

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, APRIL 10, 2000

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., April 10, 2000 in the Auditorium of the W. T. Young Library.

Members absent were: Behruz Abadi*, Wael Ahmed, Anna Allen, Ali Amoli, Leon Assael, Suketu Bhavsar*, Deborah Blades, Rachel Bomberger, Douglas Boyd, Joseph Burch, Charles Carlson*, Ben Carr, Edward Carter, Robert Dahlstrom*, Fred Danner, Susan Carvalho*, Henri DeHahn, Marc DeJesus, Roberta Dwyer*, Vincent Fields, Juanita Fleming*, Richard Furst, Eugene Gaetke, Holly Gallion, John Garen*, Amber Gatlin, Robert Gewirtz*, Jimmy Glen, Jonathan Golding, Philip Greasley*, Howard Grotch, Steven Haist, David Hamilton, Issam Harik*, Bernhard Hennig*, James Holsinger, Patricia Howard*, David Hulse, Mike Inman, Ling Hwey Jeng, David Johnson, Alan Kaplan*, Edward Kasarskis, Richard Kermode, Thomas Lester, C. Oran Little, William Lubawy, William Maloney, Mark Meier, David Mohny, James Morris, Phyllis Nash, William O'Connor, Miles Osland, James Parker, John Piccoro*, Doug Poe, Claire Pomeroy*, Thomas Pope, Dan Reedy, Luke Riddle, Thomas Robinson, Cynthia Ruder*, Ramona Rush, Jan Schach, Robert Shay, David Sloan, David Stockham, Thomas Troland, Andrea Valenteo, Henry Vasconez, Monica Wertzler, Charles Wethington*, Carolyn Williams, Eugene Williams, Emery Wilson, Donald Witt*.

Chairperson Moore called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone.

The Chair said that the first item of business was to approve the minutes of February 14, 2000 and March 6, 2000. There was a spelling correction of Professor Ruth Beattie's name in the March 6 meeting. The minutes were approved with the change.

Chairperson Moore made the following remarks:

Members of the University Senate:

We have a busy agenda for this last meeting of the academic year, but I ask that you indulge me for just a moment to say thanks to all of you for the opportunity to serve as Senate Council Chair for the last two years. As you know, this is my last meeting as Chair. Bill Fortune and David Durant will be taking over as Chair and Vice Chair, respectively, on June 1.

As members of the Senate, you have a lot with which to be pleased -- these last two years have been a busy and productive time for the Senate, thanks to all of you. Here are just a few of what I consider the highlights, most of which were initiated by the Senate Council and the Senate:

Health insurance for graduate teaching assistants, research assistants and fellowship holders (effective last fall). Graduate student Susan Mains and Dean Mike Nietzel of the Graduate School deserve special thanks for their efforts to get the health insurance proposal approved.

A staff representative on the joint Faculty-Board of Trustees Presidential Search Committee.

New centers in Nutritional Science, Spinal Cord and Brain Injury Research and Oral Health Research.

* Absence Explained

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

A new School of Public Health and new Masters of Public Health and a new Doctor of Public Health.

The Futures Committee Report, offering a blueprint for the selection of a new president.

A new tenured faculty review and development policy.

Extensive expansion of the number of faculty eligible to vote and serve in the Senate.

A new requirement that undergraduates declare a major after 60 hours of credit.

New criteria for promotion and tenure.

Four resolutions to the Board of Trustees, including two last May, articulating faculty opposition to board actions on a presidential contract extension.

I'll stop at this point and simply say thanks to a few folks who have made my job as Chair much easier. I'll start with some folks to my left:

Cindy Todd for her excellent work as the staff assistant for the Senate Council.

Gifford Blyton, who retired many years ago as a professor but who volunteers year after year to be our able parliamentarian.

Don Witt, our Senate Secretary, who could not be here today. If you concur, this may be Don's last meeting as Secretary of the Senate. See item six on today's agenda.

Susan Caldwell, who does such a great job taking minutes and assisting us with elections. (Susan would like for this to be her last meeting to take minutes.)

Our Sergeants at Arms--Michelle Sohner and Melanie Collins.

Dr. Juanita Fleming, who is a wealth of information and always available to help.

Loys Mather and Dan Reedy, our Faculty Trustees, whose wise counsel is much appreciated.

All of the chairs and members of the Senate committees, who do such great work.

President Charles T. Wethington Jr. for meeting with me regularly and keeping me informed about university matters.

The dean of my college, David Johnson, for his understanding and support during the last two years in which Senate and Senate Council matters often demanded much of my attention.

A big thanks to all of the members of the Senate Council who spend many, many hours on behalf of this university, including two hours every Monday in meetings of the council. They are among the finest people you'll find anywhere.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

Last, but by no means least, a special thanks to Lee Meyer, our vice chair, who has shown such great leadership during the last two years and who has served more as a co-chair than a vice chair. This will also be Lee's last Senate meeting. Lee, you've done a wonderful job.

I'd like to end my comments by saying that I have thoroughly enjoyed working for you and with you, and that I believe faculty governance is alive and well at the University of Kentucky. The actions and impact of this body are the clearest demonstration I know of this.

Lee will now introduce the first action item on the agenda -- a proposal to revise the Law School Honor Code.

Professor Meyer reviewed the background of the item and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

ACTION ITEM 1 - University Senate Meeting, Monday 10 April 2000. Proposal to revise the Law School Honor Code, University Senate Rules, Section VI

Background:

Current University Senate Rules, Section VI, 6.0 read as follows:

Any school or college may establish, with the approval of the Senate, an Honor Code or comparable system governed by the students with approval by and/or appeal to the faculty of such a college. When such an Honor Code or comparable system has been established, the procedures for disposition of cases of academic offenses described above shall not apply to the extent that the offenses are subject to the Honor Code and committed by a student subject to the Code.

A student found guilty of committing an offense subject to an Honor Code may appeal that finding through the Academic Ombud to the Appeals Board. The Appeals Board, however, shall not normally sit as a de novo fact finding body, but shall limit its review to ensuring that the college's academic honors board or committee adequately followed its own written procedures in determining guilt or innocence and that the finding of guilt is supported by the preponderance of evidence. (US: 2/13/95)

However, if the Board, by the majority of those present, believes the student's rights under the University Senate Rules and the applicable rules of the academic unit governing academic relationships have been substantially violated, the Board may conduct a de novo hearing on the issue of guilt. (US: 2/13/95)

If the Board, by majority of those present, believes the findings or determination of the Honors Council are not supported by the preponderance of the evidence, the Board may reverse the finding of guilt and there shall be no further proceedings in the case. (US: 2/13/95)

College academic honor councils or committees shall maintain a verbatim record of their proceedings to ensure that the Appeals Board is able to perform this function. (US: 2/13/95)

The punishment meted out to a student governed by such a system shall be as designated thereby except that actual suspension, dismissal or expulsion shall be imposed only with the recommendation of the dean of the college and upon approval by the President of the University. (US: 2/13/95)

At its meeting on 7 February, the University Senate Council accepted the recommendation of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee to approve the revised Honor Code in the College of Law. The Code was withdrawn by the Law School for additional revisions.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

Below find the revised code; it is recommended to the Senate.

Implementation Date: Fall, 2000

**University of Kentucky
College of Law**

Proposed Revised Honor Code

Preamble

The faculty and the students of the University of Kentucky College of Law establish this Honor Code in order to foster integrity and honor within the legal profession, to encourage an atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence within the College of Law, and to promote respect for the College of Law among those who work and study there and among the public generally.

Article I - The Honor Code

A law student shall not lie, cheat, steal, interfere with another student's academic pursuits, falsify or misuse academic records, or fail to report another student's breach of these rules.

Article II - Violations

The conduct specified in the following six paragraphs is a violation of the Honor Code only if (1) the conduct is intentional, and (2) it relates to any work intended to result in or lead to completion of work for academic credit from the College of Law, while using the placement resources and facilities, or on or in connection with an application for admission to the College.

(A) Lying. Lying is deliberate misrepresentation of a fact, or deliberate omission of facts making an otherwise true statement a misrepresentation.

(B) Cheating. Cheating is giving or receiving unpermitted aid in any course or assignment. Law students should assume that no aid is permitted, from other persons or materials of any kind, unless specifically authorized by the professor. Cheating specifically includes plagiarism as defined in the University Senate Rules.

(C) Stealing. Stealing is taking without permission any property belonging to another in order to obtain an academic advantage.

(D) Interference with academic pursuits. Interference with academic pursuits is any conduct which makes it difficult or impossible for other law students to perform academic work. It must be done with the intention of hindering other students' academic success.

(E) Falsification or misuse of academic records. An "academic record" is any paper or electronic version, official or unofficial, of the student's academic record, transcripts, application documents, admission credentials, and academic record transaction documents. "Falsification or misuse" is unauthorized access, use, disclosure, or alteration.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

(F) Failure to report a breach of the Honor Code. Failure to report a breach of the Honor Code is (1) failure to report, pursuant to Article IV (A), actual knowledge that another student has committed a violation of the Honor Code or (2) failure to appear and testify truthfully as a witness in any Informal Hearing conducted under Article IV (C).

(G) Exception for good faith reporting of alleged offenses. The good faith reporting of an Honor Code violation, whether or not the alleged violator is later charged or convicted with any offense under the Honor Code, may not itself be punished as a violation of the Honor Code.

Article III – Administration

The students and faculty of the College of Law shall be jointly responsible for implementing the Honor Code. An Honor Council shall be responsible for administering the Honor Code in accordance with its purpose, scope and procedures.

A. Honor Council Composition

1. Student Members - The Student Bar Association of the College of Law each year shall invite all interested students to submit their names as candidates for Honor Council positions. Each year during the month of March the Dean shall choose from the among these candidates 12 students who shall serve as Honor Council members. The Honor Council shall include at least four members of the prospective third-year class and four members of the prospective second-year class. If for any reason there is an insufficient number of candidates, the Dean shall select sufficient members from among those in the student body willing to serve on the Honor Council. Student members shall serve one-year terms from April 1 through March 31, and are eligible for re-appointment. If a student Honor Council member is unable to complete his or her one-year term, the Dean shall appoint a replacement to serve until the end of the term. If for any reason a student Honor Council member is not available for a session, the Honor Council Chair shall select a temporary alternate from the available student body.

2. Faculty Members - The Dean shall appoint four faculty members to the Honor Council. Faculty members shall serve a two-year term on the Honor Council on a staggered basis, and are eligible for re-appointment. If a faculty Honor Council member is unable to complete his or her two-year term, the Dean shall appoint a replacement to serve until the end of the term. If for any reason a faculty Honor Council member is not available for a session, the Dean shall select a temporary alternate from the faculty.

B. Honor Council Chair

The Dean shall appoint one of the student members of the Honor Council to serve as Chair. It shall be the duty of the Chair to preside at all meetings of the Council, to receive all complaints and allegations of violations of the Honor Code, to address the first-year class concerning the existence and importance of the Honor Code and its procedures, and to perform all duties required by the office.

C. Student Agreement

Upon entering the College of Law, each law student shall be required to sign the following statement:

I, [Student's Name], have read the College of Law Honor Code, understand it, and agree to abide by its provisions.

Signature Date

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

Article IV - Procedures

A. Report of Suspected Violations

A law student or faculty member having actual knowledge that a law student has committed a violation of the Honor Code shall report such knowledge by a signed written complaint filed with the Chair of the Honor Council. In addition, any student or other person who believes there has been a violation of the Code may bring the alleged violation to the attention of the Chair by filing a signed written complaint. The complaint should include a brief account of the facts describing the incident and shall be submitted no later than 30 days after the complainant becomes aware of the incident.

B. Preliminary Determination

Upon receipt of a complaint, the Chair of the Honor Council shall consult with the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and then shall determine whether the complaint alleges a violation within Article II of the Honor Code. The Chair shall inform the complainant in writing of this decision and the rationale for it and shall provide the Dean with a copy of the complaint and of the written response to the complainant. If the Chair believes the reported act falls within Article II of the Honor Code, he or she shall inform the accused person (the "Respondent") of the complaint and furnish him or her with a copy of the Honor Code. A determination by the Chair that the complaint fails to state a violation within Article II of the Honor Code does not preclude a contrary conclusion upon a subsequent complaint based on new evidence.

C. Informal Hearing

Within a reasonable time after the Chair's notice to the Dean that the complaint alleges a violation within Article II of the Honor Code, the Dean shall convene an Informal Hearing on the matter before the Dean and a Hearing Committee.

1. **Hearing Committee** - The Hearing Committee shall consist of two student members and two faculty members of the Honor Council. The student members shall be selected by the Honor Council Chair.

2. **Notice to Respondent** - The Dean shall inform the Respondent of the time and place of the Informal Hearing.

3. **Objectives** - The purpose of the Informal Hearing is to inform and advise the Dean in reaching a conclusion on the issue of guilt and on the appropriate penalty for the offense, if any. The Informal Hearing shall be conducted to permit the Dean and the Hearing Committee to hear the facts underlying the complaint, the Respondent's defense to the allegations, and any aggravating or mitigating factors that may affect the penalty.

4. **Procedures** - The proceeding shall be conducted informally. In addition to the Dean and the Hearing Committee, only the Honor Council Chair, the Respondent and his or her legal representative, if any, and, while they are testifying, any necessary witnesses may be present at the hearing. All matters discussed at the hearing are to be held confidential by those present. The Informal Hearing shall be recorded on tape by the Dean, and only the Dean and the Respondent and his or her legal representative, if any, shall have access to the tape recording without appropriate legal process. The Dean shall be responsible for the security of all taped records and shall make a proper disposition of them when they are no longer needed. The Dean will preside over the proceeding to elicit a complete record of the incident and may adjourn the proceeding to obtain further evidence relevant to the matter if necessary. The Dean and

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

the Hearing Committee may question the complainant, the Respondent, and any other witnesses present. The Respondent shall have the opportunity to present evidence and to question witnesses. The formal rules of evidence shall not apply.

5. Decision - At the conclusion of the Informal Hearing, the Hearing Committee shall deliberate on the issue of guilt and, if guilt is found, the appropriate penalty. In deciding the question of guilt, the preponderance of the evidence standard shall be applied by the Hearing Committee. A decision by a vote of at least three Hearing Committee members on the issue of guilt and/or on the appropriate penalty shall be considered a recommendation to the Dean and shall be overridden by the Dean only if he or she considers the recommendation to be clearly erroneous based on the evidence adduced at the Informal Hearing. If the Hearing Committee splits evenly on the issue of guilt or the appropriate penalty, the Dean shall decide the question(s) based on his or her own view of the preponderance of the evidence adduced at the Informal Hearing.

6. Penalties - In determining the penalty to be recommended and applied, the Dean and the Hearing Committee shall include in their consideration the seriousness of the violation, the degree of willfulness and premeditation, and the truthfulness of the Respondent throughout the Informal Hearing. If the penalty is suspension, a student may be suspended for a reasonable amount of time, which may include the time required for treatment or rehabilitation. Possible penalties for each of the categories of Honor Code violations are as follows:

a. Lying - Penalties may include a failing grade in the course and also may include a written reprimand from the Dean, the loss of privileges to participate in placement office programs, and suspension or expulsion from the College of Law.

b. Cheating - Penalties shall include a failing grade in the course, and may also include a written reprimand from the Dean, loss of privileges to participate in placement office programs, and suspension or expulsion from the College of Law.

c. Stealing - Penalties may include a written reprimand from the Dean, a failing grade in the course, loss of privileges to participate in placement office programs, and suspension or expulsion from the College of Law.

d. Interference with Academic Pursuits - Penalties may include a written reprimand from the Dean, a failing grade in the course, loss of privileges to participate in placement office programs, and suspension or expulsion from the College of Law.

e. Falsification or Misuse of An Academic Record-Penalties may include a written reprimand from the Dean, loss of privileges to participate in placement office programs, and suspension or expulsion from the College of Law.

f. Failure to Report a Breach of the Honor Code - Penalties may include a written reprimand from the Dean, a failing grade in the course, loss of privileges to participate in placement office programs, and suspension or expulsion from the College of Law.

D. Final Action

At the conclusion of the Informal Hearing, the Dean shall reach his or her determination on the issue of guilt and, if guilt is found, on the appropriate penalty. Within a reasonable time, the Dean shall inform the Respondent, the complainant, the Academic Ombud, and, if the penalty involves a failing grade, the

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

University Registrar of this determination. If the penalty imposed includes suspension or expulsion from the College of Law, the matter shall be forwarded to the Chancellor for further action.

E. Appeals

A Respondent found guilty of a violation of the Honor Code may appeal the finding of guilt and/or the penalty imposed by filing a written notice of appeal with the Academic Ombud within 10 working days of receiving notice of the Dean's determination in the matter. Appeals will proceed before the Academic Ombud and University Appeals Board under University Senate Rules 6.4.7 and 6.4.8. The student will have the right of class participation and attendance during the consideration of any appeal.

F. Confidentiality

In all matters arising under this Honor Code, faculty members and students are expected to show due consideration for legitimate concerns regarding confidentiality. Faculty members and students are generally expected to refrain from disclosing the identities of students who have alleged, reported, or been charged with violations of the Honor Code. Disclosure of the identity of such a student should only be made with the student's consent, in response to legal process, in seeking advice from legal counsel, or when necessary to further the policies underlying this Honor Code.

Kaveh Tagavi (Engineering) said that he was in favor of the proposal in principle. There was one serious concern--about the extent the code is run by students. Let me start by reading from the first page of the proposal. It says, "any school or college may establish, with approval of the Senate, an Honor Code or comparable system governed by students." I am emphasizing the word "governed." It also takes away the rights of students to a full appeal, as it does not let the University Appeals Code examine the facts of the matter only whether the procedures have been followed. The students give up certain rights when they accept this honor code, and there must be something in balance that they get back. I started thinking about what is the difference between an honor code and rules governing academic offenses otherwise. I went on the Internet. Honor Codes are self-policing; they obligate students to report instances of cheating even if they have not cheated. In other colleges they are not obligated. You can be disciplined severely if you do not report the cheating. Out of the fifteen I looked at, thirteen were entirely run by students and students dominated the other two. At the University of Pennsylvania, the honor council consists of 13 undergraduate students, Vanderbilt--all students, Rice University--the student body is directly responsible for the effective working of the honor system and is an elected body of the students. The honor system at Rice was adopted by a vote of students in 1960. To the best of my knowledge this has not been voted by the law students here. At the number one university, they regulate their own honor code. At the University of Michigan and Virginia, it is the same thing. Here are the problems: students are appointed by the dean with no substantial role from the student bar association. In fact, their only role is that they invite people who are interested. The names go to the dean and the dean chooses. There is no vote. The chair is not elected. It is also appointed. The faculty are not elected either by the faculty or by the students. Hearing panels for the Law School are two students and two faculty. It is nice that they require three to have a guilty verdict. If there is a tie, the Dean could break the tie. In Medicine, Pharmacy, and Dentistry, Honor Code student members are elected. I would like to make a motion that this be sent back to the college and be given these concerns to work from.

The motion to send back was seconded.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

Louise Graham (Law) said that the faculty had considered the things that Professor Tagavi brought up about whether or not the Honor Council would be elected, and they would prefer not to have an election for a number of reasons. One, is that professionally it is unseemly for people to run on the basis that I am more honorable than you are and less likely to lie. Second, they actually get more experienced students and a more diverse honor council when the Dean selects than they could guarantee in an election. If this is recommitted to make those kinds of changes, they would probably say forget it and go with the University system.

