

Copy 2

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, SEPTEMBER 13, 1982

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, September 13, 1982, in Room 106 of the Classroom Building.

Donald W. Ivey, presided

Members absent: James Applegate\*, Michael Baer, Charles Barnhart, William H. Blackburn\*, Jack C. Blanton, Robert Blevins\*, Robert N. Bostrom\*, Connie A. Bridge\*, Thomas D. Brower, Stanley D. Brunn, Joseph T. Burch, David Chalk, Donald B. Clapp, D. Kay Clawson\*, Dan Clifford, Andy Coiner, Clifford J. Cremers\*, Gary L. Cromwell\*, David E. Denton, Kevin Devlin, Richard C. Domek\*, Joseph M. Dougherty, Herbert N. Drennon, Nancy E. Dye\*, Anthony Eardley, William Ecton\*, Richard W. Furst, Art Gallaher, Jr., Michael Goldberg, Thomas C. Gray, Andrew J. Grimes, Anne T. Hahn, Joseph Hamburg, S. Zafar Hasan\*, Robert Hemenway\*, Wesley Holbrook, Joseph Howard, La Vonne Jaeger\*, Cheryl Jones, David T. Kao, Nancy Kelley, Peri Jean Kennedy\*, Theodore A. Kotchen, Robert G. Lawson\*, Gwendolen Lee\*, Paul Mandelstam\*, James R. Marsden\*, Sally S. Mattingly\*, Marion E. McKenna\*, John M. Mitchell, Clayton R. Paul, Robert Rabel, Phillip W. Roeder\*, Thomas A. Rush, Ed Sagan, Timothy W. Sineath, Jesse E. Sissen, John T. Smith, Teresa Stathas, Marjorie Stewart, Joseph V. Swintosky, Glenn Terndrup, John Thompson, Manuel A. Tiggos, S. Sidney Ulmer\*, William F. Wagner, Enid S. Waldhart\*, Marc J. Wallace, Terry Warren, Jesse Weil, Charles Wethington, Steven Yates, Thomas Zentall

The Minutes of the Meeting of April 12, 1982, were approved as circulated.

Chairman Donald W. Ivey called on President Singletary for some words of wisdom.

The President spoke to the Senate as follows:

I do, as usual, and especially this year, want to welcome you back to the campus for the beginning of another year, an important year for all of us here at UK. There are many items I want to comment very briefly on today and one in particular that I think I should speak to you about. The others are more or less general information. You have already read the news story that was released last week about enrollment, but I think something needs to be said about that. You all know from the newspaper accounts that enrollments on this campus are down about two percent. This is a kind of guessing game at the moment. You never know until sometime in October what the enrollment is, and you have to go through all the business of the difference in head counts and full-time equivalents and all the different ways that an academic bookkeeping system requires us to measure things. At any rate, it is very clear to us that the enrollments on the main campus are going to be down some, probably in the vicinity of 23,000 head count. The two percent decrease overall is made a little more dramatic, I think, when you look at the fact the entering freshman enrollment is down about five and one-half percent. That is a change, and it is worth saying something about or speculating about. Nobody knows for sure what causes all these specific changes or alteration in patterns, but I think there are a number of items that we ought to at least be aware of. I suspect it has

