

## MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, FEBRUARY 12, 1996

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, February 12, 1996 in Room 115 of the Nursing Health Sciences Building.

Professor Gretchen LaGodna, Chairperson of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent were: Debra Aaron\*, Gary Anglin, Patrick Arnold, Benny Ray Bailey, John Ballantine\*, Michael Bardo, Terry Birdwhistell, Douglas Boyd, Bill Brassine, Joseph Burch, Mary Burke, Lauretta Byars, Joan Callahan, Berry Campbell, Ben Carr, Edward Carter, Shea Chaney\*, Eric Christianson, Jordan Cohen\*, Scott Coovert, Raymond Cox, Carla Craycraft, Susan deCarvalho\*, Richard Edwards, David Elliott, Donald Falace, Robert Farquhar, Richard Furst, Kirby Hancock, Issam Harik\*, S. Zafar Hasan\*, Christine Havice, James Holsinger, Stuart Keller\*, Craig Koontz, C. Oran Little, Jeff Lowe, Daniel Mason\*, Jan McCulloch, David Mohney, Maurice Morrison, Wolfgang Natter, Anthony Newberry, Michael Nietzel\*, William O'Connor, Barbara Phillips, Rhoda-Gale Pollack\*, Tom Pratt, Shirley Raines, Karl Raitz, Amy Rasor, Daniel Reedy, Thomas Robinson, John Rogers\*, Scott Safford, David Shipley, Todd Shock, Sheldon Steiner, David Stockham, Michael Thomlin, Michael Uyhelji, Craig Wallace, Charles Wethington\*, Chad Willet, Carolyn Williams, Eugene Williams, Mary Witt, Elisabeth Zinser\*.

\* Absence Explained

Chairperson Gretchen LaGodna called the meeting to order.

The Chair made the following announcements:

The minutes from November 13, 1995 had been circulated. There were no corrections to the minutes and they were approved as circulated. The minutes of December 11, 1995 and February 12, 1996 will be circulated in the near future, with the approved University Calendar attached to the February minutes.

Input from colleges and student groups is still being received on the grading system. The Senate Council will consider all input as well as research based data at its February 19, 1996 meeting. After that they will be making a final recommendation that will be brought to the next Senate meeting.

The recommendations from the Ad Hoc Senate Retirement Committee are being pursued with the appropriate groups. President Wethington has assured that the proposed phased-in retirement plan for faculty is on the table for discussion in his cabinet group at the present time.

The date of the March Senate Meeting has been changed due to Spring break to Monday, March 18, 1996.

In response to a number of faculty inquires, this is to clarify regulations concerning promotion and tenure. On October 4, 1995, President Wethington issued a memo to the deans, which was interpreted by some to mean that unit-specific standards for promotion and tenure could no longer be utilized. This memo was brought to the attention of the Senate Council in January 1996, they were concerned and not entirely clear about the meaning of the memo and requested some clarification from the President. On February 8, 1996, the

President responded to the request with an explanatory memo which indicates that departments and units can certainly promulgate unit level expectations for performance that guide promotion and tenure recommendations. Nothing has substantially changed. The full memos are filed in the Senate Council in the administrative memo file, if anyone wants to see them.

The Senate Council voted on January 22, 1996 to approve with expressed concerns an AR change related to the Clinical Title Series appointments in the College of Medicine. This is AR II 1.0.1. After the vote, there was subsequent input and the Senate Council voted on January 29, 1996 to rescind its conditional approval and recommended that the issue be reopened and reviewed by the College of Medicine department chairs and faculty. The AR change had already been approved by the President, between the initial and second vote. A meeting was held with Chancellor Holsinger to share concerns, resulting in a commitment to reexamine the issue with possible additional procedures or amendments forthcoming.

Those of you in colleges in which there are elections for Senators, please note that to date there only 60 nominations to fill these Senate seats and that is really inadequate. If you can encourage nominations, please do so.

Chairperson LaGodna recognized Professor Peter Winograd from the College of Education to present a memorial resolution in honor of Dr. Kawanna Simpson.

Memorial Resolution  
Kawanna J. Simpson  
1947-1995

The unexpected death of College of Education faculty member Kawanna J. Simpson on September 29, 1995 was a difficult loss for all those who knew and loved her. But we remember her today as one among us who left a unique mark on education in Kentucky and in the hearts of so many for whom she was a mentor.

Dr. Simpson was associate professor of secondary education and former associate dean for undergraduate and graduate studies in the College of Education. She had a long and illustrious career with the University of Kentucky.

Dr. Simpson received her bachelor's and master's degrees from UK in 1972. In 1976, she earned her Ed.D. in vocational education from the university.

