position for the period of time needed to support the initial cost of the early retirement. (2) Costs associated with the early retirement of an individual within the unfunded retirement plan would also be borne by the sector.

12/11/84

**Cost (Savings) Associated With Implementation of Various
Early Retirement Options - Non-Faculty
(Group III)**

1. Early Retirement with Lump Sum and Fringe Annuities (retirement between 62 and 65 with lump sum TIAA/CREF for remaining years and continuation of group health and life insurance)	<u>Assumptions</u>	<u>1984-85</u>	<u>1985-86</u>	<u>1986-87</u>	<u>1987-88</u>	<u>Entry Level</u>		
	Retiree Salary	\$26,500	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	Salary	\$22,000	
	Retirement	2,120	6,360	--	--	Retirement	\$ 1,760	
	Social Security	1,900	--	--	--	Soc Sec	\$ 1,550	
	Health & Life	400	550	550	550	Health&Life	\$ 550	
	Retiree Comp.	\$30,920	\$ 6,910	\$ 550	\$ 550		\$25,860	
	Savings Available	-0-	\$24,010	\$30,370	\$30,370			
2. Early Retirement with Benefit Incentives		<u>1984-85</u>	<u>1985-86</u>	<u>1986-87</u>	<u>1987-88</u>	<u>1988-89</u>	<u>1989-90</u>	<u>1990-91</u>
	Retiree Salary	\$26,500	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --
	Retirement	2,120	21,200	--	--	--	--	--
	Social Security	1,900	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Health & Life	400	550	550	550	550	550	550
	Retiree Comp.	\$30,920	\$21,750	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550
	Savings Available	-0-	\$ 9,170	\$30,370	\$30,370	\$30,370	\$30,370	\$30,370
		<u>1991-92</u>	<u>1992-93</u>	<u>1993-94</u>	<u>1994-95</u>			
	Retiree Salary	--	--	--	--			
	Retirement	--	--	--	--			
	Social Security	--	--	--	--			
	Health & Life	550	550	550	550			
	Retiree Comp.	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550	\$ 550			
	Savings Available	\$30,370	\$30,370	\$30,370	\$30,370			

Assumptions: (1) Any cost associated with an individual opting for early retirement would be absorbed at the sector level, either through (a) not filling the position, or (b) delaying the filling of the position for the period of time needed to support the initial cost of the early retirement. (2) Costs associated with the early retirement of an individual within the unfunded retirement plan would also be borne by the sector.

12/11/84

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE

Academic Year 1985-86

1985 -

- August 5 Monday -- Fourth-year students begin rotations
Last day for fourth-year students to withdraw from the College of Medicine for a full refund of fees.
- August 5-6 Monday-Tuesday -- Third-year registration & orientation
- August 7 Wednesday -- Third-year students begin classes
Last day for third-year students to withdraw from the College of Medicine for a full refund of fees.
- August 12 Monday -- Last day for fourth year students to officially withdraw from the College of Medicine and receive an 80 percent refund
- August 14 Wednesday -- Last day for third year students to officially withdraw from the College of Medicine and receive an 80 percent refund
- August 19 Monday -- First-year students registration & orientation
- August 20 Tuesday -- First-year students begin classes
Last day for first-year students to withdraw from the College of Medicine for a full refund of fees.
- August 26 Monday -- Second-year students register & begin classes
Last day for second-year students to withdraw from the College of Medicine for a full refund of fees.
- August 26 Monday -- Last day for first year students to officially withdraw from the College of Medicine and receive an 80 percent refund
- September 2 Monday -- First & Second-year students--LABOR DAY HOLIDAY
- September 3 Tuesday -- Last day for second year students to officially withdraw from the College of Medicine and receive an 80 percent refund
- September 20 Friday -- Last day for fourth year students to withdraw from the College of Medicine and receive any refund
- September 25 Wednesday -- Last day for third year students to withdraw from the College of Medicine and receive any refund
- October 8 Tuesday -- Last day for first year students to withdraw from the College of Medicine and receive any refund
- October 14 Monday -- Last day for second year students to withdraw from the College of Medicine and receive any refund