

University Senate Meeting  
December 11, 2006

The University Senate met at 3 pm on Monday, December 11, 2006 in the Auditorium of the W. T. Young Library. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise. Below is a record of what transpired.

Absences: Anderson, Anyaegbunam, Bartilow, Bernard\*, Bhatt\*, Bhavsar, Bordo\*, Brown, Butler\*, Cammers, Cathey\*, Caudill\*, Chew, Clarke, Clauter\*, Cooper, Deem, Dembo, DeSimone, Draper\*, Dwoskin\*, El-Ghannam, English, Ford\*, Fording, Forgue\*, Frost, Gaetke\*, Harley\*, Hasselbring, Heath, Hoch\*, Hoffman, Houtz\*, Jackson, Johnson\*, Johnson\*, Jones\*, Karpf, Kim\*, Kirschling, Kraemer, Lee\*, Lester, Lillich, Look, Martin\*, McCormick\*, Mobley, Mohney, Newman\*, Odoi, Pauly, Pulito, Ray\*, Santhanam\*, Segerstrom\*, Shay, Smart, Smith, Sottile, Staben, Steltenkamp, Stump, Sudharshan\*, Terrell, Todd, S. Turner, W. Turner, VanDyke\*, Vasconez, Vestal, Williams, Wiseman, Witt\*, Wood, Wyatt, Yanarella\*, Yates\*.

Non-senators recognized by the Chair: Eric Anderman, Ralph Crystal, Larry Holloway, Brian Jackson, Jake Karnes, G. T. Lineberry, Phyllis Nash, Michelle Nordin, Mike Shanks, Jennifer Swanberg, Arnold Stromberg.

The meeting was called to order at 3:02 pm.

1. Minutes from October 9 & November 13 and Announcements

The Chair said that some suggested changes had been incorporated into the minutes from October 9 and November 13. There being no additional changes to them, the minutes from October 9 and November 13 were approved as amended.

The Chair reminded senators about the annual Board and Senates' Holiday Reception on Tuesday, the following day, from 2:30 – 5:00 pm at the UK Art Museum. The show, *A Romance with the Landscape*, would be held over for reception guests. Live string music would be provided by the College of Fine Arts. The Chair encouraged everyone to attend, even if an RSVP had not been sent.

The Chair noted that the Senate Council (SC) was empowered to act for the Senate in certain circumstances, so long as the actions are reported to the Senate at the next meeting. He reported two such actions, both involving retroactive withdrawal applications (RWA). The SC waived *Senate Rule (SR) 5.1.8.5.A.2* ("two-year window") for RWA for two students on December 4. One student suffered the death of her mother during the two-year window and the other submitted her paperwork at the college level within the two-year window,

---

\* Denotes absence explained prior to meeting.

but summer months and sabbatical frustrated her efforts to complete her RWA on a timely basis.

The Chair asked Vice Chair Grabau to share the results of the election for SC officers. The Vice Chair explained that elections for SC officers was held at the SC meeting on December 4 and were for terms that would begin on June 1, 2007 and end on May 31, 2008. Kaveh Tagavi (Engineering/Mechanical Engineering) was re-elected to serve as chair and David Randall (Medicine/Physiology) was elected to serve as vice chair.

The Chair reminded senators of a currently-posted web transmittal on a new Information Systems User Policy regarding recent mishaps with private information. Katherine Adams from Legal Counsel attended the SC meeting on December 4 and said that the policy addressed how university employees should take care of confidential information and the sanctions for violating the policy. Adams received comments at the SC meeting, but SC members wanted senators to also have an opportunity to offer suggestions. Therefore, the new policy was put on a web transmittal for a 10-day review by senators.

The Chair invited Senate's Rules and Elections Committee Chair Doug Michael to offer an update on the election for SC members. Michael said that during the first round, elected faculty senators nominated candidates. The six with the most nominations who were willing and able to serve were currently on the ballot for election to the SC; the voting round was open until noon on Wednesday, December 13.

Noting that only 45 senators had voted, the Chair asked senators who had not voted to please do so. He noted the importance of faculty governance and added that senators could visit the Senate's home page and click on the hot link to the voting site.

## 2. Update on New Medical Education Complex – College of Medicine Dean Jay Perman

The Chair said that deans of the health science colleges wanted an educational venue to foster interprofessional education. The Chair invited College of Medicine Dean Jay Perman to speak on the topic.

