

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, MARCH 10, 1997

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, March 10, 1997 in Room 115 of the Nursing Health Sciences Building.

Professr Janice Schach, Chairperson of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent were: Debra Aaron, David Adams*, Gary Anglin, Vasant Bhapkar, Patricia Birchfield, Ben Bogia, Maria Boosalis*, Darla Botkin, Joseph Burch, Laurette Byars, Johnny Cailleteau, Joan Callahan*, Brad Canon*, Ben Carr, Edward Carter, Jordan Cohen*, Scott Coovert, Raymond Cox*, Frederick DeBeer*, Philip DeSimone*, Lori Eaton, Richard Edwards, Anthony English*, Robert Farquhar, Juanita Fleming*, William Freehling, Andrew Fried*, Richard Furst, Christine Havice, James Holsinger, Robert Houtz, Clifford Hynniman*, Betty Huff*, Monica Kern*, James Knoblett, Craig Koontz, Gretchen LaGodna, Thomas Lester, C. Oran Little, Daniel Mason, Douglas Michael*, Jenny Miller, Karen Mingst*, David Mohny, Roy Moore*, Donald Mullineaux*, Santos Murty, David Nash, Phyllis Nash*, Wolfgang Natter, Anthony Newberry, Thomas Nieman, Melanie Shay Onkst, Rhoda-Gale Pollack*, Thomas Robinson, Michael Rohmiller, Rosetta Sandidge*, Horst Schach, David Shipley, David Stockham, Retia Walker, Charles Wethington*, Adam Wilhelm, Carolyn Williams*, Eugene Williams, Lionell Williamson, Paul Willis, Emery Wilson, Phyllis Wise, William Witt, Craig Wood.

* Absence Explained

Chairperson Schach made the following announcements:

There will be a special Senate Meeting on April 28, 1997 at 3:00 p.m. in Room 201 of the Nursing Health Sciences Learning Center. This meeting will be to discuss the recommendations coming from the Senate Council Task Force on Promotion and Tenure. The two subcommittees on Process and Criteria are finishing their recommendations and it would be appropriate for the Senate to review those prior to that meeting and to hold discussion on them.

The regularly scheduled meeting will be held on April 14, 1997. It is intended at this time for that meeting to be devoted to a discussion of where the plus/minus issue is headed. There will be some proposals for action to be taken at that time.

On February 14, 1997, I with a group of selected faculty, administrative individuals, and Board Members attended a meeting with Governor Patton at Maxwell Place. There was a really good exchange of ideas regarding the future of higher education. The University was well presented in its interest in developing itself as a premier research institution.

On March 24, 1997 the Senate Council will be meeting with Governor Ned Breathitt, the Chair of the Board of Trustees to discuss the Governor's Task Force and issues of University Governance.

The Senate Council has created two new task forces; one is for the study of course evaluations and will be chaired by Deborah Bott Slaton. They will be looking at how to improve course evaluation forms and make them more uniform University-wide. They will be looking primarily to make them of more use to the instructor, more constructive in helping instructors to improve their teaching as well as to be more accurate in evaluation purposes for tenure, promotion, and merit. The second task force will be chaired by Craig Infanger to study the faculty survey. The Senate Rules currently require the Senate Council to conduct a survey of the faculty every two years. This has not been done for a long time. They will be looking to see if the survey should be continued or if there are other mechanisms that give ample feedback from the faculty and if not, what form the survey should take.

Chairperson Schach offered the following special resolution:

SPECIAL RESOLUTION
FACULTY BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEMBER
March 10, 1997

Presented to the University of Kentucky Senate in appreciation for the service of Professor Deborah Powell, Faculty Representative, University of Kentucky Board of Trustees, July 1, 1992 to April 15, 1997.

On behalf of the University Senate and Senate Council, I present this resolution of thanks and appreciation to Professor Deborah Powell, MD for her service to us and our University.

Professor Powell joined the University of Kentucky from Georgetown University School of Medicine and Dentistry in 1976 as an Associate Professor. She has served as Chair of the Department of Pathology since 1988 and Director of the Cytogenetic Lab from 1982-1989. In 1995, she was honored with the William R. Willard Dean's Recognition Award from the College of Medicine.

We all have benefited from Deborah's distinguished research, teaching, and service in the field of pathology. Her contributions span the national and local level. Among numerous other roles, she is currently or has served at one time as Trustee of the American Board of Pathology, President-Elect of the Association of Pathology Chairs, Vice Chair of the Education Committee of the College of American Pathologists, Board Member of the College of American Pathologists Foundation, International Councilor for the United States and Canadian Academy of Pathology, member of several editorial boards including Cancer Cytopathology, Human Pathology, and The Breast Journal. In addition, she has served as a member of Kentucky Medical Examiner Advisory Commission, Delegate of the Kentucky Breast Cancer Coalition, member of the Board of Directors of the Fayette County Chapter of the American Cancer Society.

