

University Senate Agenda

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

Monday, April 12, 2010

1. Minutes and Announcements
 - o Minutes from February 8, 2010 pg. 2-10
 - o Minutes from March 8, 2010 pg. 11-16
2. UK May 2010 Degree List
3. Proposed Change to Engineering Standing Requirements for Chemical Engineering pg. 17-19
4. Proposed New Dual Degree: PharmD and MS in Physician Assistant Studies pg. 20-31
5. Proposed Change to Minor in Computer Science pg. 32-36
6. Winter Intersession Report
7. Proposed Permanent Winter Intersession (Discussion Only - First Reading)
8. Code of Student Conduct (for Endorsement) pg. 37-62
9. QEP Update
10. Proposed Changes to *Administrative Regulations* (for Endorsement)
 - o *AR 3:4* ("Out-Of-State Employment or Assignment of Faculty and Staff")
 - Track Changes Version pg. 63-65
 - Clean Version pg. 66-67
 - o *AR 4:7* ("Student Financial Aid Appeals and Advisory Committee")
 - Track Changes Version pg. 68-69
 - Clean Version pg. 70-71
 - o *AR 10:2* ("Information Technology Advisory Committees")
 - Track Changes Version pg. 72-76
 - Clean Version pg. 77-80
11. Proposed Changes to *Administrative Regulations 2:9* ("Lecturer Title Series") pg. 81-88
12. Update on Transfer Action Plan Legislation - Provost Kumble Subbaswamy
13. Reminder on Submitting New Business pg. 89

Next Meeting: May 3, 2010

University Senate
February 8, 2010

The University Senate met in regular session on Monday, February 8, 2010 at 3 pm in the Auditorium of the W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a voice vote unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Dave Randall called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:03 pm.

1. Minutes from December 14, 2009 and Announcements

Hayes **moved** to that the minutes for December 14, 2009 be approved as distributed and D. Jones **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair then reported a number of announcements.

- Approval for distance learning (DL) delivery for 800- and 900-level courses from the health care colleges will reside with the Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC) chair. In the past, such requests came to the Chair for approval, but because everything else dealing with those types of courses is handled in the HCCC, it was logical for this approval authority to also fall to the HCCC chair. All other requirements remain the same.
- There is an expedited review process for requesting DL delivery for a special topics course (assuming there is an existing special topics course). After college approval, a faculty member can submit the DL Form and a sample syllabus to the SC Chair for DL approval for four semesters.
- Senator Fran Harding-Fanning (Nursing) was chosen as the faculty representative to the Work-Life Supervisor of the Year Selection Committee.
- The Senate's Admissions & Academic Standards Committee (SA&ASC) asked Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Mike Mullen for some clarification regarding guidelines for and approval of undergraduate certificates. The issue of undergraduate certificates will return to the SA&ASC soon, and be presented to Senate later this semester.
- There is an ongoing effort to revise the language in the *Administrative Regulations* pertaining to a joint faculty/administration committee for information technology (IT). One primary goal is to involve faculty more intimately in decisions regarding IT. The new language will be presented to the Senate soon.
- A new web transmittal was posted February 4 – objections will be received through Monday, February 15.
- The Provost has requested faculty nominees for the Summative Evaluation of the College of Medicine Review Committee. Please send suggestions to Mrs. Brothers by Friday.
- While no one doubts that the activities and decisions of academic area advisory committees are very important, there is a desperate need for volunteers for these committees. An email

solicitation to approximately 350 faculty sent on three separate occasions thus far netted just 11 responses. The Chair implored senators to ask colleagues to serve, noting that faculty who do not participate in the tenure and promotion process cannot complain about said process.

- Reminding senators about the SEC Affiliated Faculty Leaders (SECAFL) meeting at UK this past fall, he explained that current faculty senators will receive email from a graduate student associated with the group, Amber Stegelin-Fallucca (University of South Carolina doctoral candidate). Her dissertation project is entitled, "Faculty Senate Knowledge and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics: A Conference-Level Perspective." UK's IRB has already been contacted, the survey takes 10-15 minutes to complete, and a summary of results will be sent to the Chair, and also posted on SECAFL web site. The Chair urged senators to participate.
- There is a new curriculum website at www.uky.edu/curriculum being piloted to track approval of course and program requests. Jeannine Blackwell, dean of the Graduate School, has been the driving force behind this effort.

2. Proposed Change to Masters of Business Administration

The Chair invited Merl Hackbart (Gatton College of Business and Economics) to explain the proposal. Guest Hackbart said that it was relatively simple – until present, the admission exam required for students applying to the Masters in Business Administration was the GMAT. Business schools are increasingly accepting the GRE, and accepting that exam score is the proposed change. Hackbart explained that the largest percentage of students coming into the Masters in Business Administration come from engineering and the hard sciences, where many have taken the GRE in anticipation of pursuing work in their disciplines.

Hackbart said that the same rationale applied to the request to change the admissions requirements for the PhD in Business Administration. He said that the GRE score was as meaningful as the GMAT.

The Chair said that he had failed to mention that all the day's proposals came from the Senate Council (SC) with a positive recommendation.

Wood **moved** that the Senate approve the proposed change to the Masters of Business Administration, effective fall 2010 and Chappell **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Proposed Change to Ph.D. in Business Administration

Hulse **moved** that the Senate approve the proposed change in the Ph.D. in Business Administration, effective fall 2010 and Sellnow **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Code of Conduct Issue – Pharmacy Senator

The Chair noted that the matter was not an action item, but rather something about which the SC wants the Senate to be informed. He invited Senator Daniel Wermeling (Pharmacy) to the podium.

Wermeling began by thanking the Chair for giving him the opportunity to meet with the SC on several occasions, and giving Pharmacy faculty the opportunity to express their concerns. He then gave a presentation outlining how the Code of Conduct policy was instituted without faculty input, how it contradicts other current University policies and how Pharmacy was able to move forward.

Chappell asked if there was any explanation for the lack of responsiveness by University attorneys when Wermeling pointed out obvious language conflicts. Wermeling said he was never given an answer, although he assumed it had something to do with his suggestions being perceived as an eleventh-hour change when the language was to be presented to the Board of Trustees (BoT) in less than two weeks; if his suggestions were investigated and incorporated, that would have required postponing the BoT presentation to another meeting. He said it was also possible that the then-impending accreditation of the College of Medicine (Medicine) was the impetus. Both the Dean of Medicine and the Provost said the Code of Conduct only applied to Medicine, but the official version on the books applies to all health care colleges, even though it is only being enforced in Medicine.

Referring to comments made by Wermeling during his recent visit to the SC, Grossman asked him to share that information with the Senate. Wermeling said that there was language in the Code of Conduct that attempted to restrict a faculty member's ability to hear someone speak – it restricted a faculty member's ability to be in a professional society that might be subsidized by the industry for continuing education, and overreached into other aspects of association with professional societies.

The Chair said that Code of Conduct language was currently being revised by the *Administrative Regulations* review committee, and he expected a positive outcome.

5. Quality Enhancement Program Topic Selection Plan

The Chair invited Guest Deanna Sellnow (Communications and Information Studies) and Senator Diane Snow (Medicine) to present information on the Quality Enhancement Program (QEP) Topic Selection Plan as required by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in anticipation of UK's accreditation visit in 2012. Sellnow said that the day's presentation was the update mentioned during her visit to the Senate in November. Sellnow then gave a presentation to senators.

Grossman asked her to comment on the financial aspects. Sellnow explained that the brainstorming session was intended to be open and without restrictions, but that another phase would follow in which criteria will be developed and guided by constraints in terms of budget and personnel. It will be important to ensure the QEP plan can be accomplished within a certain budget.

R. Jones asked about the members from Libraries. Snow replied that there were some staff members in Libraries that were also included. Snow said that she and Sellnow will return in April.

6. Relocation of Masters in Health Administration Degree Program (from Martin School of Public Policy and Administration to College of Public Health)

The Chair explained that the Senate had the authority and responsibility to approve or not approve the move of an academic degree program based upon its academic merits. There were very specific delineations between academic (Senate's purview) and non-academic responsibilities. While the Senate holds direct responsibility for academic merit, its role in the review of the proposal's non-academic merits takes the form of endorsing or not endorsing. The Chair said that the Senate would be asked to hold two votes after discussion, one on the academic merits and one on the non-academic merits of the move.

Director Bill Hoyt (Martin School of Public Policy and Administration) and Dean Steve Wyatt (College of Public Health) were in attendance to help explain the proposal, as was Jeannine Blackwell, dean of the Graduate School. The Chair invited Dean Blackwell to explain the proposed relocation of the Masters in

Health Administration (MHA) degree program from the Martin School of Public Policy and Administration (MSPPA) to the College of Public Health (PbH). She then gave a presentation explaining various aspects of the proposed move.

Noting that the motion at hand dealt with approving or not approving, the Chair noted that the vote on the proposal was not unanimous at the Senate Council (SC), but it did come with a positive recommendation. Grossman **moved** to approve the move of the MHA degree program based upon its academic merits, effective summer 2010, and Swanson **seconded**.

Hayes stated that she had a very direct question to pose; she asked Hoyt if it was the case that the issue revolved around sour grapes and if the tenured faculty member who moved from MSPPA to PbH attempted to force the MHA program to follow. Guest Hoyt replied that while it was possible it played some role, he noted that just that one departure was a significant reduction to the number of faculty devoted to the MHA program. Hoyt said fairness required a broader view – that departure certainly precipitated the discussion, but so did the Provost’s formation of the committee charged to investigate the MHA program and its associated campus resources, access to healthcare professionals for internships, and faculty expertise.

Noting that the motion on the floor pertained to the academic merits of the proposed move, D. Jones asked Hoyt to speak on behalf of the MHA program faculty and explain the best case of the academic merits to not approve the proposal. Jones reiterated that he was looking for the perspective of those faculty currently in the MHA program. Hoyt replied that as an economist by training, the best argument for not approving would be to view the MHA-graduate job market as the test, and the MHA program did a very good job placing its students. While acknowledging the need for accreditation, Hoyt added that the most relevant measure of the program’s viability in its current home was the success in placing students. Hoyt said that MSPPA faculty have been moving forward with the MHA’s move to PbH, in spite of faculty members’ opposition to the move.

Nadel raised a **point of order**. He stated that the only discussion allowed should take the form of pros and cons, and not a question and answer session. Nadel said that the Senate needed to debate the motion on the floor. If the Senate wished to move to a question and answer session, the the motion should be withdrawn. The Senate should be debating business once something is placed on the floor. The Chair replied that senators were debating the motion and Nadel asked if questions and answers were allowed according to Robert’s Rules of Order (RRO). Parliamentarian Seago began to answer, but Nadel cut her off, saying he was not interested in her opinion, but rather the language in RRO.

The Parliamentarian requested a few moments to research Nadel’s question, and quickly offered a response. The Parliamentarian read from RRO, which said that the distinction between debate and questioning should be kept in view, but that questioning was allowed when it would assist discussion, within the discretion of the Chair. The Chair ruled that the questioning was relevant to the motion on the floor.

Yanarella addressed his question to the Chair. He said that when he was last involved in discussions about the move he had some concerns, particularly the academic merits. Given the lack of majority support in MSPPA and Yanarella’s understanding that moving the MHA program would shift 30 – 40% of the students in the MSPPA toward PbH, the SC moved a motion to request that the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAO&SC) investigate some very specific questions, specifically related to the academic merits. He asked for an update since that time. Dean Blackwell replied that the

questions given to the SAO&SC were then passed to the MSPPA for responses, which were returned to the SAO&SC. The SAO&SC reviewed the answers and offered the SC a positive recommendation for the move. Dean Blackwell added that Provost Subbaswamy offered a statement ensuring continuation of resources for the MSPPA.

In response to Snow's question about student input into the move, Hoyt replied that he was unsure of the level of student input. He said that they did meet with students and discussed possibilities, but he did not recollect any attempt to ascertain their views. The anticipated move was explained to make sure that students' academic training would not be disrupted. Swanson opined that in terms of academic merits, it would be helpful for senators to understand what students in the MHA program were trained to do, and where they could be placed. Hoyt said that among other degrees, the MSPPA offered the Masters in Health Administration and the Masters in Public Policy, which trained students for careers in administration and management. Students were primarily but not exclusively placed in non- and for-profit health administration institutions and public health agencies. Initially, though, many students were placed in fellowships.

Grossman said he had a statement regarding the academic merits of the move. He pointed out that past success was no predictor of future success. It was clear that no one was trying to punish the MSPPA, and the MHA program had done well in the past. Accreditation could become an issue, since the MSPPA was moving away from a policy focus. In light of these considerations, it would make sense to look to the future of the MHA program and a better fit in PbH. Grossman said that the issue was not the MSPPA, but rather that PbH is the best fit for the future.

Wood said that at least part of the academic merit seemed to revolve around reaccreditation taking place in 2010. The MHA program is a multidisciplinary program, has been for decades, and has been reaccredited time after time with the cooperation of faculties across campus, even before the existence of the College of Public Health. She asked Hoyt to share any direct communication he received from the accrediting agency to imply that the accreditation of the MHA program was in jeopardy. Hoyt replied that he met with a representative from the accrediting agency soon after he (Hoyt) was appointed to the position of director in January 2009. Shortly thereafter in early March, he and then-director of the MSPPA met with John Lloyd, the head of the Commission on Accreditation Healthcare Management Education, and discussed matters with him. Hoyt said he left that meeting with the view that it was possible to be reaccredited, although it would be challenging. Hoyt said that he did not receive any communication about the MHA program being in peril.

Estus said that he was puzzled by the accreditation requirement for five MHA faculty, if the MSPPA had one tenured faculty member remaining, one who left and a slot unfilled, which only amounted to three positions. He asked for the home location of the faculty who are used with the MHA program. Dean Blackwell said there was a very interdisciplinary team approach to coursework for the MHA program. She said that the first year of coursework was made up of specialized sections of coursework from the MSPPA, with special sections of the same type of course for public policy and public health. Courses heavy on examples of the health administration world are taught by faculty from the MSPPA, including the individual who is the primary faculty member in the MHA program. As students move into other coursework, faculty members on overload from various related fields do more instruction, although faculty are primarily drawn from PbH and Pharmacy. Individuals from the community have also taught those courses. Dean Blackwell said that the most serious academic challenge in her eyes had to do with the revision of the entire curriculum to meet the accrediting requirements for a practice-based competency curriculum.

Noting the time and the other agenda items, the Chair asked if there were any additional questions. Wasilkowski asked how many faculty will become primary to the MHA program if it moved to PbH. Dean Wyatt replied that there were already five faculty with backgrounds in the MHA field and will work with that program, and that there were currently 13 or 14 faculty in PbH's Department of Health Services Management who will also be engaged.

Noting the emphasis on the move to competency-based instruction for the MHA program, Thelin noted that such a move started in around 1972. He wondered what caused the sudden urgency. Dean Wyatt said that while public health had been in a competency-based instruction for some time, the MHA was only just moving in that direction.

There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was held on the **motion** to approve the move of the MHA degree program based upon its academic merits, effective summer 2010. The motion **passed** with a majority in favor.

Grossman then **moved** that the Senate endorse the move of the MHA degree program based upon its non-academic merits, effective summer 2010 and Wasilkowski **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with a majority in favor.

7. December 2009 KCTS Candidate for Credentials

The Chair noted that Senate approval of KCTS candidates for credentials would be ending in the 2010/2011 academic year.

Estus **moved** that the elected university faculty senators approve the December 2009 KCTS candidate for credentials, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degree to be conferred by the Board and D. Anderson **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

8. TurnItIn Informational Presentation

The Chair invited Senator Ruth Beattie (Arts and Science) to share information about the plagiarism prevention software TurnItIn, and she gave a brief presentation. After her comments, she noted that a recommendation would be made to the SC towards the end of the semester about purchasing the software. She encouraged senators to email her with any strong comments or opinions.

9. Proposed Change in Admission Requirements for BS in Nursing

Associate Dean Patricia Burkhart (College of Nursing) explained the proposal to change the admission requirements for the BS in Nursing. Guest Burkhart said that the proposal came with a positive recommendation from the undergraduate faculty in the College of Nursing, the Health Care Colleges Council and the Senate Council.

Before offering the four main points of the proposal, Burkhart said that the overall rationale was to more accurately reflect the competitive applicant pool and for students to be more successful in practice. There were four primary changes.

1. The minimum high school GPA will rise from 2.5 to 2.75; students with a 2.5 GPA were not typically successful.

2. The minimum GPA for consideration for entry into the professional program will rise from 2.5 to 2.75; the average GPA of students accepted is 3.6. Some applicants and parents have wondered why the minimum GPA is so low when the competition is so high.
3. The new TOEFL requirement reflects the critical importance of speaking clear English to patient safety. The requirements were decided upon after discussion with campus experts and national standards.
4. The ACT composite score required for guaranteed admission to the professional level will rise from 26 to 28, to be more consistent with UK's Strategic Plan.

Chappell **moved** that the Senate approve the proposed changes in admissions requirements for the BS Nursing, effective fall 2010 and Wermeling **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

10. General Education Update

The Chair told senators that the vetting of Gen Ed courses was ongoing. He said that course submissions for Gen Ed approval need to include the undergraduate grading scale on the syllabus. Referring to the supplied draft Gen Ed form and draft Gen Ed processes, he explained that the approval process for Gen Ed courses mirrored the process for University Studies Program courses. There was an additional form that needed to be submitted, customized for Gen Ed purposes. When asked if there were any objections, no senator raised a hand.

11. Honorary Degree Recipients

The Chair invited Dean Blackwell to present the nominees for honorary degrees. He reminded senators that the names were highly confidential and asked that the names not be shared with anyone. Dean Blackwell offered a brief presentation.

Yanarella **moved** that the elected faculty representatives of the Senate approve each nominee submitted by the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees and each associated degree type, and send the recommendations to President Todd in his role as the Chair of the Senate for submission to the BoT. Chappell **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

12. Third Bachelor's Degrees – Receipt of Report from Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee

The Chair explained that senators were being asked to receive the report from the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee stating that more than two bachelor's degrees were allowed. Chappell **moved** that the Senate accept the report from the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee on more than two bachelor's degrees. Nieman **seconded**. D. Jones asked if the action by the Senate meant that the report would be received and filed, or if it would be endorsed as new policy. The Chair replied that it would be received and filed.

There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

12. Proposed Change to Graduate School Calendar

Dean Blackwell explained that the request meant that the deadline for international students to apply to the Graduate School would change from February 1 to March 15 for the fall term, and from June 15 to August 15 for the spring term. When the deadlines were established about 10 years ago, after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, there were new visa requirements established by the State

Department. The deadlines were created to ensure sufficient time for students to get a visa. Bureaucratic processes are moving more quickly, and the Graduate School wants more flexibility for admitting international students through a longer window. Dean Blackwell said that it was part of the Graduate School's attempt to address internationalization.

D. Jones asked if the change meant that the Graduate School needed less time than before, and Dean Blackwell confirmed that less time was needed to process documentation.

Mendondo **moved** that the Senate approve the change in the application date for international applicants, effective immediately. Wasilkowski **seconded**. Grossman opined that the applications dates of the calendar were more of an administrative matter. The Chair confirmed that the calendars were within the purview of the Senate.

There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

12. Memorandum of Understanding – Libraries and College of Law

The Chair explained that the agenda item at hand proposed to move six tenure-track faculty positions from Libraries to the College of Law (Law). He asked Dean David Brennen (College of Law) to come forward and explain the matter. Dean Brennan said that when he arrived at UK about seven months ago, he noticed that the administrative structure at the Law Library was out of sync with other law schools. Of about 200 law schools accredited by the American Bar Association, about six schools have structures such as the one currently in place at UK.

Currently, the Law Library staff and faculty, half of the director position budget and the budget for the Law Library is housed in Libraries. This has impacted the Law Library in a couple of ways – it has been more difficult to attract and in some cases retain directors of the Law Library and it affects the ability of Law to undergo a simplified accreditation process. The current structure does not make accreditation impossible, but it does require an extra round of questions and processes that would be avoided if the Law Library had some autonomy from Libraries. Dean Brennan said that he had spoken with a number of people at UK, include Libraries Interim Dean Birdwhistell, former dean of Libraries Carol Diedrichs, the current Law Library director, each law librarian and the staff members of the Law Library. All expressed support for the move, and all votes taken were unanimous in terms of supporting the transfer. He said that the move would be made effective July 1, 2010. Dean Birdwhistell added that Libraries offered a positive statement for the move, and had submitted letters of support.

