

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

April 1, 1983

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet on Monday, April 11, 1983 at 3:00 p.m. in the Classroom Building, room 106.

AGENDA:

- 1) Minutes of March 21, 1983.
- 2) Chairman's Remarks.
- 3) Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section V., 2.4.1 relative to the Absence Policy. (Circulated under date of March 31, 1983.)
- 4) Proposed change in Graduate Faculty Rules regarding transfer of credits. (Circulated under date of March 31, 1983.)
- 5) Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section V., 1.8.3, Grades for Students Who Withdraw or are Dropped. (Circulated under date of March 31, 1983.)
- 6) Proposed addition to University Senate Rules, Section VI., 1.7, Attendance and Participation During Appeal. (Circulated under date of March 31, 1983)
- 7) Proposed addition to University Senate Rules, Section VI., 1.3 (b) concerning Academic Evaluation. (Circulated under date of April 1, 1983)
- 8) Proposed selective admissions: Computer Science. (Circulated under date of April 1, 1983)
- 9) Proposed selective admissions for Allied Health Educator. (Circulated under date of April 1, 1983).
- 10) Proposed change in University grading system. (Circulated under date of March 31, 1983).
- 11) Proposed statements on sexual harassment in University Senate Rules Section VII, Faculty Code, and in Section VI, Student Academic Affairs. (Circulated under date of March 31, 1983.)

Page 2

University Senate Agenda - April 11, 1983
April 1, 1983

- 12) Proposed changes in University Senate Rules, Section VI, 4.0 ff.
Disposition of Cases of Academic Offenses. (Circulated under date
of April 1, 1983.)
- 13) Recommendations from the Senate Research Committee. (Circulated
under date of March 31, 1983.)

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

/cet

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, APRIL 11, 1983

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, April 11, 1983, in Room 106 of the Classroom Building.

Donald W. Ivey presided.

Members absent: R. A. Altenkirch*, Roger B. Anderson, Richard Angelo*, James Applegate*, Charles Barnhart, John Baseheart, Trudi Bellardo*, Jacques Benninga, Jack Blanton, James A. Boling, Peter P. Bosomworth*, Robert N. Bostrom*, Stanley D. Brunn*, Joseph T. Burch, Lois J. Campbell, David Chalk, Donald B. Clapp, Charlotte Clark, D. Kay Clawson*, Dan Clifford*, Henry Cole*, Glenn B. Collins, William L. Conger, Gary Cromwell, David E. Denton, Donald F. Diedrich, Richard C. Domek, Joseph M. Dougherty, Herbert N. Drennon, Jeff Dwellen, Nancy E. Dye, Anthony Eardley*, William Ecton*, Donald G. Ely*, Joseph L. Fink*, Ray Forgue*, Donald T. Frazier*, Michael Freeman, Tim Freudenberg*, Richard W. Furst, Art Gallaher, Jr., Charles P. Graves*, Thomas C. Gray, Joseph Hamburg, Robert Hemenway*, Lenda Hisle*, Michael Hislope, Donald Hochstrasser*, Raymond R. Hornback, Malcolm E. Jewell, Keith H. Johnson*, Peri Jean Kennedy*, Michael Kirkhorn, Joseph Krislov*, Robert G. Lawson*, Gwendolen Lee*, David Lowery, Bruce A. Lucas, Paul Mandelstam*, James R. Marsden, William L. Matthews, Joann Maurer, Marcus T. McEllistrem, Marion E. McKenna*, Dominic Mudd, Daniel N. Nelson, David S. Newburg*, Robert C. Nobel*, Clayton Omvig*, Leonard K. Peters, Janet Pisaneschi*, David Prior*, Thomas Roszman, Thomas A. Rush, Edgar Sagan, Otis A. Singletary*, John T. Smith, Stanford L. Smith*, Teresa Stathas, Marjorie Stewart*, Joseph V. Swintosky*, Glenn Terndrup*, John Thompson*, Manuel A. Tiggos*, Lee T. Todd, S. Sidney Ulmer, Richard Underwood, Marc J. Wallace*, Terry Warren, David Webster*, Charles Wethington, Paul A. Willis, Alfred D. Winer*, Constance L. Wood

There was no action taken on the minutes of the meeting of March 21, 1983, because they had not been circulated. There was a correction to be made on page 13. The linear equation should be $EGPA = -0.443 + 0.0534 ACT + 0.286 HSGPA$.

The Chairman made the following announcements:

"Jim Alcorn who has been the sergeant-at-arms for five years is retiring from the University; therefore he is retiring from his position as sergeant-at-arms. We will miss him and will have to find someone else.

This will be the last meeting of the senate unless we do not get through the agenda. I warn you about this ahead of time in case some of you have barrels of rhetoric you want to avail yourself of. I hope we can get through today.

I want to congratulate the senate on working through the selective admissions process. Although we got some bad press, I think you are to be congratulated.

The Ombudsman's report will be delivered in the fall semester because it is not ready for the spring. You can look forward to that as well as meeting the new Ombudsman who has not yet been chosen.

I would like to ask that the senate waive the ten-day circulation rule on the agenda items. Because there is lag

*Absence explained

time in duplicating and mailing, the agenda items were late."

There was no objection. The order of the agenda was changed in order to discuss the Computer Science Proposal first so that the entire meeting would not be televised.

