Senate Council
January 14, 2008

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, January 14, 2008 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Kaveh A. Tagavi called the meeting to order at 3:06 pm. He reported that Dembo, Randall and Yanarella had informed the Office of the Senate Council that they would be absent from the meeting.

Due to the three new Senate Council (SC) members, the Chair suggested all those present, including guests, introduce themselves.

1. Minutes from December 3 and Announcements
The Chair asked if there were any corrections to the minutes. Michael noted that he was not listed as having been in attendance but should have been. With that one change, the minutes from December 3 were approved as modified.

The Chair noted that there were a variety of announcements that he would go over after the guests' agenda items had been addressed.

2. Proposal to Expand Transfer Credit to PhD
The Chair invited Graduate School Dean Jeannine Blackwell to share information on the proposal. Guest Blackwell deferred to Graduate School Senior Associate Dean Brian Jackson, who authored the proposal.

Guest Jackson said that for many years it had been permissible to transfer nine credit hours (or 25% of required hours) towards the pursuit of a master's degree, which required that a recommendation by a program's director of graduate studies (DGS) be submitted to the Graduate School (GS). Transfer credit had not been accepted for students pursuing a doctoral degree.

Jackson explained that if approved, the transfer of doctoral credit would have to be recommended through the program's DGS and also approved by the graduate faculty committee.

Dean Blackwell added that the transferred credits would have to be free-standing and not have been used for the fulfillment of any other degree, including a previously-awarded master's degree (MS/MA). She said that there were two primary scenarios in which PhD transfer credit would be used: 1. if a senior professor came to UK and brought his/her entire lab and students, the students with some coursework in another doctoral program elsewhere might be able to incorporate that coursework into a UK doctoral program; and 2. when doctoral students attend a summer institute at a prestigious institution, they often earn credit. Dean Blackwell said it would be advisable to support enrichment

programs. She noted that when similar situations presented in the past, a student could be allowed to transfer the doctoral credit, but on the transcript it would be listed as credit awarded for a "special examination."

Michael asked if such a practice was standard at benchmarks. Jackson replied that allowing transfer credit for PhDs would bring the GS in line with UK's benchmarks, although there was a lot of variation regarding the number of hours that could be transferred. Dean Blackwell added that the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) had no problem with the proposal. Both she and Jackson confirmed for the Chair that it would be credit hours that transferred, not the grades. In response to a concern from Aken about how summer institute work could be translated into credit hours, Dean Blackwell clarified that any transfer credits would have to come from a credit-bearing course at an accredited institution, not merely from attendance at an academic event.

Wood agreed with the idea of allowing students to transfer credit from special summer institute work, but expressed concern with the number of hours of credit that could be transferred. If a student came in with a previous MS and the approximately 18 hours transferred to the doctoral efforts, the proposal would allow an additional nine hours to be transferred in, resulting in about 27 of the typical 36 hours required for a PhD being transfer credit. Jackson noted that a student could not transfer both the hours for a previously-earned MS and the nine hours – only one would be allowed.

Wood asked about another scenario – if a student was admitted to a clinical psychology PhD program at another university but did not get an MS, could those hours be transferred to the UK clinical psychology PhD program? Blackwell replied that only nine hours of credit could be transferred, and only with the approval of the program. She said that the GS would necessarily have to rely on programs to monitor whether or not the credits to be transferred were from an accredited institution, etc.

In response to a question from Chappell, Jackson and Dean Blackwell said that the nine transferred credit hours could only be earned from courses that were taken by a student with graduate standing for graduate credit.

There being no further questions from SC members, the Chair said he would entertain a motion. Finkel **moved** that the proposal to expand transfer credit to doctoral programs be sent to the University Senate with a positive recommendation, with an effective date of fall 2008. Piascik **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with seven in favor and one abstaining.