Estus **moved** that the Senate endorse the administrative move of the Law Library unit from Libraries to the College of Law, under the conditions specified in the joint Memorandum of Understanding. English **seconded**. Estus asked for and received confirmation from Dean Brennan that the faculty involved in the move were supportive of it. D. Jones asked for additional information about law librarian tenure and promotion processes. Dean Brennan said that after the move, the tenure and promotion process would be within Law, and those tenured Librarians would be tenured in Law. A dual track was set up, so that after the move law librarians will be under almost identical policies to what had been used in Libraries. D. Jones asked about Librarians serving as voting members for educational policy-making in Law. Dean Brennan was unable to say which matters Law Librarians would be able to vote on, but said the Law Librarians, in terms of faculty status, would have rights as faculty of Law.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion that the Senate endorse the administrative move of the Law Library unit from Libraries to the College of Law, under the conditions specified in the joint Memorandum of Understanding. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

13. Proposed Change to SR 1.4.2.9 (“Senate Institutional Finances and Resources Allocation Committee”)

The Chair explained that the changed language regarding the Senate’s Institutional Finances and Resources Allocation Committee (SIFRAC) was a joint effort of the Staff Senate and Senate Council; the Senate was now being asked to approve the changes. Jones **offered an amendment** to change the language¹ in *i.* pertaining to the purpose of SIFRAC to read as follows:

...Committee shall analyze public budget documents, published reports about financial and other trends, ~~be routinely offered~~ shall routinely solicit an informational session by a university financial officer on annual budget proposals and....

Nadel **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken on the amendment to change the language in section *i.* pertaining to the purpose of SIFRAC from “be routinely offered” to “shall routinely solicit.” The motion **passed** with none opposed.

There being no additional discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion that the Senate approve the change to language in SR 1.4.2.9. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Hollie Swanson,
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Adams; Almasi; Arents; Arnold; Atwood; Back; Cheever; Culver; Dyer; Edgerton; Ettensohn; Gonzalez*; Gorringer; Hall; Hardesty; Hardin-Fanning; Harris*; Heller; Humphrey; Jackson; Januzzi; Jensen; Karan; Kidwell*; Kirk*; Kirschling*; Kornbluh; Kovash; Kwon; Lester; Maglinger; Martin*; McCormick*; McCorvey; McMahan; McNamara; Mehra; Meyer; Mobley; Montgomery*; Mountford; Mullen; Nardolillo; D. O’Hair; M O’Hair; Perman; Perry; Prats; Ray*; Richey; Rieske-Kinney; Ritchie; Robinson; Rohr*; Rouse; Santhanam*; Shannon; Shay; M.S. Smith*; R. Smith; Speaks*; Steiner; Stenhoff; Suarez; Subbaswamy; Sudharshan; Sutphen; Telling; Todd; Tracy; Travis; Troske; Turner; Viele; Watt*; Wells; Whitt; Wiseman; Witt; Zhang.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on March 31, 2010.

¹ Strikethrough denotes deleted text; underline denotes added text.

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.

University Senate
March 8, 2010

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, March 8, 2010 in the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a voice vote unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Dave Randall called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:01 pm.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair drew senators' attention to the relatively short agenda, noting that since there was relatively little business to accomplish, there would be sufficient time for a discussion that the Senate Council (SC) believes to be of importance.

He noted that there were no minutes ready for approval. There were the following announcements:

- Lotsa Helping Hands is a new program from the Office of Work-Life, which offers web-based scheduling for caregivers. More information is available at the Work-Life website.
- A senator is needed to represent faculty for a group studying the use of online teacher and course evaluations. Senators are encouraged to self-nominate or contact colleagues. Volunteers should email Mrs. Brothers.
- Non-academic portions of the Student Code of Conduct are being revised. Please contact Assistant Provost for Program Support Richard Greissman with comments. The Student Code will be vetted around campus over the coming weeks.
- The SC charged the Chair with forming a small committee comprised of SC members, and representatives from the Student Government Association and the Staff Senate to work out a resolution all three bodies could support regarding UK's financial status, particularly with respect to the budget of the Athletic Association.
- The *Senate Rules* specify that final grades must be submitted to the Registrar 72 hours after administering the final exam. Many faculty members have unfortunately interpreted that language to mean that grades are due on the Monday following final exams. The Chair encouraged senators and faculty at large to get grades submitted as quickly as possible. Faculty should not wait until Monday to submit all final exam grades. That data has to be assembled and shared with students and advisors, in particular, who will counsel students on future academic endeavors.

2. Proposed Change to Admissions Requirements for MA/MS in Library and Information Science

The Chair invited Jeffrey Huber (Communications and Information Studies/Library and Information Science) to explain the proposal. Guest Huber, director of the School of Library and Information Science, said that the proposal requested a change to admission requirements for both the MA and MS in Library and Information Science. The current minimum undergraduate GPA requirement is 2.75, and the proposal will increase that to 3.0. He said that most applicants already apply with a 3.0, so changing the requirement would not create a hardship for students.

The Chair noted that all of the day's curricular items came from the SC with a positive recommendation.

Estus **moved** that the Senate approve the proposed change to the admissions requirements for the Masters of Science and Masters of Arts degrees in Library and Information Science, effective fall 2010 and Snow **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Proposed New University Scholars Program: BS Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles and MS Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles

The Chair invited Kim Spillman (Agriculture/Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles), director of graduate studies, to present the proposal. Guest Spillman explained that the proposed new University Scholars Program would allow students to move into the master's degree program one semester early. There were no questions.

Hayes **moved** that the Senate approve the new University Scholars Program of BS Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles and MS Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles, effective fall 2010, and Wermeling **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Open Discussion on Faculty Governance Options

The Chair explained that the discussion should center on thoughts of the role of the Senate and how the Senate can be improved. He explained that he invited past SC chair (and Guest) Kaveh Tagavi to attend as a resource. He noted that Vice Chair Swanson (VC Swanson) would lead this portion of the meeting.

VC Swanson offered a brief presentation on aspects of faculty governance. Afterwards, she opened up the floor for discussion. A wide variety of senators engaged in a lively discussion regarding the role of the Senate. Below are a variety of comments

- Faculty and department chairs, etc. need to value participation in faculty governance activities such as committee appointments.
- It is difficult to be a productive member of a Senate committee when there is no discernable charge, purpose, or guidelines on reviewing proposals.
- The Senate has a wide variety of committees, which deal with many aspects of campus life – Senate committees must be charged in order to expect committees to perform as intended.
- As opposed to merely reacting to top-down directives, faculty should play a role in developing policies themselves.
- All items on Senate agendas should pertain to Senate business, with no informational reports.
- There has not been a call to respond to action items or do work; meetings are made up of relatively mundane curricular items.
- The Senate should be smaller; too many individuals make the body ineffective.

- Faculty have regained increased control over courses, curricular programs, educational units, educational policy, etc. since Charles Wethington stepped down. There remains a lack of “input symmetry,” though, in that while deans, chairs, etc. have a chance to offer input into faculty educational policy, faculty are not asked for input into managerial decisions.
- The Senate size is acceptable, given its representative nature. It is, however, somewhat difficult to effectively communicate with a senator’s own unit, resulting in failure at the most basic level of engaging the faculty community.
- Provost Subbaswamy regularly contacts the Chair or the SC about a variety of issues, which are vetted back and forth.
- There needs to be input from the Senate floor into the issues that are brought by administrators for consideration.
- The Senate should not serve as a rubber stamp for the SC, even though the SC does most of the work. Committees that don’t meet are problematic, and there should be more faculty members who volunteer for University service.
- There is a perception that senators are merely asked to vote on items for which decisions had already been made. Most issues on campus really come down to money, and that is something in which the Senate must be involved.
- The timing of the annual evaluation of the President is not conducive to meaningful faculty input. There is no external or independent data on which to make any judgment – the only accompanying supporting documentation is the President’s self-evaluation.
- There was no guarantee of anonymity to faculty responding to the questionnaire for the President’s evaluation. The criteria for the evaluation are not appropriate. However, the criteria are set by the Board of Trustees (BoT).
- Committee meetings should be posted on the Senate website, in part so faculty members may hold one another accountable.
- Senators recognize the need to respond to solicitations for volunteers from the Office of the Senate Council, yet other responsibilities often hinder such desires.
- In the same way that the Provost sends a liaison to SC meetings, the Chair should be a regularly invited guest to meetings of the Provost’s Deans’ Council.
- Faculty should have some say in the criteria by which the President is evaluated.
- Kentucky statutes prevent meaningful faculty input into the criteria by which the President is evaluated.
- The SC holds a special meeting every year to deliberate over the faculty input into the President’s evaluation. SC members also have a very short turnaround time. For the past few years, SC

members have refused to offer a rating for what was perceived as irrelevant criteria, specifically the NCAA violations item.

- The input sent by the SC is counted as one vote toward the President's evaluation. It seems as though the BoT has read SC comments in the past, since phraseology similar to that used by the SC has made its way into the final evaluation by the BoT.
- The Senate should have more of a role in the budget process.
- There is a culture of distrust between faculty and administrators at UK, and a corresponding lack of strong faculty input. There are areas at UK where there is a strong faculty culture, yet perhaps it is not reflected in the Senate, but rather in the department or college.
- The Chair should request that he be included in meetings of the Provost's Deans' Council meetings.
- Committees should be more active, and regular reports by committee chairs during Senate meetings would be helpful.
- Admissions standards have been lowered at UK, and there was a question as to whether or not the appropriate Senate committee, let alone the Senate itself, was consulted prior to making the decisions.
- The Senate is too large and should be much smaller, with just one to two representatives from colleges.
- The SC will charge committees with specific tasks. This, in turn, may result in action and increased consultation with the Senate in the future.
- When faculty members are not connected, they tend to be less engaged. There is more of a culture of engagement at the level of the SC.
- Maybe there needs to be a basic understanding of what the role of the Senate should be, and how to speak as one voice.
- Faculty members are not asked by the administration to provide input. Having the Chair attend meetings of the Provost's Deans' Council would be a good way to share information with the Senate from the beginning, instead of after the fact. Faculty need more information about current issues in order to better participate.
- Although faculty may be outflanked at times, the SC tends to be very aware of situations around campus. The authority of the faculty only reaches so far, and such powers are often reactive.
- Until the late 1970's, it was routine for the April and May meetings of the Senate to concentrate on committee reports from committee chairs. If committees can be given clearer charges during orientation activities, many subsequent faculty-led activities can occur more easily.

- Although the Senate is not privy to proceedings of the Deans' Council, there are a variety of administrators on the Senate's committees. Said committees are not necessarily specifically aligned with administrative committees.
- Senators should take their collective role as quality control for degree programs seriously, and apply that responsibility when reviewing degree programs.
- The curricular review process is cumbersome and paper-heavy. The Senate's reviews of degree programs should take the form of questions regarding how such a program will affect other programs across campus, not the minutiae of whether or not a unit has a sufficient number of instructors for a program.
- There should be better guidelines for Senate committees that review curricular proposals. Currently, unless there is an egregious problem, most proposals just go on through.
- Even if a proposal receives approvals from a variety of different reviewing bodies, proposals do not seem to be scrutinized in the review process.
- Not every reviewing body considers all aspects of a proposal. Part of representative governance is that there are pieces that are not seen by everyone.
- Senators should be told the value of programs to undergraduate students, not just presented with a distribution of courses to review.
- The lengthy review process offers a variety of opportunities for faculty to speak up if something about a proposal is objectionable.
- The opportunity to stop a course proposal was utilized within the past few months, so that type of action is available to faculty.
- A lot of work is done behind the scenes, often by Mrs. Brothers, to ensure that senators see quality products. This includes revising forms for new degree programs, etc. Fewer problems with proposals are the result of iterations and experiences that certain information is and is not needed for various proposals. Curricular forms are the guidelines and instructions for proposals.
- With a group as large as the Senate, committees should function properly. When proposals come to the Senate, they Senate should be voting to approve it, showing trust in the review given by a Senate committee. The Senate should not spend time doing what committees can do well.

As discussion wound down, VC Swanson asked senators to continue thinking about the subject. As ideas occur, senators should please send those ideas to Mrs. Brothers via email, with "Improve Senate" as the subject line.

Estus asked about committee reports. VC Swanson replied that the bulk of revitalizing Senate committees and creating specific charges would likely take place during the summer. The SC will gather information now, look over the committees during the summer, and return to the Senate with recommendations in the fall. It was clarified that the SC is taking responsibility for working on

committee charges, and will be doing so over the summer. Although there are nine-month faculty members on the SC, the majority of SC members with those appointments do attend meetings and participate over the summer.

Dean Scot Smith (College of Agriculture) said that the SC should also look into how the University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities (UCAPP) functions. That committee and its subcommittees are reasonably representative through the inclusion of nominations from the Senate. Although UCAPP does not run the University by any means, it does have influence on strategic planning, etc. Dean Smith said that the influence of those committees exceeded that of the Senate committees Dean Smith served on. Jeannine Blackwell, dean of the Graduate School, added that Gen Ed was a good example of where shared governance worked, with jointly appointed committees and step-by-step approvals and interactions to ensure faculty buy-in at various stages. In addition, administrative realities of what can and cannot be accomplished have been made very clear.

VC Swanson said that it was important to have volunteers for academic area advisory committees with appropriate areas of expertise.

Jones asked Dean Smith about how Dean Smith expresses to College of Agriculture (Agriculture) faculty that their time spent at the Senate or in committee meetings is valued as much as instead of writing grants or papers. Dean Smith said that he probably did not specifically express such sentiment. He noted that he resisted a dichotomy of one or the other – in Agriculture there are several senators who are very successful in grant writing, teaching, and scholarship, and are members of the Senate. When faculty members are successful and committed to the institution, they are top-rated faculty in Agriculture.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Hollie Swanson,
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Adams; Almasi; Anderson*; Arents; Back; Barnes*; Birdwhistell; Bishop*; Brennen; Culver; Denison; Dyer; Ederington; Edgerton; English; Ettensohn*; Gonzalez*; Griffith*; Grossman; Hall; Hardesty*; Hazard*; Heller; Jackson; Januzzi; J. Jensen; R. Jensen; Kelly*; Kidwell; Kim; Kirschling*; Kornbluh*; Kwon; Lester; Maglinger; Martin*; McCormick*; McCorvey; McMahan; McNamara; Mehra; Mendiondo; Moble; Montgomery; Mountford; Mullen; Nardolillo; Nieman; D. O’Hair; M. O’Hair; Perman; Ray*; Richey; Ritchie; Robinson; Roorda; Rouse; Santhanam*; Schoenberg*; Sellnow; Shay; R. Smith; Sottile; Speaks; Subbaswamy; Sudharshan; Sutphen*; Telling*; Thacker; Todd; Tracy; Travis; Troske; Turner; Watt*; Wells; Wiseman; Witt; Wood; Wyatt*; Yanarella.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday April 6, 2010.

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.

University of Kentucky Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee

From: Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (Joe Sottile (Chair), Janice Almasi, Todd Cheever, Christopher Feddock, Carl Lee, Alan Nadel, Glenn Telling, Zachary Fuqua)

To: Sheila Brothers, Office of the Senate Council

Date: March 24, 2010

The following proposal has been reviewed by the University Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee and was unanimously approved.

Request for Change in Engineering Standing Requirements in Chemical Engineering

This request proposes dropping CME 199 from the list of courses required for Engineering Standing in Chemical Engineering. A separate proposal has been submitted that would drop CME 199 from the curriculum and add CME 299, which is recommended to be completed in the Spring Semester of the sophomore year. Because the Engineering Standing decision is based on courses taken only through the first three semesters of the curriculum, it is not appropriate to include CME 299 as a requirement for Engineering Standing.

Attachment



177 E. Paul Anderson Tower
Lexington, KY 40506-0046

859-257-8028
fax 859-323-1929

August 3, 2009

MEMORANDUM

TO: Whom IT May Concern

FROM: Dr. Kimberly Anderson, Director of Undergraduate Studies

SUBJECT: Change in Engineering Standing Requirements

This memo is to request a change in Engineering Standing Requirements for the Chemical Engineering Program. Currently, the requirements include CME 199 with a grade of C or better. We have submitted paperwork to replace CME 199, taken during Year 1 Spring semester, with CME 299, to be taken during Year 2 Spring semester. Since we decide on Engineering Standing during Year 2 Fall semester, it is no longer feasible to include CME 199/299 as part of that requirement. Below is the current and proposed Engineering Standing Admission Requirements.

Current: Completion of CHE 105, CHE 107, CHE 111, CHE 113, MA 113, MA 114, MA 213, PHY 231, PHY 241, ENG 104 with a minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.50 in these courses. Completion of CME 199 and CME 200 with grades of C or better. University repeat options may be applied as appropriate.

Proposed: Completion of CHE 105, CHE 107, CHE 111, CHE 113, MA 113, MA 114, MA 213, PHY 231, PHY 241, ENG 104 with a minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.50 in these courses. Completion of CME 200 with a grade of C or better. University repeat options may be applied as appropriate.

S

blue.

Signatures of Approval:

8/22/08
Date of Approval by
Department Faculty

D.S. KARIKA [Signature]
Printed Name Reported by Department Chair Signature

11/20/09
Date of Approval by
College Faculty

RICHARD J. SWEIGARD [Signature]
Printed Name Reported by College Dean Signature

1/19/2010
Date of Approval by
Undergraduate Council

Sharon Gill

Digitally signed by Sharon Gill
DN: cn=Sharon Gill, o,
ou=Undergraduate Education,
email=sgill@uky.edu, c=US
Date: 2010.02.03 13:58:09 -05'00'

Printed Name Reported by Undergrad Council Chair Signature

Date of Approval by Senate
Council

Reported by Office of Senate Council

Date of Approval by
Senate

Reported by the Office of Senate Council

2009.11.30

Jammine Blackwell

14:15:23

-05'00'



UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

College of Pharmacy
Office of Academic Affairs
725 Rose Street
Lexington, KY 40536-0082
Office: (859)257-5304
Fax: (859) 323-2979
pharmacy.mc.uky.edu

TO: Heidi M. Anderson, Ph.D.
Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs

FROM: Kelly M. Smith, PharmD
Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs

DATE: June 2, 2009

RE: Approval for Pharm.D./Master of Science in Physician Assistant Studies (MSPAS) Dual Degree Program

The faculty of the College of Pharmacy have approved the attached PharmD/MSPAS Dual Degree program and are submitting this program for approval by the HCCC. This dual degree option is designed along a similar format as existing dual degrees with the PharmD and the MBA, MPA, MS Econ, and MPH.

The dual degree program permits a student to gain both degrees in a total time period less than if the degrees were earned independently. This dual degree is highly desirable for persons seeking careers in patient care, particularly those that wish to become primary care providers. Such clinicians are in high demand throughout the nation, and particularly in rural areas of our state.

Once considered by the Health Care Colleges Council, it will be submitted for consideration by the Graduate Council.

Brothers, Sheila C

From: Menciondo, Marta
Sent: Thursday, February 25, 2010 10:16 AM
To: Brothers, Sheila C
Subject: SAPC

The Senate Academic Programs committee recommends approval of :

- 1) New University Scholars Program: BS in Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles and MS in Merchandising, Apparel and Textiles
- 2) New Dual Degree Program - PharmD and MS in Physician Assistant Studies

Marta S. Menciondo
Chair

Marta S. Menciondo, PhD
University of Kentucky College of Public Health - Biostatistics Department
121 Washington Avenue - Suite 201 - Lexington, Kentucky 40536-0003
Sanders Brown Center on Aging
Rm 331 Sanders-Brown Bldg. - 800 S. Limestone St. - Lexington, KY 40536 - 0230
(859) 257-1412 ext 274 - FAX (859) 323-2866
marta@email.uky.edu

Statement of Confidentiality: The contents of this e-mail message and any attachments are confidential and are intended solely for addressee. The information may also be legally privileged. This transmission is sent in trust, for the sole purpose of delivery to the intended recipient. If you have received this transmission in error, any use, reproduction or dissemination of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail or at 859-257-1412 x 241 and delete this message and its attachments, if any.



UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

MEMORANDUM

TO: Health Care Colleges Council

FROM: Sharon Stewart, CHS Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

RE: Request for PharmD/MSPAS Dual Degree Program

DATE: September 20, 2008

The purpose of this memorandum is to indicate that the College of Health Sciences has appropriately considered the proposed PharmD/MSPAS program and recommends it for approval. We believe that this proposal preserves the integrity of the Pharm D and PAS programs while offering students the option of gaining both degrees in a total time period less than that required if the degrees were earned separately. The dual degree is likely to be highly desirable for those seeking careers in various health-related clinical, research, administrative, and educational environments.

Please contact Doris Rapp (323-1100, ext 80514) regarding any concerns or questions, particularly those specific to the Physician Assistant Program.

PharmD/MSPAS Dual Degree Program Proposal May 18, 2009

Background

The University of Kentucky College of Pharmacy has a significant track record of collaborating with other academic units on campus to offer joint degree programs. The PharmD/MPA dual degree program has been offered since 1997 and 17 students have completed it to date. The PharmD/MBA dual degree program has been offered since 1999 and 12 students have graduated with this combination to date. Two students have completed the PharmD/MPP dual degree, and the newly approved dual PharmD/MPH program has enrolled seven students for Fall 2009. The College now wishes to collaborate with the College of Health Sciences to offer students a joint PharmD/MSPAS degree program. It is anticipated that this offering will enroll up to five students annually.

The University of Kentucky currently offers a 97 credit hour Master of Science in Physician Assistant Studies (MSPAS) degree through the University of Kentucky College of Health Sciences. Completion of this non-thesis program, which is accredited by the Accreditation Review Commission on Education for Physician Assistants, conveys graduates eligibility to sit for the Physician Assistant National Certifying Examination and subsequent state licensure/certification. The University's College of Pharmacy offers a four-year, 164 credit hour Doctor of Pharmacy (PharmD) degree. The PharmD degree program is accredited by the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education (ACPE), and successful program completion satisfies all educational requirements for licensure.

