



MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, April 12, 1999

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., April 12, 1999 in the auditorium of the W. T. Young Library.

Professor Roy Moore, Chairperson of the Senate Council presided.

Members absent were: Sammy Anderson, James Applegate*, Suketu Bhavsar*, Jeffrey Bieber, Brian Biermann, Deborah Blades, Rachel Bomberger, James Brennan*, Jayson Brittain, Joseph Burch, Laretta Byars, Leo Cai, Joan Callahan, James Campbell, Brad Canon, Edward Carter, Jordan Cohen, Raymond Cox, Robert Dahlstrom*, Frederick Danner, Mary Davis*, George DeBin, Susan DeCarvalho, Henri DeHahn*, Jeffrey Dembo, Roberta Dwyer*, Juanita Fleming, William Freehling, Richard Furst, Hans Gesund*, Jonathan Golding*, Larry Grabau, Philip Greasley, Howard Grotch, David Hamilton, Issam Harik*, Debra Harley, Patrick Herring, Randolph Hollingsworth*, James Holsinger, Craig Infanger, Mike Inman, Anthony Jones, Jamshed Kanga, Benjamin Karp, Edward Kasarskis, Keith Kindernecht*, Joachim Knuf, Thomas Lester, Jane Lindle*, C. Oran Little, Donald Madden, Susan Mains, Gary McCollum, Jason Miller, David Mohny, Mary Molinaro, Michael Nietzel, William O'Connor, James Parker, Thomas Pope, Shirley Raines, Dan Reedy, Thomas Robinson, Kathryn Sallee*, Claire Schmelzer, Robert Schwemm, Robert Shay, David Stockham, Thomas Troland, George Wagner, William Wagner, Thomas Waldhart, Retia Walker, Nick West, Charles Wethington*, Carolyn Williams, Eugene Williams, Lionell Williamson, Emery Wilson, Linda Worley, Ernest Yanarella, Thomas Zentall, Elisabeth Zinser.

* Absence Explained

Chairperson Moore called the meeting to order and asked for corrections or revisions to the minutes of the March 8, 1999 meeting. There were none and the minutes were approved as circulated.

The Chair made the following announcements:

There is a new Student Government Association President, Jimmy Glenn, whom I would like to welcome aboard. He will also be serving on the Senate, the Senate Council, and on the Board of Trustees.

Loys Mather was just re-elected to a three-year term on the Board of Trustees as a faculty representative. Congratulations. =20

Professor Mather was given a round of applause.

There is a revised sexual harassment policy, an Administrative Regulation that has been reviewed by the Senate Council. It is not on the agenda because it is an Administrative Regulation. The recommendations that were made by the Senate Council have been incorporated. If you have any questions about that, Nancy Ray can answer those. This will now move on to the Administration.

As part of the Board of Trustees annual evaluation of the President, the Chair of the Board, Ned Breathitt, consults with the two faculty trustees, Loys Mather and Dan Reedy, who in turn receive input from the Senate Council. If you have comments or feedback that you would like to share,

please feel free to contact either Dan or Loys or any member of the Senate Council and they will be glad to forward those comments to the appropriate person.

The following resolution has been unanimously approved by the Senate Council and I will ask for approval by the Senate.

SPECIAL RESOLUTION

In appreciation for her tireless efforts and considerable sacrifice of her time, energy and attention in successfully promoting free health insurance for graduate assistants, teaching assistants, research assistants and fellowship holders at the University of Kentucky, the University Senate, upon the unanimous recommendation of the Senate Council, expresses its gratitude and thanks to Ms. Susan Mains.

In her absence I will hold this up and show you that we have a plaque that I will present to her at the appropriate time.

The resolution was adopted in a unanimous voice vote.

I would like to express my appreciation to Susan for all of her work.

Ms. Mains was given a round of applause.

I would like to talk for a moment about the status of some of the proposals that were considered by the Senate this year.