The Chairman recognized Professor Douglas Rees for the presentation of the proposed selective admissions in computer science. Professor Rees, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposal which was circulated to members of the senate under date of April 1, 1983. Professor James Wells was present to answer questions.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Senator Yeh felt it was a shame to limit enrollment in the department but the question was whether to have a lot of students getting a poor program or have students who have demonstrated their ability the opportunity to have a good program. He was in favor of the proposal. Dean Ockerman said that he didn't see how the computer science proposal could be implemented in the Fall 1983 registration. He wanted to wait until Spring 1984. The Chairman said the proposal would have no effect on juniors and that way it would be put off for a whole year. Professor Wells spoke against the delay because he felt the implementation difficulties for fall would be minimal. The real conflict would be in completing the pre-major requirements. He added there would not be a crunch this fall because the Computer Science Department would be dealing with only a small number of students.

Following some further questions, the motion to adopt the Computer Science Admissions Policy carried unanimously and reads as follows:

Admissions Policy

The Computer Science Program comprises a lower-division component, consisting of 100- and 200-level courses, and an upper-division component or major based on 300-, 400- and 500-level courses. This division broadly corresponds to the first two and last two years of the program.

The lower-division component is open to all students who satisfy the listed prerequisites; however, admission to the University and successful completion of the lower-division component does not guarantee admission to the Computer Science major. Applicants seeking admission to the Computer Science major will be judged on the criteria listed below. The number of students admitted each academic year depends on the availability of resources - faculty, space, computing equipment - for the implementation of a high quality program.

Lower Division Admission

Admission to the University of Kentucky currently is sufficient for admission to the College of Arts and Sciences and to the lower-division component in Computer Science. Five Computer Science courses are available to students who have not been accepted for upper-division admission: CS 101, 102, 250, 270, and CS/MA 240.

Upper Division Admission

In order to qualify for the applicant pool and to be eligible for consideration for admission to a degree program in Computer Science, a student must fulfill the following requirements:

- 1) Enrollment in or, in case of transfer students, acceptance for admission to the University of Kentucky.
- 2) Completion of 60 semester hours and the English requirement of the College of Arts and Sciences.
- 3) Completion of the required lower-division courses CS 101, 102, 250, 270, CS/MA 240, MA 113, 114, 213 with a minimum GPA of 2.5.
- 4) Applicants from non-English-speaking countries are required to take the Test of English as Foreign Language (TOEFL) and must attain a minimum score of 550.
- 5) Submission of an application form to the College of Arts and Sciences, accompanied by a current official transcript and a course plan indicating that the course requirements set forth in 2) and 3) will be satisfied prior to admission to the Computer Science major.

The following selection criteria will be applied to the applicant pool:

- A) Those with a minimum GPA of 3.0 in the required lower-division CS/MA courses will be admitted automatically.
- B) Residual applicants will be linearly ordered according to the weighted average $(0.4) \text{ Overall GPA} + (0.5) \text{ GPA in L. Div. CS/MA} + (0.1) \text{ GPA in English Composition}$ and admitted to the Computer Science major as resources permit.

In this selection process, special consideration will be given those applicants who, while deficient in academic requirements, have demonstrated the essential skills and intellectual capacity for success in the Computer Science major.*

Normally, students apply for admission to the Computer Science major in the second semester of their sophomore year (the semester in which they will have accumulated 60 semester hours and completed the lower-division CS/MA requirements). Thus all grade-point averages used in the admissions procedure are based on academic work preceding the semester of application. Applications must be received by the College of Arts and Sciences no later than March 1 for the Fall semester and both Summer Sessions, and by October 1 for the Spring semester.

*A student who has been denied admission will have the right to appeal to a departmental faculty committee.

Those students approved for admission to the Computer Science major will be allowed to advance register; however, those subsequently found deficient may be asked to withdraw from upper-division Computer Science courses. Also, students who elect to defer seeking admission should be aware that those already admitted will be given enrollment preference.

Implementation Date: Fall Semester, 1983

The Chairman recognized Professor Douglas Rees for the presentation of the proposed change in the absence policy. Professor Rees, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section V., 2.4.1 relative to the Absence Policy which was circulated to members of the senate under date of March 31, 1983.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Professor Blues questioned how the policy could affect an instructor's absence policy which states that a student was allowed "X" number of absences per semester. He asked how certain absences which were excused would affect the policy. Professor Lacy's understanding was that excused absences would be those where the students would have an opportunity to make up the work. Professor Blues had a problem with that because in some courses a great deal would depend upon work in class, particularly in the writing courses in the English department. He moved that the proposal be sent back to the committee for further study. The motion was seconded.

Following further discussion and debate, the motion to send the proposal back to the committee for editorial and substantive changes passed.

The Chairman recognized Professor Douglas Rees for the presentation of the proposed change in Graduate Faculty Rules regarding transfer of credits. Professor Rees, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the change which was circulated to member of the senate under date of March 31, 1983. He said the proposal had been approved by the Graduate Council, the Graduate Faculty and the Senate Council.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Professor Gesund didn't see why a student could not go somewhere else for a semester and pick up nine credits instead of having to transfer work prior to admission to the University. He wanted the proposal revised so that a student could take courses elsewhere if needed during the program. Dean Royster said that was already taken care of by a visiting transient student status.

