

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, MARCH 18, 1996

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, March 18, 1996, in Room 115 of the Nursing Health Sciences Building.

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

Members absent were: M. Mukhtar Ali, Gary Anglin, Patrick Arnold, Benny Ray Bailey, John Ballantine, Michael Bardo, Vasant Bhapkar, Ben Bogia*, Douglas Boyd, Fitzgerald Bramwell, Bill Brassine, Carolyn Brock, Joseph Burch, Mary Burke*, Allan Butterfield, Johnny Cailleteau, Joan Callahan, Ben Carr, Edward Carter, Shea Chaney, Eric Christianson*, Jordan Cohen, Jean Cooper*, Scott Coovert, Raymond Cox, Carla Craycraft, Frederick DeBeer*, Susan deCarvalho, David Elliott*, Robert Farquhar, Juanita Fleming*, Richard Furst, Beatrice Gaunder, Philip Greasley*, Kirby Hancock, Issam Harik, Monica Harris, S. Zafar Hasan, James Holsinger, Rick Hoyle*, Edward Jennings*, Stuart Keller*, Pamela Kidd, Craig Koontz, Thomas Lester, G.T. Lineberry*, C. Oran Little, Jeff Lowe, Daniel Mason*, Douglas Michael*, David Mohney, Roy Moore, Maurice Morrison, Donald Mullineaux, David Nash*, Phyllis Nash*, Wolfgang Natter, Anthony Newberry, Michael Neitzel*, William O'Connor, Clayton Paul*, Clyde Poe*, Tom Pratt, Shirley Raines, Karl Raitz, Amy Rasor, Thomas Robinson, John Rogers*, Michael Rohmiller, Charles Russo, Scott Safford, David Shipley, Todd Shock, Richard Smith, Sheldon Steiner, William Stober*, David Stockham, Michael Thomlin, Michael Uyhelji, Retia Walker*, Craig Wallace, Charles Wethington*, Chad Willet, Carolyn Williams, Eugene Williams, Emery Wilson*, Mary Witt, William Witt, Linda Worley.

* Absence Explained

The minutes of December 11, 1995 have been distributed. There were no corrections to the minutes and they were approved as circulated.

Chairperson Gretchen LaGodna made the following announcements:

Professor Loys Mather has been reelected to the Board of Trustees. Professor Mather was given a round of applause. Professor LaGodna thanked all the outstanding candidates that were on the ballot.

Professor Lee Edgerton has accepted the request of the Senate Council and the President to serve a second term as the University Academic Ombud.

Continuing update on the retirement recommendations that were put forth by the Senate Ad Hoc Retirement Committee. Professor LaGodna met with Myra Johnson who is the Associate Director of Human Resources for Employee Benefits. HRS has taken a number of very positive steps toward the recommendations that were made. After talking they decided it would be a very productive idea if HRS and the Senate Council cosponsored some open forums for faculty. Three open forums have been set up to discuss current issues and future changes in retirement planning and benefits. Every faculty member will be getting a flyer. The dates for the forums are: April 3, 1996, April 8, 1996, and April 11, 1996. There are three separate times; two are late in the afternoon, one is over the noon hour. One is scheduled in the medical center end of the campus and the other two are on the other end of the campus. These are going to be important forums; I urge you to attend one of them. It will give you a chance to have some input into the benefits area.

Dr. Powell and Dr. Mather, as the Board of Trustees representatives and Professor Dennis Officer as a representative from the Ad Hoc Retirement

Committee, and myself met with the President to discuss progress on the major recommendation that came out of that committee, which was for the phased-in retirement plan. The President reaffirmed his intent to respond to that issue by the end of the semester.

The Senate Council endorsed the Green Lights Program, sponsored by Students for an Energy Efficient Environment.

The Senate Council also sent recommendations for faculty appointments to the Senate Advisory Committees, Area Academic Advisory Committees, the University Appeals Board, and Student Media Board to the President.

Chairperson LaGodna recognized Professor Robert Rapp from the College of Pharmacy to present the following memorial resolution in honor of Professor Michael Gosland who died on February 26, 1996.

Michael P. Gosland
Pharm.D.
1962-1996

Dr. Michael Gosland received a B.S. in Biology in 1984 and his Doctor of Pharmacy degree in 1987 graduating Summa Cum Laude, both from the University of the Pacific in Stockton, California. He then completed a Pharmacy Practice Residency at the Veterans Administration Medical Center in Palo Alto, California and a three year post-doctoral fellowship in the Division of Oncology and Clinical Pharmacology at the Stanford University School of Medicine.