3. Proposed Change to Pre-Qualifying Residency Requirement
The Chair noted that the supporting documentation for the proposal was not submitted to SC members prior to noon on the Friday preceding the meeting. According to standard practice, the Chair paused to give SC members an

opportunity to object to the review. Hearing none, he asked Jackson to offer information on the proposal.

Jackson said that the current regulations are outlined in three Models, I, II and III and had varying requirements for residency requirements, a minimum number of coursework required prior to taking the qualifying exam, etc. He said that the models had proven to be challenging for some students, particularly highly diverse students. He said that there was a change two years ago in the overall pre-qualifying requirements – up until 2005, a student could take any period of time in which to fulfill the pre-qualifying requirements. In 2005, the rules were changed to require that a student fulfill the pre-qualifying requirements within five years of enrollment in their doctoral program. If eight years passed and no qualifying exam was taken, the student would be dropped from the program.

Jackson noted that with a time period in place, it did not seem necessary for the Models to remain in place, since the proposal would require that 36 hours of coursework be completed within five years. There would still be an option for transfer credit and programs could also change the five-year time frame by submitting a request to the GS dean to shorten or extend it. He clarified that the change in time would be for the program, not on an individual basis. Dean Blackwell said that the flexibility would help programs figure out how to incorporate the needs of a diverse doctoral student population.

The Chair referred to the proposed ability of a program to shorten or lengthen the five-year period and noted that it was customary to be able to deviate from policy in only one direction. Dean Blackwell said that the program could set up its own internal requirements to require students to be enrolled with full-time status and complete the 36 hours in a shorter period, which would not need GS permission, but rather documentation of the requirement.

Finkel asked for the academic rationale behind the proposal. Dean Blackwell replied that if the degree awarded was from UK with the UK imprimatur, then students must have a substantial amount of training with faculty in the formative years of the doctoral committee. A majority of the faculty on the committee should be UK faculty. The gathering of a smattering of coursework from various locales without the majority of the work being performed at UK would diminish the degree.

Wood noted that the Model III was created at the request of programs in the College of Education (Education). She wondered what problems had been seen, since the Model III had much more flexibility and was requested to address professional students who did not have the ability to go to school full time but yet were still engaged in education. She wondered how that Model could disadvantage anyone.

Jackson replied that more and more students in Education were using Model III, and that many of those programs required over 36 credit hours. He said that the five-year time period would still apply to those programs. Wood noted that she still did not see the advantage of the change. Dean Blackwell said that the biggest advantage would be simplification. The proposal merely stated that 36 hours of coursework had to be completed within five years. Wood said that her concern was that a student could take a night course in the fall, spring and summer and that would not really engage the student with faculty and research.

Dean Blackwell stated that, for example, there was currently a nursing shortage. If one were a full-time employee as a nurse supervisor in Mount Sterling who was working on a doctorate, how else should such a student be accommodated? Wood replied that it would be better to offer courses at Morehead University or another regional institution. Wood again expressed concern that the proposed change would move graduate programs in a direction that could decrease engagement and involvement of doctoral students.

Piascik stated that graduate programs would need to be relied on to set their own internal standards. If a program believed that students needed to be engaged regularly and no exceptions would be allowed, then the program should set those standards. Piascik asked if Dean Blackwell was confident that the simplification of the rules would not erode a program's strict regulations. Dean Blackwell replied that many programs already had strict regulations in place but still offered leeway to doctoral programs in which students were not required to attend courses on a full-time basis. Blackwell said that, similar to Wood, she also regretted the demise of the full-time residency requirement on campus as the gold standard, but that doctoral education had changed substantially over the years. However, there were many, many students returning to school with additional qualifications but for whom a full-time class load was not possible. Although UK could simply opt not to accommodate those types of students, as a land-grant institution UK needed to expand its capacity to meet the educational needs of the Commonwealth. She added that she doubted that the relaxed standards would change the majority of programs.

Chappell opined that the proposal would not disenfranchise anyone and would engage some students more and was a more friendly arrangement. He believed it to be a terrific benefit rather than a liability and that the students affected would have the opportunity to play more of a role in their respective communities if given this latitude.