Deborah's research record is prolific and has focused on some of the most important women's health issues of the day including endometrial, uterine, cervical, ovarian, and breast cancer. She has authored 89 journal articles, nine book chapters, two books, and delivered 36 abstracts and presentations, and numerous invited lectures throughout the world. She is also a dedicated teacher, serving as course director for Pathology 821, required of all medical students.

However, today, it is Deborah's service to the University that is acknowledged and most appreciated. Among countless other committees and task forces, she has served as the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees since 1992, member of the Senate and Senate Council, Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure, Senate Committee on Priorities and Planning, Co-Chair of the Senate Council Task Force on Faculty Title Series, member of the University Appeals Board, Student Code Committee, Chair of the Women's Health Center Steering Committee, member of the University Strategic Planning Committee, Faculty Workload Committee, Medical Center Academic Council, Clinical Sciences Area Advisory Committee, and numerous committees within the College of Medicine. Most impressively, Deborah has been able to balance this highly successful career with responsibilities to her husband, Ralph, and four children.

Deborah has served the University faithfully, with forthrightness, and deep caring and concern for all regardless of role, status, or college. In all her dealings, she has held the best interests of the University and its members paramount. Her keen insight has allowed her to view issues from the perspective of administration, faculty, and staff. As Board of Trustees Chair Ned Breathitt declared, "Deborah has been the conscience of the Board of Trustees." Indeed, she has also been the conscience of the University.

We appreciate Deborah as a diligent and tenacious guardian of the unique role of faculty in an academic institution. We appreciate her exceptional willingness to always take time, to listen first and then to speak, and her ability to get right to the heart of an issue convincing everyone along the way of the wisest course. We appreciate her indomitable grace and the manner with which she brings reason and calm to the most tempestuous situation. Most of all, we appreciate Deborah for the warm, caring, wonderful human being she is.

In April, Deborah will be leaving the University of Kentucky to become Dean of the University of Kansas College of Medicine. She will be one of only five women deans in the 141 accredited colleges of medicine in the United States and Canada. She will be responsible for 23 departments in Wichita and at the main campus in Kansas City.

It is with mixed feelings that we say good-bye, Deborah. Sadness, as we begin to realize the depth of our loss. Joy, in congratulating you on this much deserved opportunity. We wish you and your family the best of fortune now as you assume your new role and always. Deborah, please accept our sincerest thanks for all that you have done to make this University not just an outstanding academic institution, but also a caring place to learn and grow. You will be deeply missed.

Please join me in recognizing Professor Deborah Powell.

I direct that this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the Senate and that a copy be sent to Professor Powell.

Dr. Powell was given a standing ovation.

Dr. Powell made the following remarks:

Thank you to the UK Senate

As most of you know, I will be leaving the University of Kentucky next month after 21 years. I have accepted the position of Executive Dean at the University of Kansas Medical School in Kansas City and so am trading UK for KU. As a consequence of this move I am giving up my position of your faculty representative on the UK Board of Trustees for almost five years. I appreciate the Senate Council Chair giving me this opportunity today to say thank you to the Senate, and through you, to all the UK faculty for allowing me to serve as your representative to the Board. I have tried to be an advocate for the faculty, both to the President and to the Board. I have tried to not be confrontational but rather to engender among the board members a sense of respect for the dedication of the faculty and their desire for UK to become a better institution. I hope that I have succeeded in this.

In a larger context, I want to thank you all for giving me the opportunity to participate in faculty governance, first as a member of the College of Medicine Faculty Council, as a member to the Senate for many years, as chair of a Senate committee, as a member of the Senate council and as a faculty representative to the Board of Trustees. This opportunity to serve as a member of the larger University community has made an enormous difference to me. It has given me an understanding of the importance of the components of the University - students, faculty and administration - working together with mutual respect and has shown me how the system suffers if that respect and cooperation is not present.

I want very much to be a good Dean. My success will be in large part due to the experience I have had and wisdom I have gained as a faculty member at UK involved in faculty governance. I want to thank you for having made this possible.

Dr. Powell was given a round of applause.

The Chair recognized Professor Jim Applegate, Chair-elect of the Senate Council to present a resolution.

Professor Applegate said that the Council and Senate faculty leaders has asked for endorsement for the following resolution.

