

## MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, FEBRUARY 13, 1995

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday February 13, 1995 in Room 115 of the Nursing Health Sciences Building.

Professor Raymond Cox, Chairperson of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent were: Kevin Adams, Dan Altman, Drew Alvarez, Gary Anglin, James Applegate\*, Michael Bardo\*, Paige Bendel, Mark Berger, David Berry, Thomas Blues\*, Maria Boosalis\*, Jana Bowling, Dean Brothers, Allan Butterfield\*, Ben Carr, Edward Carter, Eric Christianson\*, Jordan Cohen, Delwood Collins, Jean Cooper, Virginia Davis-Nordin, Susan deCarvalho\*, Robert Farquhar\*, Michael Freeman\*, Daniel Fulks, Richard Furst, Lorraine Garkovich, Anne Haas, Kirby Hancock, Issam Harik, J. John Harris, Monica Harris, S. Zafar Hasan\*, Christine Havice, Robert Hemenway, James Houghland, Robert Ireland, Jeff Jones, Richard Kermode\*, Craig Koontz, Thomas Lester, Jonathan Liar, Thomas Lillich\*, C. Oran Little, Brent Logan, Martin McMahan, M. Pinar Menguc, Karen Mingst, Donald Mullineaux, David Nash\*, Michael Neitzel, Scott Noble, Jack Olson\*, Ronald Pen\*, Barbara Phillips, Rhoda-Gale Pollack, Deborah Powell, Daniel Reedy, Thomas Robinson, Edgar Sagan, David Shipley, William Stober\*, David Stockham, Phillip Tibbs, Chris Vance, Henry Vasconez, Charles Wethington\*, Carolyn Williams, Eugene Williams, H. David Wilson\*.

Chairman Cox stated the minutes from the October 10, 1994 meeting need to be approved. There were no corrections to the minutes and they were approved as circulated.

The Chair made the following announcements:

Lionel Williamson from Agriculture Economics has agreed to chair the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Minorities.

The normal March meeting will be during Spring break, so the meeting has been tentatively moved to March 20, 1995. If anyone has any concerns about that, please let the Senate Council Office know.

There are three new members to the Senate Council, they are Jan Schach from Horticulture and Landscape Architecture, Karen Mingst from Political Science, and Jacqueline Noonan from the College of Medicine. The new members were given a round of applause.

The Rules Committee was supposed to report in February concerning replacing the quality point deficient with GPA; they will be reporting in March.

There was an error on the Engineering ballot for University Senate; a new ballot will be out tomorrow.

\* Absence Explained

Chairman Cox recognized Professor Don Sands from the Department of Chemistry to present a Memorial Resolution.

## Memorial Resolution

Haibin Deng

February 13, 1995

Dr. Haibin Deng, Assistant Professor of Chemistry, died of a heart attack on December 29, 1994. He was thirty-one years old. He left his wife, Jian Tan, and three-year-old son, Aaron Deng. Dr. Deng was a native of China, and a graduate of Fudan University. He earned his Ph.D. at Ohio State University in 1991, and he held postdoctoral appointments at Cornell University from 1991 to 1994.

We became aware of Dr. Deng in the fall of 1993, when we were searching for exceptional talent to fill a faculty vacancy in inorganic chemistry. He joined our faculty in August, 1994.

Haibin's one semester with us was a busy one. He taught a large section of CHE 105, where the students observed that Dr. Deng was a very smart man who really knew the material, and he was a very nice man who really cared about his students. Haibin took his teaching duties seriously, and he also worked industriously to establish his research program. At the time of his death, experiments and reactions were underway in his laboratory, grant proposals were under consideration, and plans were in place for an illustrious career.

Our perceptions agree with those of the students. Haibin Deng was an excellent scientist. And he was a nice person, with a fine sense of humor and a collegial disposition. He was at the University of Kentucky only one semester, but we are glad and proud that at least for that period Haibin was our colleague and our friend. It is always painful to lose a colleague, and a friend. In this case, our sorrow is made more intense by awareness of the promise unfilled and the potential unrealized.

Professor Sands asked that this resolution be included in the minutes of the meeting and that a copy be sent to Professor Deng's family.