The Graduate Student Health Proposal will be in effect sometime around August 27, 1999. It is not the same proposal that was recommended here but certainly a major step forward. We are all very appreciative of that.

The new Graduate School admissions standards, which passed the Council, are now in effect.

The proposal for a new School of Public Health has now been approved by the Board of Trustees.

A proposal to require undergraduates to declare a major will go into effect in the fall of this year.

The extension of voting privileges in the University Senate to the Student Government Association President and to the Director of the Teaching and Learning Center has now been approved by the Board of Trustees.

The employee benefits proposal, which dealt primarily with noncredit workshops, will be considered by the Employee Benefits Committee in the fall.

The new Promotion and Tenure Guidelines are currently being reviewed by the Legal Counsel Office and by President Wethington.

They are also reviewing the new Overload and Consulting Policy and the extension of voting privileges to contractual faculty.

There is a file in the Senate Council Office, which is primarily memos that I have received dealing with various administrative matters. The file was originally started by Professor Gretchen LaGodna when she was Chair of the Senate Council. If anyone would like to review those memos, I will be glad to share them with you.

Chairperson Moore recognized Professor Lee Meyer, vice-chair of the Senate

Council for introduction of the first action item.

ACTION ITEM 1 - Proposal to establish a Department of Landscape Architecture. If approved, the proposal will be forwarded to the Administration for appropriate action.

Background and Rationale:

Attached is a proposal to form a Department of Landscape Architecture by separating the existing Department of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture into two separate educational units. This change has been under discussion for over a decade.=20

In recent months there have been discussions with the Dean of the College of Agriculture and the Chancellor to evaluate and deal with administrative and budgetary issues that may result from this proposed transition. Once these details were resolved to everyone's satisfaction, the proposal was formally circulated to the entire college for comment. There has been no opposition to the proposal.

In January of this year, the existing Department of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture underwent a Periodic Review as required by Administrative Regulations. A draft of that committee's findings is presently under examination by the college administration. In its report, the review committee fully endorsed the creation of a Department of Landscape Architecture.

This proposal is a reflection of the natural evolution that has taken place in most other universities with a landscape architecture program. It is believed the creation of a discrete academic unit is in the best interest of the students, the profession and the University of Kentucky.=20

The proposal has been reviewed by the entire faculty of the Department of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture and received unanimous approval. It has been discussed and endorsed by the current students as well as the Landscape Architecture Advisory Council (professionals who act as a consulting group to the Landscape Architecture Program). It has been reviewed and approved by the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee and the University Senate Council.

Proposal to Establish the
Department of Landscape Architecture

College of Agriculture
University of Kentucky

Proposal

It is proposed that the Landscape Architecture Program become a discrete academic unit by designating it as a Department within the College of Agriculture. This will entail separating from the Department of Horticulture & Landscape Architecture and will allow Horticulture to revert to its departmental designation held prior to the establishment of the Landscape Architecture Program.

Current Status:

Landscape Architecture is a profession that is built on the principles of dedication to the public health, safety and welfare, and protection of the land and its resources. These principles form the foundation as well of the Landscape Architecture Program at the University of Kentucky. The program applies social, physical, economic and aesthetic concepts to the planning, design and management of the natural and built environment. In this sense

we deal with problem solving relative to land use planning, urban and suburban environments, natural ecosystems and their integration for human use and ecological stability.

The College of Agriculture began offering a degree in Landscape Architecture in 1973 and in 1976 the Horticulture Department was renamed the Department of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture. Since that time both Horticulture and Landscape Architecture have continued to develop in directions that have little similarity or continuity. Horticulture has expanded in the area of molecular biology and plant physiology while Landscape Architecture has developed its strengths in environmental design and land use planning. As a result of these changes, there is virtually no interaction between the two programs that justify retaining the existing departmental status.=20

Departmental status will give recognition to Landscape Architecture at the University of Kentucky as an academic unit which represents a distinct discipline and profession. It will further enhance educational, research and outreach opportunities on campus and throughout Kentucky as a specific unit dealing with environmental design and land use planning. This is critical at a time when public concern with creating quality sustainable environments is at an all time high. Visibility is a critical issue if landscape architecture is to assume its role among other planning and design professions in the State of Kentucky. Having a department chair would provide the opportunity, time and expertise needed to promote the visibility of Landscape Architecture as a Department within the College of Agriculture.