Scott Gleeson (Biology) said that he could see this as an experimental thing. It would be instituted; they would try things, and then want to make changes. Will the Senate have to approve changes, or is this the approval of the process of developing a system? I would oppose sending it back because this is the kind of document that would evolve with experience.

David Durant (Honors) asked what student input was involved in the formation of the proposal?

Professor Graham said that a student representative sat on the committee that drafted the code, and it was presented to the Honor Council and it approved.

The motion to end debate passed in a show of hands.

The motion to recommit the proposal failed in a show of hands.

Professor Tagavi moved that the 12 student members be elected by the Student Bar Association. He said that he called the Student Bar Association, and they did not even know there was a proposal.

The motion was seconded.

Professor Graham said that the Student Bar Association is the student body. It is fair to tell you that is not a different group from the student body. The student body did not vote last spring on the Honor Code. The Student Bar Association President did go through with them and look at the amendment to the Honor Code. This could have been long enough ago that there is now a new Student Bar Association President.

An unidentified senator asked how the faculty and Student Bar Association would react to this amendment if it is passed.

Professor Graham said that the faculty would not like it very much. She said she could not speak for the Student Bar Association.

Robert Molzon (Mathematics) asked if there was a student representative from the Law school in attendance.

Professor Graham said there was not. She would have liked for that to have happened.

Keisha Carter (Student Senator - Arts and Sciences) asked if a student drafted the proposal.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

Professor Graham said that a student sat on the committee that drafted the proposal. There was a student representative from the Honor Council, the Chair of the Honor Council, who sat on the committee that redrafted the proposed changes, along with four or five faculty.

Jeff Dembo (Academic Ombud) said that he had just come back from a meeting at the Center for Academic Integrity which talks about things like honor codes, and Dr. Tagavi's notion is a very powerful one but it has to be taken in the perspective of the maturity of an organization. In its purest form, an honor code can, and perhaps, should be student-run. It takes time to get there in many instances. A certain level of trust has to be developed. Not having that, having an honor code that is discipline specific and allows peer review at its highest form, is still better than having the university at large being the initial arbitrator of those kinds of problems.

Professor Tagavi said this was not a new proposal. This is a revision of the current code. This is the Senate rule that any school or college can establish an honor code governed by students. No one can claim this would be governed by students.

Professor Kinderknecht (Dentistry) said that there were a number of factors in the proposal. One of the characteristics of the profession is to be self-governing. Whether the students are appointed or elected, they are still students, so it would meet the guidelines of being run by students. Oftentimes, those types of elections are either popularity contests or they are from classes who do not know the members of the class. Sometimes, appointments can be done better. I am disappointed that the students are not here to represent their perspectives, and maybe that should be a consideration in whether this is dealt with today or postponed.

Keisha Carter asked if there was only one student on the committee of about five to six people to decide a governing system of students.

Professor Graham said that was correct. She said the student then took the proposal back to the twelve students on the Honor Council, and they all discussed it and approved it.

The question was called. The motion to cut off debate passed in a show of hands.

The amendment failed in a show of hands.

Professor Graham said that because the students are studying to be lawyers and understand a lot about the legal process, the honor code had gotten so lawyered up that they could not run it. There were so many deadlines, and they could not meet the deadlines. Accusations usually happen at a time when students are absent from school. They were always trying to figure out if they had violated someone's rights because everyone wanted to go home for Christmas and stay home during the holidays until January, and in the meantime I always knew that there was a problem that they were going to be facing when they came back in January. Sometimes these problems could probably have been solved if they had been faced within days after the incident was reported in ways that were very different from the ways that they were solved and detrimentally so in the end. The second thing is that in the long run their students have difficulty investigating these events. They simply do not know what they have the power to do or what they need to do to find out whether something is true or false. They tend to be either overzealous or they seem to be too timid. This is because of a lack of experience. They don't have the leverage

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

of gray hair and age when they are talking to somebody--to look enough like a parent. Perhaps, the person would, in fact, reveal information that is necessary to follow whatever the riddle is. They also do not have the time to do this investigation, which always comes at really critical times. The design was to get the investigatory process back into the dean's office but to preserve student governance in the sense that students will have a deciding role in determining whether an event occurred and what the punishment for what you did should be. We thought that was the important part of it--to fix this so that these cases can be handled expeditiously. We just had last week the resolution of a charge that was brought involving final exams last December. This was not good for our institution, but had to happen with the rules we had. We have to do something.

Professor Durant asked what the thought was behind having two students and two faculty with the Dean breaking the tie if they did want to keep student control over the final decision.

Professor Graham said that they wanted to put this back in the hands of the dean because ultimately that is the person who hears from all the lawyers that tend to show up when these things happen. The thought was with two/two neither side could control. The drafter actually thought they wanted to get back as closely as they could to the university process but have the reporting requirements.

Professor Tagavi said there was no other problem with the proposal. It creates a penalty less than an E. A student who steals an exam could technically just receive a letter of reprimand. The rest of the University has a minimum penalty of E. If this is passed, it will be inconsistent with the rest of the rules.

Bill Fortune (Law) said that the Senate Rules have as an academic offense plagiarism and cheating, but they do not have stealing. These rules correspond to the Senate Rules except that obviously these proposed rules have stealing as a possible academic offense--stealing which does not involve cheating. It was cheating under the Senate Rules and under these rules the minimum grade is an E in the course.

Michael Kennedy (Geography) moved to approve the proposal for two years and then bring it back.

The motion was seconded.

Professor Durant asked if they passed the two-year proposal, would Law School be willing to take this to the students and give them some feedback as to how they think it is working?

Professor Graham said that would be fair. They would want to have something from the students, and she could guarantee them that part of the redrafting is from students who think that people were not convicted when they had done something and other people were charged when they had not. The students thought this was a working system.

Professor Molzon said that he was encouraged by the fact that there would be some consideration of student input, but he still was a little concerned that they would approve this for two years without any input from the students here today. There could have been a statement

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

from the students who could not be here today. I am concerned we are passing something for students, and there is zero student input.

The amendment to have the proposal in effect for two years and then return to the Senate passed in show of hands.

Keisha Carter said that her biggest concern was that this was supposed to be self-governing and since there are two students and two faculty and both students are appointed by the dean, if this is supposed to be a self governing experience even though they are appointed by the dean, it seems there should be more students than faculty, maybe three/two. That way, the students still would be self-governing and the dean would still have a role.

An unidentified senator said that in this particular situation it seems that a decision could be made with two students and three faculty members on the other. Would a system in which there was one student and five faculty be self-governing? What is the definition of self-governing?

Michael Healy (Law) said that wasn't the answer, whatever the Senate said it was. It does not just say governed by students, it says governed by students with approval by and/or appeal to the faculty.

Professor Tagavi said that when it says governed, it says by students. When it says appeal, it means the proposal could be appealed to the faculty. It does not say the decision could be appealed to the faculty.

Professor Tagavi made the amendment to change to three students and two faculty members.

The amendment was seconded.

Professor Healy said that the reason it was changed was that there was a majority of students previously on the Honor Council, and it was a complete failure. Maybe the ultimate judgment is that the Law School can not have an honor code because an honor code does not work in that context with a majority of students making the decision.

George Blandford (Engineering) said that it does not matter what the honor code decides. It is all a recommendation to the dean. The dean can change any decision.

Professor Molzon asked why should they make it three instead of two. That comes back to what they mean by self-governance. If they want to call it self-governance, they need to have a clear idea of what that means. How could something be called self-governance when the students are in the minority?

The amendment to change to three students and two faculty failed in a show of hands.

Keisha Carter said that she heard the Law School say that the reason they had to do it this way, with two students and two faculty, is because the students were not able to accomplish what they set out to accomplish. If they were not able to do that, why was it called self-governance? Obviously, it is not going to be that any more if they do it this way.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

The question was called. The motion to cut off debate on the main proposal passed in a show of hands.

The amended proposal passed in a show of hands--41 for and 18 against.

The Chair recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of the second action item.

Professor Meyer reviewed the background of the item and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

ACTION ITEM 2 - Proposal to amend the University Senate Rules, Section I - 1.1.0, Authority to Waive Rules

Proposal [New section is underlined]

1.1.0 AUTHORITY

The *Rules of the University Senate* describe the composition of the Senate and procedures for the conduct of its functions as authorized by the Board of Trustees in the *Governing Regulations* of the University of Kentucky, Part IV, *THE UNIVERSITY SENATE* (University System), December 8, 1992. It further describes academic policies for the University and procedures for their implementation. These Rules may be waived by the Senate Council or by the Senate Council Chair if the decision is necessary before the next Senate Council meeting. These *Rules* may be amended by the University Senate.

Background:

In January, 1999, the Rules and Elections Committee met to consider a problem raised by the Chair of the Senate Council regarding waiver of Senate Rules. The Chair reported that he is frequently asked to waive rules, and would appreciate some consistency in the waiver procedure. He asked the Rules Committee to draft a rule permitting such waivers. The Rules Committee discussed a draft rule, but concluded that waiver as a general matter was inappropriate. The Rules Committee recommended that the appropriate action would be to make clear that the Rules cannot be waived.

In response to the Rules Committee recommendation, the Senate Council directed the Chair to send out a survey to all deans, associate deans and assistant deans, asking whether they favored or opposed the creation of a Senate Rule that would allow waivers or not, and, under what circumstances if the former. Few individuals responded, but, of those who did, all favored a mechanism to accommodate rule waivers in unusual circumstances.

At the request of the Rules Committee, the issue was returned to the Senate Council for consideration. The Senate Council did not adopt the Rules Committee position, but amended the Rules to accommodate some flexibility.

Implementation: Fall, 2000

Note: If approved, the proposal will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

Professor Tagavi said that he had a procedural question. He read from Senate Council Rule insert "If referred to a committee, the committee shall approve, disapprove, or modify the recommendation." Then the original recommendation is sent to the Senate Council: "The recommendation will be placed on the Senate agenda." It does not give even the power of modifying to the Senate Council. This is out of order and should be sent back to committee.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

Brad Canon (Political Science) said that the rule did not specifically forbid the Senate Council from making a recommendation. It is silent on that subject.

An unidentified Senator said that the last thing of the proposal was "If approved, the proposal will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification."

Chairperson Moore referred to the proposal back to the Rules Committee for interpretation of the rule.

The Chair recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of the third action item.

Professor Meyer said this proposal was the recommendations from the Transition Team to basically bring into consistency the rules applying to Lexington Community College and UK's Main Campus.

Chairperson Moore said editorial changes and matters that do not change the substance of the proposal are ordinarily done during the codification process.

ACTION ITEM 3 - Amended LCC Transition Team Rules Changes.

Background:

The ad hoc Senate Committee on the Lexington Community College transition recommends the following changes in the University Senate Rules to make them apply both to the main campus and to Lexington Community College. If approved, these changes would delete sections IV, V, and VI of the Lexington Community College Rules which were added to the Senate Rules, Section X, on April 7, 1998.

The earlier circulated errata sheet, accepted by the University Senate on 6 March 2000, has been incorporated into this document; several other changes have been proposed, considered, and accepted (or not) by LCC, by David Durant as Chair of the Transition Team, and by the Senate Council. Those that were accepted are incorporated into this copy. The proposed changes are attached.

Proposals [add bolded sections; delete portions marked with strikeovers]

2.1.0 UNIVERSITY CALENDAR

2.1.1 POLICY GUIDELINES

- A The academic year shall consist of two semesters each including 15 weeks and a minimum of an eight-week summer session with the Fall Semester beginning in time to permit completion prior to the Christmas holidays.
- B The eight-week summer session will be scheduled so that classes begin in early June. (US: 3/20/95)
- C An additional four-week summer term between the close of Spring Semester and the opening of the eight-week summer term shall be provided.
- D National holidays occurring during the period when classes are normally in session which shall be treated as academic holidays are Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day, Martin Luther King Birthday, Memorial Day, Independence Day and Election Day in presidential years. When Independence Day falls on Saturday or Sunday the preceding Friday or the following Monday shall be an academic holiday. (US: 4/25/88)
- E The Friday and Saturday after Thanksgiving Day shall be declared academic holidays.
- F The tenth week of the spring semester shall be utilized each year as the spring vacation period. (US: 4/25/88)

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

- G All grades shall be due in the Registrar's Office three (3) days after the final examination is administered. (See Section V., 1.6.)
- H Due to special scheduling problems in the Colleges of Medicine, Dentistry and Law, special calendars may be adopted for these Colleges. They shall prepare calendars at least three years in advance, forwarding them to the Registrar to be presented to the University Senate Council, along with the University calendar, for approval. Such calendars shall conform with the University calendar as nearly as possible.
- I The College of Pharmacy shall offer a 15-week summer semester.
- J The first Friday of October is designated as a mid-term reading day. No classes will be held. (US: 12/11/95)
- K. Two alternate six-week sessions may be provided. The first alternate six-week session would begin approximately at the same time as the four-week session; the end of the second six-week session would coincide as closely as possible to the end of the eight-week summer session.**

Rationale: Lexington Community College now has 6 week sessions, which it wishes to retain. UK may want to take advantage of this variant, as well.

3.1.3 REMEDIAL COURSES

All remedial courses created by the University Senate shall be designated with the letter R following the course designation and number. No course designated with an R shall receive credit towards a ~~bachelor's~~ degree at the University of Kentucky. (US: 3/7/88)

Rationale: To include Associate as well as Bachelor's degrees.

3.2.0 PROCEDURES FOR PROCESSING ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND CHANGES

Procedures for processing Academic Program Proposals and Changes in Existing Academic Programs (US: 11/14/88)

For the purpose of these *Rules*, academic programs are defined as the requirements leading to a degree. The initiation of academic programs and changes in existing academic programs shall be processed as described below.

- B The College faculty makes its recommendations to the Dean **or the LCC President** who signs the proposal and forwards it to the Council(s) of the Senate, supplying the information required, and at the same time circulating a description of these recommendations to the Deans, Department Chairsmen ~~or~~ **Division Heads** and members of the University Senate. In the case of Deans and Department Chairsmen ~~or~~ **Division Heads**, these notices shall be posted in a central location where all faculty may see and have opportunity to raise objections in the allotted time.
 1. All programs recommended by the colleges of the Medical Center shall be forwarded to the ACMC for action first.
 2. All programs or changes in programs leading to the undergraduate or professional degree (except those in the College of Law or the colleges of the Medical Center) shall be forwarded to the Undergraduate Council first.
 3. All new graduate programs or changes in graduate programs (except for the colleges of the Medical Center) shall be forwarded to the Graduate Council for action first.
 4. **All programs or changes in programs leading to an Associate Degree at Lexington Community College shall be forwarded first to the Lexington Community College Academic Council for action.**

• • •

3.3.0 Final responsibility for the approval of new courses, changes in courses and dropping of courses, shall be vested in the appropriate Councils as follows:

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

1. The Undergraduate Council will make the final decision on all new courses or changes in courses numbered 001-499 (**except for courses designed exclusively for Lexington Community College with Lexington Community College prefixes** but including 400G-499G), subject to appeal to the Senate through the Senate Council. The Undergraduate Council will have courses numbered 500-599 routed to it in the usual manner, but will only recommend on these and forward them to the Graduate Council for consideration (see paragraph 9 below). In addition, it will make the final decision on all courses numbered 800-999 originating outside the colleges of the Medical Center and the College of Law, subject to appeal to the Senate through the Senate Council.

4. The Lexington Community College Academic Council will make the final decision on courses numbered 001-299 designed exclusively for Lexington Community College with Lexington Community College prefixes.

[renumber subsequent paragraphs]

3.3.1 REMOVAL OF COURSES FROM BULLETIN: PURGING COURSES (RC: 11/14/88)

If a course has not been taught in the classroom, by extension or correspondence, within a four-year period, the Registrar shall remove the description of the course from the University *Bulletin*. A course so removed from the *Bulletin* shall remain in the University course file for an additional four years (unless the college requests its removal). During the additional four year period, the college may offer the course and, if it is taught, the Registrar shall restore its description to the University *Bulletin*. If it is not taught within the four year period, the course shall be removed from the University course file. (US: 2/10/86)

* Even if a course has not been offered on the main campus for four years, it will remain in the *Bulletin* if it has been taught during that period at **Lexington Community College** ~~or more of the community colleges~~. (SC: 2/10/88)

4.1.0 APPLICATION FOR ADMISSION AND READMISSION

All applicants meeting the appropriate academic requirements shall be considered equally for admission to the University or to any college or academic program regardless of race, color, religion, sex, marital status or national origin. (US:2/14/77) All applicants for admission to the University, and all University students who have not been enrolled for one or more semesters, must submit to the Admissions Office an official application for admission and supporting documents as described below:

B This requirement shall not apply to University students taking summer work elsewhere who are enrolled in the University for the preceding spring and following fall semesters, except that these students must submit to the Registrar's Office official transcripts of such summer work; ~~nor shall it apply to University students enrolling only in one or more sessions of consecutive summers.~~

F Transfer Students

Students at other colleges or universities, including ~~UK~~ **Lexington Community Colleges** will be permitted to transfer to the University of Kentucky if they meet one of the following criteria:

4.2.1.2 Admission to Advanced Standing

A **Admission of University of Kentucky Lexington Community College Students** ~~-(See also Section X, USR)~~ Grades, credits, quality points and academic status from courses taken in the University of Kentucky **Lexington Community College** shall be transferred when the Community College student enrolls in the University System. The applicability of any given courses not offered in the University System towards a University degree shall be determined by the Dean of the College in which the student enrolls.

4.2.6 RULES RELATING TO ADMISSION TO LEXINGTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

[Note: The following section will be renumbered when codified.]

1.0 Admission or Readmission

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

All applicants meeting the appropriate academic requirements and technical standards shall be considered equally for admission to Lexington Community College or to any academic program thereof regardless of race, color, religion, sex, marital status, beliefs, national origin, age, sexual orientation, or mental or physical disability.

For admission to the College, an applicant must file an application for admission and submit a completed entering student survey. Applicants subject to the precollege curriculum must also submit a high school transcript and, if applicable, a passing GED official score report. Degree-seeking students who are excluded from the precollege curriculum requirements are those twenty-five (25) years of age or older prior to the first day of classes, those entering the community college with 24 or more semester credit hours applicable toward a degree with a grade point average (GPA) of at least 2.0 on a 4.0 scale, and active duty military personnel, their spouses and dependents. Health forms may be required of all students, and other supporting documents may be required under the provisions of IV 2.0. These documents must be submitted prior to the first day of classes of the semester, intersession or summer session for which the student plans to enroll. The President of Lexington Community College, with the approval of the Chancellor for the Lexington Campus, may establish an earlier date. Except for non-resident aliens, the President of the College may waive the requirement that supporting documents be filed prior to the first day of classes.

Every non-resident alien applicant whose native language is other than English is required to take the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) prior to approval for admission. A score of 500 or higher on the TOEFL or an average score of 81 or higher in English Language Skills on the Michigan Test is required for admission, provided that either is obtained within the previous 18 months prior to the first day of classes of the semester for which the applicant is applying. Resident aliens may be requested to take the TOEFL or Michigan Test for guidance purposes. A non-resident alien must also submit the results of the American College Test (ACT), the Career-Planning Program (CPP), Computerized Placement Test (CPT), Advising Student Success Equity Technology (ASSET), or the Computer-Adaptive Placement Assessment and Support Services System (COMPASS) in accordance with the policies of the Council on Postsecondary Education.

A former student who has been enrolled at another college since his or her last enrollment at the community college, except as a transient, shall apply for readmission as a student with previous college work and shall be subject to regulations and deadlines set forth in the above paragraphs.