The Chair asked that the Senate stand for a moment of silence in recognition of Professor Deng.

Chairman Cox then recognized Professor David Mohney from the College of Architecture to present a memorial resolution.

## Memorial Resolution

David Spaeth

February 13, 1995

Professor David Spaeth passed away on Friday, January 6, 1995, at his home on North Limestone Street in Lexington. His sons, Anthony and Sloan, were with him. He is also survived by a sister, Mary Campbell, of Lincoln, Nebraska. A memorial service was held on Sunday, January 8, at the home of Maury Reeves, on West Third Street in Lexington.

David Spaeth was born in the village of Zanesville, Ohio, in 1941, and spent his early years in the midwest, traveling each summer to northern Wisconsin to visit his maternal grandparents. Those annual travels, first by train and later by car, introduced him to the city of Chicago, and he would write, much later in his life, of his sense of wonder when

confronted with that large and growing city. Zanesville had served as a jumping off point for western migration early in the nineteenth century, but by the time David was a child there, it had long been superseded by cities and towns further west. David would remember Zanesville as "...an environment filled with remnants of possibilities past, a kind of unrealized utopia, failed but interesting for the lessons it taught..."

Chicago, on the other hand, was a city filled with possibilities of the present for David Spaeth. Even as a child, he was fascinated by these brief visits as he passed through the city. "There was so much to see," he wrote much later in his life, "tall apartment and office buildings, the lake, parks, yacht harbors, and more..." Two buildings in particular caught his attention one summer, when he was nine, north of the Loop and near Lake Michigan. They were so unlike anything he had seen before that he assumed they had to have been designed by Frank Lloyd Wright, the only architect's name he knew at that point in his childhood. In fact they were the apartment houses at 860 and 880 Lakeshore Drive, designed by German }migr} architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe. If we look for a calling in the life of David Spaeth, surely there was no clearer foreshadowing than this moment as a child he recognized the uniqueness and quality of something he saw, and then as an adult spent his life first studying and coming to understand that quality, and then building upon it.

In 1959 David enrolled at the architecture school where Mies van der Rohe served as Dean, the Illinois Institute of Technology, and over the next seven years earned both a Bachelor of Science and a Master of Science of Architecture. He studied with Mies, a profound and quiet architect then at the pinnacle of his career in America. In his book about Mies, David would write of his mentor, "It was characteristic of Mies van der Rohe to reduce everything to its clearest and most elemental form. While the clarity and integrity of his work attest to this, these qualities also offer the greatest obstacles to understanding and appreciating that work. Not only did Mies demand that we look at the work itself, he also demanded that we look beyond the work to its inner structure-to those ideas which reflect and animate an age."

The clarity and integrity of David Spaeth's life and work attest both to the lessons he learned as a student and to his ability to transform them into his own teaching. He arrived at the University of Kentucky in 1969, where he quickly developed a reputation as a challenging teacher, one who refined a student's ideas so that they could understand the consequences of what they chose to do. His reputation among the students was a tough professor, tough but fair. No doubt many of them approached his studio and lecture classes with trepidation, but just as many if not more left with a new self-knowledge about themselves.

Among the faculty, too, David demanded intellectual honesty, he liked nothing better than a good high-brow argument. But there was an intellectually generous side to him as well, and many colleagues would find a paper of David's (or someone else) in their mailbox from time to time, to be read at their leisure and discussed when the moment was right. At the level of this institution as well, David was valued for his clarity. Accordingly he was called upon to serve the university where that virtue was most necessary, and he did so in a great variety of capacities, including participation in this body, the University Senate.

David Spaeth never forgot his responsibility to the world outside the university. His writing and lectures were meant to engage a broad spectrum of people about the possibilities in architecture, and he succeeded at this. But his reputation outside Kentucky never interfered with his pedagogy on campus. Indeed, most of his students had little idea of how well-respected he was in the academic world of architecture, and that was fine with him.

David's interests in his community extended well beyond the realm of architecture. He was active throughout his life in Lexington, with numerous civic groups, centered around preservation and neighborhood activities in the downtown portion of the city. He carried out design projects, primarily renovations, in this part of Lexington, and brought his strong sensibilities about design to a new set of people in the process. Over 200 people gathered at his memorial service, and their diversity was remarkable: students, former students, fellow faculty, colleagues, friends, clients, and even contractors were in attendance, and were testimony to the range of his abilities.

