

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, April 23, 2001

The University Senate met in regular session at 3.00 p.m., April 23, 2001 in the Auditorium of the W.T. Young Library.

The attendance records were lost due to the Administration Building fire.

Chairperson Bill Fortune called the meeting to order.

The Chair indicated that the minutes of the 9 April 2001 meeting had been circulated and asked for corrections. There being none, the Chair stated that the minutes would stand as circulated.

Chairperson Fortune made several announcements:

- a. Two rule waivers were granted by the Senate Council:
 - 1) On April 16, 2001, at the request of the student's college, the Council waived the time requirements of the incomplete grade rule (V -5.1.3.2) to allow the student to receive the grade awarded by the student's professor;
 - 2) One March 19, 2001, the Senate Council waived the requirements of the incomplete grade rule at the request of the College for a student whose illness prevented the student from completing the work within the time required by the rule.
- b. The Senate Council asked the Faculty Trustees to raise the Health Insurance Issue at the April Board of Trustees meeting (this was done).
- c. Board of Trustee Ballot #3 will be going out this week. The ballots for University Senate and Undergraduate Council will be going out soon.

Chairperson Fortune introduced Susan Scollay and Carolyn Bratt, who presented a summary of the Committee on the Status of Women's 2001 report. The chair read the following statement on behalf of the Council: "On April 16, the Senate Council voted to endorse the 2001 report including its principles and concerns and stated it looked forward to working with the entire University community to formulate, implement and measure responses to ensure gender equity at the University." Professors Bratt and Scollay were thanked and given a round of applause.

The chair introduced Caludia Peck-Heath who made a brief report on the work of the self-study committee. She urged faculty to complete the evaluation forms which had been distributed.

Several Council committee chairs made brief reports: Jane Wells (Academic Advising), Benjamin Karp (Academic Facilities), Lori Gonzales (Academic Organization and Structure), Roy Moore (Academic Planning and Priorities), Charles Coulston (Academic Programs), George Blandford (Admissions and Academic Standards), David Durant (Admissions Advisory Council), Ling Hwey Jeng (Library), Brad Canon (Rules and Elections).

ACTION ITEMS:

The full text of the motions passed is available on the Senate web site and is made part of the permanent records of the Senate.

Action Item A: Proposal to Eliminate the University Studies cross-disciplinary requirement on the recommendation of the University Studies Committee. A friendly amendment was accepted to insert the words "beyond those used to fulfill other USP requirements." Passed as amended on a voice vote after discussion, the motion reads:

Eliminate the Cross-Disciplinary requirement and allow students to complete electives in order to complete the required 6-credit hours of general education with the constraint that at least 3 credit hours beyond those used to fulfill other USP requirements must be taken outside of the major. Implementation date Fall 2002.

Action item B: Proposal to modify the rules governing Admission, Retention and Exit from University of Kentucky Education Programs in order to comply with Kentucky Department of Education requirements. This lengthy proposal was placed before the Senate on recommendation of the Senate Council and passed on voice vote without discussion. This rule will be codified as Senate Rule 4.2.2.3 and will replace Rules 4.2.2.3 and 5.4.1.2.

Action item C: The Senate Council asked the Senate to approve the COSFL statement on University Governance. Passed on voice vote without discussion.

Action item D: The Rules Committee and Senate Council asked the Senate to change the beginning date of terms on the Senate, Graduate Council, and Undergraduate Council from September 1 to August 16. The proposal passed on a voice vote without discussion.

Action item E: The Advising Committee and Senate Council asked the Senate to make minor changes in Rule 5.3.1.2 (Probation) and 5.3.1.3 (Suspension). The proposals passed on a voice vote after discussion.

The changes in 5.2.1.2:

- 1) allow freshmen whose first semester GPAs are between 1.75 and 1.99 to be placed on probation without a "warning" semester;
- 2) slightly modify and codify (make part of the rule) two rules interpretations;
- 3) make it clear that a student must obtain the minimum college GPA in order to receive a degree from that college; and
- 4) change "semester" to "term" in several places.

