

[University of Kentucky](#)**MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, October 12, 1998**

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., October 12, 1998, in the Auditorium of the W. T. Young Library.

Professor Roy Moore, Chairperson of the Senate Council presided.

Members absent were: Kimberly Anderson*, Sammy Anderson, Joseph Anthony, Leon Assael, Suketu Bhavsar, Brian Biermann, Deborah Blades, Iva Boyatt*, Fitzgerald Bramwell, Eugene Bruce*, Joseph Burch, Laurette Byars, Edward Carter, Jordan Cohen, Mary Davis*, George DeBin, Henri DeHahn*, Eric Drake, Juanita Fleming, Richard Furst, Larry Grabau*, Philip Greasley, Howard Grotch, David Hamilton, Debra Harley, Patrick Herring, James Holsinger, Craig Infanger, Mike Inman, Jamshed Kanga, Alan Kaplan*, Edward Kasarskis, Scott Kelley*, Richard Kermode, Michael Lach, Thomas Lester, C. Oran Little, Donald Madden*, Jason Miller, David Mohny, William O'Connor, James S. Parker, Thomas Robinson, Elizabeth Rompf*, Avinash Sathaye*, Michael Schlossberg, Robert Schwemm, Robert Shay, Steven Skinner*, David Stockham, Thomas Troland, Henry Vasconez*, George Wagner*, William Wagner, Nick West, Charles Wethington*, Paul Willis, Eugene Williams, Lionell Williamson, Emery Wilson, Ernest Yanarella*.

The Chair called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone to the October Senate Meeting.

Chairperson Moore stated that the minutes of September 14, 1998 had been circulated. There were no corrections or revisions and the minutes were approved as circulated.

The Chair made the following announcements:

I would like to welcome the newly elected senators for Lexington Community College: Nolen Embry, Charles Coulston, Joseph Anthony, Randolph Hollingsworth, Vicki Wilson, Sandra Carey, Iva Boyatt, Eileen Abel, and James Matchuny.

* Absence Explained

If you did not sign in, that is a part of the formality. There is a sign-up sheet outside the door. That is the way we know you are here.

There is a correction to the University calendar for the year 2001. The correction is that Spring break will be the tenth week instead of the eleventh. The week of March 12 - 16, 2001 instead of March 19-23, 2001. There will be a skeletal calendar attached to the minutes. (See Attachment 11.)

If some of you did not receive certain agenda items, it was due to a miscommunication with duplicating. It was not the fault of the Senate Council or the Registrar's Office and the problem has now been corrected.

The Chair recognized Professor Lee Meyer, Vice-chair of the Senate Council for introduction of the first agenda item.

ACTION ITEM 1 - Proposal to amend University Senate Rules, Section VI - 6.1.3. (See Attachment 1.)

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

Professor Hans Gesund (Engineering) said he would like to propose an editorial change, changing the word "sex" to "gender."

Professor Joan Callahan (Political Science) stated that the word sex should be left in. It usually refers to the distinction between male and female and gender refers to the distinction between masculine present tense and feminine present tense. Someone can not be downgraded on the basis of whether they are male or female.

Professor Gesund asked for a vote to insert the editorial change.

The vote to change the word "sex" to "gender" failed in a voice vote.

The proposal passed in a unanimous voice vote.

ACTION ITEM 2 - Amendments to University Senate Rules, Section 1 - 1.2.2 and following. Proposal to convey voting rights in the University Senate to the President of SGA and proposal to change ex officio membership on the Senate. If approved, the proposals will be forwarded to the Administration

for appropriate modifications in the Governing Regulations. The final proposal is to convey voting rights on the Senate Council to the President of SGA and to clarify voting status of the faculty members of the Board of Trustees on the Senate Council. (See Attachment 2.)

The Chair recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of the second item. Professor Meyer introduced the item and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

Professor Loys Mather (Agriculture) said this proposal was primarily allowing the President of Student Government to vote in the Senate every year instead of every other year. There are a designated number of faculty representatives that vote every year, students who vote each year, and there are a group of administrators that half of them vote in even numbered years and half vote in odd numbered years. The President of Student Government is thrown in with that group of administrators and votes in the odd numbered years. The feeling was since the Student Government President is different each year, they should vote each time. In the process of doing that, they also cleaned up another thing, which was to clarify in Section 1.3.1.2 concerning the Senate Council. If a person is an elected member of the Senate Council and then becomes an elected Faculty Trustee, one interpretation of the Senate Rules was that person would lose their vote in the Senate Council, and this clarifies that if they are elected members of the Senate Council and become a Trustee, they continue as a Senate Council voting member.

The proposal passed in a unanimous voice vote.

ACTION ITEM 3 - Proposal to change certain Election rules, Section I, University Senate Rules. (See Attachment 3.)

Chairperson Moore recognized Vice-chair Meyer for introduction of the next item. Professor Meyer introduced the item and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

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

ACTION ITEM 4 - Proposal to recommend that Part II of the Lexington Community College (LCC) Code of Student Conduct be approved to remain in force until the University Senate acts to change those. (See Attachment 4.)

The Chair recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of the next item. Professor Meyer introduced the item and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

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

ACTION ITEM 5 - Proposed changes to University Senate Rules, Section IV - 4.2.5, Graduate School Admission.

Chairperson Moore recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of the item. Professor Meyer stated that one of major changes of the proposal was the raising of the admission standards. In the past, it was a 2.5 grade point average and the proposal recommends raising it to a 2.75 grade point average. Another important change was to require that the analytical portion of the GRE be a part of the application. The proposal comes with a Senate Council recommendation to approve.

Mike Neitzel (Dean - Graduate School) said that he would like to urge the Senate to approve this change, raising the minimum undergraduate grade point average from 2.5 to 2.75. There are a number of reasons why it is a good idea to do this. In terms of how the University represents itself, of all the benchmark Universities of the universities that award a doctoral degree in this region, 2.5 is lowest minimum undergraduate grade point average. The vast majority have a 3.0, some have 2.75, and a couple have 2.7. In terms of looking at the impact of this, there are typically somewhere between eighty to ninety graduate students on academic probation at any one time. In 1997 there were sixty-one students put on probation that year and about 20 continuing. Sixty percent of those students had undergraduate grade point averages below 3.0 and the vast majority of those; about seventy percent, had been under 2.75. This is despite the fact that only fifteen percent of the students in the graduate programs had undergraduate grade point averages of 2.75 or lower. There is a link between undergraduate performance and the type of difficulties of these students on academic probation in graduate school. Another concern was would there be any impact on applications from minority students? Along with the fact that they are the lowest with respect to the minimum, they also looked at the percentage of minority students at those institutions, and none of those had lower minority representation in graduate school than the University of Kentucky. In fact, some had considerably higher minority representation. With respect to the statistics here, as it applies to minority students, speaking for applicants to doctoral programs, 6.4 percent of non-minority applicants had an undergraduate grade point average below 2.75 and 8.1 percent of minority applicants did, so it is really

negligible difference. For the master's programs, the difference is greater but is compensated for in the fact that the proposal, as well as the way that the rules are enforced now, allow for exceptions to be made upon the recommendation of the Director of Graduate Studies. Currently, for students below 2.5, DGS's recommend admission for about half of those students. He anticipates that something like that would happen with 2.75 and lower change. It would cause programs to pay particularly close attention to reasons why an exception should be made.

Bill Freehling (History) moved that the 2.75 grade point average be changed to a 3.0 grade point average. The amendment was seconded.

The amendment failed in a voice vote.

Susan Mains (Student - Graduate School) stated that she would like to propose an amendment that would delete the section that says submit scores on the analytical section of the Graduate Record Examination (GRE) and leave it the way it was. The amendment was seconded.

The amendment failed in a voice vote

The proposal passed in a voice vote.

ACTION ITEM 6 - For Discussion and Action: Criteria for Privilege and Tenure; For Information Only: Final Report, Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Title Series. (See Attachment 6.)

The Chair recognized Vice-Chair Lee Meyer for introduction of the item. Professor Meyer said that the proposal came from the Senate Council. They are revisiting the issue for criteria for Privilege and Tenure. Last time a decision was made to put off the final decision until there was a final report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Title Series, and the Senate Council responded to that. The Senate Council is still working on that issue. You have an informational copy of that with you. At its last meeting, the Senate Council passed the first two parts of that, two general recommendations. One was to maintain present categories of faculty title series and the second part is to split those into two groups--one of tenure track faculty and the other one is contractual faculty lines. The Senate Council feels that there is compatibility between moving forward on the privilege and tenure proposal and whatever is done here will not come in conflict with what they do regarding faculty title series.

Nolen Embry (Lexington Community College) said that he would like to amend the proposal. He would like for Lexington Community College faculty to be excluded from the proposal until there is an opportunity through the transition process to see how they will be affected and how they will respond.

The motion for the amendment was seconded.

The amendment passed in a unanimous voice vote.

Bill Freehling proposed an amendment to strike the word "regional" and only leave "national" in the proposal.

The proposal for the amendment was seconded.

The amendment was defeated in a show of hands.

The proposal passed in a voice vote.

Chairperson Moore recognized Professor Lee Edgerton for the annual Ombud Report.

Professor Edgerton made the following remarks:

Report of the Academic Ombud for 1997-98
Oct. 14, 1998
Lee A. Edgerton

Let me begin by acknowledging the support and encouragement which I have been privileged to receive this past year as well as during the prior period in the Ombud office. I remain impressed by the civil and collegial nature with which most grievances are addressed and even more by the genuine effort of most parties to arrive at what they consider a fair and just resolution. Those of you who have assisted the office by providing information are numerous. The hour of the day makes it inappropriate to attempt to name all of you. The limitations of my memory cells make it impossible, but I will acknowledge a representative few and hope the rest of you will vicariously assimilate my thanks.

Many in the Registrar's office provided valuable information and clarification. The Senate chairs, represented today by Roy have provided frequent and valuable advice and I know that all of them join me in acknowledging that much of that comes via the labor and effort of Cindy Todd, whose patience and cheerful demeanor is seemingly boundless. The

Ombud office has, from my perspective, had excellent relationships with the many Dean's offices and I'd like to thank the deans and their representatives, who epitomize the commitment of the colleges to balance the desire to facilitate student progress through the maze of institutional obstacles with the desire for consistency of rules and support of rigorous academic programs.

It is inappropriate to name specific faculty or students with whom I have interacted, but your patience, dedication to the process, and shared insights have made my task a meaningful experience. Finally, many of us interface with the office through the person of Michelle Sohner. Her compassion for and patience with those of us who arrive at the office in a flustered and frustrated condition is often key to obtaining resolution. On behalf of the institution, I thank you for that Michelle and for your tactful tutelage of this Ombud I thank you personally.

The complete statistical report showing numbers of cases by college etc. is included with the written record, but for now I'll briefly summarize by looking at two tables. The penultimate table (Four Year Comparisons) shows the number of cases handled and the number of contacts with the office. The latter are often simple inquiries regarding rules and policies. A case represents an issue for which a file was prepared and some further consultation with students or faculty was made. While there appear to be fewer single contacts there appears to be a slight drift upwards of more cases. The last table shows the data over this four-year period by cases in four categories. Of the 275 cases this past year, 238 fell into the four categories we call the most frequent complaints. I do not discern a pattern of change over the past four years, with the possible exception that the number of cases related to progress and promotion has increased each year during the period covered.

During the past two years, we've been fortunate to work with Mr. Tyler Harrison. Tyler is completing a dissertation with the University of Arizona in the field of Communications. He has used interviews with students coming to our office to assess the benefits of an intermediary, such as the Ombud, in a dispute. Only students who voluntarily agreed to be interviewed participated, but few objected so I think his observations are of interest to us as we consider the Ombud's function. I would like to point out four preliminary observations of the function of the office shared with me by Tyler Harrison.

1. During my term as Ombud, my personal perspective of a successful resolution was one in which a reconciliation of instructor and student was achieved so that the future academic and intellectual interactions would not be clouded by the present disagreement. Tyler's conclusion is that, "in the aftermath of a dispute, if avoidance is a feasible option it will be used". He believes that reconciliation requires face-to-face mediation, something which is used infrequently in the Ombud office. Although we frequently encourage students to meet with instructors after a case has been resolved, it is my impression, consistent with Tyler's observation, that both as students and as instructors, we choose avoidance when possible. This finding was frustrating to me personally, but is balanced in part by Tyler's observation that most students give the Ombud high marks on satisfaction and fairness. Having "someone of higher status" listen and treat their concerns as legitimate "seems to restore a sense of faith about the University overall". Emphasis here was on the act of listening, and that seems to be a major strength of the office.

2. The perception of the Ombud as "someone of higher status" is a two-edged sword. Tyler believes that power is a key factor in whether or not students pursue a grievance. Except when they believe they have nothing left to lose, most students will not pursue a grievance against faculty they may have in the future. Associated with this is Tyler's observation that students who came to the Ombud with the perception that the Ombud is all powerful were more likely to be disappointed. My perception is that the office will work more efficiently for all of us if we make it clear to both faculty and students that while the Ombud is charged with consideration of grievances, the authority to direct changes rests largely with the appeals board, a body of both faculty and students.

3. Tyler reported that over 50% of the students believed they got some resolution in their favor, although they rarely got everything they wanted, and a few found retrospectively, that what they wanted and got was not in their long term best interest. Tyler estimated that about 60% of the students believed the office was unbiased with the remaining 40% split between those who viewed the Ombud as having an institutional bias and those who viewed the Ombud as having a student bias. In this regard, I would like to point out that I have promoted the office as supporting the 'institution' with the perspective that both students and faculty are represented in the institution and that we all strive to make it work according to the rules and policies established. I believe, however, that students responding to Tyler interpreted 'institution' as representing faculty.

4. Time was an important issue for students whom Tyler interviewed, and my perception is that it is equally important for faculty. The period of time allowed to file a grievance (one year) and other technical problems often significantly extend the time for resolution to the frustration of one or more parties. Never-the-less, time, in some cases, allowed a mellowing of perspectives which was beneficial to one and sometimes all parties in the grievance.

