

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, APRIL 14, 1997

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m, April 14, 1997 in Room 115 of the Nursing Health Sciences Building.

Professor Janice Schach, Chairperson of the Senate Council presided.

Members absent were: Behruz Abadi, M.Mukhtar, Gary Anglin, John Ballantine, Michael Bardo, Vasant Bhapkar, Patricia Birchfield, Terry Birdwhistell, Darla Botkin, Fitzgerald Bramwell, Joseph Burch, Mary Burke, Johnny Cailleteau, Joan Callahan\*, Berry Campbell, Ben Carr, Edward Carter, Jordan Cohen\*, Raymond Cox\*, Virginia Davis-Nordin\*, Frederick DeBeer, Philip DeSimone, Lee Edgerton, Robert Farquhar, Donald Frazier, Richard Furst, Ottfried Hahn, James Holsinger, Robert Houtz, Raleigh Jones, Craig Koontz, Gretchen LaGodna, Thomas Lester, G.T. Lineberry\*, C. Oran Little, Loys Mather\*, David Mohney\*, Donald Mullineaux\*, David Nash, Phyllis Nash, Wolfgang Natter, Anthony Newberry, Thomas Nieman, Rhoda-Gale Pollack, Shirley Raines, Thomas Robinson, Edgar Sagan\*, David Shipley, Edward Soltis\*, David Stockham, Charles Wethington\*, Carolyn Williams, Eugene Williams, Lionell Williamson, Emery Wilson, Phyllis Wise, William Witt\*, Craig Wood.

\* Absence Explained

Chairperson Schach asked if there were any corrections or additions to the February 1997 minutes. There were none and the minutes were approved as circulated.

The Chair introduced Melanie Cruz, the new elected Student Government Association President, to introduce the new student senators.

Melanie stated that she was looking forward to working with the Senate. She introduced the following student senators:

Josh Mitchell - Education, Kim Glenn - Engineering, Mark Ison - Fine Arts, Mike O=92Dell Walker - Agriculture, Les Olson - Architecture, Stacy McCarthy - Arts and Sciences, Charles Cooper - Communications, Jill Kellemen - Nursing, George Myers - Social Work, Carrie Sparrow - Allied Health, Michael Tomblyn - Graduate School, Marianne Laurenson - Human Environmental Sciences, and Todd P=92Pool - Law School.

The Chair made the following announcements:

I would like everyone to know that on Tuesday, April 8, 1997 I fax=92d a written invitation to Governor Patton to attend a Senate Meeting. I have not received, as of yet, a response. I will get the news out when I receive information from him.

There is an upcoming visit of a team from UK, headed by Chancellor Zinser to the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania and the Institute for Research and Higher Education. The team will include Deans Shipley, Little, Raines, and myself. Our mission is to gather information on how to accelerate research and graduate education here at UK. We will be collecting information from a group of ten other institutions attending the meeting. Part of our charge was developed by the Deans=92 Council of the Lexington Campus. Upon our return we will be working with a blue ribbon committee of faculty and others appointed by this team and the Chancellor

to be looking at a constructive plan. Part of the plan will identify priorities and opportunity areas units, departments, and multidisciplinary initiatives and individual faculty for strategic enhancements. Part of this process will include the identification of areas or units for consolidation, reduction, elimination, and will outline how these enhancements can and should occur strategically. You can look forward to some rather progressive action on the university=92s mission regarding research and graduate education.

At the request of President Wethington the Senate Council has recommended on an important AR change that I thought you would be interested in knowing about. The change is to AR 2-1.0-1B, Paragraph 4-2; Notification of Nonrenewal of Appointment of Nontenured Faculty Appointments. Basically, the AR change proposed was to add wording to the effect that for faculty members ineligible for tenure, notification of nonrenewal of appointment may be given at any time contingent upon continuity of funding and the individual=92s accomplishments. This pertains primarily to Research and Clinical Title Series faculty. The Senate Council has recommended against this AR change, the basis being that the research and clinical title series faculty are valuable faculty to this University, they make important contributions particularly to the research and service mission of the University. The Senate Council believes very strongly that these individuals deserve a minimum of twelve months notification to allow time for them to secure other funding. In addition to that, some kind of bridge funding be provided to these individuals during the interim period. This recommendation has been forwarded to the Presidents=92 office for consideration.

The Senate Council has established a new task force to study the term of the Senate Council Chair. This task force is to be chaired by Brad Canon and includes Loys Mather and Wilbur Frye, all past Senate Council chairs. The task force will be looking at the term of the Senate Council chair and the possibility of the Senate Council chair succeeding themselves. Right now that is not a possibility due to the way the elections of the Senate Chair-elect are conducted. In line with the way that the Ombud position operates, the Ombud would have the option of pursuing another year if approved by the Senate Council. This group will be looking at, first of all if it is desirable for a Senate Council chair to succeed themselves and, if so, what would the election process be as specified in the Senate Rules.

There will be another Senate meeting on Monday, April 28, 1997, at 3:00 p.m., in Room 201 of the Nursing Building. If you have not already received the agenda item for that meeting you will, hopefully, soon. The main agenda is the discussion of the Senate Council Task Force on Promotion and Tenure=92s recommendations. Please review the related document and come prepared for a discussion of the Task Forces=92 recommendations. The Task Force has worked hard and you will see some meaningful suggestions.

Resolution on Excellence in Research and Graduate Education

Resolution

The University of Kentucky faculty is dedicated to the proposition that our university should be a nationally recognized doctoral degree-granting institution, and in that spirit we endorse the goals and aspirations set forth in the report recently issued by the Governor=92s Task Force on Postsecondary Education. We agree that our institution must play a pivotal role in the economic development of the Commonwealth, and that a primary contribution to that role will be through the creation of a substantial number of nationally recognized doctoral programs. Whatever form this

proposed restructuring takes, it should foster an increased emphasis on research and graduate education at the University of Kentucky, increased commitment of resources to this end, and a more sharply focused institutional mission.

#### Background

This resolution was submitted by a group of faculty of the University of Kentucky to the Senate council for consideration as a Senate resolution. The Senate Council voted to include the resolution above along with the rationale below as an agenda item.

#### Rationale

As part of the Governor=92s assessment of postsecondary education, his task force has issued a wide-ranging report which asserts that =93Kentucky does not have a nationally recognized doctoral degree-granting institution,=94 and couples this with the observation that =93World-class research institutions that attract business and industry become a breeding ground for entrepreneurial talent.=94 We do not disagree with the Report=92s assessment of our overall ranking.

However, we do think it fair to observe that the University of Kentucky faculty has, for several decades, accepted the challenge of academic excellence. Indeed, a great many of us have devoted almost our entire academic careers toward the building of just such a university as the Report calls for. But those high goals, which actually seemed attainable for a brief moment in the mid-seventies foundered amidst a series of budget disasters.