\*Absence explained

something to do with the population figures themselves. You know we have been fortunate, I think, in not having experienced the decline in numbers as soon as many other institutions in the country have. That may have something to do with the fact that Kentucky has had historically a relatively low percentage of its college age population actually going on to college. At any rate, that is part of this trend. There are fewer students in the 'pipeline' total. I think that is beginning to show up. It is also true that there is a much sharper economic focus on us now than there has been in recent years. It has been increasing but it probably is more directly focused on us today than I can remember. Not just the inflation, that is part of it, but the cuts in student aid, the increase in cost of tuition, all the rest of it you probably already know about. I would suggest the possibility, although nobody could really assert this claim with any finality, that perhaps we may be seeing in that figure a falling off of freshman applicants. You may be seeing the first reaction to our tentative discussions and policy statements up to now about the selective admissions policy at UK. All of those things go into it, but you need to know that a significant figure is that the entering freshman class is down over five percent. There are some interesting trends or continuing trends and different trends inside the institution. The college enrollments, I think, are worthy to note. Agriculture is down another 3.6 percent. That is a continuing trend. Communications is down four percent. I believe that is the first decline in enrollment in Communications since the College was organized. Education is down in excess of 13 percent; a continuing trend but certainly one of the most dramatic alterations in the Institution. Social Work is down 12.8 percent; a continuing downward trend. The Graduate School is down nearly four percent. We need to pay close attention to that because of the special nature of this Institution in terms of its responsibility in the State for graduate work. Dentistry is down eight percent but that is a planned reduction. Those enrollments, as you know, are a deliberate design to restrict an increase. Business and Economics is down in excess of nine percent. That is a combination of several things--self selection being part of it but restrictive or selective admissions being the other part. The interesting thing is to some degree that a little over half shows up as an increase in enrollment in Arts and Sciences. The arithmetic of that is not lost on anybody. This is about a two and one-half percent increase in the Arts and Sciences enrollment. Female enrollment, which has been increasing for the past 15 years, is down three percent plus at the undergraduate level. It doubles that figure at the graduate level. For the first time in awhile, there is a change in the enrollment pattern as it affects females. Black enrollment is slightly up, approximately three percent, 2.8, I believe. It continues the pattern that is here. It is a slow increase, and I think there are those who wish we would make more dramatic gains, but at least we continue to move into the right direction. We are doing what we can. I would note for you also along with that we are beginning to enjoy considerably a higher success rate for black students who are choosing to come to UK, and I think that is important. Part-time enrollment is up. What that means is that the full-time equivalent figures will be down.

Home Economics is up five percent; Nursing is up 13 percent, having to do with the changes in the curriculum, I think, and with the fact, I suspect, that the final approval of the program change was instituted late enough in the year. We haven't seen the final impact of that yet. I think you may see another surge even next year in the Nursing program. That remains to be seen.

All that brings us to some mention of another topic which may very much be in your discussions today and that is the question of selective admissions policy of the University. You recall the Prichard Committee Report recommended that this University in particular, and the others if they chose to, move to a more selective admissions policy. They made that recommendation to the Council on Higher Education. The Council on Higher Education endorsed it, recommended that UK do this; we took the matter to our Board of Trustees in the form of a general policy statement which they have adopted. The policy statement has since been turned over to the Senate Council and, I take it, the appropriate committees of the Senate to make specific recommendation for the Board's consideration and adoption. This is the process we are now engaged in. Since you have yet to have your own say and your own debates about this, I would only, at this point, want to make a couple of statements to you. The first one is that timing is important. First, they wanted us to do it this year which was impossible. They want us to institute it by the fall of next year. That being the case we need to get some kind of policy in place very soon. I am told and am not surprised that, there are members of the faculty, of the Senate and Senate Council who are restless about the amount of time involved in making the recommendation, and I think it is an appropriate concern or complaint. My second generalization is we all need to understand we are not going to put ourselves in a position of adopting something now on the grounds it is final and irreparable. I would say to you that what we need to do is get ourselves in a position to put something before our Board in a timely manner and hopefully we can all be in general agreement on, and it will serve us. We can and will indeed continue to look at the admissions policy. As a matter of fact, I think we will continue to look at the admissions policy every year because it is the impact of what we do. It is the actual experience of what happens to us that is going to be important and I for one want to urge you to err on the side of prudence in this matter. I remember years ago when the University of Texas moved to institute its selective admissions program, it started with a fairly modest program with the full knowledge that you could raise it if the experience factor showed that you needed to raise it. Historically, that is exactly what happened. I think the important thing is not to get ourselves out there with some kind of pressurized decision about the future without proper experience built into it and make us cut back on our standards. Let us build them up is what I urge you to consider. I would hope you could get something in place for next year, and that we all understand it will be a continuing process; as we establish these things we may very well want to change them. Much would be based on our own experience as well as on whatever projections we have now.

I understand you are going to talk about the calendar and that you will have sessions on your own about that matter. I will wait with interest.