The changes in 5.3.1.3:

- 1) make it clear that students on suspension may not take special UK examinations;
- 2) clarify the procedure for notifying the Registrar of rescission of suspensions; and
- 3) change "semester" to "term" in several places.

Retiring trustee Dan Reedy ended the academic year with inspirational thoughts about his years as a faculty trustee and leader.

The meeting was adjourned around 4:00 p.m.

David Durant
Secretary, University Senate

USMin 4.23.01

AGENDA

11 April 2001

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet in special session on Monday, April 23, 2001 at 3:00 PM in the first floor Auditorium, W.T. Young Library.

AGENDA:

1. Approval of Minutes: 9 April 2001.
2. Chair's Announcements
3. Senate Committee Reports

Action items:

- 1) Action on a proposal to eliminate the cross-disciplinary requirement of USP. See attached item "A".
- 2) Education: Admissions and Retention rules. See attached Item "B"
- 3) Endorsement of the COSFL Statement on University Governance. See attached Item "C"
- 4) Proposal to change terms of University Senators, and members of the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils. See attached item "D"
- 5) Comments by Dan Reedy on his retirement as Faculty Trustee

Note: Item E (Suspension and Probation Rules) was added after the agenda was circulated.

David Durant
Secretary

Item "A"

After receiving comments from the Senate and the Senate Council the USP committee withdrew the proposal to amend the cross-cultural requirement, and amended the proposal to drop the cross-disciplinary requirement to require three of the "freed" hours to be fulfilled by a course outside the major. The Senate Council recommends approval of this proposal.

University Studies Committee Recommendations April 6, 2001 for consideration by the University Senate on 23 April

Cross-Disciplinary Requirement

- a. Proposal: Eliminate the Cross Disciplinary requirement and allow students to complete electives in order to complete the required 48-credit hours of general education with the constraint that at least 3 credit hours must be taken outside of the major. Implement this recommendation Fall 2002.
- b. Assess the impact of the change on the quality of general education and consider further changes as needed.
- c. Rationale
 - i. Survey results indicate overwhelming faculty support for the elimination of the Cross Disciplinary requirement.
 - ii. Most of the current paired offerings lack the curricular and pedagogical connections originally intended and in many cases represent arbitrary pairings that offer no opportunity for students to experience a cross-disciplinary perspective.
 - iii. Courses are not offered regularly, which disrupts student scheduling and progress to degree.
 - iv. Paired courses are often taken out of sequence or with significant delays between courses, contrary to the intent of the requirement.
 - v. Many of the course options consist of courses also listed under the disciplinary course options

Implementation Date: Fall Semester, 2002

Note: If approved the proposal will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification

Item "B"

The University Senate Council proposes the adoption of the following rule, to be codified as Senate Rule 4.2.2.3, which will replace current Senate Rules 4.2.2.3 and 5.4.1.2.

The rationale for the proposal is that the changes are required by the state of Kentucky for students seeking admission to the teacher certification program.

The rationale for the codification is that the teacher certification rules should appear in one place in the Senate Rules, rather than being divided between admission and graduation requirements. Proposed Rule 4.2.2.3 is followed by the Senate Rules which that Rule will replace.

The proposal has been approved by the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee and the Senate Council and is recommended for Senate adoption.

Implementation Date: Immediate

Proposed rule 4.2.2.3.

**ADMISSION, RETENTION AND EXIT FROM UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS**
January, 2000

A student must be admitted to, retained in, and successfully exit from a state-approved teacher education program in order to receive a teaching certificate. The components of an approved teacher preparation program include: 1) an earned bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education, 2) completion of approved teaching subject matter field(s), 3. Successful completion of state mandated testing, 4) completion of a teacher preparation program, including student teaching, 5) and verification by program faculty that all applicable standards have been met.

The College of Education Certification Program Faculties, the College of Education Director of Academic Services and Teacher Certification, and the University Registrar are charged with the responsibility to monitor a student's progress through the teacher preparation program, and to recommend to the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) that a successful candidate be awarded a state teaching license (certificate).