1.1 Readmission After Two or More Years (Bankruptcy)

- a. A student who has been admitted or readmitted after having remained out of both the Lexington Community College and the University System for a period of two (2) or more years, and who has completed at least twelve (12) credit hours in courses numbered 100 or above with a grade point average of 2.0 or better after admission or readmission, may choose to have none of the course work attempted in the Community College System and the University System prior to the interruption included in the computation of the student's grade point average. The calculation of the grade point average after the student declares bankruptcy begins with the semester of admission or readmission.
- b. A student who has elected not to count past work in the computation of his or her grade point average may be permitted by the President of LCC to receive credit for those selected courses in which credit was earned with a grade of A, B, C, D, or P, prior to admission or readmission, without including those grades in the computation of the student's grade point average.

2.0 Admission Requirements

2.1 Admission to Lexington Community College

2.11 Admission as a First-Time Freshman

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

- 2.111 Resident students: Kentucky residents who have not previously attended college are eligible for admission to Lexington Community College with degree status provided they have graduated from high school, secured the GED certificate or are eligible to take the GED and:**
- a. they file an application for admission by the proper deadline;
 - b. they submit the results of the ACT, the CPP, ASSET, COMPASS, or CPT in accordance with the policies of the Council on Postsecondary Education.

A high school transcript or passing GED official score report may be required.

Precollege Curriculum

Degree-seeking students who are subject to the precollege curriculum requirements must correct any deficiencies prior to completing twenty-four (24) credit hours of degree credit at the community college. A degree-seeking student failing to correct deficiencies shall be prohibited from enrolling in additional degree credit courses until the deficiencies have been corrected. Students scoring at or above the 60th percentile on the mathematics or English portions of the ACT, or approved equivalent scores on the GED, CPP, CPT, SAT, ASSET, or COMPASS tests, shall be considered as having demonstrated proficiency in the respective subject. Students who have earned a GED subject score at the 60th percentile or above meet the precollege curriculum requirement for that subject area. Students matriculating from a non-accredited high school shall have their transcripts reviewed under the same criteria as other students entering under the precollege curriculum policy.

A waiver of a required precollege curriculum course may be justified if a handicapping condition and its impact on completing the course in question is verified by the college president (or designee) and if another course in a closely related area is substituted for the course that cannot be completed.

The precollege curriculum requirements as they appear in the "Guidelines for Undergraduate Admission to the State-Supported Institutions of Higher Education in Kentucky" (13 KAR 2:020, Section 4) are as follows:

English	4 Units	English I, II, III, and IV
Mathematics	3 Units	Algebra I, Algebra II, Geometry or Integrated Math I, Integrated Math II, Integrated Math III or Any three course combination of Algebra I and II, Geometry and Integrated Math I, II, III as long as the course sequence reflects an increasing level of complexity.
Science	2 Units	Biology I, and Chemistry I or Physics I or Principles of Technology (At least one (1) of the science courses must be a laboratory course.)
Social Studies	2 Units	World Civilization, and U.S. History or AP American History

11 Units out of 20 Total Units

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

2.112 Non-Resident Students

Applicants who are not residents of the Commonwealth of Kentucky must meet the conditions set forth for the admission of resident applicants, except that they are not required to meet the World Civilization requirement of the precollege curriculum. In addition, they must obtain the approval of the President of the community college and meet at least one of the following conditions in order to be admitted:

- a. graduate in the top 50 percent of their high school class;
- b. score in the 50th percentile (composite) or above for all students taking the ACT nationally;
- c. demonstrate through other accepted measures the ability to pursue the college academic program without substantial remedial aid.

2.113 High School Students

2.1131 Waiver of Condition of High School Graduation

The condition of graduation from high school may be waived for a student currently enrolled in high school subject to the following guidelines:

1. The applicant must have completed the junior year of high school with a B average or better.
2. The applicant must submit the following:
 - a. Application form
 - b. ACT scores
 - c. Written recommendations from the high school principal and a guidance counselor including certification of the eligibility requirements listed in 2.1131 (1).
3. The maximum number of courses that may be completed by a high school student under Section IV, 2.1131 is two (2) in any term.
4. Exceptions to these guidelines must be approved by the Community College President (or designee) and documented in the student's record.

2.1132 Dual Credit Guidelines (Council on Postsecondary Education, January 11, 1988)

1. Definition.

Dual credit exists when both a high school and a college/university award credit to a high school student for the same course taught on a high school campus.

2. Admissions Standards

- a. Recommendation of high school subject area teacher or other appropriate high school official.
- b. Certification by high school guidance counselor that student is pursuing the pre-college curriculum.
- c. Dual Credit enrollment is restricted to high school seniors.
- d. A composite ACT score that exceeds the national mean and a minimum score at the 60th percentile (national) on the discipline area of the ACT and a minimum of 3.25 high school grade point standing on all courses completed at the 9th grade level and higher.

or

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

A composite ACT score that exceeds the national mean and a minimum score at the 70th percentile (national) on the discipline area of the ACT and a minimum of 3.0 high school grade point standing on all courses completed at the 9th grade level and higher.

e. SAT scores may be substituted for the ACT as shown below:

1. A total SAT score above the national mean to be computed by adding the national mean scores on the verbal and math components of the SAT. (To be substituted for the ACT composite score.)

OR

2. A minimum score of the 70th percentile (national) on the verbal subscore of the SAT to enroll in dual credit courses in English (or one of the language arts) or a minimum score of the 70th percentile (national) on the math subscore of the SAT to enroll in dual credit courses in math and sciences. (To be substituted for the ACT area scores.)

3. The maximum number of dual credit courses that may be completed by a high school student is four, with no more than two courses in a single discipline.

2.1133 Maximum Course Load for High School Students

High school students may take no more than two (2) credit courses, including dual-credit, in any regular fall, spring or summer term.

2.12 Admission of Students with Previous College Work

An applicant with previous college work seeking admission with degree status must submit an official transcript(s) of all previous college work. A transfer student also is subject to the precollege curriculum requirements unless at least one of the following criteria is met:

- a. The student is twenty-five (25) years of age or older prior to the first day of classes;
- b. The student is entering the community college with 24 or more semester credit hours applicable toward a degree with a grade point average (GPA) of at least 2.0 on a 4.0 scale.

A waiver of a required precollege curriculum course may be justified if a handicapping condition and its impact on completing the course in question is verified by the college President (or designee) and if another course in a closely related area is substituted for the course that cannot be completed.

A transfer student who is subject to the precollege curriculum must submit a high school transcript and, if applicable, a passing GED official score report, and must correct any precollege curriculum deficiencies within the first twenty-four (24) credit hours of degree credit taken at the community college.

Grades, credits, quality points and academic status from courses taken at other community colleges in the University of Kentucky Community College System or the University System are transferred when the student enrolls.

Degree credit work taken at a fully accredited college or university outside of the University of Kentucky is recognized credit hour for credit hour. Quarter hours are

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

recognized as two-thirds (2/3) of a semester hour. In order to be classified as fully accredited, a college or university must be a member of a regional accrediting association. Advance standing from a nonaccredited college or university may be obtained by special subject examinations or may be validated by completion of twelve (12) credit hours, excluding courses numbered less than 100, with a grade point of at least 2.0. Coursework from a nonaccredited institution will not satisfy general education block transfer certification requirements.

The President of Lexington Community College is authorized to establish with fully accredited colleges and universities a reciprocal agreement whereby grades received as well as credit earned at a previous institution shall be recognized by the Lexington Community College.

2.121 Admission of Second Chance Students

If an applicant for admission from outside the Lexington Community College has less than a C average in all previous college work, the applicant may be considered for admission on probation provided the applicant:

- a. has been out of college for at least one semester, or
- b. will succeed in the opinion of the President of the College.

2.13 Admission as a Non-Degree Student

Persons who desire instruction without wishing to become degree candidates may be admitted as non-degree students. Non-degree students are exempt from the precollege curriculum requirements; however, such students must present satisfactory evidence that they are prepared to take the work desired. Before enrolling in a particular course, such a student must obtain the permission of the instructor and the President of the College. The degree-seeking status of students declaring themselves as "non-degree" will be subject to review and reclassification by the Dean of Student Affairs (or designee) in accordance with policies established at Lexington Community College.

Non-degree students may become degree students after meeting regular admission requirements; however, work taken as a non-degree student will not in itself qualify a person for admission as a degree student. Credit in degree courses earned before a student meets admission requirements will be counted toward a degree.

2.14 Admission as a Transient Student

A student may be admitted as a transient or visiting student. Such students are not subject to the precollege curriculum requirements; however, the student's parent college must certify that the student is eligible to enroll at that institution. Admission as a transient or visiting student is good only for the semester or session for which the student applies.

2.2 Admission to and Retention in Technical Programs

Admission to the College does not guarantee admission to any Associate in Applied Science Degree program. Admission to these degree programs is dependent upon the availability of resources for implementation of quality instruction, and the number of students admitted may be limited by these considerations. If, due to the availability of resources, it becomes necessary for the President to limit enrollment, the following procedures will apply:

1. Guidelines for the limitation of enrollment will be prepared by the program coordinator in consultation with the faculty of the program and once established shall be periodically reviewed.
 - a. Guidelines shall contain a clear, concise statement of all special tests, examinations, and requirements that are used in the selection process along with an identification of the minimum acceptable score on any such tests, examinations and requirements.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

- b. Guidelines shall contain a clear, concise statement of priorities assigned to any of the above items in selecting students for admission to a program.
 - c. If an admissions committee is used in the selection of students for admission to a program, the composition of the admissions committee shall be specified in the guidelines. Such a committee shall be advisory to the President of the College or the President's designee.
 - d. If a program has no special requirements other than those for admission to the college, this should be so stated.
2. Upon approval of the proposed guidelines by the faculty of the division and of the college, the guidelines have been submitted to the Senate of the University System through the Rules Committee for approval:
3. In no event shall the establishment of admission guidelines for the limitation of enrollment be viewed as an attempt to eliminate from consideration students who are educationally not prepared for admission. It shall be the responsibility of the college to counsel and assist such students in the elimination of such deficiencies so as to qualify for entrance into a program.
4. College retention guidelines or any special requirements which would limit continuation in the program of students such as the minimum grade of "C" in certain courses currently used in the Nursing, Nuclear Medicine Technology, Dental Hygiene, Dental Laboratory Technology, Radiography, and Respiratory Care programs shall be clearly identified and a rationale for such requirements shall be provided at the time the proposal is initially submitted to the Lexington Community College Academic Council. For programs which have already been approved by the Community College Council, such special requirements or additions must have approval, prior to implementation, by the Rules Committee. (See V, 4.21)
5. Each student must show evidence that he or she has professional liability insurance (in an amount to be determined by Lexington Community College) when he or she enrolls in any health related program course requiring patient/client contact.
6. An occupational program with special admission guidelines may reserve a designated number of admission slots to serve qualified students from outside the normal service area to serve the Commonwealth. If a sufficient number of qualified applicants does not apply, the college may fill these slots from the service area. Since the purpose of this rule is to serve the manpower needs of the underserved areas of Kentucky, a statement of intent to return to the home community will be required.
7. After admission and prior to enrollment in an allied health, environmental science or nursing program, each student must show evidence that he/she:
 - a. has received Hepatitis B vaccination, or
 - b. is in the process of receiving the Hepatitis B vaccine series.A signed declination form must be submitted if a student chooses not to receive the Hepatitis B vaccination.

2.21 Dental Hygiene Program

2.211 Guidelines

Enrollment in the Dental Hygiene Program may be limited because of available resources within the community and the college.

Technical Standards

Health care delivery can be characterized as the application of specific knowledge to skillful performance. Therefore, in order to be considered for admission or to be retained in the program after admission, all applicants should possess:

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

1. Sufficient visual acuity, such as is needed in the preparation and administration of therapeutic agents and for the observation necessary for patient periodontal assessment as in taking vital signs.
2. Sufficient auditory perception to interpret verbal communication from patients and members of the health team and to assess health needs of people through the use of monitoring devices such as the stethoscope.
3. Sufficient gross and fine motor coordination to perform the delicate manual intraoral operations required of dental personnel, such as is needed in the scaling of teeth.
4. Sufficient verbal and non-verbal communication skills (speech, reading, and writing), such as are needed in classroom and clinical settings to interact with patients and professional personnel.
5. Sufficient intellectual and emotional functions to plan and implement care for individuals, such as are required in developing a dental hygiene treatment plan.

Selection of students for the program will be made by the President of the College or the President's designee after considering the recommendations of the Admissions Committee. Suggested membership for this committee is as follows:

Program Coordinator
Admission Officer
Division Chair
Dental Hygiene Faculty Member
Faculty Member At-Large
Counselor

Admission to the Dental Hygiene Program is open to all qualified students regardless of economic or social status, and without discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, marital status, beliefs, age, national origin, sexual orientation, or mental or physical disability. Applicants must complete and submit the items listed below to the Admissions Office by March 1:

1. Official high school transcript or GED results.
2. ACT or CPP scores for all applicants.
3. Lexington Community College Application.
4. Transcripts of all post-secondary education.
5. Dental experience form.

This date may be extended by the college due to unusual circumstances.

Preference:

1. May be given to applicants with an "enhanced" ACT composite score of 19 or above or the equivalent on the CPP.
2. May be given to students who achieve a GPA of 2.0 or better in post-secondary education or training.
3. May be given to applicants with 24 hours of work and/or observation experience in a dental environment.
4. May be given to applicants who have completed, in the approved curriculum, anatomy and physiology, microbiology, and chemistry coursework with a grade of "C" or better.
5. Will be given to Kentucky residents.

A conference with a dental hygiene faculty member is required prior to enrolling in the program.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

Readmission

1. A student who withdraws from or earns a grade lower than a "C" in one of the approved science courses and/or in a dental hygiene course will be dropped from the dental hygiene program.
2. Applicants who wish to apply for readmission should do so prior to March 1, if planning to enroll for the summer/fall semester or October 1, if planning to enroll in the spring semester.
3. Readmission to the Dental Hygiene Program will be dependent upon available resources.
4. In order to be considered for readmission by the Admissions Committee, the applicant must:
 - a. Submit a written request to the Dental Hygiene Program Coordinator presenting evidence to justify readmission. This may include letters of recommendation from previous faculty/coordinator, additional course work, work experience, etc.
 - b. Meet current guidelines for admission to the college and the Dental Hygiene Program.
5. If more than three (3) years have elapsed since initial enrollment in the Program, the applicant will be counseled to enter appropriate dental hygiene courses.
6. A student may be readmitted to the Dental Hygiene Program a maximum of three times provided that he/she can furnish evidence of unusual circumstances, remedial study, or additional preparation.

Transfer

1. Applicants who wish to transfer from one Dental Hygiene Program to another, the latter being a program offered by the Community College System, must meet all admission requirements of the receiving institution, must apply at least two months prior to the expected date of enrollment, and must notify the Coordinator of the admitting program in writing, stating anticipated entry date, and reason for transfer.
2. Acceptance of any transfer student will be dependent upon available resources.

2.22 Dental Laboratory Technology Program

Technical Standards

Dental Laboratory Technicians fabricate custom-made prostheses designed to meet each patient's specific needs. Therefore, in order to be considered for admission or to be retained in the program after admission, all applicants must possess:

1. Sufficient visual acuity, such as is needed in the fabrication of small, highly-detailed dental prostheses.
2. Sufficient gross and fine motor coordination to safely manipulate equipment required in the fabrication of dental prostheses.
3. Sufficient intellectual and emotional functions to develop and fabricate dental prostheses as prescribed by the dentist.
4. Sufficient verbal and non-verbal communication skills (speech, reading, and writing), such as are needed to interact with professional personnel.

Admission

Enrollment is limited because of available facilities, faculty and financial resources. Selection of students for the Dental Laboratory Program will be made by the President of the College or the President's designee after

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

considering the recommendations of the Admissions Committee. Suggested membership for this committee would be as follows:

Division Chairperson
Dental Laboratory Coordinator
Dental Laboratory Faculty Member
Counselor
Admissions Officer
General Education Faculty Member]

Admission to the Dental Laboratory Technology Program is open to all qualified students regardless of economic or social status, and without discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, marital status, beliefs, age, national origin, sexual orientation, or mental or physical disability. Each applicant must submit the following data by March 1: (Qualified applicants may be considered and admitted prior to March 1, and, at the President's discretion, applicants may submit data and be considered for admission after March 1.)

1. Application for admission to L.C.C.
2. An official high school transcript or results of the GED.
3. Results of the ACT.
4. An official transcript of all post-secondary education attempted.
5. Results of a Dental Dexterity Assessment

Preference:

1. May be given to applicants who score 4 or above on a Dental Dexterity Assessment.
2. May be given to applicants with an "enhanced" ACT composite score of 19 or above.
3. Preference will be given to Kentucky residents.
4. May be given to applicants having a GPA of 2.0 or higher (4.0 scale) on all college work.

Readmission

1. A student who withdraws from or earns lower than a grade of C in a Dental Laboratory Technology course will be dropped from the Associate Degree Dental Laboratory Technology program.
2. Applicants who wish to apply for readmission must do so two months prior to anticipated enrollment for the subsequent fall or spring semesters.
3. Readmission to the Dental Laboratory Technology program is dependent upon available resources.
4. In order to be considered for readmission the applicant must:
 - a. Submit a written request to the Dental Laboratory Technology Program Coordinator including information to justify readmission.
 - b. Submit a written recommendation from a faculty member of the program addressed to the Dental Laboratory Technology Admissions Committee supporting the student's readmission to the program.
 - c. Meet current guidelines for admission.

2.23 Nuclear Medicine Technology

Enrollment is limited because of available facilities, faculty, and financial resources.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

Technical Standards

Nuclear Medicine involves the provision of direct care for individuals and is characterized by the application of verified knowledge in the skillful performance of nuclear medicine technology. Therefore, in order to be successful in the program, all applicants should possess:

- 1. Sufficient visual acuity such as needed in the accurate preparation and administration of radiopharmaceuticals and for the observation necessary for patient assessment and care.**
- 2. Sufficient auditory perception to receive verbal communication from patients and members of the health care team and to assess health needs of people through the use of monitoring devices such as cardiac monitors, stethoscopes, intravenous infusion pumps, fire alarms, etc.**
- 3. Sufficient gross and fine motor coordination to respond promptly and to implement the skills related to the performance of nuclear medicine technology, such as manipulating equipment, as well as positioning, transporting, and imaging patients.**
- 4. Sufficient communication skills (speech, reading, writing) to interact with individuals and to communicate their needs promptly and effectively, as may be necessary in the patient's/client's interest.**
- 5. Sufficient intellectual and emotional function to plan and implement care of individuals.**

Admission

All applicants meeting the appropriate academic requirements and technical standards shall be considered equally for admission to the College or to any academic program thereof regardless of economic or social status, and will not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, marital status, beliefs, age, national origin, sexual orientation, or mental or physical disability.

Selection of the students for the nuclear medicine technology program will be made by the President of the College or the President's designee after considering the recommendations of the admissions committee. Membership for this committee would be as follows:

**Division Chairperson
Nuclear Medicine Technology Program Coordinator
Nuclear Medicine Technology Faculty Member
Counselor
Admissions Officer
General education faculty member**

Each applicant must submit the following data by March 1 (at the President's discretion, qualified applicants may be considered after March 1):

- 1. Application for admission to Lexington Community College.**
- 2. An official high school transcript or result of the GED.**
- 3. Results of the ACT (if less than 12 credits of college work have been completed. The courses must be numbered 100 or higher excluding remedial courses.).**
- 4. An official transcript of all post-secondary education attempted.**
- 5. Attendance at an advising conference or interview.**
- 6. Documentation of eight (8) clock hours of observation in a nuclear medicine department.**

Preference:

- 1. Will be given to Kentucky residents.**
- 2. May be given to qualified applicants with an "enhanced" ACT composite score of 19 or above, or with a 2.5 GPA or above (4.0 scale)**

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

- on all college work consisting of at least 12 semester credit hours of courses numbered 100 or above in the approved curriculum.
3. May be given to qualified applicants of under-represented student populations in accordance with equity policies of the University of Kentucky and Lexington Community College.
 4. May be given to qualified applicants who have completed the required mathematics course and the required biological and physical science courses or equivalent courses with a grade of C or better.]