Rationale and Supporting Documentation: =20

These will follow the Guidelines for Proposals to Create an Educational Unit or Alter its Status.

A. Programmatic Considerations

1. Is the proposal consistent with University, Sector, or College strategic plans?

This proposal conforms to the University's Strategic Plan and listed goal which states, "The University will strengthen its commitment to academic excellence and enhance its stature among the nation's most distinguished public institutions."

This is the only accredited landscape architecture program in Kentucky. It is nationally only one of four programs associated with horticulture. Of the 74 accredited programs, 55 have departmental or higher standing. The lack of recognition as an academic unit has a negative impact on our status among peer institutions and impacts student and faculty recruitment. The lack of departmental status causes people who are not familiar with this program to make incorrect/biased assumptions about its level and direction of development when comparing it to other accredited programs. This is especially true for prospective students working with guidance counselors who do not have the necessary information to make the distinctions between landscape architecture and the landscape or "green" industry. A clearer distinction will enhance retention of students.

Attainment of departmental status has been a specific goal of this program and a general goal of the College of Agriculture for more than a decade as stated in strategic plans and other documents prepared throughout that time. It is a necessary step in the evolution of this program as it plans for a graduate program and seeks to expand its research/service function.=20

Departmental Strategic Plan, 1991 and 1994
 Department Periodic Review, 1999

2. What will be the impact on other programs?

Since Horticulture will continue as a department they will retain their identity and should not be impacted, certainly not in a negative way.

3. Does the new organization or structure meet accreditation criteria?

Yes. The Landscape Architecture Accreditation Reports have repeatedly stressed the need for autonomy for this program.

*Appendices available upon request]

1997 Accreditation Report: Standard #2. Governance/Administration
 Accreditation Standards and Procedures

4. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the change?

a. Academic - are there other good universities with such a structure or program?

As stated in Section A.1., 55 of the 74 accredited programs have department or higher status. These include all of the major schools such as Harvard, UC-Berkeley, LSU, U.Mass, Wisconsin, Ohio State, Virginia, Texas A&M, Florida and Michigan.

b. Financial - for example, what is the scale of savings or expense?

There will be some expense in making this separation, e.g., duplication of some office equipment. Other expenses are related to adding staff or faculty which are necessary evolutionary changes, such as obtaining a computer technician to manage changes in technology.

B. Individual Considerations

1. Faculty

a. Does it respect academic freedom, both in form and substance?

Academic freedom will be enhanced for both programs by this change because the faculty of each discipline will conduct peer review for only that area of expertise with which they are familiar.

b. How does it affect the interests of untenured faculty? Are prospects for tenure decreased?

There should be no change affecting tenure. Presently, the horticulture faculty are reviewed by the Biological Sciences Committee or Extension Committee. The landscape architecture faculty are submitted to the Arts and Humanities Committee for tenure review. With the addition of one faculty, there would be increased opportunities for sabbatical and other types of research leave.

c. Are the credentials of affected faculty consistent with their newly constituted unit and adequate to its mission?

Of the five full time faculty, all have a terminal degree (MLA) with one holding a Ph.D. Three are full professors, one an associate professor with tenure, and a newly hired assistant professor. The status change will allocate 50% administrative time for the Chair which will enable this

individual and the program to increase visibility and allow for greater involvement within the academic community and the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

d. How does the proposal affect resources and opportunity for research, teaching, and service activities? For example, will teaching loads be altered, laboratory space be changed, support staff curtailed?