I want to comment on something that has been going on here for the last year and a half: the Southern Association Self-Study visitation and report. As you recall, this happens to us every ten years or so. It is the second one in my time here. I want to say some things about that Self-Study which I want you to hear from me. First of all, I want to tell you we came out of this study with ten recommendations from them and 90 suggestions. There is a difference. A suggestion is something they tell us in passing, and they picked many of those up from our own Self-Study documents which many of you helped to prepare. First I want to say something about the ten recommendations. I am pleased to tell you it compared very favorably with the last time around. Last time they gave us 44 recommendations. I consider that a pleasant surprise. We found none of them particularly upsetting. We were already working on it in one way or another. The Administration was required to respond to those by the first of September, which we have done. Those responses go in now as part of the Institution's basic evaluation that takes place in December, and I would hope by that time there will be no question of a reaccreditation for this Institution. I personally felt the ten recommendations were alright and our response to them will be sufficient to deal with that.

The 90 suggestions on the other hand are left for us to deal with as we will. One right we have is to ignore them and in some cases we are going to take advantage of that. Some other recommendations we know we are already interested in. I am going to farm those 90 suggestions out, in the five general directions. Some of them clearly apply to specific academic sectors, and they will go through the Chancellors out to the respective units, and we will get some response from them. Clearly some of them are matters with University-wide interest, and we are going to turn them over to the Senate Council and ask them to prepare a response for us. A few of them have to do with the central administration directly, and we will prepare the response for that. Out of all of these analyses we will decide which of those suggestions we think are meritorious, which ones we want to implement, and which ones we don't. That will be an exercise going on on the campus during the year. It is one I hope to pay some attention to myself, and I know that you will certainly have that view. I don't know much else to say about the Southern Association evaluation except that it was an enormous undertaking in terms, not just of paper involved, but more importantly the amount of time it takes from people like you. I say again, I think it was the best report I have ever had an opportunity to see at first hand. They did not find a lot here that upset them. They were pleasantly surprised about a number of things: one of them was, given the trauma this Institution has been going through and recovering from in terms of its financial cuts, they found here a degree of understanding and stability in their interviews with faculty members which they thought remarkable and several members of the team said that to me. I am particularly grateful

for that. I don't think many people understand what this Institution has just gone through. I want you to know that outsiders coming in here recognize the faculty's understanding of this problem was significant and worthwhile. I am pleased to be able to tell you that.

I would also like to add a few comments about the budget situation as it stands now. It appears to me, and I hope it is a good appearance, that the State revenue has stabilized and that the budget cuts are behind us, at least for the immediate future. The operating budget we are now under establishes the new base which reflects those budget cuts which this Institution has made. Our position freezes and other temporary restrictions on the budgets were lifted back effective July 1, and the units now have some flexibility to manage their own budgets. It was a painful thing but it was also, in our view, an unavoidable thing. I personally feel we came through that 23 million dollar cut with the most cooperative spirit of any institution I know, despite the fact we went into that process as a seriously underfunded institution. The program disruption was severe, but we did get through it without sacrificing either our salary plans, which we felt should be protected, and without terminating personnel, particularly the tough question which has torn up other institutions: the termination of tenured people. That being the case, I want to again thank you for your understanding and cooperation. I also want to praise you and say to you that this faculty reflected a maturity fairly rare in the academic world. I think you reacted realistically and with some sense in what was clearly a difficult problem. I am personally grateful to you because you made what was clearly an almost intolerable situation at least tolerable.

