

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, OCTOBER 10, 1994

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, October 10, 1994 in Room 201 of the Nursing Health Sciences Building.

Professor Raymond Cox, Chairperson of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent were: Kevin Adams, Reginald Alston, Dan Altman, Drew Alvarez, Gary Anglin*, James Applegate, John Ballantine, Michael Bardo, Paige Bendel, Mark Berger, Suketu Bhavsar, Gary Bibbs*, Jana Bowling, Dean Brothers, Joseph Burch, Allan Butterfield, Laretta Byars, Ben Carr, Edward Carter, Jordan L. Cohen, Delwood Collins, Virginia Davis-Nordin*, John Deacon*, Frederick DeBeer, Lance DeLong, Paul deMesquita, Richard Edwards, David Elliott*, Robert Farquhar*, Joseph Fink*, Michael Freeman*, Richard Furst, Lorraine Garkovich, Thomas Garrity, Hans Gesund*, Anne Haas, Kirby Hancock, J. John Harris, S. Zafar Hasan*, John Houghton, Christine Havice*, Robert Hemenway, Floyd Holler, James Hougland, Clifford Hynniman, Robert Ireland, Jeff Jones, T.A. Jones, Edward Kasarskis, Richard Kermode*, Craig Koontz, Thomas Lester, Jonathan Liar, Thomas Lillich*, C. Oran Little, Brent Logan, Loys Mather*, Jan McCulloch, Martin McMahan, Douglas Michael, David Mohny, Roy Moore*, Peter Mortensen*, David Nash*, Scott Noble, Jacqueline Noble, William O'Connor*, Clayton Paul, Barbara Phillips, Rhoda-Gale Pollack, Daniel Reedy, Thomas Robinson, Ellen Rosenman, Edgar Sagan*, Horst Schach*, Janice Schach*, David Shipley, Timothy Sineath*, Beverly Stanley*, William Stober*, David Stockham, Phillip Tibbs, Chris Vance, Henry Vasconez*, Greg Watkins, Charles Wethington*, Eugene Williams, Emery Wilson, H. David Wilson, Mary Witt.

Chairman Cox made the following announcements:

At last month's meeting there was an error in the announcement regarding distribution of the minutes: Members of the Senate still get the minutes by mail, while others have access through View.

Monday, October 17, 1994 is the mid-term of the fall semester. Last year the Senate passed a rule that students are to be advised of their class situation by mid-term. By Friday, October 14, 1994 students should know where they stand in their courses. This does not require a written notification to each student, but some type of communication.

The University Studies Committee agreed, after talking with Dr. Swift about the problem, to allow students who transfer from other institutions to have some of their clustered or paired courses be courses they took off the University of Kentucky campus.

The USP Committee also agreed to drop some USP courses that had not been taught in the last two years. This will be circulated.

Chairman Cox said that minutes from the September 12, 1994 needed to be approved. There were no corrections to the minutes and they were approved as circulated.

* Absence explained

The Chair recognized Professor Gretchen LaGodna, chair-elect of the Senate Council for the first action item. Professor LaGodna stated the first item was a proposal to amend the senate rules, having to do with requirements for graduation. The proposal originated in the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee and basically the change involves adding a requirement that a student must have no less than a 2.0 grade point average in their major as

well as a 2.0 GPA overall. The previous rule would have allowed students to graduate with GPAs in their majors that could be below 2.0 unless the department has specific rules.

Chairman Cox stated this came from the Senate Council and needed no second.

There was no discussion. In a voice vote, the proposal unanimously passed and reads as follows:

Proposal: [Add underlined and bold phrase]

5.4.3 Requirements for Graduation

To be eligible for any degree, a student must have completed the requirements as approved by the University Senate, except that curriculum substitutions may be made by the college affected if not inconsistent with these Rules. Curriculum requirements must include, in addition to specified credits, a specified grade point average both overall and in the student's major which shall in no case be less than 2.0.

Every baccalaureate degree program shall include four divisions or components:

1. University Studies
2. Pre-Major or Pre-Professional
3. Major or Professional
4. Free Electives

Rationale: If the University certifies a student to have done adequate work and "majored" in an area, we as a Faculty should be confident the student is competent in the major. Some programs (Business and Economics and Engineering for example) now require a 2.0 in the major.