Chairperson Schach recognized Professor Jim Applegate, Chair-elect of the Senate Council for introduction of the resolution. Professor Applegate stated the resolution was an effort on the part of the Senate Council to focus some attention to the ongoing debate where there is a variety of competing agendas and different advocates on what the Senate Council believes to be the issue of greatest concern to the faculty of this campus, that is the commitment to enhancing their stature in research and graduate education. The Senate Council wants to emphasize this point as an important part of the discussion that sometimes seems endangered of getting lost.

Professor Hans Gesund (Engineering) questioned the correctness of the rationale statement that said =93We do not disagree with the Report=92s assessment of our overall ranking.=94 UK is within the top fifty of all research institutions and is a Rank One Carnegie Research Institution. UK is definitely in the top ranks of nationally ranked institutions, there is no question about this and we should not demean ourselves in the first paragraph of the rationale. The second thing that concerned him was the last phrase in the resolution itself, =93whatever form this proposed restructuring takes, it should foster an increased emphasis on research and graduate education at the University of Kentucky, and increased commitment of resources to this end, and a more sharply focused institutional mission.=94 That can be read as endorsing the Governor=92s plan to strip the community colleges from the University. He does not think that they want to endorse that. UK depends on the community colleges to be the roots of its whole educational mission and if we are severed from our roots, we are going to be in severe trouble. He does not feel we should be bucking the

President on this, he agrees with the President that UK should not lose the community colleges. He feels it would be very bad for the institution. He would move to strike =93and a more sharply focused institutional mission=94 from the resolution and add an =93and=94 after Kentucky.

Mike Friedmann (Fine Arts) said that when he read =93increased emphasis on research and graduate education=94 he fears decreased emphasis on undergraduate education. He felt the entire sentence should be deleted.

Jim Applegate said he did not feel the intention was to suggest the denegation of any other portion but simply to say that at this point they felt that this needed special attention. The idea was if they are looking at ways to enhance the university, it is time to present a focus on research and graduate education missions. There is some feeling that there has already been a strong move to improve in relation to undergraduate education and this should be continued. At this moment in time, particularly given the focus of the Governor=92s interest on top twenty research institutions, this would be something to give special attention to.

Bill Fortune (Law) asked if the Governor=92s Task Force on Post-Secondary Education had within it anything about the community colleges? The Chair said that the report was primarily an evaluation of the status of the community colleges. Professor Fortune asked if they endorsed the goals and aspirations in that report, what were they doing?

Professor Applegate said that the report called for a variety of goals, including work force enhancement in the state, and that was the level of what they were thinking, enhancing the quality of work force. They are not necessarily endorsing specific methods for accomplishing the goals. The idea of work force development, enhancing research and quality of graduate education at this institution, enhancing the quality of work at the regional institutions through the funds that are set up for them, and Louisville=92s urban mission, those are the goals and aspirations they were endorsing. A more responsive higher education system in the state at that level was what they hoped to endorse, not necessarily specific mechanisms for making accomplishing that.

Phil Greasley (University Extension) suggested that if that was the intent that they substitute some of the wording that Professor Applegate mentioned for the blanket statement that can be read or misread in that direction.

Mike Friedman made an amendment to the amendment to strike the last sentence of the resolution.

Jesse Weil (Arts and Sciences) said that the resolution then made no point, that the point was made in the last sentence.

The Chair reminded the Senate that the Senate Council had developed a White Paper on this subject that covers the ideas in the resolution. Plus they have already sent a Senate Council Resolution to the Governor that speaks to academic excellence, and that it also covers the subject very closely.

The question was called. The vote to stop debate passed in a count off= vote.

The amendment of the amendment failed in a show of hands; 7 for and 53 against.

The amendment failed in a show of hands; 24 for and 43 against.

The resolution was defeated in a show of hands; 19 for and 50 against.

Agenda Item IV: Proposal to change the effective date for the plus/minus grading system in the Graduate School.

Proposal:

The effective date for implementation of the +/- grading system for graduate students will be Fall 1998.

Background:

On February 10, 1997, the University Senate considered a proposal for a change in the graduate grading system. The proposed grading system was 4.0=3DA, 3.7=3DA-, 3.3=3DB+, 3.0=3DB, 2.7=3DB-, 2.3=3DC+, 2.0=3DC, 1.7=3DC-, = and 0.0=3DE.

This proposal was amended and passed as amended; the amendment was to include the grade of 4.3=3DA+. At the 2/24/97 meeting of the Senate Council=

,  
Connie Wood, Acting Dean of Graduate School, proposed the above motion on behalf of the Graduate Council. The Senate Council approved bringing this agenda item to the Senate floor for action.

Rationale:

The Graduate Faculty, upon recommendation of the Graduate Council, is seeking a delay in the implementation of the +/- Grading system for graduate students. The motivation is two-fold. Firstly, the Inclusion of 4.3=3DA+ effectively changes the range and the maximum of the grading scale. The delay of one year would allow the Graduate Faculty the opportunity to discuss, and possible address, the ramifications of such a change. The +/- grading system with 4.3=3DA+, as approved by the University Senate, has not been approved by the Graduate Faculty. Secondly, the implementation date of Fall 1998 would allow the publication of the +/- grading scale in the next Graduate Bulletin.

The Chair recognized Professor Applegate to introduce the item. Professor Applegate reviewed the item and stated it came with recommendation of the Senate Council.

Connie Wood (Graduate School) said that at the February Senate meeting the Graduate School had brought forth through the Senate Council the proposal for +/- grading at the graduate level. At the time it was brought forward, the proposal was amended to approve a grade of A+ that carried with it quality points of 4.3. The Graduate faculty and the Graduate Council had both passed resolutions asking for a delay in the implementation date. The implementation date as it stands now will be Fall 1997. Due to the timing the Graduate faculty was not able to consider this and decided whether or not they might wish to take any kind of action because of the inclusion of the A+ grade, which had not previously been approved by either body. There are two reasons there is concern over this; the primary reason is that inclusion of a 4.3 increases the maximum grade point average. As it stands now, University graduate students when dealing with issues such as probation or any type of graduate standing are working with 4.0 graduate maximum. Also when the students transfer, they are transferring under the basis of a 4.0 maximum. With the inclusion of a 4.3, this increases the maximum to a 4.3 and that can affect the standing of grades which are below a 4.3. The Graduate faculty is just asking for an opportunity to discuss ramifications of this issue and come to some kind of conclusion or recommendation.

The question was called. The item passed in a show of hands.

AGENDA ITEM V: Proposal for endorsement of University of Kentucky Principles.

#### Proposal

The University Senate is asked for its endorsement of The University of Kentucky Principles as an official University document. The Senate Council has endorsed The Principles and the vote by the Senate will be a simple up or down vote.

#### Background and Rationale

The University of Kentucky Principles is intended as a normative statement of university-wide shared values to serve multiple purposes including faculty, staff, and student orientation, classroom discussion and assignments, and as a vehicle for individual development beginning in Fall 1997.

