University Senate Agendas, 2011-2012

All meetings are from 3:00 - 5:00 pm in the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library
unless otherwise noted.

Monday, February 13, 2012

All meetings are from 3:00 - 5:00 pm in the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library
unless otherwise noted.

- SREC Recommendation on Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 3.1.0* ("Course Numbering System")   p. 30-33

- SREC Recommendation on Certain 800- and 900-Level Courses   p. 34

4. Proposed 2011 Honorary Degree Recipients - Dean Blackwell, Chair, University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees

5. Preliminary Discussion on Financial Disclosure Policy (Presentation and Clarification Only)

Next Meeting: March 19, 2012

University Senate
December 12, 2011

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, December 12, 2011 in the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Hollie I. Swanson called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:05 pm. She invited President Eli Capilouto to offer his presentation.

1. <u>Update on Current and Future Initiatives – President Eli Capilouto</u>
President Eli Capilouto began by sharing some of stories of interactions with recent graduates in a variety of cities. They all commented on their individual pride in having earned a degree from the University of Kentucky and how well their degree stacked up against that of their colleagues. He said that UK does everything from extending and saving lives to stirring souls, noting Professor Nikki Finney (AS/English) recently winning the 2011 National Book Award in Poetry. Turning to the presentation, the President explained how UK planned to moved forward and offered senators a presentation.

After his presentation, the President answered questions from senators. Peek asked President Capilouto if he was willing to comment on the recently posted Herald-Leader article. The President replied that he has said that as UK goes forward, the academic priorities remain paramount. Acknowledging the presence of a local reporter, he said he was delighted to spend time with the editorial board of the Herald-Leader, and was asked about Rupp Arena. President Capilouto explained that he thought the various options were an exciting vision, but he could not support any request for funding from the state for Rupp Arena that competes with funds for revitalizing the campus. His comments were warmly welcomed with a spontaneous round of applause by those present. He offered a few additional comments about the matter.

D. Anderson **moved** that the University Senate offer a formal resolution supporting the statement that funds from UK will not be used for modifications to Rupp Arena. Wasilkowski **seconded**. The Chair asked for discussion. Grossman opined that the resolution did not quite capture the essence of President Capilouto's comments. President Capilouto read the day's statement on Rupp Arena, that was distributed on behalf of the President, Athletics Director Mitch Barnhart, and Men's Basketball Coach John Calipari.

> In what remains a challenging economy, we must be unified as a campus community about our priorities as we seek private support and finite state dollars to help fund our dreams for the University and for the Commonwealth. To that end, our Board of Trustees, our faculty and staff, and our students have spoken with a clear and unequivocal voice: Our primary focus should – and must -- be the construction and renovation of facilities and living and learning spaces so that we can revitalize the core of our campus and, in particular, further strengthen the undergraduate education we provide. Targeted investments in athletics facilities will be part of that equation as we continue to improve our competitive position across all sports. We also will further utilize this powerful brand to recruit and retain Kentucky's best students.

After brief discussion, Grossman **moved to amend the motion** so that the Senate endorse the President's statement. Anderson and Wasilkowski both **agreed**. A **vote** was taken on the **motion** to endorse President Capilouto's statement and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Grossman reminded the President that the last time the President addressed the Senate, he was not specific about how new facilities will be funded. He asked President Capilouto if he could share more specifics. The President said he could talk about educational facilities in general. He said that in the past and in the future UK will ask permission to take on debt through the state budgeting process. He referred to information in his presentation about doing a debt capacity study for UK and said that once UK can demonstrate how it can finance construction, it will be something UK can consider.

Brion commented that she was beginning to see the President's vision; she wondered how his vision of a promise to Kentucky can be kept with respect to the number of students who cannot afford an education. He responded by saying that that he clearly articulated to individuals he met in Washington, D. C. that one quarter of UK's students rely on Pell Grants. He said that he had taken a look at the amount of debt that students hold upon graduation, and was satisfied that the amount was stable and had decreased somewhat. He is working to expand support for financial aid and to see how best to control costs.

Debski asked if it was safe to say there is a priority on educational facilities and wondered if there was a way to integrate Executive Vice President for Health Affairs Michael Karpf's plan for the medical school and health care into education. President Capilouto said that there were many parallels. The Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) has forwarded its budget recommendation with capital and operating components, although there is some uncertainty regarding how much the state can afford on the operating side. He explained that the CPE utilized components such as building age, enrollment, etc. when creating the budget. Research space is a unique factor, so funded research is also a component. He offered some additional comments about building on campus.

Butler commented that he did not see graduate education as part of the President's presentation and asked the President to comment on the professional, research master's degree and doctoral degrees are seen, and future funding. The President said that many of the things that have been undertaken in terms of facilities and enrollment meet the core of UK's mission, but is not the sole core. President Capilouto said that he thought there was a need to be more explicit on how UK acknowledges graduate, professional and undergraduate activities and identifies their associated costs. He went on to say that his perspective was that he is asking the faculty how to spend their money – the faculty have largely earned it. Expenses need to be budgeted with UK's mission and priorities. UK needs to grow its way to the top, not cut its way to the top.

In response to a question from Blonder, the President explained that the return on the $1 million invested in utilization of Huron Consulting was, for UK, a precise analysis of UK's financial picture, with respect to UK's debt capacity. Huron will comb through UK's records as expert staff with a fresh perspective that can help us move rapidly to address other issues. Creating and integrating a transparent budgeting system by which UK can allocate finances in a $2.7 billion enterprise is a serious undertaking that needs a team of experts. President Capilouto said that everyone needs to know what we want to achieve, and then find out if we have financial systems that support those goals. The consultants will also be relied upon to serve as analysts who can quickly and methodically answer questions and offer expertise on best practices to move quickly.

T. Conners asked about marketing UK; he opined that he saw more billboards for ~~anything~~ Spencerian and Sullivan colleges than he sees for UK academics. President Capilouto again thanked those present for giving him great material with which to start discussion with various individuals. He said that students are becoming more and more sophisticated consumers; not all marketing angles can be summed up through what is seen on billboards. He said he is always open to better ways to let people know what a great value and opportunity this University holds.

Coyne commented that the President experienced a land grant celebration recently in the College of Agriculture, and ~~how~~ suggested that type of interaction should be available to everyone. He asked how President Capilouto meshed a desire for having the best and brightest students at UK, with making that experience accessible for all Kentuckians, particularly high-school aged students that may start their educational college career with limited academic skills. The President said that UK's admissions process has been holistic and is not determined by an ACT score or GPA. There are many programs, like UK's First Scholars organization, that assist different types of Kentuckians. He said the land grant mission is manifested in almost everything we do around here. He commented that an emphasis on community is rooted in the community and culture here. The world is very different now from when land grant universities were conceived, there were no two-year institutions. President Capilouto said that UK does want to attract the best and brightest students and are more committed to making sure everyone who comes to UK leaves here as the best and brightest, which is the strongest contribution we can make to the state.