Dr. Gosland joined the faculty of the College of Pharmacy and the College of Medicine in 1991 as Assistant Professor in the Division of Pharmacy Practice and Science. He was appointed as Assistant Professor in the Division of Hematology/Oncology in the Department of Medicine in 1993, and promoted to Associate Professor in the Colleges of Pharmacy and Medicine in 1995. Dr. Gosland was also the Clinical Specialist in Oncology in the Department of Pharmacy at University Hospital and a member of the University of Kentucky Graduate Faculty.

In a small amount of time on the University of Kentucky faculty, Dr. Gosland touched the lives of many faculty throughout the Medical Center which is a tribute to his wonderful ability to collaborate in a wide variety of research projects involving cancer drug therapy. He was an outstanding and empathetic teacher of both pharmacy and medical students. He was the primary preceptor for the Pharmacy Practice Specialty Residency in Oncology Practice. As a clinician, Dr. Gosland worked with physicians, pharmacists, nurses, and house staff officers to give the best possible safe and effective drug therapy to Markey Cancer Center in-patients and out-patients. During the past five years at the University of Kentucky, Dr. Gosland developed an outstanding reputation for his research on the multi-drug-resistant cancer gene and ways to reverse this resistance. He was very well known for his work on the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of anti-cancer agents and a well-trained laboratory researcher who eagerly shared his views and his visions with other younger and older faculty members in the Medical Center. Dr. Gosland had already published over 20 papers in the scientific and professional literature by the time of his death. He was a highly sought after lecturer and he presented many times at state, national and international meetings in the field of oncology.

Dr. Gosland and his wife Wendy are the parents of 3 children, Meagan Kathleen, age 11, Katherine Elise, age 4, and John Philip, age 2. They

enjoyed their life to the fullest in the Crosswoods Subdivision in Jessamine County and they were members of the South Elkhorn Christian Church on Harrodsburg Road.

Dr. Gosland will be both remembered and missed by his wife and children, his colleagues, and all his many friends in Lexington and throughout the country.

A fund for the College Education of the Gosland children has been established. Contributions may be sent to Dr. Robert P. Rapp, Chair, Division of Pharmacy Practice & Science, Room C-114, University Hospital, 800 Rose St., Lexington, KY 40536. Checks should be made out to the "Gosland Children's Fund".

Professor Rapp asked that the resolution be made a part of the minutes and that a copy be sent to his family.

The Chair asked that the Senate rise for a moment of silence.

Chairperson LaGodna recognized Dr. Roseann Hogan and Dr. Louis Swift for the presentation of the Retention and Graduation Report, Follow-up Survey on Non-Returning Students.

Dean Lou Swift and Dr. Roseann Hogan, Director of Assessment and Planning for the Lexington Campus, presented a report on undergraduate retention at the University of Kentucky. The report focused on a survey of non-returning students which was conducted in the spring of 1995, but it also included findings on Freshman to Sophomore retention rates and graduation rates over the last decade. Dr. Hogan provided detailed data on the reasons which students gave for leaving the University, the impressions students had of their experience on campus, and the aspirations they entertained for continuing their education. Some attention was paid to students' perceptions of advising, their academic work habits while attending the university, and the amount of time devoted to jobs on or off campus. It was clear that respondents to the survey believed that greater attention to advising, more feedback on academic performance, and more personalized attention from faculty are items which the University needs to address.

The report evoked a spirited discussion among the senators.

The charts used for the presentation are attached to the minutes.

AGENDA ITEM I: 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 stated this item was continued from the February meeting. The amendment that was introduced by Professor Blues was being discussed when the meeting was adjourned due to a lack of quorum. Professor LaGodna asked if there was further discussion on the amendment which reads "if the student can demonstrate that the withdrawal was for urgent non-academic reasons." There was no discussion on the amendment. The amendment passed in a voice vote. There was no discussion on the amended motion. The motion passed in a voice vote and reads as follows:

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 non-academic reasons.

The Chair stated the next item was a sensitive issue. When honorary degree nominees are discussed they are recommended nominees only, the Senate is advisory to the President and Board of Trustees where these nominees are approved. In addition to the Senate's recommendation going forward, the nominees themselves have to agree to this, therefore there are a lot of reasons why it is critical not to make public who the nominees are at this point in time. Keep in mind it is very important while the Senate discusses who the nominees are that their names are not publicized and do not leave this body. The Chair asked if there were any reporters present that they leave the room during the discussion. Professor LaGodna then recognized Dean Daniel Reedy from the Graduate School for the presentation of the list of candidates for Honorary Degrees. Dr. Reedy stated the recommendations came from the Honorary Degrees Committee and had been approved by the Graduate Faculty. Dr. Reedy read biographical information on the nominees for the Senate's consideration.