The effort to establish a university-wide statement regarding inclusive learning principles and values began a number of years ago with the Student Government Association and Dean of Students David Stockholm. A number of versions were written and entitled, The Kentucky Creed, none of which were followed up on due to lack of continuous leadership. In the Fall of 1996, the Student Government Association led by president Alan Aja and the Student Affairs Committee teamed up with the Inclusive Learning Community Team and the Senate Council to write a new version.

Over the winter, the initial draft was presented to the University Senate Council, Student Organization Association representing all campus student organizations, the Student Government President=92s Roundtable, Lexington Campus Dean=92s Council, Lexington Campus Staff Council, Medical Center Academic Council, and Medical Center Student Affairs Committee. Revisions to the statement have since been made based on feedback from these groups and the title changed to The University of Kentucky Principles in an effort to more accurately represent the spirit and purpose of the statement. The Principles have received official endorsement from the University Senate Council and the Student Government Senate. This coming summer, representative groups of faculty, staff, and students in the Community College System will be asked to endorse The Principles so that it can become part of a University-wide orientation effort in Fall 1997.

#### University of Kentucky Principles

The University of Kentucky Principles have been collectively created by students, faculty and staff as ideals to strive for in order to reach a more inclusive campus environment. It is not intended for purposes of enforcement or to be exclusionary of any race, ethnic background, religion, or culture. Individuals are encouraged to use these principles as a learning tool in a process of personal growth and development. One who reads these principles is encouraged to adopt them as one sees fit and to continually explore one=92s own interpretation of them, thus collectively working for the betterment of the University as a whole.

As a member of the University of Kentucky community, I will strive to= promote:

#### Lifelong Learning

=A8=20

#### Academic Excellence and Personal Integrity

=A8=20

#### Individual Responsibility and Self Empowerment

=A8=20

#### Freedom of Thought and Speech

=A8=20

Mutual respect and Collective Responsibility

=A8=20

Cultural Diversity and Human Dignity

=A8=20

Teamwork and Shared Decision-Making

=A8=20

Physical Accessibility and Personal Safety

=A8=20

Environmental Stewardship

The Chair recognized Professor Applegate for introduction of the item. Professor Applegate reviewed the background and introduced Allan Aja, President of the Student Government Association.

Allan Aja made the following comments:

I have been asked to give some history behind the University of Kentucky Principles. In 1991 and 1992 a group of students got together and decided they wanted a creed, a common goal statement that they can strive for as students. They drafted a document, but graduation came and it never got off the ground. The same thing happened a couple of years later. Last year I was in the same position as Ms. Cruz is in now, I received a letter from Dean Stockham saying that he felt I should look at these former creeds that were put together by students but never really got off the ground. Jan Schach and I talked about these and said why didn't they make it a student and faculty issue, a university-wide common goal that everyone could work for. It was my responsibility, along with Wendy Highland and Laurel Reed from Student Government to get some student input and initiatives, while Dr. Schach did some research on other statements from universities to see what kinds of words and goals they could strive for as a university. This is what they came up with. It was presented in front of the Student Organizations Assembly last semester and they said it was a great idea. It was also presented this semester in front of the Student Government Association Senate and it passed by acclamation. This is a final step in having it officially endorsed by the University of Kentucky. How is this going to be used? Melanie Cruz in her campaign promised to put the Principles in the back of the student identification card. Nothing is forced upon the student body, it is just common goals that they as students and faculty can strive for. In the fall when the new students arrive there is a convocation and they plan to have the student body president, the students, and the faculty read it together. They want this to go on to be a part of the Inclusive Learning Community, the University, the Student Government Association, and the University Senate.

The Chair stated that this item was up for endorsement as a whole, it is not open for amendments or any type of editing. The wording is thought through to the effect that these are not going to be static words, this document hopefully will grow over time. It is really not intended to have a specific real clear word by word definition for each of the words that are there. This is suppose to be open to some interpretation by the individuals reading it. They decided not to have an accompanying document with a definition for each of these terms to allow for people to have a little bit of freedom as to how they utilize this document. Hopefully it will be brought into course work, faculty can use it as a vehicle for discussion. This is up for an up or down vote.

Hans Gesund asked what happened to equality of opportunity? If it can not be amended he would have to vote against it because that is not in there.

Tom Blues (English) said that the problem he had was that the resolution seemed to bend over backwards to be innocuous, there are a series of phrases that can mean whatever someone wants them to mean. If there is going to be a Statement of Principles, they should be a statement of principles that everyone stands behind. These are really just a list of phrases that do not mean very much.

Alan Aja said that there was a reason why the Student Government said the Principles passed by acclamation. The students realize that there is a lot of meaning behind them. Some of them are subject to personal interpretation, but that is the beauty of it all.

The Chair said they were caught between having something that is ten pages long, that includes every item they could agree to, having them all defined, and having someone sign a form to that effect. You are looking at the other end of the extreme, and trying to gain some meaning in all the words. There has never been a document like this before that even comes close to defining a picture of what they all stand for and allowing for people to have the freedom of interpretation along with it.=20

Hans Gesund asked for briefing as to whether it is permissible to not be able to amend the Principles. Where in the parliamentary rules can the Chair decide that no amendment will be permitted? The Chair stated she had anticipated the question and had consulted with the Parliamentarian ahead of time. The Parliamentarian said that it came before the Senate Council in that form and that was part of the Senate Council rules.

The Chair said that if they could appreciate the fact that when a document is written together as a whole, no word or one word stands alone but it is to stand as a whole.

Mary Ann Laurenson (Student Senator - Human Environmental Sciences) said that she was part of the organizational assembly that put this together and her basic feeling was that this was something that the students put together to be of use to students. If there is a problem with it in the Senate, send it back to the students and let them work on it some more. As far as equality of opportunity goes, that is something that is open to interpretation and when she looks through it, she sees equality of opportunity, not is so many words.

The question was called. The motion was in a show of hands; 57 for and 7 against.

AGENDA ITEM VI: Proposed amendment to Senate Rules, 4.2.0 (Admission Requirements)

Proposal

See amendments.

Rationale and Background

The attached amendments are proposed by the Senate Admissions Advisory Committee (AAC) and serve to expand the composition of the AAC as well as the criteria for admission to the University. The proposal clarifies the role of the AAC with respect to the establishment of admission criteria, the role of the Director of Admissions in review of applicants not meeting automatic admission criteria, and due process for petitions for admission. The Senate Council has approved the proposal.

These changes are in response to potential ramifications of recent legal



rulings regarding university admissions including the Hopwood Case as well as a proposed UK comprehensive enrollment management plan that focuses on both admissions and retention. Note that this proposal does not alter the role of the University Senate as the primary body that approves admission criteria and standards for the University.