Guest Perman gave a [presentation](#) on the new Medical Education Complex. Afterwards, he answered questions. Grossman commented that the new complex was impressive and attractive, but said that the need of other areas of campus was undeniable; he hoped that the needs of the entire university campus would be considered and addressed over the next 10 to 20 years.

Provost Subbaswamy said that the current administration was acutely aware of the issues of space, especially with regard to the Top 20 Business Plan. Referring to the need for expansion and two meetings during the day on the

matter, Provost Subbaswamy said that he was glad that some part of the campus was being jumpstarted with planning and a vision for future. He said that the conventional way of approaching growth of campus of one building every four years would not work well for the future. Provost Subbaswamy also noted that the academic hospital would be self-funded and would also be funded through donations.

Perman said that a clinical and translational science application was being prepared that included 13 to 14 colleges, not just the six health care colleges. He said that those involved in life sciences research would also benefit.

In response to a question by Debski about references to a biology/pharmacy building, the Provost said that an original plan called for separate biology and pharmacy buildings. At one building every four years, though, it would take too long; there had been many discussions and the current concept was still evolving a bit, but thought a joint biology/pharmacy building, as well as space from the vacated Pharmacy Building, would be part of the solution for the Department of Biology's problems with a lack of space. He went on to say that there would be 30,000 square feet of shelled research space to be used in a multidisciplinary manner, regardless of departmental origin. A life sciences research campus would be driven by research and methodologies, not department.

Snow asked about physical support for new buildings and a recent six-month wait for service on a cold room in the Biomedical/Biological Sciences Research Building (BBSRB). Provost Subbaswamy said that he had only recently learned that there was no building supervisor for the BBSRB; he wondered how on earth such an omission could have occurred. He acknowledged that certain aspects were not well planned but were being addressed.

There being no further questions, the Chair thanked Perman and Provost Subbaswamy.

The Chair introduced the new half-time staff assistant in the Office of the Senate Council, Adrea LaRoche. He then asked David Randall to stand and be identified as the vice chair-elect.

### 3. [New Program: Interdisciplinary PhD in Education Science](#)

The Chair explained that the proposal for a new Interdisciplinary PhD in Education Science was received from the Graduate Council (GC) on August 25, 2006, approved by the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) on November 11 and approved by the SC on November 20. The new program was proposed because of a need for education researchers who had been trained in sophisticated methodological aspects of educational research. The Chair invited College of Education Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies Eric Anderman to offer additional comments on the proposal.

Guest Anderman said that he had been working with the Graduate School for awhile on the proposal. It was in line with the Top 20 Business Plan. In addition, many benchmarks were distinguishing between a rigorous research-oriented (PhD) and practitioner-oriented (EdD) program and the new program was necessary to remain competitive.

There were no further questions. The Chair stated that no second was necessary, since it came from the SAPC through the SC with a positive recommendation. A **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve a new Interdisciplinary PhD in Education Science; the motion **passed** unanimously in a voice vote.

#### 4. Update on SAP Campus Management Module - IRIS Director Phyllis Nash and Michelle Nordin, Lead Person for CM

The Chair invited IRIS Project Director Phyllis Nash to offer an update on the SAP system. Guest Nash said that she would talk about pieces of the system not related to academic processes; Michelle Nordin would talk about Campus Management (CM) systems. Nash gave a [presentation](#) on the topic, after which Guest Nordin offered information about CM.

After the presentations, Nash and Nordin remained to answer questions. In response to Calvert, Nash said that her references to prioritizing actions had to do with prioritizing reports that were needed; reports to outside agencies and the government took precedence. Calvert wondered how faculty could offer input into shaping the system – Nash said that she had tried and tried to find faculty representation for various committees but had been unsuccessful. Grossman clarified the question as having to do with how to get help once CM went live; Nash replied that employees did not seem to have any trouble communicating problematic issues to IRIS. She encouraged senators to contact her or Nordin if problems occurred. Blackwell suggested senators contact the Graduate School (GS) if Nash was unavailable if there were GS-related SAP questions, since the GS had been working closely with IRIS.

Nash noted that all faculty grades would have to be submitted electronically, a decision made by then-Provost Nietzel. She said IRIS would work with departments who historically had a staff employee enter grades, with graduate students and with faculty members entering the grades themselves. She said IRIS was currently working with the College of Arts and Sciences (the only college to distribute midterm grades) to get midterm grades out during the spring semester. IRIS will send out a variety of notices to current instructors to offer information about the coming change to the process of submitting grades and would use other methods to reach those who might not be teaching currently but would be in the spring.