Landscape architecture is primarily a teaching program - only .25 FTE's is devoted to funded research. Other faculty area typically 80% teaching, 5% service and 15% unfunded research. There are no changes in facilities anticipated for either faculty offices or studio spaces. Teaching loads may be altered slightly with the creation of a Chair and the addition of one faculty position. Opportunities for additional research and service will be enhanced when a graduate program becomes a reality but not with this administrative change.

2. Students

a. Will the proposal properly honor commitments to students in the affected programs?

There will be no change in either the Horticulture (Plant & Soil Science) or Landscape Architecture curricula.

b. How will instructional resources be affected? For example, will class size increase?

Since Horticulture and Landscape Architecture have been operating as two discrete programs for over 20 years, no change is anticipated.

3. Staff

a. How will reductions and/or relocations be handled? Will the University's rules affect them fairly, or should some dispensation be made?

The staff assistant to the Landscape Architecture Program will receive a position upgrade. With minor changes in responsibilities between existing staff there will be no other major changes. A request for an additional clerical position relates to an existing need in the program and would allow some enhancement to program services.

Note: If approved, the proposal will be forwarded to the Administration for appropriate action.

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

There was no discussion and the proposal passed in a unanimous voice vote.

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

ACTION ITEM 2 - Proposal to establish a new educational unit: Spinal Cord and Brain Injury Research Center. If approved, the proposal will be forwarded to the Administration for appropriate action.=20

Background and Rationale:

Attached find a copy of a proposal from the Medical Center for a Spinal Cord and Brain Injury Research Center. The proposal meets the criteria for establishing Centers and Institutes as stipulated in AR II - 4.0-5. And, in accordance with Governing Regulations, Section IV, the University Senate recommends to the appropriate chancellor/vice president and the President on the "establishment, alteration and abolition of educational units in the

University System."

The new Center will support state-wide efforts to develop research and clinical translational programs in spinal cord and brain injury and will take advantage of recent funding from the Kentucky Spinal Cord and Head Injury Trust. =20

After careful review of the proposal and support documents, Vice President Bramwell approved the new center as one reporting to Dean Emery Wilson in the College of Medicine.

The proposal has been reviewed and approved by the Senate's Committee on Academic Organization and Structure and the University Senate Council and is recommended to the University Senate.

Implementation Date: Upon approval

Note: If approved the proposal will be forwarded to the Administration for Board action.

See Attachment I for Five Year Plan.
=20

Professor Meyer reviewed the background of the item and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council. He stated that Professor Geddes was there and would explain about the trust.

Professor Geddes said that the Spinal Cord and Head Injury Trust was supported by funds received from speeding tickets. It supports a number of research grants. The funds received have been in excess of those required to support the research grant. So for the next five years the trust will be contributing \$500,000 a year into the Spinal Cord and Head Injury Research Center.

Professor Meyer said that the funding is already in place for the Center and it has support from the University Administration as well as from the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure.

Eugene Bruce (Graduate School) asked if this was to be a degree-granting program?

Professor Geddes said it was not a degree-granting program.

Eugene Bruce - It seems from what I read that there might some be overlap or potential impact with other programs on campus such as physical medicine rehab department. What interactions were there?

Professor Geddes - There is potential for interaction with a number of other departments and centers on campus. One of the goals of the center is to bring together clinical and basic research in spinal cord and head trauma injuries. There have been meetings with physical medicine on a fairly regular basis to try to strengthen both programs.

Mark Meier (Arts and Sciences) asked if the faculty positions that were part of the proposal were assistant professor tenure track lines. =20

Professor Geddes said that one position was for the director and would be at full professor level. The other four additional positions would likely be at the assistant professor level. There is one that the candidate being recruited would be at the associate level.

Mark Meier said that the reason he asked was because the fellowships and postdoctoral fellowships were put off until years four and five. It seems

some of those would be much more useful early on to support assistant professors. Why were they in the budget so late?