Proposal [additions are underlined; deletions are bracketed]

#### 4.2.0 ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

##### 4.2.1 UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGES

Students who satisfy the basic admission requirements may register in any undergraduate college at the University except as additional entrance requirements are hereinafter stated.

The University of Kentucky prefers that applicants for admission shall have taken the ACT examination. Applicants may be considered for admission, however, on the basis of Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT) scores. The Director of Admissions shall establish annually an appropriate equivalency table of total SAT and ACT composite scores to be used with the established lower division selective admissions criteria. After approval by the Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards, this table shall be used by the Admissions Office in judging the acceptability of otherwise qualified applicants. (US: 4/8/85)

All new freshman and transfer students are required to attend an Advising Conference as assigned at the time of admission unless excused by permission of the University Registrar in special circumstances and emergencies. (US: 2/10/86)

The University=92s complete undergraduate admissions policy and all associated academic standards shall be reviewed by the Senate during the 1989-90 academic year. (US: 4/28/86)

##### 4.2.1.1 Basic Lower Division Selective Admissions (US: 11/12/90)

A The Admissions Advisory Committee (AAC) is a standing committee of the University Senate. The voting members of the Committee are the Director of Admissions, the University Registrar, the Chair of the Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards, one student appointed by the Senate Council, and three additional faculty appointed by the Senate Council to staggered three-year terms. Ex officio, non-voting members of the Committee include the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Research, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, The Director of Institutional Research for the Lexington Campus, and a member from the Medical Center whose appointment is analogous to the director of Institutional Research for the Lexington Campus. Representatives of other campus units whose expertise may be deemed necessary and appropriate may be invited by the Chair to serve as ex officio, non-voting members of the Committee. The committee must be chaired by one of the three appointed faculty members. In the case of a tie vote, the vote of the chair shall prevail.

The AAC is responsible for recommending admissions policy within general guidelines established by the University Senate. The AAC will: =20

1. Adopt an admissions management system, as described in section (B).
2. File a written report recommending to the Chancellors admissions objectives such as average ACT scores and desired size of each year=92s entering Freshman class. A copy of the report shall be presented to the Senate Council.
3. The Committee will establish internal automatic admission criteria for both Early decision and regular, full consideration admission.
4. Upon the recommendation of the Director of Admissions, approve any

warranted deviations from the initial internal admissions criteria.

5. After consultation with the Director of Admissions, the AAC may recommend closing admissions on any of the following bases: (1) the desired class size has been reached; (2) the class is large enough given existing constraints; and (3) admissions objectives other than class size have been achieved.

6. Establish guidelines for the decisions of the Exceptions Committee.

7. Request the Chancellors provide specific data on admissions, enrollment, and student performance in the Chancellors=92 annual report to the Senate.

8. Request specific other data from the University Registrar or Director of Admissions for use in establishing or evaluating admissions policy.

9. Review and analyze the information provided by the Chancellors and the Registrar or Director of Admissions and disseminate the results of its review and analysis to the academic units.

B The AAC will adopt an Admissions Management System for admissions. The Admissions Management System will:

1. Have internal [,non-published] automatic acceptance standards [recommended] established by the AAC. The University will [,however,] publish the range of scores and grade point averages which secured admission in the previous year=92s [freshman class] entering classes.

2. Admissions criteria [will] may include [not only] high school grade point average (HSGPA), [and] ACT composite score, [but] class rank, degree of difficulty of courses, and ACT subsection scores, or any other criteria or characteristics that provide insight into an applicant=92s potential for academic success at the University. [However, students with an ACT score below 15 (old ACT) or 18 (enhanced ACT) may be admitted through the Exceptions Committee only, except students admitted under Section E of this provision.] (US: 10/11/93)

3. An applicant who has a high school grade-point average which is less than 2.0 will be automatically denied admission (RC: 11/13/95).

4. At least ninety percent (90%) of all freshman admissions will be made according to the internal automatic acceptance criteria.

[5. Admissions criteria will contain an exceptions procedure for two types of applicants: (1) Internal Exceptions Procedure: for those prospective students who have certain diversity characteristics not present in the pool of students admitted by internal, automatic-admit criteria and (2) External Exception Procedure: for those students whose applications for admission have been rejected.

a. Internal Exceptions Procedure: the AAC will identify characteristics not adequately represented in the pool of students admitted under the internal-admit criteria. The Director of Admissions will forward the files of candidates having those characteristics and a reasonable academic record to the Exceptions Committee for consideration before the candidate is notified of an admissions decision. If the Exceptions Committee determines that the candidate has a reasonable chance of success, admission will be granted unless the desired class size or other critical admissions objectives have been met.

b. External Exception Procedure: the Exceptions Committee will continue to function as the appeals board for all candidates whose applications were rejected. A rejected applicant may petition for admission due to (1) significant non-academic personal achievement; (2) diversity; or (3) unusual situations affecting academic performance.]

5. The Director of Admissions will review the files of the candidates who

do not meet the admission standards established by the AAC but who offer high school grade point averages of 2.0 or higher. The Director, within guidelines established by the AAC, may use his/her discretion to offer admission to freshman applicants whose credentials indicate a reasonable potential for success at the University.

=09

6. A candidate whose application is denied may petition the Committee on Exceptions for a review of this decision. A denied applicant may petition for admission by exception on the basis of a significant non-academic performance or outstanding potential for contributing to or benefiting from an education at the University.

7.[6.] The following admissions deadlines are established:

November 1, for Early Decision applications February 15, for regular, full consideration applications August 1, for the submission of all documents. (June 1, for participation in the summer advising conference).

Students who apply after the deadline for full consideration will be admitted only as enrollment goals permit.

These deadlines apply to both transfers and entering students. Applications received after February 15 may be rejected even if they demonstrate better qualifications than some already admitted.

An exemption from the August 1 deadline may be granted to non-degree students who enroll in no more than eight (8) credits. These students may enroll through the Evening Weekend Program, at the registration conducted before the opening of classes.

The Director of Admissions may admit exceptional applicants after the desired class size has been met or the August 1 deadline has passed, but the number of such admissions should be kept to a minimum.

The AAC may change these deadlines, based on future experience.

Implementation Date: Fall, 1998

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

Chairperson Schach recognized Professor Jim Applegate for introduction of the item. Professor Applegate reviewed the background of the item and said that some of the changes were made in response to what are interpreted to being the legal implications from changes in affirmative action in the law per the Hopwood case as well as an effort to involve the right parties as they move toward an enrollment management plan that engages and attempts to improve the retention process. He recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council. =20

The Chair recognized Tony Baxter, Chair of the Admission Advisory Committee.=

=20

Professor Baxter made the following remarks:

These suggested changes came about for several reasons. The first request that they wanted to make was changing the composition of the selective admissions committee. One by adding a student member. They also wanted to formalize the role of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Research on the committee. They felt that the admissions process impacts that

entire university, as they found with what happens when there are tuition shortfalls, and they felt that the central administration=92s input was necessary. They suggest a change to add one voting member; a student member and one nonvoting ex officio member; the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Research. Currently the committee is comprised of four voting faculty members and two administration voting members; the Director of Admission and the Registrar. It is primarily a faculty committee. They also wanted to include a phrase allowing them to add ex officio members as appropriate.