I. Continuous Assessment In Teacher Education Programs

A. A student's progress through all teacher preparation programs is continuously monitored, assessed, and reviewed. In addition to typical evaluation processes that occur as part of their course work and field placements, students will be assessed a minimum of three times during their program by representatives of their respective program faculty.

B. The three assessments will occur upon entry into the Teacher Education Program, at a midpoint in the program (no later than the semester prior to student teaching), and as students exit the program following student teaching. Assessments will include, but are not limited to: (a) appropriate scores on approved standardized tests, (b) review of grades via inspection of transcript, (c) personal and professional skills assessed during interviews with program faculty, when taking campus based courses, and during field experiences, (d) portfolio documents, and (e) continued adherence to the KY Professional Code of Ethics.

C. Following admission to a teacher education program, if problems have been identified at any assessment point, program faculty will determine a plan for addressing the problems and implement the plan including feedback and direction to the student. In addition, if specific strengths are recognized during these assessments, the student will be commended.

II. Standards For Admission To A Teacher Education Program

1. Candidates for admission must have completed at least 60 semester hours, or, if pursuing initial certification as a post-baccalaureate graduate or graduate student, must have earned a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
2. Candidates for admission must demonstrate academic achievement by earning a minimum overall GPA of 2.50. In addition, post-baccalaureate graduate and graduate level students must demonstrate a minimum 2.50 GPA in the teaching subject matter field(s). Students

seeking admission to a Master's Degree initial certification program must also satisfy UK Graduate School admissions standards.

3. Candidates for admission must certify their knowledge of the Kentucky Professional Code of Ethics and must sign a state mandated character and fitness review.
4. Candidates for admission must demonstrate aptitude for teaching by presenting three letters of recommendation from individuals who can attest to the candidate's potential success in teaching.
5. Candidates must present an Admissions Portfolio. Although the contents of the portfolio will vary by program, it will include at least the following: "best piece" sample(s) of writing in the subject matter field(s); evidence of experience with students and/or community; and a written autobiography or resume.
6. Candidates for admission must demonstrate an acceptable level of skills in written communication. This will be assessed through an on-demand writing task at the time of the interview. In lieu of an on-demand task, program faculty may require that the candidate demonstrate having earned a minimum grade of 'B' in a college-level written composition course.
7. Candidates for admission must demonstrate an acceptable level of skills in oral communication. This will be assessed by the program faculty at the time of the admissions interview. In lieu of assessing oral communication skills at the time of the interview, the program faculty may require that students have earned at least a 'B' in a college level public speaking course.
8. Candidates for admission must present acceptable scores on one of the following standardized tests:

ACT, with minimum composite score of 21.

SAT, minimum composite score of 990 (combination of Verbal and Quantitative). A minimum grade of 'B' on a college level written composition course must accompany the SAT scores. Composition courses normally used to fulfill this requirement include ENG 101, ENG 102, ENG 105, ENG 305, or an equivalent course from another institution. Advanced Placement English used to fulfill the USP writing requirement may also be used.

GRE, minimum composite score of 1200 (combination of Verbal, Quantitative, Analytic). A minimum grade of 'B' on a college level written composition course must accompany the SAT scores. Composition courses normally used to fulfill this requirement include ENG 101, ENG 102, ENG 105, ENG 305, or an equivalent course from another institution. Advanced Placement English used to fulfill the USP writing requirement may also be used.

PRAXIS Core Battery Communication Skills (646 required) and General Knowledge (643 required) tests.

PRAXIS I Reading Test (173 paper or 320 computer), Mathematics (173 paper, 318 computer), and Writing (172 paper, 318 computer).

Rules which accompany the standardized testing requirements are as follows:

No standardized test scores older than eight years can be used to meet this requirement.

GRE scores may be used only by students who hold a bachelor's degree.

Students may retake subtests in multi-part tests.

Students seeking entrance to a graduate degree initial certification program must meet both the graduate school rules regarding the GRE, and College of Education rules for certificate program standardized testing.

9. For those programs requiring EDP 202 as a prerequisite for admission to teacher education, students must complete EDP 202 with a grade of C or better.

