

University Senate
2016-17 Academic Year

Monday, September 12, 2016

1. President Eli Capilouto - University Senate Chair
2. Minutes from May 2, 2016 and Announcements
3. Officer and Other Reports
 - a. Chair
 - b. Vice Chair
 - c. Parliamentarian
 - d. Trustee
4. Old Business
 - a. Committee Reports
 - i. Advisory Committee for Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement - Jane Jensen and Scott Yost, Co-chairs
 1. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 5.4.3.1* ("Composition and Communication")
 - GCCR Assessment Policy , Substitution Policy, Substitution Form and Substitution Form Instructions
 - ii. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) – Scott Yost, Chair
 1. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 4.2.2.1* ("Admission to College of Nursing")
 2. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 4.2.3.3* ("College of Medicine")
5. Candidates for Degrees
 - a. Honorary Degree Nominees for December 2016 - Interim Graduate School Dean Brian Jackson
6. Items from the Floor (Time Permitting)

Next meeting: Monday, October 10, 2016 (3 pm, W. T. Young Library Auditorium)

University Senate
May 2, 2016

The University Senate met in regular session at 2 pm on Monday, May 2, 2016 in the Athletics Association Auditorium of W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via electronic voting devices unless indicated otherwise; specific voting information can be requested from the Office of the Senate Council.

Senate Council Chair Andrew Hippisley (AS) called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 2:04 pm.

The Chair asked Vice Chair McCormick (ED) to present the 2016 Outstanding Senator Award. McCormick explained that the award was annually given to a senator who went above and beyond the requirements of serving as a senator. The 2016 recipient was Davy Jones (ME). Senators gave Jones a round of applause.

1. President Eli Capilouto, University Senate Chair and President

The Chair introduced the University Senate chair, President Eli Capilouto. President Capilouto spoke to senators about the University budget and was assisted by Provost Tim Tracy and Guest Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Eric Monday. The presentation lasted for about one hour. There were no questions from senators.

The Chair called for an attendance vote and 54 senators registered their presence.

2. Minutes from April 11, 2015 and Announcements

There were no changes to the minutes from April 11. There being **no objections**, the minutes from April 11 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**. The Chair had a couple of announcements.

- The faculty and graduate student recipients of the Provost's Outstanding Teaching Awards were recently announced. The Chair acknowledged the winners: Andres Ayoob (ME); Elizabeth Combs (AG); Christopher Doty (ME); Susan Thiel (FA); Jean Wise (ME); Patrick Herald (AS); Alyson Hock (AS); Jo Mackby (AS); and Francesco Masala (AS). Senators gave the winners [none of whom were in attendance] a symbolic round of applause.
- The Chair noted that Lee Blonder (ME) was elected to serve a three-year term (July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019) as faculty trustee, replacing John Wilson (ME), whose term will end June 30. The Chair thanked Wilson for his service and senators gave him a round of applause.

3. Old Business

a. Senate's Teaching and Course Evaluation Implementation Ad Hoc Committee - Jonathan Golding, Chair

i. Final Report (30 minutes)

The Chair said that the purpose of the discussion was to establish implementation guidelines for the newly revised teacher-course evaluations (TCE), which Senate approved March 9, 2015. He said he had invited senators a couple weeks prior to send in specific language for any planned amendments to the TCE Implementation Ad Hoc Committee's final report and that he had received a handful of suggested changes. The Chair said there were a few proposed changes that were similar to each other; amendments were in the document being handed out to senators. The Chair said that each senator who sent in a suggested amendment would need to move the amendment on the floor, and receive a second, in order for the Senate to consider the amendment. Amendments would be addressed in order of their placement in the document. The **motion** from SC was a recommendation that the Senate

endorse the plan to implement the TCE questions that were approved at the Senate's March 9, 2015 meeting, as outlined in the Committee's Final Report. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. Guest Jonathan Golding, chair of the TCE Implementation Ad Hoc Committee, also participated in discussions.

[Underline formatting denotes added text while strikethrough denotes deleted text. Each amendment was moved by the individual senator who proposed the amendment. Line number references are from the PDF handed out during the meeting and posted on the Senate agenda.]

- Amendment to "1) Availability of TCE Results," **moved** by Tagavi (lines 59 – 76)
 - 1) Availability of TCE results
TCE results ~~(as approved by UK Faculty Senate rules)~~ shall be made available to students and faculty as follows:
 - a) Only numerical ratings shall be made available to students, i.e., no written comments; and
 - b) Intramural access to TCE results concerning either course academic content or instructor performance shall continue to be managed in accordance with existing academic policy of the University Senate and administrative faculty personnel policy (AR 2:1), with the recommendation that course instructors with a supervisory role in a course (course directors, course coordinators) and the department chairs and the college deans of the unit housing the course have access to both numerical and written comments of instructor performance for all instructors in that course.
 - a. TCE comments from for example PHY 101 should not be made available to for example Engineering Dean or Chair of History.
 - c) ~~Both numerical and written comments shall be made available to faculty, department chairs and deans.~~
 - d) To safeguard student anonymity and comply with FERPA, any results (numerical ratings and written comments) for classes with < 5 TCE responses shall not be made available to anyone. However, results will contribute to aggregate UK, College, and Departmental TCE means.

Wasilkowski (EN) **seconded**. Senators discussed the proposed amendment. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 67 in favor, three opposed, and three abstained.

- Amendment to "2) Grade Release Policy," **moved** by Tagavi (EN) (lines 88 – 93)

Students who complete a TCE for a course will have access to the official final course grade as soon as it becomes available. Students who do not complete a TCE for a given course (Note: combined lecture/lab courses involve two separate TCEs) will receive their corresponding grade 8 calendar days after the deadline for the submissions of grades as set by the Registrar's office.

 - a. TCE window will consist of 2 calendar weeks ending midnight of the last day of classes. No evaluations will be allowed outside this window. (For non-standard terms the equivalent will be determined by the Registrar.)

Any student wishing to appeal a delay in the release of their grades could file an appeal to a TCE Appeals Committee following the guidelines that would be determined by that committee.

A. Wood (LA) **seconded**. Senators discussed the proposed amendment. The Chair explained that if Tagavi's amendment was voted down, the Senate would next vote on the amendment to do away with the grade release penalty altogether. A. Wood offered a **friendly amendment** to change the beginning of the new "a)" to start with "Each college's TCE window will...." Tagavi **accepted**.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **failed** with 32 in favor, 37 opposed, and one abstained.

- Amendment to “2) Grade Release Policy,” **moved** by C. Wood (AS) (lines 97 – 126)
All ~~Students who complete a TCE for a course~~ will have access to the final course grade as soon as it becomes available.