There is a change in the proposed admissions management system which is a set of rules that prescribe the manner in which undergraduate students are admitted. The first issue was that the rules as written seemed to imply that the automatic acceptance criteria, the criteria by which 90% of the freshman are admitted was to be nonpublished. They felt that there was no reason not to make it public. The new Director of Admissions, Pat Herring is here and he felt it was something he wanted to make available to high school guidance counselors and he saw no reason for it not to be published.

They strengthened the wording slightly and said that the admissions standards shall be established as opposed to recommended by the committee. They made a minor change and instead of freshman class made it entering classes, because there is the thought that more students will be entering in the summer term rather than necessarily one particular point of entry.

Currently we admit students based upon two data points; they look at high school grade point average and ACT scores. That is it. The Committee felt that this is insufficient data to admit on and wanted to open it slightly to formally look at other criteria such as; rank in class, past performance of students coming from particular high schools, subsets of ACT scores, and difficulty of courses and try to be slightly more comprehensive in what they look at in judging student success.

The most substantive change is one that was motivated by the Hopwood decision; a decision which states that all admission decisions must be done in a race blind manner. This University has currently admitted 90% of the students by looking at two factors, the ACT scores and the grade point averages and that is totally race blind. The 10% of the freshman class that have been admitted who have not necessarily made the cutoff in the automatic criteria have been admitted under two sets of policies. One called the Internal Exception Procedures and one currently called the External Exception Procedures. What has happened is that the Internal Procedures has been used to insure ethnic diversity and the External Procedures have been an appeals process for students outside the institution. What they propose is requiring that the Director of Admissions look at every records of all students who are potentially acceptable candidates; have graduated from high school with over a 2.0 and who did not make the automatic acceptance criteria. They are asking the Director of Admissions to review every one of those files and that the Academic Advisory Committee would establish the guidelines under which students in that category would be admitted. =20

The only other change is to put in a statement that says anyone has the right to appeal the decision of Admissions and of the University.

Bill Freehling (Arts and Sciences) asked if things like recommendations from teachers, student=92s essays, and extra curricular record are of absolutely no use to admissions. Professor Baxter answered that in the automatic admissions category whereby they target 90% as required by Senate Rules they are not looked at. Professor Freehling asked why that was so?

Pat Herring (Director of Admissions) said there was established every year a concordance between SAT/ACT that is blocked out into ranges of grade point average and corresponding test score and run through autoadmissions. It literally is automatic. Professor Freehling asked if that was for out of state students also? Pat Herring said that was correct. Professor Freehling asked if they did not feel they would get more out of state students if they considered some other things? Pat Herring said that they would and that was what they were after, a little more room to run.

Hans Gesund asked that if any seven footer who meant NCAA criteria would be accepted. Pat Herring said that NCAA requirements were not higher than the autoadmit criteria, but are higher than automatic denial. They would go into a review.

Tony English (Allied Health) said that the document that it is written now says in the last line that academic standards shall be reviewed by the Senate during the 1989-90 academic year. Maybe that could be changed editorially.

George Blandford (Engineering) said that he wanted to make an editorial change in Section 4.2.1, second paragraph, last sentence which says after approval by the Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards, talking about the equivalency tables, should be changed to Admissions Advisory Committee. To the best of his knowledge his committee has never looked at those tables.

The amendment passed in a voice vote. The question was called. The motion passed in a unanimous voice vote.

AGENDA ITEM VII: Proposal to place all undergraduate students on the Lexington Campus and Medical Center Sectors on a uniform grading system.

Proposal

Part I: All undergraduate students on the Lexington Campus and Medical Center Sectors are to be assigned grades from a single uniform system by Fall 1998.

Part II: A. If Part I is approved, then one of the grading systems listed below will become the single uniform grading system.

or

B. If no uniform system is approved by the Senate for Fall 1998 implementation, then Part I of this proposal will automatically be rescinded, the various systems used currently will remain in use, and the Senate will continue to consider proposals from individual units.

Grading System Options

1. No Plus/Minus System  
A,B,C,D,E with no plus/minuses
2. A+ System  
4.3 =3D A+, 4.0 =3D A, 3.7 =3D A-, 3.3 =3D B+, 3.0 =3D B, 2.7 =3D B-,  
2.3 =3D C+, 2.0 =3D C, 1.7 =3D C-, 1.3 =3D D+, 1.0 =3D D, .7 =3D D-, 0.0 =3D E
3. Rounded-Off A+

Same as No. 2, A+ System, but the cumulative GPA is rounded off so that it cannot be greater than 4.0

- 4. NO A+ System  
4.0 = 3D A, 3.7 = 3D A-, 3.3 = 3D B+, 3.0 = 3D B, 2.7 = 3D B-, 2.3 = 3D C+, 2.0 = 3D C, 1.7 = 3D C-, 1.3 = 3D D+, 1.0 = 3D D, .7 = 3D D-, and 0.0 = 3D E
- 5. All Plus/No Minus System  
4.0 = 3D A, 3.3 = 3D B+, 3.0 = 3D B, 2.3 = 3D C+, 2.0 = 3D C, 1.3 = 3D D+, 1.0 = 3D D, 0.0 = 3D E
- 6. Numerical System/No Letter Grades  
100-90 = 3D A, 89-80 = 3D B, 79-70 = 3D C, 69-60 = 3D D, <60 = 3D E
- 7. GPA Neutral System  
Plus/minus grades are assigned by the instructor and appear on the transcript, but GPA is computed on the whole letter grade only.

Background and Rationale

The Senate Council has received numerous complaints from faculty and students about the lack of a university-wide grading system. In response, the Senate Council offers the above proposal for resolution of the plus/minus grading issue. It is purposefully set up as a two-part proposal in order to separate the questions of the desirability of a university-wide grading system from the actual type of system. Such an approach to this issue has not been taken by the Senate before. While proposals for a university-wide system of grading have been defeated by the Senate, such proposals have always been linked with a particular system.

It is intended that if Part I of the proposal is defeated, then the various systems of grading used currently will remain in use. If Part I is approved, the Senate has until Spring Semester, 1998, to approve a uniform system for Fall, 1998, implementation. If no system is approved by then, Part I of the proposal will automatically be rescinded, the various systems of grading used currently will remain in use, and the Senate will continue to consider proposals from individual units.

Important Note: The grading systems listed above are proposed by the Senate Council. Other systems can be added to the list for presentation to the Senate if forwarded to the Senate Council Office in writing and received by April 11.