In concluding my presentation, I would like to briefly comment about the issue of plagiarism. It seems to me that we have seen more cases of plagiarism in the office this past year and it is my perspective that all of us need to give this issue some consideration. Some of the cases reflected technical issues of helping students learn to correctly cite materials. My personal perspective is that it is not our intent to penalize such students with formal charges. Despite significant efforts in some departments to clarify the rules, students often remain confused because we do not apply the rules consistently across departments or even within given disciplines. In other instances, based upon information shared with me by instructors, I think we have avoided charges in more blatant cases of plagiarism for reasons of convenience. To the extent that we can develop a more consistent approach we will avoid frustration and confusion among both faculty and students. Until we achieve that, I would encourage us all to continue, as best we can, to clarify our expectations in our individual courses.

That completes the body of my report and begging the Senate's indulgence, I would like to go out on a poetic note, as follows.

The Ombud's Wish

"The time has come", the Ombud said I
to summarize this year's academic trials,
to relate the sum and substance of
materials gathered within the files.

Then the Ombud paused, he thought a spell,
then peered out carefully at his peers
to see if any expression revealed out there
would validate the basis for his fears.

He looked at each face pensively,
Did any contain a set of castigating eyes,
a countenance suggesting the person might think
the Ombud just might plagiarize.

Would any think his opening line
was less than the creative Ombud's norm,
and instead see verbage pilfered from
Carroll's pinnepedal and precedential form.

So he added a footnote, referenced by
a superscript Tom Blues said might mitigate
the professorial penchant of those
who the similarity of terms would berate.

Yet academic integrity is not simply an issue
of writers avoiding embarrassing fate.
True integrity requires strong connections;
requires the community to firmly interrelate.

On this the animal scientist in him pondered.
In our vernacular, the Ombud ruminated awhile
on whether we, like cattle, can only bull-y or cow-er
or do we possess potential to truly reconcile?

This in mind, he wished for the institution
that when this academic year is through
we'll all be one year wiser and more skilled
at understanding each other's point of view.

May we, as students, see that most faculty
are not really seeking students whom they may bludgeon
may we recognize the deeply caring committed teacher
who so often resides in the outward curmudgeon.

And may we as faculty not require diverse students
to fashion themselves to our own comfortable mold
but strive to engage with them in the struggles
from which mutual and enhanced understanding unfold.

1Readers may recognize the allusion, in the opening line, to the walrus's comment ("The time has come", the walrus said) found in Lewis Carroll's *Through the Looking Glass*. See: Carroll, Lewis, 1871. In *The annotated Alice: Alice's Adventures in Wonderland & Through the Looking Glass* by Lewis Carroll; illustrated by John Tenniel; with an introduction and notes

by Martin Gardner. New York: C. N. Potter, <1960>
 STATISTICAL REPORT
 1997/1998 -- Lee A. Edgerton

Number of Single Contacts (Telephone Calls/Referrals) 1,402

Number of Cases Handled
 275

NATURE OF COMPLAINTS

Academic Offenses	18
Attendance	7
Discrimination	5
Exams	18
Grades	110
Instruction	37
Personal Problems	1
Progress/Promotion	73
University Policy	6
Total	275

COLLEGE WHERE COMPLAINT ORIGINATED

Agriculture	9
Allied Health	9
Architecture	3
Arts and Sciences	130
Business and Economics	30
Communications	8
Dentistry	2
Education	21
Engineering	19
Fine Arts	13
Human Environmental Sciences	10
Law	2
Medicine	3
Nursing	6
Pharmacy	2
Social Work	4
Non-Applicable	4
Total	275

STUDENT'S COLLEGE

Agriculture	9
Allied Health	10
Architecture	3
Arts and Sciences	126
Business and Economics	32
Communications	8
Dentistry	2
Education	21
Engineering	19
Fine Arts	14
Human Environmental Sciences	10
Law	2
Medicine	3
Nursing	6
Pharmacy	2
Social Work	4
Non-Applicable	4
Total	275

CLASSIFICATION OF THE STUDENT

First Year	43
Sophomore	55
Junior	59
Senior	64
Graduate	49
Non-degree	3
Non-applicable	2
Total	275

CASES BY MONTH

July	18
August	19
September	17
October	25
November	16
December	27
January	36
February	22
March	23
April	21
May	40
June	11

Total 275
FOUR YEAR COMPARISONS

	Cases Handled	Single Contacts
1997-98	275	1,402
1996-97	269	1,489
1995-96	266	1,523
1994-95	261	1,601

MOST FREQUENT COMPLAINTS

1997-98	1996-97		
Grades	110	Grades	92
Progress/Promotion		Progress/Promotion	68
Instruction	37	Instruction	44
Academic Offenses		Academic Offenses	21

1995-96	1994-95		
Grades	111	Grades	99
Progress/Promotion		Progress/Promotion	55
Instruction	31	Instruction	41
Academic Offenses		Academic Offenses	24

Professor Edgerton was given a round of applause.

ACTION ITEM 7 - Proposal to create a School of Public Health at the University of Kentucky Chandler Medical Center in the College of Medicine. (See Attachment 7.)

The Chair recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of the item. Professor Meyer said this proposal was discussed extensively by the Senate Council and comes to the Senate without recommendation. That does not mean disapproval but means that the Senate did not come to a consensus and felt that a full discussion before the Senate was appropriate.

Jim Applegate (Communications and Information Studies) moved to approve the proposal. The motion was seconded.

The proposal to create a School of Public Health at the University of Kentucky Chandler Medical Center in the College of Medicine passed in a unanimous voice vote.

ACTION ITEM 8 - Proposal to require undergraduates to declare a major within the first 60 hours of matriculation at the University of Kentucky. (See Attachment 8.)

The Chair recognized Vice-Chair Meyer for introduction of the item. Professor Meyer introduced the item and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

Douglas Michael (Law) said that he would like to make a motion to send the proposal back to committee. He had no problems with the proposal on the merits. As Chair of the Rules Committee he sees at least a dozen or so questions that they will have. There was a second to the motion.

Louis Swift (Dean - Undergraduate Studies) said that he appreciated the questions that were raised. Could the proposal be approved and the details then worked out?

The motion to send back to committee failed in a voice vote.

The proposal passed in a unanimous voice vote.

ACTION ITEM 9 - Proposal to adopt the policy on Academic Facilities (Utilization of Classroom Space) for the Lexington Campus. (See Attachment 9.)

The Chair recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of the item.

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

The proposal passed in a voice vote.

ACTION ITEM 10 - Proposal to amend University Senate Rules, Section I - 1.2.4.2 and ff. Full text of minutes of the University Senate. (See Attachment 10.)

Chairperson Moore recognized Professor Meyer for introduction of the item.

Professor Meyer stated that the proposal that came from the Senate Council is to change the keeping of the full minutes so that there is no full transcribing of the tapes. The tapes would still be available as an

archive if needed. The proposal has the approval of the Senate Council.

Don Witt (University Registrar) said that the Registrar's Office remained neutral. It is our responsibility to provide the minutes. Since 1992 there have only been about 5 occasions where someone has asked to see the full-transcribed minutes. It seems a lot of effort for little usage. We want to provide the service but at the same time it is being used little. We could provide an index with the tape so that people would not have to listen to an entire tape.

The question was called and seconded. The motion to call the question passed in a show of hands.

The proposal passed in a voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Donald Witt
Secretary, University Senate

ATTACHMENT 1

AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting , Monday October 12, 1998. Proposal to amend University Senate Rules, Section VI - 6.1.3

Proposal: [add underlined word]

6.1.3 ACADEMIC EVALUATION (US: 12/5/83)

A Students have the right to receive grades based only upon fair and just evaluation of their performance in a course as measured by the standards announced by their instructor(s) at the first or second class meeting.

B Students have the right to receive a fair and just academic evaluation of their performance in a program. In addition to the student's overall academic record, evaluation may include the assessment of such activities as research and/or laboratory performance, qualifying examinations, professional board examinations, studio work or performance activities, behavior in professional situations, or interviews to determine continuation in a program. The program faculty and/or relevant administrative officer must inform the student as to which activities will be included in the academic assessment no later than the beginning of the activity to be evaluated.

C Evaluations determined by anything other than a good faith judgment based on explicit statements of the above standards are improper. Among irrelevant considerations are race, color, religion, sex, national origin, sexual orientation, age, disability, marital status, and political affiliations, or any activities outside the classroom that are unrelated to the course work or program requirements. (US: 2/11/85)

Background and Rationale:

The omission of disability from 6.1.3C is apparently inadvertent. The effect of the omission is negligible because the Academic Ombud has the authority under the Board of Trustees policy to deal with discrimination complaints by students with disabilities. This revision would simply bring the rule in line with actual practice.

Implementation: Immediate

US Agenda Item: USR: VI-6.1.3, Academic Evaluation

ATTACHMENT 2

AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, 12 October 1998 at 3:00 PM. Amendments to University Senate Rules, Section I - 1.2.2 and following. Proposal to convey voting rights in the University Senate to the President of SGA and proposal to change ex officio membership on the Senate. If approved, the proposals will be forwarded to the Administration for appropriate modifications in the Governing Regulations. The final proposal is to convey voting rights on the Senate Council to the President of SGA and to clarify voting status of the faculty members of the Board of Trustees on the Senate Council.

Proposals: (delete materials in brackets; add underlined materials)

1.2.2 COMPOSITION

As specified in the Governing Regulations, Part IV, the University Senate is composed of both elected and ex officio membership. The elected membership shall number [113] 114, of which 94 members shall represent the faculty, [18] 19 shall represent the student body, and one shall represent the emeriti faculty. (US:10/12/81 and BofT:4/6/82; US: 3/20/89 and BoT:

8/22/89; US: 3/9/98 and BoT: 4/7/98)

1.2.2.2 Elected Student Membership The [18] 19 elected student membership shall consist of the President of the Student Government Association and [represent the members] representatives of the full-time student body in the various colleges including Lexington Community College and the Graduate School of the University System. The colleges and the Graduate School each shall have one student representative. Students with no declared major shall be represented through the College of Arts and Sciences. (US:10/12/81 and BoT:4/6/82; US: 3/9/98 & BoT: 4/7/98)

A Eligibility: Each elected [student member] college representative shall be a junior, senior, or graduate or professional student, or in the case of LCC, sophomore standing, and shall not be on either academic or disciplinary probation.

1.2.2.4 Ex Officio Membership: Voting The ex officio voting members shall number 13 or 12 [14]. In academic years beginning with an even number (e.g., 1984-1985, 1986-1987), this group shall be composed of the following: Chancellor for the Medical Center, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, Director of Libraries, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, [Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for the Community College System] Director of Teaching and Learning Center, and Deans of the Colleges of Allied Health Professions, Architecture, Communications and Information Studies, Dentistry, Education, Engineering, Law, and Social Work. In academic years beginning with an odd number, the ex officio voting members shall be the following: Chancellor for the Lexington Campus, [Chancellor for the Community College System] President of the Lexington Community College, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for the Medical Center, the Dean of the Graduate School, [the President of the Student Government Association,] and the Deans of the Colleges of Agriculture, Arts and Sciences, Business and Economics, Fine Arts, Human Environmental Sciences, [Library and Information Science,] Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy. (US:10/12/81 and BoT:4/6/82; US: 11/10/86; US:4/13/87 and BoT:9/15/87)

1.3.1.2 Composition The Senate Council shall be composed as follows: the elected membership shall include nine (9) members chosen by and from the faculty membership of the University Senate, The President of the Student Government Association, and two (2) members elected by and from the newly elected student membership of the University Senate; the [student and] faculty members of the Board of Trustees, who, if they are not elected members of the Senate Council, and the immediate past chair of the Senate Council shall be ex officio non-voting members. Six elected members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. (US:1 0/1 0/77)

B Elected Student Membership

1. Terms--The two [E]lected student members of the Council and the President of the Student Government Association shall serve terms of one (1) year commencing July 1 following their election and continuing until their successors are elected and qualify.

2. Election--The two (2) elected student members of the Council shall be chosen annually in the second semester of the academic year. As soon as possible after the election of the student members of the Senate during the second semester, the President of the Student Government Association shall assemble these persons to elect the student members of the Senate Council by majority vote.

Rationale:

Currently, the SGA President serves as an ex-officio member of both the Senate and the Senate Council. In the Senate, he/she is grouped with several administrators whose voting rights alternate each year, voting only in academic years which begin with an odd number. While this arrangement makes sense in the case of administrators who typically serve in their respective capacities for a number of years, it make little sense in the case of the SGA President who is elected for a one-year term.

Voting privilege should be extended to the SGA President in the Senate and on the Senate Council. The SGA President is the only member in the Senate and the Senate Council that is elected by and represents all students. Unlike the other student representatives who have a responsibility to their particular colleges, the SGA President must speak on behalf of all 30,000 students. The responsibilities of the SGA President, the limited term of the office, and the value of student input into university decisions merits a change in policy.

The proposal to add the Director of the Teaching and Learning Center was suggested because this is an administrative position comparable to the Director of Libraries, who serves ex officio. The other changes in the ex officio membership are editorial.

Note: If approved, recommendations I - 1.2.2, 1.2.2.2 and 1.2.2.4 will be forwarded to the Administration for inclusion in the Governing Regulations.

Recommendations I - 1.3.1.2 and B. under that section will be codified into the Senate Rules.

Implementation Date: Upon approval
US Agenda: Voting Rights SGAPres 10.12.98

ATTACHMENT 3

AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, October 12, 1998. Proposal to change certain Election Rules, Section 1, University Senate Rules.

Background:

One of the tasks of the Rules & Elections committee is to supervise the election of members of the University Senate and Senate Council as well as Faculty Trustees. Based on our experience over the past few years, we recommend the following changes in the Senate Rules in the following five areas. The Senate Council concurs.

1. Nomination for Faculty Trustee

Senate Rule 1.5.2 requires a cumbersome "nominating" process. Each eligible faculty member may nominate up to two nominees, and these nominations are to be rank-ordered, with votes weighted accordingly, and the six nominees with the highest vote totals are placed on a ballot. Normally, between 20 and 50 individuals are nominated. The Committee believes that this nominating process serves very little purpose, especially when compared with the four to six person-hours needed to record and score the votes from the several hundred faculty who vote each year. The following proposal would place everyone nominated on a first election ballot, without biographical sketches. The five individuals receiving the most votes would be placed on a second ballot, which would be accompanied with biographical sketches, and the remainder of the election would proceed according to current rules.