~~Students who complete a TCE for a course will have access to the final course grade as soon as it becomes available. Students who do not complete a TCE for a given course (Note: combined lecture/lab courses involve two separate TCEs) will receive their corresponding grade 8 days after the deadline for the submissions of grades as set by the Registrar’s office.~~

~~Students who do not complete a TCE for a given course (Note: combined lecture/lab courses involve two separate TCEs) will receive their corresponding grade 8 days after the deadline for the submissions of grades as set by the Registrar’s office.~~

~~Example: Spring 2016 deadline for the submissions of grades is midnight on May 9. Student failing to complete the TCE would have to wait until May 17 to get access to their grades.~~

~~The release of grade policy acts in a similar fashion to what are referred to as “holds” at UK; students receive a consequence for not fulfilling a specific requirement of the university. However, while the release of grade policy would delay the receipt of grades for 8 days, the 28 current “holds” at UK (see Appendix B) prevent a student from registering/dropping courses, as well as provide a warning notification to Admissions should a former student with an active hold reapply for admission. Finally, the Office of the Registrar will not release a transcript or diploma for students with these holds.~~

~~Note: other schools that have a university wide delayed grading policy include Harvard, Yale, Ball State Northern Kentucky University, the University of Oregon, Michigan State, Stanford University, and Boston College. Specific examples of these existing policies are presented in Appendix C.~~

~~Any student wishing to appeal this policy could file an appeal to a TCE Appeals Committee following the guidelines that would be determined for that committee.~~

Brown (AG) **seconded**. Senators discussed the proposed amendment. Wasilkowski (EN) suggested that the revised sentence was unnecessary – if the entire section was stricken, there would be no grade release penalty. Wood **accepted** the change as a **friendly amendment** by Wasilkowski. There was extensive discussion about this proposed amendment, which would remove the grade release penalty so that students would receive their final grades as soon as they are available, regardless of whether or not the student had completed any TCEs. A **vote** was taken on the amendment to remove all text from section “2) Grade Release Policy” and the motion **passed** with 39 in favor, 33 opposed, and one abstained.

- Amendment to “3) TCE Form,” **moved** by Tagavi (EN) (lines 129-130)
3) TCE Form
a. There will be 15 common questions for all course evaluations with a 5-point scale approved by the University Senate for the TCE.

Wasilkowski **seconded**. Tagavi explained that it was factually true that the TCE would have 15 questions, but he thought it should be explicitly stated. He said he considered it to be an editorial change because the TCE report from the prior year already established 15 questions. The Chair queried senators (via a show of hands) as to whether or not the change was perceived as editorial or not; one senator raised his hand to indicate that he believed the change was not editorial. The Chair suggested that the proposed addition be considered editorial and there were no objections.

- Amendment to “3) TCE Form,) **moved** by Porter (PH) (lines 139 – 142, with associated deletion of the original “a” and “b”)

3) TCE Form

a. There will be 15 common questions for all course evaluations with a 5-point scale approved by the University Senate for the TCE. [added via previous vote]

~~a. Opt Out Alternative for Questions~~

~~By a vote of 5-0, it was agreed that each question will provide an “opt-out” option.~~

~~b. Opt Out Alternative Label~~

~~By a vote of 8-0, it was agreed that the “opt-out” option will be “choose not to rate”.~~

b. Opt Out Alternative for Questions

A single question at the start of the TCE will allow students to opt out of completing the TCE without penalty. A fill-in box will allow the student to state a reason for opting out, but will not be required.

Brion **seconded**. Senators discussed the proposed amendment, the new language in particular. Wood noted that because there was no longer a penalty for a student who did not submit a TCE, it was not a forced questionnaire and there was no longer any need for a single-question “opt-out” button at the top of the form. After additional discussion, Porter said that he no longer supported his motion and **withdrew** it. The Chair noted that the language on the TCE would be “choose not to rate,” and not “opt-out.” Brion also **withdrew** her second.

- Amendment to “4) Procedural Issues for Completing TCE,” **moved** by Tagavi (EN) (lines 149 – 150)

4) Procedural Issues for Completing TCE

a. Location of Filling out TCE

By a vote of 7-0, the TCE-AIC recommends:

Course instructors will decide whether or not to dedicate in-class time to completing TCEs. Such in class evaluation time must be announced a week in advance and no evaluation outside this time period will be allowed.

The motion **died** due to lack of a second.

- Amendment to “5) Additional TCE Questions,” **moved** by A. Wood (LA) (line 172)

5) Additional TCE Questions

a. Institutional Evaluation Questions (Required)

Any required questions from university units (e.g., UKCore, Distance Learning) to be included in the TCE will adopt the same 5-point scale approved by the University Senate for the TCE.

b. Supplemental Evaluation Questions (Optional)

University Senate
May 2, 2016

By a vote of 6-0, the TCE-AIC recommends that no more than ~~10~~20 additional questions be allowed from Colleges, Departments, and/or individual instructors; allocation of these items, when necessary, should be determined within each academic unit.

Optional supplemental questions shall be added sparingly and should not replicate existing content; these questions might focus on discipline-specific and course-specific pedagogical innovations.

Bird-Pollan (LA) **seconded**. Senators discussed the proposed change. Wood **called the question** and Hulse **seconded**. A **vote** by show of hands was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. A **vote** was taken on the motion to allow up to 20 additional questions and the motion **passed** with 63 in favor and nine opposed.

The Chair opined that the next proposed amendment from Tagavi (remove “Again, supplemental questions will use the same 5-point scale approved by the Senate for the TCE, where applicable” in “5) Additional TCE Questions” was an editorial change and did not need a Senate vote; there were no objections from senators.

- Amendment to “5) Additional TCE Questions,” **moved** by C. Wood (AS) (lines 192 - 195)

5) Additional TCE Questions

a. Institutional Evaluation Questions (Required)

Any required questions from university units (e.g., UKCore, Distance Learning) to be included in the TCE will adopt the same 5-point scale approved by the University Senate for the TCE.

b. Supplemental Evaluation Questions (Optional)

By a vote of 6-0, the TCE-AIC recommends that no more than ~~10~~20 additional questions be allowed from Colleges, Departments, and/or individual instructors; allocation of these items, when necessary, should be determined within each academic unit.

Optional supplemental questions shall be added sparingly and should not replicate existing content; these questions might focus on discipline-specific and course-specific pedagogical innovations.

~~Again, supplemental questions will use the same 5-point scale approved by the Senate for the TCE, where applicable.~~ [removed via previous vote]

c. Submitting Questions

By a vote of 6-0, the TCE-AIC recommends that all supplemental questions must be submitted to UKAT by the first day of each semester.

d. Ordering of TCE Questions

The Standard 15 questions approved by the Senate will always appear first on the TCE – prior to any additional items.

~~e. TCE Completion~~

~~By a vote of 5-1, the TCE-AIC recommends that all questions (i.e., Standard + Institutional + Supplemental) be answered for a student to have immediate access to their grades.~~

Brion (EN) **seconded**. Wood explained that this particular section needed to be removed as a consequence of an earlier vote. There were no comments from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 60 in favor, seven opposed, and one abstained.

- Amendment to “7) Changing the Campus Culture about the TCE,” moved by R. Brown (AG) (lines 215 – 235)

7) Changing the Campus Culture about the TCE

The TCE-AIC was unanimous in its view that these recommendations alone may not achieve the desired results, and that a concomitant change is needed in the campus culture regarding the TCE.

One way to change the culture of TCE participation is to give students more time to complete their TCEs and to allow students to evaluate the entire course, if desired. The current window (i.e., week before dead week and dead week) is a relic of the days when paper copy TCEs were passed out during a regular class period. An updated window for students to complete their TCEs shall be as follows:

Spring/Fall Semester Courses (15-16 weeks)

* TCE window opens 2 weeks before the end of the final exam period

* TCE window closes 1 week after the end of the final exam period

Part-of-Term Courses (<15 weeks)

* TCE window opens 1 week before the end of the final exam period

* TCE window closes 1 week after the end of the final exam period

This change will allow students more time to complete the surveys (something students are concerned about), including a one-week period after students’ finals are all done. Students have said that they would prefer the opportunity to evaluate the entire course. Plus, instructors should not be granted a period at the end of the course (i.e., finals week) when they still have control over students’ grades but are immune from students’ evaluations.

Current TCE Schedule: <http://www.uky.edu/eval/tce-event-schedule>

Historically, it appears that students often do not take the TCE seriously and, as a result, do not provide valuable feedback on course and instructional quality. For example, at UK for Fall 2015, there were 1141 reports that were not generated because of less than 5 responses. Of these, 553 reports would have been generated if the number of students invited (this was 5 or more) would have responded. Compounding this problem is prior data from UK and other schools that suggest moving from a paper to an online format typically decreases response rates. A concerted effort should be made to highlight for learners the value of the TCE - both with regard to course design and delivery improvements, and for promotion and tenure decisions....