Faculty should have a formally established ongoing voice in deliberations of change in governance. To establish a permanent channel for faculty input in state wide discussions of higher education policy we recommend that a faculty member be to added to the Council on Higher Education.

The Chair said that the group; Coalition of Senate Faculty Leaders is composed of Senate Faculty chairs, Board of Trustee Members, and Regents from all the eight public institutions in the state. They have been sending white papers and position papers to the Governor's Task Force. They present this resolution today and are asking that all the eight schools endorse this resolution that will be presented to the Governor.

The motion passed in an unanimous voice vote.

Chairperson Schach said that she had received many requests over the last week for a presentation or discussion of the Lexington Campus budget. In conversations with Chancellor Zinser many very positive results have come about, one of which is Chancellor Zinser met with her on several occasions to review the proposed budget for 1997-1998. The Chancellor has also met with Doug Poe, the Chair of the Senate Committee on Institutional Finances. She will be meeting with both the Senate Council and the Senate Committee on Institutional Finances this Wednesday to give a briefing on the budget and to discuss the involvement of this committee in the development of the upcoming biennial budget. These are very positive developments and Chancellor Zinser deserves a lot of credit due to fact in the collective memory of the Senate Council this has not been done before.

Chancellor Zinser agreed to come today to give the Senate a briefing as well. I would ask that this be informational only and that you hold any questions that you may have on the budget until the meeting on Wednesday, which will be the budget briefing to the Senate Council and the Senate Committee on Institutional Finances. That will be held on Wednesday, March 12, 1997 at 4:30 p.m. in Room 230 of the Student Center. Anyone is welcome who has questions or comments on what you hear today.

Chancellor Zinser thanked the Senate for the opportunity to speak with them

The Chancellor's presentation is attached to the minutes.

Chancellor Zinser was given a round of applause.

The Chair then welcomed Dean Connie Wood to present nominations for Honorary Degrees. Any of the decisions made on this today are to be held in strict confidence. None of these have been presented to the Board of Trustees and so are not to be made public. Dr. Wood said that the nominations that are being put forward come from an Honorary Degree Committee and have been approved by the Graduate Council and the Graduate Faculty. Dr. Wood read biographical information on the nominees for the Senate's consideration.

The motion to accept the degree candidates for recommendation to the President passed in an unanimous voice vote.

ACTION ITEM 1: New Rules for the S (Satisfactory) and U (Unsatisfactory) grades in the graduate school

Proposal:

S (Satisfactory)/U (Unsatisfactory) Grades

A grade of "S" (Satisfactory work in progress) or "U" (Unsatisfactory work in progress) may be recorded for students making satisfactory or unsatisfactory progress in graduate seminars, independent work courses, research courses which extend beyond the normal

limits of a semester or summer term, and in residence credit courses for the master's or doctorate.

Grades of "S" and "U" must be removed and a letter grade (A, B,C, or E) awarded before a candidate is permitted to sit for the Final Examination.

Grades of "S" and "U" do not have to be removed in thesis or dissertation courses for residence credit (748), 749, 768, and 769) or in courses which carry no credit.

If a student accumulates 3 or more grades of =93U=94, indicating unsatisfactory progress toward a degree, a graduate program may recommend to the Dean of the Graduate School that the student's enrollment be terminated in a particular program.

Background and Rationale:

At present there is no grade which can be recorded to indicate unsatisfactory progress in a seminar, independent course, or research endeavor which extends beyond the semester or summer term in which it was begun. The "U" grade addresses that deficiency, permitting the instructor or research supervisor to provide formal notification to the student of his or her failure to meet expectations.

Implementation Date: Fall, 1997

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

Chairperson Schach recognized Professor Jim Applegate, Chair-elect of the Senate Council for introduction of the item. Professor Applegate reviewed the background of the item and recommended approval of the item.

Hans Gesund (Engineering) asked how you could tell whether a student should get an A, B, C, or E in a residence credit course? Connie Wood (Graduate School) said that residence credit courses are graded only at this point on a scale which involves an S. It is the only grade which is allowable, a letter grade is not an allowable grade. The proposal is to also allow the grade of U. The A, B, C, or E is for independent study courses and seminars, those courses for which the Senate rule and the grading scales do allow the faculty member to insert a grade of S, indicating progress being made toward the degree but for course work which may extend over the course of a single semester. Professor Hans suggested it needed to be rewritten so that it is clearer.

Kaveh Tagavi (Engineering) said he had a problem with the U. As of now there is no letter grade of U. There are two parts to this proposal, one part applies to seminars, independent work courses, and research courses and these are temporary Us. It has to be removed before the student graduates. The other part applies to research and residence credit, which does not have to be removed. He has a problem with that part only. Technically it is possible that a PhD would be granted with a U on the transcript in front of their research or residence credit. He would like the Graduate School to mandate that

all grades of U be removed before a student could sit for the final examination. He made the motion to send the item back to the Graduate Council.