The motion in favor of the revision of the Graduate School rule passed unanimously and reads as follows:

Proposal: [revisions=underlined]

With the approval of the student's adviser, or major professor, the Director of Graduate Studies, and the Graduate Dean, a maximum of nine semester hours or twenty-five percent of the semester hours required for the degree concerned (exclusive of resident or thesis credit), whichever is greater, of regular graduate course credits earned prior

to admission to a given graduate degree program may be credited toward the minimum requirements of the Master's or Specialist degree in that graduate program provided that the grades earned were A or B. For example, such credits may be earned (1) as a student in another graduate program at the University of Kentucky, from which a degree was awarded, (2) as a post-baccalaureate graduate student at the University of Kentucky, or (3) as a graduate student at another accredited graduate school. In the event a student offers credits in more than one of these categories, the total to be credited toward the degree still may not exceed nine hours or twenty-five percent of the semester hours required for the degree concerned (exclusive of residence or thesis credit), whichever is greater. In no case will independent work, research, thesis or dissertation credit completed as a part of degree requirements for one program be considered to satisfy requirements of a subsequent master's program.

Rationale:

In the past, the Graduate School has allowed students to transfer nine (9) hours toward a given graduate degree program--that is, for programs in Plan A or Plan B at the master's level which usually require up to 36 hours. In some professional areas, however, the number of hours required for the degree is larger; the proposal would permit those programs which require more hours to accept a greater number of transfer credits toward the degree.

Implementation Date: Fall Semester, 1983.

The Chairman recognized Professor Douglas Rees for the presentation of the proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section V., 1.8.3, Grades for Students Who Withdraw or are Dropped. Professor Rees, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the change which was circulated to members of the senate under date of March 31, 1983. Professor Rees said that the main change was that the deans notify the instructors in writing when a student withdraws from class after mid-semester.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Professor Gesund said that his experience had been that a lot of nonacademic reasons for withdrawals had been by students doing poorly in class. Very seldom had he seen students withdraw who were doing well, and he felt deans should be checking with the instructors before agreeing to a nonacademic reason for withdrawal. Professor Blues agreed with Professor Gesund and proposed an amendment preceding the sentence "If such a petition is approved by the dean of the student's college....."

The amendment reads:

"Before acting on such a petition, the dean will consult with the instructor of the class."

Professor Gesund seconded the motion to amend.

After brief debate, the previous question was moved and passed. Professor Blues' motion to amend passed. The motion as amended passed unanimously and reads as follows:

Proposal: [Additions and/or changes=underlined]

V., 1.8.3 A student may withdraw from a class during the later half of the term upon approval by the dean of the student's college of a petition certifying urgent nonacademic reasons including but not limited to:

1. Illness or injury of the student;
2. Serious personal or family problems;
3. Serious financial difficulties.

Before acting on such a petition, the dean will consult with the instructor of the class. If such a petition is approved by the dean of the student's college, the dean shall inform in writing the instructor of the class of his action, and the student shall be assigned a grade of W.

Implementation Date: Fall Semester, 1983.

Chairman Ivey recognized Professor Douglas Rees for the presentation of the addition to the University Senate Rules, Section VI., 1.7, Attendance and Participation During Appeal. Professor Rees, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the addition which was circulated to members of the senate under date of March 31, 1983.

There were no questions or discussion and the motion as presented passed unanimously and reads as follows:

Background:

The proposed addition was recommended by the Academic Ombudsman and approved by the University Senate Council.

Proposal:

VI., 1.7 Attendance and Participation During Appeal
Students shall have the right to attend classes, to pursue their academic programs, and to participate in University functions during the consideration of any appeal.

Implementation Date: Fall Semester, 1983.

Chairman Ivey again recognized Professor Douglas Rees for the presentation of the proposed addition to the University Senate Rules, Section VI., 1.3 (b), concerning Academic Evaluation. This proposal was circulated to members of the senate under date of April 1, 1983. The Chair said the proposal gave the student a right to appeal anything rather than only a course grade, e.g. qualifying

examinations.

Extensive discussion followed, principally centering on appeals by students in professional programs where judgments are often based on criterion other than grades in courses.

Professor Kemp said that in view of the fact the proposal was going to create problems rather than solving them, he moved the proposal be tabled until April 1984. The motion was seconded. Professor Kemp's motion to table the proposal was defeated.

Dean Royster moved to send the proposal to the appropriate committee to discuss the various professional programs, what the relative issues were and then to bring it back to the senate. The motion was seconded. The motion in favor of returning the proposal to an appropriate committee passed.

The Chairman recognized Professor Douglas Rees for the presentation of the proposed selective admissions for Allied Health Education. Professor Rees, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposal which was circulated to members of the senate under date of April 1, 1983. The Chair said the proposal was part of a larger package which was to change the program in Allied Health Education.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Professor Lambert responded to questions related to the rationale behind the admissions standards after which the motion in favor of the proposal passed unanimously and reads as follows:

Change in Admissions Standards for Allied Health Education

Present: Completion of a two-year associate degree (or its equivalent as determined by achievement on proficiency and/or equivalency examinations acceptable to the University) from an accredited program in an allied health discipline.

Change to: Entry is permitted to those who complete an accredited program in an allied health discipline and the Preprofessional Requirements.

Present: An overall grade-point average of 2.0 on a 4.0 quality point scale in all course work attempted, as computed by the University Admissions Office.

Change to: An overall grade-point average of 2.5 on a 4.0 quality point scale in all course work attempted, as computed by the University Admissions Office.

