

University Senate Minutes
February 9, 2004

The University Senate met on Monday, February 9, 2004 at 3:00 pm in the Auditorium of the W. T. Young Library and took the following actions.

Members absent: Ambrose, Anderman, Anderson, Bacon, Baldwin, Baxter*, Blandford*, Brunn, Butler, Byars, Carr, Cibulka, Cohen, Davis*, DeLuca, DeSimone, Duffy*, Duke*, Dwyer*, Fink*, Flournoy, Garen, Garkovich, Gassenheimer*, Gentry, Hanson, Hardy*, Haven, Hazard*, Hensley*, Hoffman, Isaacs*, Jackson*, Jefferies*, Jeng*, Kovarik, Lesnaw, Leser, Lewin, Marchant*, Martin, Mazur, McCormick, Mobley, Mohney, Perry, Purdue*, Ray, Roberts, Robinson, Roland*, Schomaker, Shaw, Shay, Smith, Smith, Storm, Sudharshan, Swetnam, Terrell, Todd, Vasconez*, Vestal, Wade, Waldhart*, Walker, Watts, Weis, White, Williams, Williams, Wilson.

*Excused absence.

The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm:

The Chair announced the agenda had to changes. He reported Dr. Nash's presentation on the IRIS project will be postponed until the March Senate meeting. He relayed Dr. Nash's message that the IRIS web site is operational and the on-campus vendor demonstrations from SAP and Peoplesoft are happening soon. The dates of the vendor visits are available on the web site.

1. Honorary Degree Candidates

Dean Blackwell presented the Honorary Degree Candidates. She introduced the members of the Honorary Degree Committee and thanked them for their service. Blackwell presented brief biographical sketches of the nominees and highlighted some of their achievements, honors and awards. Blackwell said the candidates have been approved by the Graduate Faculty and are before the Senate for its consideration.

After brief discussion the Senate voted unanimously to approve the Honorary Degree Candidates. The nominees will be forwarded to the President.

2. [GRE Proposal, Change to SR 4.2.5](#)

The Chair provided the background on this item, including its origins within the Graduate School and its progress from the Graduate Council, through the Admissions and Academic Affairs Committee, and the Senate Council. He noted the Senate Council placed the item on the floor with a positive recommendation.

Grossman asked why the Senate Council removed the approval of the College Dean in the appeal process required of programs wishing to substitute another exam for the GRE or waive the GRE requirement for admission to the program. Jones replied that this was a matter of educational policy rather than management, and that the faculty bodies approve such an appeal. He added that the Dean serves as the transmitter of the appeal to the next higher level.

Deem asked for clarification of the wording pertaining to the possibility of waiving all standardized tests for admission to programs. Blackwell replied that programs could require no test whatsoever, require replacement tests or a various option of tests. She added the admissions

requirements would become part of the bulletin and that such requirements would be enforced by the Graduate School.

Albisetti asked which programs were interested in waiving the GRE for their students. Blackwell replied that some science and engineering programs had originally started the discussion. Grossman said the ability to waive the GRE requirement on a programmatic level would benefit some of the programs which often attracted professionals from the field, like architects, who shouldn't be made to take a standardized test. He also noted the financial burden the GRE posed to international students for whom the GRE was not necessarily a predictor of academic success.

Peffer asked if programs which currently require an examination other than the GRE would be required to petition. Blackwell suggested that perhaps those programs in question could be approved at the first Graduate Council meeting as a group.

The Chair called for a vote. The motion passed without dissent. The item will be sent to the Rules Committee for codification.

3. College of Fine Arts Proposal, Creation of SR 4.2.2.14

The Chair provided background for this item, including the rationale for the proposal as submitted by the Arts Administration program. Ferrier noted the Admissions and Academic Affairs Committee, which he chairs, had tabled the item until the committee could learn more about the task force on Selective Admissions' recommendations. He reported that the committee had voted unanimously to support the proposal.

Dean Hoch of Arts and Sciences expressed concern about students who did not gain admission to this program who might transfer to a new degree program. He suggested that if Arts Administration wished to reduce its enrollment they should first consider the financial implications which would result from students transferring to there colleges.

Braun said the proposal would reduce the number of students by fifteen or twenty. He said the quality issue has arisen because the program had reached a cap in terms of how many students it was capable of serving, due to the increased popularity of the program.