The motion to accept the degree candidates for recommendation to the President passed in an unanimous voice vote.

AGENDA ITEM 2: Proposal to amend University Senate Rules - Section V - 5.1.2.3 & 5.3.3.3 College of Medicine student promotion rules.

Proposal: (Add bold, underlined sections; delete items in brackets]

5.3.3.3 College of Medicine (US: 3/10/86):

A Assessment of Student Learning

The University of Kentucky College of Medicine is charged with the education and training of competent physicians. Competence must be assured not only in the students' fund of knowledge and technical expertise, but also in their standards of personal and professional conduct. Student progress shall be carefully monitored to certify that students have acquired appropriate knowledge, skills, behavioral characteristics, and ethical principles. To this end, students are responsible for conforming to all rules and regulations specified by the Health Science Student Professional Behavior Code, the "Technical Standards" detailed in the College of Medicine Bulletin, and the academic standards established in these Student Promotion Rules.

The Student Progress and Promotion Committee (SPPC) is charged with the monitoring of student progress through the curriculum. The Committee regularly reviews each student's performance and makes recommendations to the Dean on such actions as graduation, promotion, remediation, dismissal and leaves of absence. Final authority on all matters of student progress and promotion is vested in the Dean of the College of Medicine.

Assessment Criteria

1. Student work is assessed by the faculty through the assignment of grades upon completion of all required courses and clerkships. Basic science grades are based upon such measures as written and oral examinations, laboratory practicals, and case write-ups. In the clinical years, grades are accompanied by detailed descriptive comments reflecting the instructors' impressions of the student's knowledge, attitudes, and technical skills.

2. Departmental faculty determine the level of student competence in the course or clerkship for which they are responsible. Within two weeks of the termination of each course, every department shall submit to the Office of Education a grade, and where possible, written comments on each student's performance. The Office of Education will provide every student a copy of this grade sheet within three weeks of the termination of the course.

3. Because of advanced academic pursuit in a biomedical discipline, some students may wish to bypass a particular first or second year course. With permission of the course director and the SPPC, a student may sit for an "opt-out" examination. The course director will determine the appropriate level of performance for bypass privileges.

4. Students will be required to pass a written comprehensive, standardized basic science examination prior to promotion to the third year and a written comprehensive, standardized clinical examination prior to graduation. Students may sit for three consecutive administrations of each examination in the attempt to achieve a passing score. During the interval between repeated attempts to pass the examinations students are in a non-promotional category. If unsuccessful after the third attempt, the student will be dismissed from the College.

5. Students will be required to pass a Clinical Performance Examination (CPX) prior to graduation. Students who do not pass the initial examination will be required to participate in remediation activities and pass a retest.

B Promotion and Retention Criteria

The education of a physician is a complex process, longitudinal in character, with many incremental steps. To assure that students graduating from the College of Medicine have the necessary knowledge, skills, demeanor, and ethical principles essential to professional competence, the following procedures will be used to evaluate and promote students:

1. At regular intervals the SPPC will review the academic record of each student and make specific recommendations addressing promotion, remediation, or dismissal. Beyond these recommendation, potential actions include but are not limited to the adjustment of academic load, repetition of curriculum segments, and participation in counseling sessions.

2. Promotion to sequential semesters or years in the curriculum is

contingent upon attaining the expected level of performance as prescribed by the faculty of the College of Medicine. Students attaining a GPA of 3.7 or higher in their current academic year will be promoted to the subsequent year With Distinction. This accomplishment will be noted in their academic records and on their transcripts.

Commencement honors of High Distinction and Distinction will be awarded at graduation for students who attain the appropriate GPA, i.e., 3.7 for High Distinction, 3.5-3.69 for Distinction.

3. A non-promotional category will identify students who are not being promoted due to unfulfilled requirements. These students may be involved in remediation activities, be working to complete an "I" grade, or be retained for not passing either standardized comprehensive examination. Students in the non promotional category will be promoted or dismissed based upon satisfactory correction of the deficiency.

4. A non-routine promotion category will identify students receiving marginal grades whose performance warrants close monitoring. Marginal performance may indicate the need for remediation or repetition of curriculum segments. Continued marginal performance may be justification for dismissal.