Grossman said that everyone had been reading about administrative bloat and referred to the portion of the President's presentation that mentioned a review of the President's organization. He asked President Capilouto for more information. The President replied that it starts with his office and the people who report directly to the president, as well as those who report to both the president and the provost. He said he expected that leadership throughout the University will undertake similar, serious reviews. Grossman asked if the President had a timeline. President Capilouto replied that he did not have a specific timeline, but rather has a framework in which to look at things.

The Chair thanked President Capilouto for attending and he thanked her and senators for the opportunity to speak.

Some of the recipients of the UK Alumni Association's Great Teacher Award were in the audience – the Chair recognized them all by name and asked those present to come forward for a picture with the President.

1. Minutes from November 14, 2011 and Announcements
The Chair noted that some editorial changes to the minutes had been received. She solicited a **motion** to approve the minutes from November 14, 2011 as amended. Grossman **moved** that motion and Brion **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

There were a number of announcements.

- The Chair offered congratulations to the UK Alumni Association's 2012 Great Teacher Award winners:
  - Kristin Ashford, Assistant Professor (Nursing)
  - Arne Bathke, Professor & DGS and Director of the Applied Statistics Laboratory (AS/Statistics)

- o Eric Christianson, Associate Professor (AS/History)
- o James Haubenreich, Associate Professor (DE/Oral Health Practice)
- o Ajay Mehra, Associate Professor (BE/Management)
- o Ana Rueda, Professor and Chair (AS/Hispanic Studies)

- A new web transmittal was posted December 7 – please review it!

- There is a "new" (from the February 2011 Senate meeting) policy on religious observances. Faculty shall give students the opportunity to make up work, and shall indicate in syllabi how much advance notice is required for such an accommodation. Please visit http://www.uky.edu/Diversity/holidays.html for additional information.

- Board of Trustees Chair Britt Brockman, MD, will attend the April Senate meeting – any suggestions for topics or questions can be sent to the Chair or Mrs. Brothers.

- General note – any information communicated via email from the Office of the Senate Council can be shared with faculty colleagues. The Senate does not have a good method of disseminating information to faculty, and relies on senators and other faculty to share information.

- There will be a University Senate "Welcome Back Reception" on Thursday, January 19, from 5 – 7 pm at the Boone Center. Please contact Dora Collins to RSVP.

2. Officer and Other Reports
a. Chair
The Chair noted that the Senate Council (SC) was currently working through the process for electing the next SC chair. She asked Wood to offer additional information. Wood reminded senators that they had previously received an email soliciting input into the election process – information will be solicited through December 14. The SC will meet on December 21 and elect the next SC chair. The nominating committee is soliciting any input from senators – anything from nominations for a particular individual to general feelings as to the direction of the SC and Senate, and how that can be affected by the SC chair. She assured senators that that comments will remain confidential – they will be summarized and shared with the SC as a whole.

- The UK Alumni Association has requested a faculty senator to serve on their Board of Directors. The Chair will serve this academic year and the SC will identify a senator to serve for the 2012 – 2013 academic year.

- The Chair attended the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) meeting on November 19. She said there was a focus on financial; there were numerous presentations on university budgets, as well as a presentation on financial exigencies. A variety of senators who attended also offered their comments on the meeting – everyone said it was a good meeting.

- The Chair announced that undergraduate and professional/graduate commencements will be held on Friday, December 16.

- The Chair invited College of Arts and Sciences Associate Dean Anna Bosch to offer an update on the document handling system. Guest Bosch did so, explaining that

- Guest and Associate Dean Anna Bosch (College of Arts and Sciences, AS) gave senators an update on the document handling system. She explained that the course approval process is being piloted in AS, since it is a large college and more likely to find pressure points in the system. Bosch explained some of the implementation practices that AS is trying. She said she was optimistic about the system.

d. Trustee Peek

Peek began by saying he saw his job as getting issues on to people's radar, and he believed he had been successful in a number of areas. He successfully worked to change the regulation regarding appearing before the Board of Trustees (Board) and just recently found in his office the rejection letter he received when he attempted to appear before the Board, prior to his election as trustee. He noted that the recent Board action regarding the Reynolds Building was positive, that the profile of the Honors Program was being raised and that a proposal for an employment ombud office was in the President's office for review. President Capilouto is working on new dorms through a private/public partnership. Although some of UK's endowments are underwater, UK will make every effort to minimize disruptions.

Peek went on to explain that he thinks the University is on a better path. On that note, he said he was resigning as faculty trustee, effective December 31, 2011; he said he had accepted a position with the Federal Reserve Bank at Boston. He quipped that he had saved the University, and will now try to save the economy. Peek offered his appreciation for the support he received, and for the help other people offered him. Peek was honored with a round of applause by senators.

Wasilkowski **moved** that the University Senate thank Joe Peek for his exemplary work. The motion was **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

D. Jones asked Peek if he had any suggestions for senators who may be interested in serving out the remainder of Peek's term. Peek offered a few comments and said that a faculty member interested in serving should understand the difference between campaigning and serving. The faculty trustee needs to get along with other trustees; Peek said he enjoyed a good relationship with the other members of the Board.

The Chair noted that there was a small remembrance for Peek and asked senators to sign it on their way out.

4. Academic Calendars

Grossman **moved** to approve the calendars (2012 - 2013 Calendar; 2014 - 2015 Calendar, Tentative; 2012-2013 Dentistry; 2014 - 2015 Dentistry, Tentative; Fall 2012 Law; Spring 2013 Law;   Summer I (four-week) 2013 Law; Summer 2013 Law; Fall 2014 Law, Tentative; Spring 2015 Law, Tentative; Summer I (four-week) 2015 Law, Tentative; Summer 2015 Law, Tentative; 2012 - 2013 Medicine; 2014 - 2015 Medicine, Tentative; 2012 - 2013 Pharmacy; 2014 - 2015 Pharmacy, Tentative; 2012 - 2013 Winter Intersession; 2014 - 2015 Winter Intersession, Tentative) as published in the handout. Wasilkowski **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

5. Establishment of Senate Committee to serve as Faculty of Record for the Honors Program

The Chair explained that prior to 2005, there was a clear body of faculty responsible for the Honors Program (Honors) curriculum, etc. Faculty who taught in the Honors Program had split appointment between Honors and their home departments. In 2005, however, policy changed and faculty teaching in Honors no longer had a split appointment; their only appointment was in their home department.

Since there is no longer a clear body of faculty to serve as the Honors Program faculty, the Senate needs to identify a group to serve that purpose. The Chair commented that the **motion** came from the SC: that the Senate create an Honors Program Committee, appointed by the Senate Council in consultation with the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, to act as the faculty of record for all Honors curriculum. This Committee will be composed of 10 faculty broadly representative of the undergraduate colleges; the Committee will report to the Director of Honors, to whom it shall transmit its recommendations for consideration by the Undergraduate Council.

Brion **offered an amendment to the motion** to change[1] the language change to "…act as the faculty of record for oversight and direction for of all Honors curriculum." Coyne **seconded**. After brief discussion, a **vote** was taken on the **motion to amend**, and the motion **passed** with a vast majority in favor.