Provost's Liaison Greissman asked how many doctoral students were supported in some fashion, through fellowships or assistantships. Dean Blackwell said that there was a substantial number, but that they were distributed unevenly across UK. Greissman followed up by saying that the proposed change would support students – either such a change will be made or diverse students will simply go elsewhere since taking classes on a full-time basis was not possible for some.

Wood clarified that she in no way wished to disadvantage any student, but that if a student was not fully engaged, then the pre-qualifying residency requirement should be more along the lines of Model III. She stated that UK should not put students in a position in which they received a doctoral education in a piecemeal fashion. While acceptable for an undergraduate degree, a doctoral degree was more than just coursework.

In response to a question from Michael, Dean Blackwell said that if a program wished to allow students more than five years to complete the doctorate, the program would need to take the request to the Graduate Council for approval. The request would need to be accompanied by a rationale for the request as well as information on why more than five years for pre-qualifying coursework would be needed. The Chair noted that such requests would not go through the SC, even though they would be programmatic changes.

Jackson noted that there was still a rule in force that required doctoral students to be evaluated yearly and that there will always be feedback regarding their current status. It was unclear if anyone was responsible for looking over the reviews. Dean Blackwell added if a student was out of UK for two semesters, the program has the opportunity and responsibility to decide whether or not the student was making good progress; if not, then the program might decide not to readmit the student.

Michael **moved** that the proposal to simplify the pre-qualifying residency requirement be approved and sent to the Senate with a positive recommendation and an effective date of fall 2008. Aken **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with seven in favor and one against.

The Chair reminded SC members that he would move directly to the agenda item for the waiting guests.

5. Revisiting Revisions to Administrative Regulations II-1.7-2 ("Access to and Use of University Technology Resources") (input only - possible endorsement)
The Chair noted that this proposal had been reviewed by the SC once previously and was returning with revisions. He then introduced the three new SC members for the guests' benefit.

The Chair invited Associate General Counsel Marcy Deaton and Associate Vice President for Information Technology Penny Cox to go over the changes.

Guest Cox said that for the benefit of the new SC members, she would offer a brief overview of the concerns raised by SC at the first review of the proposed changes to the regulation: 1. there were copyright licensing issues as a result of some ambiguous language that did not make it a copyright violation to use library materials – this was addressed; 2. a "principles" section that duplicated

information in another section which was consolidated; 3. a lack of information on who was the appropriate person to deal with terminated employees' computers, etc., with the end result being that the responsibility lay with departmental systems administrators; and 4. no clear way to let the campus at large know who to contact in the event of a violation, which was remedied by the creation of an email account (with associated human monitoring) for reports of violations.

Guest Deaton added that there were a few other things that were clarified, such as using the term "equitable" instead of "fair" to describe usage, since "fair use" of computing resources could mistakenly be confused with the copyright definition of "fair use."

Aken noted that there still seemed to be language that allowed the use of library resources by surviving spouses and dependents, which was a violation of many library agreements. Cox referred Aken to the sentence immediately following sentence number six under section II, "Scope." Aken thanked her and noted that she hoped it was clear enough for all users to easily understand.

Cox noted that a non-inclusive list of possible violations could be found in section VII, B ("Examples of Violations"), but that it was not exhaustive. In response to a question from Michael, Cox said that the person who decided if an act was a violation depended upon the violator.

Michael then asked about the violation listed in number nine: "Failure to protect one's account from unauthorized use (e.g. leaving one's terminal publicly logged on but unattended)" – he said it could be very easy to fail to protect in that fashion if one was not technologically savvy. In response to him, Cox suggested inserting "reasonably" in front of "protect", which Michael thought was fair.

Piascik **moved** to send the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations II-1.7-2* ("Access to and Use of University Technology Resources") to the Senate for endorsement and input. Swanson **seconded**.