III. Retention of Candidates In Teacher Education Programs

A. The progress of candidates who have been admitted to a teacher education program is continuously monitored. Some of the items which are monitored are: (a) whether a student continues to earn grades of C or better in professional education classes, (b) whether a student continues to maintain 2.50 minimum GPAs overall, 2.50 in the professional education component as defined in the student's program description, and 2.50 in all required subject areas, (c) whether a student continues to demonstrate adherence to the EPSB Professional Code of Ethics, and (d) whether adequate progress is being made in building the Working Portfolio.

B. If problems are identified, program faculty will determine a plan for addressing the problems and implement the plan including feedback and direction to the student.

C. Prior to the student teaching semester, each candidate will be asked to provide evidence in the form of the Working Portfolio to demonstrate the acquisition of skills related to teaching in the chosen subject field, and to document progress in any identified problem areas. Each candidate's portfolio will be reviewed by the appropriate program faculty, and continued progress through the program will be contingent on the results of this midpoint review.

D. Admission to student teaching requires a successful retention review and recommendation by the program faculty that the candidate be allowed to student teach.

E. All teacher certification candidates are encouraged to complete the required state-mandated examinations prior to beginning student teaching.

IV. Exit From Teacher Certification Programs

A. All candidates for completion of a teacher education program must continue to meet all standards for admission and retention at the time of exit.

B. At exit, all teacher certification candidates must present an Exit Portfolio for review by the appropriate program faculty. The exit portfolio will be organized by Kentucky New Teacher Standards and will include a mix of items selected by the candidate and required by the particular program faculty.

C. The program faculty must certify that a review of the Exit Portfolio, and other pertinent documents has demonstrated that the candidate has met all of the Kentucky New Teacher Standards as a prerequisite to recommending the candidate for a teaching license.

D. Prior to exit from the teacher certification program, candidates must have successfully completed all On-demand Portfolio Tasks required by the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board.

E. Prior to exit from the teacher certification program all candidates must achieve required cut-off scores on all Kentucky state mandated teacher certification tests.

V. State Mandated Testing And The Kentucky Teacher Internship

A. Successful completion of the examinations required by the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board is a precondition for the granting of a teaching license (certificate).

B. Upon being recommended by the College of Education for a Kentucky Teaching License (Certificate), a candidate will be issued a Kentucky Letter of Eligibility for the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program. Upon employment in a Kentucky P-12 school, the candidate will receive a one year license to practice as a fully qualified intern teacher. After successfully completing the internship year, the candidate will be eligible for a regular Kentucky Professional Teaching License (Certificate).

C. Information concerning licensure in other states is available from the College of Education office of Academic Services and Teacher Certification.

VI. Admission And Graduation For Secondary Education Students Not Seeking Admission To A Teacher Certification Program

1. All students pursuing a secondary education major without teacher certification must be admitted to advanced standing as described in items 2-4 below.
2. To be admitted to advanced standing a student must have completed at least 60 semester hours.
3. Students must demonstrate academic achievement by earning a minimum overall GPA of 2.50 at the time of applying for advanced standing. At the time of graduation, students must demonstrate not only a minimum overall GPA of 2.50, but also a minimum GPA of 2.50 in the teaching subject matter field(s).
4. All requests for admission to advanced standing must be reviewed by appropriate faculty advisors. Students not recommended for advanced standing by an appropriate advisor are ineligible to continue or graduate from College of Education programs.

VII. Calculation of GPAs for Admission To Initial Certification Programs

A. GPA Rules

1. All candidates for admission to a UK initial teacher certification program must have earned an undergraduate cumulative GPA of at least 2.50.
2. In addition, candidates for admission to a graduate level initial certification program, i.e., secondary programs, vocational education, must have earned in their subject area fields a GPA of at least 2.50.
3. Master's degree initial certification programs require a cumulative GPA of 3.0 for all graduate work prior to admission to the program.
4. UK cumulative GPAs are figured using the rules of the UK Registrar,
5. Undergraduate initial certification programs require a UK cumulative GPA of 2.50 calculated after the completion of at least twelve semester credit hours.
6. All courses used to satisfy subject matter certification requirements are used to calculate subject matter GPAs. Verification of subject matter GPAs require the use of any applicable non-UK transcripts for information about grades, credit hours, and quality points.
7. Master's degree initial certification programs require an undergraduate overall GPA of 2.50, but do not require a UK cumulative GPA prior to admission.
8. Post bachelor's degree initial certification programs require an undergraduate overall GPA of 2.50, but do not require a UK cumulative GPA prior to admission.