Implementation: Fall, 1995

Professor Cox then recognized Professor LaGodna for the next action item. Professor LaGodna stated the second action item was a proposal to change from a Quality Point Deficit system of monitoring progress to a GPA system. This proposal originated in the Admission and Academic Standards Committee and was unanimously approved by the Senate Council. The primary reason for the change is to provide clarity and consistency for both faculty and students. There have been problems in both those areas; presently some students can continue with less than a 2.0 GPA without any sanctions for extended periods of time. In relation to the consistency issue, after 90 credit hours are earned, the quality points are no longer relevant in determining sanctions. This has been an issue of great concern to students and faculty. The proposal directs the Rules Committee to codify changes to change those rules related to academic progress based on the GPA criteria as opposed to a Quality Point Deficit. They are looking for a sense in principle whether the Senate agrees, and if so the Rules Committee will be directed to work out the details and bring this back to the Senate in February.

Chairman Cox stated this was a fairly complicated rule and it did not behoove them to write a particular rule if the Senate did not like the idea in principle. The Senate Council took the recommendation from the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee and if the idea is liked in principle it will be

approved then the Rules Committee will come back with the particular codification.

Douglas Boyd (Dean - Communications and Information Studies) agreed that a simplification is probably a good idea, but had talked with his student services staff and they had written a formal response. The point they made in their response is there is a huge difference in having a 1.8 after 12 hours and having a 1.8 after 95 hours. Some of the students haven't come to grips with where they are in the system. For a particular student who has a 1.97 GPA and 140 hours, it is easier to talk to him in terms of a Quality Point Deficit which he understands. It sounds easy to say I have a 1.97, I will just take a course and make an A and get my degree. It takes three courses with As in this case to get to a 2.0. This seems to be something we want to think about in the overall scheme of things, because simplifying this overall maybe to the student's detriment.

The Chair stated if senators weren't familiar with this, if a student has a Quality Deficit of 7 for example, that means is the student has to get seven hours of B to raise their average to a 2.0, for a 12 Quality Point Deficit they would need 12 hours of B, six hours of A, or some mixture. That is easy to explain to students.

Professor Lynne Hall - (Nursing) would like to speak about suspension without a preliminary probationary semester if the GPA falls below 0.6 during the first semester. She feels there are occasions where students do come in and do poorly but yet come back in a subsequent semester and do well. The adjustments many times for students are very difficult, this is the first time they have been away from home for an extended period of time, they are faced with new challenges. This is one particular component of this, she is not in favor of.

Dr. Louis Swift - (Dean - Undergraduate Studies) asked if it was not possible to have general rules and the college deans can make exceptions in some cases.

Dr. Randall Dahl - (University Registrar) stated the special suspension provision for first semester students was passed about two years ago, and allows a dean to in their discretion to suspend a student who achieves less than a 0.6, the notion being the student may have dug himself or herself so deep a hole to continue and have another bad semester might make it impossible ever to get out. This is like all the academic suspensions in the University, they are discretionary with the dean of the student's college.

Chairman Cox stated the vote would be a sense of the meeting, a spirit of rule and hopefully get a report from the Rules Committee in February. The motion passed in an unanimous voice vote and reads as follows:

Proposal:

The Rules Committee is directed to codify a change in the Senate Rules replacing probation and suspension criteria based on quality point deficit with new criteria based on GPA. The spirit of the changes are as follows:

- A. Monitoring academic progress be done by a system involving GPA rather than Quality Point Deficit with rules indicated by B, C and D below.
- B. Students are placed on probation if
 1. Their cumulative GPA falls below 2.0
 2. They have two consecutive academic terms with semester GPAs below 2.0regard less of their cumulative GPA.

- C. Students are subject to suspension if
 1. They have 3 consecutive semesters with their cumulative GPA below 2.0
 2. They fail to earn a 2.0 semester GPA for any term while on probation

- D. Students are subject to suspension without a preliminary probationary semester if their term GPA is below 0.6 after their first term of full time enrollment in the University System.

- E. Rule 5.3.1.5 applying to students eligible for suspension be continued "the Dean of the Student's College may continue a student on academic probation if the individual case so justifies".

Following codification, the Rules Committee is to report to the Senate which will take final action in February, 1995.

Rationale: The present system based on the calculation of quality points is not well understood by either faculty or students, is often confusing, and is not consistently applied as probation for students with over 90 hours is GPA based.

This proposal comes from the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee and comes with unanimous approval.

Implementation: Fall, 1995.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:19 p. m.

Randall W. Dahl
Secretary, University Senate