There was discussion among senators. A **vote** was taken and the **motion** ("The Senate will create an Honors Program Committee, appointed by the Senate Council in consultation with the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, to act as the faculty of record for oversight and direction of all Honors curriculum. This Committee will be composed of 10 faculty broadly representative of the undergraduate colleges; the Committee will report to the Director of Honors, to whom it shall transmit its recommendations for consideration by the Undergraduate Council.") **passed** with a vast majority in favor.

6. Committee Reports
a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee - Andrew Hippisley, Chair
i. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in International Education
Hippisley explained the proposal and presented the **motion** from the Senate's Academic Programs Committee that the Senate approve the proposed new Graduate Certificate in International Education, effective spring 2012. There was very brief discussion.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (SAPPC) - Walter Ferrier, Chair
i. Update on Current Activities
Ferrier explained that the SAAPC had been revitalized over the summer and was making plans for the spring semester. He explained that that the SAAPC wanted to serve as a listening post for faculty ideas and initiatives. Ferrier said that the present time was an excellent time to affect cultural and institutional shifts toward a new normal to dream up and carry through new activities as UK moves forward. The SAAPC can serve as a meeting point for an exchange of new ideas. The SAAPC has created a listerv to facilitate the exchange of ideas.

He encouraged senators to utilize the listerv as a tool for ongoing conversation and discussion, and a way to exchange ideas. Ferrier also mentioned that the SAAPC wants to recognize the faculty member who proposes the best "great idea, but…" with an award, simply to celebrate bold, fresh ideas.

[1] Strikethrough formatting denotes deleted text and underlining denotes added text.

c. <u>Interim General Education Oversight Committee (IGEOC) - Bill Rayens, Chair</u>
i. <u>Report to the Senate</u>
Guest Bill Rayens introduced himself, explaining that he was chair of the Interim General Education Oversight Committee (IGEOC) and saying that he was present to report to the Senate on what IGEOC has been doing for the past 20 months.

Rayens gave senators a presentation outlining the hard work performed by IGEOC, including:

- Developing a plan for vetting courses;
- Creating forms for submissions of courses to be offered as UK Core courses;
- Requesting and receiving approval from the Senate Council (SC) for said plan and forms;
- Emphasizing intricate review of courses for inclusion in UK Core; and
- Ensuring the review is not unnecessarily thoughtful.

Approximately 200 courses have been approved for UK Core, with about 150 of them having been vetted by IGEOC; the remainder were vetted by the body that served prior to IGEOC. Because IGEOC was told early on that its roles would be defined as IGEOC functioned and worked, they developed a role in assessment and were asked to serve as a group to facilitate development and revisions of rubrics used to score artifacts used across campus. One cycle of that has been completed for Composition and Communication, as well as for Citizenship courses. The faculty who participated in scoring have suggestion for how rubrics could be revised, and those suggestions are moving back through IGEOC. Rayens explained that IGEOC's charge was essentially to help think through things as they come up, and things come up all the time. He noted that IGEOC did not set policy, but the SC had reminded IGEOC that the committee should offer suggestions regarding how the committee, and future processed, should function.

Rayens closed by saying he was proud of the members of IGEOC, who were singularly loyal to the Senate-approved outcomes. Although IGEOC is faculty-friendly, it is all very stubborn when issues of fairness and integrity are concerned. Neither bias nor lobbying is permitted. There is a strong faculty presence making decisions about UK Core and IGEOC is not afraid to tackle the issues.

The Chair thanked Rayens for his and IGEOC's hard work.

<u>Addition to agenda: 6.d Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee - Herman Farrell, Chair (Proposed New Institute for Sustainable Manufacturing)</u>
The Chair explained that the Senate needed to formally waive *Senate Rules 1.2.3* to allow the Senate to consider the proposed new Institute for Sustainable Manufacturing, because it was not included in the agenda posted six days prior to the meeting.

Blonder **moved** that the Senate waive *Senate Rules 1.2.3* to allow consideration of the proposed new Institute for Sustainable Manufacturing. Effgen **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. d <u>Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee - Herman Farrell, Chair (Proposed New [Multidisciplinary Research] Institute for Sustainable Manufacturing)</u>
Farrell explained the proposal. When he was finished, he added that the proposal had been approved by College of Engineering faculty, but quorum was not met at the meeting. A subsequent electronic vote

resulted in approval, with 67 in favor. Farrell added that the Senate would take two separate votes on the proposal for a new Institute for Sustainable Manufacturing.

The **motion** from the SAAPC is that the Senate approve the proposed new multidisciplinary research Institute for Sustainable Manufacturing, effective upon Board of Trustees approval, based upon its academic merits. After very brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Farrell introduced the second **motion**: that the Senate endorse the proposed new multidisciplinary research Institute for Sustainable Manufacturing, effective upon Board of Trustees approval, based upon its non-academic merits. After brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:1̶5̶3 pm.

> Respectfully submitted by Robert Grossman,
> University Senate Secretary

~~In attendance~~Absences: Adams; Anderson; Anstead; Ballard; Birdwhistell; Brennen; Brown-Wright; Capilouto; de Beer; DeSantis; D'Orazio; Eckman; Ederington; Ettensohn; Feist-Price; Fielden; Getchell; Hackbart; Hardin-Pierce[*]; Jackson; Kellum; Kirk; Lester; Lowry*; Martin; Mazur; Meyer; Mountford; Noonan; O'Hair, MJ; Richey; Rieske-Kinney; Scutchfield; Sekulic*; Shannon, Smith; Speaks; Steiner; Stewart; Sutphen*; Subbaswamy; Tick; Tracy, J; Turner; Voro; Wells; Williams; Wimberly; Wiseman; Witt; Wyatt*; Yost.

Invited guests present: Anna Bosch, bob Gregory and Bill Rayens.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, February 7, 2012.

---

[*] Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.

University of Kentucky
College of Agriculture
Department of Landscape Architecture

Retroactice Withdrawal Appeals Committee
Thomas J. Nieman PhD, Chair

Year End Report Fall 2010 - Spring 2011

Appeals submitted   78
Appeals approved   64
Appeals denied   11
Appeals tabled   3 - requesting additional information or clarification

Basis of appeals request and generalized rationale

Medical	41 - broad range - e.g., injury, illness, pregnancy, depression, ADHD, etc.
Financial	6 - lost job, family could no longer support, etc.
Personal	8 - domestic abuse, fire, adjustment to college life
Administrative Issue	2 - Dropped all courses but one and never got other course dropped
Legal	2 - Some issue with law, arrest, jail time, etc
Family	3 - Family had problems which required the student's involvement
Military	2 - Called up to duty

Partial Appeal   3 - Request to be allowed to keep certain courses within the semester of the appeal - e.g., because of depression could not attend morning classes but did OK in the late afternoon

No Documentation   2 - Could not document that they actually had the illness that they cited as the basis of the request - No diagnosis

Info. not Available   6 - Do not have a specific reason listed for the denial

Multiple appeals   15 - Mostly involved multiple semesters

Request for time waiver - those who wished to make an appeal but were outside the two year window for appeals

Approved   2 - both for medical reasons

Denied   1- wanted to improve GPA

There were 78 appeals this year compared to 93 last year - a 22 percent decrease.. At that time we were concerned that cases were being passed on to us that could have or should have been handled within the college impacted. As a result of working more closely with the college administrators we have developed a much better working relationship - thus the decrease in appeals.