Rolling Admission

An applicant may be admitted to the nuclear medicine technology program prior to the March 1 deadline if the following criteria are met:

1. A complete application is submitted to the college by January 15.
2. A GPA of 3.0 or better (4.0 scale) on 12 semester hours of college credit for courses numbered 100 or above applicable to the nuclear medicine technology curriculum.
3. An "enhanced" ACT composite score of 21 or above.
4. Completion of the required mathematics course and the biological science courses or equivalent courses is documented with a 3.0 or better (4.0 scale) for each course.

Enrollment

If not completed previous to admission to the nuclear medicine technology program, the student must complete the required mathematics and science courses that are prerequisite to the first NMT course with a grade of C or better.

Retention

A student who withdraws from or earns lower than a grade of C in a course with the prefix NMT will not be permitted to continue in the nuclear medicine technology program.

A student must earn a grade of C or better in each required science course in the curriculum in order to remain enrolled in the program.

Readmission

The process regarding application for readmission to the nuclear medicine technology program is as follows:

1. Students who wish to apply for readmission to the program must do so prior to March 1 if planning to enroll in the subsequent year.
2. Readmission to the nuclear medicine technology program will be dependent upon available resources.
3. In order to be considered for readmission by the program admissions committee, the student must:
 - a. Update information in the admission office file prior to March 1;
 - b. Submit a written request to the program coordinator including information to justify readmission; and]
 - c. Submit a written recommendation from a faculty member of the program addressed to the program admissions committee supporting the student's readmission to the program.
4. If three (3) years or more have elapsed since the initial enrollment in the program, the student must repeat the technical courses of the curriculum or successfully complete special examinations for those courses for which examinations are available.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

5. A student may be readmitted to the nuclear medicine technology program two times. The program admissions committee may recommend readmission a third time if a student can furnish evidence of unusual circumstances, remedial study or additional preparation.
6. Application for readmission is not a guarantee of readmission to the program.]

2.24 Nursing Program

Enrollment in the Associate Degree Nursing Program may be limited because of available laboratory facilities in the community, as well as limited faculty and financial resources at the community college.

Technical Standards

Nursing at the technical level involves the provision of direct care for individuals and is characterized by the application of verified knowledge in the skillful performance of nursing functions. All students should possess:

1. Sufficient visual acuity, such as is needed in preparation and administration of medications, and for the observation necessary for patient assessment and nursing care.
2. Sufficient auditory perception to receive verbal communication from patients and members of the health team and to assess health needs of people through the use of monitoring devices such as cardiac monitors, stethoscopes, IV infusion pumps, Doptones, fire alarms, etc.
3. Sufficient gross and fine motor coordination to respond promptly and to implement the skills, including the manipulation of equipment, required in meeting health needs.
4. Sufficient communication skills (speech, reading, writing) to interact with individuals and to communicate their needs promptly and effectively, as may be necessary in the individual's interest.
5. Sufficient intellectual and emotional functions to plan and implement care for individuals.

Admission to the Associate Degree Nursing Program is open to all qualified students regardless of economic or social status, and without discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, marital status, beliefs, age, national origin, sexual orientation or mental or physical disability (refer to Technical Standards Section). In addition to the other qualifications, the college will, in compliance with University regulations and in the manner and to the extent permitted by law, endeavor to recruit students who add to the diversity of the student population in the Associate Degree Nursing Program.

Selection of students for the Associate Degree Nursing Program will be made by the President of the College or the President's designee after considering the recommendations of an Admissions Committee which is to be appointed for this purpose. Membership on this committee shall be from the college as follows:

Admissions Officer
Associate Degree Nursing Program Coordinator
Two Associate Degree Nursing Faculty Members
Three Members-At-Large, i.e., Development Studies Counselors,
General Studies Faculty

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

Terms for the two Associate Degree Nursing faculty members and the three members-at-large are for two year terms and are to be staggered.

In order to be considered for admission to the Associate Degree Nursing program, each applicant must submit the following credentials for the fall semester class by March 1 and for the spring semester class, if applicable, by October 1 preceding the date the applicant plans to enroll. Exceptions to the March 1 and the July 1 dates can only be granted by the President of the College after consultation with the Associate Degree Nursing Program Coordinator.

1. Application for admission to the college.
2. Official high school transcript indicating that the applicant has or will complete an approved four-year high school course of study or a GED certificate.
3. Transcripts of all post-secondary education or training.
4. Results of the ACT or National League for Nursing Pre-Admission Examination RN (NLN)

A pre-admission conference with the Coordinator or the Coordinator's designee is required prior to an applicant's consideration by the Associate Degree Nursing Admissions Committee.

Preference:

1. May be given to candidates who demonstrate above average standing in high school or on the General Education Development Examination (GED).
2. May be given to applicants with an "enhanced" ACT composite score of 22 or above or score at the 50th percentile or above on the NLN.
3. May be given to applicants who have completed 12 or more credit hours in the approved curriculum with a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or better from any regionally accredited college.
4. Will be given to Kentucky residents and applicants within the Community College service area.

Readmission

1. In order to be considered for readmission by the Nursing Admissions Committee, the applicant:
 - a. Must submit a written request to the Nursing Coordinator.
 - b. Must meet current guidelines for admission.
 - c. May be required to have a Nursing faculty member submit a letter of recommendation.
2. A student may be readmitted to the Associate Degree Nursing Program one time. The Nursing Admissions Committee may recommend readmission a second time, if a student furnishes sufficient evidence of remedial study, additional preparation or resolution of factors contributing to unsuccessful course completion.
3. If more than three years have elapsed since initial enrollment in any registered Nursing program, an applicant must repeat all nursing courses.

Transfer

1. Applicants who wish to transfer from another community college Nursing Program or other nursing programs must:
 - a. Meet all admission requirements of the receiving institution.
 - b. notify the Coordinator of the Associate Degree Nursing Program in writing, stating anticipated entry date and reason for transfer, and

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

- c. have a faculty member from the program previously attended submit a letter of recommendation to the receiving institution.
2. If more than three years have elapsed since initial enrollment in any registered Nursing program, an applicant must repeat all nursing courses.

2.25 Radiography Program

Enrollment in the Radiography program may be limited because of available laboratory facilities in the community, as well as limited faculty and financial resources.

Technical Standards

Radiography involves the provision of direct care for individuals and is characterized by the application of verified knowledge in the skillful performance of radiological technical functions. Therefore, all applicants should possess:

1. Sufficient visual acuity, such as is needed in the accurate preparation and administration of contrast media and for the observation necessary for patient assessment and nursing care.
2. Sufficient auditory perception to receive verbal communication from patients and members of the health team and to assess health needs of people through the use of monitoring devices such as cardiac monitors, stethoscopes, intravenous infusion pumps, fire alarms, etc.
3. Sufficient gross and fine motor coordination to respond promptly and to implement the skills, including the manipulation of equipment, positioning and lifting patients required in meeting health needs related to radiologic technology.
4. Sufficient communication skills (speech, reading, writing) to interact with individuals and to communicate their needs promptly and effectively, as may be necessary in the patient's/client's interest.
5. Sufficient intellectual and emotional functions to plan and implement care for individuals.

Selection of students for the program will be made by the President of the College or the President's designee after considering the recommendation of the Admissions Committee. Membership on this committee would be as follows:

Radiography Program Coordinator
Radiography Faculty Member
Division Chairperson
Admissions Officer or Dean of Student Affairs
Counselor

Each applicant must submit the following credentials by March 1 in order to be considered by the committee:

1. Application for admission to the college.
2. Official high school transcript indicating that the applicant has completed an approved 4-year high school curriculum or the GED Certificate.
3. Transcripts of all post-secondary education or training.
4. American College Test (ACT) or Career Planning Program (CPP) score reports.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

5. A statement verifying at least a four-hour observation/ work experience in a Radiology Department must be completed and returned to the community college records office.

Admission to the Radiography program is open to all qualified students regardless of economic or social status, and without discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, marital status, beliefs, age, national origin or physical or mental disability.

Preference:

1. May be given to applicants with an "enhanced" ACT composite score of 21 or above; or the low number of the estimated ACT composite range reported on the CPP of 19 or above.
2. May be given to applicants who have a cumulative GPA of 2.5 or better (4 point scale) in 12 hours of college credits applicable to the radiography program.
3. May be given to applicants who have completed the biological and physical sciences and mathematics courses listed in the radiography curriculum with a grade of "C" or better.
4. May be given to applicants who have satisfied the precollege curriculum.
5. Will be given to Kentucky residents.

An interview or pre-admission conference may be required prior to admission to the radiography program.

Readmission

1. A student who withdraws from or earns lower than a grade of C in any course with the prefix RAD will be dropped from the Radiography program.
2. The process regarding application for readmission to the program is as follows:
 - a. Students who wish to apply for readmission to the program must do so three (3) months prior to the expected date of enrollment.
 - b. Readmission to the Radiography program will be dependent on available resources.
 - c. In order to be considered for readmission by the Radiography Admissions Committee, the student must:
 - i) update information in the admission office file three (3) months prior to expected date of enrollment;
 - ii) submit a written request to the Radiography Program Coordinator including information to justify readmission; and
 - iii) submit a written recommendation from a faculty member of the program addressed to the Radiography Admissions Committee.
 - d. If three (3) years or more have elapsed since the initial enrollment in the program, the student must repeat the technical courses of the curriculum.
 - e. A student may be readmitted to the Radiography program two times. The Radiography Admission Committee may recommend readmission a third time, if a student can furnish evidence of unusual circumstances, remedial study or additional preparation.
 - f. Application is not a guarantee of readmission to the program.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

Transfer

1. Applicants who wish to transfer from another community college Radiography Program or other radiography programs must:
 - a. Meet all admission requirements of the receiving institution.
 - b. Apply at least three months prior to the expected date of enrollment.
 - c. Notify the Coordinator of the Radiography Program in writing, stating anticipated entry date and reason for transfer.
 - d. Have a faculty member from the program previously attended submit a letter of recommendation to the receiving institution.
 - e. Submit an official transcript for evaluation by the admissions committee.
2. If more than three years have elapsed since initial enrollment in a radiography program, the entire sequence of radiography courses must be repeated.
3. Acceptance of any transfer student will be dependent upon available resources.

Rolling Admissions

An applicant may be admitted to the radiography program prior to the March 1 deadline date if the following criteria are met:

1. Complete application is submitted to the college by January 15.
2. The applicant has a GPA of 3.0 or better on 12 hours of college credit applicable to the Radiography curriculum.
3. The ACT composite standard score or the low number of the range reported on the CPP is 21 or above.
4. The Applicant has successfully completed BSL 110 and BSL 111 or equivalent.

2.26 Respiratory Care Program

Enrollment in the Respiratory Care Program may be limited because of available facilities within the community and the college.

Technical Standards

The respiratory therapist specializes in the application of scientific knowledge and theory to practical clinical problems of respiratory care as outlined in a description of the occupation found in the guidelines and essentials of the accredited educational program for the respiratory therapist. Therefore, in order to be successful in the program, a candidate should possess:

1. Sufficient tactile and visual acuity, such as is needed in the accurate monitoring of life support systems and for the observation necessary for patient assessment.
2. Sufficient auditory perception to receive verbal communication from patients and members of the health care team and to assess health needs of people through the use of monitoring devices such as cardiac monitors, stethoscopes, inhalators and fire alarms, etc.
3. Sufficient gross and fine motor coordination to respond promptly and to implement respiratory therapy skills including the manipulation of equipment to meet health needs.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

4. Sufficient communication skills (verbal, non-verbal, and written) to interact with individuals and to communicate their needs promptly and effectively.
5. Sufficient intellectual and emotional functions to plan and implement respiratory care.

Admission to the Respiratory Care Program is open to all qualified students regardless of economic or social status, and without discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, marital status, beliefs, age, national origin, sexual orientation, or mental or physical disability. Selection of students for the Respiratory Care Program will be made by the President of Lexington Community College or the President's designee after considering the recommendations of the Admissions Committee. Suggested membership is:

1. Respiratory Care Program Coordinator
2. Admissions Officer
3. Counselor
4. Medical Director of Program
5. General Studies Faculty member
6. Respiratory Care Faculty Member

Each applicant must submit the following data no later than March 1:

1. Application for admission to L.C.C.
2. An official high school transcript or results of the Test of General Educational Development (GED).
3. Results of American College Test (ACT).
4. An official transcript of all post-secondary education attempted.
5. Statement of work experience pertaining to Respiratory Care Technology and/or observation in this area.
6. Attendance at a mandatory pre-admission conference

Preference

1. May be given to applicants who have a cumulative grade point average of 2.5 (4.0 scale) or better in 12 or more semester credit hours from any accredited college.
2. May be given to applicants with an "enhanced" ACT composite score of 21 or above.
3. May be given to applicants with health related work experience.
4. May be given to Kentucky residents.
5. Others meeting minimum criteria will be placed on an alternate list. Those applicants remaining on the alternate list must update their application to be eligible for the next class.

Rolling Admission

Those applicants who have an enhanced composite ACT score of 24 and at least a cumulative grade point average of 3.0 (on a 4.0 scale) on 24 or more college hours may be informed of immediate admission. Admission will be contingent upon a conference with the Program Coordinator.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

Readmission

A student who withdraws from or earns lower than a grade of "C" in a Respiratory Care Course will be dropped from the Associate Degree Respiratory Care Program. Students who have withdrawn or have not been retained in the program may reapply by the following process:

- 1. Application for readmission should be made by the established college program deadline.**
- 2. Readmission to the Respiratory Care Program will be dependent on available resources.**
- 3. In order to be considered for readmission by the Respiratory Care Admissions Committee, the applicant must:**
 - a. submit a written request to the program coordinator presenting evidence to justify readmission.**
 - b. meet current admissions guidelines.**
- 4. If more than three (3) years have lapsed since initial enrollment in the program, the applicant must successfully complete available special exams or repeat the Respiratory Care courses. The student will be evaluated and may be required to demonstrate competencies prior to re-entering clinical practice if a year or more has lapsed since their last formal clinical practice.**

5.1.0 GRADES AND MARKING SYSTEMS

5.1.0.1 By the last day of class before the midterm withdrawal date, all teachers must inform the undergraduate students in their courses of their current **progress grade** based on the criteria in the syllabus. (US: 2/14/94)

Rationale: to specify that this is not intended to invent a new, official, midterm grade.

5.1.1 The Marking System

Z **Reenrollment recommended (development courses only). It has no value in computing grade point average.**

5.1.3 Explanation of Certain Grades

Z **The grade Z means that the student has made significant progress but needs and deserves more time to achieve a passing level. The student should re-enroll in the course in order to continue advancement to a level of competence set for the course. Re-enroll grades may be assigned only for development courses numbered 000-099.**

5.1.4 COURSES TAKEN ON A PASS-FAIL BASIS

Courses taken on a Pass-Fail basis shall be limited to those considered as elective in the student's program and such other courses or types of courses as might be specifically approved by the Senate Council for a college or department. Prerequisites for such courses may be ignored at the student's own hazard. Students are expected to participate fully in these courses and to take all examinations as though they were enrolled on a regular basis. Students may ~~not~~ change from a pass-fail basis ~~nor~~ from a regular basis to a pass-fail basis ~~after the last day to drop a course without a grade in any given term.~~ **within three (3) weeks from the beginning of classes in the fall or spring semester (or a proportionate amount of time in the summer term or other courses of less than a full semester's duration).**

A student may take only two elective courses on a pass fail basis at Lexington Community College.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

5.1.5 AUDIT

Students who register for an audit do so for reasons other than fulfilling explicit requirements. They must come to individual agreements with the instructor as to what responsibilities they will be expected to perform. Normally, students who audit would be expected to do the readings and attend class; they may be required to enter more fully into the class work. In any case, they will receive no credit hours or grades. Any change from audit to credit or credit to audit by a student regularly enrolled in a college must be accomplished ~~by the last date to drop a course without a grade in any given term~~ **within three (3) weeks from the beginning of classes in the fall or spring semester (or a proportionate amount of time in the summer term or other courses of less than a full semester's duration)**. No credit can be given for a class audited nor is a student permitted to take an examination for credit, except for the special examinations described in 5.2.1.2. A student who initially enrolls in a class as an auditor must attend at least 80% of the classes in the course (excluding excused absences). If a student changes her or his enrollment from credit to audit, s/he must attend at least 80% of the remaining classes (excluding excused absences). If an auditor fails to attend the requisite number of classes, the instructor may request that the Dean of the instructor's college award the grade of W for that course and the Dean shall report the grade to the Registrar. No instructor is authorized to admit anyone as an auditor to any of his/her classes unless the auditor has registered as such. (US:10/11/76; US: 12/10/90; US:9/20/93)

5.1.7 CHANGING GRADES

An individual faculty member may change a mark once it has been reported to the Registrar's Office within one year of the date of the original grade ~~only in the case of an error. Reports of all such grade changes shall be sent by forwarding~~ to the Registrar with a copy **of the grade change form. Reports of all grade changes are sent by the Registrar to the student and the Chair or Unit Head of the Department.** ~~to the dean of the college in which the instructor is assigned. The instructor may also recommend to his/her department chair the changing of a grade for any reason other than an error, and the grade shall be changed if the department chair approves. In every such approval, a report of the grade change shall be sent to the Registrar by the department chair with a copy to the instructor and dean of the college involved. There shall be only one grade change per student per course. No grade may be changed after the student has graduated from the University except in the case of the error provided for above.~~

Rationale: to obviate the unclear distinction between changing grades "in the case of an error" from those which are done for some reason "other than error."

Note: 5.1.7 was removed entirely from this proposal

5.1.9 GRADE POINT AVERAGE

A. Grade point average is the ratio of the number of points gained to the number of credits attempted, W,P,S, F, CR, **Z** and I being ignored. (US: 3/9/98)

5.1.8.2 Any student may withdraw from any class (except for those used to meet the Writing Requirement; see Section V., 5.4.3.1) during the withdrawal period which is defined as the period prior to and including the: (US: 2/12/82; US: 9/12/94)

- a. end of the ninth week for fall or spring semester
- b. third day of the fifth week for eight week summer session
- c. second day of the third week for four week summer session.
- d. second day of the fourth week for six week summer classes**

5.1.8.3 Except at Lexington Community College, a student may withdraw from a class during the latter half of the term upon approval by the dean of the student's college of a petition certifying urgent non-academic reasons including but not limited to:

Lexington Community College Withdrawal Policy

After the date of mid-term and through the last class of the semester, the Lexington Community College student may officially request the W grade, which may be given at the discretion of the

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

instructor. Each instructor shall state on the syllabus the factors to be used in determining the assignment of a W grade during the discretionary period. An instructor shall not assign a student a W grade for a class unless the student has officially withdrawn from that class in a manner prescribed by the college.