Unlimited opportunity to repeat courses, clerkships or curriculum sequences is neither feasible nor desirable.

5. A student receiving a grade of "U" or "E" has performed at an unacceptable level. To redress the grade, the SPPC will review both the student's academic record and the compensating recommendations of the department that assigned the mark. The SPPC will determine a plan of action which may include remediation, repetition of all or a portion of the course, clerkship, or curriculum year, or dismissal from the College.

6. A probation category encompasses those students who post a GPA of less than 2.5 for any academic year and those students who receive "U" or "E" grades. Students promoted on probation must improve their academic performance in the subsequent academic year or risk dismissal.

7. Dismissal from the College will result when students have an annually calculated cumulative GPA of less than 2.0; receive two or more "E" grades; receive three or more "U" grades; receive a "U" or "E" grade while on academic probation; or fail either of the comprehensive standardized examinations on three consecutive attempts. At the discretion of the SPPC and the Dean, students may be dismissed if they receive two "U" grades.

C Leaves of Absence

Students are normally expected to complete the curriculum in four consecutive years. Under compelling circumstances, leaves of absence may be granted by the SPPC. The request for a leave of absence must be submitted in writing to the Associate Dean for Education. Return from a leave must be approved by the SPPC, may necessitate an amended academic curriculum, and is subject to the availability of space in required courses. The following three categories of leave may be sanctioned by the SPPC and approved by the Dean:

1. ACADEMIC LEAVE OF ABSENCE is available to students who wish to undertake specialized academic pursuits in a defined field of study. Students must be in good academic standing. Approval will not be given for intervals in excess of one year without reapplication.

2. PERSONAL LEAVES OF ABSENCE are initiated at the students' requests. Students must be in good academic standing. Leaves in this category may range from a number of weeks to a maximum of one years.

3. MEDICAL LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Illness can seriously disrupt or impede student progress through the course of study. A student anticipating an absence of 10 days or more must secure a medical leave of absence. Application for this type of leave may be requested through the Office of Education and must be accompanied by a letter from the student's attending physician.

a. Processing and approval of a medical leave by the SPPC may require a review of the student's pertinent medical records by a specially appointed committee of physicians with relevant medical expertise. The length of the medical leave of absence will be determined by the SPPC in consultation with the student, his attending physician, and the ad hoc Committee of physicians. Request for reentry must be accompanied by a statement from the student's attending physician which addresses the student's ability (mental and physical) to carry a full academic load. At this juncture, the SPPC may again require review of the student's medical records and/or a medical assessment by a physician with relevant clinical expertise at the student's expense.

b. Absences due to acute illness do not require a medical leave of absence. However, for absences which encompass a major performance examination or more than five days of a clinical clerkship, at the student is responsible for notifying the Office of Education as soon as possible. Further, a supporting statement from an attending physician must be filed with the Office of Education prior to returning to class.

5.1.2.3 College of Medicine (US: 3/10/86)

A Represents exceptionally high achievement in performance. It is valued at four (4) quality points for each credit hour.

B Represents the expected level of achievement or performance in each course. This grade reflects student competence in all areas of course requirements. It is valued at three (3) quality points for each credit hour.

C Represents marginal performance. It is valued at two (2) quality points for each credit hour.

E Represents failure or unacceptable performance in a course. It is valued at zero (0) quality points for each credit hour.

P Represents a passing grade in a course taken on a pass-fail basis. It is not used in quality point calculations.

W Denotes withdrawal from the College or from an elective course. 'W' must be approved or recommended by the Student Progress and Promotion Committee. Withdrawal from a required course is not permitted, except when a student withdraws from the College. A student may withdraw from an elective and the 'W' will remain on the record.

U Represents unsatisfactory performance in a specified area of course requirements. It is given instead of an 'E' grade when evidence exists that the student might earn a ['C'] passing grade upon completion of make-up work. In the interim the 'U' will be valued at one quality point for each credit hour. The temporary grade must be made-up [A 'U' grade must be replaced by a 'C' or 'E' grade] before the student can be promoted to the

next year. The quality point calculation will then be the average of the 'U' and the ['C' or 'E' grade] the grade given after the make-up.

Rationale:

In the proposed paragraph on page two (bold, underlined), the exam is designed to assess the student's development of procedural skills and other proficiencies necessary for the provision of appropriate patient care which are not generally measured by written examinations such as USMLE. The CPX will be administered after the third year of the medical curriculum. Students who do not pass the examination will be required to participate in remediation activities and be retested. This promotion rule would be implemented with the Class of 1999. This request also requires a clarification in the wording of the current rules (see also page 2, section 4). Thus, it is recommended that the word "written" be added to the appropriate sentences.