Snow applauded the effort that went into the wonderful, state of the art SAP system, but wondered what types of backup systems were in place. Nash replied

that there was a 24-hour turn around time for disaster recovery. A test was conducted in July and all the data was recovered within 24 hours. She said that there was a contingency plan for student registration, grade sheets, etc. They could also use legacy systems in an emergency, until the mainframe goes away next semester. She said that extra time was built into various processes and extra hardware was on hand to allow for problems. Nash said that IRIS personnel were well aware that employees' paychecks and student grades must not be affected by problems, so sufficient back-up systems were in place to prevent this possibility.

The Chair thanked Nash and Nordin for attending. Noting the time, the Chair mentioned that if the agenda was not finished, a special, called meeting in December or January could take place.

#### 5. [New Graduate Certificate: Graduate Certificate in Applied Statistics](#)

The Chair shared that the proposal for a new Graduate Certificate in Applied Statistics was received from GC on April 4, 2006, was approved by the SAPC on September 21 and was approved by the SC on October 23. He said the certificate aimed to offer students in a variety of disciplines the ability to perform quantitative analyses. He added that the certificate came to the Senate from the SAPC through the SC with a positive recommendation. He invited Department of Statistics Director of Graduate Studies Army Stromberg to offer additional information.

Guest Stromberg said that students from various disciplines had been asking, for over five years, for such a certificate that would demonstrate an ability in statistical methods for non-statistics students. In response to Swanson, Stromberg said that the courses which would be required by the certificate were all currently offered.

There being no further questions, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve a new Graduate Certificate in Applied Statistics; the motion **passed** unanimously.

#### 6. [New Program: University Scholars Program with KY State Univ. for MS in Rehabilitation Counseling](#)

The Chair said that the proposal for a University Scholars Program with Kentucky State University (KSU) for an MS in Rehabilitation Counseling was received from the GC on April 14, was approved by the SAPC on September 21 and approved by the SC on October 23.

The Chair invited Department of Rehabilitation Counseling Director of Graduate Studies Ralph Crystal to offer information about the proposal. Guest Crystal stated that the rationale for the new University Scholars Program was partly due to a cultural diversity initiative from the United States Department of Education. The Department of Rehabilitation Counseling was approached by state constituency groups about collaborating with KSU on a University Scholars

Program. He worked closely with Juanita Fleming at KSU to develop the program, which would enable qualified undergraduate students from KSU to attend UK to complete an MS degree in Rehabilitation Counseling after graduating from KSU. Many graduates could be employed by the Kentucky Office for Vocational Rehabilitation and the Kentucky Office for the Blind.

There being no questions, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve a new University Scholars Program with Kentucky State University for an MS in Rehabilitation Counseling. The motion **passed** unanimously.

#### 7. [New Institute: Institute for Workplace Innovation \(iWIN\)](#)

The Chair said that the proposal for the new Institute for Workplace Innovation was received from College of Social Work on September 2, 2006, was approved by the Senate's Academic Organization & Structure Committee (SAOSC) on November 8 and approved by the SC on November 20. He invited College of Social Work Assistant Professor Jennifer Swanberg to offer information on the proposal. Guest Swanberg said that the institute originated as a recommendation of the Work-Life Task Force. The Institute for Workplace Innovation (iWIN) would take information gathered through research and apply that information to Kentucky businesses. iWIN will focus on engaging employers in the adoption of innovative workplace practices; use a regionally based agenda to focus on the global aspects of innovation; and encourage public discussions on the issues. Swanberg added that the Office of the President provided the seed money for start-up; they hoped to be self-sustaining after year three.

The Chair said that the proposal came from the SAOSC and went through the SC with a positive recommendation. A **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve the new Institute for Workplace Innovation. The motion **passed** unanimously.

#### 8. [Temporary Waiver of Non-Transfer of Grades to UK GPA for College of Engineering's Paducah Campus Students](#)

The Chair shared that the proposal affected not only his college, the College of Engineering, but also involved his department, the Department of Mechanical Engineering. He noted that the proposal for a temporary waiver would indicate a willingness to approve a formal, permanent waiver to treat some students differently. The SC approved waiving the rule but wanted the Senate to review it, as well. He invited College of Engineering Associate Dean for Commonwealth and International Programs G. T. Lineberry to explain the proposal.