Rationale: Due to Lexington Community College's unique mission within the university, and open door admissions policy, a separate policy regarding student withdrawal from Lexington Community College courses is necessary. The faculty at Lexington Community College value their commitment to offer Lexington Community College students multiple opportunities to succeed even as they maintain quality standards in higher education. A key part of this strategy is the individual faculty member's decision to allow students to remain enrolled in a course beyond the UK midterm cut-off point for withdrawal. Each Lexington Community College syllabus delineates the individual faculty member's withdrawal policy for that class, including specific conditions which limit unrestricted withdrawal. Many Lexington Community College faculty currently choose to allow their students to withdraw after midterm in order to promote prolonged exposure to course content and teacher instruction which would help lead to eventual student mastery of the subject.

5.2.1.1 Accelerated Programs The College Board Level Examination Program Subject and General Examinations, the College Board Advanced Placement Examinations, the American College Testing Program Proficiency Examination Program Subject Examinations, and courses evaluated by the American Council on Education for which credit recommendations are made under the Program on Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction and courses in the International Baccalaureate Program (Higher Level) are recognized as appropriate credit for meeting degree requirements. Colleges and/or departments in consultation with the Admissions and Registrar's Office shall determine and publish appropriate cut-off scores for the CLEP, AP, and PEP examinations. (US:9/13/82) Students with superior results from their International Baccalaureate Higher Level may be awarded up to six credits by the corresponding department of the University. Scores of 5, 6, and 7 normally are requisite. No AP or CLEP credit hours shall be letter graded. Rather, all such earned credit hours will be shown on the student's academic record as course credit (CR). (See also V - 5.1.4, Rules Committee Interpretation, 1/15/93) (US: 4/25/88; US: 3/9/98)

A. Credit for External Experiences at Lexington Community College

The Lexington Community College acknowledges that valid collegiate-level learning experiences occur outside the traditional college setting and will assist a student in the recognition and application of such learning experiences and credit towards a degree or course of study. To this end, the following methods will be utilized (in addition to those described above for the entire university) :

- (a) special examinations**
- (b) recognition of collegiate work completed through the United States Armed Forces Institute**
- (c) recognition of service-related experiences at the collegiate-level as recommended by the Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences;**
- (d) recognition of certain proficiency exams administered by professional certification agencies such as the Certified Professional Secretary Examination;**
- (e) American Institute of Banking Related Experiences;**
- (f) course credit awarded by articulation agreements;**
- (g) Program on non-collegiate sponsored instruction (PONSI).**

A student will be awarded credit for external experiences by the college President (or designee) only if the following criteria are met:

- (a) the student enrolls and earns credit at Lexington Community College; and**
- (b) the student has met precollege curriculum requirements.**

5.2.1.2 Credit by Special Examination

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

F The student, with the department **or division** chair's consent, may take the special examination on a Pass-Fail basis, including any course not otherwise available under the Pass-Fail option. Credit derived in this manner shall not reduce the number of courses permitted under the Pass-Fail rules. (See Section V., 5.1.4)

5.2.2 STUDENT LOAD

With the exceptions noted below, the maximum load to be carried during any semester by any student in an undergraduate college (including residence and correspondence courses) shall be 19 credit hours. (US: 10/11/93)

Students may be enrolled in a maximum of nine credit hours of classes meeting concurrently during an eight-week summer session. For this purpose, a course meeting for a four-week period during the eight-week session must be counted double. Thus, a student may enroll in two consecutive four-week (three credit hour) classes plus one eight-week class, or as many as three eight week (three credit hour) classes. A student would not, however, be able to enroll in two four-week (three credit hour) classes meeting concurrently. **A student may be enrolled in a maximum of seven credit hours for a six week summer course.** (US: 10/11/93)

5.2.4.2 Excused Absences: (US: 11/11/85; 2/9/87) Lexington Community College has adopted the current Excused Absence policy outlined in Section V of the Senate Rules.

5.2.4.4 Unsatisfactory Scholarship and Attendance A student who is doing unsatisfactory work or who is irregular in attendance (when required--see Section V., 5.2.4.1) in any course shall be reported to the **President of Lexington Community College for Lexington Community College students** or dean of the college in which the student is registered. The student shall be under the special supervision of his/her dean **or President of Lexington Community College**. If, after a suitable length of time, it becomes apparent that no improvement is being made, the dean **or President of Lexington Community College** may drop the student from the course, reporting the action to the Registrar and to the instructor. (See Section IV., 4.3.2 and Section V., 5.2.4.1)

5.3.1.2 Academic Probation Policies (US: 3/20/95)

...
* Four-week, **six-week** and eight-week summer sessions are considered one term. Thus, if a student enrolls for both the four-week and eight-week sessions, that shall be considered one term. If the student enrolls for only one session, whether it be the four-week, **six-week** or the eight-week term, that shall be considered one term. (RC: 12/4/95)

5.3.1.3 Academic Suspension Policies (US: 3/20/95)

...
B Students are subject to suspension without a preliminary probationary semester if their GPA is below 0.6 after their first term of full time enrollment in the University System. ~~This provision does not pertain to students who have transferred from the Community College System.~~

...
D. A student who is under academic suspension from the University may not enroll in any courses offered by the University of Kentucky, nor take any examination for University of Kentucky credit while on academic suspension. ~~or probation.~~

Rationale: The addition of probation goes against the current rules on that status, since students on probation may take exams.

5.3.1.5 READMISSION AFTER TWO OR MORE YEARS (ACADEMIC BANKRUPTCY) (US: 10/11/93)

A Undergraduate students who have been readmitted through the usual channels after an interruption of two or more years, and who have completed at least one semester or 12 hours **of courses at or above the 100 level** with a grade point standing of 2.0 or better after readmission

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

may choose to have none of their previous University of Kentucky course work counted toward graduation and toward the computation of their grade point standings. (US:4/12/82)

- B In addition, the dean of the student's college **or the President of LCC** may permit such a readmitted student who has elected not to count past work to receive credit for selected courses without including those grades in the computation of the student's grade point standing. (US:4/12/82)

5.4.1.4 Second Bachelor's Degrees

A student is eligible to qualify for a second bachelor's degree in a different major. The student must complete all university, college, and departmental requirements for both degrees. Courses taken towards fulfilling one degree may also count towards fulfilling parallel requirements in the other, but the student must complete a minimum of at least 144 hours for both degrees. The student may elect to receive the degrees simultaneously if college and departmental degree requirements can be met simultaneously. (US:3/8/82; 4/10/89)

Add: Second Associate Degree

A student is eligible to qualify for a second associate degree in a different major. Courses taken towards fulfilling one degree may also count towards fulfilling parallel requirements in the other, but the student must complete a minimum of at least 66 hours for both degrees. The student may elect to receive the degrees simultaneously if degree requirements can be met simultaneously. In no case will a second degree be granted for the completion of a second option in a program. The completion of a second option, however, will be recorded on the transcript.

Renumber accordingly.

Rationale: UK requires 144 hours for two bachelor's degrees and that is the 120- hour minimum plus 10%. Therefore, the 60-hour minimum is required for an associate degree plus 10% to get 66 hours.

5.4.2 COMMENCEMENT HONORS

- A Students shall be graduated "Summa Cum Laude" who attain a grade point average of 3.8 or higher for at least three years of work at the University of Kentucky (excepting correspondence study). (US: 10/11/94; US: 4/11/94)
- H Work done ~~in the University of Kentucky~~ **at Lexington Community College System** shall be counted as work at the University of Kentucky in calculating the grade point average for honors. [RC: 11/20/87].

Add following item H

The **associate** degree with honors from ~~a community college~~ **Lexington Community College** shall be based solely upon work done in the ~~University of Kentucky Community College System~~. **College or the University of Kentucky.**

~~5.21 With High Distinction in the System~~

~~Students who have completed at least forty-eight credit hours of work in the University of Kentucky shall be graduated "With High Distinction" who attain a grade point average of 3.6 or higher based on at least 48 credit hours of work at Lexington Community College or the University of Kentucky. System shall be graduated "With High Distinction" if they attain a grade point average of 3.60 or higher on all work attempted.~~

~~5.22 With Distinction in the System~~

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

~~Students who have completed at least forty-eight credit hours of work in the University of Kentucky shall be graduated "With Distinction" who attain a grade point average of 3.4 or higher based on at least 48 credit hours of work at Lexington Community College or the University of Kentucky. System shall be graduated "With Distinction" if they obtain a grade point average of 3.40 to 3.59 on all work attempted.~~

Rationale: This would seem to be consistent with the change in 4.2.1.2 so that grades from the CCS will no longer count in the UK GPA.]

Add

5.12 Residence Requirement

Regardless of the time the student has attended Lexington Community College, a minimum of twenty-four credits must be completed within the University of Kentucky, and at least 25 percent of the approved curriculum credits must be completed at the College.

6.1.7 ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION DURING APPEAL

Students shall have the right to attend classes, to pursue their academic programs, and to participate in University functions during the consideration of any appeal. (US:4/11/83)

Those students who are enrolled in Medical Center Colleges and have patient contact in clinical practicum courses will not be able to continue patient contact in the courses during an appeal, if the appeal relates to clinical competence in regard to performance. Insofar as practicable, such appeals shall be expedited. (US: 4/25/88)

Attendance and participation may be limited

- a) **when outside agencies are used as part of the student's educational experience. In this situation, precedence will be given to the terms of any agreement(s) which have been negotiated between the University and the agency.**
- b) **when patient/client contact is involved in the student's educational experience. In this situation, only patient/client contact will be limited or excluded at the discretion of program faculty.**

Rationale: To include requisite Lexington Community College populations.

6.2.0 THE ACADEMIC OMBUD

The Academic Ombuds [is] **are [the] those** officers of the university charged with consideration of student grievances in connection with academic affairs. **There will be one Office of Academic Ombud Services for the University, with offices both in the Lexington Campus and the Lexington Community College campus. Given the increased work load for the combined Ombud Services, there will be two half-time positions--one a Lexington Community College faculty member. These faculty will collaborate on issues of common concern and work in both office locations.**

Rationale: to insure cooperation.

6.2.1.4 Statute of Limitations The Academic Ombud is empowered to hear only those grievances directed to his or her attention within ~~365~~ **180** days subsequent to the conclusion of the academic term in which the problem occurred. However, the Ombud may agree to hear a grievance otherwise barred by the Statute of Limitations in those instances where (1) the Ombud believes that extreme hardship including but not limited to illness, injury, and serious financial or personal problems gave rise to the delay or (2) all parties to the dispute agree to proceed. (US:2/11/80)

Rationale: to follow the Lexington Community College shorter terms, since exceptions are allowed.

6.2.1.5 Procedures When the Academic Ombud determines that an issue merits his or her attention, the Ombud shall contact the parties involved to determine the background of the issue and areas of disagreement. With this information in hand, the Ombud shall seek to determine alternative means of

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

achieving an equitable resolution and propose to the conflicting parties those solutions which appear to offer the greatest promise of mutual satisfaction. Normally the investigatory and ~~arbitration~~ **mediation** activities shall be conducted informally and need not involve confrontation of the conflicting parties. However, the more formal procedures and direct confrontation of the parties involved may be utilized if circumstances dictate that these will produce a more effective resolution.

If the ~~arbitration~~ **mediation** efforts are unsuccessful, the Academic Ombud shall refer the case to the University Appeals Board in writing if the complainant wishes to pursue the issue. At the request of the Appeals Board, the Ombud shall appear before it to offer testimony or shall prepare a written report of the case.

6.2.1.7 & 6.2.2 Change all instances of Ombud to **Ombuds**.

6.2.3 SELECTION PROCEDURE

A The Chair of the Senate Council, with the advice of the Senate Council members, shall appoint a Search Committee consisting of the following members: 1) ~~a faculty member of the Senate Council~~ **two faculty members**, 2) ~~two three~~ **two** students, ~~one an undergraduate~~ **two undergraduates** and one a graduate or professional student, chosen by the Student Government Association; and, 3) a member designated by the President of the University who shall serve as Chair of the Search Committee. **Committee members shall be broadly representative of the University community.**

Rationale: To allow wider representation on the search committee, probably drawn both from Lexington Community College and UK.

B The Search Committee shall solicit nominations for the Academic Ombud from students, faculty and administrators, **and shall, for each position, nominate no more than three to the President.**

~~C Nominees shall be initially screened according to criteria set forth by the Rules of the University Senate and such other criteria as may be established by the University Senate and the Search Committee. The list of eligible candidates shall then be submitted for approval to the President of the University, the Senate Council and a Committee of the Student Assembly, not to exceed nine members, appointed by procedures designated by Assembly. Only those candidates approved by all three bodies shall be given further consideration for appointment to the office. Approved candidates who are willing to be considered for the post of Ombud may be interviewed by the Search Committee. From among the jointly approved candidates, the Search Committee shall recommend no more than three to the President.~~

D Should the office of Academic Ombud be vacated prior to the expiration of the normal term of office, a new appointment shall be made to fill the unexpired term using the same procedures as described above.

6.2.4 Change each instance of "the academic Ombud" to "**each Academic Ombud.**"

6.3.3 FALSIFICATION OR MISUSE OF ACADEMIC RECORDS (US: 3/20/89)

Maintaining the integrity, accuracy, and appropriate privacy of student academic records is an essential administrative function of the University and a basic protection of all students. Accordingly, the actual or attempted falsification, theft, misrepresentation or other alteration or misuse of any official academic record of the University, specifically including knowingly having unauthorized access to such records or the unauthorized disclosure of information contained in such records, is a serious academic offense. As used in this context, "academic record" includes all paper and electronic versions of the partial or complete permanent academic record, all official and unofficial academic transcripts, application documents and admission credentials, and all academic record transaction documents. The minimum sanction for falsification, **including the omission of information**, or attempted falsification or other misuse of academic records as described in this section is suspension for one semester.

Rationale: to follow the present, slightly more encompassing Lexington Community College rules

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

6.4.0-6.4.11	<u>Replace:</u>		
	Department Chair	with	Chair
	Dean	with	Dean of the college or President of Lexington Community College
	University Registrar	with	Registrar

6.5.2 COMPOSITION OF THE UNIVERSITY APPEALS BOARD

The University Appeals Board shall consist of ~~ten members; three full-time students and six faculty members~~ **a pool of eighteen faculty and nine students**, and a Hearing Officer who shall be the chair. ~~In addition, there shall be three student alternates and six faculty alternates who shall be selected on the same basis and with the same requirements as the regular members.~~ All members of the Appeals Board ~~and/or their alternates~~ shall be expected to meet within 48 hours after notice from the chair.

Rationale: slightly to enlarge the pool by including the alternates on the board, so as to make setting up appeal boards a bit easier

6.5.2.2 The Student Membership The student membership shall consist of **a four** graduate or professional students, **a four** male undergraduate students and **a four** female undergraduate students. The undergraduate students must be ~~either~~ **sophomores**, juniors or seniors in good academic standing and the graduate or professional students must have been in residence at least one year and be in good standing in their respective colleges. They shall be appointed to one-year terms, subject to reappointment. Their terms shall begin September 1 and end August 31. Members **shall be broadly representative of the University community, including the Medical Center, Lexington Community College, and the Lexington Campus,** and shall be chosen by the President of the University from the recommendations of the legislative branch of the Student Government Association.

Rationale: to allow for the shift from "alternates" and to allow Lexington Community College student participation.

6.5.2.3 The Faculty Membership The faculty members **shall be broadly representative of the University community** and shall be appointed to staggered three-year terms by the President of the University upon the recommendation of the University Senate Council. All terms shall begin on September 1 and end on August 31.

Rationale: to allow Lexington Community College participation.

6.5.2.4 Other Procedural Rules

A quorum for the conduct of business will be eight members including the Hearing Officer, not less than five of whom, exclusive of the Hearing Officer, shall be faculty members. **Normally nine members, exclusive of the Hearing Officer, shall sit to decide a case.** The Appeals Board shall establish such procedural rules, not inconsistent with the provisions of the Rules of the University Senate.

Rationale: to allow for different sets of the newly enlarged Appeals Board to be assigned to a specific Appeals Board.

Note: If approved, the proposed changes will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

Charles Coulston (Lexington Community College) said what they had in front of them should be amended from the last meeting. Issues that do not deal specifically with LCC rules have been omitted. On page 11 at the top, there is a sentence under lowercase b that says "a signed declination form must be submitted if a student chooses not to receive the Hepatitis B vaccination." That is not consistent with what is required for UK students who are in clinical programs and should be deleted. On page 27 in the second paragraph under 5.2.2, the last word in the paragraph should be changed from course to term. There are still nine references to the

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

College Program Planning Test that is no longer given at LCC, and they would like to get rid of those. It will not change the substance of anything; they are just not applicable anymore. There are 15 references to the precollege curriculum, and they would just like to remove those.

Professor Durant said that the spirit was to bring the two systems as close together as possible. The Community College has been tremendously accommodating in their agreement to make changes. One of the largest changes they made was to have their students come under a joint appeals board. There are going to joint ombuds, and students will come before the same appeals board.

Professor Tagavi said that on page 29, the rationale says for two bachelor's degrees you should have the minimum 120 plus whatever to be 144. That is 20%. Then the next sentence says they need 60 for them so for both they need 66. Do they want 66 or 72?

The answer was 10% which is consistent with the current rules.

Professor Tagavi said that on page 32, 6.5.2.4 says the quorum is "eight members including the Hearing Officer," which means seven people and one hearing officer. Then it says "normally nine members exclusive of the hearing officer," which means 10.

Professor Canon said that this was done so that if someone could not be there or was there for part of the hearing and not for all of it, that the quorum was somewhat less than what it would normally be.

Professor Fortune said that the stricken out portion of that reflects that the current makeup of the Appeals Board is 10 members, three full-time students and six faculty members and the Hearing Officer, with a quorum being eight members including the Hearing Officer. They have proposed going to a pool of eighteen faculty and nine students from which the Hearing Officer will draw a board. Normally, that Board will be nine plus the Hearing Officer. It might be more than nine; they might draw 10 or 11 in order to insure there was a quorum there. The sentence, "Normally nine members exclusive of the Hearing Officer, shall sit to decide a case," reflects what the normal composition of the Board will be. In other words, 10 people. It is not intended to change the normal composition of the Appeals Board under the quorum rule.

Tom Zentall (Psychology) suggested the bolded sentence go first. That it would clarify it.

The suggestion was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Professor Tagavi said that on page two, item K, the way it is written gives the rest of the University, permission to go the six and six. That is not what we want. Why not rewrite K like I and say Lexington Community College shall have two alternate six-week sessions.

Enid Waldhart (Communications) said it seemed to her that it said two alternate sessions will be provided. They are to be as close in time as the four-week and eight-week sessions on the Lexington Campus.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

Professor Durant said it did leave open the possibility that areas other than LCC could have six-week sessions. LCC is not pushing for that. It seemed a modification of the rules where they could profit from LCC's example.

Professor Tagavi said that if they decided to go to a six/six rather than having these two choices, you could haphazardly alternate one-year four/eight and another year six/six and then again change it.

Professor Durant said it could not happen haphazardly, but it could happen by Senate decision.

Professor Canon said that the University Senate set the calendar and, unless there was a six-week calendar, this would not occur.

Professor Tagavi moved to change K to read that Lexington Community College may offer two alternate six-week sessions. Everything else should remain the same.

The motion was seconded.

The amendment passed in a show of hands--29 for and 16 opposed.

The question was called. The motion to end debate passed in a show of hands.

The amended proposal passed in a unanimous show of hands.

Chairperson Moore recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of Action Item Four.