Woodrum (AS) **seconded**. Senators discussed the proposed amendment at length, speaking in favor of it and against it. Whitaker (AS) **called the question** and Brion **seconded**. A **vote** was taken via a show of hands and the motion **passed** with three opposed. A **vote** was taken on R. Brown’s amendment and the motion **failed** with 31 in favor, 36 opposed, and one abstained.

A **vote** was taken on the motion that the Senate endorse the plan, as amended by Senate, to implement the TCE questions that were approved at the Senate’s March 9, 2015 meeting, as outlined in the

Committee's Final Report and the motion **passed** with 43 in favor and 25 opposed. Senators offered Golding and his committee members a round of applause for all their hard work.

b. Senate's Ad Hoc Calendar Committee - Kevin Real, Chair

i. Final Report (15 minutes)

The Chair invited Real (CI) to present background information about the proposal, as well as an explanation of it, which Real did. Essentially, the Calendar Committee offered recommendations that would give departments and colleges more flexibility with offering part-of-term courses, as well as strongly suggested the use of a single summer term. The Chair said that the **motion** from SC was that the Senate approve the Calendar Committee's recommendations as outlined in its report. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

The Chair added that Provost Tim Tracy queried college deans who were supportive of the proposed change. College of Arts and Sciences Dean Kornbluh asked if the last day of the proposed new summer session, August 2, was on purpose – he noted it precluded classes from being held for a couple weeks prior to the start of the academic year. Guest David Timoney, associate registrar, explained that the three weeks leading up to the start of the fall semester are usually used for orientations and for classroom renovations. Timoney said it could create problems if the summer session were to extend further into August. Dean Kornbluh said the College of Arts and Sciences often ran summer programming up until just prior to the start of the fall semester. He said that discussions were ongoing about possibly offering those programs for credit and said that in the future he would like to see those three weeks available for programming. There were a few additional questions from senators and Guest Margaret Bausch, committee member, also participated.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 59 in favor, two opposed, and one abstained. Senators thanked the members of the Ad Hoc Calendar Committee with a round of applause for their work.

4. Officer and Other Reports

a. Chair

The Chair reported the composition for the ombud search committee, as outlined in *Senate Rules 6.2.3* ([Academic Ombud] "Selection Procedure"): Ruth Beattie (AS), chair; Joe Fink (PH), faculty representative; Allison Soult (AS), faculty representative; Sydney Barnett (HS), student representative; Todd Montgomery (EN), student representative; and Tolu Odukoya (ME) student representative.

The Chair noted that Vickery (LI) was standing in for the usual parliamentarian, Kate Seago (LI).

b. Vice Chair

Vice Chair McCormick had no report.

c. Parliamentarian

Interim Parliamentarian Vickery had no report.

d. Trustee

There was no report from either faculty trustee Wilson or Grossman.

5. Degree Recipients

a. May 2016 In Memoriam Honorary Degree List

i. College of Communication and Information Student

Guest Alyssa Eckman (CI/Integrated Strategic Communications, department chair) shared a few words about Mr. Jonathan Krueger, who passed away the prior year. Eckman stated that she had had the pleasure of teaching Jonathan in two of her classes – a skills class and a winter study abroad class, just a few months before he was killed. Jonathan was majoring in Integrated Strategic Communications, although he was best known as a photographer for the student newspaper, the KY Kernel. Jonathan had a good GPA at the time of his death and Eckman described him as one of her department's finest students and that he was the epitome of what UK wants in a student. Jonathan was from Ohio but had said there could be no other school for him than the University of Kentucky. A memorial service was held for him the week prior and it was well attended, by many who missed him greatly.

ii. College of Arts and Sciences Student

The Chair explained that Mr. Martin Striz was a doctoral student in the Department of Biology. He was on his way towards a PhD but had not yet completed his defense.

iii. College of Engineering Student

Guest Kim Anderson (EN/Chemical and Materials Engineering, associate dean for administration and academic affairs), spoke about Mr. Garrett Stephen Spence. Anderson said that Garrett was a junior in Mechanical Engineering and was hard working. He worked at a grocery store in Falmouth and was well loved there, too. His choice of major came from his love and fascination with naval ships and the Titanic; he conducted more than one in-depth study on the Titanic. Garrett spent time on his family's houseboat and enjoyed every minute of it. A younger brother, almost two years old, was lost to Garrett from cancer and Garrett set up a fund to support him and his memory, spending time raising money. Garrett's lifelong dream was to become a mechanical engineer and worked through a challenging curriculum and was set to finish strongly before he was taken by cancer.

iv. Gatton College of Business and Economics Student

Guest Summer Eglinski (Gatton College of Business and Economics, director of global initiatives) offered comments about Mr. Tyler Mackenzie Foster. Eglinski thanked senators for the opportunity to talk about Tyler; she was Tyler's academic advisor. Tyler was an exceptional student and had recently completed an internship with a prominent company in Louisville, planning to return to UK to finish his last 18 hours of coursework. Tyler had an outstanding GPA in Accounting, a difficult subject, and he was an exceptional student. He was also a member of the United States' armed services, having been deployed to Africa at one point. Eglinski recalled that Tyler was a generous, giving person and he truly heard what she said during advising sessions, asking repeatedly over time what he could do to improve his experience at UK.

The Chair stated that the **motion** from Senate Council that the elected faculty senators approve the May 2016 In Memoriam posthumous degree list, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 59 in favor and none opposed.

b. May 2016 Degree List

The Chair said that the **motion** from Senate Council that the elected faculty senators approve the May 2016 degree list, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 58 in favor and one abstained.

c. Early August 2016 Degree List

The Chair stated that the **motion** from Senate Council that the elected faculty senators approve the early August 2016 degree list, for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 56 in favor and none opposed.

d. Late Addition to the Degree List (per Senate Rules 5.4.1.1.D.1-2)

i. College of Agriculture Student SN-53

The Chair invited Guest Larry Grabau (AG/Plant Pathology, associate dean for academic programs), to explain the nature of the administrative error and Grabau did so. There were no questions from senators. The Chair said the **motion** from Senate Council was a recommendation that the elected faculty senators amend the December 2015 degree list adopted at the December 14, 2015 Senate meeting by adding the BS in Agriculture with Individualized Curriculum – Sustainable Agriculture for student SN-53 and recommend through the President to the Board of Trustees that the BS Agriculture be awarded effective December 2015. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 55 in favor and one abstained.

6. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) - Ernie Bailey, Chair

i. Proposed New Department of Arts Administration

Bailey (AG), chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), explained the proposal. The Chair said that the **motion** from SAOSC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the establishment of a Department of Arts Administration within the College of Fine Arts and the transfer of the BA and MA degrees in Arts Administration to the new Department of Arts Administration. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 56 in favor.

ii. Proposed Move of Biosystems Engineering Major from College of Agriculture, Food and Environment to College of Engineering

Bailey (AG) explained the proposal and the Chair said that the **motion** from SAOSC: that the University Senate approve the move of the Biosystems Engineering major from the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment to the College of Engineering. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. Debski (AS) asked if the proposed move would change any of the courses that students in the major would take. Guest Sue Nokes (AG/Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering, department chair) explained that courses had always been offered through the College of Engineering, so nothing about that would change. There being no further questions, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 57 in favor and one opposed.

iii. Proposed Name Change of Department of Biomedical Engineering to F. Joseph Halcomb III, M.D. Department of Biomedical Engineering

Bailey explained the proposal and the Chair said that the **motion** from SAOSC was a recommendation that the Senate endorse the name change of Department of Biomedical Engineering within the College of Engineering to F. Joseph Halcomb III, M. D. Department of Biomedical Engineering, pending compliance with *Administrative Regulations 8:4* ("Policies Governing Private Funding of Academic Positions"). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. Debski (AS) asked if there were any other units at UK that were named for an individual; Hulse (BE) responded that his department, the Von Allmen School of Accountancy, was one. There being no further questions, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 43 in favor, 10 opposed, and four abstaining.

iv. Proposed New Sports Medicine Research Institute

Bailey (AG) explained the proposal and the Chair said that the **motion** from SAOSC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the creation of the Sports Medicine Research Institute, a multi-disciplinary research institute, based on its academic merits. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 53 in favor and none opposed.