Hoch noted that all colleges were short on resources, and added that Arts and Sciences did not have a cap on its enrollment and suspected that many of the students who did not meet selective admissions requirements in Engineering, B&E, Communications and Fine Arts would relocate to Arts and Sciences. Hoch said he was uncomfortable supporting such a proposal without knowing the broader financial implications.

Grossman agreed that Agriculture and Arts and Science have been and will continue to be burdened with the students from other colleges who can't meet the selective admissions requirements.

The Chair noted that many other colleges have selective admission requirements. Grossman suggested that perhaps A&S should adopt selective admission criteria of its own.

Braun reminded the Senate that the proposal was being submitted for the second time so that it might conform to the recommendations of the Selective Admissions task force. He said he shared concerns about the merits of employing selective admissions criteria but suggested that the larger

issue be decided apart from the merit of the proposal at hand.

Gesund noted the presence of two different issues. The first was the issue of fund allocation, which was an administrative matter for the Provost and the President. The second was the ability of the students who are admitted to complete the degree requirements. He noted Engineering's selective admission policy was based on the second criteria so that Engineering might admit only those students who they were reasonably certain would graduate.

Albisetti asked if the Dean of Fine Arts could reallocate resources within the college to assist the program with its financial concerns. The Dean of Fine Arts was not present to comment.

The Provost suggested that this sort of situation might be alleviated by the employment of a differential tuition rates for upper division classes. He offered to outline how such resources might be reallocated during his upcoming annual presentation to the Senate. He informed the Senate that the vast majority of students coming into UK were automatically admitted because they meet the University's admission criteria. He said he did not see a way to limit that enrollment unless the Senate was willing to consider establishing a higher set of scores for selective admissions.

Braun requested again that perhaps the broader issue should be considered separately from the proposal at hand, noting that he had followed all of the appropriate procedures and rules in submitting the proposal. Debski asked how accurate of a predictor the proposed GPA requirement would be in determining a student's success. Braun said he did not have quantitative evidence but said he was informed by his interactions with the students in the required classes.

Ferrier reported that the Academic Affairs Committee had considered this issue carefully and had determined that 'academic integrity' was open to interpretation and noted that the committee had concluded that resources and enrollment ratios were "drivers of academic integrity and quality".

There being no further discussion, the Chair called for a vote. Forty-four voted in favor of the motion with twelve opposed. The motion **passed**. Senate Rule 4.2.2.14 will be forwarded the Rules Committee for codification.

Grossman requested that the Admissions and Academic Affairs Committee revisit the issue of selective admissions for all of the colleges to examine the effect of such policies on other colleges. He also requested the committee examine the issue of resources as related to enrollment so that it might develop a formal that would address the issue of resource reallocation. The Chair said this request will be discussed at a future Senate Council meeting so that a more formal charge to the committee could be developed.

Announcements:

The Chair announced that he had received an e-mail from Board of Trustees Chair Steve Reed requesting information regarding the Senate's position on the LCC issue. The Chair read a portion of Chair Reed's request. The Chair said he broached this topic as a discussion item only. He also apologized that his e-mail about this subject was only sent to select members of the Senate rather than the whole Senate.

The Chair provided some background on this item. He said the Senate Council had drafted a letter in conjunction with the Staff Senate in response to the Board of Regents resolution regarding the transfer of LCC to KCTCS. He added that it seemed unlikely that the Senate was

going to have an opportunity to formally comment on the possible transfer given the perception of time limitations. The Chair said much has happened since the January Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) meeting at which LCC was discussed. He said the AAC voted this morning to approve a resolution that would transfer LCC to KCTCS. The Chair said he would ask Kennedy to comment on the numerous amendments to that resolution in just a few minutes. He reported on the previous week's Senate Council meeting at which Sparks, Young, Kennedy, Jones and Williams were in attendance. The Chair said that Chair Reed knows the Senate has not voiced an opinion on this issue. The Chair asked how the Senate should respond to Chair Reed's statement and request.

Gesund suggested that the Senate should support the wishes of the LCC faculty. He added that the faculty of LCC should decide what is best for LCC.

At the request of the Chair, Kennedy reported on the nature of the resolution and amendments passed by the AAC earlier in the day. Kennedy outlined the various highlights of the resolution along with the basic elements of his amendments. He said it was important to reassure LCC people that their ties with UK would continue to be strongly maintained, that even though they would be transferred to another institution they would be able to execute numerous contacts with UK and that the students would be able to use the dorms, athletic facilities, and so on. He reported on his amendment that adjunct faculty would continue to receive the same rate of pay after the transfer and on an amendment that guaranteed the use of the LCC campus to LCC for a minimum of five years. He said LCC would not be asked to relocate after that time unless an agreeable campus was available elsewhere. He added that for the next six years LCC students would graduate were guaranteed to graduate in their degree program with the current diploma.