Professor Meyer viewed the background of the item and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

ACTION ITEM 4 - Proposal to Amend the Senate Rules to Reassign the Responsibilities of the Registrar as Secretary to the Senate to the University Senate Council

Change SR 1.2.4.2

From: 1.2.4.2 Secretary – The University System Registrar shall serve as Secretary

To: 1.2.4.2 Secretary – The Secretary shall be the Vice Chair of the Senate Council, as provided in SR 1.3.1.3B (“Officers”)

Change SR 1.3.1.3 Officers

From: B. The Senate Council shall also elect a vice-chair at its December meeting from among the six faculty members whose terms do not expire at the end of that month. The vice-chair's duties are to preside at any meeting of the Senate or the Senate Council at which the chair is not present, and to introduce the Senate Council motions and resolutions at Senate meetings. The vice chair shall become chair of the Senate Council for the remainder of the chair's term if for any reason the chair is no longer able to serve in that capacity.

To: Same as above but add:

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

The Vice Chair shall also serve as Secretary of the Senate.

Add as H.

An assistant, employed by and responsible to the Senate Council, shall carry out the routine and continuing activities essential to the functioning of the University Senate such as scheduling meeting rooms; taking minutes, word processing and distributing Senate agenda, memos and other correspondence; assisting the Chair of the Rules Committee in conducting nominations and elections and other activities.

Proposed implementation date: Upon approval. Note that the proposal will be forwarded to the Administration for the appropriate GRs to be revised to reflect the changes.

Rationale: The Registrar's Office is willing to transfer a half-time administrative staff position to assume the functions currently performed for the Senate by the Registrar's Office. This should provide for more integration of routine functions of the University Senate with those of the Senate Council by incorporating their responsibilities and activities under one office.

The proposal passed in a show of hands.

The Chair recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of Action Item Five.

Professor Meyer reviewed the background of the item and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

ACTION ITEM 5 - Proposal to revise the cross-disciplinary requirement in the general education program (USP)

Introduction:

At its meeting on March 6, the University Senate acted on two recommendations brought forward by the University Studies Committee. A third recommendation, dealing with the cross-disciplinary requirement, was withdrawn by the USP Committee for further study. The results of that study follow below with a specific recommendation. It has been approved by the Senate Council.

Background:

The USP Committee has once again deliberated on the proposal to change the Cross-Disciplinary requirement. We have decided that the best option for now is to *amend* the requirement. We propose to maintain the current options for satisfying the requirement, but to also make available the opportunity for programs to add courses. The USP Committee will approve all new additions. The criteria to be used to judge the adequacy of new course options is included in the proposal statement. This approach is much less aggressive than the original proposal, which was to abandon the Cross-Disciplinary requirement. It does provide a mechanism, however, with which to address the course-bottleneck problem, which is one of the major problems with the current requirement. The basic principle underlying the original requirement is also preserved. New courses, just as with current course options, would expose students to the boundaries and nature of disciplinary thinking by study within at least two different disciplinary perspectives. The more lofty ambition, having students examine a topic from two different disciplinary perspectives, is not maintained, but it should be recognized that this principle has failed with the current requirement. Students have not always taken paired courses in succession nor has there been any attempt for instructors to ensure that the same topics have been covered. We hope the Senate will find the new proposal satisfactory. We believe that the present proposal benefits our students and improves our general education curriculum.

Recommended Change in USP Cross-Disciplinary Requirement:

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

Change the Cross-Disciplinary Requirement of USP to allow students to take, in addition to paired courses and clustered courses currently listed under the Cross Disciplinary Requirement, two courses from among options prescribed by their major degree program and approved by the USP Committee. The criteria for approving each new course will consist of the following: (1) each course must involve disciplines outside that of the student's major; (2) in addition to substantive topics, each course must expose students to a disciplinary perspective; and (3) there must be evidence that sufficient sections and seats will be available for such courses to meet demand.

If a student meets the cross-disciplinary requirement while enrolled in one major, the student has met the cross-disciplinary requirement for graduation.

Implementation: Fall Semester, 2000

Notes: If approved, the relevant sections in the Senate Rules will be codified by the Rules Committee

Phil Kraemer (Dean, Undergraduate Studies) said it was self-contained, and it helps with the bottleneck issue. It may help them begin to move or rethink the requirement by asking departments to participate and maybe define some of the requirements in ways that are creative and can serve as models. Rather than cutting it by six credit hours, which was one of the implications to the original proposal which was not well received by the Senate Council, they at least preserve some semblance of the original motion of disciplinary breadth.

Jacquie Hager (Registrar's Office) said that in 1995, the Kentucky Legislature mandated that, for all outgoing transcripts, they have to certify that the student has completed components of their general education requirements. In order to do that, they paid an external firm to do some programming. Under that programming, they can not manage this change. What they would like to be able to do is to have an opportunity to review the programming, meet with Dr. Kraemer and see if they can work out some procedures on how this can be handled.

Professor Kraemer said he had no knowledge of that problem.

Professor Canon said that he would oppose the proposal on its merits. When it says, "Each course must involve disciplines outside that of the student's major," a department like biology might take chemistry courses as a cross-disciplinary requirement that the student might well take anyway. This would be the natural temptation. This is really being driven by the bottleneck, not by well thought-out academic thoughts.

Professor Fortune moved to recommit in light of the statement from the Registrar's Office.

The motion to recommit passed in a show of hands.

Chairperson Moore recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of Action Item Six.

Professor Meyer said the next item was the Honor Code from the College of Medicine and recognized Sue Fosson from the College of Medicine to give a background and overview of the substantive changes.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

ACTION ITEM 6 - Proposal to revise the College of Medicine Honor Code, University Senate Rules, Section VI - 6.6.2.

Current:

6.6.2 Honor Code: College of Medicine

The Honor Code requires honorable and ethical behavior in all professional and academic affairs of students enrolled in University of Kentucky College of Medicine. Failure to exhibit such behavior shall constitute a violation of the Honor Code.

The following are violations of this code:

1. CHEATING - copying another's work; use of crib notes; use of unauthorized material during examinations; authorized collaboration during an exam, report, or writing a paper; plagiarism; falsification of data.
2. LYING - deliberately misrepresenting the trust areas relating to academic or professional performance.
3. STEALING - taking or acquiring possession of, without permission, any academic material from a member of the academic community.
4. Breach of confidence of the proceedings of the Honor Council.
5. Deliberately misusing the Honor Code to harass another student.

I agree to uphold the Honor System of the College of Medicine and to report violations of this code should I become aware of them.

Signature

Organizational Framework

Administration of the Honor System shall be the responsibility of the Honor Council. This group consists of eight students and five faculty members. The Council shall elect a student as Chairperson. The Council shall establish, with University Legal Counsel, rules of procedure to govern its proceedings in conformity with the adopted code of student conduct in the UK Student Rights and Responsibilities Handbook - section 2.3, p. 19 (rights of the accused). These procedures shall be made available to all students when signing the honor code, and on file in the University Ombud's office.

Annually, each class will select a pool of six Honor System Representatives. The pool from each class will be responsible for selecting two members from among themselves to serve on the Honor Council. The remaining four students from each class will serve on Ad Hoc Honor Committees. The five faculty members will be appointed annually by the Dean, with recommendations from Faculty Council/Chairmen.

Ad Hoc Honor Committees

When an infraction is reported to the Honor Council Chairperson, he/she will establish two Ad Hoc Honor Committees. Committee membership will come from the Honor System Representatives and the Honor Council Faculty.

Investigation Committee - composed of two students and two faculty members. This body has the responsibility of investigating alleged failure of a student to adhere to the honor code. This

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

committee will review their findings and will recommend to the Honor Council Chairperson whether to conduct a formal inquiry.

Judicial Committee - composed of six students and three faculty. This body is responsible for holding formal inquiries of alleged violations, determining innocence or guilt, and recommending a penalty for each violation to the Dean.

Notifications to the Student

After investigation into an alleged violation of the Honor Code, if the Investigation Committee informs the Honor Council Chairperson that a formal hearing is required, the Dean of the College of Medicine shall:

1. Notify the student in writing at a meeting or by certified mail that the student is charged with a violation of the Honor Code; and
2. Notify the student in writing of the student's rights:
 - a. The student has the right to waive the rights to a hearing and an appeal.
 - b. The student has the right to a hearing before an impartial committee of faculty and students (the Judicial Committee). A request from the student for a hearing must be communicated in writing to the Dean and received within five working days of the student's receipt of notification of the charge.
 - c. The student shall not be compelled to give testimony which might tend to be incriminating. Refusal to do so shall not be considered evidence of guilt.
 - d. The students shall receive a written statement of the conclusions and recommendation reached by the Judicial Committee.
 - e. The student shall have the right to appeal the decision of the Dean to the Academic Ombud of the University.

Penalties/Sanctions

The Dean is responsible for a) imposition of modification of any penalty and b) reporting to the Registrar according to Senate Rule 6.4.9. Possible penalties would include: failure of course, probation with specific conditions, suspension or dismissal. Suspension or dismissal shall be imposed only with the recommendation of the Dean and upon approval by the Chancellor of the Medical Center.

Appeal

A student found guilty by the Judicial Committee will have all rights of appeal according to University policy. The student may appeal the determination of guilt to the Academic Ombud.

The final decision disposition shall be recorded in writing and made part of the student's permanent record.

The Honor Code fulfills the requirements stated in Section VI, 6 of the Senate Rules.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

COLLEGE OF MEDICINE

PROFESSIONAL CODE

(Approved 4/10/2000)

I. Introduction

A) Purpose

The University of Kentucky College of Medicine Professional Code seeks to foster the highest standards of responsibility, integrity, and professionalism throughout the College community. The code is intended to positively impact the institutional culture at the University of Kentucky College of Medicine and professional development of the College's medical students. The code also establishes a mechanism to address cases of alleged misbehavior in a manner that is fair and constructive to the students, faculty, and College.

B) Recognition of Responsibility

The students of the University of Kentucky College of Medicine recognize that members of the medical profession should subscribe to a set of ethical standards that recognizes our primary obligation to the patient and which fosters integrity and honor within our profession. We recognize our responsibility to society, other health professionals, and ourselves. Furthermore, we recognize the great trust society bestows on us as we administer to the health care needs of our patients. Because of this responsibility, we do hereby affirm and undertake to live within the privileges and duties accorded us and required by this Code.

C) Additional Documentation

In addition to this Code, students are expected to understand and abide by the standards outlined in the following University/Professional documents: Health Science Student Professional Behavior Code, University Student's Rights and Responsibilities, American Medical Association Code of Ethics, Behavioral Standards in Patient Care, Policy Statement for a Drug Free Institution.

D) Scope

- This Code is intended first and foremost to be an educational tool that fosters an environment of professional conduct and mutual respect for others.
- Students come to the College of Medicine with a variety of experiences, values, and beliefs; this Code sets forth a standard to allow all students to conform their behavior in a manner compatible to the medical profession.
- This Code is intended to reinforce professional conduct so that all students can become successful, efficient, and ethical physicians.
- Self-regulation is a feature of the medical profession and this code is designed to begin this process while in this institution. This Code is meant to be flexible, yet enforceable, allowing for effective mediation between individual parties. However, it is understood that the University has guidelines and procedures for various situations in place, and that these will be used as appropriate.

II. Behavioral Standards

Empathy, integrity, honesty, concern for others, dependability, good interpersonal skills, interest and motivation to excel are all personal qualities that are expected of the University of Kentucky College of Medicine students. Below are listed specific behavioral expectations pertaining to students in the College of Medicine. Students are expected to:

- 1) Be well read, exercise good judgement, and develop the skills necessary to be active learners in medical school and as future medical professionals;

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

- 2) Be self-motivated and seek out information to understand the many topics discussed in the curriculum;
- 3) Accept appropriate suggestions and criticism and, if necessary, respond by modification of behavior;
- 4) Behave with integrity and respect toward colleagues and faculty in all academic situations;
- 5) Adapt to changing environments, display flexibility, work for extended periods, and learn to function in the face of uncertainties inherent in the educational and clinical arenas;
- 6) Complete promptly all responsibilities attendant to the diagnosis and care of patients;
- 7) Develop appropriate professional relationships with patients;
- 8) Respect the rights of patients, colleagues, and other health care professionals, and safeguard patient and others' confidences within the constraints of the law;
- 9) Recognize a responsibility to participate in activities contributing to an improved society;
- 10) Obtain consultation, and use the talents of other health professionals when indicated;
- 11) Accept the responsibility to identify peers who are physically/emotionally impaired due to substance use/abuse in order that assistance might be given and patient harm might be prevented.
- 12) Continue to study, apply and advance scientific knowledge, make relevant information available to patients, colleagues and the public.

III. Specific Academic and Professional Misconduct

A) Cheating

A medical student must not cheat. Cheating is defined, but not limited to, the wrongful giving, taking or presenting of any information or material by a student with the intent of aiding himself/herself or another in any academic work. It is understood that because of the nature of the medical curriculum at the University of Kentucky College of Medicine, a certain amount of teamwork and sharing of information is necessary for completion of assignments; however, these situations will be clearly identified by the course instructor. Cheating on an examination can take a variety of forms including: 1) discussing the examination during the examination with anyone except the instructor or the instructor's substitute unless specifically authorized to do so by the instructor; 2) giving, receiving, or soliciting unauthorized aid during any examination, take-home examination, or make up examination before or after the regularly scheduled examination has been administered; 3) using materials in any examination except those which are specifically authorized by the instructor; 4) exchanging materials with another student during the examination unless authorized to do so by the written examination instructions; 5) violating any rules that the instructor has established for an examination period.

B) Plagiarism

A medical student must not plagiarize materials of others. Students' work is expected to be the result of their own thought, research or self-expression. Plagiarism is the act of presenting the information, ideas, organization or phrasing of another source without appropriate acknowledgement as one's own, either intentionally or because of gross negligence.

C) Interference with academic pursuits

A medical student will not engage in grossly negligent or intentional conduct, which interferes with the academic performance of any member of the College of Medicine.

D) Lying

A medical student will not deliberately misrepresent the truth. Lying includes gross negligence or intentional misrepresentation within the academic setting. Students must deal honestly with patients and colleagues, and strive to expose those medical students who engage in fraud or deception.

E) Stealing

A medical student must not intentionally take or acquire any property without permission. Stealing includes, but is not limited to: 1) theft or conversion of property belonging to the College of Medicine or to another member of the College of Medicine community; and 2) the misappropriation or destruction of

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

property needed by other students for a specified academic endeavor. This offense includes removing academic resources, including items such as reserve articles, radiologic files, microscope slides, etc. from the library or an equivalent reference area without checking them through the proper channels.

F) Grossly Disrespectful or Inappropriate Behavior

As members of the medical profession it is imperative that medical students recognize their responsibility to society and their patients and exhibit behavior representing high standards, polite etiquette, compassion and respect for human dignity. Disrespectful or inappropriate behavior to others is considered an infraction of this Professional Code. For the purposes of this Code, disrespectful behavior includes but is not limited to: cursing at patients/ancillary staff, degrading comments or actions, rude behavior, disrespectful nonverbal communications, fraudulent behavior, deception or willful neglect of patients. Sexual harassment, as defined by University Policy, is considered an infraction of this Code and shall be dealt with under established University Policy.

G) Substance Abuse

Medical students will not participate in the clinical setting while under the influence of a controlled substance not specifically prescribed for an illness/disorder. The clinical setting includes on-call responsibilities whether in house or home call. Medical students will not drink alcohol while on-call. Like any other profession, physicians are susceptible to the pitfalls that others in society face including substance abuse; however, when these situations put our patients at risk, it is a breach of this Code.

IV. Integrity of Professional Code

The basis of the code rests upon each student's acceptance of the responsibility to act honorably and to uphold the code of honorable conduct. For this system to be effective, each student must acknowledge that he or she will not accept dishonorable conduct among fellow students. Similarly, each student should be willing to testify as a witness in any proceeding related to the administration of this code, if called upon to do so. A student will not deliberately misuse the code. This offense includes:

- misusing the code to harass another student;
- failing to maintain rules of confidentiality and discretion for Professional Code Committee and Professional Code Panel proceedings.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

Professional Code Committee - Procedure

Definitions

1. **Professional Code Committee (PCC)** - a standing student-faculty committee of the College of Medicine with the composition and charge noted below.
2. **Professional Code Advisory Panel (PCAP)** - an ad hoc group convened by the Professional Code Committee and consisting of members of the Professional Code Committee and students and faculty of the college, charged with investigating and making recommendations about a specific issue and/or case referred to it by the Professional Code Committee.
3. The Professional Code Committee will have complaints and concerns referred to it by its own membership and by members of the academic community. At times these complaints and concerns may include specifics about one or more named students; at other times, they will not. The Committee will take the complaints/concerns and redefine them as issues and/or cases. Anonymous information would be addressed as an issue. An **issue** is a general area of concern that needs to be addressed within the whole academic community or some portion of the community. A **case** is a specific concern or complaint about the actions and/or behaviors of one or more identified students.

Composition and Function

1. There will be a standing Professional Code Committee (PCC). The PCC will consist of one M1 student; two M2 students; three M3 students; four M4 students; one administrator; and four faculty members. Each year, by majority vote, the PCC will elect a third year student to serve as Vice-Chair of the committee. That individual will then serve as Chair during the subsequent year. If that individual does not remain on the Committee an election will be held for Chair.
2. The M1 representative will be elected from the class in January. Each year in spring each medical school class will elect another member of the PCC for the following year. Once elected, students will remain on the PCC until graduation, resignation by the student, or removal of the student from the PCC by majority vote of the PCC. If there is an opening due to a student not remaining with their class, the class will elect the necessary members.
3. The administrator member will be selected by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs annually.
4. Faculty members will be proposed by the administration and confirmed by the majority of votes of ballots cast by the entire student body in the spring. Faculty service on the PCC will be from July 1-June 30. If a faculty member is on a PCAP at the time that his/her term expires, he/she may continue on the PCAP until the issue and/or case has been resolved. Initially four faculty (two basic science; two clinical) will be identified. One person each will have an initial term of one year, two years, three years and four years (decided by lot). After the initial assignment of faculty, subsequent faculty appointments will have a four-year term. A faculty may serve up to two consecutive terms on the PCC.
5. The PCC will have the charges of impacting the culture of the institution by regularly reviewing the Code; educating incoming students about the Code and regularly reeducating students, faculty and staff about the Code; participating in and providing leadership for Professional Code Advisory Panel hearings, and reviewing recommendations and decisions of the PCAP.
6. When a PCAP is convened, members of the PCC will be assigned to participate as noted below. PCC representatives and student community representatives on the PCAP may come from any of the classes, but any member should exclude him/herself from the Panel if there is a conflict.