B. Determination of GPAs for Admission to Initial Certification Programs

1. If the initial certification program requires a UK GPA, the GPA would be calculated using the rules of the UK Registrar.
2. If the initial certification program does not require a UK GPA, the required cumulative GPA of at least 2.50 is taken directly from the transcript that shows the award of the Bachelor's degree.
3. If an initial program requires review of the graduate GPA, all graduate courses taken on all transcripts are used to calculate the graduate GPA of at least 3.0.
4. Candidates for admission to a post-baccalaureate graduate initial certification program with less than a 2.50 cumulative GPA may establish a UK undergraduate GPA for the purposes of admission to the program. The UK GPA calculated for this purpose must include at least 12 semester hours taken from four sections of the UK University Studies categories and approved course lists.

5. Subject area GPAs are calculated using all courses included on the candidate's approved subject area course listing form.

Item "C"

At its meeting on 2 April 2001, the University Senate Council voted to endorse the COSFL statement on University Governance and recommends University Senate endorsement.

COSFL Position Paper on University Governance
Adopted 3 March 2001

The Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership (COSFL) endorses the "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges in 1966 (see AAUP Policy Documents & Reports, 8th Ed. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors, 1995, 179-185).

COSFL believes: that a collegial system of academic governance adds value to higher education; and that collegial governance both sustains and extends the missions of a college or university in teaching, research, and service to the institution and to the wider communities it engages.

Academic governance derives its authority from the institution's mission. It is rooted in the responsibility all members of the academic community bear in achieving the purposes of the college or university. The academic community includes: students, faculty, staff, administrators, members of governing boards and alumni. A collegial system is based upon the participation of all stakeholders, each in their own way, in the discourse from which policy and practice are constructed.

Collegial governance is characterized by:

- the recognition of and respect for the many and varied roles that members of the academic community perform in a complex institution;
- the timely disclosure of information needed to participate meaningfully in the discourse that makes good policy and practice, wherever those conversations take place;
- the opportunity for members of the academic community to provide input before decisions are made;
- the principle of dissent

In a diverse academic community, the participants will not and should not always be of one voice on matters of policy and practice. It is imperative that dissent from the majority view be respected by all involved.

As a practical matter, collegial governance is seldom exercised in the committee of the whole. Rather, the various authorities in a complex institution speak through groups or offices: governing boards, administrative officers, students, faculty and staff and their representative bodies. Whatever an institution's structure, however, the spirit and practice of collegiality calls for either the election of these people or their appointment with the broadest possible consultation, representing diverse points of view. Moreover, the spirit and practice of collegial governance requires these people, once having been elected or appointed, to maintain their discourse with their institutional constituents. In a spirit of full and open disclosure there is little that should be

excluded from community discourse. While, for example, it is the traditional responsibility of a collegiate faculty to establish admission and graduation requirements, to approve academic programs, or to approve changes to program curricula, that faculty best does so when it consults with the students, staff, and administrators. Additionally, the primary responsibilities of administrators can best be accomplished when they consult with other members of the academic community. Since academic institutions are primarily made up of people engaged in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service to the institution and the wider community, no realm is more sensitive to the spirit and practice of collegial discourse than the appointment and review of personnel.

Item "D"

Proposal:

Amend the University Senate Rules to provide that the terms of Senators and members of the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils begin on August 16th.

Rationale:

This is when faculty on nine month appointment are due to be back in school and allows the Senate and its Committees and Councils to function immediately. Comes with the approval of the Senate Council

Implementation Date: Fall, 2001

Note: If approved the proposal will be codified by the Rules Committee

Item "E"

Note: This item was added to the agenda after it was circulated

The Senate Academic Advising Committee recommends the following changes in the University Senate Rules applying to probations and suspensions.