Present: At least one year's professional experience (2000 hours) following acquisition of the associate degree.

Change to: Drop requirement.

Present: References from three allied health professionals.

Change to: References from three health professionals.

Present: Highest level of registration, certification and/or licensure appropriate to the allied health discipline.

Change to: Eligibility for professional practice as determined by the appropriate certifying, licensing or registering body of that particular discipline.

The Chairman recognized Professor Douglas Rees for the proposed change in the University grading system. Professor Rees, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposal which was circulated to members of the senate under date of March 31, 1983.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Extensive debate ensued and finally a motion was moved and seconded to send the proposal back to the committee.

Professor Canon said he knew the committee had looked very closely at the proposal and sending it back without guidance the senate would likely get the same thing back. He felt a vote should be made as to what the senate wanted. After a straw vote, the Chair said the proposal would be sent back to the committee for consideration of a complete +/-system rather than + only. Professor Harris said he wanted the committee to find out in detail how other universities feel about the pluses and minuses. Dean Ockerman suggested bringing all colleges under the same system with the recommendation of the pluses and minuses.

The Chairman recognized Professor Douglas Rees for the presentation of the proposed statements on sexual harassment in University Senate Rules Section VII, Faculty Code, and in Section VI, Student Academic Affairs. This was circulated under date of March 31, 1983.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. After lengthy discussion on the wording of the paragraph, Professor Jewell moved the previous question. The motion to include the statement in the University Senate Rules passed and reads as follows:

Recommendations for Section VI, Student Academic Affairs

Section 1.0 Academic Rights of Students (underlined portions are new):

Amend 1.3 to read:

Academic Evaluation

Students have the right to receive grades based only upon fair and just evaluations of their performance in a course as measured by the standards announced by their instructors at the first or second class meeting. Grades determined by anything other than their instructors' good faith judgment based on such standards are improper. Among irrelevant considerations are race, color, religion, sex, national origin, political affiliation, or activities outside the classroom that are unrelated to the course work. One form of sex discrimination is sexual harassment. It is defined as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other

verbal or physical conduct or written communication of an intimidating, hostile, or offensive sexual nature, when submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of the student's status in a course, program, or activity, as a basis for academic or other decisions affecting such student, or substantially interferes with a student's academic performance, or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or academic environment.

Section 2.0 The Academic Ombudsman:

Amend first paragraph 2.1.2 to read:

Jurisdiction

The authority of the Academic Ombudsman is restricted to issues of an academic nature involving students on the one hand and faculty or administrative staff on the other, explicitly governed by Sections IV, V, VI of the Rules of the University Senate. However, the Ombudsman may refer issues falling outside his/her jurisdiction to appropriate offices charged with the responsibility for dealing with them, such as the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs or the Affirmative Action Officer.

Amend 2.1.6 to read:

Liaison

The Academic Ombudsman shall maintain close liaison with the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, the Affirmative Action Officer and other such officials who have responsibility and concern for the academic governance of students. However, he shall not violate the rights of students or other parties involved in cases brought to him through the disclosure of any information communicated to him in confidence.

Amend first two sentences 2.1.7 to read:

Records and Reports

The Academic Ombudsman shall retain a record of all cases accepted. In cases involving discrimination (including sexual harassment), a summary of the case shall be sent to the Affirmative action Officer.

Recommendation for Section VII, Faculty Code.

The addition of the following statement under 2.1, "General Relations."

They shall respect the rights of all campus members to be given fair treatment and to be judged on basis other than race, religion, political belief, age, or sex. Sexual harassment is considered by the University of Kentucky to be one form of

sexual discrimination. (See Governing Regulation Part XII and Administrative Regulations-----) Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal or physical actions of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when:

Submission to such conduct is made explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment, promotion, or academic standing; as a basis for employment, promotion, or academic decisions; or substantially interferes with an individual's work or academic performance, or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive academic environment.

RATIONALE: These statements are simply necessary follow-ups of the Senate's adoption of a policy statement on sexual harassment.

Implementation Date: Immediately

The Chairman recognized Professor Douglas Rees for the presentation of the proposed change in the University Senate Rules, Section VI, 4.0 ff. This proposal concerned the Disposition of Cases of Academic Offenses and was circulated to members of the senate under date of April 1, 1983. The Chairman said two amendments had been suggested by Dean Baer which stated that anytime the number of days were mentioned in the appeals process, it meant school days. Under extenuating circumstances when the dean is unable to respond, his designee may do so. The committee accepted those.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Professor Gesund moved an amendment to change all mention of three (3) days to ten (10) days. The motion was seconded. Professor Pival told Professor Gesund the time limit was not when the professor discovered the offense but was when the investigation was started. Senator Yeh wanted to know if the charge involved sending a registered letter to the student telling what the problem was. Professor Pival said that was one possibility and the other was to face the student in a conference and make a charge. Professor Kao amended the amendment to "five (5) working days or seven (7) calendar days." Professors Pival and Gesund accepted the amendment. The amendment passed.

Professor Weil questioned item 4.3. Professor Pival said that applied to a situation where the Dean of the College discovered the penalty rather than the instructor. Professor Gesund had a problem with 4.1.c. He wanted to know what would happen if the student's address was incorrect. Professor Pival pointed out that on page 6 there was a statement that "failure of a student to apprise the Ombudsman of a change of address shall be cause for dismissal of the appeal." She said the idea of the certified letter was to protect the instructor and the University.