The proposed paragraph on page three (bold, underlined) is needed to retain the College of Medicine commencement honors since the University Senate decided to change commencement honors to a Magna, Summa, and Cum Laude designation.

The changes on page 5 (definition of the "U" grade) are proposed because the old definition restricted the grade after make-up work to a "C". With multidimensional evaluation systems, faculty requested the ability to assign an unsatisfactory grade when a single dimension was not at a passing level, but wanted the ability to then assign a grade that reflected the student's performance as the average of all the evaluation components.

The proposals have been reviewed and approved by the Senate's Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards. They proposed one revision which the College of Medicine accepted. The proposal as revised was approved by the University Senate Council.

Proposed Implementation: Class of 1999

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

Chairperson LaGodna recognized Professor Jan Schach, chair-elect of the Senate Council for introduction of the item. Professor Schach reviewed the background of the proposal and stated the proposals had been reviewed and approved by the Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards as well as the Senate Council, she moved approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

Professor Jesse Weil (Physics and Astronomy) asked if on page two, item four the examinations meant the first one or the second one or if it should be plural and apply to both? Sue Fosson (College of Medicine) stated it was either and it should be read each examination. Professor Weil asked that examination was being talked about on page three, item three. Ms. Fosson stated both and the word should be plural. Professor Weil said the bold faced incertion on page 2 seemed to be the same as item number four. Ms. Fosson said it was not the same examination and it was determined to make the bold faced insertion item five. Professor Weil stated that on page five on the bottom line promotion rule seemed to conflict with page two where it says the CPX exam is required for graduation but not for promotion. Ms. Fosson stated all the rules were considered promotion rules including graduation. It was determined to remove the term promotion.

The question was called. The College of Medicine rule changes as amended

passed in an unanimous voice vote.

AGENDA ITEM 3: Proposal to amend University Senate Rules, Section V - Grades and Marking systems - to establish a plus/minus grading system for the College of Arts and Sciences

Background

During the 1994-95 academic year, the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee considered a College of A&S proposal to establish a plus/minus grading system for undergraduate students in that college. After deliberations, the committee recommended that the change be instituted on a university-wide basis rather than in just the College of Arts & Sciences. Plus/minus grading is already in use in the colleges of Law, Fine Arts, and Architecture, and the Landscape Architecture program.

At the April 10, 1995 Senate meeting a general discussion was held. Debate ensued regarding instituting the plus/minus system for all University undergraduate students, as well as solely in the College of A&S. No clear consensus was achieved.

At the October 9, 1995, Senate meeting, the proposal was again discussed, and the following concerns raised:

1. Issues of equity if system is not university-wide
2. If there were no designated A+ grade, the best students may be less likely to earn 4.0s. This concern was confirmed by experience of Shippensburg University of PA., who adopted a +/- grading system in 1992.)
3. Weakest students may be more likely to fall below 2.0 GPAs.

The Senate returned the proposal to the Senate Council for further study.

In response to the Senate's directive, the Senate Council sought additional input by sending the proposal to the deans of undergraduate colleges, asking that faculty councils or comparable groups review it. The request specifically asked that they consider the advisability of a University-wide plus/minus system for all undergraduate students. The memo invited student input from the colleges as well. A separate request was made to the Student Government Association.

The Senate Council then reconsidered the proposal at its 19 and 26 February meetings, taking into consideration the following input:

- Discussion at previous Senate meetings
- SGA's October 1995 petitions and January 1996 Kernel survey
- Internet assessment of other universities' experiences
- Responses from 10 UK Colleges
- Research-based data from Dr. Tom Guskey and Dr. Roseann Hogan

While the Senate Council acknowledged that those UK units which currently use such a system are satisfied, it concluded that there was no compelling rationale to recommend instituting such a system university-wide. The Council believed, however, that the original proposal forwarded by the College of A&S should be brought back to the floor of the full Senate for vote.

The Senate Council therefore forwards the following proposal.

Proposal: Add to Section V - 5.1.2.4 the bolded area below

- 1.0 Grades and Marking Systems
College of Arts & Sciences

The following grades are given with the respective point value indicated.