Staten asked if LCC faculty will have the same options as the faculty who transferred to KCTCS in 1998. Kennedy replied that they would, but hastened to add that the AAC will make its recommendation to the Board, which will in turn make a recommendation to the legislature since this reorganization would require a revision to House Bill 1.

The Chair asked for elaboration on the position he'd heard expressed at the AAC meeting that SACS had no preference as to which change occurred so long as things did not stay as they currently are. Kerley agreed that SACS does not have a preference and added that during the conference call with SACS last Friday SACS indicated their willingness to allow time for changes to occur. He noted that "we're not totally boxed in like we thought we were". Kerley expressed concern that the administration does not want LCC to have the necessary autonomy within UK to satisfy SACS, but added his appreciation for the concessions made by the administration and the AAC during the morning meeting. Kerley said he was still unhappy with the possibility of having to relocate the campus after five years, reiterating his position that the buildings in question were built for LCC by the legislature.

The Chair asked Saunier to explain why the majority of the Task Force would have preferred Option One (separate accreditation within UK) to Option Three (relocation of LCC to KCTCS). Saunier replied that according to the deadlines presented to the Task Force it seemed as if a decision had to be reached and change implemented by February. She said the Task Force examined the complexity of the types of changes needed and the risk of losing accreditation and decided to recommend Option Three since LCC definitely needed to maintain its separate accreditation.

Womack expressed her support of Saunier's statement and noted that during the Task Force's deliberations it seemed as if the nature of the time-dependent issues narrowed the variety of options seriously considered by the Task Force. Womack added that she "heard the clock ticking in the task force process" and felt that the option of maintaining separate accreditation within UK suffered as a result. She suggested that the apparent time constraints along with the dire need for separate accreditation influenced her thinking.

Kennedy rebutted the idea that SACS has no preference regarding this decision. He noted that SACS has specific requirements if LCC were to remain part of UK but with autonomy. He said he had reached the conclusion that moving LCC to KCTCS was the only viable option and added that the issue is "not just a timing thing". Kennedy added that if LCC moves to KCTCS then SACS will send a substantive change committee rather than the special committee it would send to possibly decide the termination of LCC's accreditation on June 30th if LCC were to seek separate accreditation within UK.

Nietzel said SACS would give extra time for reorganization, but noted that SACS was not interested in giving more time to the decision-making process. He noted that either option will take years to implement, but that SACS needed a decision.

Yates expressed confusion about the issue involved. He noted great unrest among the LCC faculty and expressed the need to make sure the faculty were treated well. He asked to hear Kennedy's argument as to why he felt that Option Three was the only viable option.

Kennedy read a portion of an e-mail he sent to the Senate Council and the AAC in which he reported on the phone call with SACS. He said the most important thing he learned was that moving LCC to KCTCS would only necessitate a substantive change committee and that the issue of autonomy would be addressed. A special committee would assess changes to the administrative structure if Option One were undertaken. This special committee would then make a recommendation to the 77-member committee which would decide if sufficient autonomy had been gained, which represented a risk to LCC's accreditation. He suggested that if both presidents reported to the Board then autonomy would no longer be an issue, but then realized that LCC wouldn't be part of UK and would be in competition for the attention of the Board. He added "No matter how much we try to work it, SACS would not be satisfied. If we fail, LCC loses accreditation." He noted that SACS was bound by bureaucracy. Kennedy said that for these reasons he proposed amendments to AACR1 which would emphasize these thoughts. He reported to the Senate that the AAC had arrived at the same conclusion as he did; Option One was not feasible and that it wasn't just an issue of time. He noted that the Senate Council had expressed its view on this matter and that it had enunciated its concerns about the transfer of LCC to KCTCS.

Cibull asked if LCC will be autonomous from KCTCS. Kennedy responded that SACS wants to see either a free-standing institution or a part of a system. Cibull asked if we currently have a system. Kennedy replied that UK was an institution with a community college attached to it, not a system. He said there was a possibility of developing a system in which the research institution and the community college would both have chancellors who reported to the same President, who would in turn report to the Board. He noted the addition of another level of hierarchy to this scheme but said that SACS would approve.