Professor Geddes said that the rationale was that part of the budget includes support for startup costs. The money for startup costs and recruiting the faculty are in the front of the budget. The graduate students and postdoctoral fellows support does not require startup costs. It does not need funds that are in the initial years of the budget.

Don Frazier (Physiology) said that he supports this proposal. In their department, one of the positions they got from the new initiative in terms of trying to make this into a research institution, they had actually already designated a faculty member, an associate professor level, a person who's primary appointment would be in Physiology and would also be appointed to that particular center. We see it as one of the things that we have identified as an area of growth and growth potential and one of things that the College of Medicine has decided that it was one of the areas that they wanted to invest in.

Eugene Bruce asked if there would be faculty lines in the center?

David Watt (Medicine) said that it was not a graduate program center. This is a research center reporting to the Dean of the College of Medicine. No faculty lines and no graduate degrees granted by the center.

The proposal passed in a unanimous voice vote.

Chairperson Moore recognized Professor Lee Meyer for introduction of the next item.

ACTION ITEM 3 - Proposal to amend University Senate Rules to establish admissions standards for the College of Social Work. =20

Background and Rationale:

The College of Social Work seeks to become a selective admission College. The College faculty members unanimously approved the attached policy.

The Council on Social Work Education, accrediting body for the Social Work College, requires all programs (Baccalaureate and MSW) to have admissions criteria. The Handbook on Accreditation Standards and Procedures in Accreditation Standard 5.0 states: "The program must clearly articulate and implement criteria and processes of student admission. =85 Criteria and processes of admission should be designed and implemented to accept from the group of applicants those who, in accordance with the program's educational goals, are best qualified to become professional social workers at a beginning level of practice". In summary, there are no accredited programs in the USA which are absent admissions' criteria. =20

The Undergraduate Admission Policy includes the completion of two pre-social work courses, a GPA of 2.5 or above, completion of selected social and behavioral sciences courses, and the ability to articulate reasons for choosing social work as a career. These criteria are similar to most undergraduate social work program requirements elsewhere in the country. In addition, accreditation standards require students to have completed beginning courses in the social and behavioral sciences before embarking upon the professional curriculum.

There is no question that the prevailing norm for all professional programs includes admission requirements for their educational programs. Social Work is no exception to the norm. Social work is a profession which has as one of its entry levels the baccalaureate degree from an accredited social work program. Persons who complete the degree are eligible for positions

in a number of areas including child welfare, geriatric social work services, youth services and school social work (among others). Positions in the aforementioned areas require persons who have completed a rigorous academic program and a demanding internship. In addition, they must be persons whose ethical decision making is highly developed. Only a program that screens out individuals who are not able to complete such a program can maintain the high standards necessary to carry out the profession's expectations and goals.

The College believes that instituting these criteria beginning in Fall 1999 is essential. In Fall 1999 the College begins its curriculum revisions for the reaccreditation process that takes place in 2000-2001. In order to ensure that the program can be reaccredited, admission requirements must be in place.

The proposal has been approved by the Senate's Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards and the University Senate Council.

Proposal: [to be codified into Section IV, University Senate Rules]=20

UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSION POLICY

Admission to the University of Kentucky is sufficient for admission to the College of Social Work as a premajor. Social work students receive academic advising from the College of Social Work faculty and must successfully complete the premajor course requirements before applying to the BASW degree program. The premajor course requirements are: SW124 and SW222 or SW322; an introductory psychology course; an introductory sociology course; and BIO102 and BIO103 or BIO110.=20

An application must be filed with the College of Social Work in order for a student to be considered for admission as a major. In general, admission as a major depends upon the qualifications and preparation of the applicant, as well as the availability of resources for maintaining quality instruction.