She began her work at UK as a graduate assistant in business education. From 1973 to 1976, she was an instructor in the Department of Vocational Education. After earning her doctorate, she became an assistant professor, and, in 1981, she received tenure and was promoted to associate professor. Dr. Simpson served as program faculty chair in business education from 1983 to 1986. For eight years, from 1986 through 1993, she was the associate dean for undergraduate and graduate studies, working with Dean Edgar L. Sagan and Dean J. John Harris III. Since 1993, she was a full-time faculty member in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction.

A much beloved teacher and graduate program advisor, Dr. Simpson consistently

received outstanding teaching evaluations from her students. She was a recipient of the College of Education's Exceptional Achievement Award for Teaching and Advising. In 1984, she was honored with Kentucky's Outstanding Business Teacher of the Year Award. Dr. Simpson served as guest lecturer on educational and cultural topics at a technology institute in Changchun, People's Republic of China, in 1985.

She was committed to developing student leaders through her work with Delta Pi Epsilon, a national honor society in business education, and she was an active leader in the University of Kentucky chapter of Phi Delta Kappa, serving at various times as president, vice president, and secretary/treasurer.

Dr. Simpson was a leader in education reform efforts in Kentucky. She was appointed by the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board to the Council on Experienced Teacher Standards and also served on several committees for the Council on Higher Education.

In addition to her extensive academic work, Dr. Simpson served in many other university and community roles. She was a member of the UK Faculty Senate and served on numerous department, college, and university committees. Her service to the community included participation in several key civic committees concerned with housing and homelessness, including the Lexington Housing Committee and the Mayor's Task Force for the Homeless.

A memorial fund has been established in Dr. Simpson's name at the College of Education. Please contact the Office of the Dean at the college for more information about this fund.

Dr. Simpson was deeply committed to her students and to the improvement of education in the state of Kentucky. Her resonant life exemplified the best in education. She is deeply missed.

Professor Winograd asked that the resolution be made a part of the minutes and a copy be sent to Dr. Simpson's family.

Chairperson LaGodna asked the Senate to stand for a moment of silence in honor of Dr. Simpson.

The Chair stated there was another resolution to bring before the Senate and everyone should have a copy of it. This resolution is sent forward by the Senate Council, who moves its endorsement by the full Senate. In the same spirit of last year's approval of the resolution supporting the development of a staff congress, this resolution recognizes the importance of the staff representation in the University community. The resolution reads as follows:

WHEREAS, the over 9,000 full-time staff members at the University of Kentucky University System and Community College System do not have an elected representative on the UK Board of Trustees.

WHEREAS, staff at Eastern Kentucky University, Kentucky State University, Morehead State University, Murray State University, Northern Kentucky University, University of Louisville, and Western Kentucky University all have elected representatives on each of their respective governing boards,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the University of Kentucky University Senate affirm its support of House Bill 83 which will add an elected staff representative to the University of Kentucky Board of Trustees.

Chairperson LaGodna stated the Senate Council recommends to the full Senate endorsement of the resolution. The Senate Council supports this in regard to their continued support of staff efforts to be represented and have some voice in the governance of the University. To borrow words from former Senate Council Chair Ray Cox, because it is the right thing to do.

Delwood Collins stated that there was a need to look at what the definition of a board should be. He felt the Board should be a lay board, and if there were too many people representing different factions of the University, it would no longer be a lay board.

The question was asked, how would the staff member be chosen?

Chairperson LaGodna introduced the two co-chairs of the staff association, Tom Kunselman and Shannon Price. Mr. Kunselman said that the way the legislation has been defined for the other regional universities, it includes the full-time non teaching staff. At UK that would include the staff at the community colleges, Lexington campus, medical center, hospital, and central administration. Professor LaGodna said the selection would not be an easy task but it would be doable. The details of how it would be implemented would have to be worked out.

The resolution passed in a show of hands.

Chairperson LaGodna then introduced Vice-President Bramwell to give an update on the status and future of research and graduate studies.

Dr. Bramwell made the following remarks:

#### Graduate Education and the Scientific Research Infrastructure

Graduate education plays a pivotal and complex role within the scientific research infrastructure. Within the numerous elements that comprise graduate education and contribute to this role several groupings stand out. These include faculty, students, administration, curricula offerings, available resources and research networks, and the influence of legislative and business sectors on higher education. These elements, and a host of others, are of critical importance in fabricating the web known as the research infrastructure. To simplify this presentation, I will restrict my comments to what I call the three R's: recruitment, retention and risk; particularly as they apply to faculty, students, administration and other elements of the human resource development component of the complicated equation known as the scientific research infrastructure. The next few slides show the research infrastructure for the University of Kentucky, its effectiveness in garnering appropriate support for academic research, its relation to benchmark universities, and some funding concerns for the future.