The Chair said that the next **motion** from the SAOSC was a recommendation that the Senate endorse the proposed resources for the Sports Medicine Research Institute, a multidisciplinary research institute, and its reporting to the Health Sciences dean, on its nonacademic merits. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions from senators, although Tagavi (EN) expressed his support of the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 55 in favor and one abstained.

v. Proposed New Institute for Biomedical Informatics

Bailey (AG) explained the proposal and the Chair said that the **motion** from SAOSC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the creation of the Institute for Biomedical Informatics, a multi-disciplinary research institute, based on its academic merits. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 53 in favor and one opposed.

The second **motion** from SAOSC was a recommendation that the Senate endorse the proposed resources for the Institute for Biomedical Informatics, a multi-disciplinary research institute, and its reporting to the Provost, based on its nonacademic merits. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 49 in favor, two opposed and one abstained.

The Chair offered his thanks to the SAOSC and to Bailey in particular, noting that the SAOSC had reviewed diverse proposals during the academic year, from changing a department name to creating a new college. The Chair gave Bailey a white rose as a token of his appreciation and senators gave Bailey a round of applause.

The Chair invited the next hero of the Senate to come forward and Schroeder did so.

b. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) - Margaret Schroeder, Chair

i. Proposed New Master of Science in Research Methods in Education

Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal. Ferrier (BE) inquired as to the identity of the young, small individual who Schroeder carried with her to the podium. Schroeder noted the recent arrival of her son, Riley, who made his appearance shortly after the previous Senate meeting. There were no additional questions from senators. The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a MS degree in Research Methods in Education, in the Department of Educational Policy and Evaluation within the College of Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 53 in favor and none opposed.

ii. Proposed BLS Bachelor of Liberal Studies

Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal and the Chair said that the **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new BLS degree with a major in Liberal Studies, in the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 48 in favor and four opposed.

iii. Proposed BS Digital Media and Design

Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal and the Chair noted that the **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new BS degree with a major in Digital Media and Design, in the School of Art and Visual Studies within the College of Fine Arts. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 52 in favor and none opposed.

iv. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Universal Design

Schroeder (ED) explained the proposal and the Chair said the **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in Universal Design in the Division of Undergraduate Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 51 in favor and two opposed.

The Chair thanked Schroeder for all her hard work in reviewing over 20 program proposals during the academic year, noting she did have many other things on her plate. The Chair presented her with a white rose as a token of his appreciation. Senators gave Schroeder a warm round of applause.

c. Advisory Committee for Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement - Jane Jensen and Scot Yost, Co-chairs

i. Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules 5.4.3.1* ("Composition and Communication")

Yost (EN), chair of the Advisory Committee for Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement, noted that his co-chair was unable to attend so he would be addressing both the proposed assessment and substitution policies. He offered senators some background information about the Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement (GCCR) and how it replaced the prior Graduation Writing Requirement. Yost explained the proposed assessment policy for GCCR courses and there were no questions from senators.

Next, Yost (EN) explained the proposed GCCR substitution policy. When he was finished, Guest Anna Bosch (AS/English, associate dean for undergraduate programs) asked for permission to speak and the Chair recognized her. Bosch asked for more detail on who would make a request for a GCCR course substitution, asking if the Advisory Committee for GCCR would accept a department's request or if a student would need to author the petition. Yost referred to the supporting documentation posted with the agenda and said that every substitution would need to be in the form of the petition. Anyone could make the request (faculty member, student, director of undergraduate studies (DUS), etc.) but that the petition must also be attested to by the DUS or department chair to confirm that the request is consistent with what the program was doing relative to GCCR. College of Arts and Sciences Dean Mark Kornbluh expressed concern about the proposed policy, as was C. Wood (AS). There were a number of questions from senators about the substitution process and related activities.

University Senate
May 2, 2016

Tagavi asked that the motion be placed on the floor so that someone could call the question. The Chair said that the **motion** from the Advisory Committee for GCCR was a recommendation that the Senate approve the assessment and substitution policies and the associated changes to *Senate Rules 5.4.3.1* ("Composition and Communication"). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. Tagavi **called the question** and Porter **seconded**. A **vote** was taken via a show of hands and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Chair said the next vote would be on the committee's motion. During the voting, however, it became apparent from the number of votes appearing on screen that the Senate had lost quorum. Wood called for quorum and there were 40 senators recording votes. {Forty-six senators are required to meet quorum.} Yost noted that the previously existing GCCR transfer agreements had already been done away with, so until Senate approved a substitution policy, there would be no substitutions. In response to a question from Schroeder (ED), Yost confirmed there was a possibility that the lack of a substitution policy could prevent some students from graduating. There were comments about the possibility of interim approval by the SC.

The Chair apologized to Yost and the others whose agenda items would not be reviewed by Senate.¹

The Chair noted that his term as SC chair was coming to an end and that it was time to pass the gavel to the incoming SC chair, Katherine McCormick. The Chair invited McCormick to the podium and presented her with the official gavel. The Chair thanked McCormick for her service as vice chair and commented that she would be a great SC chair. He presented her with a bouquet of white roses and senators gave a round of applause. Vice Chair McCormick presented the Chair with a fine bottle of local spirits and thanked him for his leadership over the past two years. Senators offered their appreciation of the Chair's service via a round of applause in his honor.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine McCormick,
University Senate Secretary

Invited guests present: John Abt, Kimberly Anderson, Anna Bosch, Kelly Bradley, Alyssa Eckman, Summer Eglinski, Jonathan Golding, Larry Grabau, Rob Jensen, Scott Lephart, Brett McDaniel, Eric Monday, Abhijit Patwardhan, Rachel Shane, Kathy Sheppard-Jones, John Walz, and GQ Zhang.

Absences: Allaire, Allen, Arthur, Ayers, Bada, Birdwhistell, T., Birdwhistell, M., Blackwell, Brennen, Brown, Browning*, Burks, Butler, J., Calvert, Carvalho, Cassis, Clark, Cofield, Combs, Cox, Crist, DiPaola, Doolen, D'Orazio, Doyle, Firey*, Folmar, Gower, Healy*, Huja*, Jasper*, Jung*, Kearney, Kyrkanides*,

¹ [Editorial note: At the Senate Council meeting on May 9, 2016, the SC [waived offered provisional approval for the proposed changes to Senate Rules 4.2.2.1](#) ("Admission to College of Nursing") and [for the proposed changes to Senate Rules 4.2.3.3](#) ("College of Medicine") [to allow the proposed policies \(as described in the Senate's May agenda\) to be in effect provisionally until the Senate discusses them at the September Senate meeting](#). Senate will officially review these two items at its September 12, 2016 meeting, as well as consider the other two items on the agenda that Senate was unable to review at the May 2, 2016 meeting (proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations 2:10* ("Voluntary Series Faculty") and proposed additions of Title IX language to syllabus template/guidelines).]