The PharmD/MSPAS dual degree program would be one of fewer than five of its type offered in the nation. Currently this joint degree program is offered at Albany College of Pharmacy, University of Washington, and Washington State University.

The dual degree program permits a student to gain both degrees in a total time period less than if the degrees were earned independently. The dual degree is thought to be highly desirable for persons seeking careers in primary care (e.g., clinic, acute care, long-term care settings), particularly in rural practice areas, as well as clinical research, healthcare administration and higher education.

Structure of Program

A. Admissions

A student desiring admission into the dual degree program will be required to apply formally and independently to both programs. Admissions standards are the same as if the student were applying solely to one program. To be admitted, an applicant is required to meet the independent admission standards of the College of Pharmacy, College of Health Sciences MSPAS Program, and The Graduate School.

(1) For the MSPAS program, application will be made to the College of Health Sciences following completion of the second professional year in the College of Pharmacy. Students who do not hold an awarded bachelor's degree must have at least 90 hours of undergraduate and professional credit hours to apply to the Graduate School at the end of the second professional year. Course prerequisites (in addition to those required for entrance to the College of Pharmacy or provided

during the pharmacy curriculum) that must be completed prior to application to the MSPAS program include: general psychology, developmental psychology, and anthropology OR sociology. A cumulative undergraduate grade point average of at least 3.0 on a 4.0 scale is required, as must also have been achieved in the professional program. A combined score of 900 on the verbal, quantitative and analytical portions of the Graduate Record Examination (GRE) must have been achieved within the last five years of application to the program. Applicants must apply directly to the College of Health Sciences and to the Graduate School. This requires the submission of official transcripts, three letters of recommendation, an admission essay, and GRE scores.

(2) For the College of Pharmacy, PCAT scores and grade point average, as well as letters of recommendation, a formal interview, and other factors described in the College of Pharmacy bulletin, are considered to establish admission eligibility.

(3) The Director of Physician Assistant Studies from the College of Health Sciences and the Dean for Academic and Student Affairs from the College of Pharmacy, or their designees, serve as an advising team, each in their respective schools for all prospective and newly-admitted students.

B. Programs of Study

(1) The Existing MSPAS and PharmD Programs

The Master of Science in Physician Assistant Studies degree requires 97 total credit hours of core and elective courses and clerkships, and a passing score on a final program examination.

The College of Pharmacy offers a four-year curriculum leading to the Doctor of Pharmacy degree (PharmD). The Doctor of Pharmacy degree is awarded upon completion of a minimum of 164 semester credit hours of specified coursework with a GPA of at least 2.0 out of a possible 4.0.

(2) Dual PharmD/MSPAS Program

The following MSPAS courses are satisfied by the PharmD curriculum:

MSPAS Curriculum	Credit Hours	PharmD Curriculum	Credit Hours
HSM601 Overview of Healthcare Delivery	3	PHR910 Introduction to Pharmacy Practice PHR950 Pharmaceutical Policy and Public Health	3 4
PGY412G Human Physiology	4	PHR911/921 Physiological Basis for Therapeutics I/II	7
STA570 Statistics	4	PHR940 Evidence Base for Pharmacy Practice PHR950 Pharmaceutical Policy and Public Health	4 4
PAS678 Disease Prevention and Health Maintenance	2	PHR923 Pharmacological Basis for Therapeutics: Nutrition and Health Promotion PHR950 Pharmaceutical Policy and Public Health	3 4
PAS653 Introduction to Human Disease	3	PHR911/921 Physiological Basis for Therapeutics I/II	7
PAS610 Research Methods and Epidemiology	3	PHR940 Evidence Base for Pharmacy Practice PHR950 Pharmaceutical Policy and Public Health	4 4
PAS672 Pharmacology I	3	PHR913/923/931/951 Pharmacological Basis for Therapeutics Course Sequence	16
PAS673 Pharmacology II	3	PHR913/923/931/951 Pharmacological Basis for Therapeutics Course Sequence	16

PAS640 Survey of Geriatric Medicine	3	PHR813 Geriatric Pharmacy	3
CNU503 Applied Nutrition	1	PHR923 Pharmacological Basis for Therapeutics: Nutrition and Health Promotion	3

Experiential education (i.e., clerkships) will be delivered through a combination of MSPAS and PharmD (PHR988; Advanced Pharmacy Practice Experience) rotations. The following clerkships satisfy requirements towards the MSPAS and PharmD degrees:

Course	Weeks	Credit Hours	Credit
PAS660 Family Medicine (clinic)	8	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets PharmD requirement for Ambulatory Care (6 weeks, 6 credit hr) Training will be conducted at practice sites with established PA and PharmD preceptors
PAS669 Internal Medicine (hospital)	8	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets PharmD requirement for Adult Medicine (6 weeks, 6 credit hr) Training will be conducted at practice sites with established PA and PharmD preceptors
PAS661 Pediatrics	4	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets PharmD requirement for elective experience (12 weeks, 12 credit hr)
PAS662 Obstetrics/Gynecology	4	3	
PAS663 Surgery	4	3	
PAS664 Geriatrics	4	3	
PAS670 Emergency Medicine	4	3	
PHR988 Psychiatry	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets PAS671 Psychiatry requirement for MSPAS (4 weeks, 3 credit hr)
PHR988 Community Hospital	12	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets PAS665 elective requirement for MSPAS (4 weeks, 3 credit hr)

The dual degree program is suitable for full-time students only. Students independently pursuing the PharmD who wish to enter the dual program must be accepted before their third year of the PharmD curriculum.

An example of the program of study for dual degree students is:

Year 1: Fall - 19 credit hours of required PharmD courses
 Spring – 19 credit hours of required PharmD courses
 Summer - 4 credit hours of Introductory Pharmacy Practice Experience I
 Total = 42 credit hours

Year 2: Fall - 17 credit hours of required PharmD courses
 Spring - 17 credit hours of required PharmD courses
 Summer - 4 credit hours of Introductory Pharmacy Practice Experience II
 Total = 38 credit hours

Year 3: Fall – 17 credit hours of required and 3 credit hours of elective PharmD courses
 Spring – 17 credit hours of PharmD and 2 credit hours of MSPAS required courses
 Summer – 12 credit hours of Advanced Pharmacy Practice Experience
 Total = 51 credit hours

- Year 4: Fall - 13 credit hours of required MSPAS courses
 Spring – 15 credit hours of required MSPAS courses
 Total = 28 credit hours
- Year 5: 15 credit hours (n=5) required MSPAS clerkships
 6 credit hours (n=1) elective Advanced Pharmacy Practice Experience (satisfies MSPAS requirement)
 12 credit hours (n=2) required MSPAS clerkships with joint PharmD preceptors
 2 credit hours of a required MSPAS course
 Total = 35 credit hours

C. Advantages of Dual Program

The PharmD/MSPAS program of study affects the total number of minimum required hours as follows:

(1) MSPAS and PharmD Pursued Independently

Total hours required in MSPAS program (61 required classroom + 33 required clerkship + 3 elective clerkship)	97
Total credit hours required in PharmD program (106 required didactic + 8 elective + 50 Practice Experience)	<u>164</u>
Total credit hours	261

(2) Dual Program

Total MSPAS hours required in joint program (32 required classroom + 15 clerkship)	47
Total joint MSPAS/PharmD required practice experience	12
Total PharmD credit hours required in joint program (106 required didactic + 3 elective + 26 Practice Experience)	<u>135</u>
Total credit hours	194

This dual program of study may be completed in five years.

D. Grade Point Average

Grade point average for both programs is calculated independently and respectively by the College of Pharmacy and the Kentucky College of Health Sciences. Dual degree students are required to remain in compliance with the academic standards of each degree-granting unit. For example, a student must satisfy the College of Pharmacy GPA requirements solely on the basis of graded pharmacy school

course work and The Graduate School's GPA requirements solely on the basis of graded Graduate School course work.

E. Student Status

During the period of MSPAS studies, the student will have the status of graduate student and will have to comply with the rules and regulations of The Graduate School.

During the period of Pharmacy residence, the student will have the status of a pharmacy student and will have to comply with the rules and regulations of the College of Pharmacy.

F. Granting of PharmD/MSPAS Degree

Upon satisfactory completion of all degree requirements of both programs and the successful completion of 47 credit hours of MSPAS course work and 135 hours of Pharmacy course work, and 12 hours of joint experiential coursework, the student is granted both the MSPAS and PharmD degrees. He/she is eligible to attend graduation ceremonies for either or both schools.

G. Fee Payments

During any period of full-time College of Pharmacy enrollment, the student will pay fees/ tuition at the College of Pharmacy rates. During any period of full-time enrollment in The Graduate School, the student will pay fees/tuition at Graduate School rates.

H. Failure to Complete PharmD or MSPAS Requirement

The PharmD/MSPAS dual degrees will be granted only upon successful completion of all course work and examinations.

If a student finds it impossible to complete the pharmacy component, the student who holds a prior bachelor's degree has the option of selecting additional courses within the MSPAS program to complete MSPAS program requirements. Upon successful completion of all MSPAS requirements, the MSPAS degree will be granted.

College of Pharmacy credit given for MSPAS course work is also provisional upon completion of the dual degree program. Should a student fail to complete the MSPAS requirements but desire to obtain the PharmD, he/she would be subject to all remaining College of Pharmacy degree requirements. Such a student may receive pharmacy school credit for up to eight hours of the MSPAS course work satisfactorily completed with a grade of "B" or above and subject to approval by the College of Pharmacy Dean for Academic and Student Affairs.

PROPOSED CURRICULAR SEQUENCE – Dual PharmD/PA (MSPAS) Degree

YEAR ONE

Fall Semester

PHR 910: Intro to Pharmacy Practice (3)
 PHR 911: Physiology I (4)
 PHR 912: Physiological Chemistry I (3)
 PHR 913: Antibiotics (3)
 PHR 914: Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics I (3)
 PHR 916: Non-Prescription - OTC I (2)
 PHR 919: Patient Care Lab I (1)

TOTAL=19 credits

Spring Semester

PHR 920: Communication and Behavior in Practice (3)
 PHR 921: Physiology II (4)
 PHR 922: Physiological Chemistry II (3)
 PHR 923: Nutrition and Health Promotion (3)
 PHR 924: Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics II (3)
 PHR 926: Non-Prescription - OTC II (2)
 PHR 929: Patient Care Lab II (1)

TOTAL=19 credits

Summer Semester

PHR 928: Introductory Practice Experience I (4)

TOTAL=4 credits

YEAR TWO

Fall Semester

PHR 930: Law, Ethics, Access (4)
 PHR 931: Nervous System (5)
 PHR 932: Immunology and Biotechnology (3)
 PHR 933: Endocrine System (3)
 PHR 939: Patient Care Lab III (2)

TOTAL=17 credits

Spring Semester

PHR 940: Evidence Base for Pharmacy (4)
 PHR 944: Medicinal Chemistry (3)
 PHR 946: Advanced Pharmacotherapy I (5)
 PHR 947: Pharmacokinetics (4)
 PHR 949: Patient Care Lab IV (1)

TOTAL=17 credits

Summer Semester

PHR 948: Introductory Practice Experience II (4)

TOTAL=4 credits

YEAR THREE

Fall Semester

PHR 950: Pharmaceutical Policy and Public Health (4)
 PHR 951: Cardiopulmonary/ Renal (5)
 PHR 953: Current Topics Seminar (1)
 PHR 957: Pharmacotherapy I / II (5)
 PHR 959: Patient Care Lab V (2)
 PHR 813: Geriatric Pharmacy (3)

TOTAL=20 credits

YEAR THREE (continued)

Spring Semester

PHR 960: Pharmacy Practice Management (5)
 PHR 966: Pharmacotherapy III (5)
 PHR 967: Pharmacotherapy IV (5)
 PHR 969: Patient Care Lab VI (2)
 PAS 851: Intro to PA Profession (2)

TOTAL=19 credits

Summer Semester

PHR 988: Advanced Practice Experience – Community (6)
 PHR 988: Advanced Practice Experience – Hospital (6)

TOTAL=12 credits

YEAR FOUR

Fall Semester

PAS 645: Masters Project I (1)
 PAS 646: Masters Project II (2)
 PAS 654: Clinical Lecture Series I (4)
 PAS 651: Clinical Methods (H&P) (3)
 PAS 657: Clinical Lab Procedures (3)

TOTAL=13 credits

Spring Semester

PAS 655: Psychosocial Factors in Medicine (3)
 PAS 658: Clinical Lecture Series II (4)
 PAS 656: Patient Management and Evaluation (3)
 ANA 611: Anatomy (5)

TOTAL=15 credits

YEAR FIVE

PHR 988/PAS 660: Family Medicine (clinic) – 8 weeks (6)*
 *Preferential scheduling in summer

PHR 988/PAS 669: Internal Medicine (hospital) - 8 weeks (6)

PAS 661: Pediatric – 4 weeks (3)
 PAS 662: Obstetrics/Gynecology – 4 weeks (3)
 PAS 663: Surgery - 4 weeks (3)
 PAS 664: Geriatrics - 4 weeks (3)
 PAS 670: Emergency Medicine - 4 weeks (3)

PHR 988: Psychiatry – 6 weeks (6)

PAS 680: Seminar in PA Studies II (2)*

*Seminar integrated at conclusion of each clerkship

TOTAL=42 weeks/35 credits

UNIVERSITY SENATE ROUTING LOG

Proposal Title: Dual PharmD/MSPAS Degree

Contact Person (name, email & phone #): Kelly M. Smith; ksmit1@email.uky.edu; 7-2521
MSPAS Perspective: Doris Rapp; darapp1@uky.edu; 3-1100, x80514

Instruction: To facilitate the processing of this proposal please identify the groups or individuals reviewing the proposal, identify a contact person for each entry, provide the consequences of the review (specifically, approval, rejection, no decision and vote outcome, if any) and please attach a copy of any report or memorandum developed with comments on this proposal.

Reviewed by: (Chairs, Directors, Faculty Groups, Faculty Councils, Committees, etc.)	Contact person Name (phone/email)	Consequences of Review:	Date of Proposal Review	Review Summary Attached? (yes or no)
College of Pharmacy Curriculum Committee	Peggy Plascik 257-1766	Approved	July 1, 2008	Yes
College of Pharmacy Faculty	Joe Fink 218-6515	Refer to Dept. of Pharmacy Practice and Science	August 21, 2008	Yes
Professional Education Advisory Committee, Dept. of Pharmacy Practice and Science, College of Pharmacy	Melody Ryan 257-8790	Approved	March 5, 2009	No
College of Pharmacy Faculty	Joe Fink 218-6515	Approved	April 15, 2009	Yes
Division of Physician Assistant Studies	Doris Rapp, PhD 313-1100, x80514 darapp1@uky.edu	10 PAS Faculty, including the Director, reviewed the proposal; 7 voted to approve the proposal and 1 was in favor of the proposal but wanted to wait on implementation; 2 faculty did not vote (1 was a new faculty member who was not familiar with the proposal)	Proposal was reviewed and email vote finalized on 7/01/08	No
Department of Clinical Sciences	Karen Skaff, PhD 323-1100, x80585 koskaf0@uky.edu	Dept. faculty voted for Approval; 12 voted in support of the proposal; none opposed the proposal; 2 were absent. The remaining 8	Discussion of the proposal and vote taken on 08/06/08.	No

College of Health Sciences		Sharon Stewart, EdD 323-1100, x80570 srstew01@uky.edu	eligible voters were on vacation or out of the office on business. All 6 members of the CHS Academic Affairs Committee voted for approval. One member identified editing errors to be corrected before proposal is submitted to the HCCC.	Proposal was reviewed and email vote finalized on 9/13/08.	Proposal and related new courses available via link
----------------------------	--	-------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------

31
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE – COLLEGE OF PHARMACY
Meeting Minutes Excerpt
July 1, 2008

Reconsider Proposal for PharmD/MSPAS

The committee reconsidered a proposal for dual degree in PharmD/MSPAS, first introduced and well received on 4/23/08, and referred for review to the pre-residency work group and the PPS department curriculum committee [Handout #1]. Neither of those groups had concerns, and both groups approved the proposal. Since the PA program has limited capacity, the expected number of pharmacy students enrolled in the dual degree program per year will most likely not exceed 5. Currently, there are 4 PY2 students interested in the program; their enrollment would affect the course load for their PY3 year (2009-10). [Portions of] The PharmD curriculum would satisfy the PA course requirements, and the experiential rotations would be in carefully monitored sites with two preceptors (a pharmacist and a physician's assistant).

MOTION: To approve the dual degree program in PharmD/MSPAS as proposed.
Motion was approved by vote of 7 in favor, 0 in opposition, 0 abstained.

FACULTY MEETING – COLLEGE OF PHARMACY
Meeting Minutes Excerpt
August 21, 2008

Vote on PharmD-MSPAS Joint Degree Program

This program is designed to allow a PharmD to join the PA program early and to complete in 5 years instead of 6 years. We are presently targeting 5-7 students; PY3s and PY4s have expressed interest. This requires the GRE and will not accept the PCAT. As to licensure, the students would be regulated by the State Board of Pharmacy for pharmacy issues and by the Board of Medicine for medicine issues. There are no overt contradictions at this time. Students would require preceptors for both programs. The Provost in particular is interested in offering more joint degree programs.

Move made to table the vote at this time (refer to the PPS department); so moved.

FACULTY MEETING – COLLEGE OF PHARMACY
Meeting Minutes Excerpt
April 15, 2009

PharmD/MSPAS Dual Degree

The dual degree proposed by Dr. Smith is a PharmD and MS-Physician Assistant program; this was referred to PPS for resource analysis. It then went to the PEAK committee, has been reviewed with an agreement that there would not be undue outlay of additional resources. There are sufficient and quality experiential sites and mentors.

The proposal for the program would be sent to the Graduate School, the University Senate, and then to the Health Care Colleges Council. This is a rare program; the University of Washington is known for training in this. The PA role spans the spectrum as primary care providers (first point of care settings).

The details of the program are that the admissions progress would be monitored under the health sciences college, including their additional requirements as well as taking the GRE. Some courses may be counted twice; there needs to be an overview of the coursework. The total time to complete is 5 continuous years.

Approval of the dual degree program was proposed and seconded for consideration. This is typically a smaller program; we anticipate a small number and could cap at 5. Students often go to academia or PCP settings. PAs are able to prescribe, though there may be questions about controlled substances. There is already a list of students considering this program.

Motion was made to approve the program: motion passed.

University of Kentucky Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee

From: Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (Joe Sottile (Chair), Janice Almasi, Todd Cheever, Christopher Feddock, Carl Lee, Alan Nadel, Glenn Telling, Zachary Fuqua)

To: Sheila Brothers, Office of the Senate Council

Date: March 24, 2010

The following proposal has been reviewed by the University Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee and was unanimously approved.

Request for Change in Requirements for Minor in Computer Science

This request proposes (1) dropping CS 100 as a requirement for a minor in Computer Science and (2) adding GPA and residency requirements for a minor in Computer Science.

Attachment

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
REQUEST FOR NEW UNDERGRADUATE MINOR OR CHANGE IN MINOR

Program Bachelor of Science in Computer Science

Minor Minor in Computer Science

Department Department of Computer Science College College of Engineering

Bulletin PP _____

CIP Code _____ UK ID No. _____ HEGIS Code _____

Accrediting Agency (if applicable) the Computing Accreditation Commission of ABET

**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

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
REQUEST FOR NEW UNDERGRADUATE MINOR OR CHANGE IN MINOR

Change in Minor Requirements

<u>Current</u>	<u>Total Hours</u>
Minor in Computer Science	
CS 100 The Computer Science Profession 1	
CS 115 Introduction to Computer Programming 3	
CS 215 Introduction to Program Design, Abstraction, and Problem Solving 4	
CS 216 Introduction to Software Engineering 3	
CS 275 Discrete Mathematics 4	
CS 315 Algorithm Design and Analysis 3	
plus three additional hours in computer science 3	
21	

<u>Proposed</u>
Minor in Computer Science
The Minor in Computer Science requires a minimum of 20 hours of course work in CS, to include the following: CS 115 (3), CS 215 (4), CS 216 (3), CS 275 (4), CS 315 (3), or equivalent, plus three additional hours of upper-division courses (300 or higher) in Computer Science. A GPA of at least 2.5 across these courses is required. At least 10 of the credit hours required to complete the minor must be earned at the University of Kentucky.
20

Rationale for Proposal

The proposed change adds a minimum GPA requirement and a residency requirement better aligning the requirements with Minor Requirements in other UK programs (no other departments in the College of Engineering offer Minor). Additionally, CS 100 is removed from the requirements. CS 100 is a 1 credit hour introductory seminar intended for CS majors.

Will this program be printed in the Bulletin?