The previous question was moved and passed. The proposal as amended passed unanimously and reads as follows:

Background:

In May, 1982, the Senate Council appointed an ad hoc Committee to study the time frame for appeals procedures. In order to set an overall time limit on an appeal, the committee found it necessary to make changes in each step of the process. In summary, the recommendations follow below:

1. That an appeal should be taken through the complete process--from the date the student is confronted with the accusation to the hearing of the University Appeals Board--within a maximum of 60 days (unless the student delays the process.)
2. Delete the step requiring investigation by the dean of the college in which the academic offense occurs. This would place the responsibility of investigation and the burden of proof on the instructor and the department chair who are most closely involved with the infraction. An exception would have to be made for this in cases that include a non-academic violation, such as the theft of an exam, since the Student Code specifies that the Dean of Students must work with the dean in which the offense occurs. Deleting this level of investigation would allow the student full investigation by the Dean of the student's college, the Academic Ombudsman, and a hearing by the University Appeals Board. An unnecessary and time-consuming step could, without harm to the student, be eliminated.
3. The time frame the committee recommends for each step is as follows:
 - a. Submission of letter to student by instructor after initial charge is made--7 calendar days
 - b. Investigation and recommendation by department chair--7 days.
 - c. Recommendation and/or investigation by dean of students' college--7 days.
 - d. Student's appeal to Academic Ombudsman--15 days.
 - e. Investigation of Academic Ombudsman--21 days, unless student gives written permission to extend time for investigation.
 - f. Hearing of University Appeals Board--21 days.
4. An addition to the rules requiring the appealing student to keep a current address on file with the Academic Ombudsman; otherwise the case will be subject to dismissal.

4.0 Disposition of Cases of Academic Offenses

4.1 Responsibility of Instructor

- c. recommend a more severe sanction than the instructor may alone impose, by forwarding through the department chairman a written report of the offense to the dean of the student's college. Notice of action taken under b. and/or c. must be sent by the instructor, within 5 days after the accusation is made, to the student by certified mail with copies to the department chairman and the dean of the student's college.

Rationale: The teacher should, before accusing the student, investigate the incident and gather evidence to support any accusation of cheating or plagiarism. Therefore, five days should be sufficient to write a letter and to construct a file for the chairman and dean.

4.2 Responsibility of the Department Chairman

After reviewing the report referred to in 4.1.c. and making appropriate investigation, including the hearing and examination evidence presented by or in behalf of the student, the department chairman, within 7 days, forwards the file with a recommendation to the dean of the student's college. If, however, the offense also involves a violation of Part I, Code of Student Conduct, the report shall be sent first to the dean of the college in which the offense occurred with a copy to the Dean of Students and the dean of the student's college.

4.3 Responsibility: Dean of the College Where the Offense Occurred

Change last paragraph to:

Within 7 days after determining action to be taken under a., b., or c. notice must be sent by the dean to the student by certified mail, with copies to the instructor, and the department where the offense occurred, dean of the student's college, Registrar and Academic Ombudsman. In case of acting under c., notice of action should also be sent to the appropriate chancellor.

4.4 Responsibility of the Dean of the Student's College

Change to:

After reviewing the file forwarded by the department chairman or the dean of the college in which the offense took place, the dean shall, within 7 days, forward the file to the appropriate chancellor(s). Should a case arise where the deans are unable to reach agreement on the sanction to be recommended, their separate recommendations should be forwarded to the appropriate cancellor(s).

4.8 Responsibility of the Academic Ombudsman

Change to:

The Academic Ombudsman shall, within a reasonable time, preferably within 21 days of receiving the student's written appeal,....If the Academic Ombudsman cannot within 21 days of receiving the student's written appeal satisfactorily resolve the case, he/she shall forward a written report to the University Appeals Board with copies to the student, and to thw person who instituted the charge. However, the period may be extended to pcrmit more time for investigation with written approval of the student. The report should include copies of the student's appeal and report of the incident, and any reports submitted by the accuser.

4.9 Responsibility of the University Appeals Board

Change to:

The Hearing Officer of the University Appeals Board shall schedule a hearing in any case of cheating or plagiarism reported by the Ombudsman, the hearing to be held within 21 days of the receipt by the Hearing Officer of the Ombudsman's report, unless the student consents to an extension of time for the hearing. The student may withdraw the appeal at any time. Notices to the student will be sent by certified mail to the address on file with the Ombudsman; failure of a student to apprise the Ombudsman of a change of address shall be cause of dismissal of the appeal.

An additional recommendation made by the ad hoc committee and approved by the Senate Council is as follows:

Recommendation:

That the minimum sanction for cheating or plagiarism be made an E in the course.

Rationale:

This would eliminate the uneven punishment currently doled out in this University: some students who blatantly cheat get by with a lowered grade or an E on the paper; while others are suspended for a first, comparatively minor offense. An across the board penalty would not be unduly harsh, since the Appeals Board could recommend a lighter penalty if circumstances indicated it.

Implementation Date for all actions: Fall Semester, 1983

The final item on the agenda was consideration of recommendations from the Senate Research Committee. The Chairman said they could be accepted or rejected and asked if there were objections to the recommendations. Discussion concerned principally the significance of the research recommendations and the need to discuss them fully before accepting them. Professor Weil moved to table the report until the October meeting. There was a second. The motion to table the report until the October, 1983, meeting passed.