Procedure

1. When a member of the academic community knows or suspects a Professional Code violation, they must do at least one of three things: a) confront the individual(s) suspected of violating the Code; b) confront the class as a whole; c) report the violation to the PCC. Individuals are encouraged to speak to suspected violator(s) individually as a first step, and are expected to behave professionally in the manner in which they pursue any/all of the above steps.
2. The PCC will have a regularly scheduled monthly meeting, which may or may not occur. In addition

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

- to its other activities, the PCC will consider any charges brought to it at this meeting.
3. A complaint or concern may be forwarded to the PCC by a student, faculty or administrator (including members of the PCC) in writing or by appearance at the committee meeting.
 4. When a complaint or concern is received by the PCC, the following procedure will occur.
 - A. The full committee with a quorum (majority of members) present will consider the charge. All members may participate in discussion. Any member who perceives that he/she has a conflict will announce the conflict to the remaining members but may participate in the discussion after this announcement.
 - B. As a result of this discussion, the PCC will a) define the issue and/or case (which may include a decision that there is no issue and/or case); b) refer the issue and/or case to another institutional mechanism if deemed appropriate by the PCC; c) convene a PCAP if appropriate. As examples: 1) The PCC may consider a complaint against an individual, define the complaint as an issue not involving a specific case, and convene a hearing panel to consider the issue but not the specific complaint. 2) The PCC may receive a complaint, define a case and refer it to another university mechanism and convene a PCAP to consider an issue. 3) The PCC may receive a complaint, define a specific case and convene a PCAP to consider the case. Other examples are possible.
 - C. In general, if a case falls into another university mechanism the PCC is encouraged, but not required, to refer the specific case into that mechanism. This does not preclude the PCC from considering the broader issue raised by the case or convening a hearing panel to consider the broader issue.
 - D. If there is an accused party, she or he will be notified in writing of the concern and given the date of the hearing. An accused party is encouraged to participate in the Professional Code Advisory Panel process but may refuse. If the accused party refuses to participate in a hearing Panel, this information will be conveyed to the PCC. The accused will be allowed to defer any examinations during this period if requested. The accused may work with the administrator member of the PCAP to identify other individuals who should present testimony at the PCAP.
 - E. Professional Code Advisory Panels will include three members from the PCC (two students and one faculty) or five members from the PCC (three students and two faculty); one of these students will chair the proceedings, another will serve as vice-chair. The administrator member of the PCC, or her/his designee, will sit on each PCAP. Remaining members of the PCAP will be randomly chosen from the student community; eight students (two from each class) will be identified. In order to preserve the integrity of the process, these students should be willing to be a PCAP participant. In general, PCAP members should not have a significant conflict with the particular case. Members with a significant conflict should remove themselves from the Panel. If a member questions the possibility of a conflict, they may present the question to the hearing panel and act on the judgement of the Panel. However, if an issue and/or case is one which involves an entire class or is such that it appears that members of an entire class group may be in conflict, this conflict will be announced, affected Professional Code Advisory Panel members will not vote on an issue and/or case, but members may participate in discussions and deliberations of the Panel. It is better to have full involvement of the student community with announcement of a possible conflict than to eliminate input from a large portion of the community. If a PCAP is considering a specific case, the accused student may identify perceived conflicts or other concerns regarding any Panel member to the chair. The chair may remove individual members of the PCAP if deemed appropriate.
 - F. Within five working days of determining that an issue and/or case will be heard by a Panel, Panel membership will be defined, the person(s) subject to a case investigation (if any) will be notified, and a meeting (to take place within a two-week time frame) will be scheduled.
 - G. No attorneys will be present at the hearing panel. An accused may be present for all the testimony presented. The accused may be accompanied by a non-attorney faculty advisor. The PCAP will discuss and deliberate in executive session. Both the accuser (if any) and the accused may be present during or made aware of testimony presented at any testimony given to the panel.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

- H. A majority of members will constitute a quorum for a Professional Code Advisory Panel. The PCAP will investigate the charge as fully as possible through interviews with the accused, the person bringing the charges, and other individuals identified by the accused or the Panel. In general, witnesses will be present only to provide testimony. However, the Panel will deliberate in closed session. The PCAP may convene additional meetings but should schedule meetings so that any hearing panel convened to hear charges about an individual completes its work within six weeks of the first PCAP meeting considering the issue, whenever possible.
- I. The Professional Code Advisory Panel shall reach a conclusion about a particular issue or case, when appropriate exonerate an individual either privately (or publicly should the individual chose), where appropriate, identify corrective action for the educational community and/or the individual and, where appropriate, recommend that action to the accused. When there is an accused party, the goal of the Panel with regard to corrective action is to reach a consensus itself about the most appropriate corrective action and then reach agreement with the accused. Corrective action recommendations, which must be agreed to by an accused party prior to forwarding to the PCC, may include, but are not limited to, an oral warning, a service activity, suspension, withdrawal from school, and/or completion of a learning activity (e.g., paper or other project). Follow up of corrective action recommendations will be part of the PCAP report.
- J. If agreement is reached about corrective action, the full PCC will be informed. The PCC should then implement the agreed action. If an accused party is unwilling to participate in the corrective action plan identified, or if the Panel cannot reach a consensus about the issue, the Panel will forward their findings, recommendations and other information to the PCC. The PCC may then refer the issue for consideration within other academic mechanisms, including those within the University, under the Health Sciences Student Professional Behavior Code, or the technical standards rules.
- K. Referral of an issue and/or case by the PCC to another committee can occur before a PCAP or after a PCAP. Referral of an issue and/or case conveys no conclusion of innocence or guilt. Only the issue and/or case is referred forward, not the deliberations or conclusions of the PCAP. Once an issue has been forwarded to another mechanism, the rules of that system shall be in place. An individual who participated in the Panel deliberations may be called and may provide testimony in another setting. However, this testimony may not include information about the deliberations, findings or recommendations of the PCAP.
- L. The purpose of the PCAP is to identify and explore issues, improve the community, form a conclusion about individual behavior, and devise a plan to address and improve the behavior of individuals who have violated the standards of the Professional Code. The Panel proceedings are intended to be fair. When there is a disagreement, the Panel is intended to be a dispute resolution mechanism. The process is not intended to be legalistic. Attorneys are not to be present, and traditional rules of evidence are not enforced. However, any accused is considered innocent until a majority of hearing panel members believe that guilt has been established by a preponderance of the evidence.
- M. It is expected that all participants of the PCC and Panels will: keep all proceedings about a specific case confidential; keep all information that may be damaging to an individual that surfaces during exploration of an issue confidential; and use discretion in discussing all other matters that surface during deliberations.

Approved 4/10/2000

Sue Fosson made the following remarks:

I am Sue Fosson from the College of Medicine Assistant Dean for Student Affairs, and with me is Dr. Darrell Jennings. We represent the administration and faculty of the College of Medicine. We, likewise, do not have a student here. The students came to the Academic Council

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

for the Medical Center's Meeting in which the Honor Code for the College of Medicine was discussed.

The College of Medicine has proposed this code. It is a significant change from our previous code. It addresses several of the issues already discussed today in terms of students having governance over the honor code process. The students were the majority of the task force that revised the code.

I would like to point out several of the significant differences in this code from the previous code. It covers things beyond the academic realm than our previous code covered. It covers things like professional behavior that medical students have agreed is a dimension of their training that they would like to have included in this process. It also changes the configuration of the Professional Code Committee. You will note that there are 10 students on the committee, several faculty, and an administrator. Those individuals are elected by their class. There is the means for the process of growth of the individual's expertise in that the student that is elected in the first year remains on that particular board for their entire time in school.

Another major change, acknowledges the College of Law's issues of litigious processes and the difficulties that does cause. We significantly changed our code to be a mediation code in which in a collegial process, the code committee, along with the accused, or accused students, or dealing with an issue or case, mediates together and comes to a consensus as to an appropriate remedy in the situation. We felt that in previous code situations, many of the items would have been covered by better education by the college, better explanations to students, better things that the faculty might do as well. Oftentimes, that is a better outcome than having a case decided up or down with the student having a conflict.

Professor Tagavi said he would like to make a friendly amendment. He had some 20 changes.

Professor Jennings said they accepted all the editorial changes.

Ms. Fosson said there were several editorial changes--several of them correcting sentence structure. There is a handout of the changes (see Attachment I). There is also an issue of composition and function of the committee to deal with the possibility that students might not complete their four years with their class and what they would do in terms of correction of that. Also, under procedure, we clarified that the Advisory Panel would include three members. There are eight other students elected to the Advisory Panel, either three or five members coming from the Professional Code Committee. We also identified within five working days. Dr. Jennings and I decided to withdraw Item I.

Professor Jennings said that was in actions that the committee can take, which are outside of handling these cases through standard University regulations. A key part of the code is that the assumption will be in cases that represent obvious or clear violations of the University rules and regulations, the code diverts into the standing University ones. The code functions uniquely in settings where things are not clear, where a faculty member did not witness a particular episode, and there is a dispute among students. "Withdraw" refers to the setting where the accused student would agree to withdraw. We think that if we change that term to dismiss any student who is

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

willingly going along with this is going to see a huge difference between the term being "dismissed" versus "withdrawing." By the location of the paragraph in which this is in, this has to be something that is mutually agreed to by the Professional Code Committee and the student. We think it is very important that it stay "withdraw" out of respect to the students' willingness to accept this outcome.

Professor Tagavi said the biggest part of the honor code is that students who are aware of cheating are not compelled to come forward, but under the honor code, they are. This is one of the biggest changes. However, you say that the students who know of a cheating instance must do one of three things. One is to confront the cheater. That is it? I think you meant confront and bring it to the attention of the panel. If it is something very marginal in a gray area, the student could just be confronted. If it is something very serious, the honor code compels them to do it, but if you don't do it, that is okay.

Ms. Fosson said Professor Tagavi was referring to Procedure under Professional Code Committee - Procedure Number One.

Professor Jennings said that they had discussed this extensively in the development of the code and also in the review process in the Medical Center. We have a prepared answer for this particular issue. The issue is that somehow this code allows there to be a lesser punishment in these settings for these violations than what the University regulations stipulate. What they would like to look at is when a student witnesses some activity on the part of another student, they in fact always have these three choices--only it is that the choice to confront the other student, the choice to do nothing are nowhere codified in any of the existing things. But they can not remove that choice from the student. That is precisely where the previous code ran into trouble and where the Law School ran into trouble with the fact that it becomes litigious from the very first decision that is made. We would say in the obvious case where a student witnesses another student stealing an exam, their expectation is that the student would report that as a stolen exam, as an inappropriate behavior. On the other hand, there are examples where a student thinks another student stole an exam, or a student sees a student doing something suspicious. If you mandate in the code that they have to make it a full-blown honor code violation, it has been their experience that students just do not deal with those questionable or marginal cases. What we want to do and think it will actually do is to lead to more cases and better enforcement of professional standards. We want to make it possible that a student can come forward and say, "I have an issue," or the student will say, "I am concerned about what you are doing and I want to discuss it." We are trying to push students to up front deal with those cases that will not meet the criteria for a black and white legalistic issue.

Professor Knuf said that on the language in that same paragraph it says "a) confront the person/s suspected of violating the Code individually." This is probably the person confronting the individual violating the code and not the mode in which they are confronted. Does this mean that the student goes personally without someone with them, or does it mean they confront the individual?

Ms. Fosson said that the idea was that the individual who suspected a violation would speak with the person they were assuming had made the violation, personally.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

Professor Knuf said it would be clearer to say "confront the individual violating the code."

Ms. Fosson agreed with the change.

Professor Tagavi said that what they just said that they would hope the students did, the proposal did not require them to do. He suggested that the individual confront the person and if not satisfied with their answer or resolution would bring it to the panel. That is the Honor Code. They have to compel students to report cheating.

Ms. Fosson said her assumption is that that is already implied--that is, the individual did not feel comfortable in that person's assuming that they understood what they were talking about and would correct it and would then proceed with one or the other choices.

The question was called.

The Chair asked if there were any objections to waiving the ten-day circulation rule for items six and seven. There were none.

The motion to cut off debate passed in a show of hands.

The proposal passed in a unanimous show of hands.

The Chair recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of the next item. Professor Meyer recognized Professor Green from the College of Pharmacy.

Professor Green made the following remarks:

We have changed our code, and it is very similar to what Medicine did in a lot of ways. We actually worked with them on their code. The Honor Code Committee that we had in place used to be their Student Advisory Council. It was essentially the elected leadership of the college, the presidents of the classes and the presidents of the organizations. When an honor code violation occurred that group became the honor code committee. A number of faculty and students in the College never felt comfortable with that. It placed a lot of pressure on students who, when they ran for office, found themselves as an honor code committee when a violation occurred, and that was not their intent when they ran for office. That was one significant change. The new composition is very similar to what Medicine has proposed. It allows one elected student from the first year class, two students from the second year class, three from the third year class, and four from the fourth year class.

The second major change from the previous code is that the previous code had no faculty involvement at all. Having served as an advisor to the students in that capacity as a nonvoting member of that committee, I can tell you there were many instances when I felt it would have been advantageous to have had more senior leadership there. This new proposal has four faculty elected by the faculty.

The previous code only dealt with the violation of cheating. It was a very limited definition. It was rather restrictive in the way the honor code committee could come to a conclusion of guilt.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

The new code has expanded the definition of cheating. It also deals with lying, plagiarism, and stealing. We have identified some other areas that in the past we have had difficult time in explaining and coming to a conclusion about.

Finally, with regard to a change, this committee is compelled to meet on a regular basis. It is the intent that this committee meet on a regular basis. Obviously, there will be new membership on the committee each year as additional students are elected. It is hoped that the committee will offer direction to the faculty and the student advisory council to things that the Honor Code Committee will see as possible problems within classes and give some direction on the educational progress of students.

Those are the primary changes. There are also some editorial and grammatical changes.

ACTION ITEM 7 - Proposal to modify the College of Pharmacy Honor Code

Background: The College of Pharmacy, similar to all Colleges of the Medical Center, endorses an honor code under which its professional students conduct themselves. The current Honor Code was originally approved in 1983 and has not significantly been modified since its original implementation. The faculty of the College of Pharmacy approved the proposed new Honor Code at their meeting on August 17, 1999. The Honor Code was then approved by the Academic Council for the Medical Center, the Senate's Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards, and the University Senate Council.

Rationale: The principal changes in the new honor code being proposed include:

1. Modifying the membership on the Committee- this will facilitate including a broader array of student participation and formally include faculty representation. The current Honor Code provides representation on the Honor Code Committee based on leadership in other College student organizations,
2. Providing specific guidelines for the operation of the Committee
3. Expanding the scope of infractions that would constitute violation of the Honor Code. The current Honor Code limits infractions to cheating and plagiarism.

The modified Honor Code follows below.

Introduction

A. Recognition of Responsibility

Students of the University of Kentucky College of Pharmacy recognize that members of the pharmacy profession should subscribe to a set of ethical standards that recognizes our primary obligation to the patient and which fosters integrity and honor within our profession. We recognize our responsibility to society, other health professionals, and self. Furthermore, we recognize the great trust society bestows on us as we administer to the health care needs of our patients. Because of this responsibility, we do hereby affirm and undertake to live within the privileges and duties accorded us and required by this Code.

B. Scope

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

The Honor Code supplies the statutes under which the College of Pharmacy Operates and prevents the possible implication of an innocent individual.

These are:

When a member of the academic community suspects an Honor Code Violation, they must choose one of three options; a.) confront the person/s violating the Code individually; b.) confront the class as a whole; or c.) report the violation to the Honor Code Committee. Any member(s) of the academic community is obligated to take whatever action, as described above, they believe to be most effective to stop the academic misconduct or to prevent its recurrence.

1. In relation to the Honor Code, the faculty of the College of Pharmacy has the responsibility to:
 - a. Support the Honor Code.
 - b. Avoid placing the students in situations where violations of the Code may unintentionally occur.
 - c. Indicate conditions for carrying out the examination, such as, but not limited to, use of scratch paper, tools, appropriate seating arrangements and time allotment.
2. Students should bear in mind that (a) they are enrolled in the University as well as in the College, and therefore are subject to University Senate rules Part I, Article II, and Section 2.3 of the Code of Student Conduct, (Attachment- "Rights of the Accused") and (b) faculty shares with students the responsibility of maintaining academic integrity. The University Senate has outlined faculty responsibilities in regard to cheating and plagiarism. If a faculty member suspects a breach in academic integrity, the faculty member may proceed under the University Senate Rules, Section VI, 4.0.

Honor Code Committee:

A. Composition

1. There will be a standing Honor Code Committee (HCC). The HCC will consist of one Pharmacy First Year (PY1) student, 2 Pharmacy Second Year (PY2) students, 3 Pharmacy Third Year (PY3) students, and 4 Pharmacy Fourth Year (PY4) students with two of the four PY4 students as alternates, one administrator, and four faculty members.
2. The PY1 student will be elected from the class in January. Each April, each pharmacy class will elect another member for the HCC for the following year. Once elected, students will remain on the HCC until graduation, resignation by the student or removal of the student from the HCC by majority vote of the HCC. If there is more than one opening in a class in a given year, the class will elect a replacement member in September.
3. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will select the administrative member.
4. Faculty members will be proposed by the Nominating Committee of the Faculty and confirmed by majority vote of the Faculty. Initially, four faculty members (two basic sciences and two clinical) will be identified. One person each will have an initial term of one year, two years, three years, and four years (decided by lot). After the initial assignment of faculty, subsequent faculty appointments will have a four-year term. A faculty member may not serve more than two consecutive terms on the HCC.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

5. The Chair of the HCC will be elected annually by the members of the HCC from the group of PY4 students on the HCC or from the group of four faculty members on the HCC. The Administrative member will appoint a non-voting member as a secretary annually from the College of Pharmacy staff who will provide staff support to the HCC during the proceedings.

III. Function

The HCC will have the charges of influencing the culture of the institution by regularly reviewing the Code and educating incoming students about the Code and regularly re-educating students, faculty and staff about the Code. The HCC will develop materials and fair procedures as necessary.

IV. Specific Academic Misconduct

A. Definitions of Violations

1. Lying

A pharmacy student must not deliberately misrepresent the truth. Lying includes gross negligence or intentional misrepresentation within the academic setting. Students must deal honestly with patients and colleagues, and strive to expose those pharmacy students deficient in character or competence, or who engage in fraud or deception.

If an individual lies concerning some matter but, later on his or her own initiative, tells the truth concerning the same matter before the individual is confronted with committing a breach of honor, this will be considered a mitigating factor in the case.

2. Cheating

A pharmacy student must not cheat. Cheating is defined, but not limited to, the wrongful giving, taking or presenting of any information or material by a student with intent of aiding the student or another in any academic work. Cheating can also include a student intentionally listening to or participating in a discussion of an examination, which the student is yet to take. It is understood that because of the nature of the pharmacy curriculum at the UK College of Pharmacy, a certain amount of teamwork and sharing of information is necessary for completion of assignments; however, these situations will be clearly identified by the course instructor.

Cheating on an examination can take a variety of forms including: a) discussing the examination with anyone except the instructor or the instructor's substitute until all students have taken the exam unless specifically authorized to do so by the instructor; b) giving, receiving, or soliciting unauthorized aid during any examination, take-home exam, or make-up exam before or after the regularly scheduled exam as been administered; c) using materials in any examination except those that are specifically authorized by the instructor; d) exchanging materials with another student during the examination unless authorized to do so by the written exam instructions; or e) violating any rules that the instructor has established for an examination period.

3. Plagiarism

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

All academic work, written or otherwise, submitted by students to their instructors or other academic supervisors, is expected to be the result of their own thought, research, or self-expression. In cases where students feel unsure about a question of plagiarism involving their work, they are obliged to consult their instructors on the matter before submission.

When students submit work purporting to be their own, but which in any way borrows ideas, organization, wording or anything else from another source without appropriate acknowledgment of the facts, the students are guilty of plagiarism. Plagiarism includes reproducing someone else's work, whether it be a published article, chapter of a book, a paper from a friend or some file, or whatever. Plagiarism also includes the practice of employing or allowing another person to alter or revise the work which a student submits as his/her own, whoever that other person may be. Students may discuss assignments among themselves or with an instructor or tutor, but when the actual work is done, it must be done by the student, and the student alone.

When a student's assignment involves research in outside sources or information, the student must carefully acknowledge exactly what, where and how he/she has employed them. If the words of someone else are used, the student must put quotation marks around the passage in question and add an appropriate indication of its origin. Making simple changes while leaving the organization, content and phraseology intact is plagiaristic. However, nothing in these Rules shall apply to those ideas which are so generally and freely circulated as to be a part of the public domain..