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.

University Senate
May 2, 2016

Lee, C., Loven, Mullin, Nathu, Niespodziany, O'Connor, O'Hair, D. *, O'Hair, MJ, Peffer*, Profitt, Richey, Royster*, Sachs*, Sanderson, Schoenberg, Schultz, Smyth, Swanson, Symeonidis*, Thorpe, Tick, Tracy, Vosevich, Walz, Watt, Williams, Wilson, K., Witt, and Wood.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, May 19, 2016.

Proposed Changes to the GCCR requirements, SR 5.4.3.1

Background: In May of 2013 (and implemented for all first-time students entering the University in the Fall of 2014), the Senate approved a replacement to the Graduation Writing Requirement. The Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement (GCCR) had the intent that students will be best served by fulfilling the requirement within the context of their chosen degree program. Students would demonstrate information literacy in the discipline and communicate in styles and modes most appropriate for their anticipated career. At the time of implementation there was no formal assessment requirement nor a substitution policy for transfer students. The GCCR committee was charged with proposing a comprehensive assessment policy and a substitution policy. The two policies have been proposed, as shown in the proposed changes to SR 5.4.3.1

5.4.3.1 Composition and Communication [US: 5/6/2013]

All students on the main campus must satisfy the Composition and Communication requirement in the UK Core. Before graduation, they must also satisfy a more advanced course to fulfill the Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement (GCCR). The faculty in each undergraduate degree program shall implement a Composition and Communication Requirement (GCCR) appropriate to the academic discipline and professional expectations of the major. (Exception: Students in the Honors Program will continue to satisfy the entire University Writing Requirement through that curriculum.) Each undergraduate program faculty shall articulate this requirement in terms of one or more learning outcomes that will be assessed regularly as required by program accreditation standards and university standards for SACS reaffirmation of accreditation. Each GCCR requirement, learning outcome, and assessment protocol must be vetted and approved by the Senate GCCR Advisory Committee.

Students must successfully complete this requirement after achieving sophomore status and prior to graduation. To satisfy the GCCR, students must earn an average grade of C or better on the designated Composition and Communication (C&C) intensive assignments produced in any given course designated as fulfilling some or all of the GCCR.

A. Requirements

1. The GCCR shall consist of three components, each of which should reflect the standards and practices of the particular discipline:
 - (a) one or more written assignments in English that total to at least 4,500 words (the equivalent of 15 pages of double-spaced, typewritten text);
 - (b) either an oral assignment in English, in which students must give a formal presentation at least 10 minutes long, or a visual assignment, in which students create at least one significant visual/electronic artifact (e.g., a web site or video presentation);
 - (c) an assignment in English that requires the student to demonstrate information literacy in the discipline.

2. The GCCR may be satisfied via either a single GCCR intensive course or a series of GCCR intensive assignments in a series of courses. Faculty may specify that a course offered by another undergraduate program fulfills the GCCR if the faculty in the second undergraduate program so agree.

3. Courses must incorporate a draft/feedback/revision process on GCCR assignments.

B. Assessment

Each undergraduate degree program shall identify to the Senate (via the GCCR Advisory Committee) at least one specific program learning outcome and a plan for assessing both the writing and oral or visual components of the GCCR.

The assessment plan will include (a) clear goals for successful achievement of the GCCR, (b) specific criteria and rubrics for systematically assessing student work, and (c) a cogent description of how assessment results will be utilized to revise GCCR instruction and/or curriculum if the goals are not met.

C. Approval

Programs shall submit proposals to the Senate GCCR Advisory Committee (see SR establishing this committee) for approval. This Advisory Committee is responsible for:

1. establishing procedures and guidelines for proposal submissions;
2. evaluating programs' implementations of the GCCR and recommending approval (or disapproval) to the Undergraduate Council;
3. establishing and implementing a campus assessment plan for the GCCR.

D. Substitution for a Program's GCCR Requirement

1. Requirements. For a course(s) to be substituted for a program's GCCR requirement, the petitioner (Chair, DUS, student affairs officer, program advisor, or student) shall demonstrate the following:

(a) Substitution using UK course(s).

i. The substitution course(s) must have been approved for GCCR at the time the student took the course(s).

ii. The department seeking the substitution shall attest (Chair or DUS) that the substitution is substantially equivalent to the program's GCCR learning outcomes, discipline literacy and needs of their profession.

(b) Substitution using non-GCCR approved course(s). This could include a non-UK course, a UK course, or combination. The petitioning program shall document/include the following:

i. The course(s) was taken at sophomore level, or above.

ii. The requirements of the course(s) meets the requirements stipulated by these Senate Rules 5.4.3.1.A, namely, English composition

(FOR A VOTE ON MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2016)

of 4500 words, formal oral or visual assignment, demonstrates information literacy, and utilizes a draft/feedback/revision process.

iii. A syllabus of the course(s).

iv. The student earned a C or better on the GCCR components.

v. Any additional information that supports the petition. (i.e., sample assignments, student work, assessment rubrics, etc.).

vi. Review and approval from the outside department who services the petitioning program's GCCR course(s), if any.

vii. An attesting statement from the petitioning program's Chair/DUS certifying that:

1. the GCCR prerequisites requirements, as stated in the Senate Rules 5.4.3.1, were similar and followed by the student.

2. the substitution is substantially equivalent to the petitioning program's GCCR learning outcomes, discipline literacy, and the needs of their profession.

2. Submission. The petitioner shall submit the request using the GCCR Substitution Request Form along with the documentation required by the University Senate as described on that form and accompanying instructions (<http://www.uky.edu/Faculty/Senate/forms.htm>). Once the application includes all required documentation, the petition will be reviewed for approval by the petitioning program's Academic Dean (for UK Course(s) substitutions), or the Senate's GCCR Committee (for non-UK course(s) substitutions).

3. Extenuating Circumstances. Under special and extenuating circumstances the program faculty (Chair/DUS and relevant tenured faculty) may petition the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the GCCR Committee Chair to approve a substitution exception so as to not delay a student's graduation. The petition shall explain why the student's graduation would be delayed without the approval, why the student has not fulfilled the GCCR previously, and also document what specific academic experience will be used to substitute for the program's GCCR requirement. If the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and GCCR committee Chair(s) approve the exception, the student will have fulfilled the GCCR requirement, and the petition by the program faculty with the approval justification shall be forwarded to the GCCR committee for informational purposes.

of 4500 words, formal oral or visual assignment, demonstrates information literacy, and utilizes a draft/feedback/revision process.

iii. A syllabus of the course(s).

iv. The student earned a C or better on the GCCR components.

v. Any additional information that supports the petition. (i.e., sample assignments, student work, assessment rubrics, etc.).

vi. Review and approval from the outside department who services the petitioning program's GCCR course(s), if any.

vii. An attesting statement from the petitioning program's Chair/DUS certifying that:

1. the GCCR prerequisites requirements, as stated in the Senate Rules 5.4.3.1, were similar and followed by the student.

2. the substitution is substantially equivalent to the petitioning program's GCCR learning outcomes, discipline literacy, and the needs of their profession.

2. Submission. The petitioner shall submit the request using the GCCR Substitution Request Form along with the documentation required by the University Senate as described on that form and accompanying instructions (<http://www.uky.edu/Faculty/Senate/forms.htm>). Once the application includes all required documentation, the petition will be reviewed for approval by the petitioning program's Academic Dean (for UK Course(s) substitutions), or the Senate's GCCR Committee (for non-UK course(s) substitutions).