	B+	3.3	C+	2.3	D+	1.3	E	0
A	4.0	B	3.0	C	2.0	D	1.0	
A-	3.7	B-	2.7	C-	1.7	D-	0.7	

The use of the plus/minus system does not change any college or university grade point average requirements, nor the method by which grade point averages are computed, nor the interpretations of other grades awarded, such as F, I, P, W, & S. (US: 9/20/93)

For all studio work in the College of Architecture, the minimum passing grade from level to level in the studio sequence shall be a grade of "C" (US: 5/2/78, US: 9/20/93)

All students enrolled in courses using the plus/minus grading system will have the appropriate point value calculated into their grade point average regardless of their College of origin.

Rationale:

A +/- grading system would provide more precise and accurate evaluation of student performance. The distinctions are seen as especially helpful in courses that carry a large number of credit hours. Other colleges which have +/- grading systems have been satisfied with the process.

Implementation Date: Fall, 1996

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

Professor Jan Schach introduced the item and reviewed the background. She moved approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

Professor Lou Swift asked if this was permissive or obligatory legislation? Does a professor in the College of Arts and Sciences have to use the plus/minus system or can they choose to the system if the college decides to do that? Chairperson LaGodna said that question had been raised a lot. Her understanding of how it would be handled was at this time a professor is not obligated to assign grades in every category. If an individual faculty member chooses not to use the plus/minus system, they would be able to do that.

Professor Lee Edgerton (Academic Ombud) said his understanding of the proposal was that a student taking Arts and Sciences courses regardless of their college of origin would get a +/- grade in that course on their transcript, he asked how the transcript would read to someone outside reading it, would it indicate that the student is in college that does not recognize +/-, a student in his college would not be taking courses that got +/-, would someone reading the transcript know that individual received a B without the option of a B+/B-? Chairperson LaGodna stated that the way it was currently written does not say that it would be indicated on the transcript. Betty Huff (University Registrar) stated that the grade legend would be put on the back of the transcript, and a statement that says not all courses and not all colleges necessarily follow the +/- grading system.

Professor Enid Waldhart (Communications and Information Studies) asked Professor Schach to further explain what she meant by the colleges did not give a response. Professor Schach said they asked each college to respond to the university wide proposal through their faculty groups. The students also responded by way of the Kernel and the Student Government

Association. The responses were mixed from college to college. The student survey was against, but the numbers were low. They did not get a strong sense one way or the other.

Professor Tom Blues (English) wanted to report on Professor Tom Guskey's comment on +/- grading systems to the Senate Council. He said three things that the Research on Grading revealed; one is that +/- grading does not make any significant difference in grading, second that +/- grading is just as subjective as non +/- grading, and thirdly there was no difference in the complaints. His overall conclusion was that in effect it doesn't make any difference. Professor LaGodna said one of the things that the Senate Council concluded after talking with Professor Guskey that there may be a great need for grading to be examined in general in many ways in the University, but that creating a +/- system did not necessarily address the problems in inequitable grading or grading methods.

Motion to stop debate passed in a show of hands.

The proposal passed in a show of hands.

AGENDA ITEM 4: Proposal to amend University Senate Rules - Section IV - Admission to Non-Certification Undergraduate Program, College of Education

Proposal:

Students will meet a 2.5 GPA overall and in each academic specialization (major, minor, and support) at the end of their first 60 hours. They will be admitted to advanced standing and counseled by the academic specialist advisor. Application for a degree in the College of Education for the secondary education major will require an appropriate admission to advanced standing and verification of a 2.5 GPA overall and in each academic specialization (major, minor, and support).

Background:

In the late Fall, 1994 (December 24, 1994), the Senate Council approved a new undergraduate program in the College of Education. That program, a secondary education (non-certification) program, will eventually replace the current undergraduate teacher certification program.

When the proposed program was circulated to the Senate for final approval, objections were raised by faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences as well as by the Dean of the Graduate School. Those objections have been resolved and the program is ready to be offered.

The College of Education has asked that the program not be implemented until a selective admissions standard is approved and in place. The admissions statement they have proposed follows below, to be added to Section IV, University Senate Rules.

The statement has been reviewed and modified by the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee. The College of Education accepted the Committee's modifications, and the Senate Council recommends it to the Senate.

Implementation: Fall, 1996

Note: If approved, the proposal will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification. Chairperson LaGodna recognized Professor Schach for that last agenda item. Professor Schach introduced the item and reviewed the background. She recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

After several questions that could not be answered it was decided to put the

item on the agenda for the April meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:48 PM.

Betty J. Huff
Secretary, University Senate