#### Faculty

There are numerous concerns that face a department chair, dean and college administrator in the recruitment of new faculty. Appropriate planning and specificity of purpose are two key elements which lead to successful, long term faculty recruitment. A clear vision of the research environment and its interaction with the graduate education effort should be articulated to create the optimal atmosphere and conditions for a successful faculty hire.

This involves working not only at the departmental level to determine the academic and scholarly needs of the department, but also working within the context of a college strategic plan.

Budgetary constraints in putting together an attractive employment package require some creative management techniques. The current trend seems to be toward shared use facilities and shared start-up costs within a multidisciplinary framework. The days of single user, high-end instruments appear to be dwindling. For example, the purchase of capital intensive equipment and its requisite infrastructure may be necessary to support the research of a prospective faculty member and may be a critical element of a start-up package. However, that equipment purchase with its probable high-end maintenance costs should be put into the context of a college strategic plan as well as departmental needs. Thus, a shared use facility such as a 500mHz nuclear magnetic resonance spectrometer may meet the needs of new hires in a school of pharmacy, a department of biochemistry and medical school department of immunology as well as address a university need to develop expertise in structural biology.

The working environment which includes, but is by no means limited to, the following: the proximity of shared use facilities to departmental offices and laboratories; the possibilities for travel and for professional development; the extent to which an office of sponsored program activity assists in drafting, formulating and promoting research proposals; the mechanism or protocol for including a new hire into departmental activities; the availability of an academically and technically strong graduate student body; a strong and well-defined curriculum; a flexible protocol for incorporating the latest research results into graduate education; can be a powerful inducement for the recruitment of faculty.

Faculty are often attracted to those schools they perceive as being active and well led: in short, schools with vision. Thus, departmental leadership, its interaction with the campus administration, and its ability to attract and retain high caliber faculty are also important in the recruitment of faculty. Departmental leadership should consider a team concept in attracting new faculty. Indeed, the possibility of joint or multidisciplinary appointments, should be actively discussed among various departments and centers as well as with the appropriate college administrators prior to faculty recruitment.

The living environment is also a critical point which is often dismissed or given short shrift when hiring new faculty. Yet my experience leads me to believe that the living environment is a key factor to the retention of faculty. Spousal job opportunities, affordable housing, participatory involvement in cultural and civic events, all play roles which must be considered in bringing a new hire to campus.

#### Students

The Graduate School has a number of outstanding accomplishments as well as some concerns which are outlined in the next series of slides.

If faculty are the heart and brains of the research enterprise, then students are its lifeblood. They are a resource that is constantly renewed, invigorated and occasionally spilt. Many of the same protocols used to recruit faculty are applicable here. For example, student recruitment is greatly enhanced when students interact through seminars, research opportunity awards, or by scholarly reputation, with graduate faculty.

The career path in which I started many years ago was a simple, not easy, but simple two-dimensional path which began with K-12 education, continued

through college, graduate school, industrial experience and the university. By substituting post-doctoral experience for industrial experience, I am willing to venture that most colleagues of my generation in the sciences followed a similar career path.

The world that today's students face is three-dimensional. It is a world that promotes life-long continuing education and offers an enormous number and variety of options. For example, students may opt to go from K-12 to industry to a two-year college to industry to a four year college to a graduate school within a university. This is not an uncommon path. Indeed, the average age of students entering graduate school has increased. These students have different career aspirations than those from my generation. These aspirations are, in part, molded by parental responsibilities, multidisciplinary career paths, and a changing market place in which to seek job and business opportunities.

On average, doctoral education in the sciences takes over five years, considerably longer now than in the past. Yet interestingly, the majority of technology-based products which we will purchase in the next five years have not even been conceptualized! This is, indeed, an interesting paradox, and speaks loudly for a paradigm shift in which problem solving and creativity assume an equal or greater stature than the ability to execute algorithmically driven technology. In short, our students need to further develop creative and multidisciplinary approaches to research.

Once again, providing a good living environment is a critical point which is often dismissed or given short shrift when recruiting new students. Yet my experience leads me to believe that the living environment is a key factor to the success of students. Spousal job opportunities, affordable housing, participatory involvement in cultural and civic events, all play roles which must be considered in bringing a new student to campus and thereby investing in the academic success of the graduate school.

#### Conclusion

The few minutes that I've devoted to this issue have not even scratched the surface. The purpose for presenting these thoughts is to provoke comment and reaction. Thank you for the opportunity to outline my views and experiences to you. Having said that, I once again would like to thank you so very much for your attention, and now invoke for you the three B's. We talked about the three R's: recruitment, retention and risk. The three B's are: be concise, be to the point, and be gone. So, thank you very much.

Following Dr. Bramwell's remarks he took questions from the audience. Dr. Bramwell was given a round of applause.

AGENDA ITEM 1: Proposal to amend University Senate Rules, Section I, 1.4.5.2 - Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure. If approved, the proposal will be forwarded to the President for appropriate administrative action.