Durant asked Kerley to speak to the issue of LCC's preference since time constraints have been

relaxed. Kerley said that LCC's faculty, staff and students had all passed resolutions stating their strong preference for Option One. He said that around 86% of the faculty and staff preferred to stay with UK. Kerley noted that SACS did not care which option was selected but noted that SACS would require a specific course of action. Kerley added that the President mentioned that the situation had changed a little bit since the task force's recommendation. He concluded by saying "SACS is willing to give us more time if we give them a convincing argument".

Durant asked if LCC supports the action recommended by the AAC earlier in the day. Kerley replied that all constituents at LCC were firmly against AACR1. He noted that 3,500 student had signed a petition to that effect. He expressed concern about the five-year provision for the use of the campus. He said the AAC had done a great job in trying to dissect the information they'd received to make a decision and he thanked them for doing so. He noted that this decision was not an easy one.

Grossman asked if KCTCS's Board of Regents had changed its position that all parts of LCC would transfer to KCTCS and immediately fall under their system. Siemer said he had a lengthy conversation with KCTCS President McCall who expressed that the BoR resolution was an expression of their preference but was not a requirement. Siemer added that they've agreed to make the transfer just as it was made for the other community colleges during the formation of KCTCS.

Grossman noted that much of the conversation was the same as when the last transfer occurred. He noted that now, much like then, much of the issue was fear of the unknown. He asked how much of LCC's hesitance to move was related to KCTCS and how much was related to LCC's interest in maintaining the status quo. Kerley replied that LCC's people were not afraid of anything and said academics was the key issue. He said LCC's enrollment has grown by 3,000 students since the formation of KCTCS and that its minority faculty and student populations had grown. Kerley said he could provide numerous reasons why LCC should stay with UK and suggested that perhaps UK and LCC could "develop a creative model" to create a new relationship.

Gesund suggested the Senate should back the faculty, students and staff at LCC in whatever they want since they were the people who would have to live with the decision. The Chair reminded the Senate that since this was not an official action item only a straw poll could be taken. He added that the Governing Regulations say the Board relies on the President and the Senate regarding changes in academic organizational structure. He reiterated the need to provide Chair Reed with a Senate opinion.

Yates asked if one side of the coin was to back the LCC contingent was the other side, then, to back the President and the Board? Berger asked for clarification on which obstacles to Option One were deemed infeasible. Kennedy said that LCC and UK could not continue their current relationship without significant change. Berger asked which changes, specifically, should occur.

Hardwick asked Kerley to describe the two models of Arkansas and LSU that had been cited as possible models for LCC. Kerley said that in the Arkansas example the chancellor had the support of the president, could lobby for community college buildings, the college had its own Senate, had a private foundation for fundraising, could enter into its own contracts and had control over its own budget. Kerley noted that such a model was complicated but that it could be done, adding that there was some risk that this option might not be acceptable to SACS. Kerley

hastened to add that a firm commitment from the Board and the Administration could make such a change in structure happen.

Berger reiterated his request to know which changes could not be accomplished. Kennedy noted that in the Arkansas example there exists a state system with other types of institutions involved, one of which is a community college. Kerley said that there was more than one system in Arkansas. Tagavi asked Kerley if a model in which a chancellor reports to the President was acceptable to him. Kerley said that reporting to either the President or the Board was acceptable.

The Provost interjected that Arkansas has a President over a system and that each institution has its own chancellor who reports to the President. He added that the system consists of multiple institutions, and that he was not aware of any state that had a system that consisted of one research institution and a community college. The Provost said that SACS presented two options. The first was to have both Presidents report to the Board. He suggested the Board was not interested in that option. The second was the creation of a system with the President over two chancellors.

Kerley noted that SACS said the creation of a system was not necessary, that such a change could be accomplished within UK. The Provost disagreed, noting that if LCC reported to the President the same autonomy issues would arise. He added that both Presidents would have to report to the same level, either to a President or a Board.

The Chair reminded the Senate that it had not been given the opportunity to present its opinion due to the timing. He reminded the Senate of the Board meeting scheduled for the following afternoon and asked the Senate what response he should forward to Chair Reed.

Gesund reminded the Chair that he already had a suggestion on the floor. Cibull spoke against the suggestion, and asked if instead the Senate could say it had not been given enough information to form an opinion. Cibull added he'd like to know if Kerley or the Provost were correct. He added that if Kerley was correct he'd support Option One, but that if the Provost were correct then he didn't see how such an arrangement could work. Cibull concluded by saying that the Senate could not make a judgment until this important question was answered.