Over the last two and a half decades, Professor David Spaeth was valued across the campus, as well as within the Colleges of Architecture and Agriculture, not only for his individual achievements, both academic and professional, but perhaps more for his high standards of excellence that provided a basis for his life and work. He made the virtues of clarity and professionalism integral to everything that he did, from his teaching to his writing to his extensive service to this University. Perhaps the best remembrance of David Spaeth can be found in the words of his mentor, Mies van der Rohe:

True education is concerned not only with practical goals but also with values. By our practical aims we are bound to the specific structure of our epoch. Our values, on the other hand, are rooted in the spiritual nature of men. Our practical aims measure only our material progress. The values we profess reveal the level of our culture - the long path from the material through function to creative work has only a single goal: to create order out of the desperate confusion of our time.

Professor Mohny asked that the resolution be included in the minutes of the meeting and that a copy be sent to Professor Spaeth's family.

Chairman Cox asked that the Senate stand for a moment of silence in recognition of Professor Spaeth.

The Chair recognized Professor Bradley Canon from the Political Science Department to present a memorial resolution.

Memorial Resolution  
Kenneth E. Vanlandingham  
February 13, 1995

Dr. Kenneth Vanlandingham died at age 74 in January 1995. A son of Kentucky, he was born and raised in Crittenden. He had polio as a child, overcoming considerable physical obstacles. He received his BA and MA degrees from the University of Kentucky, and his PhD degree in 1950 from the University of Illinois. His dissertation topic, county financial administration in Kentucky, reflected this Kentucky heritage.

He was professor in the Political Science Department of University of Kentucky, joining the faculty in 1950. His courses on Municipal Government and Rural Local Government were popular, taken by many future attorneys and public administrators around the state. Although officially retiring in 1986, Dr. Vanlandingham never completely retired, still proctoring two correspondence courses and communicating with students about their written responses. In fact, he was grading yet another set of papers in his hospital bed just weeks before his death.

Dr. Vanlandingham wrote a number of articles and other publications dealing with state and local government and the Kentucky constitution. Those articles appeared in such publications as Municipal Government, Kentucky Law Journal, William and Mary Law Review, and Northwestern University Law Review. In the profession he wrote the book on home rule, becoming known as the "prophet of home rule" for cities. As one former student and city manager himself commented, ". . . he brought it all together, explained all the vagaries, running up the necessary storm warnings but more important, offering the keys to making the theory work. The man was a treasure for those that believe in home rule."

Dr. Vanlandingham used his professional expertise in the broader community. He conducted a number of studies for the Kentucky Legislative Research Commission and served as a member of state committees to study problems of metropolitan government in Kentucky. He also served as consultant to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and to the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

But most of all he was a gentle man, one who believed that institutions at the local level best serve the community. He is survived by his wife Joyce and their daughter and family, all of Lexington.

Professor Canon asked that the resolution be included in the minutes of the meeting and that a copy be sent to Professor Vanlandingham's family.

Chairman Cox asked that the Senate stand for a moment of silence in recognition of Professor Vanlandingham.

The Chair recognized the Chair-elect of the Senate, Professor Gretchen LaGodna from Nursing, to present a resolution.

Special Resolution  
Randall W. Dahl  
February 13, 1995

Randall Dahl was named Registrar for the University of Kentucky in March of 1985 and thus became Secretary to the University Senate. In this capacity he has served us well. His has been a tireless voice in efforts to make this a better University. He served on the Admission and Academic Standards Committee, as well as several others, and was the originator of many rule and procedural changes which resulted in an improved academic atmosphere for us all -- most especially students. He oversaw our move to greatly enhanced electronic records keeping, to telephone registration, and to improved service for both faculty and students.

Dr. Dahl has left UK for the University of Alabama and we will miss

him. It is appropriate that the Senate thank him for his many efforts on our behalf and that we wish him well.