Delete strikeouts; add bolded sections

5.3.1.2 Academic Probation Policies

A Students are placed on probation if:

1. Their cumulative Grade Point Average (GPA) falls below 2.0. Students on probation for this reason who achieve a cumulative 2.0 GPA **or greater** shall be removed from probation.

OR

~~2. They are freshman students who have completed a semester of 18 or fewer hours with a GPA of less than 1.75. Students on probation for this reason who achieve a cumulative GPA of 2.0 shall be removed from probation. The dean shall warn students with GPAs between 1.75 and 1.99 in exclusively that they are not making satisfactory academic~~

~~progress.~~

- ~~* The warning letter is to be sent following the freshman student's first semester in which s/he earned 18 or fewer hours. (RC: 9/20/95)~~
2. They have two consecutive **UK** academic terms with ~~semester term~~ **term** GPAs below 2.0 regardless of their cumulative GPA. Students who achieve a 2.0 or better in the next term and have a cumulative GPA of 2.0 or ~~better~~ **greater** will be removed from probation.
- ~~* Once~~ **If** the student has completed all the **academic and procedural** requirements for the degree while still maintaining an overall GPA ~~greater than 2.0 of 2.0 or greater (or the minimum GPA established by a specific college), the degree must shall~~ **be awarded and the student placed in good standing**. Thus the student would no longer be on probation. (RC: 9/20/95)
- ~~* A student who has been put on probation under the old rules is subject to being removed under either the old or the new rules, whichever is more favorable to the student. (RC: 9/20/95)~~
- ~~* Four week, six week and eight week summer sessions are considered one term. Thus, if a student enrolls for both the four week and eight week sessions, that shall be considered one term. If the student enrolls for only one session, whether it be the four week, six week or the eight week term, that shall be considered one term. (RC: 12/4/95; US 4/10/00) Summer I and Summer II are considered two separate academic terms and are subject to the same probation and suspension guidelines as Spring and Fall.~~
- ~~* All grade changes made after the end of the term require recalculation of the term grade point average for purposes of applying the probation and suspension rules. A course retaken under the Repeat Option (Rule 5.3.1.1) does not result in a grade change for the term in which the course was first taken, and therefore requires no recalculation of any grade point average.~~

Rationale

Since the warning does not constitute probationary status, the warning confuses students and gives them a false sense of security. First year students will be treated the same as other students.

The Committee felt that it should be emphasized that the consecutive semesters apply to semesters completed at the University Kentucky, and that coursework completed at other colleges/universities would not be used for probation decisions.

The word "term" and the word "semester" have been randomly used in the Senate Rules involving probations and suspensions. This creates confusion in dealing with rules affecting fall, spring, first summer term, and second summer term. The word "term" more accurately defines a time period of academic evaluation.

The rule provides a clearer explanation that degree requirements include both completing the appropriate application for a degree as well as fulfilling the academic requirements of a degree.

Original wording suggested that a student needed a higher GPA to graduate than a 2.0.

With the advent of terms of different lengths, it was felt that clarification needed to be made for how these terms of varying lengths would be handled. Therefore, it was decided that each term, including Summer Session I and Summer Session II, should be considered a separate term.”

5.3.1.3 Academic Suspension Policies (US: 3/20/95)

A Students are subject to suspension if:

1. They fail to earn a 2.0 ~~semester~~ **term** GPA for any term while on probation, **or**

Rationale: The word “term” and the word “semester” have been randomly used in the Senate Rules involving probations and suspensions. This creates confusion in dealing with rules affecting fall, spring, first summer term, and second summer term. The word “term” more accurately defines a time period of academic evaluation.

2. ~~they~~ **They** have three consecutive ~~UK semesters~~ **terms** in which their cumulative GPA remains below 2.0.

Rationale: The Committee felt that it should be emphasized that the consecutive semesters apply to semesters completed at the University Kentucky, and that coursework completed at other colleges/universities would not be used for suspension decisions. The word “term” and the word “semester” have been randomly used in the Senate Rules involving probations and suspensions. This creates confusion in dealing with rules affecting fall, spring, first summer term, and second summer term. The word “term” more accurately defines a time period of academic evaluation.