Proposal: The fourth and fifth paragraphs of Rule 1.5.2 should be modified as follows (existing language unchanged is in ordinary type, deletions are struck and additions are underlined).

1.5.2 Elections shall be by secret ballot and shall be conducted by the Secretary of the University Senate from rosters prepared and certified as specified above. The Secretary shall submit to the eligible voters a complete list of members eligible for election together with a nominating ballot on which a member shall nominate his first and second choice may nominate one or two eligible members. Nominations may be submitted to the Secretary of the University Senate in writing or by fax, or e-mail, and need contain only the name(s) of the nominee(s) and the nominator. All candidates so nominated shall be placed on a first election ballot, on which each member shall vote for one candidate. Ballots not indicating first and second choices shall be invalid. From those nominated (weighting first choices as 2 and second choices as 1) the Secretary of the Senate shall place six (6) persons receiving the highest number of votes on the elections ballot. The five candidates receiving the highest number of votes will be placed on a second election ballot. A short biographical sketch of each candidate shall accompany the second election ballot. If no person receives a majority vote on the first second ballot, the Secretary of the Senate shall place on a second third ballot the names of the three individuals who received the highest number of votes on the first second ballot. In the event of a tie for fifth place on the first ballot or a tie for third place on the first second ballot, the names of all persons receiving the same number of votes for third that place shall be placed on the subsequent ballot.

On the second third ballot, [continue with remainder of fifth paragraph unchanged].

2. Nominations

Rule 1.5.2 (just discussed) and Rule 1.2.2.1(B), governing election of members of the Senate, provide for nominations to be received by the Secretary of the Senate. Rule 1.2.2.1(B) specifies that such nominations shall be "by letter," and Rule 1.5.2 has no limitation. In the past, the Secretary has accepted nominations by fax e-mail, and telephone. We believe that all these methods are acceptable, so long as the eligibility of the nominator is confirmed by the Secretary. In addition, the nomination "letters" have sometimes been quite lengthy. Since no qualifications other than eligibility are relevant at this stage, we believe the rules should state that no information other than the name of the person being nominated is necessary.

Proposal: This modification is made already to proposed Rule 1.5.2 above. Rule 1.2.2.1(B) should be modified by striking from the second sentence of the second paragraph the words "by a letter" and inserting the following new sentence immediately thereafter:

1.2.2.1 B Nominations may be submitted to the Secretary of the University Senate in writing or by fax, or e-mail, and need contain only the name of the nominee and the nominator.

3. Insufficient Nominations

Despite the language in Rule 1.2.2.1 (B) requiring there to be twice as many candidates as positions to be filled in Senate elections, the Secretary reports that it is often the case that there are insufficient nominees, and the Rule's requirement that the Dean or department chair follow a procedure to generate sufficient nominees sometimes does not produce the required number of nominees. The Committee believes that, so long as these procedures are followed, the election should be held even if there are not twice as many nominees as positions to be filled.

Proposal: The first sentence of the third paragraph of Rule 1.2.2.1(B), which reads "The ballot for the election of senators shall contain at least twice as many names as there are persons to be elected" should be deleted.

4. Inaccurate Lists

Under Rule 1.2.2.1(A), lists of individuals eligible for election to the Senate are provided to the Secretary by the "chief administrative officer of each specified academic unit." The Committee believes that the Registrar may rely upon these lists as valid, and if anyone should question the validity of these lists, the matter should be taken up directly with the Committee. Existing Rule 1.2.2.1(A) already says that, but still individuals have in the past raised eligibility issues with the Secretary. The Committee believes the rule should be clarified.

Proposal: Rule 1.2.2.1(A) should be modified as follows (existing language unchanged is in ordinary type, deletions are struck and additions are underlined):

1.2.2.1(A) Eligibility: At the time of the election to the Senate, the chief administrative officer of each specified academic unit shall be responsible for submitting a list of eligible faculty to the Secretary of the Senate for certification and determination of the number to be elected. The Secretary shall rely on the lists so provided, and in case of any dispute, Tthe Rules Committee shall be responsible for certification of eligibility. Eligibility shall be determined as of the time of conduction of the election.

5. Tie Votes

Rule 1.5.2 contains a tie-breaking procedure for election of faculty trustees, but there is no mention of ties in Rule 1.2.2.1 governing election of Senators. With some departments being very small, ties do happen regularly. The Committee believes that an election that results in a tie should be repeated. Eligible voters may change their minds, and individuals who declined to vote may vote the second time. However, the Committee believes this process should not go on further; if a tie results a second time, the winner(s) should be determined randomly.

Proposal: Rule 1.2.2 1(B) should be modified by the addition of a fourth paragraph as follows:

1.2.2.1(B) If any election should result in a tie vote affecting the outcome of the election, the election will be repeated with respect to the candidates with tied votes. If a tie results a second time, the winner will be chosen by coin-toss or similar random process.

Implementation Date: Upon approval.

USAgenda Item: Election Rules 10.12.98

ATTACHMENT 4

AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, 12 October 1998 at 3:00 PM. Proposal to recommend that Part 11 of the Lexington Community College (LCC) Code of Student Conduct be approved to remain in force until the University Senate acts to change those.

Proposal:

The Lexington Community College (LCC) transition subcommittee recommends that Part II of the LCC Code of Student Conduct "Selected Rules of the University of Kentucky Community College Senate Governing Academic Relationships" be approved to remain in force until any changes to those rules be recommended to the Senate.

Background and Rationale:

As it stands, students rights as well as the disposition of cases affecting those rights and academic offenses as well as their disposition are

different at LCC than at UK. Until we investigate those differences and their rationales, it seems cogent to leave the standing LCC rules in place.

The proposal comes from the LCC transition team and has Senate Council approval.

Implementation: Immediate

US Agenda Item: Part II of the LCC Code: 10.12.98

ATTACHMENT 5

AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, 12 October 1998 at 3:00 PM.
Proposed changes to University Senate Rules, Section IV -4.2.5, Graduate School Admissions

Proposal:

Note that italicized words indicate additions and square bracketed words mark deletions.

4.2.5 GRADUATE SCHOOL [A student who is a graduate of a fully accredited institution of higher learning and has a grade point average of 2.5 on a basis of 4.0 may apply for admission to the Graduate School.] Students seeking admission to the University of Kentucky Graduate School must hold a baccalaureate degree from a fully accredited institution of higher learning. All applicants for admission to a graduate degree program must have an undergraduate grade point standing of at least 2.75, and a graduate grade point standing (if applicable) of at least 3.0 on a basis of 4.0. Furthermore, all applicants must submit scores on the verbal, quantitative, and analytical portions of the aptitude section of the Graduate Record Examination (GRE). This rule may be waived in individual cases upon recommendation of the Director of Graduate Studies in an individual department or program. However, in cases where GRE waivers are granted, the GRE scores must be submitted before the end of the first semester of graduate study. The advanced portion of the GRE may be required by individual (departments or) programs. [if they so desire.] A student with a grade point average of less than 2.75 [2.5] or a graduate of a non-accredited institution may be admitted, or provisionally admitted, only after the [Graduate Record Examination] GRE and other evidence acceptable to the program [department] and the Dean of the Graduate School is submitted indicating that the student is capable of doing satisfactory graduate work. Individual [departments] programs may establish higher requirements.

Background: At the 9 February 1998 meeting of the University Senate, this proposal was considered and sent back for additional information. Attached find the response of the Dean of the Graduate School to the Senate's request. The Senate Council considered the information set forth in Nietzel's memo and recommends approval of the Admissions proposal.

Rationale: A periodic review of the Graduate School Admissions criteria compared to the benchmark institutions revealed that the standards at UK are low. The proposed changes will bring the admissions criteria at UK more in line with our benchmark institutions.

The proposed changes were recommended by the Graduate Council ad hoc Committee on Admissions Standards and have been approved by the Graduate Faculty, the Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards, and the Senate Council, and are recommended to the Senate for adoption.

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

Implementation Date: Fall Semester, 1999

Attachment

US Agenda Item: Graduate School Admissions, 10.12.98

Research and Graduate Studies
The Graduate School
Patterson Office Tower
Lexington, Kentucky 40506-0027
FAX: 606-323-1928

March 23, 1998

MEMO

To: Senate Council

From: Mike Nietzel, Dean
The Graduate School

Subject: Increase in UGPA Standard for Graduate School Admission

At a recent meeting of the University Senate, consideration was given to a recommendation that the minimum UGPA for admission to a University of Kentucky graduate program be raised from the current 2.5 to 2.75. This standard would not apply to post-baccalaureate students, and, as is the case now, it may be waived on the recommendation of a DGS.

The Senate wanted additional information about the proposal, which had previously received unanimous approval by the Graduate Faculty. Questions were also raised about the impact of the proposed change on admissions and certain categories of students.

I would like to respond to each of these topics and would request that the Council take this proposal back to the University Senate with a recommendation for approval as soon as possible.

I. Rationale

A. The basic rationale for raising admissions standards is, of course, to assure that the University is admitting students for graduate education who have a level of educational attainment that suggests they will succeed at advanced study. Fundamentally, this is the same rationale that directs selective admissions at the undergraduate level. In addition, by setting a higher UGPA minimum, the University signals its expectation that graduate students will perform with excellence. It does not seem unreasonable to require a minimum UGPA (2.75) that is actually below the graduate GPA (3.0) which mandates academic probation.

B. It was in this context that benchmark institutions and the University of Louisville were surveyed to determine their minimum UGPA for graduate school admission. No other school had a standard as low as the University of Kentucky. It is also important to point out that, in comparison to the University of Kentucky, these schools have as high or higher percentage of minority graduate students and female graduate students. It is simply not the case that setting higher academic standards is an obstacle to diversifying our graduate student enrollments.

C. The need for increasing the minimum UGPA admission standard has been endorsed by other groups who have studied graduate education on campus. For example, The Committee On Graduate Education Report, circulated August 20, 1996, by President Wethington, recommended that "While admissions standards should be determined by the various program areas, minimum standards for admission into graduate programs should be increased."

As a result of this recommendation, the Presidential Response to the Committee report directed the Dean of the Graduate School to "present a recommendation which addresses the issue of minimum standards to the Graduate Council for consideration during Fall 1996 semester." This recommendation, now before the Senate, was proposed by an Ad Hoc committee of Graduate Council members and was approved by both the Graduate Council and the Graduate Faculty.

D. In addition to local recommendations, Criteria for Accreditation, SACS states that "The institution must establish qualitative and quantitative requirements which result in the admission of students whose educational preparation evidences the potential for a high level of performance." In comparison to how our peer institutions have interpreted this guideline, it is appropriate to suggest that a minimum UGPA standard of 2.75 should be established at UK.

E. Finally, the proposed admissions criteria retains the flexibility of our current policy for admission to a graduate degree program. Namely, on recommendation of the Director of Graduate Studies, the Dean of the Graduate School may waive the minimum requirements or grant provisional admission.

II. Impact on Admissions

A variety of questions were raised about the impact of increasing the minimum UGPA from 2.5 to 2.75. Here are some answers.

A. Increasing the minimum UGPA likely will reduce the number of students placed on academic probation. Of the 61 graduate students placed on academic probation between 1/1/97 and 2/1/98, 56% had UGPAs less than 3.0, and the majority of these students had UGPAs less than 2.75. (By contrast, only 5% of students on probation had UGPAs of 3.5 or higher, even though they typically account for half of admitted students.) The degree to which low UGPAs are over-represented among students on probation is illustrated by the fact that only about 15% of all admitted students have UGPAs lower than 2.75.

Approximately 4% of admitted students have UGPAs less than 2.5, and 2% of students placed on probation had a UGPA less than 2.5. This initially

surprising result might be explained by the fact that the current minimum of 2.5 requires such students to be screened particularly closely for other indications of academic potential before they are admitted. It is possible that a similar effect would occur with students in the 2.5 -2.75 range, given a new standard that requires a 2.75 minimum.

B. For Fall, 1996 applicants for doctoral programs, only 6.4% of nonminority applications were completed by students in the 2.5 - 2.75 range; 8.1% of minority applications were completed by students in this range. 42% of the nonminority applicants in this range were offered admission-, 67% of minority applicants in this range were offered admission.

For Fall, 1996 applicants for doctoral degrees, 3.5% of nonminority applications were completed by students with a UGPA less than 2.5; 19% of these applicants were admitted. 17.5% of minority applications were completed by students with less than a 2.5 UGPA average, and 38% of these students were offered admission.

C. Considering the 2.5 - 2.75 range for Masters degrees applicants, 12% of nonminority and 20% of minority applications were completed by students in this range. The admission rate for nonminority applicants in this category was 51 %; for minority applicants it was 76%.

For 1996 applicants for Masters degrees, 5.2 % of nonminority and 16.8% of minority applications were completed by students with less than a 2.5 UGPA; The admission rate for nonminority applicants in this category was 50%; for minority students it was 52.4%.

One obvious implication of the above data is that numerous exceptions are made to the required minimum UGPA, on recommendation from the DGS. However, even with these exceptions, a lower percentage of students with UGPAs below 2.5 are admitted compared to students in the 2.5 to 2.75 range.

ATTACHMENT 6

AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, 12 October 1998 at 3:00 p.m. W.T. Young Auditorium, first floor. For Discussion and Action: Criteria for Privilege and Tenure; For Information only: Final Report, Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Title Series

At its last meeting for the 1997-1998 academic year on April 13, 1998, the University Senate discussed and debated the proposed changes to AR II-1.0-1 regarding Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure. At that time, the Senate decided to postpone voting on the recommendations until a final report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Title Series was available for review. The consensus was that the recommendations in that report might affect the recommendations of the Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Report. Copies of both are attached.

The Senate Council has carefully reviewed both reports and held discussions with one of the co-chairs of the Ad Hoc committee on Faculty Title Series. The Council believes the reports are completely complementary and do not contradict one another. The Council voted unanimously to recommend the P&T Report be adopted. Recommendations from the Faculty Title Series Report will be considered by the Senate later in the year.