Guest Lineberry explained that ten years ago, the College of Engineering (CoE) received approval from the Senate and the Council on Postsecondary Information (CPE) to offer a cooperative degree program in Paducah in chemical and mechanical engineering. Students were admitted to UK as freshmen but took courses at Murray State University (MSU) and Western Kentucky Community and Technical College (WKCTC, formerly Paducah Community College). UK remained the home institution with respect to financial aid, KEES money,

suspension, etc. Lineberry said that the CoE was requesting a temporary, one year waiver to give the CoE time to complete a formal proposal to waive the rule permanently.

The Chair said that he felt obligated to explain further so that senators understood the importance of the proposal. He added that when a student transferred to UK from another institution, the credit and grade for a course may be transferred, but the transferred grade does not factor into the UK GPA. The temporary waiver proposed by CoE would allow the grades received at WKCTC (while in the CoE program) to transfer to the UK GPA. The inclusion of the non-UK grade in the UK GPA was understood and accepted by the Senate and CPE when the original cooperative program was approved years ago; due to the recent separation of the community colleges from UK, the non-UK grades would not factor into the UK GPA after December 31, 2006. A narrow band of students would be negatively affected, hence the request to temporarily waive the rule for these students so that grades earned at WKCTC while pursuing a CoE degree in the cooperative program would be included in the UK GPA.

Bollinger asked about what would happen if the student enrolled in the CoE program at Paducah but then took courses other than courses required for an engineering degree – would the extra courses be included in the UK GPA? Lineberry replied that if a student transferred to UK's main, Lexington campus, none of the grades would factor into the UK GPA. The Chair clarified that Bollinger was wondering if non-required courses taken while in the CoE cooperative program would be included in the UK GPA. Lineberry replied that it was unlikely a student who was working toward a 139 credit degree would have the time to take additional courses, but said it could be done. He said courses taken through another community college would not transfer.

Finkel requested that Lineberry offer a brief statement of what Lineberry was asking the senators to approve. Lineberry replied that it was a temporary waiver of non-transfer of non-UK grades to the UK GPA for students in the CoE Paducah campus engineering program. Only students enrolled in the cooperative program would be affected, and only so long as the student remained enrolled in the program and remained in Paducah. The Chair added that the SC and the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee ruled that after December 31, 2006, grades earned at community colleges including Bluegrass Community and Technical College (BCTC, formerly Lexington Community College) would not be calculated into the UK GPA if the student transferred to UK. The request from the CoE was for a small group of students and would effectively allow those students to continue to be treated as they had been in the past, with their MSU and WKCTC grades (earned in pursuit of a UK CoE Paducah campus degree) being factored into the UK GPA.

Finkel asked for additional information regarding the time frame during which the courses were taken – would it be for some period in the past? Lineberry replied

that the waiver would only apply to students admitted to UK in the CoE, for one year, starting in January, for the spring, summer and fall 2007 semesters. The Chair recognized Mike Shanks, an advisor in the College of Arts and Sciences, who asked why CoE students in Paducah should be treated differently from other Kentucky Community and Technical College students. Lineberry replied that the CoE cooperative program with MSU and WKCTC was approved by both the Senate and the CPE, which effectively mandated that those students would be treated differently. UK collects the students' tuition and disperses MSU and WKCTC's portions out to them; rejecting the request for a temporary waiver would negatively impact the students' needs with scholarships, financial aid, suspension, etc. These matters were not anticipated when the program was initially approved ten years ago.

Mr. Shanks then asked what would happen if the CoE Paducah campus student subsequently began to take classes on the Lexington campus and transferred to another college. Lineberry replied that the credit for the courses would be included, but the grades would not; the waiver was only for students while enrolled in the CoE Paducah campus program. Finkel asked for clarification – would a student leaving the CoE Paducah program for another college on main campus have their grades or credits transfer to UK? Lineberry replied that if the student transferred colleges, the student would be treated as any other student – only the credit for the courses would transfer to UK and the grades would not factor into the UK GPA. The Chair added that University Registrar Don Witt was comfortable with the idea behind the temporary waiver.