#### Background:

The 1994-1995 Annual Report of the University Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure included a recommendation that the Senate Rules related to the Committee's function be reviewed and revised if warranted. In response, the Senate Council appointed an ad hoc group to review the designated portion of the Rules. The ad hoc group, consisting of Jim Hougland, Brad Canon and Gretchen LaGodna, did so and they forwarded the following recommended changes:

University Senate Rules, Section I [add bold sections; delete bracketed section]

#### 1.4.5.2 Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure

The Committee is charged with giving preliminary consideration to the following matters as referred to it by the President, the University Senate, or individual staff members of the University: cases of appointment termination for cause of a faculty member who has tenure; cases of dismissal of a faculty member during a limited appointment; cases of non-renewal of a probationary appointment with less advance notice than specified by the Governing Regulations; cases of allegation by a faculty member on a non-tenure appointment that a decision for non-reappointment violates his or her academic freedom as a faculty member; cases of allegation by a faculty member on a non-tenured appointment that a decision for non-reappointment violates either Part X A or Part XIIA in the Governing Regulations banning certain discriminatory practices in academic employment; cases of allegation by the University administrator that a decision to terminate his or her appointment to his or her administrative post, or not to reappoint him or her, violates his or her academic freedom; cases of termination of a tenure appointment or the dismissal of a person prior to expiration of a non-tenure appointment, because of a financial emergency; and all similar cases. The function of the committee in all such cases is to attempt to effect an adjustment when appropriate [and, in cases of failure, to recommend to the President action to be taken]. Recommendations for action shall be made to the President or to other administrators deemed appropriate by the Committee with a copy to the President.

The Committee may, upon request, advise individual staff members on the interpretation of University privilege and tenure regulations, with copies of the interpretation being sent to the University Senate Council, the chair of the Department, the Dean, and the President. The Committee also may consider allegations of faculty members who believe that their privilege as scholars has been abridged or abused. Faculty members should address statements to the chair of the Committee setting forth in detail the reasons why they believe their privilege has been abused. The Committee will review the statement and determine whether conditions warrant further investigation. Upon investigation the Committee will make recommendations to the faculty member and file a copy with the President. Recommendations may be made also to the President with a copy sent to the faculty members.

The Committee is also charged with making a continuing study of privilege and tenure regulations, making recommendations to the University Senate.

The Chair recognized Professor Jan Schach, Chair-elect of the Senate Council for introduction of the first agenda item. Professor Schach reviewed the background of the item and moved approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

Professor Jesse Weil (Physics) proposed an additional amendment. He said that for some time a number of faculty have felt an addition was needed to the proposed section on the Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure. The purpose of it is to address some very occasional cases where decisions are made that appear to be grossly inconsistent with the dossier or other records available. If you read the grounds for bringing a case to Privilege and Tenure, the grounds primarily are violation of academic freedom or failure to follow procedures that are specified in the Governing or Administrative Regulations. Making a bad or unsubstantiated decision does not fall into either of those categories. He moved the amendment which would add language to the reason for bringing a case to the Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure which would at least provide a route of appeal in such cases.

Paragraph one, line 11, add "cases of allocation by a faculty member on a

nontenure appointment that a decision for nonreappointment or terminal appointment is not supported by substantial evidence, that is, is not only marginally incorrect but is a decision that could not have been made by reasonable persons acting reasonably."

Paragraph two, line five add after the phrase abridged or abused, "abridgment or abuse of privilege shall include the rendering of any administrative decision or evaluation affecting a faculty member which is not supported by substantial evidence."

There was no second to the motion, the amendment to the main recommendation did not pass.

The main motion passed in a show of hands.

AGENDA ITEM 2: Proposal to amend University Senate Rules, Sections IV-4.2.2.10 and V-5.3.2.3 - College of Engineering Admissions & Suspension Policies. If approved, the proposals will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

Background:

Re: Probation, Suspension and Reinstatement: The major purpose of the change is to simplify College of Engineering probation, suspension and reinstatement rules by basing them on the UK grade point average. Currently, these rules are based upon the students' "engineering standing" grade point average which includes only course work taken while enrolled in the College of Engineering. The UK grade point average is readily available to the student while the engineering standing grade point average is more difficult to determine.

Re: Admissions: Under the present system admission to "engineering standing" is gained either "automatically" (for students with a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.5, plus a number of other conditions), or (in the case of students with lower GPAs), through "departmental review" for which no criteria are published. Under the proposed policy, criteria for admission to engineering standing will be defined clearly and will be published in the University Bulletin. Therefore students will know precisely what is required for admission to a given department. Having admissions requirements which differ from department to department will enable departments with heavy student demand to restrict admission based on GPAs, to keep enrollment commensurate with teaching and space limitations. It will also enable departments to impose prerequisite course requirements appropriate to their specific programs.