The last item I want to talk to you about today is the one I feel is mine specifically to talk about, and that is the reorganization. There are some comments which need to be made about the reorganization and they need to be made by me and made to you. First of all, let me tell you there was nothing new in my mind about that. I have been thinking about such a reorganization for sometime. I very nearly proposed it two years ago. I did not at that time because of a kind of drift, I guess. I had become more and more confirmed in my feeling that the time had come. I am aware of the fact many people did not like the reorganization--did not like any aspects of it. I don't believe there are many forensic points I could make here to change that, but I do want you to hear from me how I thought this should be done. My basic view is that this Institution had simply outgrown its historic structure. People disagree with that. I believe the size of it, the numbers of students, faculty and staff, and the physical plant continued to mushroom to where we now have in excess of 40,000 students in this system. In addition to that, the complexity factor continues to work, not just in graduate and undergraduate and professional programs but also the teaching, research and service functions. I felt that we need to improve the responsiveness of this Institution. Everybody likes to use the word bureaucratic. Any organization this size is bureaucratic. There is no way to avoid it. I have never seen one that has. For all those reasons

I, at least, had come to the conclusion that no one person was very likely to sit on this thriving 'ant heap' with any degree of comfort much less any degree of effectiveness much longer. That is my view. I am perfectly willing for you to disagree with it, but I want you at least to understand that is my view. I also favored the Chancellor system which the Board, in fact, adopted and I think you should know why it seemed best to me. It is an established system. It has been tried lots of places and works as well as anything works in the academic setting. It was one that was familiar to me. I worked in such a system in North Carolina. I was a Chancellor in the University in North Carolina. I was part of the Texas system which also has Chancellors. I was a consultant to Tennessee years ago when they adopted their system which is closely akin, I think, to our own. Not only was it a proven thing and not only was I familiar with it, but I felt we could do it with the least amount of turmoil inside. We had good people on hand and in a position to make it work. That is what we have done. I would add that there are certain characteristics and aims of the system that prompt me to continue to believe it is the best thing for us to do. First of all, we have to establish a sensible, practical and pragmatic division of labor between the Chancellors and the President. That is the whole concept. There are few clear-cut issues out there, and that is where the problems come in time. Closely allied to that is the need to place in the Chancellors' bailiwick the authority to act and the responsibility for those actions. I have committed to both of those things; they are going to have the authority to act with finality in many areas and they are going to be held accountable and responsible for those actions. If you are looking for a fundamental definition of this or breakdown of the division here between the President and the Chancellors, my view is that the day-to-day operations of the three units are essentially in the hands of the respective Chancellors. Those things that overreach sectors and are essentially state wide or beyond and are policy matters will remain in the province of the President. The aim, I say again, is to try to make this organization somewhat more responsive. Academic planning, I hope, is going to be somewhat more responsive than it has been. Student services, I hope, will be more responsive. Business services can certainly be more responsive. Just in the general run of things it does seem to me that three Chancellors hopefully paying close attention to their respective areas are going to be much closer to the concerns and problems than one person who is essentially trying to catch up with his paper work all the time. I also know that some of you say, 'That's all well and good, but what are you going to do?' I have heard the story that there are some in this room who say this is my early retirement program. I appreciate that. I would like to assure you, however, that is not my intent. I am sure all of you know the arithmetic. If not, let me tell you. I will be 61 years old next month so obviously we need to be looking, and we will be looking, at some change in this administration in the years immediately ahead of us. There is no question about that. One of my hopes is to get this new system shaken down and in operation by the time my successor here is named. It is my belief that it is a proper province for the President to recommend the administrative structure. I would hope

what we put in place is an administrative structure that may well serve this University for the rest of this century. It may not work that way, but it is my hope and indeed that is my wish and that is what I am going to work for.

Let me summarize briefly what I propose to be doing in this new organization. First of all, I am going to remain in what I call the policy position vis-a-vis of the Board of Trustees of this University. That is not going to change. The basic Janus-like position of facing the Board on one hand and facing the University on the other remains an inescapable function of the President of the University, and I see no change in that. All matters of policy at the University of Kentucky will be matters I will continue to be very closely concerned about. Secondly, we are going to continue at the level of the central administration to do the basic budget planning and preparation of the biennial budget requests. Those are two separate things. There is a budget planning process that has to go on here and in the building of those budgets, the staff, including the three Chancellors, will be present and involved in every one of those decisions. The basic thrust of the University is reflected in the budget planning and in the budget requesting process. What is going to change about the budget process is once we have made the operating budgets, we are going to turn them over to the Chancellors for administration.