B Students are subject to suspension without a preliminary probationary ~~semester~~ **term** if their GPA is below 0.6 after their first term of full time enrollment ~~in the University at UK.~~ (US 4/10/00)

Rationale: The word “term” and the word “semester” have been randomly used in the Senate Rules involving probations and suspensions. This creates confusion in dealing with rules affecting fall, spring, first summer term, and second summer term. The word “term” more accurately defines a time period of academic evaluation.

C In cases ~~of students~~ **when a student** is eligible for suspension, the Dean of the student’s College may continue a student on academic probation if the individual case so justifies.

D A student who is under academic suspension from the University may not enroll in any courses **(including courses taken through the Office of Independent Study)** offered by the University of Kentucky, nor take any **special** examination for University of Kentucky credit while on academic suspension. (US 4/10/00) **Students already enrolled in correspondence course(s) will be allowed to complete the coursework upon notification of his/her suspension.**

Rationale: The Committee endeavors to make it clear to students that the definition of “courses” includes courses taken through the Office of Independent Study.

E A student who has been academically suspended from the University a second time shall not be readmitted to the University except in unusual circumstances and then only upon recommendation of the dean of the college in which the student plans to enroll and approval of the University Senate Council.

- F Once reported to the University Registrar an academic suspension may be rescinded by the dean only in the event of an error in the determination of the student's eligibility for suspension, an official grade change that alters the student's suspension eligibility, or exceptional circumstances. ~~In such cases a written notice of rescission documenting the basis for the action must be filed with the University Registrar by the dean imposing the original suspension.~~ (US: 10/16/89)

Rationale: Academic suspensions are reported to the University Registrar through the Student Information System (SIS); rescissions should be reported in the same manner.

Implementation: Fall, 2001

Note: If approved, the proposal will be sent to the Rules Committee for codification

US Agenda: Item "E" -- Probation and Suspension Rules

REMARKS TO UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE

– April 23, 2001—

Five years ago, as I departed the Deanship of the Graduate School and resumed my role as professor of Spanish in the College of Arts and Sciences, the Senate Council chair asked me to make a few remarks about the status of graduate education. I don't remember many particulars of what I said about graduate education at that time, but I do remember expressing my perception that the faculty, staff, and students of the University, in general, and the University Senate, were becoming quiescent about their role and the exercise of their responsibilities in the shared governance of the University.

Unlike many comparable universities, UK has enjoyed an enviable institutional history of shared governance for more than four decades. During my thirty-four years at UK, I have witnessed periods of assertive involvement, as well as times of disinterest and self-marginalization, on the part of faculty and students. Some groups, such as the University's staff, have yet to win the opportunity to form their own equivalent of a senate or broad-based council to represent their views; unfortunately, they remain without a collective voice for the time being. My admonition to the Senate five years ago was that involvement in shared governance must be **active** and **cooperative**: If you don't exercise your rights and privileges, you will soon lose them or find them difficult to reassert.

The University of Kentucky owes to our retired colleague Paul Oberst of the College of Law the fact that it has voting faculty representatives on the Board of Trustees. Paul was the voice of innovation before the State's legislature almost five decades ago, and it was at his urging that a voting faculty representative was added to the BoT membership. At the time, and even now, voting membership of faculty on university governing boards is rare. In the interim, that representation has grown to include a student member, a second elected faculty member, and most recently an elected member from the staff.

Four years ago, I was privileged to be selected by my faculty colleagues to represent them, alongside Loys Mather, on the Board of Trustees. In my naiveté, membership on the

Board meant mid-court or 50-yard line tickets to games and a “T” parking pass. Well-known events involving the Board of Trustees during the past two years could lead me to paraphrase Moctezuma, the great leader of Mexico’s Aztec Empire, during the conquest of his country by the Spanish conquistador Cortez. Already a prisoner of the Spaniards and besieged by his own people, Moctezuma purportedly remarked that he was not born to lie in a bed of roses. I myself was little aware of the thorns that one could encounter in a “bed of roses”.