3. Extenuating Circumstances. Under special and extenuating circumstances the program faculty (Chair/DUS and relevant tenured faculty) may petition the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the GCCR Committee Chair to approve a substitution exception so as to not delay a student's graduation. The petition shall explain why the student's graduation would be delayed without the approval, why the student has not fulfilled the GCCR previously, and also document what specific academic experience will be used to substitute for the program's GCCR requirement. If the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and GCCR committee Chair(s) approve the exception, the student will have fulfilled the GCCR requirement, and the petition by the program faculty with the approval justification shall be forwarded to the GCCR committee for informational purposes.

Proposed Changes to the GCCR requirements, SR 5.4.3.1

Background: In May of 2013 (and implemented for all first-time students entering the University in the Fall of 2014), the Senate approved a replacement to the Graduation Writing Requirement. The Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement (GCCR) had the intent that students will be best served by fulfilling the requirement within the context of their chosen degree program. Students would demonstrate information literacy in the discipline and communicate in styles and modes most appropriate for their anticipated career. At the time of implementation there was no formal assessment requirement nor a substitution policy for transfer students. The GCCR committee was charged with proposing a comprehensive assessment policy and a substitution policy. The two policies have been proposed, as shown in the proposed changes to SR 5.4.3.1

5.4.3.1 Composition and Communication [US: 5/6/2013]

All students on the main campus must satisfy the Composition and Communication requirement in the UK Core. Before graduation, they must also satisfy a more advanced course to fulfill the Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement (GCCR). The faculty in each undergraduate degree program shall implement a Composition and Communication Requirement (GCCR) appropriate to the academic discipline and professional expectations of the major. (Exception: Students in the Honors Program will continue to satisfy the entire University Writing Requirement through that curriculum.) Each undergraduate program faculty shall articulate this requirement in terms of one or more learning outcomes that will be assessed regularly as required by program accreditation standards and university standards for SACS reaffirmation of accreditation. Each GCCR requirement, learning outcome, and assessment protocol must be vetted and approved by the Senate GCCR Advisory Committee.

Students must successfully complete this requirement after achieving sophomore status and prior to graduation. To satisfy the GCCR, students must earn an average grade of C or better on the designated Composition and Communication (C&C) intensive assignments produced in any given course designated as fulfilling some or all of the GCCR.

A. Requirements

1. The GCCR shall consist of three components, each of which should reflect the standards and practices of the particular discipline:
 - (a) one or more written assignments in English that total to at least 4,500 words (the equivalent of 15 pages of double-spaced, typewritten text);
 - (b) either an oral assignment in English, in which students must give a formal presentation at least 10 minutes long, or a visual assignment, in which students create at least one significant visual/electronic artifact (e.g., a web site or video presentation);
 - (c) an assignment in English that requires the student to demonstrate information literacy in the discipline.

2. The GCCR may be satisfied via either a single GCCR intensive course or a series of GCCR intensive assignments in a series of courses. Faculty may specify that a course offered by another undergraduate program fulfills the GCCR if the faculty in the second undergraduate program so agree.

3. Courses must incorporate a draft/feedback/revision process on GCCR assignments.

B. Assessment of the Program's GCCR

~~Each undergraduate degree program shall identify to the Senate (via the GCCR Advisory Committee) at least one specific program learning outcome and a plan for assessing both the writing and oral or visual components of the GCCR.~~

~~The assessment plan will include (a) clear goals for successful achievement of the GCCR, (b) specific criteria and rubrics for systematically assessing student work, and (c) a cogent description of how assessment results will be utilized to revise GCCR instruction and/or curriculum if the goals are not met.~~

The GCCR Advisory Committee shall monitor each degree program's assessment of GCCR student learning outcome(s) as part of the University Office of Assessment's regular program review and student learning outcome(s) assessment cycle. This is not an additional assessment nor stand-alone process.

1. Degree Programs GCCR Assessment Plan. The GCCR Assessment Plan follows the University schedule for Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessment. Each undergraduate degree program shall submit an Assessment Plan to the Office of University Assessment which includes their program's SLOs. At least one SLO shall directly align to the GCCR and all SLOs shall be assessed within a three-year cycle.

Based on the degree program's Assessment Plan, the assessment of the GCCR outcome(s) may occur yearly, bi-yearly, or once every three years. The GCCR section in each degree program's assessment plan shall include at least one specific Program Student Learning Outcome for composition and communication outcomes. During the first year, and each year in which the GCCR is being assessed, the degree program shall submit the following:

- (a) a plan for assessing the composition components of the GCCR;
- (b) a plan for assessing the oral and/or visual components of the GCCR;
- (c) clear goals, rubrics, and revision plans for GCCR implementation;
- (d) a description of assignment(s) and instructions resulting in student artifacts;
- (e) a sampling plan for collecting and submitting student artifacts as evidence for GCCR SLOs;
- (f) a copy of current assessing rubrics for GCCR assignment(s);
- (g) a copy of the current syllabus for GCCR course(s);
- (h) For degree programs with outside provider(s) (outside the program's department) of the GCCR, a copy of the current MOU/MOA which details the involvement and roles of the provider(s) and degree program relative to this assessment plan.

2. Review of the Degree Program's GCCR Assessment Plan. When submitted

or updated, the GCCR component of the Assessment Plan shall be reviewed by the GCCR Committee, or designee. Based on this review, the degree program's GCCR Assessment Plan shall receive feedback and an evaluation score of either a "Meets Expectations" or "Does Not Meet Expectations".

3. **University Assessment of the Degree Program's GCCR Outcomes.** When the GCCR SLO is scheduled for assessment, the results shall be included in the program's Annual SLO Assessment Report, which is due on October 31st of each year. As described in the sampling plan, programs shall submit a sample of student artifacts (assignments) for each GCCR approved course. Programs requiring their students to complete courses outside of their home department shall collaborate with the department offering the required GCCR course to ensure artifacts are submitted for assessment. All evaluation feedback on the GCCR outcome shall be provided to the degree program's GCCR Committee/Contact for review.

3. **Program GCCR Assessment Noncompliance.** Programs that do not submit a GCCR learning outcomes assessment plan that meets expectations and/or do not submit assessment documentation and artifacts following the approved plan will be provided with technical assistance from the Office of University Assessment for the improvement of their plan and/or find a reasonable solution for submitting artifacts. In addition a status report shall be submitted to the appropriate Associate Dean(s) for follow-up.

C. Approval

Programs shall submit proposals to the Senate GCCR Advisory Committee (see SR establishing this committee) for approval. This Advisory Committee is responsible for:

1. establishing procedures and guidelines for proposal submissions;
2. evaluating programs' implementations of the GCCR and recommending approval (or disapproval) to the Undergraduate Council;
3. establishing and implementing a campus assessment plan for the GCCR.

D. Substitution for a Program's GCCR Requirement

1. **Requirements.** For a course(s) to be substituted for a program's GCCR requirement, the petitioner (Chair, DUS, student affairs officer, program advisor, or student) shall demonstrate the following:

(a) **Substitution using UK course(s).**

- i. The substitution course(s) must have been approved for GCCR at the time the student took the course(s).
- ii. The department seeking the substitution shall attest (Chair or DUS) that the substitution is substantially equivalent to the program's GCCR learning outcomes, discipline literacy and needs of their profession.