In 2009 - 2010 the majority of the appeals were for financial reasons of one type or another.

In 2010 - 2011 the majority of the appeals were for medical reasons, with financial dropping back to a considerable degree.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas J Nieman, Ph D, Chair
Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Board

Brothers, Sheila C

From:	Raphael Finkel [raphael@cs.uky.edu]
Sent:	Tuesday, November 22, 2011 10:56 AM
To:	Brothers, Sheila C
Cc:	Davis, Alison F; Feddock, Christopher A; Meyer, A L; Carl Lee; Lowry, Regina; Fuqua, Zachary D; Raphael Finkel; Scott Yost; Provost, University of Kentucky; Witt, Don
Subject:	SAASC, item 5: Community Communication and Leadership Development

Sheila,

After deliberation, the SAASC has voted in favor of the two proposals concerning Community Communication and Leadership Development: admission requirements and minor requirements.

Raphael

--- notes

First, there have been some already approved curricular changes to CLD courses

    Renumberings:

        320 -> 225
        302 -> 230
        405 -> 305

    The following still exist, even though they are no longer to be required for all majors:

        102, 250, 340, 420

    The following still exist and are still required:

        362, 490

    The following are new:

        100 (1 hour), 260, 300, 370, 497 (practicum)

The proposal for the undergraduate program is

    Change the name of major from Community Communications and Leadership Development to simply Community and Leadership Development

    Change the course structure to introduce a pre-major status, in which students must earn at least a C in
    100, 225, 230, 260

    The further requirements on majors are
    300, 305, 362, 370, 490, 497

    Drops requirements for 102, 250, 340, 420, but adds 497.

    The effect is that instead of official "options" with different requirements, students can study what interests them best.

We see no difficulty with this proposal. It looks like the department is taking its restructuring seriously.

1. General Information

College:	Agriculture	Department:	Community and Leadership Development

Current Major Name:	Community Communications and Leadership Development	Proposed Major Name:	*Community and Leadership Development*
Current Degree Title:	B.S. in Community Communications and Leadership Development	Proposed Degree Title:	*B.S. in Community and Leadership Development*
Formal Option(s):	Agricultural Communications, Public Service and Leadership	Proposed Formal Option(s):	*N/A*
Specialty Field w/in Formal Option:	_____	Proposed Specialty Field w/in Formal Options:	_____

Date of Contact with Associate Provost for Academic Administration[1]: 8-25-10

Bulletin (yr & pgs): 2010-11	CIP Code[1]: 01.0899.01		Today's Date: 9-17-10

Accrediting Agency (if applicable): _____

Requested Effective Date: ☒ Semester following approval. OR ☐ Specific Date[2]: _____

Dept. Contact Person:	Dr. Richard Maurer	Phone: 7-7582	Email:	richard.maurer@uky.edu

2. General Education Curriculum for this Program:

The new General Education curriculum is comprised of the equivalent of 30 credit hours of course work. There are, however, some courses that exceed 3 credits & this would result in more than 30 credits in some majors.

- There is no foreign language requirement for the new Gen Ed curriculum.
- There is no General Education Electives requirement.

Please list the courses/credit hours currently used to fulfill the University Studies/General Education curriculum:
USP: I. MA109or MA111, II. University requirement, III. PHI120, STA200, IV. ENG104, VI. any 6 hours natural science, VII. CLD 102 or AEC101, VIII. any 6 hours humanities, IX. any 3 hours cross-cultural, X. any 3 hours outside major

Please identify below the suggested courses/credit hours to fulfill the General Education curriculum.

General Education Area	Course	Credit Hrs
I. Intellectual Inquiry (one course in each area)		
Arts and Creativity	*A-S245, A-S280,LA111*	*3*
Humanities	*EGR201, ENG230, ENG264,GWS201, HIS112, MCL100*	*3*
Social Sciences	*CLD 102*	*3*
Natural/Physical/Mathematical	*PLS104,ANT230,BIO102,GEO130, GEO135,GLY120, GLY180,*	*3*

---

[1] Prior to filling out this form, you MUST contact the Associate Provost for Academic Administration (APAA). If you do not know the CIP code, the (APAA) can provide you with that during the contact.
[2] Program changes are typically made effective for the semester following approval. No program will be made effective until all approvals are received.

II. Composition and Communication			
Composition and Communication I		CIS or WRD 110	3
Composition and Communication II		CIS or WRD 111	3
III. Quantitative Reasoning (one course in each area)			
Quantitative Foundations[3]		*MA111, MA123*	*3*
Statistical Inferential Reasoning		*STA210, PSY215/216*	*3*
IV. Citizenship (one course in each area)			
Community, Culture and Citizenship in the USA		*CLD360, GEN100*	*3*
Global Dynamics		*CLD380*	*3*
		Total General Education Hours	*30*

3. Explain whether the proposed changes to the program (as described in sections 4 to 12) involve courses offered by another department/program. <u>Routing Signature Log must include approval by faculty of additional department(s).</u>

4. Explain how satisfaction of the University Graduation Writing Requirement will be changed.

Current	Proposed
☐ Standard University course offering. List: _____	☐ *Standard University course offering.* List: _____
☐ Specific course – list: _____	☐ *Specific course) – list:* _____

5. List any changes to college-level requirements that must be satisfied.

Current	Proposed
☐ Standard college requirement. List: _____	☐ *Standard college requirement.* List: _____
☐ Specific required course – list: _____	☐ *Specific course – list:* _____

6. List pre-major or pre-professional course requirements that will change, including credit hours.

Current	Proposed
_____	_____

7. List the major's course requirements that will change, including credit hours.

Current	Proposed
_____	_____

8. Does the pgm <u>require</u> a minor AND does the proposed <u>change</u> affect the required minor? ☐ N/A ☐ Yes ☐ No
If "Yes," indicate current courses and proposed changes below.

Current	Proposed
_____	_____

---

[3] Note that MA 109 is NOT approved as a Quantitative Foundations course. Students in a major requiring calculus will use a calculus course (MA 113, 123, 137 or 138) while students not requiring calculus should take MA 111, PHI 120 or another approved course.