The Chair introduced Professor Applegate for introduction of the item. Professor Applegate reviewed the background of the item and recommended approval.

The Chair presented a Resolution from the College of Education.

We support implementing a consistent grading system for all undergraduate colleges and the Graduate School. Consistency would mean that either all plus/minus systems use the same scale and quality point values or undergraduate colleges and the Graduate School eliminate plus/minus grading systems. The University Senate Council should delay implementation of the plus/minus grading system for the Graduate School until existing inconsistencies are resolved.

The Chair said that the discussion would start with Part 1 and that was the question as to whether all undergraduate students on the Lexington Campus

and the Medical Center Sectors are to be assigned grades from a single uniform system by the Fall of 1998.

Kaveh Tagavi (Engineering) said that he would like to add Graduate School. They have had the same system for decades and it was fine. It will come to the point that a graduate student and an undergraduate student in the same 500 level course who perform identically will not receive the same grade.

Michael Tomblyn (Student Senator - Graduate School) asked if they were deciding whether or not to have the same grading system by adding the graduate school if they would either have to add Ds to the graduate school or take Ds away from the undergraduate system.

Louis Swift (Undergraduate Studies) asked if this negated the decision they had already made to give the Graduate Council an opportunity to discuss this issue. They are eliminating that possibility that they made possible by their earlier motion. =20

Carolyn Brock (Chemistry) asked if the professional schools would be included in this uniformity. Kaveh Tagavi said no his amendment did not include professional schools.

Doug Michael (Law) asked if the intention was to effect graduate students in undergraduate courses or graduate students throughout. The Chair said that according to the proposal, grades would be assigned according to the student=92s category.

Connie Wood (Graduate School) said that there were two different decisions; one being the decision about uniformity at the undergraduate level and then whether or not the graduate school should follow a similar policy in order to avoid complications at the 400 and 500 level. She would urge that the two be considered separately.

The question was called on the amendment. The vote on the amendment failed in a voice vote.

The question was called on Part 1. The vote to call the question failed in a show of hands.

David Hamilton (History) said that he had been troubled in this debate about plus/minus. The Senate is an odd collection of people who show up from month to month. It seemed that grading is the single most serious responsibility that the faculty share on the campus. They take it very seriously. He would like to amend the resolution to suggest that any uniform grading system be done by a mail ballot of the entire faculty. That every faculty member should have an equal chance to participate in this decision. Only then will it have the kind of legitimacy it deserves. They should not privilege one group to make this decision.=20

Joe Schuler (Student Government) said the body was comprised of students and faculty for a reason and that is so that the students have a voice. If they are going to do a faculty ballot, that he would suggest that they send it to the 24,000 students on campus and see what they think.

Mary Ann Lorenson (Student Senator - Human Environmental Sciences) said that she appreciated the concern for representation of all the faculty, however it was her understanding that any faculty or student member can come to the Senate Meetings and speak whether they vote or not. So the opportunity it open to them and if they are not willing to make the effort to come to the meetings, there is really no reason to exclude the students

in the voting and send out ballots because someone won=92t come and voice their opinion.

Jim Applegate (Senate Council) said he wanted to speak against the amendment because he felt they would have to send out 24,000 student ballots. He feels that the Senate is a serious body and is empowered to act on behalf of the students and faculty. They have been elected as responsible representatives and have a responsibility to make a responsible decision whatever that may be. He would like to see the Senate as the usual avenue for this important academic decision making.

Tom Blues (English) asked if the amendment was for Part 1 or whether if Part 1 is passed then the vote on Part 2 should be by ballot.

David Hamilton said that they should have a uniform grading system and that should be determined by a mail ballot. The Chair said that was a vote on procedure not an amendment.

Mike Friedman (Fine Arts) asked if it was only a mail vote to faculty. The answer was yes.

Louis Swift said that if it was just the faculty voting than the faculty at large can out vote all the students within the Senate. What are they doing as a representative body of both the students and the faculty? It seems that is why they have representative government. He would oppose the motion on those grounds.

The question was asked could they do that? The Chair stated yes they could. In order to change the rules they would have to vote on it as a Senate body officially.

Debra Aaron (Agriculture) said she felt that the Senate should be the one to vote on it. When she votes she represents what her colleagues in the College of Agriculture think because she has spoken with their administration and faculty. She also believes she will represent the students when she votes, because she has talked to student groups in her college also.

The question was called on the amendment. The motion to conduct this by faculty poll failed in a voice vote.

Sharon Brennan (Education) said that this was a very serious issue and it occurred to her that the last time they voted the vote was very close. She made the motion to have a mail ballot for the senators, so they could be sure that there really is representation across the University. =20

Michael Tomblyn (Student Senator - Graduate School) said that he was against that on the grounds that faculty can control when they teach their classes and they know they are suppose to be at the Senate meetings and if they do not come it is because they do not take it seriously enough. Students can not control when their classes are and they have 100% attendance. If they are responsible enough to do that and the faculty is not, he fails to see why they should bend over for that.

Michael Cibull (Medicine) said that the senators who are not there are not subjected to the discussion and that is a drawback in terms of voting. He would oppose the motion.

David Hamilton (History) said that he would speak in favor of the motion. This is an issue that has been debated and most of the senators are well



informed about the issues.

Joe Schuler (Student Government) agreed that the issue itself has been debated but not in this format. This meeting is a regularly scheduled meeting.

Tony English (Allied Health) said that the agenda was set well in advance and they knew the issue was coming up and he believes they should go ahead and vote.

The motion to have a mail ballot failed in a voice vote.

The motion to end debate was made and passed in a show of hands.

The motion for Part One passed in a voice vote.

The Chair said that that there were seven systems on the list. It was requested that if there were to be any other systems added they were to have been submitted to the Senate Council Office by April 11, 1997, to her knowledge they had not received any. As it stands the seven listed are their chooses.

The Chair read the following resolution.

Whereas the Student Government is comprised of elected representatives serving as an official voice of the student body.

Whereas the student body was demonstrated their disapproval of the University plus/minus grading system,

Whereas the system disproportionately affects students, may their competitive scholarships and admission granted to professional programs,

Whereas the system fosters an environment with a great amount of attention being awarded to grades with the emphasis on learning and academic achievement,

Whereas the voluntary implementation of the faculty and the lack of uniformity among academic colleges further magnifies these concerns

Here resolve that the University of Kentucky Student Government Association endorse and call upon members of the University Senate to adopt a GPA neutral plus/minus grading system University-wide.

=20

The Chair stated that they had tried to narrow down the choices. She proposed to conduct a paper ballot and all voting members select their two top choices in rank order. They are trying to narrow down to the two top choices which they will bring back to the next meeting on April 28, 1997. They will conduct discussion on them and vote on one or the other system.

Mark Ison (Fine Arts) asked when the results of the ballot be available to the University Senate and the University as a whole, so they could question their constituents. The Chair replied as quickly as they could be counted.