Admission Criteria to the Bachelor of Arts in Social Work degree program: In order to be admitted to the BASW degree program as a major, applicants must fulfill the following requirements:

1. Enrollment in the University of Kentucky (Students are considered for acceptance by the College only after acceptance by the University);=20
2. A grade of B or better in both SW124 and SW222 (or a grade of B or better in SW322);=20
3. Submission of an application form;=20
4. Minimum of a 2.5 cumulative grade-point average on all college work attempted as computed by the Registrar's Office;=20
5. Ability to articulate reasons for choosing social work as a career, as evidenced in an essay.=20
6. A passing grade in the introductory psychology course, sociology course, and in the required biology courses.

Applications for admission to the College of Social Work must be received by the Records Office of the College of Social Work no later than May 1 for summer sessions, August 1 for the fall semester, and December 1 for the

spring semester.

Individuals who do not meet the admissions criteria may submit additional materials to the College's Admissions Exceptions Committee. Admission may be granted if there is persuasive evidence of both the capability and motivation to undertake successfully the BASW degree program.

Implementation Date: Fall, 1999

Note: If approved, the proposed admissions standards will be codified by the Rules Committee.

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

Dean Kay Hoffman (Social Work) stated that the College faculty supported this and it was imperative if they are going to be accredited in 2002.

Kaveh Tagavi (Engineering) asked if everyone understood that "a" and "b" or "c" is two courses or one course.

Beth Rompf (Social Work) said that Social Work 322 equals SW 124 plus SW 222, so students take either 124 and 222 or 322 which is designed specifically for junior and senior transfer students. She asked how it should be clarified.

The answer from the floor was to put parenthesis around SW124 and SW222.

Louis Swift (Dean, Undergraduate Studies) asked for clarification about transfers. =20

Lee Meyer said that in Item 1 enrollment should be changed to acceptance. The concept is that students have to meet University of Kentucky acceptance criteria first before you apply to be a major in social work.

Professor Swift made a friendly amendment to change enrollment to acceptance. =20

Dave Durant (English) asked how a student could be admitted into a college if they were not admitted to the University?

Beth Rompf said that the proposal followed the outline of the other colleges in the Bulletin. She assumed they did that so that students are not applying to the colleges first before applying to the University.

Lee Meyer said that his interpretation is that acceptance is step one and enrollment is step two.

Don Witt (University Registrar) said that admission was a better word.

The friendly amendment was changed to admission and accepted.

Claire Pomeroy (Medicine) said that if they were accepting transfer students number two should be changed to a grade of B or better in both SW124 and SW222 "or equivalent." =20

The change was accepted as a friendly amendment.

The proposal passed in a unanimous voice vote.

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

ACTION ITEM 4 - Proposal to amend University Senate Rules, Section V -
5.1.8.5 ff Retroactive Withdrawal

Proposal: [add sections bolded and underlined; delete strikeouts]

Section V=20

5.1.8.5 Retroactive Withdrawal: Withdrawals initiated after the last day of classes for the semester are governed by this rule (US: 12/8/97)

A. Requirements

(1) Typically, a student may withdraw from a given semester only if the withdrawal is from all classes.

(2) Requests for retroactive withdrawals may not be granted after a student has graduated or beyond two calendar years one calendar year from the last day of class for the semester for which the withdrawal is requested.

(3) Retroactive withdrawals may be granted only when the student has demonstrated satisfactory evidence that the student has incurred:

(a) a serious injury or illness

(b) serious personal or family problems

(c) serious financial difficulties; or

(d) permanent disability verified by the Disability Resource Center and diagnosed after the semester for which the withdrawal is requested

B. Procedure

To the extent possible, the following procedures shall be uniform throughout the University:

(1) Requests for retroactive withdrawal shall be made of the Dean of the college in which the student was enrolled at the time the classes were taken, on the form and with the documentation required by the University Senate. that office. Requests for retroactive withdrawals shall be made through the University Senate - Retroactive Withdrawal Petition. Forms for requesting retroactive withdrawal shall, to the extent possible, be uniform throughout the University.

(2) The Dean shall recommend approval or disapproval of the request and shall forward the recommendation to the Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee.