CHANGE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM FORM

1. General Information

College: __Agriculture__   Department: __Community and Leadership Development__

Current Major Name: __Community Communications and Leadership Development__   Proposed Major Name: _Community and Leadership Development_

Current Degree Title: __B.S. in Community Communications and Leadership Development__   Proposed Degree Title: _B.S. in Community and Leadership Development_

Formal Option(s): __Agricultural Communications Public Service and Leadership__   Proposed Formal Option(s): _N/A_

Specialty Field w/in Formal Option: _____   Proposed Specialty Field w/in Formal Options: _____

Date of Contact with Associate Provost for Academic Administration[1]: __8-25-10__

Bulletin (yr & pgs): __2010-11__   CIP Code[1]: __01.0899.01__   Today's Date: __9-17-10__

Accrediting Agency (if applicable): _____

Requested Effective Date: ☒ Semester following approval.   OR   ☐ Specific Date[2]: _____

Dept. Contact Person: __Dr. Rick Maurer__   Phone: __7-7582__   Email: __richard.maurer@uky.edu__

2. University Studies Requirements or Recommendations for this Program.

	Current	Proposed
I. Mathematics	MA 109 or MA 111	GEN ED IIIa
II. Foreign Language	University requirement	same
III. Inference-Logic	PHI 120/STA 200	GEN ED IIIb
IV. Written Communication		same
V. Oral Communication		Suspended through Fall 2009
VI. Natural Sciences		GEN ED Ib
VII. Social Sciences	CLD 102/AEC 101	GEN ED Ic (CLD 102)
VIII. Humanities	any 6 hours	GEN ED Ia
IX. Cross-Cultural	any 3 hours	GEN ED IVb
X. USP Electives (3 must be outside the student's major)	any 3 hours	any elective

This section has been replaced with new GenEd information

3. Explain whether the proposed changes to the program (as described in sections 4 to 12) involve courses offered by another department/program. Routing Signature Log must include approval by faculty of additional department(s).

__No__

4. **Explain how satisfaction of the University Graduation Writing Requirement will be changed.**

Current	Proposed
☐ Standard University course offering. List: _____	☒ *Standard University course offering.* *List:* CLD 250 or any GWR approved course
☒ Specific course – list: CLD 250	☐ *Specific course) – list:* _____

5. **List any changes to college-level requirements that must be satisfied.**

Current
☒ Standard college requirement.
   List: GEN 100

☐ Specific required course – list: _____

Proposed
☒ *Standard college requirement.*
   List: GEN 100

☐ *Specific course – list:* _____

6. **List pre-major or pre-professional course requirements that will change, including credit hours.**

Current
N/A

Proposed
CLD 100, Intro to CLD, 1 hour
CLD 225, Community & Communications, 3 hours
CLD 230, Intrapersonal Leadership, 3 hours
CLD 260, Community Portraits, 3 hours

Students must earn at least a C in the above 4 courses ~~and have a 2.0 cumulative GPA~~ before they will be admitted to any upper division courses in the program.
Students in Career and Technical Education who are admitted into the Teacher Education Program would also be able to register for upper division courses in the program.

7. **List the major's course requirements that will change, including credit hours.**

Current	Proposed
CLD 102, Dynamics of Rural Social Life, 3 hours	*CLD 300, Foundational Theories in CLD, 3 hours*
CLD 250, Reading Critically and Writing Well, 3 hours	*CLD 305, Research Methods for CLD, 3 hours*
CLD 302, Leadership Studies, 3 hours	*CLD 362, Field Experience in CLD, 3 hours*
CLD 320, Survey of Agricultural and Consumer Media, 3 hours, 3 hours	*CLD 370, Learning in Society, 3 hours*
CLD 340, Community Interaction, 3 hours	*CLD 490, Senior Seminar in CLD, 3 hours*
CLD 362, Field Experience in CLD, 3 hours	*CLD 497, Professional Practicum in CLD, 3 hours*
CLD 405, Analytic Methods for CLD, 3 hours	
CLD 420, Sociology of Communities, 3 hours	
CLD 490, Senior Seminar in CLD, 3 hours	

8. **Does the pgm require a minor AND does the proposed change affect the required minor?** ☒ N/A   ☐ Yes ☐ No
   If "Yes," indicate current courses and proposed changes below.

Current	Proposed
_____	_____

9. Does the proposed change affect any option(s)?   ☐ N/A   ☒ Yes   ☐ No

If "Yes," indicate current courses and proposed changes below, including credit hours, and also specialties and subspecialties, if any.

Current	Proposed
Option A, Agricultural Communications (21 hours)	*Replaced by 18 hours of "additional courses" in CLD from the following list:*
JOU 101, Introduction to Journalism, 3 hours	
CLD 204, Writing for the Mass Media, 3 hours	
CLD 301, News Reporting, 3 hours	*CLD 325, Writing for Community Media, 3 hours*
CLD 400, Agricultural Communications Campaigns, 3 hours	*CLD 425, Community Communications Campaigns, 3 hours*
CLD 440, Community Processes and Communication, 3 hours	*CLD 440, Community Processes and Communications, 3 hours*
CLD 485, Community Journalism, 3 hours	*CLD 465, Topics in Community Communications, 3 hours*
AEC 101, Agricultural Economics, 3 hours	*CLD 525, Community Diversity and Media, 3 hours*
Option B, Public Service and Leadership, 21 hours	
PS 101, American Government, 3 hours	*CLD 340, Community Interaction, 3 hours*
AEC 305, Food and Ag Marketing Principles, 3 hours	*CLD 420, Sociology of Communities, 3 hours*
AEC 532, Ag and Food Policy, 3 hours	*CLD 460, Community Development and Change, 3 hours*
ECO 201, Principles of Economics I, 3 hours	*CLD 480, Topics in Community, 3 hours*
Choose one of the following:	*CLD 560, Community Inequalities*
CLD 400, CLD 440, CLD 485	*CLD 330, Interpersonal Leadership Skills, 3 hours*
Plus 6 additional hours of courses at the 200-level or higher with advisor's approval from the following departments: PS, ANT, COM, SOC	*CLD 430, Leading in Communities, 3 hours*
	CLD 470, Topics in Leadership, 3 hours
	CLD 530, Fundamentals of Organizatioal Leadership, 3 hours
	CLD 375, Contemporary Adult Learning, 3 hours
	CLD 475, Topics in Non-formal Education, 3 hours
	CLD 575, Schools, Community, and Society, 3 hours
	plus other CLD courses such as 360, 401, 517, 534

10. Does the change affect pgm requirements for number of credit hrs outside the major subject in a related field?   ☐ Yes   ☒ No

If so, indicate current courses and proposed changes below.

Current	Proposed

11. Does the change affect pgm requirements for technical or professional support electives?   ☐ Yes   ☒ No

If so, indicate current courses and proposed changes below.

Current	Proposed

12. Does the change affect a minimum number of free credit hours or support electives?   ☒ Yes   ☐ No

If "Yes," indicate current courses and proposed changes below.

Current	Proposed
17	23

13. Summary of changes in required credit hours:

		Current	Proposed
a.	Credit Hours of Premajor or Preprofessional Courses:	0	10
b.	Credit Hours of Major's Requirements:	27	36
c.	Credit Hours for Required Minor:	--	--
d.	Credit Hours Needed for a Specific Option:	21	--
e.	Credit Hours Outside of Major Subject in Related Field:	--	--
f.	Credit Hours in Technical or Professional Support Electives:	18	18
g.	Minimum Credit Hours of Free/Supportive Electives:	17	23

h.	Total Credit Hours Required by Level:		Current	Proposed
		100:	3	1
		200:	3 +	9 +
		300:	12+	12+
		400-500:	9+	6+

		Current	Proposed
i.	Total Credit Hours Required for Graduation:	120	120

14. Rationale for Change(s) – if rationale involves accreditation requirements, please include specific references to that.