The Chair said to rank order their choices and to sign the ballot. The question was asked if their could be only one choice. The answer was yes.

A question was asked concerning the proposed numerical system if it would appear on the transcript. The Chair said that her understanding of that was there would be both.

The question was asked if any study had been done that addressed which one of the system is the most or least likely to hurt students. The Chair answered that they were not aware of any such studies.

Michael Tomblyn (Graduate School) asked if the GPA neutral system had been used at UK before? The Chair said that her understanding was that years ago before there was the computer could translate plus/minus into GPA number, it was basically a GPA neutral system.

Kaveh Tagavi (Engineering) said that two choices were not enough because the plus/minus vote would be divided between systems 2, 3, and 4. 2, 3, and 4 are basically similar, by having three versions of it the interest in plus/minus is being divided by three. The Chair said that the reason for that was it was very difficult to anticipate any choice.

Richard Smith (Psychology) said that it was hard to believe that there were not any actual studies done on this. The Chair said that they had heard from Tom Guskey from the College of Education and he was not able to produce these kinds of studies that would indicate which to choose. Professor Smith said that he went through 200 hundred transcripts of students applying to the clinical psychology program and looked at what was the base rate for different types of grading systems for these schools. He was surprised to find that it was about 50/50 in terms of basic plus/minus and no plus/minus. If you look at the back of the transcripts and see the history of changes over the years you can see trends in going from basically no plus/minus to plus/minus and it looks like people are struggling with grade inflation problems. All the shifts were from no plus/minus to plus minus. It seemed to be correlate with the struggle people are having with grade inflation. Also the quality of school seemed to be a pretty unbiased sample. His plea is for more quality information about these issues and concerns.

The Chair said that they may find on April 28, 1997 they may not come to a conclusion.

Jim Applegate said that a part of the problem was turnover and this had been going on for a long time. This is one of the issues where they did ask for input from experts on campus, there were reviews on the research available. The outcome that he remembered that there was not strong evidence that this has any significant impact on learning outcomes one way or the other. It tends to boil down to certain preferences among faculty and there may be some evidence that some systems have impact on certain segments of students more than others. This was one of the first issues that they had actually gone and consulted with their colleagues and pulled in what they thought was available. In the process they have consulted, had panels of people who have had some experience with it.

A senator from Agriculture said that there were two major components to this; one is the precision of grading which faculty members look at, there is a range of from five points with the first one down to forty or more for item number six. The other issue is what the students have called what is going to hurt students and basically what that means is are they going to shift someone with a current GPA to another GPA and therefore effect their ability to get scholarships, be on probation, or apply to professional schools. If they look at those two things as they discuss it it will help a lot. They have individual bias=92 in terms of how precise they think they are grading. He knows he can not separate students into forty classes and be that precise. They are going to need to find a system that they as faculty members can be comfortable with the amount of precision that they

have and when they apply that there will be some flexibility in how they apply it, but to take into account the student=92s impact in terms of the student issues.

Mike Cibull (Medicine) said that if the information from the studies that have been done was available he would like to have it distributed. His biggest concern is not hurting students in a systematic way. If there is a subgroup of students that is systematically hurt, particularly if it is the lowest subgroup, he would like to know that. The graduation rate at this university is around 50% over seven years, the graduation rate at six years is 50%, and at five years is 43% which is really fairly disgusting and anything that lowers that even a percent or two he would be very much against. He would like to know if there was any information at all that points to one system or another as hurting that subgroup of students who are least likely to graduate.

The Chair said that they would attempt to gather everything they have to-date.

Mark Ison (Student Senator - Fine Arts) felt that the most important thing is that they do not misinterpret their role as members of this body. Research is no substitute for the people they represent. If all they were suppose to do was to read research studies then they would be in the body because they have a greater ability to research not because people want them to represent them. Go and ask people what they want, he has and that is how he is going to vote regardless of what research says. They are there to represent people not to do independent studies and form their own opinions.

=20

The Chair said it was time to go on to another agenda item. They have made an important decision today, they made a commitment to a uniform system. It is important to acknowledge that they may not find a system that they personally find to be perfect, but looking for the system that is most acceptable overall. If they take that view they will get somewhere. If they entrench themselves in their own personal point of view, they are going to end up in the same point.....stalemate.

AGENDA ITEM VIII: Proposal for acceptance of Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities report.

#### Proposal

The University Senate is asked to accept the Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities report, Views on Distance Learning Courses.

#### Rationale and Background

The Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities was charged by the Senate Council in 1995 to study the University=92s efforts in distance education and to report on possible avenues for greater coordination. As a continuation of this effort, the Committee was charged in 1996 to develop recommended policies for distance education regarding quality control, resources, faculty development, and coordination. It is intended that these recommendations be forwarded to the President and Chancellors in an effort to develop formal university policies regarding distance education.

#### Views on Distance Learning Courses

presented to UK University Senate Council

(Prepared by: Academic Planning and Priorities Committee  
Chair - Dr. Craig H. Wood)

This report of the Academic Planning and Priorities committee is intended

to raise issues and make recommendations to stimulate future oriented thinking and conversation that will assure that the University has a world class higher education system ready to meet the educational demands of future students. It is not the intent of this report to suggest that distance learning technology be used in all courses and in all learning environments. Distance learning technology and course development will find its niche in the university environment and coexist with traditional teaching methods. The following issues were raised and recommendations to address each were agreed upon by the committee.

#### FACULTY ISSUES

##### A. COURSES TAUGHT VIA DISTANCE LEARNING VERSES TRADITIONALLY TAUGHT COURSES.

A.1 Recommendation: The University should develop economically and educationally viable distance learning courses for students who cannot come to the Lexington campus, and to give students more flexibility in scheduling. But, is absolutely no substitute for on-campus instructor/student relationships and for the development of small group, more personalized education at the core campus.

##### B. DEVELOPMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY OF DISTANCE LEARNING COURSES

B.1 Recommendation: The University should establish a center that provides support to faculty members who are developing distance learning courses in a synchronous and asynchronous learning environment. The center would contain technical staff to support faculty members in the development, delivery and maintenance of distance learning courses from conception to delivery.

B.2 Recommendation: The University should provide support for faculty to travel to remote sites for on-site coordinator discussions and delivery of lecture material from a remote site. The committee felt strongly that this interaction is essential in the success of a distance learning course. The University should provide travel support for faculty advising of graduate students at remote sites, particularly doctoral students after completion of course work.

B.3 Recommendation: The University should provide technical expertise and release time to faculty members developing on-line courses. This could very easily be accomplished through the development of recommendation B.1. Additional support should be provided to help supervise and manage students in distance learning courses. Departments must be made aware of the cost they will incur in the development and maintenance of distance learning courses.

B.4 Support services need to be developed and provided for remote students in remote locations. A committee appointed should explore ways to provide digital library services and other technological services to remote students. Remote students need to have more access to technology at remote sites that will give them greater accessibility to instructors.