Note: If approved, the Privilege and Tenure Report will be forwarded to the Administration for inclusion in the Administrative Regulations

US Agenda: CoverLetter: P&T and STS, 10.12.98

Office of the Chair
10 Administration Building
Lexington, Kentucky 40506-0032
Office: (606) 257-5871 or (606) 257-5872
FAX: (606) 323-1062

25 September 1998

MEMORANDUM

TO Members, University Senate

FROM University Senate Council

RE AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, 12 October 1998 at 3:00 PM. Criteria for Privilege and Tenure

CURRENT: From the Current Administrative Regulations
AR II-1.0-1

V. Criteria of Evaluation for Appointment and Promotion in the Regular Title Series

PROPOSED: (a new section A is added)

V. Criteria of Evaluation for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

A. Introduction

In order to:

1. assure teaching, research and other creative activity, and service are of high quality;
2. maintain a diverse university faculty
3. support the faculty in preparing students to participate effectively in a democratic and pluralistic society;
4. foster rigorous professional standards; and
5. maintain a high quality of shared academic governance;

the University of Kentucky adheres to the following general system for determining academic appointment, tenure, and rank.

The University of Kentucky is distinguished as the state's flagship institution for research, teaching and service. The research scholarship of a dedicated and creative faculty enhances the teaching and service missions of this land grant university.

The balance of emphasis between [the various forms of] scholarship and other assigned activities varies from one faculty position to another. Forms of scholarship appropriate to each unit's specific mission within the University should be clearly written as guidelines by the unit's faculty, taking into consideration the full range of UK academic and civic mandates.

In the area of research and/or other creative activity, University faculty have a responsibility for the creation of knowledge. Common to all endeavors is the expectation that the work is original, of high quality, and validated by a rigorous peer review process. Communication of the work's significance to appropriate audiences is an integral part of the University's mission. The documented quality of research and/or creative scholarship shall be an integral component of the promotion and tenure evaluation process as appropriate given the faculty member's assignment.

Superior teaching scholarship shall be recognized as an integral component of the evaluation for promotion and tenure as appropriate given the faculty member's assignment. Contributions to students learning inside and outside the classroom that contribute to a learning environment (e.g., service on committees enhancing instructional practice, as an advisor) should be recognized in the evaluation process. Objective evidence of the quality of teaching scholarship shall be included in the dossier.

Finally, service and outreach to the University, local, state, national and international communities also must be recognized in evaluations of candidates for promotion and tenure appropriate to the nature of their assignment. Faculty members are expected to engage in service related to their professional role as a scholar for the benefit of the broader community. Documented high quality scholarship related to service will be recognized as positive evidence for promotion and tenure.

Objective and systematic appraisal of faculty candidates for initial and continued reappointment, promotion in academic rank, and granting of tenure is essential. The land grant mission and guidelines listed below provide common criteria applicable to all University of Kentucky faculty in the professorial rank.

CURRENT:

A. Areas of Activity

Four areas of activity are important in the evaluation of faculty for appointment and promotion in the regular title series: (1) teaching, including both formal classroom activities and informal influence on students' growth; (2) research and other creative productivity; (3) professional status and activity; and (4) University and public service.

Since all appointments and promotions shall be made on the basis of merit, the following detailed statements regarding each of these areas will serve as a guide to review committees evaluating the accomplishments of a faculty member.

PROPOSED: (section A becomes B and is changed)

B. Areas of Activity

Participation in any or all of these scholastic areas is appropriate in the evaluation of faculty at all ranks: (1) research and/or other creative activity; (2) teaching, advising and other instructional activities; (3)

professional, University and public service.

Each of these areas is essential to the successful mission of a land grant university. These criteria apply to all tenure track faculty, regardless of appointment. However, t[The level of a faculty member's participation should be commensurate with his/her specified allocation of distribution of effort for each area. Excellence in research and creative scholarship, teaching, advising and other instructional activities, and in professional, University and community service should be rewarded. It is critical that all scholarly activities be well documented and recognized as positive evidence for promotion and tenure.

CURRENT:

2. Research and Other Creative Activity

The individual under consideration must show evidence of continuing research or creative activity in the particular field of assignment. Normally, publication in the form considered appropriate for the field will constitute this evidence. Evaluation of the quality of such publication is imperative, and specialists in the field from both inside and outside the University should be called upon to attest to the value of the individual's research. Since certain types of research or creative work require a longer period of development before publication than do others, evaluation also should be made of work in progress, particularly in cases where retention is involved. It should be understood that in certain activities, "publication" as used in this document may be achieved in modes different from those of the sciences and the book-based disciplines.

PROPOSED: (this becomes section 1 and is changed)

1. Research and Other Creative Activity

Faculty members should document their scholarship related to research and/or creative endeavors. Common to all endeavors is that the work is original, of high quality, and validated by rigorous peer review. Moreover, communication of the work's significance to the scholarly community and to the public at large is a component of the mission of a land grant university and, therefore, its evaluation is an integral part of the promotion and tenure process.

Evidence of recognition of research and/or creative activity and its long-lasting merit and worth is valued. The impact of a person's research or creative work will be assessed by the intellectual and creative traditions of his/her discipline, as stated by unit guidelines.

In addition to the more traditional methods of presentation, examples of creative scholarship include public performances and exhibitions, audio and visual recordings, applications of technical innovations, and both exterior and interior contributions to the built environment. This work must be evaluated for originality, significance, quality, and must be communicated to others. For example, the value of creative works can be determined through adjudicated productions using outside reviewers and/or peer review, publication of critical reviews of performances or exhibitions, and invited juried shows or exhibitions.

CURRENT:

1. Teaching and Student Relations

Markedly superior teaching and advising are distinct values and should be recognized in appointment or promotion. Recognition also should be given to a faculty member's contribution to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees or as an advisor to student organizations.

Objective evidence of the quality of teaching shall be included in the final dossier. Such evidence should include: (a) reports by colleagues qualified in the field; (b) evaluations by students and, if available, graduates; and (c) when appropriate, the subsequent accomplishments of graduates whose major work has been supervised by the individual under consideration.

Colleges shall evaluate the quality as well as the quantity of academic advising done by each faculty member. The results of this evaluation shall be considered in the annual performance review and in the decisions concerning retention and/or promotion of each faculty member.

PROPOSED: (this becomes section 2 -after research- and is changed)

2. Teaching, Advising and Other Instructional Activities

Teaching involves creating a learning environment, as well as transmitting, transforming and extending knowledge. Excellence in teaching and advising are distinct values that are recognized in appointment and promotion.

Themes for the teaching mission are to encourage students to:

- o maximize use of their intellect;
- o practice problem-solving;
- o demonstrate the ability to think creatively; and
- o foster inquiry, imagination, initiative and integrity.
- o foster students' accomplishment of academic and career goals
- o create an inclusive learning community in which students understand and value diversity of perspectives

A faculty member's contributions may be demonstrated in a diversity of ways. For faculty whose assignment includes teaching, evidence of successful fulfillment of these duties is critical for appointment and promotion. Teaching (and advising activities, where applicable) must be documented through the teaching portfolio. Educational activities extend far beyond the classroom, and the University of Kentucky acknowledges the importance of educating citizens of Kentucky, both on and off campus, as part of its land grant mission. Appropriate methods of documenting outreach activities and scholarly contributions to the state will be elaborated in unit guidelines. Evaluation of the quality of instruction and advising shall include careful consideration of all materials in the Teaching Portfolio documenting the multiple forms of teaching scholarship.

CURRENT:

3. Professional Status and Activity

The demonstration that the abilities of the individual under consideration are recognized outside the University is important in evaluation, but such recognition must be weighted according to rank. Obviously, a candidate for the lowest rank will not be likely to have achieved wide recognition. There are many ways in which extramural recognition may be evidenced, and those entrusted with evaluation will use the kind of evidence appropriate to their fields. Qualitative rather than quantitative judgments should be made.

4. University and Public Service

Effective participation in activities appropriate to the formation of educational policy and faculty governance and effective performance of administrative duties shall be taken into consideration in the evaluative process. A service component is a normal part of a faculty member's obligation to the University.

Service to the community, state, and nation also must be recognized as positive evidence for promotion, provided that this service emanates from the special competence of the individual in an assigned field and is an extension of the individual's role as a scholar-teacher. In the colleges of the Medical Center, patient care is recognized as a special competence in an assigned field and is an integral part of the service component. Public service unrelated to the individual's role as a scholar-teacher does not constitute evidence for appointment, promotion, or salary increase.

PROPOSED: (sections 3&4 are collapsed into section 3 and changed)

3. Professional, University and Public Service

The activities and contributions of faculty to their professional field are important in the evaluation process. Active interest in professional groups of colleagues and practitioners contributes to regional, national and/or international intellectual networks which supports the creation and dissemination of knowledge in a field. Further, contributions to this professional networking establish the faculty member's reputation outside the university and contribute to the overall image of the university. Documented evidence of professional leadership, activities, contributions and recognitions should be recognized as positive evidence for promotion and tenure.

Effective participation in activities appropriate to the formation of educational policy and faculty governance, and effective performance of administrative duties, will be taken into consideration in the evaluation process. A service component is a normal part of a faculty member's obligation to the University.

Faculty members are expected to engage in service related to their professional role as scholar for the benefit and development of the broader community. This includes local, state, national and international populations, and the University community. Documented scholarship related to service that is directly associated with one's special field of knowledge, expertise, and professional role within the University will be recognized as positive evidence for promotion and tenure.

Citizenship activities of faculty members and projects unrelated to faculty members' professional roles in the University, while laudable, do not constitute evidence for academic tenure and rank.

CURRENT:

B. Balance and Intellectual Attainment

A major consideration in any appointment or promotion with tenure is superior achievement in the various activities discussed in the preceding paragraphs. While the proportion of these activities may vary in terms of the individual's assignments and specialty, it must be recognized that superior intellectual attainment is evidenced both by the quality of the individual's teaching and the quality of the individual's research or other creative activity. Ideally, individuals selected for tenure should demonstrate superiority in all of the major criteria discussed here and, while special circumstances may cause the weight of emphasis on each to vary, care must be taken to insure that outstanding performance in a single activity does not obliterate the other factors that should be considered in evaluating academic excellence.

PROPOSED:

B. Balance and Intellectual Attainment

A major consideration in any appointment or promotion with tenure is superior achievement in the various activities discussed in the preceding paragraphs. [While t] The proportion of these activities [may] will vary in terms of the individual's [assignments] assigned distribution of effort, specialty, and job description. [, it must be recognized that superior intellectual attainment is evidenced both by the quality of the individual's teaching and the quality of the individual's research or other creative activity.] Ideally, individuals selected for tenure should demonstrate superiority in all of the major criteria discussed here as reflected in their assigned distribution of effort. [and, while special circumstances may cause the weight of emphasis on each to vary, care must be taken to insure that outstanding performance in a single activity does not obliterate the other factors that should be considered in evaluating academic excellence.]

PROPOSED: (C&D are added following B above which is unchanged)

C. Evaluation of Collaborative Efforts

The products of collaborative efforts in teaching, research, and service shall be considered as evidence of scholarship by the candidate. The candidate shall document the contribution he/she has made to the collective project and appraisal of the candidate's effectiveness as part of the collaborative effort should include statements by co-members.

D. Implementation at Unit Levels

The faculty of e[E]ach unit is required to develop [guidelines] a recommendation related to its criteria of evaluation for initial and continued reappointment, promotion, and tenure for inclusion in its unit rules document, consistent with this [document] Regulation.

After review and approval, the dean of the college shall forward the educational unit's recommended criteria to the appropriate chancellor. The chancellor shall refer the recommended criteria to the appropriate area committee for evaluation, suggestions on any desirable and/or necessary revision, and approval. After approval of the criteria by an area committee, the chancellor shall approve or disapprove the educational unit's recommendation. A copy of the approved unit criterial statement shall be included in each appointment, promotion or tenure dossier.

CURRENT:

C. General Criteria for Ranks

Although it is impossible to specify the exact criteria for judging an appointment or promotion to any one particular rank, the following general statements are guides for review committees.

1. Assistant Professor

Appointment or promotion to the rank of assistant professor shall be made after it has been determined that the individual has earned the terminal degree appropriate to the field of assignment and has a current capability for good teaching, research, and University service and a potential for significant growth in these areas.

2. Associate Professor

Appointment or promotion to associate professor shall be made only after an indication of continuous improvement and contribution by an individual both in teaching and research or other creative activity. Furthermore, the

individual should have earned some regional recognition for excellence appropriate to the field of assignment.

3. Professor

Appointment or promotion to the rank of professor is an indication that, in the opinion of colleagues, an individual is outstanding in teaching and in research or other creative activity and, in addition, has earned national and, perhaps, international recognition. It should be stressed further that this rank is recognition of attainment rather than of length of service.

PROPOSED:

E. General Criteria for Ranks

The following general criteria for appointment and promotion serve as guidelines for persons involved in the decision process.

Assistant Professor

Appointment or promotion to the rank of assistant professor shall be made after it has been determined that the individual has earned the terminal degree appropriate to the field of assignment as recognized by the academic discipline, has capability for excellent scholarship and teaching, and demonstrates potential for significant growth.

Associate Professor

Appointment or promotion to associate professor shall be made only after a candidate has met the criteria for assistant professor and has demonstrated high scholarly achievements commensurate with his/her assignment in areas of.- (1) research and other creative activity; (2) teaching, advising and other instructional activities; (3) professional, university and public service. Particularly, an indication of continuous improvement and scholastic contributions should be evident as documented by the candidate. Further, the individual should have earned external recognition for excellence in her/his scholarly activities. Where appropriate, this recognition should be on a regional or national level as appropriate to [in] the field of assignment.

Professor

Appointment or promotion to full professor shall be made only after a candidate has met the criteria for associate professor and has demonstrated high scholarly achievements commensurate with his/her assignment in areas of. (1) research and other creative activity; (2) teaching, advising, and other instructional activities; (3) professional, university and public service. Particularly, such an appointment implies that, in the opinion of colleagues, the candidate's scholarship is excellent and, in addition, s/he has earned a high level of professional recognition. Where appropriate, this recognition should be on a national or international level in the field of assignment. It should be stressed further that this rank is in recognition of attainment rather than length of service.