(3) The Committee shall rule on the request, normally within 30 days of receipt of the recommendation from the Dean. The student shall have the right to appear in person before the Committee to present his or her request and shall have the right to be represented by an attorney or other designated individual.

(4) The Committee shall forward all approved requests to the Office of Registrar for implementation.

(5) The Committee shall forward a copy of its decision - whether the request was approved or not - to the Dean of the student's current college and to the Dean of the College in which the student was enrolled at the time of the retroactive withdrawal, if different from the current college. The Dean of the student's current college shall notify the student and instructor of the Committee's decision.

Background and Rationale:

The Committee on Retroactive Withdrawals made these suggestions for change and the Senate Council concurred.

The explanation for changing "one calendar year" to "two calendar years" is that the Committee feels that in some circumstances one year is simply not enough time. Students experiencing major catastrophic life events may need more than one year to put all the pieces back together again.

The rationale behind the second change is that the Committee would like the Rules to include reference to the standardized-university-wide form that is

now available.

As the Rules currently read, it appears there is no mechanism for the student to be informed of the TWA Committee's decision. This change will provide a mechanism.=20

Implementation Date: Upon passage

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

Scott Kelley (Committee Chair) said that as they processed these it had become apparent that in some cases it may not be realistic to expect the student to have requested this within a year. They were looking for a little more time. The second part was trying to get the rules to read like the process. They have created a university-wide form that was not available when the committee first began meeting and wanted to have that in the rules as well.

Louis Swift asked that if the opening phrase "to the extent possible" meant that a college could have other rules.

The Chair said that was to give some flexibility to the committee, not to create a loophole.

Kaveh Tagavi said that A-2 should be classes instead of class, in B-1 the long dash should be changed to a hyphen, in B-5 instructor should be instructors, and TWA should be changed to RWA. He made an amendment for B-2 to add "normally within 30 days." The amendment was seconded.

Tony English (Allied Health) asked if the intent of the thirty days was for the Dean to recommend for approval or disapproval or for the entire process. If it is both, the amendment should be at the end of the statement rather than in the middle.

Professor Tagavi said it was for both and should be at the end.

Jane Wells (Business and Economics) asked what the 30 days meant? Within 30 days of what? =20

Professor Tagavi said within 30 days of the receipt of the petition. Professor Wells said the statement needed to be a little more specific because the student may petition but may lag on getting the supporting documentation. Perhaps, it should say something to the effect of providing the supporting documentation. With Dr. Kelly's request, the student has to provide three items. So maybe it should say after providing the three= items.

Kaveh Tagavi changed his amendment to say "from 30 days from receipt of the petition and all supporting documentation."

Doug Michael asked if 30 days was realistic? =20

Scott Kelley said that most are done in thirty days, a few had lagged and this would have been useful for those.

Nate Brown (President, Student Government) asked what happened if the dean did not get it done in 30 days. =20

The Chair said that it said "normally" and he assumed that deans would in good faith abide by it.

The amendment passed in a unanimous voice vote.

Kaveh Tagavi asked if there was a course required for admission to upper division with a B or better. The student takes the course and two years later the student asked for a withdrawal and everything is dropped. What happens to the admission to upper division?

Scott Kelley said that out of the thirty or forty they had processed this situation might have happened twice. They generally stick by either all or nothing and students have actually lost courses where they have had an A.

The amended proposal passed in a unanimous voice vote.

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

ACTION ITEM 5 - Proposal to amend University Senate Rules, Section I - 1.3.0 Councils of the Senate

Proposal: Add the following wording to the functions of each of the Senate's Councils, including the Graduate Council (1.3.2.1), the Undergraduate Council (1,3,3,1), the Academic Council for the Medical Center (1.3.4.1) and the Academic Council for the Lexington Community College (to be codified)]

Off-campus Courses and Programs-The Council shall review distance learning activities for quality and effectiveness, in keeping with Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) substantive changes criteria.