Yes No

Signatures of Approval:

Date of Approval by Department of Faculty
February 20, 2009 (unanimous decision)

11-20-09

Date of Approval by College of Faculty

1-19-2010

*Date of Approval by Undergraduate Council

*Date of Approval by Graduate Council

*Date of Approval by Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC)

*Date of Approval by Senate Council

*Date of Approval by University Senate

Kenneth Calvert
Reported by Department Chair
Dr. Kenneth Calvert

Sharon Gill
Reported by College Dean

Sharon Gill
Reported by Undergraduate Council Chair

Reported by Graduate Council Chair

Reported by HCCC Chair

Reported by Senate Council Office

Reported by Senate Council Office

ACTION OTHER THAN APPROVAL

*If applicable, as provided by the Rules of the University Senate

Current**Minor in Computer Science**

CS 100 The Computer Science Profession	1
CS 115 Introduction to Computer Programming	3
CS 215 Introduction to Program Design, Abstraction, and Problem Solving	4
CS 216 Introduction to Software Engineering	3
CS 275 Discrete Mathematics	4
CS 315 Algorithm Design and Analysis	3
plus three additional hours in computer science	3

21

Proposed**Minor in Computer Science**

The Minor in Computer Science requires a minimum of 20 hours of course work in CS, to include the following: CS 115 (3), CS 215 (4), CS 216 (3), CS 275 (4), CS 315 (3), or equivalent, plus three additional hours of upper-division courses (300 or higher) in Computer Science. A GPA of at least 2.5 across these courses is required. At least 10 of the credit hours required to complete the minor must be earned at the University of Kentucky.

Total Hours

20

UNIVERSITY SENATE REVIEW AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY SHEET

Proposal Title: *Insert name here* Changing CS Minor Requirements
Name/email/phone for proposal contact: *Insert information here* Jerry W. Jaromczyk, DUS
jwrc@dcsl.vky.edu

Instruction: To facilitate the processing of this proposal please identify the groups or individuals reviewing the proposal, identify a contact person for each entry, provide the consequences of the review (specifically, approval, rejection, no decision and vote outcome, if any) and please attach a copy of any report or memorandum developed with comments on this proposal.

Reviewed by: (Chairs, Directors, Faculty Groups, Faculty Councils, Committees, etc)	Contact person Name (phone/email)	Consequences of Review:	Date of Proposal Review	Review Summary Attached? (yes or no)
CS department	Jerry W. Jaromczyk, DUS <i>jwrc@dcsl.vky.edu</i>	Approved	02/20/2009	no
College of Engineering	Rick Swergard <i>rswergar@engr.vky.edu</i>	Approved	10/07/09	No
Undergrad Educ Team	"	Approved	11/6/09	No
College Faculty				

Brothers, Sheila C

From: Greissman, Richard
Sent: Wednesday, April 07, 2010 4:15 PM
To: Randall, David C
Cc: Brothers, Sheila C; Subbaswamy, Kumble; Hazard, Victor; Jones, Barbara W; Crystal, Ralph; Davis, Joanne; Glassmeyer, Sarah L; Botto, Ronald W; Walton-Macaulay, Dana; Hellmich, Linda K; Blanton, Tony; Deaton, Marcy; Bostic, Meghan P; Sun, Evan; Hundley, William E
Subject: Student Code of Conduct
Attachments: Revised Student Code - substantive changes (March 2010).pdf; Code of Student Conduct (revision 4-07-10).pdf

Dear Dave,

With the generous assistance of your office, the Student Code of Conduct Committee distributed the revised Student Code [revision 1-27-10] to Faculty Senators and asked for feedback from them and their college faculties by April 2. The response was sparse but very thoughtful, indeed quite helpful.

I write to report that the faculty responses did not suggest any substantive change to the proposed revision; rather the faculty input helped us clarify the existing language in the revision. Therefore, I have no additional summary of substantive changes; and the other attached document, which we distributed to Faculty Senators the other month along with the 1-27-10 revision of the Student Code, stands as the summary narrative.

Finally, please allow me this one editorial remark: I know from conversations I've had with faculty across colleges that a number of our colleagues gave the revised Student Code a close read. The dearth of commentary is attributable to any number of circumstances, but none more compelling than the effort put forth (for more than one year) by the members of the Student Code Committee to produce a worthy successor to the current Code. We owe them a debt of gratitude.

I look forward to the discussion and vote on endorsement at Monday's University Senate meeting.

My best,
Richard

An Overview of the Substantive Revisions to the Student Code of Conduct

**As submitted to the University Community
by the Student Code Committee
March 2010**

Preface

The *Code of Student Conduct* (the *Code*) is amended only by final action of the Board of Trustees. Responsibility for proposing revisions to the *Code* is delegated to a committee - the Student Code Committee (the "Committee") - consisting of students, faculty and administrators. The President of the University determines the exact composition and procedure of the Committee. The Committee accepts and reviews recommendations from students, faculty and administrators regarding revisions to the *Code of Student Conduct*. The Committee prepares proposed revisions and forwards them to the President for approval and, after approval, for presentation to the Board of Trustees for its consideration and final approval.

The Student Code Committee has been meeting for the past year to complete a multifaceted assignment:

- To align the current *Code* with national best practices;¹
- To ensure that the *Code* is in compliance with recent changes to Federal and State law (e.g., the Clery Act, Title IX, policies issued by the Office of Civil Rights);
- To incorporate recent University policy changes (e.g., AR 6:2 [Policy of Sexual Assault, Stalking and Relationship Violence] & the Interim Guidelines for Handling Allegations of Student-on-Student Sexual Assault, Stalking and Relationship Violence);
- To clarify the judicial procedures associated with alleged violations of the *Code*
- To affirm that the *Code* is a living document which requires regular and thorough review and revision

Before the Committee forwards the revised *Code* to President Todd for his review and recommendation to the Board of Trustees, the Committee is obligated to vet its work with the members of the University community and their governance bodies - the Student Government, the University Senate and the Staff Senate.

The proposed timetable for the vetting and approval processes reads as follows:

3/1/10	Present to the Senate Council and request that the revised Code to be distributed to members of the University Senate
3/1/10	Distribute the revised Code to the members of the Staff Senate and request comments by 4/2/10
3/3/10	Present to Student Government and request comments by 4/2/10
3/8/10	Present to the University Senate and request comments by 4/2/10
3/19/10	Post the revised <i>Code</i> and this overview document to the Dean of Students' website
3/22/10	Send email to the members of the University community (faculty, staff & students) and request comments by 4/2/10

¹ See Stoner, Edward n., and Lowery, John Wesley. *Navigating Past the 'Spirit of Insubordination': A Twenty-First Century Model Student Conduct Code With a Model Hearing Script*, 31 *Journal of College and University Law* 1 (2004). [In this overview, references to this paper are cited as the "Model Code"].

4/12/10 University Senate vote to endorse
By 4/12/10 Student Government vote to endorse
4/13-16 Student Code Committee vote to endorse
4/20/10 Presentation to Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees
6/8/10 BoT Student Affairs Committee takes Code to BOT for approval (effective July 1, 2010)

An Overview of the Substantive Revisions to the Student Code of Conduct

Article I

Under "*Rights within University Hearing Processes*"

[page 3]

[7.] i. The Complainant has the right to choose whether to file a formal complaint. There may be circumstances, however, such as the status of the alleged assailant or the seriousness of the offense, in which the University must investigate and take action to protect the Complainant or other members of the University community.

[7.] j. In addition to pursuing administrative penalties and remedies, the Complainant maintains the right to pursue criminal charges.

[7.] k. A Complainant has the right to change University housing and academic arrangements if such changes are reasonably available.

[7.] l. In cases involving allegations of violence or the threat of violence, the Complainant shall be informed of the outcome -- the University's final determination and any sanction(s) -- of any institutional disciplinary proceeding. In cases not involving allegations of violence or the threat of violence, the Complainant shall be informed only of the University's final determination of whether the Respondent is "responsible" or "not responsible".

RATIONALE: The new language brings the Code into compliance with Federal law (i.e, the Clery Act) and the recently adopted University policies on sexual assault, stalking, and relationship violence as codified in AR 6:2.

Article II

Under "*Referrals*"

[page 11]

16. Once an alleged violation of this Code has been referred to the Dean of Students Office, the Dean of Students shall assign a Conduct Officer to the case. If the Complainant in a case is another student, the Complainant shall be given an opportunity to indicate a preference, if any, for the gender of the Conduct Officer. The Dean of Students shall honor the Complainant's preference whenever possible. Once assigned the case, and before beginning his or her investigation, the Conduct Officer shall meet separately with both the Respondent and Complainant to explain the disciplinary policies and procedures articulated in this Code, and the rights of the Respondent and Complainant. The Respondent and Complainant may each be accompanied by an advisor whose role shall be limited as outlined in Article II, Sections 30 and 31 of this Code, the Dean or authorized designee shall investigate the allegation. If the Dean or authorized designee determines that evidence exists to prove the allegation, the Dean of Students Office shall notify and charge the accused student with a specific violation of this Code and request that the student schedule an informational meeting with the Dean or authorized designee.

RATIONALE: The revised language incorporates recommendations contained in the "Interim Guidelines for Handling Student/Student Allegations Sexual Assault, Stalking, or Relationship Violence" ("Interim Guidelines") and the final report of a Provost's committee charged with conducting a portfolio review of the Division of Student Affairs.

Under "*The Preliminary Disciplinary Process*"

[page 12]

20. When the Respondent denies the finding of responsibility or accepts responsibility but finds the proposed sanction unacceptable, the Respondent may request a review of the case by the VPSA. The VPSA or designee shall honor all such requests and agree to meet with the Respondent before making a decision.

21. When required or permitted by law, the University shall also notify the Complainant of the determination of responsibility and the proposed sanction, if any. The Conduct Officer shall explain to the Complainant that, if he or she is not satisfied with the determination of responsibility or proposed sanction, or both, the Complainant may request a review of the case by the VPSA. The VPSA or designee shall honor all such requests and agree to meet with the Complainant before making a decision.

RATIONALE: Universities have ethical and legal obligations to protect the welfare of their students. Indeed, they must have in place a comprehensive and fair set of policies, guidelines and procedures to respond to allegations of student misconduct. However, by design, student codes of conduct are guided by but do not align fully with criminal codes. The educative and restorative functions of university judicial processes militate against the strict adherence to legal constructs of the criminal justice system. Hence, a provision in this revised section of the *Code* grants the right of preliminary appeal to both Respondent and Complainant should either party not be satisfied with the determination of responsibility or sanction by the Conduct Officer. This is the first of two instances in the revised *Code* in which the right of appeal is extended to both parties in a disciplinary case. Furthermore, the inclusion of an appeals process in the preliminary stage of the judicial process is itself new and intended to help ensure that both parties to a disciplinary case perceive the process, independent of outcome, as unflinchingly fair and comprehensive.

Under "*Referral to a Disciplinary Hearing Officer Panel*"

[page 12]

25+9. If the Respondent ~~When a student denies responsibility for an alleged violation or withdraws from or refuses to comply with the conditions of the preliminary disciplinary counseling process or refuses to accept the finding of responsibility or proposed sanction,~~ the Conduct Officer ~~Dean or authorized designee~~ shall forward the reports and evidence concerning the case to a Panel of three (3) disciplinary hearing officers. Once the information has been forwarded to a Disciplinary Hearing Officer Panel (hereinafter referred to as "Panel") ~~hearing officer,~~ the Respondent ~~accused student~~ has entered the University Disciplinary Hearing Process. The Dean of Students Office is then responsible for furnishing testimony as requested by the ~~Panel Disciplinary Hearing Officer,~~ keeping their records for the Disciplinary Hearing Officer, serving as a Complainant as appropriate and aiding the student in complying with any sanction decreed by the ~~Panel Disciplinary Hearing Officer.~~

RATIONALE: Under the current *Code*, a single Hearing Officer presides at a judicial proceeding. In the past year's training session for Disciplinary Hearing Officers, the cohort (faculty and staff persons who volunteer to serve in this capacity) recommended that disciplinary hearings be conducted by a panel of three Disciplinary Hearing Officers. The complexities and sensitivities inherent in student conduct cases, they argued, warranted the collective judgment of a three-person panel. This change is congruent with best practices identified by and discussed in the "Model Code."

Under "*Interim Leave of Absence*"

[page 13]

27. When a student poses a threat to the university community as a result of a psychological, mental health or other medical condition, the Dean of Students shall be permitted to divert the student from the disciplinary system by imposing an interim leave of absence from the University. Before the student is permitted to reenroll in the university, he or she shall be required to undergo a comprehensive evaluation to assess the student's readiness to return and not pose a threat to the university community. The disciplinary proceedings in which the student was involved as a Respondent may resume upon the student's reenrollment in the university.

28. If a Respondent in a disciplinary proceeding leaves the university before his or her case is resolved, the student's disciplinary proceedings may resume upon the student's reenrollment in the university.

RATIONALE: The "Model Code" and the final report of the Student Affairs portfolio review committee recommend these changes, which are intended to ensure that the University judiciously balances its sensitivity to a Respondent's circumstances against its obligation to protect the members of the University community.

Under "*University Disciplinary Hearings*"

[page 14]

(34.) c. The hearing will be closed to the public, other than the advisors, if any, designated by the Respondent and Complainant. The hearing will be closed to the public unless the accused student or the complainant(s) requests that the hearing be open by filing a written request with the Disciplinary Hearing Officer at least 24 hours prior to the time set for the hearing. The hearing will remain closed to the public unless both the accused and the complainant(s) agree to an open hearing. If both parties agree to an open hearing, the Disciplinary Hearing Officer shall admit to the hearing, in addition to those admitted to a closed hearing, one properly identified member of any established newspaper, magazine, television station or radio station requesting admission as well as up to four persons who have been invited by the accused student, up to four persons who have been invited by the complainant(s) and up to four persons invited by the Disciplinary Hearing Officer.

(34.) f. Both the accused student Respondent and the Complainant shall have the right to call relevant and necessary witnesses. The accused student Respondent and the Complainant (not the advisors) shall also be given an opportunity to ask relevant questions of those witnesses who testify at the hearing. Witnesses shall be excluded from all hearings, except for the period of their testimony. The Panel may accommodate concerns for the personal safety, well-being, and/or fears of confrontation of the Complainant, the Respondent, or other witnesses during the hearing by providing separate facilities, by using a visual screen, and/or by permitting participation by telephone, videophone, closed circuit television, video conferencing, videotape, audiotape, written statement, or other means, where and as determined in the sole judgment of the Panel to be reasonable and appropriate. Either party may submit the written report or statement from a witness in lieu of the witness' personal appearance at the hearing; however, in the event that a party chooses to submit written statements from witnesses, all reasonable attempts should be made to have those individuals available by telephone.

RATIONALE: The "Model Code" and the final report of the Student Affairs portfolio review committee and the "Interim Guidelines" underscore the University's responsibility to safeguard the well-being of all persons party to a judicial proceeding and ensure the confidentiality of those proceedings.

Under "*University Disciplinary Hearings*"

[page 15]

(34.) i. Evidence of the sexual behavior of the Complainant of a sexual assault is inadmissible in the hearing unless such evidence clearly relates to the issue of consent between the Complainant and Respondent for the specific act(s) in question or the evidence relates to the likelihood that the act(s) in question were committed by the Respondent. Such evidence may not be proved by reputation or opinion.

RATIONALE: The "Model Code" and the final report of the Student Affairs portfolio review committee recommend the inclusion of the language cited above. Furthermore, the "Interim Guidelines" stipulate such protections for a Complainant.

"*Appeals of the Panel's Decision*"

[pages 15-16]

RATIONALE: This section is entirely new. Heretofore, only the Respondent could appeal a decision of the Hearing Officer, and then only in the limited case of an appeal in which a Respondent is found responsible for a violation of the *Code* and is sanctioned with social suspension, disciplinary suspension, or expulsion. This new section of the revised *Code* broadens the right of appeal for a Respondent, and also extends to a Complainant, a right of appeal on two grounds:

- a claim of procedural error in the conduct of the case may have affected the determination of a finding of responsibility; or,
- a claim of the new information that was unavailable at the time of the original hearing and could have altered the determination of responsibility.

The Chair of the UAB and two (2) members of the UAB chosen by the Chair shall review an appeal to determine if the appeal has merit and therefore warrants further consideration of the case by a Disciplinary Hearing Officer Panel.

The University must not only conduct its judicial proceedings in a fair and impartial manner, with unrelenting fidelity to its written policies, procedures and guidelines, but it must also be *perceived* by Respondent and Complainant alike as having been resolutely fair and proper. This new section on appeals of a Panel's decision will help ensure that both Respondent and Complainant may seek redress in instances of perceived irregularity (procedural error) or unforeseen circumstance (new evidence). Having the UAB Chair and two members of the UAB evaluate the merits of an appeal will also ensure the integrity and proper functioning of the judicial process.

CODE OF STUDENT CONDUCT
[revision 4-07-10]

**Rules, Procedures, Rights and Responsibilities
Governing Non-Academic Relationships**

ARTICLE I - UNIVERSITY RIGHTS OF STUDENTS

Introduction

The University of Kentucky is an academic community in which all students, faculty, and staff share responsibility for its growth and continued welfare. As an academic community, the University strives to:

- 1) Facilitate learning, informed by scholarship and research;
- 2) Expand knowledge through research, scholarship and creative activity; and
- 3) Serve a global community by disseminating, sharing and applying knowledge.

Decisions and behavior in the community ~~are~~ should be guided by the University's core values including: integrity; academic excellence and freedom; mutual respect and human dignity; diversity of thought, culture, gender and ethnicity; shared governance; a sense of community; sensitivity to work-life concerns; and civic responsibility. As members of this community, students can expect to be afforded certain basic rights and can ~~also~~ expect to be held accountable for certain basic responsibilities.

Definitions

When used in this *Code of Student Conduct (Code)*:

- a. "Advisor" means a person, including parent or spouse, invited by a Respondent or Complainant to attend any meeting or hearing in the preliminary or formal phases of the University Disciplinary Process and provide assistance or support to the Respondent or Complainant. An attorney may serve as an advisor to the Respondent or Complainant in the disciplinary process, although the attorney's participation is limited to the role of advisor as described in Article II, Sections 30 & 31 of this Code.
- b. "Business Day" means Monday through Friday, excluding Saturday and Sunday and holidays while classes are in session.
- c. "Complainant" means any person who reports or alleges that a student has violated this Code.
- d. "Conduct Officer" means any person(s) authorized under Article II, Sections 16-21, of the Code to conduct investigations that stem from allegations of Code violations, determine responsibility and set sanctions, as appropriate.
- e. "Disciplinary Hearing Officer" means any person(s) authorized by the President to conduct hearings under Article II, Sections 25-29, of the Code and impose sanctions when a violation has been committed. The Disciplinary Hearing Officers shall hear cases as a hearing panel of three (3) officers.
- f. "Faculty Member" means any person hired by the University to conduct classroom or teaching activities or who is otherwise considered by the University to be a member of its faculty.
- g. "Group" means a number of persons who are associated with each other and operate as an organization, but who have not complied with University requirements for registration as an organization.
- h. "Organization" means a number of persons who have complied with University requirements for registration.

- i. “Presider” means the member of a Disciplinary Hearing Officer Panel elected by the Panel members to serve as the facilitator at a disciplinary hearing.
- j. “Policy” means the written rules and regulations of the University, including but not limited to, the Governing Regulations, the Administrative Regulations, the Code of Student Conduct, the Residence Halls Rules of Conduct, the Rules of the University Senate, the Human Resources Policy & Procedure, and the Business Procedures Manual.
- k. “Respondent” means any student accused of violating this Code.
- l. “Student” means any person who is admitted, registered, or enrolled in any University program or course, either full-time or part-time, pursuing undergraduate, graduate, or professional studies.
- m. The term “may” is used in the permissive sense.
- n. The term “shall” is used in the imperative sense.
- o. “University” means the University of Kentucky.
- p. “University Appeals Board” is the body authorized by *Governing Regulation, Part XI* to consider an appeal in a student disciplinary proceeding.
- q. “University Community” includes any person who is a student, faculty member, staff or University Official, or any other person employed by the University. A person’s status in a particular situation is generally determined by the individual’s status at the time the alleged incident occurred and the capacity in which the incident occurred. Depending on the nature of the circumstances, a person may be subject to disciplinary action under more than one University regulation or policy.
- r. “University Official” means any person (faculty or staff) who is employed by the University, performing assigned administrative or professional responsibilities.
- s. “University Property” is defined as all property owned, operated, leased, or controlled by the University, public sidewalks and streets that are contiguous to or in the immediate vicinity of such property, and all such property leased to or operated by student and non-student organizations that are under the control and regulation of the University.

Right of Admission and Access

1. An applicant for admission to the University shall not be discriminated against because of race, color, religion, sex, marital status, sexual orientation, national origin, age or beliefs. Moreover, no otherwise qualified person with a disability will be denied admission solely because of the person’s disability.
2. An applicant for, or a recipient of, University financial aid, a University grant-in-aid, or a University scholarship, shall not be discriminated against because of race, color, religion, sex, marital status, sexual orientation, national origin, age or beliefs. Moreover, no otherwise qualified person with a disability will be denied financial aid solely because of the person’s disability.
3. The University may delineate the purpose for which students may use certain facilities and shall make the facilities available on a fair and equitable basis. However, the University may restrict its facilities and services when their use would interfere with normal University operations.
4. The University will use its influence to secure equal access for all students to public facilities in the local community.