Add:

FACULTY HANDBOOK ADDITION:

Information on Policies and Procedures

Promotion and Tenure

Dossier and Considerations

The candidate and unit chairperson develop a dossier for each recommendation to promote and/or grant tenure. Such a dossier contains materials from the Standard Personnel file although ordinarily only materials since the last promotion or appointment are included in addition to the following material:

- o a statement specifying whether the unit chairperson has or has not recommended the faculty member for promotion and tenure;
- o the written judgment of each faculty member consulted in the unit;
- o written evidence of consultation with and related materials submitted by appropriate undergraduate, graduate, and professional student advisory groups;
- o at least three letters of evaluation from qualified persons outside the University, which the unit chairperson requests directly from appropriately qualified persons;
- o the recommendation of the director of each multidisciplinary research center or institute with which the appointee is associated;
- o the recommendation of each multidisciplinary research center or institute with which the appointee is associated;
- o an updated curriculum vitae;
- o a teaching portfolio; (excluding faculty in the Clinical, Extension, and

Research Title Series)

- o a bibliography of all published research articles and articles accepted for publication in refereed professional journals, patents, writings and a listing of other creative or professional productivity;
- o copies of publications and published reviews or letters concerning publications and copies of materials related to creative productivity;
- o copies of Distribution of Effort forms;
- o copies of faculty performance reviews.

Contents of the file must include documentation related to teaching and student relations as well as advising. To document teaching efforts, the following are required:

- o a brief reflective statement by the instructor which describes teaching and advising assignments, sets forth philosophies or objectives, and provides whatever information may be necessary to provide colleagues with a context for interpreting and understanding the other evaluative information;
- o for each semester under review, a list of all courses taught, with the title, course number, number of students enrolled and -for each different course - a short description;
- o representative course syllabi; and
- o a quantitative and qualitative summary of student evaluations since the last review or promotion. (For considerations of promotion and tenure, but not of regular performance evaluation, department and/or college norms and rating scale must be included.)

The following are suggested but not required:

- o materials prepared for teaching activities, such as assignments, exercises, handouts, examinations or other assessment materials;
- o indicators of student learning, such as examples of graded work, reference to students who succeed in advanced courses of study and/or who earn academic awards, accomplishments of former students, and evidence of learning by the use of pre- and post-testing procedures;
- o evidence of peer regard: colleague class visitation reports, and peer evaluations of course content, materials, assignments, and practices;
- o documentation of teaching-related activity: curriculum and course development, consulting work, innovative teaching methods, participation in teaching programs of other units or at other universities;
- o evidence of recognition: teaching-related grants, publications related to teaching and advising, teaching awards and honors; and
- o enumeration and description of work with individual students: supervision of Honors students, independent or experiential learning, consultation with students outside the department.

Where advising is a portion of the faculty member's usual assignment, evaluation should include the extent of advising and its quality along with an indication of the grounds for evaluation, including the following required items:

- o a section of the reflective statement which describes the nature and extent of advising and any other information necessary to provide colleagues with a context for evaluation of advising;
- o for each semester under review, the number and level of undergraduate and graduate program advisees, and a list of masters and doctoral students for whom the instructor served as a member of a thesis or advisory committee;
- o a list of those students for whom the professor served as preceptor, or director of a thesis or dissertation; and
- o a summary of activities associated with student organizations and service on student-faculty committees.

Suggested, but not required are:

- o student evaluation of advising; and
- o evaluation of advising by unit colleagues or administrators.

Add:

Illustrations of possible activities to be included in the dossier and evaluated

To illustrate activities which help fulfill the tripartite mission of the land grant university and which could be incorporated into criteria for evaluation of promotion and tenure dossiers for faculty the following is provided. These criteria must be tailored to the opportunities for scholarship that exist within each unit or field.

Appendix

To illustrate activities which help fulfill the tripartite mission of this land grant university, academic units should consider the following in developing their guidelines for initial and continued reappointment, promotion in academic rank, and granting of tenure. These criteria should be tailored to the opportunities for scholarship that exist within each unit's field.

Research and Other Creative Activity

Examples of research and other creative activity include, but are not limited to:

- o publication of work in appropriate outlets;
- o invitations to present work at colloquial symposia, workshops, and

conferences;

- o publication of review articles and book chapters;
- o authorship or editorship of books;
- o citation of person's work by other scholars;
- o garnering competitive research grants and contracts, as well as documenting extramural proposals which reflect scholarly quality;
- o the creation and archiving of research data, technology, materials or procedures;
- o development of intellectual property, such as inventions, patents, release of plant varieties, etc.; and
- o documented evidence that one's research has been applied by others.

Teaching, Advising, and Other Instructional Activities

Examples of teaching, advising, and other instructional activities include, but are not limited to:

- o contributions to faculty governance of curriculum;
- o academic program development and administration;
- o classroom instructional performance;
- o innovative pedagogy;
- o creative delivery of teaching programs independent of time and location, to reach diverse or non-traditional student populations;
- o academic advising and career counseling;
- o integrative scholarship;
- o student-faculty relations and welfare through service on student-faculty committees or as advisor to student's honor and professional organizations;
- o recruitment and mentoring undergraduate and graduate students;
- o independent study programs for students;
- o critiques of fine, applied, and performing arts projects;
- o extending University programs and expertise to public;
- o counseling practitioners in their field of expertise; and
- o leadership to improve instructional programming, techniques and learning aids.
- o directing research of graduate students, postdoctoral personnel, and visiting scholars;

Professional, University, and Public Service Activities

Examples of professional, University, and public service activities include, but are not limited to:

- o evidence of professional activities, contributions, and leadership;
- o awards and honors received from international, national, regional, and local peers, or professional organizations for scholarly work;
- o international, national, regional, and local awards and honors received by graduate and undergraduate students who do research, teaching, or service activities while under the candidate's direction;
- o editorial service or other invitations to review or adjudicate the work of others;
- o Extension programming;
- o clinical service;
- o diagnostic and analytical services;
- o information services;
- o unsalaried service as consultant, advisor, or expert participant;
- o preparation of public information materials and commentary, including public lectures;
- o service to the public through contributions to public policy;
- o enhancement of community and state programs;
- o assistance with solving problems of communities or the state;
- o integration of knowledge or technology which leads to new applications or interpretations of research data and/or helps solve problems;
- o international development;
- o contributions to public relations of the University;
- o contributions to public awareness of teaching, research and service programs; and
- o involvement in faculty governance.

Background and Rationale

The Senate Task Force on Promotion and Tenure devoted academic year 1996-97 to a review of the promotion and tenure system at the University. Their report provided a number of proposed revisions which the Senate Council has reviewed and forwarded to the Senate over the course of this academic year. This proposal is a significant revision in the criteria for promotion and tenure. The task force intended to broaden and make more explicit the types of scholarship (e.g., the scholarship of discovery, teaching, application) that could be evaluated as a basis for promotion and tenure. In addition it sought to provide better guidance to those seeking promotion and tenure. Finally, it sought to make explicit the role of the academic unit and the University respectively in the process.

If approved, this proposal will be forwarded to the administration for inclusion in the Administrative Regulations.

Implementation Date: 1 July 1998

US Agenda: P&TCompDoc #3 10.12.98

Pharmacy Practice & Science
800 Rose Street
Lexington, Kentucky 40536-0082
(606) 257-3281 Fax (606) 323-2049

December 9, 1997

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: James Applegate
Chair, University Senate Council

FROM: Ann B. Amerson
Toni Powell
Co-Chairs, Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Title Series

SUBJECT: Final Report

The Faculty Title Series Committee is submitting its final report for review by the University Senate Council. After several meetings, the Committee identified two primary areas for its focus - the Special Title Series and the nontenure track series or using our newly recommended term - Contractual Title Series. You will find that our report provides recommendations for both areas along with some general recommendations.

The Committee supports the changes in the lecturer title series and includes this series in its recommendations regarding the Contractual Title Series

The Committee was asked by the Promotion and Tenure Committee to address job descriptions for Regular Title Series or annual performance agreements. This issue was not really addressed by the committee in depth and no recommendations are made. Another issue raised but not dealt with is that of mobility between title series. The Committee felt that its other recommendations needed to be addressed along with those of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The other topics warrant future consideration but how they might be dealt with depended on the outcome of the proposed recommendations.

Report on the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Title Series

The Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Titles Series was charged with "a comprehensive review of the title series system, to identify strengths and weaknesses, and develop recommendations to simplify, clarify, improve the structure, and ultimately invigorate the spirit of the system." The committee began its work by gathering information about series at other institutions and the historical development of the Faculty Titles Series at the University of Kentucky. After reviewing the background information, the committee decided to focus its attention on the Special Title Series, Research Title Series, and the Clinical Titles Series. The Committee was later given responsibility to review the proposed Lecturer Series. To accomplish this, the committee divided into two task forces, Special Title Series and Non-Tenure Track series. Reports from these two task forces follow in Parts I and II.

General Recommendations

- 1 . That the present categories in the Faculty Title Series be retained.
2. That two generic title series be created as umbrellas for all the current title series. The Committee recommends that the following umbrella terms be used. Tenure Track Faculty Lines to include the current Regular Title Faculty Series, Special Title Faculty Series, Librarians Title Series, and Extension Title Series. Contractual Faculty Lines to include Clinical Titles Series, Research Title Series, Lecturer, and Adjunct Faculty Titles Series.
3. That all Faculty Series positions, both Tenure Track and Contractual, be provided all of the same rights as Regular Titles Series Faculty. These rights include eligibility for all committees as well as eligibility for voting in elections and the opportunity to participate in all other decision making processes within the University.
4. All tenure track faculty be eligible to participate in the selection

process for Graduate Faculty membership*.

5. The Task Force recommends that Recommendation nos. 5, 7, 8, and 9 of the Committee for Review of Special Title Series dated May 8, 1986 (Appendix I) be implemented (if they have not already been) concerning the Extension Title Series. This is in keeping with the recommendations 3 and 4 above.

*Note this has already been done.

Part 1: Recommendations on the Special Title Series

Background

When the Special Title Series (STS) was established in 1965, it was emphasized in Dr. Oswald's memorandum to the Faculty that this titles series was a limited one. "It was recognized that some departments have specialized teaching needs not accurately reflected in the criteria established for the professorial ranks and that a limited number of special titles or position would have to be created to provide these needs." (Memorandum dated April 28, 1965 from John W. Oswald to Member[sic] of the Faculty)

In 1986, A committee for Review of Special Titles Series, Chaired by Donald Leigh was convened to make recommendations on this series (as well as the Extension Title Series). The current Special Title Series Task Force reviewed this report but could not confirm whether the recommendations of this group were considered or implemented. A copy of the report is found in Appendix I.

Based on information that the current committee has collected (see Table 1), the use of the STS faculty ranges from 17-57% of all tenured positions in the Medical Sector Colleges. On the Lexington campus (Table 2), the percentage of STS faculty compared to all tenure tracks ranges from 3.7% in Arts and Sciences to 47% in Fine Arts. The overall percentage of STS faculty in the Medical Sector is 35%, compared to 10% for the Lexington Campus. Likewise, our findings show that the use of non-tenured faculty lines is much greater in the Medical Sector than on the Lexington Campus.

TABLE 1

MEDICAL CENTER CAMPUS

	College	Allied	Health	Dentistry	Medicine	Nursing	Pharmacy
Total full time positions	70	59	609	54	77		
STS positions	36	24	102	31	22		
%STS	51%	41%	17%	57%	29%		
Tenure track positions	49	46	437	42	47		
% STS	73%	52%	23%	74%	47%		

Table 2

LEXINGTON CAMPUS

College	AG	Arch	A & S	B & E	Com/i	Edu	Eng	FA	HES	SW
Total full time positions	259	23	380	80	36	90	121	79	41	21
STS positions	14	3	14	4	10	13	2	37	11	6
% STS	5.4%	13%	3.7%	5%	28%	14%	1.7%	47%	27%	29%
Ext title is										
Tenure Track positions	245	22	377	79	As above	89	118	As above	As above	As above

% STS 5.7% 13.6% 3.7% 5.1% 14.6% 1.7%

The College of Law has no Special title series positions listed in the data received.

Recommendations

1. The Special Title Series be retained (as recommended in the Leigh Report) with a revision of the definition. It is the feeling of the Task Force that for any tenure track position there should be some expectation for creative or scholarly activity. (The Committee recommends that Boyer's expanded scope of scholarship--discovery, integration, application and teaching--be considered in determining the kind of activity expected.)1. The level of expectation and the kind of activity must be clearly stated in the job description that is approved by the appropriate Area Committee.
2. The Task Force reaffirms Recommendation no. 2 in the Leigh Report that STS should be reserved for positions having special functions and not merely for faculty who have a large teaching effort in a program where otherwise the faculty would be in regular title series.
3. Creation of an STS position be denied if that position fits into an existing Faculty Title Series.
4. Criteria approved for one STS position may be applied to another on the condition that the criteria for both are the same.

1Boyer, Ernest L. 1990. "Enlarging the Perspective" in Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities on the Professoriate. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, pp. 15-25.

Part II: Report on the Contractual Title Series

Introduction

In light of the renewed emphasis on research productivity underpinning the quest to be a top 20 research institution, this subcommittee finds it surprising that major assets in reaching that goal, the research title faculty, are facing less job security and in some instances unfair treatment as a result of their non-tenure status. This is a concern since in some colleges the research title series faculty bring more funding to the University than regular title series faculty (e.g. in the College of Medicine sponsored research activity is two to three times greater for research title series faculty than for regular title series faculty). Likewise, clinical title faculty fulfill important roles within the University that ultimately will help us reach that goal, and the proposed lecturer title series will do so as well. In his recent Dean's Letter, Emery Wilson notes that "[a] faculty member must be provided the time and resources to excel if the individual and the College are to be successful." Wilson states that the College of Medicine will improve not through adding more faculty, but through nurturing the talents of our current faculty. In that vein, we propose the following, which we envision will foster the development of ALL faculty, and ultimately help our institution move up in the national ranking of U.S. research institutions.

- 1) In view of the proposal for the Lecturer Title Series we propose all title series in which tenure is not granted as part of the promotion process (research, clinical, lecturer) be referred to as contractual title series.

Rationale: We feel the term nontenure denotes a secondary status.

- 2) Rules and regulations of each of the various title series should be standardized from College to College and within the University.

- 3a) Initial contracts for individual faculty appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor within any of the contractual title series will be for no less than one year. The initial appointment can be up to three years if long-term funding is available.