Proposals:

Section V - Probation, Suspension and Reinstatement: [delete current section; replace with proposed section beginning 5.3.2.3 College of Engineering on page 2]

DELETE: 5.3.2.3 College of Engineering (US: 4/25/84) In addition to the University rules on probation and academic suspension, the following rules apply in the College of Engineering. Engineering standing is defined as the overall grade-point average for all course work taken while enrolled in the College of Engineering. Excluded are correspondence courses and transient work. (The term semester standing refers to the GPA for a single semester.)

A A student who fails to achieve an engineering standing of 2.0 at the end of any semester shall be placed on probation.

B A student, regardless of engineering standing, whose semester standing is



less than a 2.0 for two consecutive semesters shall be placed on probation.

C A student who, at the end of his/her first probationary semester, achieves a semester standing of 2.0 but fails to bring his/her engineering standing up to 2.0 will be continued on probation.

D A student who, at the end of a probationary semester, fails to have achieved a semester standing of 2.0 shall be suspended from the College of Engineering.

E A student who, at the end of his/her second consecutive probationary semester, fails to have achieved an engineering standing of 2.0 shall be suspended from the College of Engineering.

F A student who fails to achieve an engineering standing of 1.5 at the end of any semester shall have his/her record reviewed and may be suspended from the College without a preliminary probationary semester.

G A student who has been suspended a single time for academic deficiency may be reinstated into the College of Engineering after an absence of one year. A student will be reinstated as a first semester probationary student and subject to final suspension according to these rules.

H The dean may use his/her discretion in applying these rules where a particular case justifies less severe action.

REPLACE WITH 5.3.2.3 College of Engineering: In addition to the University rules on academic probation, suspension and reinstatement, the following rules apply to the College of Engineering.

1. No Student with a cumulative UK GPA of less than 2.0 will be enrolled in the College of Engineering. Any student who fails to maintain a cumulative UK GPA of 2.0 will be dropped from the College of Engineering and will not be readmitted until this GPA is 2.0 or greater. No probationary notice will be given.

2. Any student enrolled in the College of Engineering who achieves a GPA of 2.0 or less in any semester will be placed on academic probation.

3. Any student on academic probation who fails to achieve a 2.0 semester GPA will be dropped from the College of Engineering and will not be readmitted until he or she has obtained a semester GPA of 2.0 or greater for one semester and the student's cumulative UK GPA is 2.0 or greater.

4. Students who are dropped twice from the College of Engineering will not be readmitted.

Section IV - Admissions [Delete current section; replace with proposed section beginning 4.2.2.10 College of Engineering on page 5]

DELETE: 4.2.2.10 College of Engineering (except Computer Science) (US: 4/25/84) Admission to the University of Kentucky does not guarantee admission to one of the degree programs in the College of Engineering. In addition to the requirements for admission to the University, all applicants seeking admission to one of the engineering degree programs will be considered on the basis of the criteria outlined below.

Application must be made for admission to a specific degree program.

However, subsequent transfer between programs will be permitted and may be accomplished by applying and satisfying the appropriate specified criteria.

In all admission categories, an applicant whose native language is other than English and who is not a citizen of the United States is required to take the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) and to have a minimum score of 550 in order to be considered for admission. (An equivalent score from another English proficiency test similar to TOEFL may be allowed upon request.) [RC/US transmittal: 12/9/87]

In the admission considerations, when personal, academic, professional, or intellectual circumstances tend to discount low academic or ACT scores, admission may be granted if there is other persuasive evidence of both the capability and motivation to undertake successfully an engineering program.

#### LOWER DIVISION ADMISSION

A High School applicants with no transfer work must meet all the following minimum admission criteria:

1. A high school grade point average 2.5.
2. An ACT composite score at or above the 60th percentile on national (college bound) norms. (Approximate raw score of 20.)
3. An ACT mathematics score at or above the 70th percentile on national (college bound) norms. (Approximate raw score of 22.)

#### B Transfer Applicants

Transfer applicants who have completed at least 10 semester hours of mathematics, chemistry, and/or physics applicable to an applicant's degree program must meet the following minimum criteria:

1. Cumulative GPA 2.5.
2. GPA 2.5 in the group of courses made up of the mathematics, chemistry, physics and English applicable to the degree program.

Note: All grades on repeated courses to be included in calculating standings; no repeat options.

C Transfer applicants with fewer hours than specified above must meet the requirements in A. plus meet the GPA requirements in B. for the transfer work that has been attempted.

#### PRE-ENGINEERING (10/8/90)

Students who qualify for admission into the University are eligible to enroll in any of the pre-engineering programs offered by the College of Engineering.