Freedom from Discrimination/Harassment

5. All students shall be free from discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, marital status, sexual orientation, national origin, age, beliefs or disability.
6. All students shall be free from sexual harassment by University faculty, staff, and students. Sexual harassment—a form of sex discrimination—includes unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal or physical actions of a sexual nature when submission to such conduct is made explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of the student’s status in a course, program or activity; or is used as a basis for academic or other decisions affecting such student; or when such conduct has the purpose or effect of substantially interfering with the student’s academic performance, or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive academic environment.

Rights within University Hearing/Judicial Processes

7. A student shall be guaranteed the following rights in all proceedings of a University hearing agency:
 - a. The student shall have the right to a fair and impartial hearing in all proceedings of any hearing agency.
 - b. The student shall not be compelled to give testimony and refusal to do so shall not be considered evidence of responsibility for an alleged violation.
 - c. The Respondent student shall be informed in writing of the reasons for appearance before any hearing agency and given sufficient time to prepare for the appearance.
 - d. The student-Respondent shall be entitled to receive, upon written request, a copy of all rules and procedures governing the hearing agency at least 72 hours prior to appearance before the agency.
 - e. Both the Complainant and Respondent student shall have the right to hear all evidence and question all witnesses and/or witness reports, and present witnesses and/or witness reports of the student’s choice.
 - f. Both the Complainant and the Respondent ~~The student~~ may choose up to two an advisor(s) and/or support person(s), as outlined in Article II, Sections ~~1230~~ and ~~1331~~ of the *Code*, to assist and support in all processes of the University Disciplinary Hearing Process.
 - g. The student may request that any member of a hearing agency be disqualified on the ground of personal bias.
 - h. The student shall have access to the record of every hearing agency hearing in which the student is the Respondent~~accused~~.
 - i. The Complainant has the right to choose whether to file a formal complaint. There may be circumstances, however, such as the status of the alleged assailant or the seriousness of the offense, in which the University, absent a formal complaint, must nonetheless investigate and take action to protect the Complainant or other members of the University community.
 - j. In addition to pursuing administrative penalties and remedies, the Complainant maintains the right to pursue criminal charges.
 - k. A Complainant has the right to change University housing and academic arrangements if such changes are reasonably available.
 - l. In cases involving allegations of violence or the threat of violence, the Complainant shall be informed of the outcome -- the University’s final determination and any sanction(s) -- of any institutional disciplinary proceeding. In cases not involving allegations of violence or the threat of violence, the Complainant shall be informed only of the University’s final determination of whether the Respondent is “responsible” or “not responsible”.

Right to Privacy

8. A student shall be free from searches and seizures of person and possessions while on University property unless said search and seizure is conducted in accordance with state and federal laws. In cases of imminent danger or when there are reasonable grounds upon which to believe it is necessary to conduct a

search immediately in order to protect life or property, searches may be conducted in the presence of the Dean of Students or another University official acting as the Dean's authorized representative.

9. Student records will be maintained in accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 and the guidelines for implementation (see Part V of this publication www.uky.edu/StudentAffairs/Code/part5.html).

10. A student's disciplinary record shall be kept separate and confidential unless the student consents in writing to have it revealed. However, the Dean of Students may disclose the student's disciplinary record without the student's consent if legal compulsion or the safety of people or property is involved, or if the information is required by authorized University personnel for official use at the University. In these circumstances, only the information pertinent to the inquiry may be revealed. The Dean may also act without the student's consent to have a statement of disciplinary suspension or disciplinary expulsion entered on the student's academic record for the duration of the disciplinary sanction, which would prohibit the student from registering. Written notice of this action shall be sent to the student.

11. A student's test data and record in the Counseling Center shall be kept in the Center, separate and confidential, unless the student consents in writing to have it revealed to a designated person and/or for a designated purpose. Without such release, no information will be revealed except to an appropriate authority and then only when there is a clear and imminent danger to an individual or others, and such information will be limited to that which is directly pertinent to the reduction of that danger.

12. University Health Service medical, surgical and mental health records and information are strictly confidential and are not released to anyone without the student's knowledge and signed authorization. Student Mental Health records are maintained separately in a confidential file. If it becomes apparent in the course of treatment that the student is likely to cause injury to self or others, pertinent information to this extent may be revealed for protection of the student or others.

13. Official records and information maintained by the Dean of Students Office are treated in a confidential manner. A student has the right to view his/her own disciplinary records. Disciplinary ~~and~~ ~~judicial~~ records and the information contained therein will not be released except with the written authorization of the student, or as noted in Article I, Sections 7 & 10 of this *Code*.

Directory information about a student (as defined in Part V of this publication www.uky.edu/StudentAffairs/Code/part5.html) is released at the discretion of numerous University departments upon receipt of a specific request for such information.

Directory information about a student will not be released if the student has filed a request, in writing, with the Registrar of the University, stating the information is to be withheld.

14. A student's character and ability shall be evaluated only by those with personal knowledge of the student. Records containing such evaluations shall indicate when the evaluation was made, by whom, and the position of the individual. Upon a student's request to an individual faculty member or administrator, that student should be informed of all inquiries about that student directed to the faculty member or administrator and that judgments have been or will be given.

15. If presented with a subpoena to produce information about specific students and/or campus organizations, the recipient shall immediately notify the University Legal Counsel and forward to that office a copy of the subpoena. The University Legal Counsel shall immediately notify the students or student organizations involved or use his/her best effort to do so, and forward to them a copy of the subpoena by certified mail, addressed to their last known address.

16. Information about a student's or a student organization's political or social views or beliefs that faculty, staff or administrators acquire in the course of their work as instructors, advisers, counselors or supervisors is to be kept confidential. A student may waive the protection of this section by granting express permission to the relevant faculty, staff, or administrator.

Right of Free Expression

17. A student has the right to engage in discussion, to exchange thought and opinion, to speak, write, or print freely on any subject, and to join associations in accordance with the guarantees of federal or state constitutions. The freedom of expression includes the right to picket or demonstrate for a cause, subject to the following conditions:

- a. the student must act in an orderly and peaceful manner;
- b. the student must not ~~in any way interfere~~ in any way with the proper functioning of the University;
- c. the student must obey the University's Regulations Governing Meetings, Demonstrations, Assemblies, and Invited Speakers (See <http://www.uky.edu/Regs/files/ar/ar9-1.pdf> ~~Part III of this publication~~).

Right to a Free Student Press

18. Student publications must be free to deal openly, fearlessly and responsibly with issues of interest and importance to the academic community. Student publications shall avoid such practices as the use of libel, undocumented allegations, obscenity, attacks on personal integrity, deliberate deception of its readers, unnecessary harassment and innuendo, and other violations of individual rights. The editors shall have the right of editorial freedom without the prior approval of copy and will be protected against dismissal or suspension or other retribution, except for violations of University policies, ~~established by the Board of Student Media. Such policies shall be in accordance with the guarantees contained herein.~~

Right of Student Access to Meetings of Registered Student Organizations

19. The University affirms the right of all students, including members of the student press, to attend meetings of registered student organizations that receive the majority of their regular operating budgets from allocations of student fees money and/or University allocations.

Exceptions to the foregoing right include:

- a. deliberations of election boards and selection committees;
- b. proposed or pending litigation;
- c. discussions or hearings ~~that which~~ might lead to the appointment, discipline or dismissal of an individual employee, member or student.

Grievances

20. All student grievances involving rights stated herein shall be reported to the Dean of Students within 30 business days of their occurrence. Grievances reported after this period or which otherwise come to the attention of the Dean may be acted upon according to the Dean's determination of the circumstances.

21. The Dean of Students or an authorized designee shall investigate each student grievance to determine whether it has merit. If the Dean decides that it does, the Dean shall attempt to negotiate and settle the case, use moral persuasion, negotiation, personal appeal and the prestige of the Dean's office to settle the case to the Deans' satisfaction and that of the student. If the Dean is unable to satisfy the grievance to the satisfaction of the student or when the Dean has notified the student that the grievance does not contain merit, the student has the right to appeal within 30 business days to the University Appeals Board (hereinafter referred to as the "UAB").

22. The Dean of Students shall have broad investigatory powers in the nonacademic cases and the Dean shall receive prompt and full cooperation from students, student organizations, faculty and administrators. The Dean may recommend policies or practices that should be terminated, modified, or initiated to the

Student Government Association, the Senate Council, deans, department heads or other appropriate persons.

ARTICLE II: THE UNIVERSITY DISCIPLINARY SYSTEM

Introduction

The University is empowered by Kentucky Law K.R.S. 164.200 to establish a disciplinary system to govern the campus. The statute provides:

“The Board of Trustees may establish proper regulations for the government of the University and the physical training, military or otherwise, of the students. It may authorize the suspension and dismissal of students for neglect or violation of the regulations, or for other conduct prejudicial to the character and welfare of the University.”

By this publication of the rules governing student conduct, the University recognizes that students have the right to know the circumstances and manner in which this disciplinary power will be exercised and advises students that disciplinary rules shall be enforced.

The *Code* does not cover decisions of the faculty of a professional school as to character, moral or ethical, required of a student for purposes of awarding a degree or certificate, or for continuation as a candidate for such degree or certificate. Similarly, the *Code* does not cover decisions of the University Administration that are made concerning a contractual agreement between the University and a student. Therefore, such decisions are not subject to review within the procedures established in the *Code* unless specifically stated within the *Code*.

Authority for Student Discipline

1. Ultimate authority for student discipline is vested in the University of Kentucky Board of Trustees. Disciplinary authority may be delegated to University administrators, faculty members, committees, and organizations, as set forth in this *Code*, and in other appropriate policies, rules, or regulations adopted by the Board.
2. Pursuant to the provisions of K.R.S. 164.200, 164.210 and 164.220 and this *Code*, the Board of Trustees delegates the responsibility for student discipline to the President of the University. The President has delegated administration and oversight of this *Code* to the Vice President for Student Affairs (hereinafter referred to as the “VPSA”). The VPSA may delegate enforcement authority of this *Code* to the Office of the Dean of Students. Concerns about the administration of the *Code* may be brought to the Dean of Students or other University official.

Purpose of the Disciplinary System

3. Pursuit of a college education provides an opportunity for exploration of new ideas, experimentation, self-examination, formation of new friendships and development of ideals and directions. An academic community is a place where the free exchange of ideas and concepts can take place among faculty, staff and students in an atmosphere that allows for debate and disagreement on contemporary issues.

In order to protect our community, certain standards of behavior are expected of all members of the University community, including students. In general, the University of Kentucky expects students to: maintain standards of personal integrity that are in harmony with the educational goals of the institution; observe national, state and local laws, as well as University regulations; and respect the rights, privileges, and property of other people.

The University disciplinary process is a learning experience that can result in personal growth as well as an understanding of the responsibilities that accompany participation in an academic community. By

formulating a general code of conduct and regulations, the University reaffirms for students the rights, protections, guarantees and responsibilities that are outlined in Article I of this *Code*.

Interpretation of Regulations

4. The purpose of publishing disciplinary regulations is to give students general notice of behavior that is expected and behavior that is prohibited by the University. This *Code* is not written with the specificity of a criminal statute and is not intended to be interpreted with the specificity of a criminal statute.

Inherent Authority

5. The disciplinary regulations outlined in this *Code* apply to behavior that occurs on University property, as defined in Article II, ~~Section 10a.~~, and may also apply to off-campus behavior that is prejudicial to the character and welfare of the University, as follows:

- a. any activity sponsored, conducted or authorized by the University or a registered organization (see Article II, Sections 47 & 48-32);
- b. conduct that poses a possible serious threat to the safety, security or well-being of any member of the University community;
- c. conduct that involves academic work or the forgery, alteration, or misuse of any University document, record, key, electronic device or identification;
- d. conduct that is considered disorderly and/or causes substantial destruction to property belonging to the University or members of the University community.

Disciplinary Action while Criminal Charges Are Pending

~~6. Students may be simultaneously accountable to both civil authorities and to the University for acts that constitute violations of law and of this *Code*. Disciplinary action at the University shall normally proceed during ongoing criminal proceedings and shall not be subject to challenge on the ground that criminal charges involving the same incident are pending or have been resolved in any manner.~~

Disciplinary proceedings may be instituted against a student charged with conduct that potentially violates both the criminal law and this *Code* (that is, if both possible violations result from the same factual situation) without regard to the pendency of civil or criminal litigation in court or criminal arrest and prosecution. Proceedings under this *Code* may be carried out prior to, simultaneously with, or following civil or criminal proceedings off campus at the discretion of Dean of Students. Determinations made or sanctions imposed under this *Code* shall not be subject to change because criminal charges arising out of the same facts giving rise to violations of University rules were dismissed, reduced, or resolved in favor or against the criminal law defendant.

Standards of Classroom Behavior

7. The primary responsibility for managing the classroom environment rests with the faculty. Students who engage in any prohibited or unlawful acts that result in disruption of a class may be directed by the faculty member to leave the class for the remainder of the class period. Longer suspensions, or dismissal from a class due to disruptive behavior, must be preceded by a disciplinary hearing as set forth in Article II, Section 24 of this *Code*.

Prohibited Conduct

8. Punishable disciplinary offenses include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. Interference, coercion or disruption that impedes, impairs or disrupts University missions, processes or functions or interferes with the rights of others. The following, while not intended to

be exclusive, illustrate the offenses encompassed herein: occupation of any University building or property, or part thereof, without authorization by the University; blocking the entrance or exit of any University building or corridor or room therein; setting fire to, or by any other means, damaging any University building or property or the property of others on University premises; any possession or display of, or attempt, or threat to use firearms, explosive or other weapons upon University property without University authorization; prevention of the convening, continuation or orderly conduct of any University class or activity or of any lawful meeting or assembly upon University property; blocking normal pedestrian or vehicular traffic on University property; and failure to vacate premises when ordered to do so by a University official.

b. Use, possession, or distribution of narcotic or dangerous drugs, except as expressly permitted by law.

c. Disorderly, abusive, drunken, violent or excessively noisy behavior or expression.

d. The threat or commission of physical violence against self or other persons.

e. The commission of acts or the implementation of programs or activities that constitute a violation of local, state or federal law.

f. Failure to comply with directions of University officials acting in the performance of their duties.

g. Falsifying, altering or forging any official University records or documents, employing official University documents or records for purposes of misrepresentation, or causing any official University documents or records to be falsified by means of any misrepresentation.

h. Hazing by any action taken or situation created, intentionally or recklessly, whether on or off University premises, to produce mental or physical discomfort, embarrassment, harassment, or ridicule. Such abusive activities and situations may include, but are not limited to the following: illegal or harmful use and/or forced consumption of food, alcohol or drugs; paddling in any form; creation of fatigue; personal servitude; physical and/or psychological shocks; wearing apparel which is conspicuous and not normally in good taste; engaging in public stunts and buffoonery; degrading or humiliating games and activities; sleep or food deprivation; any meetings which unreasonably interfere with scholastic activities; and/or any other activities which are not consistent with the regulations and policies of the University of Kentucky.

i. Knowingly passing a worthless check or money order to the University or to a member of the University community acting in an official capacity; recurring financial over-obligation and nonpayment of debts to the University.

j. Theft of property or services; knowingly possessing stolen property.

k. Possessing a deadly weapon without authorization, as defined by *Administrative Regulation 6:6 (Policy on Deadly Weapons)*, of the Dean of Students.

l. Defacing, disfiguring, damaging or destroying public or private property.

m. Giving false testimony or other evidence at any official hearing of the University or giving false information to any faculty or staff members acting in the performance of their duties.

n. Bribing any University employee or student officials.

o. Harassing anyone present on University property.

p. Providing information to individuals involved in organized gambling activities concerning intercollegiate athletics competition; or participating in any gambling activity that involves intercollegiate athletics or amateur athletics, through a bookmaker, a parlay card or any other method employed by organized gambling.

q. Violation of conditions imposed in connection with one or more of the sanctions enumerated in Article II, Section 1011 of this *Code*.

r. Violation of other published University regulations or policies. Such regulations or policies include, but are not limited to, policies regarding computer use, alcohol, tobacco, hazing, entry and use of University facilities as well as regulations governing student organizations and residence halls.

s. Sexual assault, stalking, and relationship violence, including threats thereof, as defined by Administrative Regulation R 6:2 (Policy On Sexual Assault, Stalking, and Relationship Violence).

t. Retaliation, either directly or indirectly through others, against any individual involved in a disciplinary complaint or proceeding.

9. Attempts to commit acts prohibited by this *Code* or assisting in the commission of such acts may be punished to the same extent as completed violations.

Definitions

~~10. When used in this Code:~~

~~a. "University property" is defined as all property owned, or leased to, and operated exclusively by the University, public sidewalks and streets that are contiguous to or in the immediate vicinity of such property, and all such property leased to or operated by student and non-student organizations that are under the control and regulation of the Board of Trustees of the University of Kentucky.~~

~~b. "Group" means a number of persons who are associated with each other and operate as an organization, but who have not complied with University requirements for registration as an organization.~~

~~e. "Organization" means a number of persons who have complied with University requirements for registration.~~

~~d. "Student" means any person who is admitted, registered or enrolled in any University program or course, either full-time or part-time, pursuing undergraduate, graduate, or professional studies.~~

Sanctions

1011. All disciplinary sanctions imposed upon students are cumulative in nature and will be recorded in the student's disciplinary record. Sanctions that may be imposed in accordance with this *Code* include:

a. *Disciplinary Warning*: notice, oral or written, that continuation or repetition of prohibited conduct may be cause for additional disciplinary action. A student may be given a warning for infractions deemed by the hearing officer to be minor in nature.

b. *Disciplinary Reprimand*: a written reprimand for violation of specified regulations, including a warning that continuation or repetition of prohibited conduct may be cause for additional disciplinary action,

without loss of good standing with the University. A violation of the terms of disciplinary reprimand, or subsequent misconduct after discipline, is grounds for further disciplinary action, including disciplinary probation, social suspension, disciplinary suspension, or disciplinary expulsion.

c. *Disciplinary Probation*: exclusion from participation in specified privileges or extracurricular institutional activities for a specified period of time. Additional sanctions or restrictions may also be imposed. A student on disciplinary probation is not in good standing with the University. A violation of the terms of disciplinary probation, or subsequent misconduct, is grounds for further disciplinary action, including social suspension, disciplinary suspension, or disciplinary expulsion.

d. *Social Suspension*: exclusion from University premises, as well as exclusion from participation in all privileges and extracurricular institutional activities, except for attendance in classes in which officially enrolled and defined privileges ~~that which~~ are necessary and required for a specified period of time. Additional sanctions or restrictions may also be imposed. A violation of the terms of social suspension, or subsequent misconduct, is grounds for further disciplinary action, including disciplinary suspension or disciplinary expulsion.

e. *Disciplinary Suspension*: exclusion from University premises, as well as participation in all privileges or extracurricular institutional activities, for a stated period of time at the end of which the student may apply for readmission to the University. While under disciplinary suspension, the student is not entitled to attend classes, use University facilities, participate in University activities, or be employed by the University. Special conditions may be stipulated for a student to be reinstated at the conclusion of the period of suspension. A violation of the terms of disciplinary suspension, or subsequent misconduct, is grounds for disciplinary expulsion.

f. *Disciplinary Expulsion*: permanent termination of student status, and exclusion from University premises, privileges and activities.

g. *Other Sanctions*: other sanctions or conditions may be imposed instead of or in addition to those specified in Article II, Sections 11 of this Code ~~(a) through 11(f)~~. Examples include, but are not limited to termination of residence hall contract, restriction of access to specific areas of campus, monetary penalty, monetary reimbursement, public or community service, research projects, compulsory attendance at education programs, compulsory psychiatric/psychological evaluation and counseling, such as alcohol and drug counseling.

Temporary Sanctions

~~1142.~~ Whenever there is evidence that the continued presence of a student at the University poses a substantial and immediate threat to him/herself or to others, or to the stability and continuance of normal University functions, the ~~Vice President for Student Affairs~~ VPSA or authorized representative may impose such temporary sanctions as the ~~VPSA or authorized representative~~ considers necessary, including exclusion from campus property. The temporary sanctions shall become effective immediately without prior notice. Upon taking such action, the ~~VPSA or authorized representative~~ shall immediately notify the ~~chair of the UAB University Appeals Board~~ (see Rules of the University Senate, Part II, Section 6.5).

~~1243.~~ A student may appeal the decision of the ~~Vice President for Student Affairs~~ VPSA or authorized representative to the ~~UAB University Appeals Board~~ (herein after referred to as the "UAB") in writing within seven (7) ~~business~~ days. Temporary sanctions will remain in effect during any appeal. If requested in the written appeal, a student shall be given an opportunity to appear personally before the ~~UAB University Appeals Board~~ within ~~three (3) business days~~ 72 hours in order to discuss the following issues only:

- a. the reliability of the information concerning the student's conduct, including the matter of his or her identity.
- b. whether the conduct and surrounding circumstances reasonably indicate that the continued presence of the student on University premises poses a substantial and immediate threat to himself or herself or to others or the stability and continuance of normal University functions.

A student under temporary sanction shall be given an opportunity for a prompt disciplinary hearing within the University Disciplinary System.

No Contact Orders

13. If the Dean of Students determines that a Respondent, Complainant or other party needs to be protected from violence, the threat of violence or other menacing behaviors attributable to another party in a disciplinary proceeding, the Dean may impose a “no contact” order on the offending party. The Dean of Students may issue “no contact” orders on multiple parties in a disciplinary proceeding if there are independent determinations that those parties must be afforded protection from acts of violence, threats of violence or other menacing behaviors.