Professor LaGodna moved that this resolution be spread upon the minutes and that a copy be forwarded to Randall Dahl

Chairman Cox then called the Senate into executive session for the presentation of the honorary degree candidates. He stated that the information was in confidence and should not be announced until the President is ready to make the information public. He recognized Dr. Emery Wilson from the College of Medicine for the presentation of the list of candidates. Dr. Wilson stated he was pleased to present the recommendations of the Honorary Degree Committee. He thanked the members of the committee and particularly Dr. Dan Reedy for their work. Dr. Wilson read biographical information on the four nominees for the Senate's consideration.

Chair-elect Professor Gretchen LaGodna moved that the Senate accept the recommendations from the Honorary Degree Committee. The motion was seconded and there was no discussion. The motion was unanimously approved for recommendation to the President.

Chairman Cox recognized Professor Gretchen LaGodna, Chair-Elect of the Senate Council, for the first action item. Professor LaGodna stated that the first item was a proposal to change the name of the Department of Agricultural Engineering to the Department of Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering. This proposal reflects the changes in the field of Agricultural Engineering. Chairman Cox stated the proposal came from the Senate Council and needed no second.

There was no discussion. In a voice vote, the proposal unanimously passed and reads as follows:

Proposal:

Change the name of the Department of Agricultural Engineering to the Department of Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering.

Rationale:

In addition to the traditional areas of emphasis, modern agricultural engineering includes such areas as food and bioprocess engineering and bioenvironmental engineering. This has led the field of agricultural engineering into greater emphasis on basic biology and biological systems in its instructional, research and extension programs. The proposal reflects these changes and has the approval of both the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure and the Senate Council.

If approved, the proposal will be forwarded to the administration for appropriate action.

Chairman Cox recognized Professor LaGodna for the second action item. Professor LaGodna stated the second item was another name change proposal, i.e. to change

the  
name of the Department of Special Education to the Department of Special Education  
and Rehabilitation Counseling. The Chair said the item required no second.

There was no discussion, the item passed unanimously in a voice vote and reads  
as follows:

Proposal:

Change the name of the Department of Special Education to the  
Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation Counseling.

Rationale:

In the College of Education the program of Rehabilitation Counseling  
has been affiliated with the Department of Special Education, and this  
proposal simply reflects this administrative change. The proposal has  
the approval of both the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and  
Structure and the Senate Council.

If approved, the proposal will be forwarded to the administration for  
appropriate action.

Chairman Cox recognized Chair-elect LaGodna for Action Item C. Professor  
LaGodna stated C was a proposal to change the 1995 5th year calendar for the  
baccalaureate students in the College of Pharmacy. The change would mean that the  
semester began January 3, 1995 and ended Friday, April 21, 1995. The rationale  
has  
to do with the particular course work that these students take during the fifth  
year  
and the need to coordinate that with the rotations of the other health care team  
with whom they work.

There was no discussion and the item passed unanimously in a voice vote. The  
item reads as follows:

Proposal:

To Change the 1995 5th year calendar for B.S. students in the College of  
Pharmacy to begin Tuesday, January 3 and end Friday, April 21.

Rationale:

For the past four years Pharmacy has sought Senate approval to change  
the calendar for the B.S. Students because of complications with their  
Clerkship courses. Spring semester B.S. students only enroll in two  
experiential courses. An integral part of the experience involves  
rotating in patient care areas, where the teams change on a monthly  
basis, on the calendar. In order to have the students start and stop  
with the other teams, it is necessary to begin the semester immediately  
after the new year with student rotations scheduled on a monthly basis.  
Spring break is scheduled at the end of the semester.

The proposal is supported by the University Senate Council.

Chairman Cox recognized Chair-elect LaGodna for item D. Professor LaGodna said  
that item D was a proposal to merger the Department of Materials Science and  
Engineering and the Department of Chemical Engineering into a new department entitled

Department of Chemical and Materials Engineering. The purpose of the proposal is to maximum the academic resources of both the departments.

There was no discussion and the item passed in an unanimous voice vote. The item reads as follows:

Proposal:

To merge the Department of Materials Science and Engineering and the Department of Chemical Engineering into a new Department of Chemical and Materials Engineering.