Pam Kidd (Nursing) asked for a point of clarification. Does this mean that that a student could not be granted a degree if they have a U.

Connie Woods said that the first part of the proposal refers to the fact that an S grade is given in courses that are graded with a letter grade. Currently the S can only be used to show that the student is making satisfactory progress. This part of the proposal would allow for a U to be used. This makes no change in terms of operating for graduate students because all of those have to be removed and converted to letter grades before any type of final examination can be attempted. The second part of the proposal says that when, in particular, doctoral students who are postqualifying who are not making sufficient progress on their dissertation, at this point the only option is to either withhold a grade, put in an Incomplete, or award the grade of S. This will allow the faculty member the opportunity to submit a grade of U. As the proposal is today, that grade of U could actually stand and the student could take their final defense and graduate with that U in doctoral residency staying there permanently on the record.

Jesse Weil (Physics) said he had some discomfort with the practice of rewriting history. The grade of U indicates that in that particular semester the student did not make the progress that is normally expected of them. To say later, that the degree was received so the U should be taken from the record is rewriting history.

Kaveh Tagavi said that the grade of S or U says work in progress, so it is not rewriting history anymore than converting the grade of I to a letter grade. Indeed half of the proposal does allow that. As it is written now, it is possible someone could have a PhD from the University of Kentucky and in front of their doctoral research course there would be an U.

The vote on the motion to recommit to the Graduate School passed in a voice vote.

ACTION ITEM 2: Proposed amendment to the Senate Rules, Section V (Incomplete Grades) changes in the I grade rules for graduate level courses.

Proposal

I (Incomplete Grades)

A grade of I (Incomplete) may be assigned to a graduate student if a part of the work of a course remains undone and there is a reasonable possibility that a passing grade will result from completion of the work. All incomplete (I grades) must be replaced by a regular final letter grade within 12 months of the end of the academic term in which the I grade was awarded or prior to the student's graduation, whichever occurs first.

If an I grade has not been replaced within the allowable period, the University Registrar shall change the I grade to a grade of E on the student's permanent academic record and

adjust the student's grade-point standing accordingly, unless otherwise approved because of exceptional circumstances by the Dean of the Graduate School on recommendation of the Director of Graduate Studies in the student's program.

Instructors who assign an I grade should file with the student's Director of Graduate Studies information which includes 1) the name of the student, 2) the course number and hours of credit, 3) the semester and year of enrollment, 4) specific information on the work to be completed before a final grade can be assigned, and 5) the time frame in which the specific requirements are to be met (not to exceed 12 months). Graduate students should consult with their Director of Graduate Studies concerning procedures relative to the awarding of "I" grades and the conditions under which they may be removed in that particular program.

Background and Rationale:

Present policy requires that 'I' grades be removed, but does not specify the time period in which this must occur. The proposed policy spells out the time frame and the consequences of failure to remove the 'I' grade in the allotted time. The proposal also calls for administrative procedures which ensure that the student is fully informed of the instructor's expectations for completion of the course.

Implementation Date: Fall, 1997

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

The Chair recognized Professor Applegate for introduction of the second Agenda Item. Professor Applegate reviewed the background of the proposal and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

Jesse Weil said he was the Director of Graduate Studies and deals with students who have I grades. He wanted to know why the proposal was being made, since all student must convert I grades to letter grades before they can sit for any exam, so eventually if the student is going to make any progress they must get the Is off. Why then is it necessary to set a time limit on converting the incomplete? This will make a lot of time consuming work for the director of graduate studies and the dean of the Graduate School. Is it intended that the I convert to an E only if the student is enrolled? Do they have twelve months of enrollment or is it twelve calendar months irregardless of the status? If there is a good reason for having a conversion, he would prefer to have it be after two or perhaps three years.

Connie Wood said the intent is to better inform faculty and students of the expectations that in fact I grades need to be removed and removed in a timely manner. There is a feeling by many directors of graduate studies and many faculty that this is just a second class withdraw from a course. That a grade of I can be assigned and it can remain. The students are often very surprised to learn when they apply to sit for their final exam that no such exam will be allowed due to the fact that old incomplete grade must be

completed in the ten days before they will sit for their final exam. The intent is to codify the expectations that these incomplete grades are only to be given in situations where the student does have a reasonable chance of completing the course and also to set an expectation for the time.