Finkel noted that the list of violations did not easily identify which violation was being violated. He wondered if it was possible to include information on how the items were violations. For example, number seven involved intentionally obscuring or forging information about the date, time, other header information, etc. of an email message – which policy was violated by this action? He said that if there were a cross-reference of how something was a violation, it would also ensure that there was a policy in each case that had been violated. The Chair added that including principles would be an easy way to identify what might have been violated.

Cox explained that principle-type information had been incorporated into the scope of the document. Michael stated that for each of the 14 examples, there should be an argument regarding how it was a violation.

Wood expressed concern about violation number eleven, "Excessive use of information technology resources...." She said that as a research institution, faculty members were renowned for gobbling up computer time. Cox noted that it also applied to students. Deaton said that the introductory sentence stated that the list that followed was not an exhaustive list – there were various principles and policies throughout the policy. If the work by the faculty member was research-related, however, the faculty member would not be in violation. Wood commented that it still was not entirely fair – just because usage is big does not mean it is excessive. The Chair suggested that "if after being warned" language could clarify the intent.

Cox noted that the majority of space complaints pertained to students playing internet games. She recalled the example of one student who requested a huge amount of storage space for his network to accommodate game playing. Cox said that the intent was to write a policy that was flexible enough to deal with truly excessive use. Aken offered another space example – a student downloaded so many journals that the journal access was turned off until Aken had a chance to talk with the student and explain the problem. Aken noted the student had made an innocent mistake and was horrified upon realizing his error.

Cox thanked SC members for their comments and said the suggestions had improved the final document. There being no more comments, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to send the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations II-1.7-2* ("Access to and Use of University Technology Resources") to the Senate for endorsement and input. The motion **passed** seven in favor and one abstaining.

4. <u>December 2007 List of BCTC Candidates for Credentials</u>
The Chair referred SC members to the Bluegrass Community and Technical College (BCTC) list. Mrs. Brothers confirmed that she emailed the list to the BCTC Faculty Council chair, who could then identify any problems and have them addressed in a subsequent list. In response to Michael, the Chair replied that UK would continue to approve BCTC lists until 2010.

Chappell **moved** to approve the December 2007 list of BCTC candidates for credentials and send it to the Senate. Anderson **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair said he would return to announcements.

(continued) 1. <u>Announcements</u>
The Chair said that there were a number of liaison positions that needed to be filled. He asked if a vote was necessary, but Michael opined that the Chair could make the appointments.

In response to a question from Chappell, the Chair said that the term of appointment was usually for three years or until the individual was no longer a SC member, but those were not hard and fast rules.

After a brief discussion, two liaisons were identified, one to the Work-Life Advisory Council and the other to serve the Health Care Colleges Council.

There being two liaison positions left unfilled, the Chair said that he would bring the matter back to the next SC meeting.

The Chair then turned to the tentative agenda item, that of the Health Care Colleges Professional Student Behavior Code. Greissman stated that there were substantial revisions still going on, so it was not a good use of time to discuss the code in its current state. He said he would keep the Chair informed as to its progress.

The Chair then asked SC members to recall the email he forwarded to them from Provost Subbaswamy about faculty policies. Finkel commented that the proposal had a lot of strength to it – it collapsed the proliferation of special title series and others into two, and perhaps a third (as-yet unnamed) category – tenurable and untenurable. The Chair asked SC for input into how to proceed.

After a brief discussion, it was decided that the Chair and Randall would discuss it with the Provost during their next regular meeting, and would proceed from there.

There being no further items to address, Wood **moved** to adjourn. Michael **seconded**. A vote was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:18 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh A. Tagavi, Senate Council Chair

SC members in attendance: Aken, Anderson, Chappell, Finkel, Michael, Swanson, Tagavi, Piascik, Wood.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Invited guests present: Jeannine Blackwell, Penny Cox, Marcy Deaton, and Brian Jackson.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on January 22, 2008