Referrals.

14. Any person may refer a student or a student group or organization suspected of violating this *Code* to the Dean of Students Office.

15. Those persons referring cases are normally expected to serve as the Complainant and to present a written account of the incident, including relevant evidence to the Dean of Students Office. The Complainant may request the assistance of an advisor, as outlined in Article II, Sections ~~2230~~ and ~~231~~ of this *Code*. In cases that are referred to the University Disciplinary System, the Dean of Students or authorized designee ~~may~~ shall serve as an additional ~~C~~complainant.

16. Once an alleged violation of this *Code* has been referred to the Dean of Students Office, the Dean of Students shall assign a Conduct Officer to the case. If the Complainant in a case is another student, the Complainant shall be given an opportunity to indicate a preference, if any, for the gender of the Conduct Officer. The Dean of Students shall honor the Complainant’s preference whenever possible. Once assigned the case, and before beginning his or her investigation, the Conduct Officer shall meet separately with both the Respondent and Complainant to explain the disciplinary policies and procedures articulated in this *Code*, and the rights of the Respondent and Complainant. The Respondent and Complainant may each be accompanied by an advisor whose role shall be limited as outlined in Article II, Sections 30 and 31 of this *Code*, the Dean or authorized designee shall investigate the allegation. If the Dean or authorized designee determines that evidence exists to prove the allegation, the Dean of Students Office shall notify and charge the accused student with a specific violation of this *Code* and request that the student schedule an informational meeting with the Dean or authorized designee.

17. The Conduct Officer will gather all relevant information, including, when appropriate, conducting interviews with the Complainant, Respondent, and all witnesses, and determine whether there is sufficient support for a charge of a *Code* violation. If the Conduct Officer determines that information exists to support the allegation, the Dean of Students Office shall notify and charge the Respondent with a specific violation of this *Code* and request that the student schedule an informational meeting with the Conduct Officer.

The Preliminary Disciplinary Process

The Informational Meetings and the Counseling Process

~~18~~17. A student accused of violations of this *Code* ~~will meet with the Conduct Officer~~ is subject to an informational meeting with the Dean of Students or authorized designee ~~who conducted the initial investigation~~. The procedural protections outlined in Article I, Section 7 of this *Code* shall be explained to the accused student during ~~the~~ an informational meeting. Also, the accused student shall state whether s/he is “responsible” or “not responsible” for the alleged violation during the ~~informational~~ meeting.

~~1918. When a student accepts responsibility for an alleged violation, the Conduct Officer Dean or authorized designee shall discuss the violation with counsel the student and outline proposed disciplinary action as defined in Article II, Section 1011 of this Code. Information obtained from the student during this counseling process is confidential and inadmissible in any disciplinary hearing of the University except in cases where the student withdraws from the counseling process or refuses to comply with the conditions of the counseling process.~~

20. When the Respondent denies the finding of responsibility or accepts responsibility but finds the proposed sanction unacceptable, the Respondent may request a review of the case by the VPSA. The written appeal shall be submitted to the VPSA, or postmarked, if mailed to the VPSA, within seven (7) business days of the meeting with the Conduct Officer (see Sections 18 and 19 above). The VPSA or designee shall honor all such requests and agree to meet with the Respondent before making a decision.

21. When required or permitted by law, the University shall also notify the Complainant of the determination of responsibility and the proposed sanction, if any. The Conduct Officer shall explain to the Complainant that, if he or she is not satisfied with the determination of responsibility or proposed sanction, or both, the Complainant may request a review of the case by the VPSA. The written appeal shall be submitted to the VPSA, or postmarked, if mailed to the VPSA, within seven (7) business days of the notification by the University. The VPSA or designee shall honor all such requests and agree to meet with the Complainant before making a decision.

Review by the Vice President for Student Affairs

22. After concluding his or her review, the VPSA or designee shall meet with the student who submitted the request for the review and explain his or her determination of the appropriateness of the finding of responsibility or the proposed sanction, or both. The Respondent will always be notified of the VPSA's decision. When required or permitted by law, the University shall also notify the Complainant.

23. If a Respondent accepts the VPSA's or designee's finding of responsibility and sanction, if any, the VPSA or designee shall instruct the Dean of Students that the case is closed. If a Respondent does not accept the VPSA's or designee's finding of responsibility and sanction, if any, the VPSA or designee shall instruct the Dean of Students to forward the case to the Disciplinary Hearing Process.

24. If the VPSA or designee finds merit in a Complainant's challenge of findings and/or sanction, the case shall be forwarded to the Disciplinary Hearing Process. If the VPSA or designee finds that there is insufficient evidence to support the Complainant's challenge, the VPSA or designee shall instruct the Dean of Students that the case is closed and inform the Complainant that he or she has no further recourse within the disciplinary process of the University.

Referral to a Disciplinary Hearing Officer Panel

~~2519. If the Respondent~~ When a student denies responsibility for an alleged violation or withdraws from or refuses to comply with the conditions of the preliminary disciplinary counseling process or refuses to accept the finding of responsibility or proposed sanction, the Conduct Officer Dean or authorized designee shall forward the reports and evidence concerning the case to a Panel of three (3) disciplinary hearing officers. Once the information has been forwarded to a Disciplinary Hearing Officer Panel (hereinafter referred to as the "Panel") hearing officer, the Respondent accused student has entered the University Disciplinary Hearing Process. The Dean of Students Office is then responsible for furnishing testimony as requested by the Panel Disciplinary Hearing Officer, keeping their records for the Disciplinary Hearing Officer, serving as a Complainant as appropriate and aiding the student in complying with any sanction decreed by the Panel Disciplinary Hearing Officer.

~~2620. When a student fails to respond to proper notification of the an informational meeting or counseling session or fails to attend a scheduled meeting within the specified period, the Dean of Students or authorized designee may:~~

- a. place a hold on the student's ability to register, receive transcripts, transfer credits, be readmitted to the University, or receive the graduation diploma which certifies the degree earned until the ~~informational meeting-counseling session~~ or disciplinary hearing has taken place, and;
- b. deem that the student has denied responsibility for the pending charges and refer the matter to a ~~Panel/disciplinary hearing officer~~ to conduct a disciplinary hearing.

Interim Leave of Absence

27. When a student, as a result of a psychological, mental health or other medical conditions, poses a threat of violence directed against self, others, or University property as evidenced by verbal statements or other menacing behaviors, the Dean of Students shall be permitted to divert the student from the disciplinary system by imposing an interim leave of absence from the University. Before the student is permitted to reenroll in the university, he or she shall be required to undergo a comprehensive evaluation to assess the student's readiness to return and not pose a threat to the university community. The disciplinary proceedings in which the student was involved as a Respondent may resume upon the student's reenrollment in the university.

28. If a Respondent in a disciplinary proceeding leaves the university before his or her case is resolved, the student's disciplinary proceedings may resume upon the student's reenrollment in the university.

The Disciplinary Hearing Process

Disciplinary Hearing Officers and Members of the University Appeals Board

2921. The President of the University shall annually appoint no fewer than ~~three~~ ten (10) individuals ~~disciplinary hearing officers~~ from among the faculty, staff, and retirees of the University, who shall serve as Disciplinary Hearing Officers. Disciplinary Hearing Officers, working as members of a three-person Panel, shall have sole authority to determine the issue of responsibility in those cases referred. Similarly, disciplinary hearing officers shall have sole authority to impose sanctions upon students found responsible for violations through the University Disciplinary Hearing process. The majority vote of the Panel members assigned to a case (at least 2 of the 3 Panel members) shall determine the outcome of a case. The Disciplinary Hearing Officers assigned to a case shall designate one of their Panel members to serve as the Panel Presider. The Presider shall function as the facilitator in the disciplinary hearing proceedings.

Disciplinary Hearing Officers and members of the UAB, shall complete annual training in the areas of: a) the University hearing processes and procedures; b) investigative techniques; and c) sexual misconduct and relationship violence. The training shall be coordinated by the VPSA or authorized designee.

Advisors

3022. A ~~Ce~~complainant and ~~an~~ accused student ~~Respondent~~ may each be accompanied ~~assisted by~~ no more than two ~~one~~ advisors throughout the disciplinary process, including the investigation. The role of the advisors shall be limited to providing advice or support to the ~~Ce~~complainant or ~~accused student~~ Respondent. Even if accompanied by an advisor, ~~the~~ Complainant and ~~an~~ accused student ~~Respondent~~ shall personally respond to inquiries from the ~~Panel, Disciplinary Hearing Officer~~ the Conduct Officer or the UAB. An advisor is not permitted to address directly the members of a Disciplinary Hearing Panel, the Conduct Officer, the UAB or any witnesses participating in a disciplinary hearing.

3123. In consideration of the limited role of ~~an~~ the advisor, and of the compelling interest of the University to expeditiously conclude the matter, a disciplinary hearing shall not, as a general practice, be delayed due to the unavailability of an advisor.

University Disciplinary Hearings Process

32. Prior to the start of a University Disciplinary Hearing, a Conduct Officer shall conduct separate meetings with the Respondent and Complainant to review the relevant policies and procedures that inform the disciplinary hearing process. The Respondent and Complainant may each be accompanied at these sessions by an advisor(s) whose role shall be limited as outlined in Article II, Sections 30 and 31 of this Code.

33~~24~~. The purpose of ~~a the~~ University Disciplinary Hearing Process is to provide a fair evaluation of ~~the Respondent's an accused student's~~ responsibility for violating University regulations. Formal legal rules of evidence shall not be applied, nor shall minor deviations from prescribed procedures necessarily invalidate a decision, unless significant prejudice to ~~Respondent, Complainant an accused student~~ or the University may result.

34~~25~~. The following procedural guidelines, along with the rights outlined in Article I, Section 7, shall be applicable in hearings conducted by a Panel ~~University hearing officer~~:

a. The Dean of Students Office shall give the Respondent and Complainant ~~accused student~~ written notice of the date, time and place of the hearing as well as the specific charge against the student. ~~The Respondent and Complainant An accused student~~ shall be given reasonable access to the case file, which will be retained in the Dean of Students Office.

b. A Respondent ~~n accused student~~ who fails to appear after proper notice shall be deemed to have denied responsibility for the alleged violation. A hearing may be conducted in the student's absence, if necessary.

c. The hearing will be closed to the public, other than the advisors, if any, designated by the Respondent and Complainant. ~~The hearing will be closed to the public unless the accused student or the complainant(s) requests that the hearing be open by filing a written request with the Disciplinary Hearing Officer at least 24 hours prior to the time set for the hearing. The hearing will remain closed to the public unless both the accused and the complainant(s) agree to an open hearing. If both parties agree to an open hearing, the Disciplinary Hearing Officer shall admit to the hearing, in addition to those admitted to a closed hearing, one properly identified member of any established newspaper, magazine, television station or radio station requesting admission as well as up to four persons who have been invited by the accused student, up to four persons who have been invited by the complainant(s) and up to four persons invited by the Disciplinary Hearing Officer.~~

d. ~~The Presider of the Panel~~Disciplinary Hearing Officer shall exercise control over the proceedings to avoid needless consumption of time and to achieve orderly completion of the hearing. Any person, including the ~~accused student~~Respondent, who disrupts the hearing may be excluded by the Presider of the Panel~~Disciplinary Hearing Officer~~ after the Presider has consulted with the others members of the Panel.

e. A record of the hearing shall be made.

f. Both the ~~accused student~~Respondent and the Complainant shall have the right to call relevant and necessary witnesses. ~~The accused student~~Respondent and the Complainant (not the advisors) shall also be given an opportunity to ask relevant questions of those witnesses who testify at the hearing. Witnesses shall be excluded from all hearings, except for the period of their testimony. The Panel may accommodate concerns for the personal safety, well-being, and/or fears of confrontation of the Complainant, the Respondent, or other witnesses during the hearing by providing separate facilities, by using a visual screen, and/or by permitting participation by telephone, videophone, closed circuit television, video conferencing, videotape, audiotape, written statement, or other means, where and as determined in the sole judgment of the Panel to be reasonable and appropriate. Either party may submit the written report or statement from a

witness in lieu of the witness' personal appearance at the hearing; however, in the event that a party chooses to submit written statements from witnesses, all reasonable attempts should be made to have those individuals available by telephone.

g. Witnesses shall be asked to affirm that their testimony is truthful and may be subject to charges of violating this *Code* by intentionally providing false information to the University.

~~h. Prospective witnesses, other than the Complainant and the Respondent, may be excluded from the hearing during the testimony of other witnesses.~~

~~h.i. The All members of a Panel/Disciplinary Hearing Officer may ask questions of the parties and all witnesses.~~

i. Evidence of the sexual behavior of the Complainant of a sexual assault is inadmissible in the hearing unless such evidence clearly relates to the issue of consent between the Complainant and Respondent for the specific act(s) in question or the evidence relates to the likelihood that the act(s) in question were committed by the Respondent. Such evidence may not be proved by reputation or opinion.

~~j.k. The charges against the accused must be established by~~ The burden of proof shall rest on the Complainant, and the standard of proof shall be a "preponderance of the evidence" (i.e. more likely than not).

k. When a student is found responsible for a violation of the *Code*, the hearing shall conclude with a supplemental proceeding to determine the sanction that should be imposed. Both the Respondent~~accused~~ and the Complainant may submit relevant evidence or make relevant statements regarding the appropriateness of a specific sanction. The past disciplinary record of the ~~accused student~~ Respondent shall only be supplied to the Panel/Disciplinary Hearing Officer during the supplemental proceeding.

l. The Panel shall submit to the Dean of Students a written summary of its findings of fact and responsibility, and sanctions as applicable.

m. The Complainant's address and other contact information shall be redacted on any documents shared with the Respondent.

n. Notification of the Respondent's violations, penalties, and remedies shall be sent as directed by the Dean of Students, Hearing Panel, or UAB to the University officials necessary to make the penalties and remedies effective, and to other persons who might provide counseling assistance to the Respondent. Such University officials and other persons shall maintain confidentiality in accordance with the Code of Student Conduct and these guidelines. Violations of confidentiality will be dealt with under the appropriate existing, applicable University regulation(s) or policy(s).

Appeals of the Panel's Decision

35. A Respondent or Complainant may file an appeal of the Panel's decision. The written appeal shall be submitted to the Chair of the UAB, or postmarked, if mailed to the Chair, within seven (7) business days of the receipt of the decision rendered by the Panel. An appeal shall be limited to the following grounds:

a. To determine whether the disciplinary proceedings were conducted fairly in light of the charges and information presented, and in conformity with prescribed procedures giving the Complainant reasonable opportunity to prepare and to present information that the Code was violated, and giving the Respondent a reasonable opportunity to prepare and present a response to those allegations. Deviations from designated procedures will not be a basis for sustaining an appeal unless significant prejudice results.

- b. There is information that was unavailable at the time of the original hearing that would alter the determination of responsibility.
36. A Respondent who is found responsible by a Panel for a violation of this Code and is sanctioned with social suspension, disciplinary suspension, or expulsion may appeal in writing to the UAB (see *Governing Regulation, Part XI.C*) and (see Rules of the University Senate, Part II, Section 6.5). The basis of the appeal shall be limited to the severity of the sanction imposed by the Panel for the infraction for which the student was found responsible. The written appeal shall be submitted to the Chair of the UAB or postmarked, if mailed, within seven (7) business days of the receipt of the decision rendered by the Panel.
37. The Chair of the UAB and two (2) members of the UAB chosen by the Chair shall review an appeal submitted in accordance with section 35 above to determine if the appeal has merit and therefore warrants further consideration of the case by a Disciplinary Hearing Officer Panel. The two (2) individuals chosen by the UAB Chair may be current UAB members and/or individuals who have served on the UAB within the past two academic years. The decision on the merit of the appeal shall be decided by majority vote of the UAB Chair and the 2 consulted persons. An appeal shall be deemed meritorious if they concludes that:
- a. a procedural error in the conduct of the case may have affected the determination of a finding of responsibility; or,
- b. the new information was unavailable at the time of the original hearing and could have altered the determination of responsibility.
38. The Chair of the UAB shall notify the Dean of Students of the decision on the question of merit.
39. The Dean of Students shall take one of the following three courses of action:
- a. Act on the Panel's finding of responsibility and assigned sanction, if the Chair communicates that the appeal was without merit;
- b. Instruct a new Panel to reconsider the case in light of a procedural error that may have affected the determination of a finding of responsibility; or,
- c. Instruct the original Panel to resume the case in light of evidence that was both unavailable at the time of the original hearing and could have altered the determination of responsibility.
40. The Panel instructed by the Dean of Students to reconsider or resume consideration of a case (see subsections 39(b) and 39(c) above) shall:
- a. Conduct the proceedings in accordance with Section 34 of this Code.
- b. Submit to the Dean of Students a written summary of its findings of fact and responsibility, and sanctions as applicable.
41. Neither the Respondent nor Complainant in a case shall have further access to the appeals process after the Panel has acted on the case in accordance with subsections 38(b) or 38(c) above, except as is afforded the Respondent in section 36 above.

Appeals to the University Appeals Board

26. A student who is found responsible for a violation of this Code and is sanctioned with social suspension, disciplinary suspension, or expulsion may appeal in writing to the Chair of the University Appeals Board (see Part II, Section 6.5). The written appeal shall be submitted to the Chair or postmarked,

if mailed to the Chair, within seven (7) class days of the receipt of the decision rendered by the Disciplinary Hearing Officer.

~~27. The written appeal shall clearly state the reason for appeal. Acceptable reasons for an appeal are: an assertion and evidence that:~~

- ~~a. Due process rights have been violated through the University Disciplinary Hearing Process;~~
- ~~b. The sanction is inappropriate for the infraction for which the student was found responsible; or~~
- ~~c. There is information that was unavailable at the time of the original hearing which would alter the determination of responsibility, or which would alter the sanction.~~

~~4328. The University Appeals Board UAB shall review the written findings of the Panel, the appeal of the Respondent and the submission, if any, from the Complainant and then render a prompt decision, after receipt of the appeal. The University Appeals Board UAB may uphold or reduce the sanction decision imposed by of the Panel, Hearing Officer, or modify the decision by reducing or increasing the level of sanctions imposed and/or modifying any terms and conditions of the initial sanctions. The imposition of sanctions shall be deferred during the review unless, in the discretion of the Vice President for Student Affairs VPSA or authorized designee, the continued presence of the student on the campus poses a substantial threat to him/herself or to others, or to the stability and continuance of normal University functions.~~

Disciplinary Files and Records

~~4429.~~ The record of disciplinary actions shall be maintained by the Dean of Students Office.

~~4530.~~ The file of a student found responsible for any violations of this *Code* shall normally be retained as a disciplinary record for seven years following the incident or five years after the last semester enrolled, whichever is longer. If a student transfers to another institution, the record shall be shared with the new institution upon request and if released by the student.

Revocation of Degrees

~~4631.~~ The University reserves the right to revoke an awarded degree for the discovery of previously unknown fraud in receipt of the degree, or for the discovery of previously unknown serious disciplinary violations committed by a student prior to the student's graduation.

Student Groups and Organizations

~~4732.~~ The registration of any student organization shall be at the discretion of a designated member of the Student Affairs staff and shall be dependent upon the completion of the required application form and compliance with the rules and additional criteria the staff member may set forth. Such criteria shall be established and published by the designated staff member and made uniform for all similar types of organizations. The designated staff member may limit an organization's registration to a fixed ~~period of time~~ period. The length may be determined at the staff member's discretion.

~~4833.~~ A student group or organization may be charged with violations of this *Code* as outlined in Article II, Sections 8 and 9, whether the alleged violations occurred on or off University property.

~~4934.~~ A student group or an organization and its officers may be held collectively ~~and individually~~ responsible when violations of the *Code* by those associated with the group or organization have received the consent or encouragement of the group or organization or the group's or organization's leaders or officers. In addition, individuals of a student group or organization may also be charged with a violation of this Code.

~~5035.~~ The officers or leaders or any identifiable spokesperson for a student group or organization may be directed by the Dean of Students or authorized representative to take appropriate action designed to prevent

or end violations of this *Code* by the group or organization. Failure to make reasonable efforts to comply with such directive shall be considered a violation of this *Code*, both by the officers, leaders or spokesperson for the group or organization and by the group or organization itself.

5136. No specific procedures for adjudicating the commission of violations by a student group or organization are established other than the Dean of Students may impose sanctions for group or organization misconduct up to and including revocation or denial of registration, as well as other appropriate sanctions. A student group or organization may appeal the denial or revocation of registration to the ~~University Appeals Board~~UAB as outlined in Section 4226 of this *Code*.

University Residential Facilities

5237. The rules and regulations for University student residences are contained or provided for in the written rental agreement between the student and the University as well as in the *Residence Hall Rules of Conduct*.

5338. A compilation of all rules established under the rental agreement and currently in effect shall be made readily available on request to all residents of the University building to which such rules apply and shall be posted in the University building to which such rules apply.

5439. The Director of Residence Life or an authorized representative shall investigate alleged violations of the rules that are outlined in the rental agreement. Disposition of such cases shall be made in accordance with established and published procedures that have been approved by the ~~Vice President for Student Affairs~~VPSA. In cases where the alleged rental agreement violation would also constitute a violation of the provisions of this *Code*, the Director of Residence Life ~~shall may hear and/or~~ refer the case to the Dean of Students Office.