David Hamilton (History) said another rationale for this proposal was it brings into conformity with the undergraduate rule, which has been a successful rule. A second reason is that it is felt that a number of students simply become burdened with incompletes and it is to their detriment as a student to take on so many incompletes and satisfy them a couple of days before they sit for their exams. They felt it was in the best interest of the students to not let the incomplete go on for more than a year unless there was some legitimate reason. There was also some concern that some faculty members are simply too willing to issue the incomplete and that this proposal would discourage that.

Carolyn Brock (Chemistry) said that rules could be passed to solve all possible problems and waste more hours of the director of graduate studies' time. There is so much that goes back and forth between the DGS and the Graduate School now that the job is almost unmanageable. Getting someone to take the job is very difficult. The more rules that are passed like this the more than will happen. Graduate students are not like undergraduate students. They are housed in a department which is a unit substantially smaller than a college. These kinds of problems need to be solved in the department.

Enid Waldhart (Communications) said that it was her understanding that the Registrar's Office would take care of doing the translation of the I's to E's if they have not received any other type of notification. The Chair stated that was the case. Professor Waldhart stated that then it would not be the Director of Graduate Studies responsibility. Professor Jesse Weil said it would be the Director of Graduate Studies responsibility to request the waiver.

Professor Weil made the motion to amend to the proposal to change the one year conversion time to a two year conversion time.

The amendment failed in a show of hands.

The proposal passed in a show of hands; 34 for, 16 against.

ACTION ITEM 3: Proposal to establish principles and objectives for evaluating alternate routes for satisfying the oral communication requirement in University Studies.

Proposal

The University Studies Committee shall employ the principles and learning objectives set forth below for evaluating the alternate routes for satisfying the Oral Communication Requirement in University Studies.

Rationale

The University Studies Committee seeks endorsement of the general guidelines (i.e. principles and objectives) set forth below for evaluating the alternate means of satisfying the Oral Communication requirement in the USP. Since alternate routes for completing the Oral Communication requirement vary considerably from discipline to discipline, and since effective evaluation requires a common understanding of what we are seeking to achieve, the Committee thought it best to establish some general guidelines. The Committee does not anticipate that each program will strive to achieve each and every stated objective in the areas of public speaking or interpersonal communication but that each unit will substantially pursue these aims. The Committee also anticipates that individual academic units will pursue these aims in ways which are tailored to particular programs, bearing in mind, however, that the Oral Communication requirement is part of general education and is intended to help students acquire skills which are applicable to a broad range of topics and situations.

The Committee also recommends that for purposes of evaluation the following procedure be followed. The principles and objectives will be forwarded to responsible units with a request for a written statement concerning the ways in which the various units are following the guidelines. Upon receipt of written statements about the methods used by the various units, the USP Committee may request additional information through interviews and conversations with appropriate individuals in the unit. Where differences occur regarding the interpretation of the principles and/or objectives, the Committee will use every effort to reach consensus. If the Committee believes that the program in a specific unit is not substantially following the guidelines set forth below, it will provide the unit with an opportunity to adjust its program so as to rectify the situation. If the unit does not make adjustments in a reasonable time, the USP Committee will recommend to the Senate Council that the alternate route be discontinued as part of University Studies. In the case of such action, the Senate Council will function as an appeals committee, and its decision shall be final.

The Committee sees this methodology as a type of pilot project in carrying out its responsibility for evaluating all components of University Studies. If the system works as anticipated, it will provide a model for developing similar methodologies for the rest of the Program.

Criteria for Evaluating Alternate Routes in Oral Communication General Principles

1. Students will receive instruction from individuals with formal or specialized training in oral communication. This principle does not mean that instructors must have a degree in communication or have taken formal courses in the subject. However, instructors must have acquired sufficient knowledge through activities such as workshops, individual consultations, cooperative projects, and the like with professionals in the field.

2. Students will utilize appropriate resource materials (e.g., textbooks focused on the development of oral communication skills) in order to develop their skills in oral communication.
3. Students will be provided substantial opportunity to practice, receive comment, and be evaluated on their oral communication competencies.
4. Students will be required to develop the ability to communicate with a wide variety of audiences which go beyond specific disciplines.
5. A significant part of the final grade(s) will be dependent on the acquisition of the stated oral communication objectives.

Objectives
Alternate Routes: Public Speaking

Courses should be designed to increase students' understanding of the principles and processes of communication in public contexts and to facilitate development of effective public speaking skills.