Procedure and Rationale:

When substantive change reporting is indicated in a new or existing course or program, it will be communicated to the Senate Council by the appropriate Council. The information will include the type of substantive change planned, the name of the program(s) or course(s) involved and the proposed date when the change is to be implemented. The substantive change information will be a part of the Senate Council's circulation to the members of the University Senate. The Special Assistant for Academic Affairs will receive the University Senate communication from the University Senate Council stamped approved. The President will be notified of substantive changes that require a report to SACS. =20

The emergence of the Southern Regional Electronic Campus, the Kentucky Commonwealth Virtual University along with our present satellite, interactive video and other distance learning course and program offerings require our vigilance. We are obliged to use principles of good practice and to assure that all of our offerings are of excellent quality. Adding the function above to each Academic Council seems appropriate because they already have a role in reviewing and evaluating courses and programs and in approving them.

Implementation Date: Fall, 1999

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

Professor Meyer said this was a proposal to have the rules catch up with technology. Through emergence of Southern Regional Electronic Campus, the Commonwealth Virtual University, and those kinds of satellite interactive video distance learning courses there has been no procedure to insure that courses meet generally accepted standards of the University. This proposal is to add wording to the functions of the four Senate Councils that have jurisdiction over course work to assure that those courses meet criteria for quality and effectiveness. He recommended approval on behalf of the

Senate Council.

Ray Forgue (Family Studies) asked if the last part -- "substantive changes criteria" -- was a major course change if it is an existing course. So if you were going to offer a distance learning course that has been offered on campus does this have to be put through as a major course change?

The Chair said, as he understood it, it was only when there were substantive changes in the course itself, not just changes in the site.

Lee Meyer asked Cindy Todd for the criteria for substantive course changes. She stated that they had a brochure from the Southern Association.

Louis Swift said that the Undergraduate Council discussed this and it was their understanding that what the Southern Association is concerned about is that the quality of the distance learning courses match the quality of the classroom course. The understanding they have is that if you were going to teach a course through this method, the University has to tell the Southern Association that the course is equivalent to the classroom course.

What Dr. Fleming did was to get the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils together to establish some procedures whereby a department could present a course and say, in effect, this is the same course with the same quality and standards. The intent of the Undergraduate Council was to simply review these and, in effect, say there are no problems here. They could then present the information to SACS; this is part of their rules, which they have established, to maintain quality across the system.

Ray Forgue said he was worried about what the codification would be. If it would put such an onerous barrier to these things that it would be a difficult task to get them through in a timely manner. The schedule comes out in March for the fall term. Is that sufficient lead-time to be able to get them done?

Lee Meyer said that this brings courses taught through distance methods under the same criteria. Any new course has to go through this procedure. It just makes sure those courses go through the same procedure and is done through those four councils.

The proposal passed in a voice vote.

Chairperson Moore said that since this was the last meeting of the year he wanted to thank a few people. He wanted to particularly thank Cindy Todd for her work; she has done an outstanding job. Gifford Blyton, our volunteer parliamentarian, Michelle Sohner and Lana Dearing, the sergeants at arms, Don Witt, the Registrar and Susan Caldwell from the Registrar's Office. Those of you who are going off the Senate this year, I would like to particularly thank you for having served on the Senate. I would like to thank all the Senate Committee Chairs, particularly Scott Kelley, who had by far the toughest committee assignment, a new committee the Retroactive Withdraw Appeals Committee. Finally, thanks to the Senate Council for all the work it has done this year.

The Chair recognized Nate Brown, Student Government President.

Nate Brown said that he was proud to introduce Jimmy Glenn, the new Student Government President. Mr. Glenn was given a round of applause.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Don Witt
Secretary, University Senate

You are visitor Unable to open config file for reading since May 10, 1999

Return to [University Senate Page](#)

Return to [University Senate Minutes](#)

Return to [Registrar's Home Page](#)

This page was last updated on 10 May 1999.

If you have [questions or comments](#) about this web page, please use this [comment form](#)

URL: <http://www.uky.edu/USC/Minutes/sm041299.html>