The meeting adjourned at 4:48 p.m.

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

Phillip N. Dare
Instr. Service
4 King Library

0039

1

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

March 31, 1983

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, April 11, 1983.
Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section V., 1.8.3,
Grades for Students Who Withdraw or are Dropped.

Background:

At the request of several faculty members, the Senate Council asked the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee to consider changes in the current policy regarding withdrawal from classes. In response, the Committee recommends the changes below; the Senate Council concurs.

Proposed: [Additions and/or changes=underlined]

V., 1.8.3 A student may withdraw from a class during the latter half of the term upon approval by the dean of the student's college of a petition certifying urgent non-academic reasons including but not limited to:

1. Illness or injury of the student;
2. Serious personal or family problems;
3. Serious financial difficulties.

If such a petition is approved by the dean of the student's college, the dean shall inform in writing the instructor of the class of his action, and the student shall be assigned a grade of W.

Rationale:

Under the present policy, an instructor may not know that a student withdraws after the half-way point of the semester until he/she sees the grade card at the end of the semester. The proposed change will require notification of the instructor of the dean's action.

The committee does not think it is necessary for the instructor to be involved in the decision as to whether or not a student should be allowed to withdraw for non-academic reasons. The instructor is in no better position to judge what constitutes "urgent non-academic reasons" than the dean.

Implementation Date: Fall Semester, 1983.

/cet

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

March 31, 1983

TO: Members, University Senate
FROM: University Senate Council
RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, April 11, 1983
Proposed addition to University Senate Rules, Section VI, 1.7

Background:

The proposed addition was recommended by the Academic Ombudsman and approved by the University Senate Council.

Proposal:

VI., 1.7 Attendance and Participation During Appeal
Students shall have the right to attend classes, to pursue their academic programs, and to participate in University functions during the consideration of any appeal.

Rationale:

Currently only students appealing academic offenses (charges of plagiarism and cheating) are entitled to the right of class attendance and participation during the consideration of any appeal. That right should be extended to students appealing questions or violations of their academic rights.

Implementation Date: Fall Semester, 1983.

/cet

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

March 31, 1983

TO: MEMBERS, UNIVERSITY SENATE

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: Inclusion of a statement on sexual harassment in Senate Rules Section VII, Faculty Code, and in Section VI, Student Academic Affairs.

Recommendations for Section VI, Student Academic Affairs.

Section 1.0 Academic Rights of Students (underlined portions are new):

Emend 1.3 to read:

Academic Evaluation

Students have the right to receive grades based only upon fair and just evaluations of their performance in a course as measured by the standards announced by their instructors at the first or second class meeting. Grades determined by anything other than their instructors' good faith judgment based on such standards are improper. Among irrelevant considerations are race, color, religion, sex, national origin, political affiliation, or activities outside the classroom that are unrelated to the course work. One form of sex discrimination is sexual harassment. It is defined as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal or or physical conduct or written communication of an intimidating, hostile, or offensive sexual nature, when submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of the student's status in a course, program, or activity, as a basis for academic or other decisions affecting such student, or substantially interferes with a student's academic performance, or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or academic environment.

Section 2.0 The Academic Ombudsman:

Emend first paragraph 2.1.2 to read:

Jurisdiction

The authority of the Academic Ombudsman is restricted to issues of an academic nature involving students on the one hand and faculty or administrative staff on the other, explicitly governed by Sections IV, V, VI of the Rules of the University Senate. However, the Ombudsman may refer issues falling

outside his/her jurisdiction to appropriate offices charged with the responsibility for dealing with them, such as the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs or the Affirmative Action Officer.

Emend 2.1.6 to read:

Liaison

The Academic Ombudsman shall maintain close liaison with the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, the Affirmative Action Officer and other such officials who have responsibility and concern for the academic governance of students. However, he shall not violate the rights of students or other parties involved in cases brought to him through the disclosure of any information communicated to him in confidence.

Emend first two sentences 2.1.7 to read:

Records and Reports

The Academic Ombudsman shall retain a record of all cases accepted. In cases involving discrimination (including sexual harassment), a summary of the case shall be sent to the Affirmative Action Officer.

Recommendation for Section VII, Faculty Code.

The addition of the following statement under 2.1, "General Relations."

They shall respect the rights of all campus members to be given fair treatment and to be judged on bases other than race, religion, political belief, age, or sex. Sexual harassment is considered by the University of Kentucky to be one form of sexual discrimination. (See Governing Regulations Part XII and Administrative Regulations-----)
Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal or physical actions of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when:

Submission to such conduct is made explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment, promotion, or academic standing; as a basis for employment, promotion, or academic decisions; or substantially interferes with an individual's work or academic performance, or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive academic environment.

RATIONALE: These statements are simply necessary follow-ups of the Senate's adoption of a policy statement on sexual harassment.

Implementation: Immediate

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

April 1, 1983

TO: Members, Univeristy Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, April 11, 1983.
Proposed admissions policy, Department of Computer Science.

Background:

The attached proposed admissions policy for the Department of Computer Science has been reviewed and approved by the department faculty, the A&S Faculty Council, the Undergraduate Council, the Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards and the University Senate Council.