Pre-major requirements have been added so that students have knowledge of the components of Community and Leadership Development before becoming majors. A minimum grade of C is required for the 10 hours of pre-major classes so that students show some proficiency in the major's emphasis areas. The pre-major courses are also intended for enrollment management for the upper level CLD courses. The proposed curriculum also allows more flexibility for students to study the various emphasis areas as best fits their academic interests; the two separate current options (agricultural communications and public service and leadership) will no longer exist. The flexibility will also help the department manage faculty teaching resources since more courses taught by more different faculty will be available for students outside the core course requirements.

15. List below the typical semester by semester program for the major. If multiple options are available, attach a separate sheet for each option.

YEAR 1 – FALL: (e.g. "BIO 103; 3 credits")	GEN ED II a, 3 credits GEN ED III a, 3 credits GEN ED 1a, 3 credits GEN 100, 3 credits CLD 100, 1 credit Elective, 3 credits	YEAR 1 – SPRING:	GEN ED IIb, 3 credits GEN ED Ic, 3 credits GEN ED Ib, 3 credits GEN ED Id, 3 credits GEN ED IVb, 3 credits
YEAR 2 - FALL :	GEN ED IIIb, 3 credits CLD 225, 3 credits CLD 230, 3 credits CLD 260, 3 credits Elective, 3 credits	YEAR 2 – SPRING:	Graduation Writing Req., 3 credits CLD 370, 3 credits CLD Additional (1), 3 credits CLD Adiditional (2), 3 credits Elective, 3 credits

YEAR 3 - FALL:	CLD 300, 3 credits CLD Additional (3), 3 credits CLD Additional (4), 3 credits Specialty Support (1), 3 credits Elective, 3 credits	YEAR 3 - SPRING:	_CLD 305, 3 credits_ _CLD 362, 3 credits_ _CLD Additional (5), 3 credits_ _Specialty Support (2), 3 credits_ _Specialty Support (3), 3 credits_
YEAR 4 - FALL:	CLD 497, 3 credits CLD Additional (6), 3 credits Specialty Support (4), 3 credits Specialty Support (5), 3 credits Elective, 3 credits	YEAR 4 - SPRING:	_CLD 490, 3 credits_ _Specialty Support (6), 3 credits_ _Electives, 8 credits_

CHANGE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM FORM

Signature Routing Log

General Information:

Current Degree Title and Major Name: <u>B.S. in Community Communications and Leadership Development</u>

Proposal Contact Person Name: <u>Dr. Rick Maurer</u>   Phone: <u>7-7582</u>   Email: <u>richard.maurer@uky.edu</u>

INSTRUCTIONS:

Identify the groups or individuals reviewing the proposal; note the date of approval; offer a contact person for each entry; and obtain signature of person authorized to report approval.

Internal College Approvals and Course Cross-listing Approvals:

Reviewing Group	Date Approved	Contact Person (name/phone/email)	Signature
Dpt Faculty	8/20/10	Gary Hansen 17-7586 ghansen@uky.edu	
UCC-CBA	10/29/10	Larry Grobay 71885 larry.groboy@uky.edu	Gary J. Grabfer 11/27/10
		/ /	
		/ /	
		/ /	

External-to-College Approvals:

Council	Date Approved	Signature	Approval of Revision[3]
Undergraduate Council	3/23/2011	Sharon Gill *Digitally signed by Sharon Gill DN: cn=Sharon Gill, o=Undergraduate Education, ou=Undergraduate Council, email=sgill@uky.edu, c=US Date: 2011.03.23 11:24:03 -04'00'*	
Graduate Council			
Health Care Colleges Council			
Senate Council Approval		University Senate Approval	

Comments:

---

[3] Councils use this space to indicate approval of revisions made subsequent to that council's approval, if deemed necessary by the revising council.

Brothers, Sheila C

From:	Raphael Finkel [raphael@cs.uky.edu]
Sent:	Tuesday, November 22, 2011 10:56 AM
To:	Brothers, Sheila C
Cc:	Davis, Alison F; Feddock, Christopher A; Meyer, A L; Carl Lee; Lowry, Regina; Fuqua, Zachary D; Raphael Finkel; Scott Yost; Provost, University of Kentucky; Witt, Don
Subject:	SAASC, item 5: Community Communication and Leadership Development

Sheila,

After deliberation, the SAASC has voted in favor of the two proposals concerning Community Communication and Leadership Development: admission requirements and minor requirements.

Raphael

--- notes

First, there have been some already approved curricular changes to CLD courses

    Renumberings:

        320 -> 225
        302 -> 230
        405 -> 305

    The following still exist, even though they are no longer to be required for all majors:

        102, 250, 340, 420

    The following still exist and are still required:

        362, 490

    The following are new:

        100 (1 hour), 260, 300, 370, 497 (practicum)

The proposal for the minor is to revamp the minor requirements by replacing

    302, 320, 2 of (405, 420, 340, 440), 2 CLD courses 300+
    (18 hours)

    with

    pre-major: 100 (1 credit), 225 (renumbered from 320),
        230 (renumbered from 302), 260
    major: 300, 370, 2 CLD courses 300+
    (22 hours)

We see no difficulty with this proposal. It looks like the department is taking its restructuring seriously.

NEW UNDERGRADUATE MINOR / CHANGE UNDERGRADUATE MINOR FORM

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Program: Community and Leadership Development

Minor: Community and Leadership Development

College: Agriculture   Department: Community and Leadership Development

Bulletin PP: _____   CIP Code: 01.0899.01

Accrediting Agency (if applicable):   _____

⇨

Section II: New Minor

Minor Prerequisites (list course prefix, number and title):   _____

Minor Requirements (list course prefix, number and title):   _____

Minor Electives (list course prefix, number and title):   _____

Total Hours Required: _____

Rationale for Proposal: _____

Section III: Change in Minor Requirements

Current	Proposed
CLD 302	Pre-Major requirements: CLD 100, CLD 225 (formerly 320), CLD 230 (formerly 302), CLD 260
CLD 320	CLD 300
Two of the following: CLD 405, CLD 420, CLD 340, CLD 440	CLD 370
Two additional courses in CLD, 300-level and above, with advisor's approval.	Two additional courses in CLD, 300-level and above, with advisor's approval
_____	Students must earn at least a C in the above 4 courses ~~and~~ ~~have a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.0~~ before they will be admiited to any upper division courses in the program.
_____	_____

Current Total Hours: 18   Proposed Total Hours: 22

Rationale for Proposal: The CLD undergraduate program is undergoing extensive revision, and these changes in the minor better reflect the new course offerings.