During the past two years we have witnessed the prelude to change in the University’s leadership —activities that involved assertive actions by the University’s Senate Council and by the Senate itself. We have seen as well the greater involvement of members of the Board of Trustees in policy considerations through a number of new Board committees (orchestrated largely by Loys Mather); the Senate was directly involved in selecting representatives for the Presidential Search Committee; and the successful outcome of that search will culminate on July 1, 2001 when Dr. Lee Todd takes office as UK’s 11th president.

Permit me to observe that when you elect representatives to the Board of Trustees, you are not electing surrogate administrators. You are electing, though, a voice in the formulation of the institution’s financial, educational, and other policies and its relation with the state and federal governments (KRS 164.131). In my opinion, Boards of Trustees that construe themselves as having a role as “parallel presidents” will do little to benefit an institution’s progress. Board members must be informed and knowledgeable about the issues, able to judge collectively the performance of the person they hire to guide the University administratively, and strong in their determination to see the University achieve its full potential.

As a new era unfolds in UK’s history, the opportunity is at hand for cooperative interaction of constituent groups (faculty, students, and **staff**) with the central administration to forge jointly a promising future for the University. I speak only for myself when I note some of the primary initiatives that will likely form important segments of this institution’s agenda during the next few years:

Institutional Priorities.

In keeping with the State’s legislative mandate, there should be a renewed focus on institutional planning and priorities aimed at clearly defined goals for achieving top-20 public research university status by 2020, including the identification of initiatives leading to excellence and methods for achieving them.

Financial Resources.

The University will have to explore existing avenues, as well as other alternatives, for improving public and private financial support of the university, pursuing energetically the existing capital fund-raising campaign and Research Challenge Trust Fund initiatives to expand beyond existing institutional goals; focusing resources on identified initiatives, and expanding the development of intellectual properties of UK faculty. Major financial needs include competitive salaries and benefits for faculty, staff, and graduate assistants, support of research initiatives, as well as general operating budgets, and enhanced scholarship opportunities for undergraduates and fellowships for graduate students.

Administrative Organization & Academic Structure.

I believe that the University must address its administrative organization and academic structure, leading to the streamlining of decision-making processes, the creation of an effective leadership team at all levels, and the reallocation of any savings from reorganization to support institutional priorities.

Academic Programs.

Faculty, staff, and students need to be reenergized in order to strengthen internal partnerships for the achievement of university goals –the development and retention of an outstanding faculty commensurate with a top-20 research institution; the improvement of the undergraduate experience (recruitment, retention and progress toward graduation), the quality of graduate and professional programs, and the effectiveness of instruction at all levels.

Partnerships in Research and Economic Development.

Although it may be controversial in the opinion of some of my colleagues, I believe that the University must use UK's intellectual capital –knowledge, research and the teaching of its professors— to serve more effectively as an engine for economic development within the region, to build on its current research base, to expand its entrepreneurial capacity, and to build collaborative research partnerships between itself, the business community and state government, with the major goals of improving the R&D climate in the State and to provide employment for scientists, engineers, and a highly trained workforce.

Institutional Infrastructure:

Efforts must be made to prioritize crucial needs for the University's infrastructure, especially space, facilities, and support staff (related to research, service and instruction) in all areas, but especially in those areas that may lead to top-20 status. Funding mechanisms must be developed to meet these needs.

University Community:

For this University to progress, great effort must be expended to foster a collegial environment, enhance diversity and gender initiatives, and communicate effectively with university constituents at the institutional and public levels.

I continue to have faith in the future of the University of Kentucky. It is once again on the threshold of making substantial progress toward its 21st century goals. In cooperation with President Lee Todd, the University Senate will have renewed opportunities to inform the administration and collaborate in its decision-making processes. I believe that Dr. Todd is a person who values advice from a multiplicity of sources, that he will listen attentively, and that he will act with the University's best interests in mind. The University is likely to be confronted by numerous obstacles in this process of advancement, but it can and will move forward during the years to come.

Thank you.
Dan Reedy