Financial Delinquency

5540. The University expects the student to be financially responsible and not be delinquent in financial obligations to the University or to any department or division thereof, including room and board payments to registered fraternal student organizations. Such obligations shall not include fines and penalties assessed against the student ~~by~~ other than ~~by~~ University officers.

5641. An office or a department of the University, with previous approval of the Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration, shall notify a student twice of any unmet financial obligation owed to it exceeding \$20.00. If not paid within 60 business days, from date due, the office or department shall notify the Registrar's Office that the student is delinquent.

5742. Once notified, the Registrar shall not allow the student to register, transfer credits, be readmitted to the University, or receive the graduation diploma which certifies the degree earned until the office or department declaring the delinquency notifies the Registrar that the obligation has been met or until the statute of limitations on collection applies.

5843. If there is a dispute as to whether or not a student is legally liable for a financial obligation asserted by the University, and the student challenges such obligation by contacting the Office of the through either timely administrative ~~(Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration) within seven (7) business days of receipt of a notice of financial delinquency, or legal means,~~ then the sanctions of Section 5742 with respect to registration shall not apply until final resolution of the dispute.

Amendment

6044. The *Code of Student Conduct* shall be amended only by final action of the Board of Trustees. Responsibility for proposing revisions to the *Code of Student Conduct* is delegated to a committee consisting of students, faculty and administrators. The exact composition and procedure of the committee shall be determined by the President of the University.

- | ~~6145~~. The Committee shall accept and review recommendations from students, faculty and administrators regarding revisions of the *Code of Student Conduct*. The Committee shall prepare proposed revisions and forward them to the President for approval and, after approval, for presentation to the Board of Trustees for its consideration and final approval.
- | ~~6246~~. Nothing included above shall be construed as a limitation upon the President to propose changes without reference to the Committee.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS	IDENTIFICATION AR 3:4 II-1.1-8		PAGE 1
	DATE EFFECTIVE 1/11/99	SUPERSEDES REGULATION DATED 11-1.1-8: 6/16/83, 8/5/87, 1/11/99	

~~GUIDELINES FOR OUT-OF-STATE EMPLOYMENT OR ASSIGNMENT OF FACULTY
AND STAFF RELATED TO OUT-OF-STATE PROGRAMS~~

I. Introduction

The University of Kentucky is ~~continuously~~ regularly involved in out-of-state programs which are pertinent and justifiable in view of both the nature and mission of the University. ~~Funding for these programs shall be derived through contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements.~~ Activities in such programs ~~are~~ must be considered as appropriate professional activities for the faculty and staff associated with the programs.

II. A. ~~Faculty Performance Review, and Promotion, and Salary Increases~~

Faculty and staff on out-of-state assignments ~~in international or other programs~~ shall be evaluated for purposes of performance review, ~~and promotion, and salary increases~~ on the basis of their performances and accomplishments in their assigned areas of activity (refer to Sections A and B.4 of AR II 1.0-5). They shall receive salary increases based on merit, promotion, and ~~catch up adjustments~~ in conformity with such increases received by on-campus faculty and staff of comparable rank or status.

III.B. Salary Adjustments

Out-of-state assignments ~~on international or other programs~~ may involve some disruptions of individuals' personal and professional lives and ~~usually incur significant~~ additional costs such as those associated with maintaining dual residences and making more long-distance communications. Therefore, relative to such assignments, the following salary adjustments shall be permitted:

A1. During out of state employment or assignments involving at least one month but less than one year ~~or more~~ of continuous service, salaries of faculty and staff participants may be increased up to ten percent to provide compensation for additional costs usually incurred while on temporary assignments away from home.

B2. During out-of-state employment or assignments involving a period of one year or more, faculty ~~who normally are appointed on a nine-month, ten-month, or eleven-month assignments basis~~ may ~~shall~~ have their assignment period ~~appointments~~ increased, changed to a twelve month assignment basis and their annual base salaries increased accordingly by a factor of two ninths, two tenths, or one eleventh, respectively. (See AR 3:7 - Salary Conversion) Such changes shall be made by mutual agreement of the University and the faculty employee.

~~C3.~~ Subject to approval of the University and availability of funds, a faculty employee's annual base salary may be increased when ~~When an out-of-state such an assignment does not allow~~ faculty consulting activities in accordance with normal University policy, ~~an individual's twelve-month base salary may, to the extent permitted by the funding agency, be increased.~~

~~D4.~~ Assignments involving increased responsibilities may carry salary increases up to ~~ten~~ eight percent of twelve-month annual base salaries, subject to University approval. ~~Normally only one individual per program or project shall receive such an increase, and~~ The increase shall be limited to the period during which the individual has increased responsibilities. ~~No such adjustment shall be made for a temporary assignment of sixty days or less.~~

~~E5.~~ Faculty and staff serving in such assignments supported through contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements from governmental agencies or other institutions shall be eligible to receive other allowances and ~~benefits~~ perquisites ~~which the funding agencies normally afford their employees. In the absence of other arrangements, the regulations for United States Government employees may be used.~~

IVC. Vacation and Temporary Disability/Sick Leave

~~Faculty and staff on out-of-state assignments shall be entitled to annual leave and temporary disability leave normally available to them under applicable University policies. in international or other programs for periods of less than one year shall maintain their normal annual leave or vacation privileges. When such assignments prevent taking vacation leave which shall lapse on a given deadline, individuals may request postponement of the deadline, but in no case shall postponement of more than three months be approved.~~

~~Individuals on out of state assignments in international or other programs for periods of one year or more shall be expected to take vacation leave earned during such assignments prior to the end of the assignments. Unused vacation leave to which faculty and staff were entitled at the commencement of their out of state assignments shall be restored to them upon their return to campus.~~

~~Faculty and staff shall be eligible for sick leave during out of state assignments in international or other programs exactly as though they were assigned on campus. Sick leave required during such an assignment shall, to the maximum extent possible under the rules of the funding agency, be paid from contract, grant, or cooperative agreement funds; in all cases, however, individuals shall be entitled to sick leave normally available to them under University policies.~~

V.D. Employment of Visiting Faculty

~~A. When it is necessary to employ visiting faculty for out-of state assignments, such appointments shall be made in accordance with AR 2:1, Section II.C.5 in international or other programs for a period of one academic year (nine months) or less, appointments shall be made on a visiting faculty basis. When it is necessary or desirable to employ faculty for such programs for a period exceeding nine months, but not exceeding seven years, appointments without tenure shall be made and handled in the same manner as for those of other non-tenured faculty. However, in such a case, if it is not known that a position will be available for an individual to continue with the University after completion of an out-of state assignment, the individual should be so informed at the time of initial appointment.~~

~~Also, remarks should be included on the Notice of Academic Appointment and Assignment form for the individual to indicate clearly that conditions of the appointment are such that the appointment shall neither be renewed beyond a fixed date nor lead to consideration for tenure.~~

~~When individuals are on leave from similar institutions where they are employed in capacities equivalent to those for which they are being employed in international-out-of-state programs, salaries shall be commensurate with ~~determined as though the individuals were already University of Kentucky~~ salaries for that position. employees with the exception that differences in fringe benefits paid by their home institutions and those paid under their assignments with the University of Kentucky may be taken into account. When the preceding conditions are not applicable, salaries shall be negotiated.~~

VI.E. Exceptions

~~Because of regulations of certain funding agencies or special requirements of some out-of state assignments in international or other programs, it is recognized that it may not always be possible to follow exactly the guidelines in this administrative regulation. Deviations from these guidelines, therefore, may be made upon written approval of the Provost or the appropriate executive vice president. ~~appropriate chancellor.~~~~

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS	IDENTIFICATION AR 3:4	PAGE 1
	DATE EFFECTIVE	SUPERSEDES REGULATION DATED 11-1.1-8: 6/16/83, 8/5/87, 1/11/99

OUT-OF-STATE EMPLOYMENT OR ASSIGNMENT OF FACULTY AND STAFF

I. Introduction

The University is regularly involved in out-of-state programs which are pertinent and justifiable in view of both the nature and mission of the University. Activities in such programs are considered appropriate professional activities for the faculty and staff associated with the programs.

II. Performance Review, Promotion, and Salary Increases

Faculty and staff on out-of-state assignments shall be evaluated for purposes of performance review, promotion, and salary increases in conformity with on-campus faculty and staff of comparable rank or status.

III. Salary Adjustments

Out-of-state assignments may involve disruptions of individuals' personal and professional lives and additional costs such as those associated with maintaining dual residences and making more long-distance communications. Therefore, relative to such assignments, the following salary adjustments shall be permitted:

A. During out of state employment or assignments involving at least one month but less than one year of continuous service, salaries of faculty and staff participants may be increased up to ten percent to provide compensation for additional costs usually incurred while on temporary assignments away from home.

B. During out-of-state employment or assignments involving a period of one year or more, faculty on nine-month, ten-month, or eleven-month assignments may have their assignment period increased and their annual base salaries increased accordingly. (See AR 3:7 - Salary Conversion) Such changes shall be made by mutual agreement of the University and the faculty employee.

C. Subject to approval of the University and availability of funds, a faculty employee's annual base salary may be increased when an out-of-state assignment does not allow faculty consulting activities in accordance with University policy.

D. Assignments involving increased responsibilities may carry salary increases up to ten percent of annual base salaries, subject to University approval. The increase shall be

limited to the period during which the individual has increased responsibilities. No such adjustment shall be made for a temporary assignment of sixty days or less.

E. Faculty and staff serving in such assignments supported through contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements from governmental agencies or other institutions shall be eligible to receive other allowances and benefits which the funding agencies normally afford their employees. In the absence of other arrangements, the regulations for United States Government employees may be used.

IV. Vacation and Temporary Disability Leave

Faculty and staff on out-of-state assignments shall be entitled to annual leave and temporary disability leave normally available to them under applicable University policies.

V. Employment of Visiting Faculty

When it is necessary to employ visiting faculty for out-of state assignments, such appointments shall be made in accordance with AR 2:1, Section II.C.5

When individuals are on leave from similar institutions where they are employed in capacities equivalent to those for which they are being employed in out-of-state programs, salaries shall be commensurate with University of Kentucky salaries for that position.

VI. Exceptions

Deviations from these guidelines may be made upon written approval of the Provost or the appropriate executive vice president.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS	IDENTIFICATION AR 4:7III-8.3-3	PAGE 1
	DATE EFFECTIVE 7/1/83	SUPERSEDES REGULATION DATED AR III-7.0-3: 8/16/76 AR III-8.3-3: 7/1/83

COMMITTEE ON STUDENT FINANCIAL AID ~~APPEALS AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE~~

I. Introduction

The ~~Advisory Committee on Student~~ Student Financial Aid Appeals and Advisory Committee reviews appeals and conducts hearings of appeal for: (1) students who have lost their federal, state, or institutional need-based financial aid due to failure to maintain satisfactory academic progress towards their degree; (2) student athletes whose athletic grants have not been renewed or have been reduced by the Athletic Department; and, (3) student athletes requesting the Committee to overrule the Athletic Department's decision to limit or not release the athlete to receive an athletic grant at another NCAA institution to which the student may wish to transfer. ~~shall serve as an advisory and policy recommending body in matters relating to student financial aid. In addition, the Committee is charged with the specific responsibility of making recommendations to the Director of Student Financial Aid on the approval of athletic grants in-aid and on all dismissals of student athletes from grants in-aid. Although t~~ The Committee may also advise and recommends policy in matters relating to student financial aid upon request of the Director of Student Financial Aid or the Assistant Provost for Enrollment Management offer specific advice to the Director of Student Financial Aid and other administrative officers, it is generally accountable to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs for the Lexington Campus.

II. Membership

A. The Committee is appointed by the President of the University of Kentucky and reports to the Assistant Provost for Enrollment Management ~~Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs for the Lexington Campus.~~

B. Committee membership shall be comprised of individuals from the faculty, staff, administration, and students body.

C. The chairperson and ex officio members shall be designated by the President. The committee members other than those with student or ex officio status normally shall have staggered three-year appointments.

III. Committee Responsibilities

A. The Committee shall conduct hearings of appeal for students who have had their federal, state or institutional aid denied for failure to maintain satisfactory academic progress as prescribed by those agencies. The Committee shall have the sole authority to

determine whether there are grounds to grant an exception to the requirement that the student maintain academic progress in order to continue to receive financial aid. The determination of the Committee is final and there are no further appeals available.

B. The Committee shall conduct requested hearings by student athletes whose athletic grants have not been renewed or have been reduced by the Athletic Department. This authority and responsibility is granted to the Committee by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). The Committee shall have sole authority to make an exception to the Athletic Department's decision by renewing the athletic grant or by restoring the worth of the athletic grant to its original sum of the prior year. The determination of the Committee is final and there are no further appeals available.

C. The Committee shall conduct all appeals requested by student athletes to overrule the Athletic Department's decision to limit or not release the athlete to receive an athletic grant at another NCAA institution to which the student may wish to transfer. This authority and responsibility is granted to the Committee by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). The committee shall have the sole authority to deny or approve such an appeal. The determination of the Committee is final and there are no further appeals available.

IV. Reports

The Committee is responsible for providing an annual report and, on request, special reports to the Assistant Provost for Enrollment Management upon request~~Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs for the Lexington Campus.~~

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS	IDENTIFICATION AR 4:7	PAGE 1
	DATE EFFECTIVE	SUPERSEDES REGULATION DATED AR III-7.0-3: 8/16/76 AR III-8.3-3: 7/1/83

STUDENT FINANCIAL AID APPEALS AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

I. Introduction

The Student Financial Aid Appeals and Advisory Committee reviews appeals and conducts hearings of appeal for: (1) students who have lost their federal, state, or institutional need-based financial aid due to failure to maintain satisfactory academic progress towards their degree; (2) student athletes whose athletic grants have not been renewed or have been reduced by the Athletic Department; and, (3) student athletes requesting the Committee to overrule the Athletic Department's decision to limit or not release the athlete to receive an athletic grant at another NCAA institution to which the student may wish to transfer. The Committee also advises and recommends policy in matters relating to student financial aid upon request of the Director of Student Financial Aid or the Assistant Provost for Enrollment Management.

II. Membership

A. The Committee is appointed by the President and reports to the Assistant Provost for Enrollment Management.

B. Committee membership shall be comprised of faculty, staff, and students.

C. The chair and ex officio members shall be designated by the President. The committee members other than those with student or ex officio status shall have staggered three-year appointments.

III. Committee Responsibilities

A. The Committee shall conduct hearings of appeal for students who have had their federal, state or institutional aid denied for failure to maintain satisfactory academic progress as prescribed by those agencies. The Committee shall have the sole authority to determine whether there are grounds to grant an exception to the requirement that the student maintain academic progress in order to continue to receive financial aid. The determination of the Committee is final and there are no further appeals available.

B. The Committee shall conduct requested hearings by student athletes whose athletic grants have not been renewed or have been reduced by the Athletic Department. This authority and responsibility is granted to the Committee by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). The Committee shall have sole authority to make an exception to the Athletic Department's decision by renewing the athletic grant or by

restoring the worth of the athletic grant to its original sum of the prior year. The determination of the Committee is final and there are no further appeals available.

C. The Committee shall conduct all appeals requested by student athletes to overrule the Athletic Department's decision to limit or not release the athlete to receive an athletic grant at another NCAA institution to which the student may wish to transfer. This authority and responsibility is granted to the Committee by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). The committee shall have the sole authority to deny or approve such an appeal. The determination of the Committee is final and there are no further appeals available.

IV. Reports

The Committee is responsible for providing an annual report and, on request, special reports to the Assistant Provost for Enrollment Management upon request.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS DRAFT	IDENTIFICATION AR 10:2	PAGE 1
	DATE EFFECTIVE 01/29/09 <u> / /10</u>	SUPERSEDES REGULATION DATED AR III-2.0-1: 7/30/90, 9/1/91, 8/2/00, 1/1/01, 6/4/08, 1/29/09

UNIVERSITY COMPUTING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

I. Introduction

~~The University is committed to providing Information Technology (IT) infrastructure to support the University's mission and strategic plan. To facilitate the exchange of information regarding University-wide computing and data communication needs and interests in research, instruction, and administration, the University establishes three standing advisory committees: the University IT Coordinating Committee, the Academic Computing Committee, and the Enterprise Systems Committee, in the areas of research, instruction, and administration. The committees provide advice and recommendations to the Provost, appropriate executive vice president, and University Chief Information Officer (CIO) relative to broad, University wide computing policies, procedures, and directions. In addition, at the request of the President or the President's designee, the committees may be asked to consider specific information systems related problems or proposals.~~

II. Membership

~~The President shall appoint the members of each committee and shall designate the chair for each committee. Faculty members shall be appointed from a list of candidates provided by the Senate Council. The list shall include at least twice as many names as there are vacancies. Appointment terms shall be staggered and normally for three years, except that the appointments of students shall be for one year. Reappointments are permitted. The committees may also include non-voting ex-officio members.~~

III. Committees

~~The three standing committees, as defined below, shall individually focus on the areas of research, instruction, and administrative computing. The committees shall meet at least once each academic semester.~~

A. ~~Research Computing~~ University IT Coordinating Committee

~~The University is committed to providing state-of-the-art computing services to support research. This commitment includes providing sufficient computing capacity to support existing and planned computing needs of researchers in most disciplines. The Research Computing Committee provides advice regarding computing services to support existing and planned research.~~

1. Responsibilities

The IT Coordinating eCommittees provides advice and recommendations to the Provost, appropriate executive vice president, and University Chief Information Officer (CIO) relative to broad, University-wide ITe computing policies, procedures, and directions.

The University IT Coordinating Committee's responsibilities shall include: (a) recommending priorities for issues that cut across the enterprise (including future development, change, and enhancement in the University's network and security infrastructure including between-building network improvements, wireless access, access to the regional and national networks, research and instructional data management and backup); (b) recommending significant IT policies that cut across the various University units; (c) reviewing and coordinating the recommendations of the Academic Computing Committee and the Enterprise Systems Committee; and, (d) serving as liaisons across the University to facilitate communication and collect input from the faculty and staff regarding information technology systems.

At the request of the President or the President's designee, the committee also may be asked to consider specific information systems related problems or proposals.

2. Membership and Chair

The Committee shall be comprised of:

Seven (7) faculty members;
~~One (1) Chair of Academic Computing Committee~~
~~One (1) Chair of Enterprise Systems Committee~~
 One (1) senior administrator from the Provost area
 One (1) senior administrator from the EVPFA area
 One (1) senior administrator from the EVPHA area
 CIO, University of Kentucky
 CIO, University of Kentucky Healthcare

The President shall designate the chair from the faculty members.

~~One (1) graduate student (to be nominated by the Dean of the Graduate School);
 One (1) senior research administrator; _____
 One (1) senior administrator responsible for high performance computing; and
 Two (2) representatives from Information Technology (advisory, non-voting).~~

B. Academic Computing Instructional Computing Committee

1. Responsibilities

The Academic Computing Committee provides advice and recommendations to the University IT Coordinating Committee on computing systems that support research and instruction.

The Academic Computing Committee responsibilities include: (a) establishing priorities for future development, change, and enhancement in the enterprise-wide research, high performance computing, and instructional computing needs; and, (b) serving as liaisons across the University to help collect input regarding research and instructional computing systems. The University is committed to providing students with access to appropriate computing facilities, including state-of-the-art hardware, software, and courseware. The Instructional Computing Committee provides advice regarding general purpose instructional computing services, with the aim of ensuring that students have access to a wide variety of computer languages, applications, and services in an easy-to-use environment.

At the request of the President or the President's designee, or the IT Coordinating Committee, the committee also may also be asked to consider specific information systems related problems or proposals.

2. Membership and Chair

The Committee shall be comprised of:

Seven (7) faculty members;

One (1) undergraduate student (~~to be~~ nominated by the Student Government

Association);

~~Two (2) senior academic administrators in the Provost areas, e.g. enrollment~~

~~management, undergraduate education, academic support; and~~

~~Two (2) representatives of Information Technology (advisory, non-voting).~~

One (1) graduate student (~~to be~~ nominated by the Graduate Student Association. ~~Dean of the Graduate School~~);

One (1) senior ~~research~~ academic administrator in the Provost area,

One (1) ~~senior administrator responsible~~ representative from the Center for Computational Science ~~high performance computing; and~~

~~Two~~ One (2) representatives from Information Technology

~~Two~~ One (2) representatives from HealthCare Information Technology ~~(advisory, non-voting).~~

The President shall designate the chair from the faculty members.

C. Enterprise Systems Committee Integrated Resources Information Systems Administrative Computing Systems Coordinating Committee (IRIS ACSCC)

1. Responsibilities

The Enterprise Systems Committee provides advice and recommendations to the University IT Coordinating Committee relative to administrative computing systems that support institutional operations.