Will this program be printed in the Bulletin?   Yes ☒   No ☐

NEW UNDERGRADUATE MINOR / CHANGE UNDERGRADUATE MINOR FORM

Signature Routing Log

General Information:

Proposal Name: <u>Community and Leadership Development</u>

Proposal Contact Person Name: <u>Dr. Rick Maurer</u>   Phone: <u>7-7582</u>   Email: <u>richard.maurer@uky.edu</u>

INSTRUCTIONS:

Identify the groups or individuals reviewing the proposal; note the date of approval; offer a contact person for each entry; and obtain signature of person authorized to report approval.

Internal College Approvals and Course Cross-listing Approvals:

Reviewing Group	Date Approved	Contact Person (name/phone/email)	Signature
Dept. Faculty	8/20/10	Garry Hansen 7-7586 ghansen@uky.edu	
UCC-CDA	10/29/10	Larry Grabau 7-18851 Larry.Grabau@uky.edu	11/29/10
		/ /	
		/ /	
		/ /	

External-to-College Approvals:

Council	Date Approved	Signature	Approval of Revision[1]
Undergraduate Council	2/15/2011	Sharon Gill *Digitally signed by Sharon Gill DN: cn=Sharon Gill, o=Undergraduate Education, ou=Undergraduate Council, email=sgill@uky.edu, c=US Date: 2011.02.16 10:00:48 -05'00'*	
Graduate Council			
Health Care Colleges Council			
Senate Council Approval		University Senate Approval	

Comments:

---

[1] Councils use this space to indicate approval of revisions made subsequent to that council's approval, if deemed necessary by the revising council.

UK University Scholars Combined BS-MS Program

The WKU-UK joint Civil Engineering program is a collaborative program between Western Kentucky University and the University of Kentucky leading to a Bachelor of Science degree. Students in this program are considered students of both institutions by the joint program agreement, and are strongly encouraged to pursue graduate studies in Civil Engineering. As such, eligible students may apply to participate in the UK University Scholar Combined BS-MS Program. This program leads to a Bachelor of Science (BS) degree from WKU/UK and a Master of Science in Civil Engineering (MSCE) degree from UK. After admission to the program, the benefits to the student would be the following:

- The student may apply up to six hours of 500-level UK courses, taken as an undergraduate in the joint program toward his/her MSCE at UK. However, the faculty in these courses must be informed by the student that he/she should be treated as a graduate student.
- The student may be able to complete his/her last semester at UK and take advantage of the 6-hour BS-MSCE double count.

Students seeking admissions to the UK University Scholar Program may apply for entry to the program after completing at least 100 credit hours of the undergraduate Civil Engineering curriculum. No less than 30 of these credit hours must be in CE prefix courses. Students must also have an overall undergraduate GPA not less than 3.2, and a GPA not less than 3.5 for all CE prefix courses at the time of application to the program. Students must also take the Graduate Record Examination (GRE), and the scores must be available prior to entry. Student applicants must have a combined score on the verbal and quantitative portions of the GRE of at least 1,000.

Students admitted into the UK University Scholars Program in Civil Engineering have two options for completing a Master of Science in Civil Engineering (MSCE) degree. These options are:

- Option A: Thesis option: 24 credit hours of course work plus thesis. The thesis counts as six credit hours. This is a research oriented MSCE.
- Option B: Non-thesis option: 30 credit hours of course work. This is a course oriented MSCE.

MSCE Thesis Option A:
All students choosing the thesis option complete a minimum of 24 credit hours. At least 12 credit hours at the 600 or 700 levels except University Scholar students need only complete 9 credits hours at the 600 or 700 levels.

MSCE Non-thesis Option B:
Option B1: Students choosing this non-thesis option will have to complete a minimum of 30 credit hours of graduate course work, including three hours of CE 790 or CE 791. At least 15 credit hours must be at the 600 or 700 levels except for University Scholar students who need only 12 credit hours at the 600 or 700 levels.

Option B2: Students choosing this non-thesis option will have to complete a minimum of 30 credit hours of graduate course work. These courses must have at least three hours of embedded independent study hours. The list of such courses is provided in the UK-CE Graduate Handbook, which may be found on-line. At least 15 credit hours must be at the the 600 or 700 levels except for University Scholar students who must complete 12 credit hours at the 600 or 700 levels.

For more information contact:

Shane M. Palmquist, Ph.D., P.E.
Associate Professor
Civil Engineering Coordinator
Department of Engineering
Western Kentucky University
270-745-2919
shane.palmquist@wku.edu

Kamyar C. Mahboub, Ph.D., P.E.
Lawson Professor of Civil Engineering
Director of Graduate Studies
Department of Civil Engineering
University of Kentucky
859-257-4279
kmahboub@engr.uky.edu

Approved by College of Engineering Faculty – 02/27/2011

Richard J. Sweigard
rsweigar@engr.uky.edu
7-8827

Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 1.4.4.2*

Background:
In its 2010-2011 annual report to the University Senate, the Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure described that situations have arisen in which the affected faculty employee did submit partial appeal documentation by the deadline of 60 days to "initiate" an appeal, but then did not submit the remainder of the appeal documentation until sometimes months later. When there is such a delay in finally submitting all materials it can frustrate the achievement of what would have been the most commensurate remedy to the situation. The University Senate has the discretion to prescribe a final deadline for submission of all appeal materials to the SACPT. The SACPT recommended that this 75th day deadline be incorporated into the Senate Rules.

1.4.4.2   Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT)

….

> As prescribed by GR X.B.1.e, when the petitioner lodges his/her complaint in writing to the Chair of the SACPT, the SACPT shall make an informal investigation, including affording the petitioner an opportunity to be heard by the SACPT, for the purpose of attempting to effect a resolution mutually agreeable to the President and the petitioner. In the case that such a resolution is not obtained, the SACPT shall recommend to the President whether, in its opinion, the termination or nonreappointment decision should be sustained. The subsequent disposition of the matter by the President shall be as prescribed in GR X.B.1.e.
>
> **(c)**   Consideration of allegations of violation of established procedure, academic privilege and/or academic freedom that involve**:**
>
> > **i.**   a faculty employee's terminal reappointment, promotion and/or tenure (AR II-1.0-1.IV.A; AR II-1.0-1.III.I)
> >
> > **ii.**   cases of allegation by a faculty member on a non-tenured appointment that a decision for non-reappointment violates either GR I.D.2.a or GR X.A.1 dealing with certain discriminatory practices.

The petitioner ~~shall~~ must submit ~~the complaint in writing~~ to the Chair of the SACPT a letter initiating the appeal within 60 days, and the appeal and supporting documentation within 75 days, after written notification by the dean of a final decision of nonrenewal, terminal reappointment or disapproval of promotion and/or tenure.

The SACPT may extend the 75-day deadline by majority vote.

The function of the committee in all such cases is to first exercise informal vetting processes to attempt to effect a resolution that makes a formal recommendation to the President for action unnecessary. In cases where such an informal resolution is not obtained, the committee will exercise formal processes of investigation, including affording to the petitioner an opportunity to appear before the SACPT. With copy to the petitioner, the SACPT will submit to the President its analysis of the alleged violations and will recommend to the President what commensurate remedial action, if any, ought to be taken. The President, or upon the President's delegation the Provost, shall notify the petitioning faculty employee and the SACPT in writing of the decision.