Rationale:

The Chemical and Materials Engineering faculty sees some long-term advantage to the merger, specifically, the opportunity to build critical masses of researchers in several areas such as polymers/composites, carbon materials, ceramics, microelectronics/thing films, biomaterials/biomedical/biopharmaceutical engineering, and others areas where the department has the appropriate skills to address technology needs. These critical masses may be within the new department, with other units in the College of Engineering, with other centers, departments and programs at the University of Kentucky, or with units outside the University. Coordinated program planning can allow both curricula to improve with the efficient use of our resources.

The proposal is recommended by the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure and the University Senate Council.

If approved, the proposal will be forwarded to the administration for appropriate action.

Chairman Cox recognized Professor LaGodna for item E. Professor LaGodna said the proposal was to dissolve the Department of Vocational Education in the College of Education. Faculty assignments have been moved to other departments; therefore, the department has no faculty and needs to be abolished.

There was no discussion; the item passed in voice vote and reads as follows:

Proposal:

To dissolve the Department of Vocational Education, College of Education.

Rationale:

On October 6, 1994, the Board of Trustees approved the move of the faculty in this program into units in the College of Agriculture (two persons) and College of Human Environmental Sciences (one person) and one person reassigned in the College of Education. Now the department in Education must be formally abolished. This proposal has the approval of the University Senate Council.

If approved, the proposal will be forwarded to the administration for

appropriate action.

Chairman Cox recognized Professor LaGodna for item F. Professor LaGodna stated F was a proposal to change the University Senate Rules, Section IV, dealing with admission criteria to the College of Nursing. The change is basically to add a particular criterion to apply to all students. The students must complete a written statement describing reasons for pursuing Nursing as a career. This statement will be required of all applying students.

Professor Lee Meyer (Agriculture) asked if the statement would be evaluated according to particular criteria or is any written statement acceptable. Professor LaGodna said there would be criteria established by which the statements would be evaluated.

The item passed in an unanimous voice vote and reads as follows:

Proposal: (add underlined portions, delete bracketed portions)

4.2.2.1 Admission to College of Nursing: (US:4/12/82; US:3/10/86; US:10/14/91)

The College of Nursing 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 rubeola titers, and have an annual tuberculin test or chest 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. A freshman student will be [admitted] eligible for admission to the College of Nursing (CON) if the student has a high school grade point average (GPA) of 2.50 or above on a scale of 4.0, and also meets the criteria for automatic admission to the University of Kentucky, and completes a written statement describing reasons for pursuing nursing as a career. (Specific criteria available in Student Services, College of Nursing.)
2. A transfer student who is not a registered nurse will be [admitted] eligible for admission to the CON after meeting the following requirements:
  - a. Applicants with less than 24 credit hours must meet the criteria for entering freshman and have at least a GPA of 2.35 on all college work attempted as computed by the Office of Admissions.

b.

Applicants with 24 credit hours or more must have at least a GPA of 2.35

on all college work attempted as computed by the Office of Admissions.

c.

All transfer applicants complete a written statement describing reasons for

pursuing Nursing as a career. (Specific criteria available in Student Services, College of Nursing.)

\*\*\*\*\*

Background and Rationale:

Over the past three years Nursing has been unable to admit all of the qualified applicants. As a mechanism for selecting those most likely to do well in Nursing and be successful and persistent in a Nursing career, the College proposes to add to the admission requirements the submission of a written statement describing reasons for pursuing Nursing as a career. This proposal is supported by both the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee and the Senate Council.

Implementation: Fall, 1995

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

Chairman Cox recognized Professor LaGodna for item G. Professor LaGodna stated item G was a proposal to add to the University Senate Rules, Section V, Graduation Requirements. The proposal is to add the Inference Requirement that was on the circulated materials in the same sense that the Writing Requirement is now a separate and additional graduation requirement. This does not alter the place of the Inference Requirement in University Studies but pulls it out and makes it separate.

Professor Louis Swift (Dean Undergraduate Studies) explained that this is a technical change which came about as a result of a long discussion which has gone on across the Commonwealth sponsored by the Council on Higher Education to share general education requirements across the state. An agreement was proposed that under certain conditions students who satisfy the general education requirements at one institution will satisfy the general education requirements at another institution. There are differences in these general education programs, and when the proposal, which was hammered out over the course of a year, came to our Senate Council, they thought we should make sure that all of our students have the Foreign Language requirement and the Inference requirement. The Senate Council endorsed the proposal only under those conditions. In the CHE proposal the Foreign Language requirement was made an exception; thus foreign language is not a problem. All transfer students who come to the University without a foreign language will hav

e to  
have a foreign language before they leave the Institution with a degree.