Rationale: The initial appointment will be consistent with the availability of funds to support the position and in no case may be less than a 1-year term.

- 3b) After six years at the rank of Assistant Professor (6 successive one year term contracts or single and/or multi-year term contracts totaling 6 years) a faculty member in a contractual title series must be considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and if promoted all subsequent appointments will be on 3 to 5 year revolving contracts. If the individual is not promoted a one-year terminal contract will be offered.

Rationale: Any faculty member who is employed by the University of Kentucky for greater than six years must be a valuable asset to the University and appointment beyond the sixth year should be on a 3 to 5 year revolving contract as a reward for being successful. This will provide a moderate amount of job security to the individual and would facilitate productivity and growth. Continual one-year contracts encourage faculty to keep an eye on the job

5. Revision of the Administrative Regulations regarding the STS appointment, promotion, and tenure to further clarify the intent of the series, expectations for appointment and promotion, and to specify both creative productively and criteria for promotions. Some recommended changes for the current Administrative Regulations can be found in Appendix II.

(Recommended additions are underlined and recommended deletions are crossed through.)

6. Inclusion of a statement in the regulations that will ensure review of the approved job description by the individual who is hired into the position (prior to hiring) and to be inclusion of the job description in all promotion evaluation materials. Significant changes that occur in an individual's responsibilities/expectations prior to consideration for promotion should be appropriately documented.

7. The Task Force recommends that when STS faculty are evaluated for promotion and /or tenure, the evaluation committees should include members who are the same titles series as the candidate.

market. The lack of multi-year contracts is especially concerning in view of the recent letters to the Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky from the Senate Council and Emery Wilson, MD Dean of the College of Medicine asking for state funds to attract research faculty.

3c) Contractual faculty must be notified at least one year in advance if their contracts will not be renewed the following year.

Rationale: All faculty need the time to find suitable employment. 12 months is not an unusual amount of time needed to find another academic position.

4) All full-time contractual faculty (or 11, 10, or 9 month appointments) shall be provided the same benefits as full-time faculty at the University.

Rationale: We need to remove any regulation that denotes a second class status on the contractual title series.

5) Professional development should be provided to all faculty in the contractual title series and should be similar to the professional development offered to faculty in tenure title series. This could be done through the indirect funds generated from grants for the research title series and from operating budgets within units for faculty in the clinical and the lecturer title series.

Rationale: The contractual title series faculty are a valuable resource to the University and it is in the best interest of the University that all faculty grow professionally. The University must provide the time and the opportunity for its faculty to grow.

6) All faculty in the contractual title series should be provided all of the same rights as faculty in tenure tracks within respective Colleges. These rights include eligibility for all committees except committees deciding tenure decisions for special and regular title series as well as eligibility for voting in all elections and the opportunity to participate in all other decision-making processes within the University.

Rationale: This has to be done or a second class status results because we are not providing all faculty the opportunity to participate in the governance of the University. Times have changed, and a much larger percentage of the faculty are in one of the contractual title series than in the past.

7) The number of faculty within the contractual series (research and clinical and lecturer) will not exceed 50% of the total number of faculty in any one department.

Rationale: In order to maintain the integrity of the tenure process and to ensure academic continuity, we must not allow any department within the University to systematically eliminate positions in tenure tracks.

Committee Members:

Ann Amerson

Co-Chair
Pharmacy
Toni Powell
Co-Chair
Libraries

Dwight Billings Charles Mactutus, Ph.D.
Department of Sociology Tobacco and Health Research Institute

Maria Braden Jean Pival
School of Journalism & Telecommunications English - Emerita

David G. Elliott Shirley Raines
Music/Fine Arts Dean, Education

Steve Haist, M.D. Daret St. Clair
Medicine Toxicology

Kathy Luchok Lee H. Townsend
Preventive Med. & Envir. Health Entomology

Appendix I

May 8, 1986

Report of

COMMITTEE for REVIEW of SPECIAL TITLE SERIES

M. Randall Barnett
Charles B. Byers
John F. Crosby
Joseph H. Gardner
Elizabeth A. Kirlin (9/84 - 7/85)
John W. Landon (7/85 -)
James A. Knoolett
Ronald P. Monsen
Donald C. Leigh, Chairman

The Committee received its charge from Vice Chancellor Sands in a memorandum dated September 19, 1984 (Appendix A). Chairman Leigh met with Dr. Sands during the last week of September, and at that time it was agreed that the Committee should also look at the Extension Title Series (Special Title Series for Extension). The Administrative Regulations covering the Special Title Series (STS) and the Extension Title Series (ETS) are attached in Appendices B and C. Dr. Sands gave Dr. Leigh copies of several Special Title Series requests, which were subsequently distributed to the Committee members.

The Committee met on October 31, 1984 to review its charge and to plan its strategy. Among other things, it was decided that the Committee should interview most of the deans in whose colleges the STS and ETS faculty have positions, as well the Dean of the Graduate School.

The Committee has interviewed the following deans:

November 28, 1984: Dean Hasan, College of Social Work
December 12, 1984: Dean Domak, College of Fine Arts
February 13, 1985: Dean Royster, Graduate School
February 20, 1985: Dean Sagan, College of Education
February 27, 1985: Dean Barnhart, College of Agriculture

Each dean was asked to give his views on the items listed below (although not always stated in precisely these words):

Purpose of the STS and/or ETS in his college?
How well is it working? What are the problems, if any?
How should it work?
Specific recommendations?

Dean Sagan also sent a letter to the Committee.

During the Fall of 1985 the Committee constructed and sent out a questionnaire to the STS faculty and a separate one to the ETS faculty. Of 83 sent to STS faculty 22 were returned, and, of 111 sent to ETS faculty 20 were returned. These questionnaires, including all results appear in Appendices D and E.

In addition to the meetings with deans, the Committee met on the following dates: 10/31/84, 4/10/85, 10/17/85, 2/14/86 and 4/18/86.

OBSERVATIONS and/or CONCLUSIONS

The following observations and/or conclusions were drawn from interviews with the deans and from the results of the questionnaire as well as other sources.

1. STS are useful faculty series in several colleges, although the need may differ from college to college and, indeed, from department to department.
2. Many STS descriptions are not clear in terms of the need and/or of the criteria for promotion and tenure decisions.
3. There is a perception amongst STS faculty that they do not receive appropriate consideration for receiving Graduate Faculty status.
4. A majority of STS faculty believe that there should be separate STS Area Committees.
5. ETS is a useful faculty series in several colleges.
6. ETS faculty are eligible for Graduate Faculty Associate Membership only, renewable every five years. Isolated cases can be full members - only one now. Role of ETS has changed in last ten years - many now involved in research - and important for, graduate students.
7. The majority of the ETS faculty are not happy with the "Extension" qualifier in their professorial title.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Special Title Series (STS) and the Extension Title Series (ETS) (or special title series for extension) are needed faculty series in addition to the regular title series, and should be retained. Further, there are differences between the STS and ETS and the Committee sees no particular advantage in merging them into a single series at this time.

Rationale. The Introduction to the section on the STS in the AR's states the need well:

The University System requires the services of professionally competent individuals to meet teaching and service responsibilities in selected areas or positions in which assignments do not necessarily include research or creative work. To meet these responsibilities effectively and to be competitive in attracting and retaining needed professional personnel, a special title Series has been established as defined below.

Some example STS titles are Applied Music, Statistical Services, Accounting Practice, and Journalism Practice.

Faculty in the ETS have as their primary activity the promulgation of state-of-art knowledge concerning the livelihoods of the people of the Commonwealth to those people in an off-campus environment.

The STS and ETS are handled in the AR's in distinct sections. Whereas rather detailed criteria for promotion and tenure are contained in the AR's for the ETS as a whole, each STS series is established through a procedure which includes approval of a description of need and criteria for promotion and tenure.

2. The STS should be reserved for positions having special functions and not merely for faculty who have a large teaching effort in a program where otherwise the faculty would be regular title series.

Rationale. Here the Committee is simply agreeing with above excerpt from the AR's.

3. The guidelines for the STS in the Administrative Regulations should be reviewed and strengthened along the lines of those for ETS, particularly with regard to the criteria for promotion and tenure.

Rationale. In the case of the ETS, criteria for appointment, promotion and tenure are list in the AR's, whereas for the STS no criteria are listed explicitly in the AR's - reference is made only to the "pertinent special criteria for appointment and promotion". While the ETS is a fairly homogeneous series whereas the STS meet a variety of needs, the Committee nevertheless believes that it would be beneficial if a list of general criteria could be drawn up for the STS as a whole. Comments from several of the deans, results of the questionnaire, and the Committee's examination of several descriptions of need and criteria indicate the need for more uniform standards. It is expected that the individual description of need and criteria for appointment, promotion and tenure for each STS series would still be required.

4. All current STS position descriptions and criteria should be reviewed and revised in relation to the new guidelines in 3. above, with concurrence of the STS faculty to whom the descriptions apply. The new descriptions should then be approved by the usual process, i.e., by the Area Committees, Chancellor, etc. Even if 3. is not adopted, this recommendation should be implemented. In the light of this review, some present STS positions which include a significant component of research and/or creative work should be converted to the regular title series.

Rationale. The rationale for this recommendation is more or less implied by recommendation 3.

5. The ETS Area Committee should have a balance of ETS faculty and regular faculty with ETS faculty in the majority.

Rationale. Comments from the deans and results of the questionnaire made the point that regular faculty on the ETS Area Committee often do not seem to understand the role of the ETS and the criteria for Promotion and tenure. Therefore in order that the ETS Area Committee not be dominated by regular series faculty we make this recommendation.

6. An STS Area Committee (or Committees) should be established to handle the promotions and tenure of STS faculty. The Committee should have a balance of STS faculty and regular faculty with the STS faculty in the majority on the Committee.

Rationale. Comments from deans and others and results of the questionnaire indicate that the Area Committees, which are composed almost exclusively of regular faculty, often do not appreciate the role of STS faculty and their criteria for appointment, promotion and tenure. The Committee believes that an STS Area Committee composed according to the recommendation could treat STS cases more seriously and with greater uniformity, without necessarily lowering standards.

7. Rules and criteria for Graduate Faculty membership should be no different for ETS faculty than they now are for regular faculty and STS faculty.

Rationale. Under current rules of the Graduate Faculty, ETS faculty are only generally eligible for five-year renewable Associate membership. On October 11, 1984 the Graduate Council ". . ." realized that there are individual cases that should be considered for full membership. The Council agreed to consider each individual application and consider full membership for a five year term, renewable at the end of the term, for these individuals." In support of their position the Graduate Council had this to say about ETS faculty: "However, due to the fact that their assignments change periodically, continuous involvement in graduate programs could not be assured." It is the opinion of the Committee that ETS faculty are no more likely to change their assignments away from involvement in research than are regular faculty.

6. The "Extension" qualifier should be dropped from the professorial titles, including its use in the Administrative Regulations.

Rationale. The response to the questionnaire shows that a clear majority of the ETS faculty do not like the "Extension" qualifier as part of their professorial title and that this is a practice which exists at few other universities -- it seems to serve no useful purpose.

9. ETS faculty should be included in the head count for Senate seats.

Rationale. The Committee believes that it is discriminatory towards both ETS faculty and the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics to not include ETS faculty in the head count in the determination of the numbers of senate seats apportioned to Agriculture and Home Economics.

Appendix II

Please note: this section of the report takes the current Administrative Regulation for the Special Title Series and suggests revised wording.

A. Introduction

The University System requires the services of professionally competent individuals to meet teaching and service responsibilities in selected areas or positions in which assignments do not necessarily include research or creative work. To meet these responsibilities effectively and to be competitive in attracting and retaining needed professional personnel, a special title series has been established as defined below.

The University has a Special Title Series to address needs of some departments for specialized functions in teaching, research/creative activity, and/or other services. An individual appointed in this series

will be evaluated in teaching, professional status and activity, and University and public service, and scholarly and/or creative productivity. The level of scholarly and/or creative productivity which may be less than the faculty in the regular title series, should be reflective of the individual's distribution of effort and the type of position responsibilities required. This series is intended to provide flexibility for departments to meet responsibilities effectively and to be competitive in attracting and retaining needed professional personnel.

B. Definition

The academic ranks and titles in the special title series parallel those in the regular title series (i.e. instructor*, assistant professor*, associate professor* and professor*). Examples of more specific special titles are Associate Professor of Applied Music and Assistant Professor of Medicine. Examples of more specific special titles are Associate Professor of Applied Music* and Assistant Professor of Medicine.* The asterisk, as a superscript immediately following a title, designates that the rank and title are associated with a position in the special title series. Each position will be defined by a job description that indicates the distribution of effort in the respective categories and outlines the appointment and promotion criteria for the person in the position.

C. Establishment of Positions and Criteria

In recommending the establishment of one or more new special title positions and related criteria for appointment and promotion, To establish a special title series position(s), the initiating educational unit shall prepare supporting material which will demonstrate the need for such positions, outline the position responsibilities, and propose criteria for appointment and promotion to each of the four ranks in the special title series. Where the applicable criteria for appointment and promotion have been approved previously for the same type of special title positions, a statement of this action shall be included in the supporting material along with the proposed job description. After review and approval, the dean of the college shall forward the educational unit's recommendation and supporting material to the appropriate chancellor.

The chancellor shall, if such have not been previously approved, refer the pertinent criteria for appointment and promotion the job description to the appropriate Area Committee for evaluation, suggestions on desirable and/or necessary revision, and approval. The Area Committee reviews the job description for consistency between the criteria for appointment and promotion and the described responsibilities and their distribution. After approval of the appointment and promotion criteria by an Area Committee, the chancellor shall approve or disapprove the educational unit's recommendation for the establishment of new special title positions.

D. Guidelines and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion and Granting of Tenure

Before an individual can be appointed or promoted to a position in the special title series, the position must have been approved by the appropriate chancellor. The individual responsible for hiring should assure that the job description is reviewed with the new faculty member at the time of hiring.

The special title series is not intended to serve as a means for appointing and promoting, in the regular disciplines, individuals who are unable to qualify for appointment or promotion because of demonstrated lack of research competence.