Yanarella noted the incredible influx of information on this topic over the course of the past week. He said he did not support Gesund's suggestion because it missed the basic issue. He said the current debate was "a day late and a dollar short" because of the recent information that there was more room to maneuver than previously thought. Yanarella suggested that the process had been influenced by the perception that SACS had been the overriding problem and that the time line had been such that other options could not be considered. He reminded the Senate that only a week had passed since Sparks had been asked to call SACS to find out where they stood in terms of the different options. Yanarella suggested the Task Force should have been in continual consultation with members of SACS about their receptivity about the range of options. He said he only learned in the last week that the Task Force had preferred Option One but believed that Option Three was the only option available. Yanarella suggested the Senate should say something about the process being biased or flawed. He would have preferred the opportunity to examine the full range of options to determine their own merits so the Senate could make its own decision. He proposed presenting an alternate sense of the Senate to say that the process by which AACR1 went forth to the Board was unduly constrained by certain assumptions, and that had the Senate been aware of the greater range of maneuverability it would have been more

equipped to supply a more independent decision.

Ferrier asked if the sense of the Senate could be that the Board should table the discussion and the decision until Yanarella's suggestion could be accomplished. The Chair replied that the Board relied on the advice of the Senate and that the Senate could put forth whatever advice it felt was appropriate.

Albisetti said that it struck him as odd in 1997 that just one community college stayed with UK. He noted the AAC's addition of protective wording and said he thought the draft resolution is a proper response to the situation and that it would correct an anomaly.

Abel said the concerns of the faculty were not just related to personnel issues. She said that the proximity of LCC to UK could not be overvalued. Abel also expressed concern about the differences in requirements between some of LCC's programs and those offered through KCTCS. She noted the possible negative impact moving LCC to KCTCS would have on the perception of students who like going to LCC as UK students. She worried that the loss of the current proximity along with the loss of the UK name association would affect LCC students "in ways we haven't considered yet. Those fears are not that easily dismissible".

Kennedy suggested Abel might have interpreted the part of the resolution regarding the use of the buildings incorrectly. He said the LCC buildings and grounds will be guaranteed for five years and added UK would not ask for those buildings unless another campus was available. Abel noted that students would not have the same access to the library if LCC were relocated. Kennedy said he guessed that there will always be part of LCC at the Cooper Drive campus.

Jennings expressed concern about Option One, saying that it might not be acceptable to SACS. He asked if the "fall back" position would then be to make LCC a college within UK in order to preserve accreditation and, if so, if that was an acceptable risk or fall back position for Kerley. Kerley replied that it was an unacceptable fall back position. He added that the maintenance of separate accreditation was vital to LCC's mission.

Noonan suspected that most people would like to maintain the current relationship. The Provost replied that for two years adjustments had been made to try to keep the current relationship, but the SACS consultant hired by LCC said the adjustments fell far short of SACS expectations. He added "part of what makes us work so well together is part of what they object to".

The Chair asked if the majority of the Senators felt they had enough information to form an opinion. Tagavi suggested the Senate should decline to give an opinion on the grounds that it did not have enough information to make a strong opinion on either side. Durant disagreed, noting the Senate had a chance to have input on an important measure. He suggested asking the Board for a new time line to see if LCC's preference could be implemented.

Grossman said he thought that much deliberation by knowledgeable people had already occurred and that a better conclusion has already been reached than the Senate could reach in half an hour. He expressed his belief that Kennedy, Nietzel, Kerley, Jones and President Todd would reach a consensus to present to the Board. Grossman supported Tagavi's statement.

The Chair asked for a straw vote, noting the Senate could always provide an expedited set of Minutes to the Board so it could get the sense of the Senate. A majority of Senators

voted against the suggestion.

Yanarella said he'd be willing to support Tagavi's suggestion if it included some illusion to the fact that the process was biased by misperception of SACS position and had the effect of unduly constraining the range of discussion and amount of information that would have allowed the Senate to make a recommendation to the Board.

Staben asked if supporting AACR1 was the alternative. Cibull said the Senate could decide to support the resolution. Staben said he would like to do that in a straw poll. He said it made sense for a community college to belong to a community college system.