Calvert opined that two different things had been said by Lineberry about the circumstances under which the grade would transfer to UK. Lineberry said that as long as the student remained in the CoE, even if the student moved to the main Lexington campus, the credits and grades earned at WKCTC for a CoE degree would travel with the student. Randall stated that statement did not mesh with what he understood the proposal to entail, when it was discussed at the SC meeting. Lineberry said that the temporary waiver would begin in spring 2007 for one year's grace period; the waiver would be for January 2007 through December 2007, two semesters. The Chair added that grades for CoE Paducah campus students for the current (fall 2006) semester were not affected, since those were already accepted into the UK GPA.

Molitero wondered if this waiver would set a precedent for other similar undergraduate programs; Lineberry replied that he knew of no other similar programs. Blackwell confirmed that there were no similar programs at the graduate level.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve a temporary, one year waiver to allow non-UK grades to be factored into the GPA of students enrolled in the College of Engineering's Paducah campus students. The motion **passed** unanimously.



9. [New Program: Dual BS \(Electrical or Mechanical\) Engineering/MS in Manufacturing Systems Engineering](#)

The Chair said that the proposal for a Dual BS (Electrical or Mechanical) Engineering/MS in Manufacturing Systems Engineering was received from GC on April 14, 2006, approved by the SAPC on November 10 and approved by the SC on November 20. He invited UK Center for Manufacturing Director Larry Holloway to offer information on the proposal.

Guest Holloway gave a brief synopsis. The proposal would allow students working toward a BS in either electrical or mechanical engineering to also be able to take classes toward an MS in mechanical systems engineering. It would be similar to many other dual degree programs on campus and would not reduce a student's course load.

There being no questions, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve the proposal for a Dual BS (Electrical or Mechanical) Engineering/MS in Manufacturing Systems Engineering. The motion **passed** unanimously.

10. [Policy Change: Minimum Language Requirements for International Teaching Assistants](#)

The Chair said that the policy change was received from the GC on April 4, 2006, was approved by the Senate's Admissions & Academic Standards Committee (SA&ASC) on October 4 contingent upon changes requested and returned to the Graduate School on October 10. The revised proposal was again received on November 15 and approved by the SC on December 4. The Chair invited Graduate School Dean Blackwell to offer information on the proposal.

Blackwell stated that there were two similar proposals before the Senate for approval. Agenda item number ten would change the minimum language requirements for international teaching assistants (ITA); the subsequent proposal would allow the Graduate School (GS) to accept the British equivalent of the TOEFL exam, the IELTS, which is accepted by European Union countries.

Blackwell said that approval of the policy change would allow the segment of the test that is an oral interview to be used in lieu of the current practice of conducting an on-campus language screening the week before classes started in August. The proposal would utilize the oral interview component of either TOEFL or IELTS and set forth specific scores to be met. Kentucky state statute required a spoken language screening, which would be met by the proposal. If approved, it would require a change to the *Administrative Regulations (AR)*. If the DGS, department chair or anyone else involved with the ITA thought there was a discrepancy between the oral interview score and classroom performance, the ITA could be removed from the classroom and required to undergo the traditional screening. Blackwell added that students who took an older version of TOEFL that did not include an oral interview or who had a speaking component score not

high enough for classroom teaching could also undergo the traditional on-campus screening.

In response to Grossman, Blackwell said the policy change would be effective for fall 2007. Debski expressed concern that there were already students going through the GS application process who had not been informed about this (proposed) new policy. Blackwell replied that if the student took an older version of the test, the student would be screened according to the current practice of on-campus screening. Debski wondered if a student who took the old version would have to take the spoken component to satisfy the language requirement. Blackwell said that there would always be on-campus screening available for students who fulfilled the TOEFL requirements through other means. The scores were acceptable only for three years, anyway, after which a new test would have to be taken.

In response to Calvert, Blackwell explained that the TOEFL ibt was not a face-to-face oral exam, but rather a tape recorded version. She said that in a recent conversation with a TOEFL administrator, the security measures for IELTS had been cloned for use in TOEFL. Copies were made of the oral presentation tapes and were then sent to two different evaluators in two different countries. Blackwell acknowledged that in the high-stakes arena of English language testing, there would always be attempts to commit fraud, but said that the backup of offering on-site testing on campus in cases of discrepancies between test scores and classroom performance would always be available.

Bollinger asked if there were comparisons for what benchmarks required. Blackwell said that the GS looked at benchmarks that already accepted the IELTS and that equivalency scores were already available. She added that a conversation with an IELTS administrator confirmed that requiring a score of 7 was fine. The proposed policy would be for a trial period of two years, after which she would return to the Senate with a report on the success of the pilot and a request for permanency.