The procedures for handling recommendations for appointment, promotion and granting of tenure in the special title series are the same as those for processing similar recommendations related to the regular title series (refer or Sections II, III, IV, XIII, and XIV). However, the pertinent special criteria for appointment and promotion in special title position shall be taken into consideration. A referral to and a recommendation from the Dean of the Graduate School shall not be required, however, unless the individual is or may be involved in research and/or a graduate program.

In developing the criteria for appointment or promotion, the following general criteria should be taken into consideration.

1. Assistant Professor

In order to qualify for appointment as assistant professor in the special title series, the candidate shall hold the terminal degree appropriate to the field of assignment and, where required, certification or eligibility for certification in the field. Further, the candidate shall possess the essential instructional, organizational, professional and/or other skills required by the job description with the potential for growth and development.

2. Associate Professor

In addition to meeting the criteria for assistant professor, appointment or

promotion to the rank of associate professor shall be based on:

- a. Demonstration of continuing growth and improvement in achieving excellence in teaching
- b. Significant contribution of service to both the College and University.
- c. Evidence of professional development on a state and regional basis as indicated by factors such as leadership, participation in professional organizations, requests to serve as consultant, advisor, or expert participant and/or recognition for outstanding service in the field of specialization.
- d. Demonstration of scholarly and /or creative activity through publications, presentations, development of innovative instructional materials and/or other activities as defined by the job description and commensurate with the allocated distribution of effort.

3. Professor

Appointment or promotion to the rank of professor is based, in addition to meeting the criteria for the rank of associate professor, on continued broad professional growth and distinguished achievements by the individual in the particular field of assignment. The following criteria are considered:

- a. Excellence as a mature teacher and/or supervisor of students
- b. Increased contributions of service to the College, University and Community
- c. Outstanding leadership and service to the profession as evidence by national and perhaps, international recognition
- d. Continued growth in scholarly activity and/or creative productivity as defined by the job description.

E. Conditions of Employment

Employment in a special title position implies does not normally imply a specific responsibility to engage in research to develop scholarly research and/or creative activity commensurate with the job description. Consequently, appointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor or professor in the special title series does not automatically qualify an individual for membership in the Graduate Faculty. In all other respects, the conditions and benefits of employment related to appointments in the special title series are the same as those related to appointments in the regular title series.

ATTACHMENT 7

AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, October 12, 1998. Proposal to create a School of Public Health at the University of Kentucky Chandler Medical Center in the College of Medicine. If approved, the proposal will be forwarded to the administration for appropriate action.

Proposal

It is proposed to create a School of Public Health at the University of Kentucky Chandler Medical Center in the College of Medicine.

Rationale

As it currently stands, there is no school of public health in Kentucky. In fact there are no schools of public health in several of the states that surround Kentucky. The closest schools are St. Louis University, the University of North Carolina, Emory University and the new school at Ohio State University. There are now nationally only 27 schools of public health accredited by the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH), the national voluntary accrediting body for schools and programs in public health. The School will seek accreditation by the CEPH.

There are three potential student targets for a school of public health. These are, first, students entering traditional public health disciplines for the first time. Schools of public health are traditionally interdisciplinary and focus their attention at the graduate, primarily master's, level. Thus students from a variety of backgrounds from the sciences, both natural and social, to the liberal arts, to those who hold professional health related degrees would be attracted to such a program. The second group of students is that in the other professional schools. One of the hallmarks of schools of public health is that they frequently provide dual or joint degrees, so that students in medicine, dentistry, nursing, pharmacy, law or social work can simultaneously earn both the first professional degree and the master's degree in public health. Finally, the Commonwealth of Kentucky's public health departments, in many cases, do not have well prepared public health professionals. It is likely that these individuals, particularly if provided distance learning opportunities, will want both degree programs and continuing education.

Process

The school will be established within the College of Medicine. The notion of schools existing within colleges is common on the University of Kentucky of campus. The school will be led by a Director, who will also hold the title of Associate Dean of the College of Medicine for Public Health, as delineated in the UK Governing Regulations.

The College of Medicine offers the Master's of Science in Public Health (MSPH). As is common in other colleges of medicine, it is a generalist degree without specific majors or concentrations in specific areas. It requires a thesis and is a 30-unit masters program. It currently has seven students, full and part time, in the program. The program was primarily developed to assist residents in occupational and preventive medicine meet American Board of Preventive Medicine requirements for an MPH, or its equivalent, to take that Board examination. In many cases, the Department of Preventive Medicine, in which the degree is offered, must turn away students because the breadth of courses offered is not available here, but is available in schools of public health.

The proposed MPH would flow out of the existing MSPH, which would remain a degree option, with an academic rather than a practice orientation, i.e., the MSPH would only have a Plan A option.

A thirty (30) unit MPH is planned. Faculty of the unit would have the responsibility for the development of the curriculum and proposal of degrees as appropriate. In addition to the MPH, the School would envision the future development of a Doctorate in Public Health (DrPH). This is the professional doctoral degree offered by schools of public health.

The proposal has been approved by the Senate Academic Organization and Structure Committee and is being forwarded by the Senate Council without recommendation.

US Agenda: PublicHealth, Sch of 10.12.98

ATTACHMENT 8

AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, October 12, 1998. Proposal to require undergraduates to declare a major within the first 60 hours of matriculation at the University of Kentucky.

Proposal

Proposal to require undergraduates to declare a major within the first 60 hours of matriculation at the University of Kentucky.

Background:

The attached proposal was developed by the Undergraduate Council after having been discussed with the Lexington Campus Chancellor, the University Registrar, Academic Deans, the Director of Admissions, some members of the Advising Network and the Academic Affairs co-chairs of Student Government. It was endorsed of the University Studies Committee.

Rationale:

The proposal is designed to help students make a decision about their career and their major within a reasonable period of time. It is designed neither to discourage experimentation by students nor prevent them from attempting more than one career path.

Students are free to change their major at any time.

Adequate provision is made for students in special circumstances (e.g. transfers, students returning from suspension, etc.)

Individual colleges are free to make exceptions to the policy and allow students to go beyond the 60 hours as long as they are willing to admit the students who fulfill the colleges' stipulations

Implementation: The policy will not affect current students but will apply to undergraduates entering the University in the fall of 1999.

The proposal has the support of the Lexington Community College faculty and is recommended by the University Senate Council.

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

University of Kentucky

Declaring a Major: a Proposal

There is ample evidence that many undergraduates at the University of Kentucky graduate with considerably more than 120 hours of academic credit. Frequently, students accumulate a large number of credit hours while seeking entrance to a particular college or major program without ever achieving their aim or making significant progress toward a degree. Currently there are approximately 500 seniors or juniors without a major and without the prospect of graduating in the near future.

It appears that a large part of the problem is the current policy of allowing undergraduates to continue indefinitely to enroll in classes at the University without declaring a major or being admitted to a particular program. This arrangement leads to two understandable results: excessive accumulation of credits prior to graduation and serious difficulty in providing students with timely and helpful advising.

In order to serve students better and assist them in seeking a degree, the Undergraduate Council proposes a change in policy whereby undergraduates must declare a major by the time they have accumulated 60 earned hours of undergraduate credit. By stipulating the time (i.e. the credit hours) within which students must be admitted to a major program, the University can accomplish several desired ends: a) students will tend to focus their attention on a major or career goal earlier in their academic life than has been the case heretofore; b) students who have little or no prospect of gaining entrance to a desired program will make plans for an alternate major and career; c) students will save time, money, and aggravation by graduating in a more timely manner; d) students currently unable to enroll in classes in their major because desired places are taken by individuals who will never gain admission to that college or program, will be better able to get the courses they need.

For these reasons we propose the following academic policy for undergraduates at the University of Kentucky.

1. In the semester in which the 45th hour is earned, students at the University of Kentucky who have not chosen a major or been admitted to a selective admissions college shall meet regularly with an advisor in order to determine their major within the ensuing semester.
2. In the semester in which the 60th hour is earned, students who have not chosen a major or been admitted to a selective admissions college shall have a registration stop placed on their record until such time as they have chosen a major.
3. The Central Advising and Transfer Center, as well as Colleges with undeclared majors, will inform students of their academic status at appropriate stages in order to assist them in gaining entrance to a major program.
4. Students who have earned 60 hours and are lacking specific courses to gain admission to a college or to declare a particular major will be granted an extra fifteen earned credits before a stop is placed on their record if they have a written commitment from the college of their choice to accept them upon successful completion of specified courses.
5. Students may change their major at any time during the approved periods.
6. Students with 60 or more hours 1) who have been dropped from a college for academic reasons, or 2) who have been readmitted to the University of Kentucky with 60 or more hours, or 3) who are transfer students will be allowed an additional 15 earned credit hours before they must declare a major.
7. The deans of the individual colleges will handle appeals from students wishing to enroll in specific academic programs.

Although this policy will not ensure that all students share the benefits outlined above, it will work toward that end and in doing so will enable the University of Kentucky to provide better service to all its undergraduates.

ATTACHMENT 9

AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting , Monday October 12, 1998. Proposal to adopt the policy on Academic Facilities (Utilization of Classroom Space) for the Lexington Campus

Background and Rationale:

In the Fall, 1966, the Senate Committee on Academic Facilities was asked to consider developing a general policy on the utilization of classroom space. Then Registrar Betty Huff was concerned about the shrinking number of classrooms available to the Registrar's office for class scheduling as a result of classroom conversions to other needs, departmental/college decisions to take certain rooms off the list of those for general use, and an increasing tendency toward non-standard class hours that eroded the Registrar's ability to schedule classes.

After a number of meetings, a draft policy was circulated among the deans for their comments. The attached policy includes their input. One issue remains unresolved. It is not clear who will provide security for classrooms used in the evenings and weekends and how charges for these services, once the responsible unit is identified, will be calculated.

The Senate Council accepted the policy report from the Academic Facilities Committee and recommends it for adoption by the Senate.

Implementation: Immediate

Attachment

US Agenda Item: AcademicFacilities 10.12.98

POLICY FOR THE UTILIZATION OF CLASSROOM SPACE
ON THE LEXINGTON CAMPUS

Last revised April 8, 1998

The following policy was developed in order to ensure the most efficient use of classroom space on the Lexington Campus.

Students

For the purposes of this document, a student will be defined as any individual paying tuition associated with a University course.

Categories of Users

There are basically three categories of usage of space in academic buildings on the Lexington Campus:

1. Academic classes, activities, and events. These include scheduled course sections, guest lectures and seminars by external speakers, etc. This category does not include outside groups sponsored by an academic unit.
2. Administrative use. These include committee meetings, University sponsored activities such as Merit Day, Advising Conferences, Orientation, etc. This category does not include outside groups sponsored by an administrative unit.
3. Student organization activities sponsored by an academic or administrative unit. These include open houses/fair days, sorority/fraternity rush, etc.

Space Utilization

1. Space that is equipped as student laboratories, studios, practice rooms, theaters, computer laboratories, or "smart" classrooms is available for scheduling by the department or college for academic-related classes and functions approved by the chair or dean. Departments/colleges will release any unassigned times to the Registrar's Office with sufficient lead time to permit the Registrar to use these classrooms in constructing semester schedules. Once the Registrar has assigned this space, it cannot be "reclaimed" by the department and college during that semester.
2. Space that is not equipped as student laboratories, studios, computer laboratories, or "smart" classrooms is available for course section scheduling by the Registrar's Office utilizing an algorithm of priority policies, size, and facility type required by the course. Unique zones may be defined for purposes of practicality and preference. Exceptions in a college may be granted on a case-by-case basis by the Chancellor.
3. Administrative use of available classroom space, after the semester schedule of classes has been created, is available for scheduling by the Registrar's Office on a first-come, first-serve and space available basis.
4. Student organizations requiring space for social or business meetings are expected to utilize the Student Center. The new Commonwealth Library, which will be open twenty-four hours/day may also provide a venue for such meetings. When space is not available in the Student Center or the Library, space in an academic classroom may be reserved for student organizations. Such requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis by a dean and if approved, scheduled through the Registrar's Office in the case of academic-related space.
5. Security and clean-up costs may be transferred to the user of the space for unique events through a fee-for-service charge. This fee will recover all direct costs associated with the service provided. This is especially true when the space is reserved on weekends and the building must be opened and secured following the event. A fee-for-service rate should be established where appropriate.
6. Outside organizations sponsored by an academic or administrative unit may be subject to the fee-for-service charge depending upon the nature of the event and the time scheduled. In all instances, events involving outside organizations must have a University sponsor who is in attendance at the event and who assumes responsibility assuring adherence to

University policies.

Scheduling

1. Departments will follow standardized scheduling hours from 8:00AM to 3:00PM for MWF classes and hours from 8:00AM to 3:15PM for TTh classes. Departments will not be allowed to drop a particular day of the week for scheduling classes.

2. Non-standard scheduling (e.g., a MW class that meets for 90 minutes) will be allowed only for pedagogically sound reasons approved by the chair and dean and received by the Registrar prior to the college cutoff for preparation of their schedule materials for the term. For additions or changes after the schedule has been produced, this approval must appear on the Pink Sheet. Non-standard scheduling will not "roll over" into subsequent years and must be requested annually.

Reassignment of Space

Departments and colleges cannot convert classrooms regularly scheduled by the Registrar without the written permission of the Chancellor.

Plans

Implement this space policy as of July 1, 1998 subject to revisions by the Faculty Senate Committee of Academic Facilities, deans, and the Chancellor.

space.doc

ATTACHMENT 10

AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, 12 October 1998 at 3:00 p.m. W.T. Young Auditorium, first floor. Proposal to amend University Senate Rules, Section I- 1.2.4.2 and ff. Full text of minutes of the University Senate.

Current: Senate Rule 1.2.4.2 provides that "The University System Registrar shall serve as Secretary" and Rule 1.2.5.1A provides that one of the functions of the Secretary is:

A to keep minutes of the Senate meetings and to circulate these to all members of the University Senate and faculty and to administrative offices that are concerned with academic affairs;

According to a Senate Rules Committee interpretation of 4/28/98,

*The Secretary may, at the direction of the Chair of the Senate Council, circulate only a summary of the minutes to members, provided the full text of the minutes are made available for inspection to any interested member (RC 4/28/98)

Proposed: The University Senate Council recommends that the Senate Rules Committee interpretation be changed and incorporated into 1,2,5,1A to read:

A. The Secretary may, at the direction of the Chair of the Senate Council, circulate only a summary of the minutes to members, provided a copy of the audio recordings of the meeting is made available to any interested member.