(b) Substitution using non-GCCR approved course(s). This could include a non-UK course, a UK course, or combination. The petitioning program shall document/include the following:

- i. The course(s) was taken at sophomore level, or above.
- ii. The requirements of the course(s) meets the requirements stipulated by these Senate Rules 5.4.3.1.A, namely, English composition of 4500 words, formal oral or visual assignment, demonstrates information literacy, and utilizes a draft/feedback/revision process.
- iii. A syllabus of the course(s).
- iv. The student earned a C or better on the GCCR components.
- v. Any additional information that supports the petition. (i.e., sample assignments, student work, assessment rubrics, etc.).
- vi. Review and approval from the outside department who services the petitioning program's GCCR course(s), if any.
- vii. An attesting statement from the petitioning program's Chair/DUS certifying that:
 1. the GCCR prerequisites requirements, as stated in the Senate Rules 5.4.3.1, were similar and followed by the student.
 2. the substitution is substantially equivalent to the petitioning program's GCCR learning outcomes, discipline literacy, and the needs of their profession.

2. Submission. The petitioner shall submit the request using the GCCR Substitution Request Form along with the documentation required by the University Senate as described on that form and accompanying instructions (<http://www.uky.edu/Faculty/Senate/forms.htm>). Once the application includes all required documentation, the petition will be reviewed for approval by the petitioning program's Academic Dean (for UK Course(s) substitutions), or the Senate's GCCR Committee (for non-UK course(s) substitutions).

3. Extenuating Circumstances. Under special and extenuating circumstances the program faculty (Chair/DUS and relevant tenured faculty) may petition the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the GCCR Committee Chair to approve a substitution exception so as to not delay a student's graduation. The petition shall explain why the student's graduation would be delayed without the approval, why the student has not fulfilled the GCCR previously, and also document what specific academic experience will be used to substitute for the program's GCCR requirement. If the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and GCCR committee Chair(s) approve the exception, the student will have fulfilled the GCCR requirement, and the petition by the program faculty with the approval justification shall be forwarded to the GCCR committee for informational purposes.



College of Nursing
UK Medical Center
315 College of Nursing Bldg.
Lexington, KY 40536-0232
859 323-5108
fax 859 323-1057
www.uknursing.uky.edu

February 26, 2016

TO: Andrew Hippisley, Chair, University Senate

FROM: 

Patricia B. Howard, Exec Vice Dean, Academic Affairs
Darlene Welsh, Assistant Dean, BSN program

RE: Change to Senate Rule 4.2.2.1

The College of Nursing requests a change to Senate Rule 4.2.2.1 to move application deadline for applicants to the RN-BSN option.

Fall admission: The current deadline of March 1 is too early for RN-BSN applicants. This student population is more likely to apply to a program closer to the beginning of the semester. A deadline of May 1 would allow adequate time for applications to be reviewed by the Admission and Progression Committee before the summer and allow sufficient time for applicants to provide the necessary immunization records before enrollment.

Spring admission: The current deadline of December 1 is too late for review by Admission and Progression and does not allow sufficient time for applicants to provide the necessary immunization records before enrollment. The spring due date would change to October 15 to allow additional time for completion of admission requirements.

Attached is a copy of the Senate Rule with tracking to show the requested changes. This is found at the bottom of page 3 of the document.

4.2.2.1 Admission to College of Nursing [US: 4/12/82; US: 3/10/86; US: 10/14/91; US: 2/13/95; US 4/10/2000]

The College of Nursing (CON) enrollment will be composed of four-year students, associate degree nursing graduates and diploma nursing school graduates. Admission to the University does not guarantee admission to the College of Nursing. Preference will be given to Kentucky residents.

Applicants must be in a state of good health enabling them to carry out the functions of the professional nurse. Routinely, each student will be required to obtain a rubella and rubeola titers, and have an annual tuberculin test or chest x-ray.

Progression to upper division courses is regulated so that the total number of full time equivalents at the beginning of the junior year does not exceed 120. Admission criteria for four types of students are presented below:

A. Criteria for Admission to the 4-year BSN Program Include: [US 4/13/98; US 4/10/06; US 2/8/2010]

1. Freshman Student

Students will be admitted as freshman to a prenursing curriculum based on the following criteria:

- (a) high school grade point average of 2.75 or above on a 4.0 scale
- (b) meeting criteria for selective admission to the University of Kentucky as established by Rule 4.2.1.1

The College of Nursing guarantees admission into the nursing curriculum to incoming freshmen who have a 28 ACT composite score (or the corresponding SAT score) and a 3.50 high school GPA, and who maintain a 3.25 cumulative GPA, both overall and in their science courses, each semester in their first year at the University.

2. Selection for admission to the nursing curriculum will occur at the sophomore level for all students based on the following criteria:

- (a) a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.75;
- (b) a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.75 in science courses;
- (c) a grade of "C" or better in all required prenursing courses;
- (d) completion of an approved Medicaid Nurse Aid training program;
- (e) for applicants whose first or primary language is not English, a minimum TOEFL score of 90, with minimum scores of 26 in speaking, 22 in listening, 20 in writing, and 22 in reading.

In addition, any or all of the following information may be evaluated as part of the admission application:

- (f) a writing exercise based on criteria established by the CON;

(g) two letters of reference from individuals who can assess potential for success (e.g. teacher, employer);

(h) an interview with members of the Admissions and Progression Committee, or their designees.

B. Criteria for Admission to the 4-year BSN Program for Transfer Students Include:
[US: 4/13/98; US 4/10/2000; US 4/10/2006]

1. for transfer students with less than 24 hours of college credit, meeting the criteria for entering freshman and a minimum grade point average of 2.75 on all college work attempted as computed by the Office of Admissions;
2. for transfer students with more than 24 hours of college credit, maintaining a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.75 on all college work attempted, and a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.75 in science courses, as computed by the Office of Admissions;
3. for applicants whose first or primary language is not English, a minimum TOEFL score of 90, with minimum scores of 26 in speaking, 22 in listening, 20 in writing, and 22 in reading;
4. grades of "C" or better in all courses required for CON curriculum;

In addition, any or all of the following may be requested as part of the application:

5. a writing exercise based on criteria established by the CON;
6. two letters of reference from individuals who can assess potential for success (e.g., teacher, employer, etc.); and
7. completion of an approved Medicaid Nurse Aid training program;
8. an interview with members of the Admission and Progression Committee or their designee.

C. Students will be eligible to apply for readmission the College of Nursing after suspension from the College when they meet criteria as stated in Section B 1 and 2 of this policy.

D. A student who is a registered nurse will be considered for admission to upper division courses in the nursing program based on the following criteria:

1. **For Associate Degree Nurses.** The registered nurse with an associate degree in nursing from a college accredited by one of the six regional academic accrediting associations will be considered for admission with a minimum GPA of 2.5 on a scale of 4.0 in all course work attempted as computed by the Office of Admissions. NOTE: RN licensure is required prior to beginning clinical experiences.

2. For Diploma Prepared Nurses. The registered nurse who is a graduate of a diploma program will be considered for admission after earning a minimum of 60 credits from a regionally accredited college with a 2.5 minimum GPA which include:

- English - 6 semester credits
- Natural Sciences – 6 semester credits
- Social Sciences – 6 semester credits
- Humanities – 6 semester credits
- Nursing* - 28 semester credits

*Nursing credits may be earned from regionally accredited colleges by taking the courses or by submission of a portfolio of RN licensure and experience to the RN-BSN Option Coordinator.

3. For Registered Nurses [US: 3/18/2013]. Registered nurses who received their nursing education abroad and are licensed to practice in the state of Kentucky will be considered for admission after earning or transferring in a minimum of 60 college credits with a 2.5 minimum GPA. These courses should include:

- English - 6 semester credits
- Natural Sciences – 6 semester credits
- Social Sciences – 6 semester credits
- Humanities – 6 semester credits
- Nursing* - 28 semester credits

NOTE: Nursing credits may be earned from regionally accredited colleges by taking the courses or by submission of a portfolio of RN licensure and experience to the RN-BSN Option Coordinator.