#### UPPER DIVISION ADMISSION (US: 3/10/86; 10/8/90)

There are two procedures available to move from pre-engineering to engineering in one of the degree programs of the College. These two procedures are described in detail below. Admission to engineering in a degree program is necessary in order to be granted a baccalaureate degree in engineering. Students must complete at least 30 hours of the last 36 hours of their programs in residence at the University. At least 24 credit hours must be department courses at or above the 300 level.

#### A Automatic Admission (US: 10/8/90)

Students enrolled in pre-engineering in a degree program and those applying to enter a program may progress to engineering in that program if they meet the following criteria: (1) submission of application for engineering standing in a department; (2) program with a minimum of 50 semester hours acceptable toward the degree program with a minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.5; (3) completion of the program

requirements with a minimum grade point average of 3.0 in the following courses--freshman English (writing courses), freshman chemistry course sequence, physics course sequence, calculus course sequence; (4) completion of additional specific program admission requirements listed below.

B Admission Based upon Departmental Review: (US: 10/8/90)

This procedure is available for those individuals who meet the requirements in (A) above with the exception of the grade point averages. These individuals are encouraged to apply for a review of their academic record by the department of their choice. This review will give the student the opportunity to have his or her record evaluated in order to determine if there are special circumstances which should be considered in support of the admission decision. The specific criteria to be used during the departmental review can be obtained from each departmental office. In general terms, the criteria will consist of tangible factors such as overall grade point averages, grades in specific courses, and resources available in the department, and intangible factors such as personal motivation, work experience, and career plans. No department will consider an individual for admission unless the two grade points mentioned in (A) above are both greater than or equal to 2.25.

C. ADDITIONAL SPECIFIC PROGRAM ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

1. CIVIL ENGINEERING

Include Statics (EM 221) in addition to other already listed required program courses, and earn a grade of C or better in any civil engineering (or equivalent) course used to satisfy a degree requirement.

2. ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING

Complete EE 211, EE 221, and EE 222 with a grade of C or better in each course.

3. CHEMICAL ENGINEERING.

Complete CME 205 and CME 210 (US:12/04/89)

All students must apply for admission to engineering in a specific department. Those students who do not qualify for engineering in the department of their choice may be eligible for consideration for engineering in another department. (US: 10/8/90)

Pre-engineering students who meet all of the other requirements for engineering but who do not have a sufficient grade-point average to qualify for engineering in their department must move to another department in which they qualify for engineering or leave the College of Engineering within two semesters. (US: 10/8/90)

REPLACE WITH 4.2.2.10 College of Engineering Admission to engineering 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.

Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering

Completion of AEN 202, BIO 150, BIO 152, CHE 105, CHE 107, CS 221, ENG 101, ENG 102 (or ENG 105), EM 221, MA 113, MA 114, MA 213, MA 214, PHY 231, PHY 232, PHY 241, and PHY 242 with a minimum grade point average of 2.25 (computed using grades from the last attempt at each course) in these courses and a overall cumulative grade point average of 2.25. University repeat options may be applied as appropriate.

Chemical Engineering

Completion of CHE 105, CHE 107, CHE 115, MA 113, MA 114, MA 213, MA 214, PHY 231, PHY 232, PHY 241, ENG 101, and ENG 102 or ENG 105) with a cumulative grade point average of 2.70 in these courses. Completion of CS 221 with a passing grade and completion of CME 200 with a grade of C or better.

University repeat options may be applied as appropriate.

#### Civil Engineering

Completion of a minimum of 50 semester hours acceptable towards the degree with a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.5. Completion of ENG 101, ENG 102 (or ENG 105), CHE 105, CHE 107, PHY 232, PHY 241, PHY 242, MA 113, MA 114, MA 213, and MA 214 with a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.50 in these courses. A grade of C or better must also be earned in all civil engineering courses which have been attempted if these courses are to be credited towards meeting degree requirements. University repeat options may be utilized as appropriate. Students who do not meet these GPA requirements may request consideration based upon departmental review if both of these GPAs are 2.25 or better.

#### Computer Science

Completion of a minimum of 50 semester hours acceptable towards the degree including the University Writing requirement. Completion of MA 113, MA 114, MA 213, CS 121, CS 122, CS 245, CS 250 and CS 270 with a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.5 in these courses. University repeat options may be utilized as appropriate.

#### Electrical Engineering

Completion of EE 211, EE 221, EE 222, and EE 280 with a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.4 in these courses. University repeat options may be utilized as appropriate. In addition, the Electrical Engineering Department will not permit a third admission into any of these courses.

#### Mechanical Engineering

Completion of at least 50 semester hours applicable to the degree program with a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.5. Completion of ENG 101, ENG 102, (or ENG 105), MA 113, MA 114, MA 214, CHE 105, CHE 107, PHY 231, PHY 241, PHY 232, and PHY 242 with a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.7 in these courses. A student may repeat four of these courses in order to improve this grade point average, except that he/she may not repeat a course in which he/she already has a grade of "A". All attempts (up to a maximum of sixteen) in this group of twelve courses will be included in the calculation of this grade point average. No grade will be dropped. Attempts in excess of the first sixteen will not be included in this calculation.