Rationale: Transcribing the full text of the minutes requires an inordinate amount of time and effort by the University System Registrar. The minutes are distributed to members of the Senate but are rarely, if ever, requested by anyone else. Under the proposed change, anyone who wanted a complete transcription of a Senate meeting could create it from the audiotapes, which would be readily available from the Senate Archives. No other university body, including the Board of Trustees and the Senate Council, is required to make a full text version of the minutes available.

The proposal has the approval of the Senate Council.

US Agenda Item: Minutes, fulltext, 10.12.98

ATTACHMENT 11

UNIVERSITY CALENDAR 09-01-97 Version

2000 Fall Semester

February 1	Tuesday - Deadline for international applications to be submitted to The Graduate School for the 2000 Fall Semester
February 15	Tuesday - Priority deadline for freshman applicants. Applicants for the 2000 Fall Semester by this date

who meet selective admission criteria will be offered general admission; applicants after this date or deferred decision candidates will be considered on a space-available basis only

February 15 Tuesday - Priority filing deadline for financial aid for entering freshmen

March 1 Wednesday - Deadline for submission of application and all required documents to the Office of Admissions for UK Community College transfer applicants planning to attend April Advising Conference (including registration for classes) for 2000 Fall Semester

April 1 Saturday - Priority filing deadline for financial aid for continuing and transfer students

April 15 Saturday - Deadline for applying with college deans for reinstatement after a second academic suspension for the 2000 Fall Semester

May 1 Monday - Deadline for undergraduate international applicants to submit 2000 Fall Semester application

June 1 Thursday - Deadline for submission of application and all required documents to the Office of Admissions for undergraduate applicants planning to attend Summer Advising Conferences (including registration for fall classes)

June 19- July 28 Summer Advising Conferences for new freshmen, Community College transfers, advanced standing (transfer) students, auditors, non-degree and readmitted students enrolling for the 2000 Fall Semester

July 21 Friday - Deadline for applying for admission to a program in The Graduate School for the 2000 Fall Semester. Applications for readmission, post-baccalaureate status, and visiting student status will be accepted after the deadline

July 29- August 19 Saturday through Saturday - Add/Drop for registered students

August 1 Tuesday - Final deadline for submission of application and all required documents to the Office of Admissions for undergraduate admission for the 2000 Fall Semester. Non-degree students who enroll through the Evening/Weekend Program registration before the beginning of classes for eight (8) hours or less are exempt from this deadline.

UNIVERSITY CALENDAR
09-01-97 Version

2000 Fall Semester

August 2 Wednesday - Last day for students in the Employee Educational Program registered through August 2 to submit EEP form to Human Resource Services to confirm 2000 registration and tuition waiver

August 9 Wednesday - Deadline for applying to The Graduate School for readmission, post-baccalaureate status, and visiting student status for the 2000 Fall Semester in order to register before the beginning of classes and avoid late fee

August 15-21 Tuesday through Monday - Registration for new program graduate students

August 15-21 Tuesday through Monday - Fall registration for new undergraduate and new program graduate students who entered the University in either the 2000 Four-Week Intercession or Eight-Week Summer Session

August 18-19 Friday and Saturday - Registration for Evening/Weekend students

August 17-21 Thursday through Monday - Fall registration for new post-baccalaureate students admitted for the Four-Week Intercession, Eight-Week Summer Session or Fall Semester

August 18 Friday - Advising Conference and Registration for new international students who have been cleared for admission but did not priority register

August 19-21 Saturday through Monday - Fall Orientation for all new undergraduate students

August 21 Monday - Advising Conference and Registration for new freshmen and transfer students who have been cleared for admission but did not priority register

August 21-25 Monday through Friday - Approved time period for students to change academic majors (note: please check with college for admission deadline)

August 22 Tuesday - Last day a student may officially drop a course or cancel registration with the University Registrar for a full refund of fees

August 21-22 Monday and Tuesday - Opening-of-term add/drop for registered students (1:00pm-8:00pm)

August 22 Tuesday - Advising Conference and Registration for readmission, transient, non-degree, and auditing students who have been cleared for admission but did not priority register

August 23 Wednesday - First day of classes

August 23 Wednesday - Payment of registration fees and/or housing and dining fees

August 23- August 30 Wednesday through Wednesday - Late registration for returning students who did not priority register and new applicants cleared late for admission. A late fee is assessed students who register late

August 29 Tuesday - Last day to add a class for the 2000 Fall Semester

August 30 Wednesday - Last day to officially withdraw from the University or reduce course load and receive an 80 percent refund

UNIVERSITY CALENDAR
09-01-97 Version

2000 Fall Semester

August 30 Wednesday - Last day for students in the Employee Educational Program who registered and/or changed schedules after August 2 to submit EEP form to Human Resource Services to confirm 2000 Fall Semester registration and tuition waiver

September 4 Monday - Labor Day - Academic Holiday

September 13 Wednesday - Last day to drop a course without it appearing on the student's transcript

September 13 Wednesday - Last day to change grading option (pass/fail to letter grade or letter grade to pass/fail; credit to audit or audit to credit)

September 15* Friday - Last day for reinstatement of students cancelled for nonpayment of registration fees and/or housing and dining fees
Requires payment of fees and may require payment of reinstatement fee

September 20 Wednesday - Last day to officially withdraw from the University or reduce course load and receive a 50 percent refund

September 21 Thursday - Last day for filing an application for a December degree in college dean's office

September 21 Thursday - Deadline for submission of application and all required documents to the Office of the Registrar for change of residency status for 2000 Fall Semester

October 6 Friday - Fall Break - Academic Holiday

October 15 Sunday - Deadline for submission of application and all required documents to the Office of Admissions for undergraduate applicants planning to attend November Advising Conference (including registration for spring classes)

October 16 Monday - Midterm of 2000 Fall Semester

October 17- October 30 Tuesday through Monday - Approved time period for students to change academic majors (note: please check with college for admission deadline)

October 20* Friday - Last day to withdraw from the University or reduce course load. Students can withdraw or reduce course load after this date only for "urgent non-academic reasons."

October 31 Tuesday - Deadline for international applications to be submitted to The Graduate School for 2001 Summer School

October 30- November 17 Monday through Friday - Priority registration for the 2001 Spring Semester

November 7 Tuesday - President Election Year - Academic Holiday

November 17 Friday - 2001 Spring Semester Advising Conference for new and readmitted undergraduate students

November 23-25 Thursday through Saturday - Thanksgiving -

Academic Holidays

UNIVERSITY CALENDAR
09-01-97 Version

2000 Fall Semester

November 30- Thursday through Saturday - Add/Drop for registered
 January 6 students for the 2001 Spring Semester
 December 4 Monday - Deadline for applying for admission to a
 program in The Graduate School for the 2001 Spring
 Semester. Applications for readmission, post-
 baccalaureate status, and visiting student
 status will be accepted after the deadline.
 December 6 Wednesday - Last day for students in the Employee
 Program registered through December 6 to submit EEP
 form to Human Resource Services to confirm 2001 Spring
 Semester registration and tuition waiver
 December 8 Friday - Last day of classes
 December 11-15 Monday through Friday - Final Examinations
 December 13 Wednesday - Deadline for applying to The Graduate
 School for readmission, post-baccalaureate status,
 and visiting student status for the 2001 Spring
 Semester in order to register before the beginning of
 classes and avoid late fee
 December 15 Friday - End of 2000 Fall Semester
 December 18 Monday - Final deadline for submission of grades to the
 Registrar's Office by 4 p.m.

* These dates are under review and are subject to change.

SUMMARY OF TEACHING DAYS, FALL SEMESTER 2000

	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.	Teaching Days
August	1	1	2	2	1	1	August 8
September	3	4	4	4	5	5	September 25
October	5	5	4	4	3	4	October 25
November	4	3	5	4	3	3	November 22
December	1	1	1	1	2	1	December 07
Totals	14	14	16	15	14	14	87

UNIVERSITY CALENDAR
09-01-97 Version

2001 Spring Semester

June 15 Thursday - Deadline for international applications to
 2000 be submitted to The Graduate School for the 2001
 Spring Semester

September 1 2000 Friday - Deadline for undergraduate international applicants to submit 2001 Spring Semester application

September 15 2000 Friday - Deadline for applying with college deans for reinstatement after a second academic suspension for the 2001 Spring Semester

October 15 2000 Sunday - Deadline for submission of application and all required documents to the Office of Admissions for undergraduate applicants planning to attend November Advising Conference (including registration for spring classes)

December 1 2000 Friday - Final deadline for submission of application and all required documents to the Office of Admissions for undergraduate admission for the 2001 Spring Semester. Non-degree students who enroll through the Evening/Weekend Program registration before the beginning of classes for eight (8) hours or less are exempt from this deadline

November 30-January 6 2000 Thursday through Saturday - Add/Drop for registered students for the 2001 Spring Semester

December 4 2000 Monday - Deadline for applying for admission to a program in The Graduate School for the 2001 Spring Semester. Applications for readmission, post-baccalaureate status, and visiting student status will be accepted after the deadline.

December 6 2000 Wednesday - Last day for students in the Employee Educational Program registered through December 6 to submit EEP form to Human Resource Services to confirm 2001 Spring Semester registration and tuition waiver

December 13 2000 Wednesday - Deadline for applying to The Graduate School for readmission, post-baccalaureate status, and visiting student status for the 2001 Spring Semester in order to register before the beginning of classes and avoid late fee

January 2-8 Tuesday through Monday - Registration for new program graduate students

January 5 Friday - International Student Advising Conference

January 5-6 Friday and Saturday - Registration for Evening/Weekend students

January 5-8 Friday through Monday - Registration for new post-baccalaureate students

January 8 Monday - Advising Conference and Registration for new students who have been cleared for admission but did not priority register

January 8-12 Monday through Friday - Approved time period for students to change academic majors (note: please check with college for admission deadline)

January 9 Tuesday - Last day a student may officially drop a course or cancel registration with the University Registrar for a full refund of fees

UNIVERSITY CALENDAR
09-01-97 Version

2001 Spring Semester

January 8-9 Monday and Tuesday - Opening-of-term add/drop for registered students (1:00pm-8:00pm)

January 9 Tuesday - Advising Conference and Registration for readmission, transient, non-degree, and auditing students

January 10 Wednesday - First day of classes

January 10 Wednesday - Payment of registration fees and/or housing and dining fees

January 10-17 Wednesday through Wednesday - Late registration for returning students who did not priority register and new applicants cleared late for admission. A late fee is assessed students who register late.

January 15 Monday - Martin Luther King Birthday - Academic Holiday

January 17 Wednesday - Last day to add a class for the 2001 Spring Semester

January 17 Wednesday - Last day to officially withdraw from the University or reduce course load and receive an 80 percent refund

January 17 Wednesday - Last day for students in the Employee Educational Program who registered and/or changed schedules after December 6 to submit EEP form to Human Resource Services to confirm 2001 Spring Semester registration and tuition waiver

January 31 Wednesday - Last day to drop a course without it appearing on the student's transcript

January 31 Wednesday - Last day to change grading option (pass/fail to letter grade or letter grade to pass/fail;

- February 1 credit to audit or audit to credit)
Thursday - Deadline for international applications to be submitted to The Graduate School for the 2001 Fall Semester
- February 2* Friday - Last day for reinstatement of students cancelled for nonpayment of registration fees and/or housing and dining fees. Requires payment of fees and may require payment of reinstatement fee.
- February 7 Wednesday - Last day to officially withdraw from the University or reduce course load and receive a 50 percent refund
- February 8 Thursday - Last day for filing an application for a May degree in college dean's office
- February 8 Thursday - Deadline for submission of application and all required documents to the Office of the Registrar for change of residency status for 2001 Spring Semester
- March 5 Monday - Midterm of 2001 Spring Semester
- March 6-26 Tuesday through Monday - Approved time period for students to change academic majors (note: please check with college for admission deadline)

UNIVERSITY CALENDAR
09-01-97 Version

2001 Spring Semester

- March 9 Friday - Last day to withdraw from the University or reduce course load. Students can withdraw or reduce course load after this date only for "urgent non-academic reasons."
- March 12-17 Monday through Saturday - Spring Vacation - Academic Holidays
- March 26- April 13 Monday through Friday - Priority registration for the 2001 Fall Semester and both 2001 Summer Sessions
- April 6 Friday - Deadline for applying for admission to a program in The Graduate School for the 2001 Summer Sessions. Applications for readmission, post-baccalaureate status, and visiting student status will be accepted after the deadline
- April 13 Friday - 2001 April Advising Conference for Community College transfer students cleared for fall admission
- April 24- May 7 Tuesday through Monday - Four-Week Intercession registration and add/drop continue for students enrolled in the 2001 Spring Semester
- April 24- June 6 Tuesday through Wednesday - Eight-Week Summer Session registration and add/drop continue for students enrolled in the 2001 Spring Semester
- April 24- June 16 Tuesday through Saturday - Add/Drop for priority registered students for the 2001 Fall Semester
- April 25 Wednesday - Deadline for applying to The Graduate School for readmission, post-baccalaureate status, and visiting student status for the 2001 Four-Week Intercession in order to register May 7 and avoid late fee
- April 27 Friday - Last day of classes
- April 30-May 4 Monday through Friday - Final Examinations
- May 4 Friday - End of 2001 Spring Semester
- May 6 Sunday - Commencement
- May 7 Monday - Final deadline for submission of grades to the Registrar's office by 4 p.m.
- May 7- August 18 College of Pharmacy 15-Week Summer Term

* These dates are under review and are subject to change.

SUMMARY OF TEACHING DAYS, SPRING SEMESTER 2001

	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.	Teaching Days
January	2	3	4	3	3	3	January 18
February	4	4	4	4	4	4	February 24
March	3	3	3	4	4	4	March 21
April	5	4	4	4	4	3	April 24
May	-	-	-	-	-	-	May -

Totals	14	14	15	15	15	14	87
--------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

You are visitor Unable to open config file for reading since November 18, 1998

Return to [University Senate Page](#)

Return to [University Senate Minutes](#)

Last Updated: Friday, November 20, 1998 (Prior revision: 11/18/1998)