Competencies to be developed

1. Message/argument construction - includes identifying clear specific statement of purpose and central idea, selection of logical and ethical strategies to help audience make necessary connections, gathering and selecting information necessary to formulate complete and coherent arguments.
2. Audience Analysis - understand the need to take the perspective on one's audience in order to select appropriate message and delivery strategies.
3. Message Organization - includes organizing and outlining messages which will accomplish the speaker's goals.
4. Message Reception/Critique - includes active and critical listening both as one hears other students' presentations as well as speakers in other contexts.
5. Message Delivery/Presentation - includes the skills needed to present message effectively through use of voice, eye contact, movement and gestures, etc.

Alternate Routes: Interpersonal Communication

1. Context Situation/Audience Analysis
 - a) Identify and adapt to perceived needs and desires of other communicators

- b) Broaden range of possible responses and make effective decisions during communication situations
 - c) Recognize when a message is not being understood
 - d) Express and manage emotions appropriately
2. Message Development, Support and Organization
- a) Select the most appropriate method for communicating a message
 - b) Identify goals and objectives as a communicator
 - c) Anticipate the range of possible responses
 - d) Accomplish communication goals
3. Conversation Management and Evaluation
- a) Understand the differences in communicator style
 - b) Listen carefully and clarify the messages of others
 - c) Analyze assumptions and purposes of others
 - d) Detect and respond to discrepancies in communication with others
4. Assertiveness, Gaining Compliance and Interpersonal Influence
- a) Motivate others to disclose information when appropriate and change behavior or attitudes of others
 - b) Effectively assert oneself, manage conflict, and gain the compliance of others
 - c) Convey empathy when communicating
 - d) Build and maintain constructive relationships with superiors, peers, and subordinates
5. Self-Presentation, Impression Management and Message Delivery
- a) Recognize and use appropriate nonverbal behaviors for the message and 'audience'
 - b) Describe/express emotions appropriately; cope with negative feedback
 - c) Accept responsibility for self-presentation and impression management

- d) Accept responsibility for own communication behavior
6. Ethical Communication and Decision-Making
- a) Develop criteria for ethical communication
 - b) Analyze and apply criteria in a broad range of ethical communication situations
 - c) Understand and demonstrate the =93ethics=94 of appreciating cultural and communicator style differences
 - d) Detect and evaluate communication practices which indicate prejudice in regards to gender, race, age, ethnic or sexual/affectual orientation.

Implementation Date: Fall Semester, 1997

Chairperson Schach recognized Professor Applegate to introduce the next item. Professor Applegate reviewed the background of the item and recommended approval of behalf of the Senate Council.

The Chair asked Professor Applegate to take her place as Chair so she could speak to the issue as a faculty member.

Jan Schach (Agriculture) said she wanted to support the motion as a faculty member in Landscape Architecture where they are one of the alternate routes for the Oral Communication requirement. As it stands now, there are certain alternate programs that are not meeting the spirit of the Oral Communication requirement and anyone who is fair and would evaluate those programs would come to the same conclusion. Therefore is it necessary that there be some type of fair criteria by which those programs are evaluated.

The charge of the USP Committee is to on occasion go back and evaluate this program. There is not a list of objective criteria to do that and this is an attempt and a very good one on behalf of the USP to develop these criteria. She said she felt they were reasonable in doing this and supported them. She reminded the Senate that in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Accreditation Requirements it is required that this Institution produce people who are competent at oral communication. One could technically, if they looked closely enough, say that it not ensured right now, because there are alternate routes are not evaluated.

Hans Gesund said that the criteria were very comprehensive but the one thing that had been left out was whether the instructor knew the subject of the communication. That is where things have to start; one can not communicate effectively unless the subject is known. The more important question is how is anyone going to check this? Is the Senate Council or the Undergraduate Studies Committee going to send a representative into each

class in which a department has an oral communication component to assure that all of this is being done? There is no way other than that of assuring this.

Professor Applegate said in regard to who would teach the course, the criteria said that students would receive instruction from an individuals with formal or specialized training in oral communication. This does not mean the instructor must have a degree or have taken formal courses, however, the instructor must have acquired sufficient knowledge through activities such as workshops, individual consultations, cooperative programs, and the like with professionals in the field.

In regard to the second issue, the second paragraph under Rationale reads: The committee also recommends for purposes of evaluation the following procedure be followed. The principles and objectives will be forwarded to responsible units with a request for a written statement concerning the ways in which the various units are following the guidelines. Upon receipt of written statements about the methods used by the various units, the USP Committee may request additional information through interviews and conversations with appropriate individuals in the unit. Where differences occur regarding the interpretation of the principles and/or objectives, the committee will use every effort to reach consensus. If the committee believes that the program in a specific unit is not substantially following the guidelines set forth it will provide the unit with an opportunity to adjust its program so as to rectify the situation. So there is a procedure outlined in there. He said he was not on the University Studies Committee, but they employed a similar procedure to assess the writing component in the University Studies program when he was on the committee to get feedback to see if people were observing the requirements.