The proposed plan is not to limit enrollment in the lower-division component of the program to any student regardless of his/her department or college but to use performance in this component of the program for deciding which scheme for admission to the upper-division is not substantially different from the one recently adopted by the University Senate for the University as a whole. Students could be automatically accepted or rejected based on their GPA in the lower-division computer science and mathematics component of the program. Those not falling into one of the categories would be rank ordered according to a weighted formula and admitted according to tank as space and resources permit.

Implementation Date: Fall Semester, 1983.

Note: If approved, the proposed standards will be forwarded to the Senate Rules Committee for codification.

/cet

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

April 1, 1983

MEMO

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: Change in Admissions standards for Allied
Health Education

Present: Completion of a two-year associate degree (or its equivalent as determined by achievement on proficiency and/or equivalency examinations acceptable to the University) from an accredited program in an allied health discipline.

Change to: Entry is permitted to those who complete an accredited program in an allied health discipline and the Preprofessional Requirements.

Present: An overall grade-point average of 2.0 on a 4.0 quality point scale in all course work attempted, as computed by the University Admissions Office.

Change to: An overall grade-point average of 2.5 on a 4.0 quality point scale in all course work attempted, as computed by the University Admissions Office.

Present: At least one year's professional experience (2000 hours) following acquisition of the associate degree.

Change to: Drop requirement.

Present: References from three allied health professionals.

Change to: References from three health professionals.

Present: Highest level of registration, certification and/or licensure appropriate to the allied health discipline.

Change to: Eligibility for professional practice as determined by the appropriate certifying, licensing or registering body of that particular discipline.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

April 1, 1983

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, April 11, 1983.
Proposed changes in University Senate Rules, Section VI, 4.0 ff.
Disposition of Cases of Academic Offenses.

Background:

In May, 1982, the Senate Council appointed an ad hoc Committee to study the time frame for appeals procedures. In order to set an overall time limit on an appeal, the committee found it necessary to make changes in each step of the process. In summary, the recommendations follow below.

1. That an appeal should be taken through the complete process--from the date the student is confronted with the accusation to the hearing of the University Appeals Board--within a maximum of 60 days (unless the student delays the process).
2. Delete the step requiring investigation by the dean of the college in which the academic offense occurs. This would place the responsibility of investigation and the burden of proof on the instructor and the department chair who are most closely involved with the infraction. An exception would have to be made for this in cases that include a non-academic violation, such as the theft of an exam, since the Student Code specifies that the Dean of Students must work with the dean in which the offense occurs. Deleting this level of investigation would not interfere with the student's right to due process and would allow the student full investigation by the Dean of the student's college, the Academic Ombudsman, and a hearing by the University Appeals Board. An unnecessary and time-consuming step could, without harm to the student, be eliminated.
3. The time frame the committee recommends for each step is as follows:
 - a. Submission of letter to student by instructor after initial charge is made--3 days.
 - b. Investigation and recommendation by department chair--7 days.
 - c. Recommendation and/or investigation by dean of student's college--7 days.
 - d. Student's appeal to Academic Ombudsman-- 15 days.
 - e. Investigation of Academic Ombudsman--21 days, unless student gives written permission to extend time for investigation.
 - f. Hearing of University Appeals Board--21 days.
4. An addition to the rules requiring the appealing student to keep a current address on file with the Academic Ombudsman; otherwise the case will be subject to dismissal.

The following specific recommendations for changes in the USR are recommended by the ad hoc committee and the University Senate Council. If approved, these items will be forwarded to the Senate Rules Committee for codification.

4.0 Disposition of Cases of Academic Offenses

4.1 Responsibility of Instructor

- c. recommend a more severe sanction than the instructor may alone impose, by forwarding through the department chairman a written report of the offense to the dean of the college where the offense occurred. Notice of action taken under b. and/or c. must be sent by the instructor to the student by certified mail, with copies to the department chairman and the dean of the college where the offense occurred, and the dean of the student's college.

Change to:

- c. recommend a more severe sanction than the instructor may alone impose, by forwarding through the department chairman a written report of the offense to the dean of the student's college. Notice of action taken under b. and/or c. must be sent by the instructor, within 3 days after the accusation is made, to the student by certified mail with copies to the department chairman and the dean of the student's college.

Rationale: The teacher should, before accusing the student, investigate the incident and gather evidence to support any accusation of cheating or plagiarism. Therefore, three days should be sufficient to write a letter and to construct a file for the chairman and dean.

4.2 Responsibility of the Department Chairman

After reviewing the report referred to in 4.1.c and making appropriate investigation, the department chairman forwards the file, with his recommendation, to the dean of the college where the offense occurred.

Change to:

After reviewing the report referred to in 4.1.c. and making appropriate investigation, including the hearing and examination of evidence presented by or in behalf of the student, the department chairman, within 7 days, forwards the file with a recommendation to the dean of the student's college. If, however, the offense also involves a violation of Part I, Code of Student Conduct, the report shall be sent first to the dean of the college in which the offense occurred with a copy to the Dean of Students and the dean of the student's college.

Rationale for the change:

Note that the step for sending the file in an academic offense to the dean in which the offense occurs has been omitted. This step seems an unnecessary part of the appeals process and adds considerable time to it. It is the instructor's obligation to establish proof of guilt, not either dean's, unless, of course, the dean discovers the offense. Also, since the chairman as an officer of the college is involved in the recommended sanction, it seems logical to send the report directly to the dean of the student's college, except in those cases where the Dean of Students might also be involved in the case, and when the dean of the college discovers the offense.