Calvert, also chair of the SA&ASC, said that there was some concern among committee members that there could be issues of fraud, but that members were also sympathetic to the compressed time frame in which DGS' currently have to ensure that an ITA was capable of teaching in the classroom – the trial period helped SA&ASC members approve the proposal.

Debski stated that she was still confused about the wording. She said it indicated that a student would have to have a test score on a test that was currently not required. There was additional discussion among Debski, Blackwell and Grossman on what exactly the language required.

Finkel asked about language in the proposal that referred to a “conditional” and “unconditional” approval. Blackwell clarified that the description of the approval

was based on the scores received and that conditional approval allowed an ITA to enter the classroom in a support role (but not as the main speaker) for one semester, after which the student would be retested.

After additional expressions of concern by Debski, Blackwell said she would change the language on page three of the proposal, in the section with the revised language incorporated, as follows: "For student who have taken older ESL examinations within the last two years, scores of 550 on the TOEFL ~~and at least 250 on the Test of Spoken English~~ are is required, and these students...." Blackwell confirmed for D. Williams that the revised proposal would still meet the minimum requirements. Calvert wondered how the language "...within the last two years...." would be addressed so that it remained current. Blackwell replied that when the pilot ends in two years, the language would be cleaned up.

In response to Steiner's question about a possible increase in the cost for students, Blackwell said that the oral component was a part of the test as a whole; while the cost of taking the test would likely rise over time, there was no additional financial burden on the student.

There being no further questions or comments, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to change the current policy regarding minimum language requirements for ITAs as outlined in the proposal. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Noting that it was already past the five o'clock hour, the Chair requested that at least one more agenda item be reviewed.

#### 11. [Policy Change: Test of ESL for International Graduate Students](#)

Blackwell said that the proposal merely allowed the GS to accept the IELTS as an official test for admission to the GS. The grade of 6.5 was standard among benchmarks. The GS had been accepting the IELTS on a case-by-case basis, so this change would allow the GS to advertise accepting the score. Guest Brian Jackson (Graduate School Senior Associate Dean) said the proposal would also codify an acceptable minimum score for the new internet-based TOEFL.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve the policy change regarding test of ESL for international graduate students as outlined in the proposal. The motion **passed** unanimously.

#### 12. [Disability Resource Center Resolution - DRC Director Jake Karnes](#)

The Chair stated that from time to time, instructors interacted with a student needing an accommodation for a disability. When instructors asked for the authority by which they were required to offer an accommodation, Disability Resource Center Director Jake Karnes referred them to state and federal statutes, but thought it would be more appropriate to refer instructors to a set of Senate minutes that affirm the need to offer accommodation. He asked if Karnes wanted to offer additional information.

Guest Karnes said that 1,200 accommodation letters had gone out to faculty during the fall 2006 semester, showing that a large number of students were interacting with a large number of faculty on accommodation. The Chair asked if there were any questions. R. Smith asked a question regarding the timing of the letters to the instructor. Due to the late time, the Chair asked that any questions pertain specifically to the agenda item at hand.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion that the Senate fully support the resolution below.

Students with disabilities are required to provide instructors letters of accommodation from the University of Kentucky Disability Resource Center prior to requesting any accommodation in their classes for a disability. Students must provide the Center extensive disability documentation before qualifying for accommodations. (The accommodation criteria can be found on the Center web page under "Documentation Guidelines.") The confidential letters are the official notice to instructors confirming that the student is eligible for the stated accommodations according to University guidelines and that it is the instructor's legal responsibility to fulfill the requests. Additionally, the letters serve as a guideline for effective teaching and testing of students who, because of limitations imposed by disability, have different modes of learning and demonstrating mastery of material. Instructors are encouraged to contact the Center for additional information, clarification and assistance about providing accommodation.

The University has a long tradition of accommodating students with disabilities, preceding the existence of any Federal mandates. In keeping with that tradition and in recognition of the necessity to comply with the law (Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and Americans with Disabilities Act), the University Senate acknowledges the need to accommodate students with disabilities, as determined by the Disability Resource Center, and endorses the University accommodation procedure.

The motion **passed** unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:11 pm

Respectfully submitted by Larry Grabau,  
University Senate Vice Chair

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on December 13, 2006.