Carolyn Brock asked if the first item meant that any course used to fill the oral communications requirement must be taught by a person who has qualifications to be judged by someone unspecified in Oral Communications.

Louis Swift (Undergraduate Studies) said that what they were trying to do was to make sure that the people who are responsible for oral communication have some knowledge of what the objectives are and some knowledge about how to achieve them. That does not mean a degree in Communications, but it does mean that the department that has developed an alternate route has consulted with knowledgeable individuals and the obvious people are people in communications either here or at other institutions and developed a program which people are knowledgeable about and know how to teach and assess. The important thing is to endorse the alternate routes and make sure that the people who are running the alternate routes know what they are doing. Professor Brock said that the requirement stated that it was based on criteria that could be written down or certified rather than whether they could communicate or teach to communicate. Professor Swift stated that the committee will try to determine whether an individual who is teaching the oral communications component has some knowledge. The USP Committee wants the department or the unit to tell them how they are doing it. They are not particularly concerned about whether departments do it the same way; they are asking

what are the objectives, how are they achieving them, and what are the methods they are using to assess whether or not you are achieving them.

Mike Friedman (Fine Arts) said he did not understand item number four under the general principles which talks about the ability to communicate with audiences outside specific disciplines. He did not know how that would be evaluated by people in the College of Communications.

Professor Swift said that one of the ways it could be done would be to indicate that the students that are being trained are able to communicate in an area other than their own particular profession. That an individual can use interpersonal communications with an audience that is broader than the specifics of the profession. That could be done by exercises in a particular course that involve colleagues, professors, or with people outside the University. The purpose of this is general communicative skills, not professional communicative ability in a particular area.

Jesse Weil asked for explanation of item two under Objectives. Professor Applegate said it was a typing error and should read "of one's audience"

The question was called. The vote to end debate passed in a voice vote.

The proposal passed in a voice vote.

ACTION ITEM 4: Proposal to create a grade of CR (credit) to reflect the credit granted for a pass in AP or CLEP work.

Proposal

The "pass" (P) designator for AP or CLEP or bypass work be assigned a grade of CR (credit) to reflect that credit is granted for a course.

Background

Currently, some CLEP and AP credits are designated with the P grade. Since P is a grade within the university system, and since P grades are not allowed for credit toward the major in some disciplines, there is a problem in the degree audit system if AP or CLEP credit is used for major work.

Degree audit can be programmed to allow CR to count for work toward the major without changing the policy for UK courses taken P/F.

This will not affect those records where letter grades are awarded for certain CLEP and AP scores.

The proposal has been approved by the Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards and the Senate Council and is recommended to the Senate.

Implementation Date: Fall Semester, 1997.

The Chair recognized Jim Applegate to introduce the next item. Professor Applegate reviewed the background of the item and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

There was no discussion. The motion passed in an unanimous voice vote.

ACTION ITEM 5: Proposal to place undeclared students not affiliated with a college under the Dean of Undergraduate Studies for purposes of advising and for decisions concerning academic status.

Proposal

Undeclared students not associated with a particular college shall no longer be enrolled in the College of Arts and Sciences. They shall be under the Dean of Undergraduate Studies who shall be responsible for providing appropriate advising and shall make decisions about the academic status of these students until such time as they gain entrance to the college of their choice.

Background

With the establishment of the Central Advising & Transfer Center in 1993, undeclared students have received much needed academic attention. Individuals who are seeking a major or who are in transition from one major to another are now able to obtain timely guidance from a corps of eleven dedicated professionals. When the CATC was started, however, no changes were made in the University's regulations regarding the academic home of undeclared undergraduates. Officially, all students without a major continue to be registered to the College of Arts & Sciences and all official actions (suspensions, probations, record keeping, etc.) are housed in that college.

This arrangement is not satisfactory. Both the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Undergraduate Studies are unhappy with a system which separates advising from other formal academic activities and from student record keeping. Not only must we constantly exchange records, but students are not well served by having to deal with two different offices regarding their academic status and their progress toward graduation. Formally, they are bound by the rules and procedures of Arts & Sciences, but, technically, they obtain advising from the CATC.

The College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Undergraduate Studies propose to correct this anomaly by amending the rule that all undergraduates must be enrolled in an academic college. We propose that undeclared students be made the responsibility of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, with official actions regarding their academic life housed in that office. Once a student has chosen a major, records will be transferred to the appropriate college and the student will become the responsibility of the respective dean.