4.3 Responsibility: Dean of the College Where the Offense Occurred

When a violation of Part I, Code of Student Conduct, Section 1.21 c,d,e,f,g,h,i,m,o,q, or r and a violation of Part II, Selected Rules of the University Senate Governing Academic Relationships, Section on Academic Offenses and Procedures, has allegedly been committed in the same set of circumstances or facts, the Dean of Students shall first consult with the dean of the college where the offense occurred. They shall determine whether the Dean of Students, the dean of the college where the offense occurred, or both will investigate and pursue the case in accordance with appropriate procedure(s) and authority(ies) as set forth in Part I or Part II of Student Rights and Responsibilities.

After reviewing the file or report, the dean may then take one or more of the following actions listed under a., b., and c.

When it is the dean who initially finds that a student has committed an academic offense in a college non-classroom situation, the dean should first arrange a personal conference with the student and do the following: present the evidence with respect to the offense; give the student an opportunity to state his/her case; and make known to the student the charges, if any, and the possible sanctions which may be imposed or recommended. If the student is not reasonably available or fails to attend such a conference, the dean shall proceed to inform the student of the nature of the evidence, charges and possible sanctions by certified mail.

The dean may then take one or more of the following actions listed below:

- a. force the student to withdraw from the course in which the offense occurred;

- b. if the student is enrolled in the college where the offense occurred, forward the file to the appropriate chancellor recommending a sanction of suspension, dismissal or expulsion;
- c. if the student is enrolled in another college, forward the file to the Dean of the student's college recommending a sanction of suspension, dismissal or expulsion. In any case of disagreement with respect to such a sanction, the deans shall forward their separate recommendations to the appropriate chancellor(s).

Notice of action(s) taken under a., b., or c. must be sent by the Dean to the student by certified mail, with copies to the instructor, and the department where the offense occurred, dean of the student's college, Registrar and Academic Ombudsman. In case of acting under c., notice of action should also be sent to the appropriate chancellor.

Change last paragraph to:

Within 7 days after determining action to be taken under a., b., or c. notice must be sent by the dean to the student by certified mail, with copies to the instructor, and the department where the offense occurred, dean of the student's college, Registrar and Academic Ombudsman. In case of acting under c., notice of action should also be sent to the appropriate chancellor.

- 4.4 Responsibility of the Dean of the Student's College
After reviewing the file referred to in c., and making any appropriate investigation, the dean may forward the file to the appropriate chancellor (s) recommending a sanction of suspension, dismissal or expulsion. Should a case arise where the deans are unable to reach agreement on the sanction to be recommended, their separate recommendations should be forwarded to the appropriate chancellor(s).

Notice of action taken must be sent by the dean to the student by certified mail, with copies to the instructor, department chairman and dean of the college where the offense occurred, Academic Ombudsman and the Registrar.

Change to:

After reviewing the file forwarded by the department chairman or the dean of the college in which the offense took place, the dean shall, within 7 days, forward the file to the appropriate chancellor(s). Should a case

arise where the deans are unable to reach agreement on the sanction to be recommended, their separate recommendations should be forwarded to the appropriate chancellor(s).

4.8 Responsibility of the Academic Ombudsman

The Academic Ombudsman shall, within a reasonable time, preferably within 30 days of receiving the student's written appeal, attempt to resolve the case to the satisfaction of the student and of the instructor or dean imposing or recommending the sanction. If the Academic Ombudsman cannot satisfactorily resolve the case, he shall forward a written report to the University Appeals Board with copies to the student, and to the instructor or dean.

Change to:

The Academic Ombudsman shall, within a reasonable time, preferably within 21 days of receiving the student's written appeal,....If the Academic Ombudsman cannot within 21 days of receiving the student's written appeal satisfactorily resolve the case, he/she shall forward a written report to the University Appeals Board with copies to the student, and to the person who instituted the charge. However, this period may be extended to permit more time for investigation with written approval of the student. The report should include copies of the student's appeal and report of the incident, and any reports submitted by the accuser.

4.9 Responsibility of the University Appeals Board

After the Academic Ombudsman has forwarded a written report to the University Appeals Board, the student and also the instructor or dean may file a statement with the Board. The Board will then decide by majority vote whether or not to hear the case, except that it must hear any case in which a student has appealed suspension, dismissal or expulsion.

Change to:

The Hearing Officer of the University Appeals Board shall schedule a hearing in any case of cheating or plagiarism reported by the Ombudsman, the hearing

to be held within 21 days of the receipt by the Hearing Officer of the Ombudsman's report, unless the student consents to an extension of time for the hearing. The student may withdraw the appeal at any time. Notices to the student will be sent by certified mail to the address on file with the Ombudsman; failure of a student to apprise the Ombudsman of a change of address shall be cause for dismissal of the appeal.

An additional recommendation made by the ad hoc Committee and approved by the Senate Council is as follows:

Recommendation:

That the minimum sanction for cheating or plagiarism be made an E in the course.

Rationale:

This would eliminate the uneven punishment currently doled out in this University: some students who blatantly cheat get by with a lowered grade or an E on the paper; while others are suspended for a first, comparatively minor offense. An across the board penalty would not be unduly harsh, since the Appeals Board could recommend a lighter penalty if circumstances indicated it.

Implementation Date for all actions: Fall Semester, 1983.

/cet