4. Stealing

A pharmacy student must not intentionally take or acquire any property without permission. Stealing includes, but is not limited to: a) theft or conversion of property belonging to the College of Pharmacy or to another member of the College of Pharmacy community; and b) the misappropriation or destruction of property needed by other students for a specified academic endeavor.

B. Procedure

1. When a member of the academic community knows or suspects an Honor Code violation, they must do at least one of three things: a) confront the person/s violating the Code individually; b) confront the class as a whole; or c) report the violation to the HCC.
2. A complaint or concern may be forwarded to the HCC by a student/faculty or administrator in writing or by appearance at the committee meeting.
3. When a complaint or concern is received by the HCC, the following procedure will occur.
 - a. The full committee with a quorum (majority of members) present will consider the charge. All members may participate in the discussion. Any member who perceives a conflict will announce the conflict to the remaining members but may participate in the discussion after this announcement unless the Chairperson deems such participation to be inappropriate. The accused student may also identify perceived conflicts or other concerns regarding the HCC members to the chair. The chair may

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

- remove individual members of the HCC at any time during the proceedings if deemed appropriate.
- b. All action of the HCC must be kept in complete confidence to ensure the protection of the innocent. Any member breaching confidentiality may be subject to removal from the HCC.
 - c. The HCC may, with the permission of the Dean, seek information concerning the suspected infraction from any source deemed necessary.
 - d. The HCC will interview all concerned parties.
 - e. To be considered guilty, the accused student must be found guilty by at least two-thirds vote of the total HCC membership.
 - f. If a student is not found guilty by the HCC, the case is dismissed and the records of the proceedings will be destroyed after one year. This shall be the responsibility of the Assistant to the Dean for Student Affairs.
 - g. If the student is found guilty, a written report of the proceedings and a recommended penalty will be submitted to the Dean of the College.
 - h. If the student is found guilty, written records, including the name of the violator, will be kept on file in the Assistant to the Dean's Office and a copy forwarded to the University Registrar according to Senate Rules Section VI, 4.0.
 - i. If a member of the HCC is charged with an infraction of the Honor Code, that member will remove himself or herself for the duration of the hearing. The Administrator will appoint a replacement from the alternates if available from that class or from the class officers of the member removed.
 - j. If an infraction occurs in a class instructed by a faculty member on the HCC, that member will step down from the HCC and will assume only the role of the involved instructor during the proceedings. The Administration will appoint a faculty alternate.
 - k. This Honor Code is subject to Part I, Article II, and Section 2.3 of the Code of Student Conduct dealing with the rights of the accused. (Attachment-"Rights of the Accused").

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

VI. Penalties

The penalty for violations of the Honor Code should reflect the degree of both the intention and the infraction. A range of penalties is necessary to cope with the myriad of possible situations.

Minimum Penalty for Cheating ---“ E “ in the course.

Maximum College Penalty --- Dismissal from the College.

When an agreement on a recommended penalty has been reached by the HCC, the recommendation is forwarded for consideration to the Dean. If the penalty is actual suspension or dismissal, it shall be imposed by the Chancellor only with the recommendation of the Dean of the College.

Implementation: Fall Semester, 2000

The proposal passed in an unanimous show of hands.

Chairperson Moore recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of Action Item 8. Professor Meyer reviewed the background of the item and said that following the list of courses, the GPA was incorrect. It said 2.25 but should be 2.5. He recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

ACTION ITEM 8 - Proposal to modify University Senate Rules, Section IV – 4.2.2.10 (Engineering Standing in Materials Engineering)

Proposal: Delete course in brackets

4.2.2.10 College of Engineering (US: 4/25/84; 2/12/96;) Admission to engineering standing in a degree program is necessary in order to be granted a baccalaureate degree in engineering or computer science. Students must complete at least 30 of the last 36 hours of their programs in residence at the University. Specific departmental requirements for admission to engineering standing are as follows. The same criteria are applied to transfer students with the equivalence of courses determined by the Director of Undergraduate Studies. A student must apply to the specific department for admission to engineering standing. Note: The cumulative grade point average includes all college level work taken at the University of Kentucky or elsewhere.

Materials Engineering

Completion of ENG 101, ENG 102 (or ENG 105), MA 113, MA 114, MA 213, MA 214, PHY 231, PHY 232, PHY 241, [PHY 242,] CHE 105, CHE 107 and CHE 115 with a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.50 in these courses and completion of CS 221 with a passing grade. University repeat options may be utilized as necessary.

Rationale: The new requirement is more consistent with the admission to engineering standing requirement of other engineering degrees and will improve the quality of students in the materials engineering program. PHY 242 is no longer required.

Implementation: Fall, 2000

The proposal passed in an unanimous show of hands.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

The Chair recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of the next item.

Professor Meyer said it was a proposal from the College of Nursing. He reviewed the background of the item and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council. He recognized Ms. Joann Davis for an overview of the changes.

ACTION ITEM 9 - Proposal to revise the Admission Requirements for the Bachelor of Science in Nursing Degree , University Senate Rules, Section IV

Proposal: (Bold sections added; delete strikeouts)

4.2.2.1 Admission to College of Nursing: (US:4/12/82; US:3/10/86; US:10/14/91; US: 2/13/95) The College of Nursing (CON) enrollment will be composed of four-year students, associate degree nursing graduates and diploma nursing school graduates. Admission to the University does not guarantee admission to the College of Nursing. Preference will be given to Kentucky residents.

Applicants must be in a state of good health enabling them to carry out the functions of the professional nurse. Routinely, each student will be required to obtain a rubella and rubella titers, and have an annual tuberculin test or chest x-ray.

Progression to upper division courses is regulated so that the total number of full time equivalents at the beginning of the junior year does not exceed 120. Admission criteria for five types of students are presented below:

1. **Criteria for admission to the 4-year BSN program include** (US 4/13/98)

A. Freshman students

Students will be admitted as freshman to a prenursing curriculum based on the following criteria:

- a. high school grade point average of 2.5 or above on a 4.0 scale
- b. meeting criteria for selective admission to the University of Kentucky as established by Rule 4.2.1.1
- c. ~~ability to articulate reasons for choosing nursing as a career, as evidenced in an essay written according to criteria established by CON~~
- d. ~~one letter of reference from an individual who can assess potential for success (e.g., teacher, employer, etc.)~~

B. Admission to the nursing curriculum will occur at the sophomore level for ~~students in the prenursing category only if the student~~ **all students based on evaluation of the following criteria:**

- a. ~~maintains~~ a **minimum** cumulative grade point average of 2.5 ~~or greater~~;
- b. ~~received~~ a grade of "C" or better in all required prenursing courses; and
- c. ~~completes~~ a **certificate from** an approved certified nursing assistant program.
- d. **An essay which articulates reasons for choosing nursing as a career, with criteria established by the CON; and**
- e. **One letter of reference from an individual who can assess potential for success (e.g. teacher, employer)**

2. **Criteria for admission to the 4-year BSN program for transfer students include:** (US: 4/13/98)

- a. for transfer students with less than 24 hours of college credit, meeting the criteria for entering freshman and maintaining a grade point average of 2.5 on all college work attempted as computed by the Office of Admissions;
- b. for transfer students with more than 24 hours of college credit, maintaining a grade point average of 2.5 on all college work attempted as computed by the Office of Admissions;
- c. grades of "C" or better in all courses required for CON curriculum;

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

- d. ability to articulate reasons for choosing nursing as a career, as evidenced in an essay written according to criteria established by CON;
- e. one letter of reference from an individual who can assess potential for success (e.g., teacher, employer, etc.); and
- f. completion of an approved certified nursing assistant program.

3. Students will be eligible **to apply** for readmission the College of Nursing after suspension from the College when they meet criteria as stated in Section 2 a and b of this policy.

~~4. A student who is eligible to take the examination for licensure (NCLEX-RN) and who wishes to be considered for admission to upper division courses in the nursing program must meet the following requirements:~~

~~a. The applicant must be a graduate of or enrolled in the final semester of an associate degree nursing program in a college accredited by one of the six regional academic accrediting associations, OR the applicant must be a graduate of or enrolled in the final semester of a diploma program and have earned a minimum of 60 college credits which include:~~

English	6 semester credits
Natural Sciences	6 semester credits
Social Sciences	6 semester credits
Humanities	6 semester credits
Nursing^o	28 semester credits

~~^oNursing credits may be earned from regionally accredited colleges by taking the courses or by taking the ACT-PEP tests. It is strongly recommended that applicants contact the Office of Student Services in the College of Nursing regarding the approved nursing ACT-PEP credits. All nursing courses taken in associate degree or diploma programs are considered lower division courses and are not equivalent to upper division courses in this program.~~

~~b. For automatic acceptance, the applicant in this category must have a cumulative GPA of 2.5 or above on a scale of 4.0 in all college course work attempted as computed by the Office of Admissions.~~

~~Applicants with a GPA between 2.35 and 2.49 will be considered for admission on an individual basis. Such actions are recommended by the Undergraduate Student Admission and Progression Committee and approved by the Dean of the College of Nursing.~~

~~e. An applicant admitted in this category must hold a valid Kentucky license to practice as a registered nurse prior to beginning the first clinical course.~~

4.5. A student who is a registered nurse and who wishes to will be considered for admission to upper division courses in the nursing program based on the following criteria: must meet the following requirements:

- a. The applicant must be a registered nurse licensed to practice in Kentucky.
- b. ~~The applicant with~~ an Associate Degree in Nursing from a college accredited by one of the six regional academic accrediting associations ~~will be automatically accepted if the applicant has at least~~ **with a minimum** GPA of 2.5 on a scale of 4.0 on all course work attempted as computed by the Office of Admissions.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

~~Applicants with a GPA between 2.35 and 2.49 will be considered for admission on an individual basis. Such actions are recommended by the Undergraduate Student Admission and Progression Committee and approved by the Dean of the College of Nursing.~~

- c. **A statement of academic and professional goals; and**
- d. **A letter of reference from a supervisor**

* The registered nurse who is a graduate of a diploma program will be **considered automatically accepted** for admission after earning a minimum of 60 college credits which include:

English	6 semester credits
Natural Sciences	6 semester credits
Social Sciences	6 semester credits
Humanities	6 semester credits
Nursing**	28 semester credits

**Nursing credits may be earned from regionally accredited colleges by taking the courses or by taking the ACT-PEP tests. It is strongly recommended that applicants contact the Office of Student Services in the College of Nursing regarding the approved nursing ACT-PEP credits. All nursing courses taken in associate degree or diploma programs are considered lower division courses and are not equivalent to upper division courses in this program.

The applicant must have at least a GPA of 2.5 on a scale of 4.0 on all college course work attempted as computed by the Office of Admissions, and must have satisfactorily completed the ACT-PEP tests which establish the nursing credits.

The application deadline for admission to the Nursing program **for all categories of students** is ~~February~~ **May 1st.** (SC: 4/24/95)

Background and Rationale; The changes in requirements for four-year students reflect the desire to eliminate freshmen admission to Nursing and have an open pool for all interested students. The selection will be at the point of entry to professional NUR courses much the way other professional colleges make their selections.

The changes for the RN/BSN applicants are an attempt to align with the RN/MSN requirements so that the information available on all applicants is comparable.

The changes have been approved by the faculty of the College of Nursing, the Senate's Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards and the University Senate Council.

Implementation: Fall Semester, 2000

Ms. Davis made the following remarks:

The changes are to take out freshman admission and move admission for the professional level to the sophomore year. This is in alignment with our benchmarks and almost all the colleges of nursing across the country. It allows them to get proven students who have successfully completed the freshman core requirements.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

Professor Tagavi said that they had discussed several changes and agreed on them.

Ms. Davis said that much of what she found was errors in translation from their original proposal to what was circulated.

The Chair said those changes should be forwarded to the Rules Committee.

The proposal passed in a unanimous show of hands.

Chairperson Moore recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of Action Item Ten.

Professor Meyer said the proposal was to have a Senate Academic Advising Committee. It would be a standing committee with purposes of setting standards for quality of academic advising, reviewing and examining faculty and professional advising, making recommendations to the Senate Council regarding academic advising, and considering other recommendations related to university operations, through proper channels, involving academic advising. He recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

ACTION ITEM 10 - Proposal to Establish a Senate Standing Committee on Academic Advising, Section I, 1.4.3.3

Proposal: Add Senate Academic Advising Committee to Section I, USR

There shall be a standing committee with the purpose of creating a process of constant review and accountability to all academic advising of the University of Kentucky:

- A. Setting standards for the quality of academic advising.
- B. Reviewing and examining faculty and professional advising.
- C. Making recommendations to the Senate Council regarding academic advising.
- D. Considering all other recommendations made to the University Senate, through the proper channels, involving academic advising.

Membership of the Academic Advising Committee shall consist of no more than three (3) faculty members of the University Senate who are currently faculty advisors; three (3) students (two student senators of the University Senate and one student at-large) to be determined by the Senate Council upon recommendation of the President of the Student Government Association; three (3) professional advisors determined by a process designated by the University of Kentucky Advisors Network and the Senate Council and two ex officio members, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and the Vice Chancellor for Advising Services.

Rationale: The University of Kentucky Strategic Plan states our commitment to, "Strengthen the University's commitment to excellence in teaching and student advising" through the enabling strategies of "Providing timely and informed student advising," "Promote and reward excellent teaching and advising," and "Strengthen the academic, cultural, and recreational opportunities outside the classroom."

We, the UK Student Government Association, seek the creation of this committee to provide the first steps toward excellent advising. This governing body will be responsible for the standards, procedures, and accountability of academic advising at the University

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

The Council for the Advancement of Standards Higher Education (CAS) believes that,

"Academic advising is an essential element of a student's college experience. It evolves from the institution's culture, values, and practices, and is delivered in accordance with these factors." "

CAS also acknowledges that advising is one of the few elements of an institution that all students experience. Based on anecdotal evidence, SGA has observed that students who encounter advising problems at the University tend to remain in school longer, usually 5-6 years. The University's graduation rate data shows that only 19% of freshmen that entered in the fall of 1993 graduated in 1997, the year of most recently available data. Of the students entering in the fall of 1992, only 41.2% graduated in 1997.

The University has made a commitment, through its strategic indicators, that 55% of students entering in the fall of 1997 will graduate in 2003. In 1999, the six-year graduation rate stood at 50.8%. Therefore, SGA sees the creation of this committee as imperative to the achievement of this indicator.

We believe that the standing committee would create a catalyst for advising reform from the entire University Community. Though we realize that there is no one solution to the problems facing academic advising, this committee will create an atmosphere of culpability to our goals here at the University of Kentucky by enabling leadership on various academic advising issues.

The proposal was approved by the University Senate Council.

Implementation: Fall, 2000

If approved, the proposal will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

The Chair said the proposal was initiated by the Student Government Association.

Shirley Raines - (Vice Chancellor for Academic Services) said the proposal's membership listed Vice Chancellor for Advising Services, but it should be Vice Chancellor for Academic Services.

The proposal passed in an unanimous show of hands.

The Chair said that the proposal that the Senate passed about extending the voting privileges was approved unanimously by the Board of Trustees at the March 7, 2000, meeting.

Chairperson Moore recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of the last item.

Professor Meyer reviewed the background of the item and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

ACTION ITEM 11 - Proposal to amend the University Senate Rules, Section VI – 6.1.6, Student Participation in Academic Affairs

Proposal (Delete bracketed portion; add underlined portion)

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

6.1.6 STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

The faculty of each college within the University and the faculty of the Graduate School shall establish some form of Student Advisory Council (SAC) to represent student opinion on academic matters pertinent to that college or school.

The form for each Council, as well as the areas of responsibility, shall be determined by the faculty of the college or school. Students themselves shall be responsible for the selection of Council members by democratic process. Each Student Advisory Council shall keep records of its proceedings. The dean of each college or school shall forward for approval a statement of form and of areas of responsibility to (1) the University Senate Council and (2) the appropriate chancellor.

The faculty of each college or school shall [determine whether] include a student member [of] recommended by its Student Advisory Council who shall be entitled to vote with its faculty council or equivalent body on academic affairs.

Rationale:

This proposal is made in the spirit of the Strategic Plan of the University of Kentucky, whereby it states that we as a community must "Pursue diligently a climate of integrity, openness, trust, and mutual respect for all members of the University community," by "ensuring that appropriate and timely information is provided to students on matters that affect their personal well-being and academic development."

Implementing these proposed changes will cater to the cause of "Strengthening consultation with faculty, staff, and students in decision-making within academic and other units." It will also cater to the cause by "Recognizing all members of the University as colleagues, equal as persons and important in their contribution to the University community." The students, as members of the this University community, must have insurance that our representation is intact and sufficient to carry out all of our future endeavors that pertain to academic affairs and ultimately the betterment of our University.

The proposal was initiated by the Student Government Association and approved by the Senate Council.

Implementation: Fall, 2000

A student senator said that the substantive change was that each faculty council would be required to have a student to represent student opinion on academic matters pertinent to that college. They are aware that some faculty councils may address tenure issues and other issues that are not related to academic affairs, and, in that case, it would be up to that faculty council to decide whether the student would be allowed to participate in those discussions. This is simply to allow the students to have a voice on academic affairs.

Professor Tagavi asked if they would accept a friendly amendment changing "academic affairs" to "educational policies"? Although they said it would not include tenure and promotion, in his opinion it does.

The student asked for the change to be a regular amendment.

Professor Tagavi said he would make it as a regular amendment.

There was a second.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

Michael Kennedy (Geography) said that it seemed that educational policy is a very restrictive term. There are areas of academic affairs, which do not include tenure matters, that students should be allowed to participate in.

An unidentified senator asked if academic affairs included academic dismissal of a particular student or readmission.

An unidentified senator said that if the faculty council handled those matters, he believed so.

An unidentified senator said that readmission is decided by the college dean if a student is being readmitted to the college. If the student is being readmitted to the University, it goes through the Registrar's Office. If it is an exception, there is a committee for that.

An unidentified senator said he did not understand the comment with regard to promotion and tenure.

Professor Tagavi said it looks like it would include students on promotion and tenure cases. The students mentioned that was not their intention. To make their intention clear, he suggested the amendment. In the College of Engineering, the faculty council does consider promotion and tenure.

A student asked for clarification of excepting tenure and promotion.

Professor Tagavi said that there was a set of academic affairs and there is a set of education policies, and there is a third set, which is academic affairs minus tenure and promotion. These are not identical. In fairness, he would like to keep that.

Keisha Carter asked what was a reason besides tenure and promotion that made the change from "academic policies" to "educational policies?"

John Thelin (Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation) said he would say that "educational policy studies" was about as broad of an umbrella that would encompass academic affairs and other things as well. He understood the intent but had problems with the language.

Professor Kennedy said he wondered if what they wanted to exclude was personnel issues.

Professor Tagavi asked who thought "educational policies" was broader than "academic affairs."

Professor Knuf asked "what was the objection to having students included in promotion and tenure?"

Professor Tagavi said he did not object but that the students said they did not want to be included in that.

A student senator said he felt that the Senate would come closer to passing a proposal that allowed them to sit in on academic matters rather than tenure and promotion.

Minutes, University Senate, April 10, 2000

George Blandford (Engineering) said that assistant professors were not allowed to sit in judgment of faculty who are going up for promotion and tenure to associate or full, and this is the same sort of situation.

The question was called. The motion to end debate on the amendment passed in a show of hands.

The amendment failed in a show of hands.

An amendment was made to change the wording to "excepting personnel matters."

The motion was seconded.

The amendment passed in a show of hands

The proposal, as amended, passed in a show of hands.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Don Witt
Secretary, University Senate