The Senate Council recommendation under discussion places the Inference requirement in the same category as the Writing Requirement, i.e. makes it also a graduation requirement for all students. It changes absolutely nothing regarding the students who come here as freshmen and graduate; substantially it changes nothing regarding transfer students. Currently both transfer students and native students have to fulfill the Inference requirement. Technically, by making the Inference requirement a graduation requirement as well as part of USP, we assure that all students, whether they are transfer students or native students will satisfy the Inference requirement before they get a degree. This is a technical change which really does not alter anything currently in practice at the University; it gives us a category under which to obligate transfer students to take the Inference Requirement if they come to the Institution without having taken it in their general education program elsewhere.

Greg Watkins (Student Representative - Business and Economics) asked if a transfer student was defined as a student from another university and a community college.

Dr. Swift indicated the transfer students being dealt with are from all the public institutions in Kentucky, including the Community Colleges. If the students take USP courses in the Community College system they satisfy the requirement automatically. A Community College student is a UK student.

There was no further discussion, the proposal passed in a unanimous voice vote and reads as follows:

Proposal: (Add to Section V, Graduation Requirements, the following)

Inference Requirement:

Each baccalaureate student must satisfy one of the following:

- (1) Any calculus course  
or
- (2) STA 200, Statistics, A Force in Human Judgment plus PHI 120,  
Introductory Logic of PHI 320, Symbolic Logic I

or the equivalent of one of the above.

Rationale:

The effect of this action is to place the Inference Requirement (like the Writing Requirement) in the category of a graduation requirement as well as in the University Studies Program. The result will be that native students will satisfy this requirement through the regular path of University Studies; transfer students who come to the University without having fulfilled this requirement must do so prior to graduation.

Implementation Date: Fall Semester, 1995

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

Chairman Cox recognized Professor LaGodna for action item H. Professor LaGodna stated this was a proposal to change the University Senate Rules - Section VI, concerning Honor Codes. Currently there are three colleges within the University that have established Honor Codes that were approved by the University Senate. The purpose of this addition to the Honor Code part of the rules is to insure that there is a consistent and equal due process that is afforded students whose offenses may be dealt with under an Honor Code versus students whose offenses may be dealt with under usual University Senate Rules. This addition says that all students whether or not they are in a college with an Honor Code have the right of appeal through the Academic Ombud Office.

Chairman Cox stated there was one editorial correction. On the third line of the second page the word "dismissal" should be underlined.

Professor Douglas Michael (Law) asked why there is not a provision permitting the remanding of the case to the college academic honor council or committee, so that if the student's rights have been substantially violated, they might be corrected that way.

Chairman Cox stated that the Senate Council conferred with Professor Bill Fortune on this item. The Council's view was that it was better not to do that.

Professor Tom Garrity (Medicine) stated he was from a College that has an Honor Council and Honor Code, and in their discussion there was some question as to whether or not they could expect that the case being sent back to the original body would have a fair and unbiased hearing the second time around. Their thought was if the student appealed from the Honor Council, it might be taken by members of the Honor Council to be like a slap in the face. If the appeal ended up before the same Honor Council, a fair and impartial hearing might be more difficult to obtain.

There was no further discussion and the proposal passed in an unanimous voice vote. The Proposal reads as follows:

Proposal:[add underlined sections; delete bracketed portions]

#### 6.6.0HONOR CODE

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Rationale:

The purpose of this proposal is to make explicit a student's appeal rights of an honor code violation and to give guidance to the Appeals Boards as to how it may handle such appeals. In essence this gives a student found guilty of an honor code violation the same appeal rights as students found guilty of an academic offense in a college without an honor code. This proposal is submitted and endorsed by the Senate Council.

Implementation Date: Fall, 1995

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

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Cox at 3:55 p.m.

Louis J. Swift  
Acting Registrar