~~The University is committed to providing appropriate administrative computing systems to support institutional operations. The IRIS ACSCC Enterprise Systems Committee responsibilities shall include: shall have as its primary responsibility the (a) establishingment of priorities for future development, change, and enhancements inof the Integrated Resources Information Systems (IRIS) enterprise systems, (including SAP and related operational and administrative systems); (b) — Secondary responsibilities include reviewing, approving, and prioritizing all change requests to IRISfor enterprise systems; maximizing the return on the University's investment in the IRIS project; establishing priorities for reporting; and, (c) serving as advocates for the senior University administrators responsible for the major administrative computing systems listed below.~~

At the request of the President or the President's designee, or the IT Coordinating Committee, the committee also may alsomay be asked to consider specific information systems related problems or proposals.

2. Membership

The ~~IRIS ACSCC Committee~~ shall be comprised of the principal University administrators responsible for the major administrative computing systems based on their role for the following se-administrative systems:

Financials and Accounting;
Human Resources;
Materials Management;
Campus Management;
Plant Maintenance;
Faculty Effort;
Business Warehouse;
Budget;
Research
Office of Associate Provost for Academic Administration
Health Care CIO (ex officio non-voting);
University CIO (ex officio non-voting); and
Director, IRIS Administrative SystemsIT Enterprise Applications Group

And shall also include:

CIO, University of Kentucky
CIO, University of Kentucky Healthcare
Chair of Academic Computing Committee

~~(ex officio non-voting).~~ |

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS DRAFT	IDENTIFICATION AR 10:2	PAGE 1
	DATE EFFECTIVE / /10	SUPERSEDES REGULATION DATED AR III-2.0-1: 7/30/90, 9/1/91, 8/2/00, 1/1/01, 6/4/08, 1/29/09

UNIVERSITY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

I. Introduction

The University is committed to providing Information Technology (IT) infrastructure to support the University's mission and strategic plan. To facilitate the exchange of information regarding University-wide computing and data communication needs and interests in research, instruction, and administration, the University establishes three standing advisory committees: the University IT Coordinating Committee, the Academic Computing Committee, and the Enterprise Systems Committee.

II. Membership

The President shall appoint the members of each committee and shall designate the chair for each committee. Faculty members shall be appointed from a list of candidates provided by the Senate Council. The list shall include at least twice as many names as there are vacancies. Appointment terms shall be staggered and normally for three years, except that the appointments of students shall be for one year. Reappointments are permitted.

III. Committees

The three standing committees, as defined below, shall meet at least once each academic semester.

A. University IT Coordinating Committee

1. Responsibilities

The IT Coordinating Committee provides advice and recommendations to the Provost, appropriate executive vice president, and University Chief Information Officer (CIO) relative to broad, University-wide IT policies, procedures, and directions.

The University IT Coordinating Committee's responsibilities shall include: (a) recommending priorities for issues that cut across the enterprise (including future development, change, and enhancement in the University's network and security infrastructure including between-building network improvements, wireless access, access to the regional and national networks, research and instructional data management and backup); (b) recommending significant IT policies that cut across the various University units; (c) reviewing and coordinating the recommendations of the Academic Computing Committee and the Enterprise Systems Committee; and, (d)

serving as liaisons across the University to facilitate communication and collect input from the faculty and staff regarding information technology systems.

At the request of the President or the President's designee, the committee also may be asked to consider specific information systems related problems or proposals.

2. Membership and Chair

The Committee shall be comprised of:

- Seven (7) faculty members
- Chair of Academic Computing Committee
- Chair of Enterprise Systems Committee
- One (1) senior administrator from the Provost area
- One (1) senior administrator from the EVPFA area
- One (1) senior administrator from the EVPHA area
- CIO, University of Kentucky
- CIO, University of Kentucky Healthcare

The President shall designate the chair from the faculty members.

B. Academic Computing Committee

1. Responsibilities

The Academic Computing Committee provides advice and recommendations to the University IT Coordinating Committee on computing systems that support research and instruction.

The Academic Computing Committee responsibilities include: (a) establishing priorities for future development, change, and enhancement in the enterprise-wide research, high performance computing, and instructional computing needs; and, (b) serving as liaisons across the University to help collect input regarding research and instructional computing systems.

At the request of the President or the President's designee, or the IT Coordinating Committee, the committee also may be asked to consider specific information systems related problems or proposals.

2. Membership and Chair

The Committee shall be comprised of:

- Seven (7) faculty members
- One (1) undergraduate student (nominated by the Student Government Association)

One (1) graduate student (nominated by the Graduate Student Association). One (1) senior academic administrator in the Provost area,
 One (1) representative from the Center for Computational Science
 One (1) representative from Information Technology
 One (1) representative from HealthCare Information Technology

The President shall designate the chair from the faculty members.

C. Enterprise Systems Committee

1. Responsibilities

The Enterprise Systems Committee provides advice and recommendations to the University IT Coordinating Committee relative to administrative computing systems that support institutional operations.

The Enterprise Systems Committee responsibilities shall include: (a) establishing priorities for future development, change, and enhancement in the enterprise systems, (including SAP and related operational and administrative systems); (b) reviewing and prioritizing all change requests for enterprise systems; establishing priorities for reporting; and, (c) serving as advocates for the senior University administrators responsible for the major administrative computing systems listed below.

At the request of the President or the President's designee, or the IT Coordinating Committee, the committee also may be asked to consider specific information systems related problems or proposals.

2. Membership

The Committee shall be comprised of the principal University administrators responsible for the major administrative computing systems based on their role for the following administrative systems:

Financials and Accounting
 Human Resources
 Materials Management
 Campus Management
 Plant Maintenance
 Faculty Effort
 Business Warehouse
 Budget
 Research
 Office of Associate Provost for Academic Administration
 IT Enterprise Applications Group

And shall also include:

CIO, University of Kentucky
CIO, University of Kentucky Healthcare
Chair of Academic Computing Committee

**Substantive Changes to Revision (4-06-10)
of
AR 2:9 (Lecturer Series Faculty)**

II. *Appointment*

Section A

- Identifies departments, school without departments, graduate centers and college without either departments or schools as the educational units that shall set limits (percentage or number) on Lecturer Series appointments within those units

Section B

- Increases from 2 to 4 years the time period in which Lecturer Series faculty (Lecturer or Senior Lecturer) shall serve after initial appointment before being eligible for rolling contracts
- Reduces from 4 to 3 years the time interval of a rolling contract for Senior Lecturers

III. *Non-renewal of a Rolling Contract*

- Establishes the policies and procedures for suspending a rolling contract at such time that a Lecturer Series faculty employees is assigned an unsatisfactory composite score in a faculty performance review

IV. *Criteria for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Merit Review*

- Prescribes annual faculty performance review for Lecturer Series faculty at the rank of Lecturer and biennial reviews for Senior Lecturers
- Clarifies the language on the opportunity for consideration of promotion to Senior Lecturer and the identifies the change in duration of a rolling contract (from 2 to 3 years) upon the final approval of a promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer

V. *Periodic Course Reduction Associated with Professional Development Opportunities*

- Clarifies the terms of the professional development opportunity as a one-year course reduction equivalent to six (6) undergraduate credit hours of teaching

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY	IDENTIFICATION AR 2:9		PAGE 1
<u>ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS</u>	DATE EFFECTIVE X/YY/ZZ	SUPERSEDES REGULATION DATED AR II-1.0-1, Page II.S, 7/1/05	

LECTURER SERIES FACULTY

-[revision 4-06-10]

I. Definition

Lecturer Series faculty employees are professionally qualified teachers hired for a fixed term. Lecturer Series faculty employees do not have the same responsibilities and professional obligations of faculty employees in Regular, Special, Extension or Librarian Title Series. Lecturer Series appointments shall not be made when appointment in a title series is appropriate. The Lecturer Series is comprised of two academic ranks: Lecturer and Senior Lecturer.

II. Appointment

A. Personnel actions in the Lecturer Series faculty are appointed or reappointed finalized by final action of the Provost upon recommendation recommendations of the educational unit administrator and the dean without reference to an Academic Area Advisory Committee. Initial appointments at the rank of Lecturer shall not exceed a term of one year. A faculty employee at the rank of Lecturer may be reappointed for one or more additional terms for a period of no more than two years per appointment. Senior Lecturers may be appointed to an initial term not to exceed two years and reappointed for additional terms of no more than two years per appointment. The final action of the Provost shall be communicated in writing to the dean. The dean shall notify the candidate in writing of the Provost's decision and send a copy of the notification to the educational unit administrator. The maximum number or percentage of Lecturers in an educational unit must be based on the written approval Lecturer Series faculty employees in a department, school without departments, graduate center or college without either departments or schools shall be established by the majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of that educational body of the unit and documented in the rules of the unit. The assignment period for Lecturer Series faculty employees may be on a nine-month, ten-month, eleven-month, or twelve-month basis.

B. Appointment, reappointment and termination in the Lecturer Series are subject to the following conditions:

1. Initial appointment at the rank of Lecturer or Senior Lecturer shall not exceed two (2) years. Notification of non-renewal of appointment at the end of

the first year of service shall be given no later than March 1 if the appointment expires at the end of that academic year or three months in advance if the one-year appointment terminates during the academic year. ~~Notification~~The final action of the Provost on the matter of non-renewal of appointment ~~after~~ shall be communicated in writing to the dean. The dean shall notify the candidate in writing of the Provost's decision and send a copy of the notification to the educational unit administrator.

2. ~~Notification of non-renewal of appointment~~ After the first year of service, and until such time that a rolling contract is offered (see subsections 3 & 6 below), notification of the decision to offer a terminal reappointment shall be given to Lecturer Series faculty employees at least ~~one year~~ twelve (12) months before expiration of the appointment. ~~Notification~~The final action of ~~non-renewal~~the Provost on the matter of terminal reappointment shall be ~~made~~communicated in writing ~~by~~to the dean. ~~The dean shall notify the candidate in writing of the Provost's decision and send a copy of the notification to the educational unit administrator.~~

3. Reappointment reviews shall be conducted in accordance with the policies and procedures prescribed in AR 2:1-1 and its accompanying appendices (AR 2:1-1 Appendices I & II).

4. After the unit administrator has completed the reappointment review of a faculty employee in his or her fourth year of continuous full-time service at the rank of Lecturer, the educational unit administrator shall recommend to the dean either:

a. An offer to the faculty employee of a 2-year rolling contract (i.e., a two-year notice before any potential termination of employment), subject to the conditions stated in Section III below.

or

b. An offer to the faculty employee of a terminal reappointment contract for a fifth and final year of employment. The final action of the Provost on the matter of terminal reappointment shall be communicated in writing to the dean. The dean shall notify the faculty employee in writing of the Provost's decision and send a copy of the notification to the educational unit administrator.

5. After the unit administrator has completed the reappointment review of a faculty employee in his or her fourth year of continuous full-time service at the rank of Senior Lecturer, the educational unit administrator shall recommend to the dean either:

a. An offer to the faculty employee of a 3-year rolling contract (i.e., a three-year notice before any potential termination of employment), subject to the conditions stated in Section III below.

or

Lecturer AR (revision 4-06-10)

b. An offer to the faculty employee of a terminal reappointment contract for a fifth and final year of employment. The final action of the Provost on the matter of terminal reappointment shall be communicated in writing to the dean. The dean shall notify the candidate in writing of the Provost's decision and send a copy of the notification to the educational unit administrator.

III. Non-renewal

~~Notification of non renewal of appointment at the end of the first year of service shall be given no later than March 1 if the appointment expires at the end of that academic year or three months in advance if the one-year appointment terminates during the academic year. Notification of non renewal of appointment after the first year of service shall be given at least one year before expiration of the appointment. Notification of non renewal of appointment shall be made in writing by the dean.~~

III. Non-renewal of a Rolling ContractA. Lecturer Series Faculty at the Rank of Lecturer

1. In the event that a faculty employee at the rank of Lecturer is assigned a composite rating of unsatisfactory on an annual faculty performance review (see AR 3:10), the unit administrator shall not recommend the renewal of the faculty employee's rolling contract. After informing the appropriate unit faculty (see AR 2:1-1 Appendix D), the unit administrator shall recommend to the dean that the faculty employee be offered a two-year reappointment contract without the provision for a rolling contract. The final action of the Provost on the matter of reappointment shall be communicated in writing to the dean. The dean shall notify the candidate in writing of the Provost's decision and send a copy of the notification to the educational unit administrator.

2. At any time in the two-year duration of the reappointment contract, but with sufficient time to ensure that the final action of the Provost is communicated to the faculty employee no later than the last day of the reappointment contract, the unit administrator shall recommend to the dean one of the three actions enumerated below. The unit administrator shall consult with the appropriate faculty (see AR 2:1-1 Appendix D) and, where prescribed in Appendix I, obtain written judgments from those faculty. The recommendation of the unit administrator shall be limited to one of the following actions:

a. An offer to the faculty employee of a 2-year rolling contract (i.e., a two-year notice before any potential termination of employment), subject to the conditions stated in Section III.A.1 above.

b. An offer to the faculty employee of a terminal reappointment contract.

c. An offer to the faculty employee of a reappointment contract, not to exceed two years in duration and without the provision for a rolling

Lecturer AR (revision 4-06-10)

contract. At the end of that reappointment period, the terms of reappointment shall be limited to:

i. the restoration of a 2-year rolling contract (i.e., a two-year notice before any potential termination of employment), subject to the conditions stated in Section III.A.1 above.

or

ii. the issuance of a terminal reappointment contract.

3. The final action of the Provost on the matter of reappointment shall be communicated in writing to the dean. The dean shall notify the candidate in writing of the Provost's decision and send a copy of the notification to the educational unit administrator.

B. Lecturer Series Faculty at the Rank of Senior Lecturer

1. In the event that a faculty employee at the rank of Senior Lecturer is assigned a composite rating of unsatisfactory on a biennial faculty performance review (see AR 3:10), the unit administrator shall not recommend the renewal of the faculty employee's rolling contract. After consultation with the appropriate unit faculty (see AR 2:1-1 Appendix I), the unit administrator shall recommend to the dean that the faculty employee be offered a three-year reappointment contract without the provision for a rolling contract. The final action of the Provost on the matter of reappointment shall be communicated in writing to the dean. The dean shall notify the candidate in writing of the Provost's decision and send a copy of the notification to the educational unit administrator.

2. During the reappointment period without the provision of a rolling contract, the faculty employee shall undergo an annual faculty performance review.

3. In the second or third year of the reappointment contract, and with sufficient time to ensure that the final action of the Provost is communicated to the faculty employee no later than the last day of the reappointment contract, the unit administrator shall recommend to the dean one of the three actions enumerated below. The administrator shall consult with the appropriate faculty (see AR 2:1-1 Appendix I) and, where prescribed in Appendix I, obtain written judgments from those faculty. The recommendation of the unit administrator shall be limited to one of the following actions:

a. An offer to the faculty employee of a 3-year rolling contract (i.e., a three-year notice before any potential termination of employment), subject to the conditions stated in Section III.B.1.

b. An offer to the faculty employee of a terminal reappointment contract.

c. An offer to the faculty employee of a reappointment contract, not

Lecturer AR (revision 4-06-10)

to exceed two years in duration and without the provision for a rolling contract. At the end of that reappointment period, the terms of reappointment shall be limited to:

- i. the restoration of a 3-year rolling contract (i.e., a three-year notice before any potential termination of employment), subject to the conditions stated in Section III.B.1 above.
- or
- ii. the issuance of a terminal reappointment contract.

4. The final action of the Provost on the matter of reappointment shall be communicated in writing to the dean. The dean shall notify the candidate in writing of the Provost's decision and send a copy of the notification to the educational unit administrator.

IV. Criteria for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Merit Review

- A. The Faculties of the educational units that employ full-time Lecturer Series faculty employees shall establish unit criteria and procedures for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and merit review (pursuant to GR VII.A.6). The criteria for appointment shall include an earned terminal degree appropriate to the field of assignment. The appropriate professional experience or credentials may substitute for a terminal degree with the approval of the Provost. These unit criteria and procedures shall be submitted to the dean of the college for final approval.
- B. The college policies on performance review of Lecturer Series faculty employees shall prescribe that Lecturer Series faculty employees undergo Faculty Performance Review (see AR 3:10) as follows:
 - 1. Lecturer Series faculty at the rank of Lecturer shall undergo Faculty Performance Review on an annual basis.
 - 2. Lecturer Series faculty at the rank of Senior Lecturer shall undergo Faculty Performance Review on a biennial basis, except as prescribed in Section III.B.2 above.
- C. ~~After a minimum of five years of continuous service as a full-time Lecturer, consideration for promotion (without tenure) from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer may occur.~~ A Lecturer Series faculty employee may be considered for promotion (without tenure) from the rank of Lecturer to the rank of Senior Lecturer at any time after five (5) years of continuous full-time service. In preparing a recommendation to the dean on a promotion case in the Lecturer Series, the educational unit administrator shall consult with the appropriate faculty employees of the unit and obtain their written judgments (see AR 2:1-1 Appendix I). The Provost makes the final decision on the promotion, without reference to an Area Committee. A faculty employee promoted to the rank of

Lecturer AR (revision 4-06-10)

Senior Lecturer shall be offered a 3-year rolling contract (i.e., a 3-year notice before any potential termination of employment, subject to the conditions stated in Section III above).

V. Periodic Course Reduction Associated with Professional Development Opportunities

After six (6) years of continuous service, Lecturer Series faculty employees shall be eligible to apply for a one-year course reduction, equivalent to six (6) undergraduate credit hours of teaching, to devote time for professional development in order that the quality of faculty employee's service to the University may be enhanced. The unit administrator shall review such requests from Lecturer Series faculty employees and make recommendations to the dean of the college. The dean shall make the final decision on recommendations for periodic course reductions for Lecturer Series faculty employees.

Normally "continuous service" is interrupted by the two-course reduction associated with the professional development opportunity identified in this regulation. That is, no service prior to the two-course reduction may be credited toward eligibility for future professional development opportunities described herein. However, in the event that it becomes necessary for an individual to postpone such professional development at the request of and/or for the benefit of the University or one of its educational units, the period of postponement shall be counted as part of the six (6) years of continuous service necessary for the individual to become eligible again for the professional development opportunity identified in this regulation. The request for and/or agreement that the professional development opportunity be postponed shall be made in writing by the unit administrator to the dean, who has final authority in this matter. The request or agreement shall specify the period of postponement and the reason for it.

VI. Conditions of EmploymentA. Distribution of Effort

The annual assignment for faculty employees in the Lecturer Series shall normally be seventy-five (75) percent instruction (typically equivalent to nine (9) undergraduate credit hours of teaching per semester), with the remaining twenty-five (25) percent of the annual assignment apportioned among other assigned duties that serve the undergraduate program of the faculty employee's educational unit or college. Teaching assignments shall be limited to 100-, 200- and 300-level courses. Exceptions to these provisions may be granted by the Provost upon the written recommendation of a dean.

V-B. Eligibility for Tenure, Leave, and Other Benefits

A-1. Lecturer Series faculty employees are not eligible for tenure, sabbatical leave or membership in the Graduate Faculty. ~~Lecturers~~ Lecturer Series faculty employees are eligible for faculty membership with voting privileges in the college faculty and the University Senate, subject to the approval of the tenured and tenure-track members of the faculty in the college to which they have been assigned. They are also eligible for faculty membership with or without voting privileges in the educational unit to which they have been assigned, subject to the approval of the tenured and tenure-track members of the faculty in that educational unit. The extension of these privileges to Lecturer Series faculty employees shall be recorded in the respective Rules documents of the educational

unit and college (GR VII).

2. B. If a Lecturer is subsequently appointed in the Regular, Special, Extension or Librarian Title Series Lecturer Series faculty employees are eligible to apply for positions in other faculty series. If a Lecturer Series faculty employee is subsequently appointed in a tenure-eligible faculty series, time spent as a Lecturer Series faculty employee shall not count toward eligibility for sabbatical leave nor as a part of the individual's probationary period.

3. C. Lecturers Series faculty employees are eligible for the same University employee benefits, such as retirement, health care and life insurance plans as are Regular, Special, Extension or Librarian Title Series faculty, as other regular faculty employees. Similarly, temporary disability leave may be granted by the Provost.

DRAFT

University Senate
April 12, 2010

Reminder on Submitting New Business
Excerpt from *Senate Rules 1.2.3 ("Meetings")*

1 The Senate Council shall prepare agendas for regular Senate meetings. Any student, faculty member or
2 administrator may present a written recommendation for Senate action to the Senate Council. The
3 Senate Council may refer it to committee or act on it itself. If referred to committee, the committee
4 shall approve, disapprove, or modify the recommendation. The original recommendation with
5 committee action shall be forwarded to the Senate Council. The recommendation shall be placed on
6 the Senate agenda unless both the committee and the Senate Council determine otherwise. If the
7 Senate Council acts on the recommendation without sending it to committee, it can decide not to place
8 the matter on the agenda. In this situation, the recommendation may be introduced on the Senate
9 floor if its initiator obtains either the signature of ten (10) Senators, or a petition approved by a
10 corresponding percentage of the members of the University Faculty in the case of matters for which the
11 elected University Faculty Senators are responsible. The agenda plus all recommendations for Senate
12 action shall be posted on the University Senate's Web site and circulated by e-mail to all members of
13 the University Senate and to administrative offices that are concerned with academic affairs at least six
14 (6) days prior to regular Senate meetings. For special meetings, as much notice as practical shall be
15 given. (See Section I, 1.3.1.) [US: 4/12/04]