Rationale

Both the College of Arts & Sciences and the Office of Undergraduate Studies have agreed that it is in the best interest of undeclared students not affiliated with a college to be under the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. The major reason for this change is that undeclared students (numbering about 2200 each year) currently are advised by the staff in the

Central Advising and Transfer Center, which is under the direction of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. Technically, however, these students are enrolled in the College of Arts & Sciences where their records are maintained and where decisions concerning their academic standing are made. In order to coordinate academic advising and academic decisions for these students and in order to free the staff in Arts & Sciences to provide better service to declared majors in that college, both of the affected units (Undergraduate Studies and Arts & Sciences) endorse the proposed change. Both units are agreed that this new arrangement will redound to the benefit of the students. We also request that in those areas where the deans of the colleges are authorized to take action in reference to students in their college, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies be authorized to so act in reference to undeclared students who are not affiliated with a specific college.

It should be noted that "undeclared" students in this proposal are students who are not affiliated with any college. Some students have declared their intention to major in a particular college (where they receive advising) but have not yet chosen or gained access to a particular program or department. These latter will not be affected by the proposed changes in any way.

This proposal has been approved by the Senate Council and is recommended to the University Senate.

Implementation Date: Spring Semester, 1997

Chairperson Schach recognized Jim Applegate for introduction of the item. Professor Applegate reviewed the item and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

Louis Swift said this was talking about undeclared students in Arts and Sciences, they would be the only students affected by this. He said there were about two hundred nondegree students in Arts and Sciences and they would like to include them. Any students who receive advice from any other college are not included in the proposal. It has been endorsed both by the College of Arts and Sciences and the Undergraduate Studies Office. They are trying to make it easier for students to have their academic status and their advising tied together. Currently all of these students who are undeclared in Arts and Sciences, they number about 2,000-2,200 each year, receive their advising through Central Advising ran by Mary Sue Hoskins. When they need to find out their academic status, and when decisions need to be made about suspension and probation they have to go to the College of Arts and Sciences. They are going back and forth between two units on campus; this does not facilitate advising or coordination. By doing this, some of the resources in Arts and Sciences will be freed up to do a better job advising those students who are in Arts and Sciences. The purpose is not to keep the students in this status any longer than is absolutely necessary; the whole purpose of central advising is to move students on into a degree program in a college or department as quickly as it is reasonable to do.

Michael Tomblyn asked if this was based on enrollment and how the student will appear in the Registrar's computer or is it simply a change by whom they are advised?

Professor Swift said they would have to introduce a different code so that the students are not ASUN. Part of the problem now is getting the students who are undeclared the information and advising they need.

Hans Gesund asked about the students who had been suspended or dropped from a college for academic reasons. He said that the proposal only spoke to students who were coming in undeclared. Professor Swift said that what would happen if a student were dropped from a college is they would either go into the next college they had chosen or will be in the undeclared status and therefore be advised by Central Advising.

Louis Swift made the amendment to add the nondegree students to the proposal. The amendment was seconded.

Connie Wood asked if this included people who were coming in as nondegree undergraduates that also hold a bachelors degree that are perhaps preparing for their professional or graduate degrees. Professor Swift said that it technically could, but the admissions officer would put them in either in an undeclared status or in a specific college. The student coming back and thinking they want to be in a specific college are likely to be put in by the admissions officer.

Ali Amoli (Student Senator - Arts and Sciences) asked how many students are currently under Central Advising and when this proposal is implemented would they be able to handle 2,000 more students. Professor Swift stated that these students are currently being advised by Central Advising. This does not change anything about the number of students who will be served.

Mandy Lewis (Student Senator - Social Work) asked how these students would be represented in Student Government? Will they vote in elections for a student senator from Arts and Sciences, or for their perspective college, or will there will be a new senator representing them? Professor Swift said that this proposal would have to go the Rules Committee. These students will be represented but that is something the Rules Committee will have to work out. This is not a college, it is an administrative way of making sure that the advising and the academic status decisions are put together so that the students are not going back and forth. The Chair assured them that they would make certain there was representation for these students.

The question was moved. The motion to stop discussion passed in a voice vote.

The amended passed in an unanimous voice vote.

Jesse Weil said that this would obviously require some resources in the Dean of Undergraduate Studies to keep these records. Is it clear that they are going to get new resources; they spoke of Arts and Sciences being able to use present resources to other purposes. Professor Swift answered yes.

The amended motion passed in a voice vote.

The last agenda item to change the effective date of the plus/minus grading system in the Graduate School was moved to the April 14, 1997 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Betty J. Huff
University Registrar

US Agenda: US Minutes - 3.10.97