#### 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 cumulative minimum GPA of 2.25 in these courses and completion of CS 221 with a passing grade. University repeat options may be utilized as necessary.

#### Mining Engineering

Completion of a minimum of 50 semester hours acceptable towards the degree in mining engineering with a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.5. Completion of ENG 101, ENG 102, (or ENG 105), MA 113, MA 114, MA 213, MA 214, CHE 105, CHE 107, PHY 231, PHY 232, PHY 241, and PHY 242 with a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.50 in these courses. University repeat options may be utilized as appropriate. Students who do not meet these GPA requirements may request consideration based upon departmental review if both of these GPAs are 2.25 or greater.

Implementation: Fall, 1996

Chairperson LaGodna recognized Professor Jan Schach for introduction of the item. Professor Schach review the background of the proposal and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

Professor Fred Trutt (Engineering) had additional, mainly editorial recommendations, which were to clarify the document so there would be a minimum of misunderstanding by the students. The additions and changes are as follows in italics, the deletions have been struckthrough:

1. REPLACE WITH 5.3.2.3 College of Engineering: In addition to the University rules on academic probation, suspension and reinstatement, the following rules apply to the College of Engineering. [Note: The UK GPA is the grade point average for all work taken at the University of Kentucky. It is the grade point average that appears on the student's grade reports and transcripts.]

REPLACE WITH 4.2.2.10 College of Engineering 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 of elsewhere.]

#### Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering

Completion of AEN 202, BIO 150, BIO 152, CHE 105, CHE 107, CS 221, ENG 101, ENG 102 (or ENG 105), EM 221, MA 113, MA 114, MA 213, MA 214, PHY 231, PHY 232, PHY 241, and PHY 242 with a minimum grade point average of 2.25 (computed using grades from the last attempt at each course) in these courses and a [minimum] overall cumulative grade point average of 2.25. University repeat options may be applied as appropriate.

#### Chemical Engineering

Completion of CHE 105, CHE 107, CHE 115, MA 113, MA 114, MA 213, MA 214, PHY 231, PHY 232, PHY 241, ENG 101, and ENG 102 or ENG 105) with a [minimum] cumulative grade point average of 2.70 in these courses. Completion of CS 221 with a passing grade and completion of CME 200 with a grade of C or better. University repeat options may be applied as appropriate.

#### Civil Engineering

Completion of [at least] a minimum 50 semester hours acceptable towards the degree with a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.5. Completion of ENG 101, ENG 102 (or ENG 105), CHE 105, CHE 107, [PHY 231,] PHY 232, PHY 241, PHY 242, MA 113, MA 114, MA 213, and MA 214 with a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.50 in these courses. A grade of C or better must also be earned in all civil engineering courses which have been attempted if these courses are to be credited towards meeting degree requirements. University

repeat options may be utilized as appropriate. Students who do not meet these GPA requirements may request consideration based upon departmental review if both of these GPAs are 2.25 or better.

#### Computer Science

Completion of [at least] a minimum of 50 semester hours acceptable towards the degree including the University Writing requirement. Completion of MA 113, MA 114, MA 213, CS 121, CS 122, CS 245, CS 250 and CS 270 with a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.5 in these courses. University repeat options may be utilized as appropriate.

#### Mechanical Engineering

Completion of at least 50 semester hours applicable to the degree program with a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.5. Completion of ENG 101, ENG 102, (or ENG 105), MA 113, MA 114, [MA 213,] MA 214, CHE 105, CHE 107, PHY 231, PHY 241, PHY 232, and PHY 242 with a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.7 in these courses. A student may repeat four of these courses in order to improve this grade point average, except that he/she may not repeat a course in which he/she already has a grade of "A". All attempts (up to a maximum of sixteen) in this group of twelve courses will be included in the calculation of this grade point average. No grade will be dropped. Attempts in excess of the first sixteen will not be included in this calculation.

#### 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 minimum GPA of 2.25 in these courses and completion of CS 221 with a passing grade. University repeat options may be utilized as necessary.

#### Mining Engineering

Completion of [at least] a minimum of 50 semester hours acceptable towards the degree in mining engineering with a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.5. Completion of ENG 101, ENG 102, (or ENG 105), MA 113, MA 114, MA 213, MA 214, CHE 105, CHE 107, PHY 231, PHY 232, PHY 241, and PHY 242 with a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.50 in these courses. University repeat options may be utilized as appropriate. Students who do not meet these GPA requirements may request consideration based upon departmental review if both of these GPAs are 2.25 or greater.