Recommendation from the SREC: that the University Senate approve the proposed amendment to Senate Rule 1.4.4.2.

University Senate
February 13, 2012

Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 3.1.0*

<u>Background</u>:
In June 2005, the Board of Trustees *Governing Regulations* were extensively revised, including a number of provisions clarifying and extending the role of the University Senate to establish University-level academic policies. In February 2006, the University Senate approved an omnibus revision to the *Senate Rules*, to reflect those 2005 changes in the *Governing Regulations*; except that Section 3 of the *Senate Rules* was not correspondingly revised and has yet to be correspondingly revised. Hence, its current language does not reflect some of the authorities and responsibilities that have been delegated to the University Senate by the Board of Trustees.

In addition, there have been subsequent changes in policies of SACS and the Council on Postsecondary Education that control particular programmatic features of the University's academic programs. Those SACS/CPE academic policies also need to be incorporated into Section 3 of the *Senate Rules*.

The attached revised Section 3.1.0 of the *Senate Rules* (next page) is the first installment from the Senate Rules and Elections Committee of the necessary updating of the University Senate Rules to reflect the current Board of Trustees *Governing Regulations* and the policies of SACS and the Council on Postsecondary Education. These revisions to *SR 3.1.0* also incorporate responses of the Registrar, the Dean of the Graduate School and the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education.

<u>Recommendation from the SREC</u>: that the University Senate approve the proposed revisions to Senate Rule 3.1.0.

3.0 Section III: Course Numbering System and Curriculum Procedures

3.1.0 COURSE NUMBERING SYSTEM

Courses shall be numbered as follows:

001-099 No credit, non-degree and/or developmental courses; [US: 9/10/01]

100-199 Open to freshmen; undergraduate credit only;

200-299 Prerequisite sophomore classification; or consent of instructor; undergraduate credit only;

300-399 Prerequisite junior classification; undergraduate credit only;

400-499 Prerequisite junior classification; undergraduate credit;

400G-499G Graduate credit for non-majors;

500-599 Prerequisite junior classification; undergraduate and graduate credit;

600-799 Open only to graduate students;

800-999 Open only to students in professional colleges and to students in other colleges offering professional degrees as defined by the Council on Postsecondary Education.

3.1.1 Exceptions

Exceptions to the requirements for admission to courses may be made as follows:

A. Freshmen and sophomores may be admitted to courses numbered between 300 and 499, upon approval of the instructor and the dean of the student's college. Such approval shall be limited to students who have demonstrated superior ability or preparation.

B. Seniors with superior ability or preparation may be admitted to courses numbered between 600 and 799, upon approval of the instructor, the dean of the student's college and the dean of the Graduate School.

C. Courses elected on a Pass-Fail basis (see Section 5,1.4 for specifics).

3.1.2 Blocks of Numbers for Certain Courses
The following blocks of numbers are set aside by the Registrar's Office for use of specific courses as indicated:

A. 395 Independent Work or Independent Study. If a department offers more than one such course, numbers lower than 395 shall be used.

B. 396 Reserved for the University Experiential Education course.

C. 399 Departmental field based experiential education courses. May be repeated to a total of 30 hours. To provide the opportunity for students with the approval of a faculty member and the department chairman--or his/her designee--to earn credit for work-study experience. The student must work with a faculty member to describe the nature of the experience, the work to be performed, accompanying learning experiences, appropriate course credit for the work, and criteria by which the student's work may be evaluated. This information must be written and filed in the departmental office and the Office for Experiential Education prior to the student's registration for the course. *Bulletin* descriptions of these courses shall include an explicit statement of the need for filling out a learning contract.

D. 748 Master's Thesis Research. May be repeated three calendar years (0 credits [US 3/6/00]

E. 749 Dissertation Research. May be repeated three calendar years (0 credits) [US 3/6/00]

F. 768 Residence credit for master's degree. May be repeated once. (1-6 credits equivalence)

767 Dissertation Residency Credit. Residency credit for dissertation research after the qualifying examination. Students may register for this course in the semester of the qualifying examination. A minimum of two semesters are required as well as continuous enrollment (Fall and Spring) until the dissertation is completed and defended. (2 credit hours).

G. 770-779 Seminar courses.

H. 769 Residence credit for doctoral degree. May be repeated indefinitely. (0-12 credits equivalence)

I. 790-799 Research courses.

J. 880-889 Seminar courses in professional colleges.

K. 895-899 Independent work: professional colleges.

L. The following are reserved for enrollments to report numbers in these categories to the Council on Postsecondary Education

  1. **PD 099** Reserved for enrollment of Postdoctoral Scholars and Postdoctoral Fellows

  2. **MC 800** Reserved for enrollment of Residents and Clinical Fellows in the health care professional programs

3.1.3 Remedial Courses

All remedial courses created by the University Senate shall be designated with the letter R following the course designation and number. No course designated with an R shall count for credit towards a degree at the University of Kentucky. [US: 3/7/88; US 4/10/00; US9/10/01; SREC: 6/8/06]

3.1.4 Expectations in 400G and 500-level courses

Combined instruction of graduate and undergraduate students in 400G and 500-level courses must be structured to ensure appropriate attention to both groups, and a corresponding differentiation in expectations. This differentiation is to be accomplished by (i) the completion of additional or distinct assignments by the enrolled graduate students that are consistent with graduate-level scholarship; and/or (ii) the establishment of different grading criteria in the course for graduate versus undergraduate students, reflecting a higher standard for graduate students. The grading scale for both graduate and undergraduate students must be clearly stated in the syllabus. [US: 5/5/03]

University Senate
February 13, 2012

Recommendation Regarding Certain 800- and 900-Level Courses

Background:
During earlier years, SACS and the KY Council on Postsecondary Education defined professional degree programs in terms of "first professional degree." However, the Interim VP for Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness (Heidi Anderson) and the Associate Provost for Administration (Jeannine Blackwell) have described that recently SACS and CPE changed the definition so that the only degree programs that are classified as "professional" degree programs (as distinct from undergraduate or graduate degree programs) are those which are programs for the "first professional doctorate."

The University Registrar also described to the Senate Rules and Elections Committee that the use of 800-900 number courses by degree programs that are not in the SACS/CPE classification as "professional" degree programs creates difficulties for the Registrar in generating various programmatic reports to external agencies.

Therefore, the Senate Rules and Elections Committee submits the below recommendation that these degree programs currently using 800-900 level course numbers but which do not meet the new SACS/CPE definition of "professional degree program" change their course numbers to the appropriate different number series.

Recommendation from the SREC: that the degree programs which currently use the 800-900 professional program course number series, but which do not meet the recently changed definition by SACS/CPE for professional degree programs, process through the Senate 'minor changes' procedure changes of their course numbers into the appropriate number series, with a goal that the changes will be effective fall semester 2013.