##### C. QUALITY CONTROLS AND STANDARDS

The quality of distance instruction depends on quality of the faculty member delivering the instruction and on the quality of the technology. Quality of a course is an issue that has been raised nationally and a number of documents are being drafted to address this concern.

C.1 Recommendation: Quality of instruction should be determined in the manner that is presently used for courses taught on the Lexington campus (i.e., faculty peer review and student evaluations). Student evaluation forms would have to be modified or additional questions asked that are more pertinent to a distance learning course.

C.2 Recommendation: Quality of technology and technical assistance to faculty delivering distance learning courses will have a direct impact on the quality of instruction. A faculty member with experience in teaching with distance learning technology should be appointed to each committee that is involved in technological development issues relating to instructional delivery. Quality of technology should be determined by a University administrator who is an expert on technological matters and whose obligation is to insure that quality instructors get quality technical assistance. The technology should be invisible and the learner should not be aware of its existence during a course. A faculty member should be responsible for content and instructional delivery and not the operation of the technology or in technological problem solving.

#### D. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND INCENTIVES

Preparation and delivery of academic courses and programs at a distance are a new challenge for most faculty members. Development of a distance learning course requires a tremendous amount of faculty time.

D.1 Recommendation: The University should provide rewards and incentive programs to encourage faculty involvement in distance learning. Adjustments in DOE allocations for distance learning courses; i.e., release time, credit for teaching off-site students, credit for teaching out-of-state students, remuneration and consideration of distance learning in promotion and tenure decisions should all be mandatory.

D.2 Recommendation: University administrators must enter into a dialogue with faculty members on the development and delivery of distance learning courses. The University should recognize that the intellectual property rights of a professor should be protected in a distance learning environment.

#### E. TARGET STUDENTS

E.2 Recommendation: Two major groups of students can benefit from distance learning technologies. The first are students seeking advance degrees (graduate). Many of these students are place bound because of families or careers. The second group is students seeking undergraduate degrees. A focused effort on providing a set of core courses at the first and second year levels could allow students more flexibility in scheduling and in their economic situation, prior to attending the Lexington campus.

Courses and programs delivered at a distance can be accomplished by a wide array of technologies, such as compressed video, satellite, video tapes and the Internet. In the future, those technologies will likely change, so discussion should not be focused upon technologies, but rather on the delivery of higher education, independent of time and location barriers.

The Chair recognized Jim Applegate for introduction of the item. Professor Applegate reviewed the background of the item and said that this was the outcome of a long piece of work from one of the Senate Committees that was given a specific charge to take a look at this issue and try and create a set of policies. He recommended approval of behalf of the Senate Council.

Bill Freehling (Arts and Sciences) said that there were two important things in the report. First of all the report says that distance learning is not the kind of learning and not a substitute for learning on this campus. Secondly there is a series of guidelines which reward the people who are actually doing distance learning.

Tony English (Allied Health) wanted to speak in favor of the item. He was involved with distance learning in the physical therapy program and the recommendations are very well thought out and express a lot of feelings their faculty have.

Jim Applegate said he was in favor of the issue. If any of them follow the American Association of Higher Education Roundtable where they are debating nationally the issues concerning learning outcomes and what needs to be done to move ahead in a sensible way. The committee has done an excellent job of capturing the issues on a national scale.

The motion passed in a unanimous voice vote.

AGENDA ITEM IX: Proposal to amend University Senate Rules, Section I - 1.3.3.2, Composition, Undergraduate Council.

#### Proposal

That an ex-officio, non-voting position representative from the Registrar=92s Office and selected by the Registrar be added permanently to the Undergraduate Council.

#### Background and Rationale

Some years ago, then Registrar Randall Dahl asked the Undergraduate Council to allow a representative from the Registrar=92s staff to sit in on meetings of the Undergraduate Council to serve as a resource to that group. The person provides Council members with valuable information regarding the course inventory file, CHE policies regarding new and continuing courses, and pinpoints potential problems or discrepancies from an historical perspective. The proposal before the Senate is to make the position permanent.

The proposal was initiated by the Registrar and has the approval of the Senate Council.

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

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

Louis Swift (Undergraduate Studies) said he strongly supported the issue. It does help to have someone from the Registrar=92s Office.

The motion passed in a unanimous voice vote.

AGENDA ITEM X: Proposal to revise University Senate Rules, Section IV - 4.2.5.4, Combined Bachelors/Masters Degree Program -- University Scholars

Proposal: [Eliminate bracketed sections; add underlined sections]

4.2.5.4 Combined Bachelors/Masters Degree Program--University Scholars

## Admissions

Applications to the University Scholars=92 Program will follow current procedures and rules for=20

admission with the following additions:

A The program is open to undergraduates with senior standing who have completed at least 90 hours of course work and should have satisfied all university studies requirements. Application to the program should be at the end of the student=92s junior year.

B The master=92s program should be in the field of the undergraduate major.

C The undergraduate grade point average (UGPA) should be greater than or equal to 3.5 in the student=92s major and 3.2 overall.

[D An applicant must provide evidence of superior scholarship in the proposed area of study. Examples of such evidence include a project, a term paper or other creative endeavors that indicate achievement beyond what is normally expected.]

[E The Graduate Record Examination (GRE) must be taken prior to entering the program.]

[F]D Application to the program will follow the current procedures for application to the Graduate School, subject to the above conditions. Admission decisions will be made by the Graduate Dean or his/her appointee. [, and including a letter from the Director of Graduate Studies evaluating item 4 above. The application and supporting evidence will be reviewed by a committee appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School.] (See Section V., 5.2.2 and 5.4.1.6)(US: 9/13/82)

Note: Degree Requirements: The total number of credit hours completed for the combined program may be twelve (12) fewer than the total required for both the bachelor=92s and master=92s degrees. Requirements for the bachelor=92s degree will be unaffected.

Rationale: The Proposed revisions in the University Scholars program streamline the admission process and thus encourage and facilitate the entry of outstanding undergraduate students into the University=92s graduate programs.

Implementation Date: Summer 1997

The Chair introduced Jim Applegate for introduction of the item. Professor Applegate reviewed the background of the item and recommended approval on behalf of the Senate Council.

Connie Wood (Graduate School) said that there were two major points. The first would be that it is not going to be required to actually submit evidence of exceptional scholarship. What is being proposed is for it to be imbedded in the standards for admission. It does streamline the procedure. The other item is with regard to the graduate record examination, a proposal to handle them in the same way they handle applications to the Graduate School. Which means that there will be provisional admission and be admitted provisionally upon acceptable receipt of the GRE scores. Probably the most important point of the proposal is that it leaves unaffected the degree requirements for the masters and bachelors degree. There is a double counting of twelve hours.

The motion passed in a unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:48 p.m.=20

Patrick Herring  
Acting Registrar