The question was asked to clarify "work of other universities", since UK does not transfer grades, credit is accepted but not the grade. Professor Trutt stated they have many transfer students who are ready to apply for engineering standing when they arrive, they have had all the courses the college uses to make decisions on admission and engineering standing and the college needs to use the grade point standing the student has from a previous college or university. They then use all the college work the student has taken.

Betty Huff (University Registrar) asked if in Item 3 on page 2 if the assumption

was the semester GPA was UK and if it was could it be added? Professor Trutt stated yes it was. Item three will now read:

3. Any student on academic probation who fails to achieve a 2.0 semester GPA will be dropped from the College of Engineering and will not be readmitted until he or she has obtained a [UK] semester GPA of 2.0 or greater for one semester and the student's cumulative UK GPA is 2.0 or greater.

The question was called. The motion passed in an unanimous voice vote.

AGENDA ITEM 3: Proposal to amend University Senate Rules, Section IV,4.3.3 - Repeated Registration in a Course.

Proposal: [Add sentence that is bold]

#### 4.3.3 Repeated Registration in a Course

The Chair of a department may refuse to allow a student to register in a course a third time, including correspondence. A withdrawal from the course shall not be counted as a registration for these purposes.

#### Background and Rationale:

The proposal was initiated by the Academic Ombud. It was sent to the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee for their review. It was revised in Committee and sent back to the Senate Council where it was further amended.

The recommendation is based on the general principles that withdrawal from a course prior to the official withdrawal deadline does not and should not penalize the withdrawing students. Withdrawals after the official deadline are permitted only for non-academic reasons and, therefore, should not penalize the student. Refusal by a Chair to allow a student who has previously withdrawn from a course to register in the course for a third time is inconsistent with these general principles.

Implementation Date: Summer, 1996

Note: If approved, the proposal will be codified by the Rules Committee

Chairperson LaGodna recognized Professor Jan Schach for introduction of the action item. Professor Schach review the background of the proposal and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council. Professor Schach recognized Professor Horst Schach for comments.

Professor Horst Schach stated there is a one sentence regulation that says the chair of the department may refuse to allow a student to register in a course for a third time, including correspondence. In checking on the history of this, the rationale behind this is there is a time when a chairman should have the power to intervene when a student has tried over and over again and it looks as though they may never pass the course. In the spirit in which that rule was passed, some academic units were using the rule to do other things such as for example in a department where there are multiple sections with multiple instructors and there was a not popular instructor, the chair would intervene and in the schedule book

all the instructors were listed as staff, the tradition has been when students would sign-up for the course and then all bail out when they saw who had for an instructor. This was a way for the chair to make them stay in the class. The other problem is a little more severe, when a student was being told to go to another university and take a certain course because they had signed up for a course twice in this particular academic unit, when you sign-up for a course that was an attempt, you get two attempts and that is it, no questions asked, no leniency. It was felt that this additional would make this a slightly more civil rule, to say nothing of being in line with the normal policy which is if a student goes so far in a course and finds they are not surviving academically they have a right to drop. The would supersede this and bring it back into a more clear posture.

Professor Tom Blues (English) offered the following amendment:

#### 4.3.3 Repeated Registration in a Course

The Chair of a department may refuse to allow a student to register in a course a third time, including correspondence. A withdrawal from the course shall not be counted as a registration for these purposes if the student can demonstrate that the withdrawal was for urgent nonacademic reasons.

Professor Blues said the phrase urgent nonacademic reasons was consistent with Senate Rule 5.1.8.3 which says a student can withdraw after nine weeks for urgent nonacademic reasons if the dean of the college approves. He felt this amendment would make the proposal less extreme.

There was a second to the amendment.

Professor Ted Tauchert (Engineering) stated the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee considered the amendment last year and recommended it to the Senate Council.

The clarification was made that the intent of the amendment was for any student who withdraws from the class with a W, whether it be when the students does it by VIP or if the student has to go to the Dean of the College and withdraw for some other reason. As long as a W appears on the transcript, it that withdraw was for urgent nonacademic reasons, it would not be counted as an attempt in the course. If the withdraw was for academic reasons, then it would be counted.

Professor Dan Fulks (Business and Economics) said there were some valid points being raised, but was not sure the right issue was being debated. He felt the wisdom of the University's withdrawal policy, that has been in place for many years was being debated. This rule proposes that the student not be penalized for withdrawing any more so than the University has chosen to penalize a student for withdrawing. A student should not be penalized for withdrawing for any reason and if that is the problem then the Senate should revisit the University's withdrawal and drop policy. The withdrawal policy is in place and the student is either penalized or not.



There was a request for a quorum count. There was not a quorum present and the meeting was adjourned at 4:40 pm.

Betty J. Huff  
Secretary, University Senate