Nelda Wyatt, an LCC faculty member, said that LCC was unique from the other community colleges due to its geography and the way in which it was created. She said she did not care if UK's logo was on her paycheck, but that she did care about the students. She expressed her belief that LCC provides an excellent education to its students in a college not in need of repair. She said the issue had been presented "in so many false frames, so many smoke screens about what is going on here". She added that it would really not be that difficult for LCC to be independently accredited under UK's Board and said that the argument that it would be easier to transfer to KCTCS was not the case; that it would actually be more complicated.

Cibull spoke against AACR1. He noted LCC's longstanding special relationship with UK. He said that LCC prepares students for college who would not otherwise be able to graduate, adding that LCC provides access to UK for many students. He said he did not have a full set of information with which to make a decision, and that he had heard contradictory statements about what information had been obtained from SACS. Cibull said he would not accept AACR1 and that he'd like to recommend that the Board recognize the special relationship between UK and LCC by try to resolve the question about SACS before making its decision.

Staben requested that a straw vote be taken on his suggestion to support AACR1. Fifteen voted in favor of it and thirty-four voted against it. Five abstained.

Staten said there was no solution for the Senate to offer and expressed her concern for the LCC faculty. She suggested the Senate should express that much thought has gone into this issue, and that it was very good though, but that the Senate remained concerned for LCC faculty.

Finney, a faculty member from LCC, suggested that if the goal of the Senate was to support the student, faculty and staff voice of LCC the Senate could refer to the various polls and resolutions produced by LCC, all of which indicate LCC's wish to stay with UK. He expressed the need to maintain the academic, social and cultural services provided to LCC students and to the state that may be lost if the unique relationship between LCC and UK comes to an end.

Kaalund suggested forwarding to the Board the expedited Senate Minutes with a statement that the Senate is of divided opinion and that no consensus can be reached. He said there was not enough time to obtain the information desired by the Senate. Kaalund suggested providing Chair Reed with the Senate's lack of a majority opinion. The Chair said he would endeavor to be fair-minded when reconstructing for Chair Reed the various opinions presented and that he would forward a cover letter with Ms. Scott's Minutes.

Noonan said no division of opinion exists. "We want it to be like it is now and we can't have that.

We'd like it to stay like it is.”

4. [Winter Intersession Proposal](#)

The Chair requested the Senate vote on this item so the Registrar's Office could finalize the calendar. He provided some background, including the Provost's initial discussion of the idea with the Senate Council, the proposal itself and the subsequent follow-up meeting in early January. The Chair reported the item was on the floor with a positive recommendation from the Senate Council.

The Provost provided a brief overview of the proposal, saying about a dozen courses would be offered, some of which would be experimental courses and some of which would be offered to help students stay on progress to degrees. He said the departments would suggest which courses to offer.

The Chair showed an example calendar prepared by the Registrar's Office. The Provost noted assignments could be made during the holiday break. He said the syllabi would be posted on the web in advance so students would be aware of the expectations. Students would be limited to enrollment in only one course.

Yates asked if the usual number of students needed for a class to occur would hold. He also asked if the Winter Session would be revenue neutral or if it would make money. The Provost replied that he thinks it will make money because that is what has occurred at other institutions, but said that at the very least it must be revenue neutral.

Arthur said that the usual Winter Sessions are presented in three consecutive weeks rather than having a break in the middle. Greasley said he knew of 32 schools offering the proposed schedule including such notable institutions as Centre College, MIT, Ohio University, Oklahoma State, Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, Hartford, Maryland, Miami and Montana, to name a few. He noted that some schools offered even shorter sessions. The Provost said he wanted to avoid moving the start and end dates of the Spring semester, which is partially why he preferred this arrangement.

Grossman asked how this proposal would impact faculty DOE's and if courses would be taught via overload assignment or if additional compensation would be available. The Provost replied that some payment would be made to the faculty for teaching the course, but added he could foresee situations in which faculty and their chairs might negotiate in-load assignments.

Michael asked for clarification as to precisely what the Senate was being asked to approve. The Chair replied the Senate would vote on the pilot proposal, the change in the calendar and the waiver of Senate Rule 5.2.1. Tagavi spoke in favor of the proposal. Blackwell wondered if SACS would object to the concentration of hours. Griesley said SACS has no minimum time limit.

Staben asked how the success of this pilot would be evaluated. The Chair replied that faculty would be asked to provide the method by which they would evaluate the course when they submitted their proposal to teach a course.

The Chair called for a vote. The item passed without dissent.

Due to the lateness of the hour, the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by [Jeffrey Dembo](#)
Chair, University Senate Council

Prepared by [Rebecca Scott](#) on February 9, 2004.