All nursing courses taken in associate degree or diploma programs are considered lower-division courses and are not equivalent to upper-division courses in this program. The applicant must have at least a GPA of 2.5 on a scale of 4.0 in all college course work attempted as computed by the Office of Admissions.

4. a statement of academic and professional goals;
5. a letter of reference from a supervisor.

The ~~preferred~~ application deadline is March-May 1 for the fall semester; ~~however, applicants will be considered on a space available basis until August 1 for the fall semester.~~ For spring semester, applications must ~~and be received by December 1~~ October 15 for spring semester.
[SC: 4/24/95; US 4/10/2000; SC: 10/30/06; US: 5/4/2009]

**University of Kentucky College of Medicine
2015 Program Change RE: Prerequisites for Admission**

Summary

In lieu of a program change form (which is not available for professional programs or required by University Senate rules), this cover letter serves as an overview and summary of proposed changes. In an effort to better prepare students for our M.D. program, the College of Medicine (COM) proposes to revise the M.D. program prerequisites for admission. As such, the COM proposes a change to Senate Rule 4.2.3.3, and new language for the University Bulletin, both related to admission to the College of Medicine.

Rationale

Nationally, medical education is under a period of substantial changes. The requirements for medical school entry and graduation have been revised and continue to undergo refinement of the standards. Colleges of medicine need flexibility in their admission requirements in order to optimize their medical education. As such, it does not seem appropriate to have detailed requirements in the Senate Rules, but rather reserve the specifics for the University Bulletin. The COM requests a change in the Senate Rule 4.2.3.3, paralleling the language approved by the University Senate in 2013 for the College of Pharmacy prerequisites for admission.

Current Senate Rule 4.2.3.3

Applicants for admission to the College of Medicine, in addition to meeting general University requirements, must meet the requirements of the College of Medicine and be accepted by the Medical Colleges Admissions Committee. Applicants normally will be required to have taken the MCAT and to have completed a liberal arts degree program in an accredited college of arts and sciences. However, consideration may be given to applicants who have completed only two or three years of college if their academic background and other credentials demonstrate superior ability. Applicants must be prepared with the following minimal requirements or their equivalent: two semesters of physics which includes laboratory work; two full-year courses in chemistry with laboratory, including organic chemistry; two semesters of biology with laboratory; and one year of English with emphasis on communicative skills.

Proposed Senate Rule 4.2.3.3 (tracked changes version)

Applicants for admission to the College of Medicine M.D. program, in addition to meeting general University requirements, must meet the requirements of the College of Medicine and be accepted by the ~~Medical Colleges~~College of Medicine Admissions Committee. Applicants normally will be required to have taken the MCAT and to have completed a liberal arts degree program in an accredited college of arts and sciences. However, consideration may be given to applicants who have completed only two or three years of college if their academic background and other credentials demonstrate superior ability. ~~Applicants must be prepared with the following minimal requirements or their equivalent: two semesters of physics which includes laboratory work; two full-year courses in chemistry with laboratory, including organic chemistry; two semesters of biology with laboratory; and one year of English with emphasis on communicative skills.~~ The required pre-medicine coursework

shall be listed the University Bulletin. Consideration for admission will be based on a holistic review of the applicant's previous academic record, potential for academic achievement, standardized admission test scores, assessment of communication skills, contribution to diversity, integrity, commitment, motivation, character, maturity and emotional stability.

Proposed Senate Rule 4.2.3.3 (clean version)

Applicants for admission to the College of Medicine M.D. program, in addition to meeting general University requirements, must meet the requirements of the College of Medicine and be accepted by the College of Medicine Admissions Committee. Applicants normally will be required to have taken the MCAT and to have completed a liberal arts degree program in an accredited college of arts and sciences. However, consideration may be given to applicants who have completed only two or three years of college if their academic background and other credentials demonstrate superior ability. The required pre-medicine coursework shall be listed the University Bulletin. Consideration for admission will be based on a holistic review of the applicant's previous academic record, potential for academic achievement, standardized admission test scores, assessment of communication skills, contribution to diversity, integrity, commitment, motivation, character, maturity and emotional stability.

If the change in Senate Rules is approved, the COM would propose new language for the University Bulletin to alter the existing admission requirements for students matriculating for the 2017-2018 academic year. This consists of two changes. First, the addition of biochemistry as a requirement within the chemistry courses and, second, a designation of semesters for the English requirement, so that language is consistent. An overview of the current and proposed prerequisites for admission to the M.D. program is provided below.

Current University Bulletin College of Medicine

"ACADEMIC PREPARATION FOR THE STUDY OF MEDICINE"

Medical science and practice involve complex relationships between physical, biological, psychological, cultural, and environmental aspects of human behavior. In the preparation for medical school, fundamental undergraduate college training in biology, chemistry, physics and English is essential. Minimal requirements are satisfied with the equivalent of two semesters of studies in physics; two semesters in the biological sciences; four semesters in chemistry, including organic chemistry; and at least one year of English with emphasis on communication skills such as reading, writing, and speaking.

Proposed University Bulletin College of Medicine

"ACADEMIC PREPARATION FOR THE STUDY OF MEDICINE" (tracked changes)

Medical science and practice involve complex relationships between physical, biological, psychological, cultural, and environmental aspects of human behavior. In the preparation for medical school, fundamental undergraduate college training in biology, chemistry, physics and English is essential. Minimal requirements are satisfied with the equivalent of two semesters of studies in physics; two semesters in the biological sciences; four semesters in chemistry, including organic chemistry and biochemistry; and at least ~~one year~~two semesters of English with emphasis on communication skills such as reading, writing, and speaking.

Proposed University Bulletin College of Medicine

“ACADEMIC PREPARATION FOR THE STUDY OF MEDICINE” (clean copy)

Medical science and practice involve complex relationships between physical, biological, psychological, cultural, and environmental aspects of human behavior. In the preparation for medical school, fundamental undergraduate college training in biology, chemistry, physics and English is essential. Minimal requirements are satisfied with the equivalent of two semesters of studies in physics; two semesters in the biological sciences; four semesters in chemistry, including organic chemistry and biochemistry; and at least two semesters of English with emphasis on communication skills such as reading, writing, and speaking.

Appendix: National Changes in Medical Education

For medical schools, the requirements for entry, the content being taught and the expectations of graduate skills have all had new standards established over the last five years. In his March 2012 address, Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) President and CEO Dr. Darrell Kirch described the need for a different kind of physician to appropriately respond to important shifts under way in health care. That same year, the AAMC announced the most significant changes to the Medical Colleges Admission Test (MCAT) in decades. Content would now require students to have a more advanced knowledge in the fields of biochemistry, sociology and psychology. The new MCAT released this year (2015) still contains two natural science sections, but a much larger focus of each (25% of biological/biochemical section and 25% of chemical/physical section) is biochemistry. Organic chemistry contributes a mere 15% of the chemical/physical section of the exam.

In terms of medical school graduation standards, in 2013, the AAMC published the Physician Competency Reference Set (PCRS), which established a common list of learner expectations in medical education. In 2014, the AAMC published the Core Entrustable Activities for Entering Residency (CEPAER), which defined the core skills all medical students should be able to perform before graduating medical school. In addition, the Liaison Committee for Medical Education (LCME) restructured all standards for medical school accreditation beginning in 2015. These new standards expanded the list of skills that must be taught by medical schools to include interprofessional education and self-directed learning. These considerable changes in the process and outcomes of medical education remain in a state of flux. Medical schools across the United States are experimenting with curricular changes to redesign the current medical education model to meet these new requirements. As new educational standards are developed, the medical education program of today will undoubtedly become obsolete in the upcoming years.