In addition to the budget and planning function we will also be keeping the comptroller function. The comptroller function in an institution this size is a significant one because he is the person who prepares the official financial records and reports of the University. Those two functions, budget planning which tells you where you want to go and the comptroller function which lets you look back and tell you where you have been are absolutely essential, and I think are University-wide and are properly in the province of the President.

We are going to keep personnel policy at the President's level. The overall personnel policy of the Institution, not the actual decisions on individuals.

The governmental relations function will continue to be a very important function for us both in terms of our local folk in Lexington and our State Government. We will continue to have a considerable amount of dealings with agencies and offices in Washington and those are going to continue to be essentially University-wide.

The development function of the University is going to continue, which is basically the fund raising arm, and it has been one of the larger successes. It needs to be nourished. We are going to continue to pay a lot of attention to that. While there is a great temptation to want to assume outside these walls that 'We can get private money to run this institution,' such a statement is simply not true. Private money is not going to run an institution as large as the University of Kentucky. The State must supply the basic core support for this Institution.

Otherwise, it will simply not amount to anything at all. What the private dollars can do is to make some margin of difference. We can do a number of things in this Institution with private dollars that we could not and probably should not do with public monies. All of those things are important for a university like ours to be able to do. We are keeping the development function at the President's level. The same is true with public relations. While we are going to have some availability of that capability in the three sectors, the basic thrust is still going to be University-wide.

That is a general overview. Whatever time I gain, I do not intend to spend nearly as much time raffling through papers that I am not sure I ever needed to raffle. I think there is a substantial possibility I will have an increase in time. I have two things in mind for that increase in time. One is that I expect to get around the State more and talk to people out there about this University and its needs, aspirations and ambitions, for whatever that is worth. Secondly, I would like to have more time to deal with some of the internal problems of this University that the President hardly ever gets any time to deal with under the present structure because of the great mass of paper. For example, I have a report from the Research Committee which I have been holding. The paper has some good suggestions and deserves serious attention. I think we need to address that problem, and I want to be part of that. Another area of interest is what we are going to do about our Southern Association suggestions. I want to have some time to do what some of you are able to do and that is to ponder some of those things and to make decisions about them. Basically, whatever time I gain, and it is my intent to gain some, I propose to use that time in both those ways. I did that deliberately. There is a footnote to all this I wish to make. There are a number of decisions about this reorganization that have not been made, and they have not been made deliberately. They have not been made because it is my feeling they were matters that had very strong academic overtones and consequences. We have said we will not attempt to settle these until we go through the normal processes of the University. For example, we have not yet decided on the structure of the Graduate School and the role and specific reporting functions of the Graduate Dean and the Coordinator of Research. We will make that decision this year. We know that has to be addressed. We want that addressed and when the recommendation comes to me I will refer it to the Senate Council for their advice. What I am saying is that we have no interest in trying to do that kind of thing without full input from you. I do not propose to make any recommendation to the Board of Trustees on that matter until I am reasonably sure everybody has had their say. You need to hear that, and you need to hear that from me.

There is another feeling I detect out there and that is the suspicion about some hidden agenda about this Senate and its reorganization. I want to tell you there is no hidden agenda about this Senate, at least on my part. If there is to be any discussion of any reorganization of this body, it will come in the form of a proposed change in the governing regulations, which will come



from an appropriate faculty group. And if it does come, it will be treated like other proposed changes in the governing regulations, which means it will be given full study and debate including this body but certainly will be referred by me to the Senate Council.

I have very real concerns about some of the problems in this Institution that stem from our basic assumption that all the units of this Institution are just alike and can be treated alike. That is a mistake. We get into a bit of trouble by that mistake. We create a lot of problems for ourselves. There are all kinds of ways to approach those problems. But I say to you again that before there is any resolution to that matter, there will be full debate and discussion.

There are some concerns I have about my own role that I have withheld making any judgment about. The whole question about what my relationship now is going to be with the Privilege and Tenure Committee within the chancellor system is one of those concerns. Another question is what my role will be concerning appeals. I am not comfortable at this point about that and before I make any kind of recommendation, particularly if it involves a change in the governing regulations, I would propose to talk with the Senate Council and get their advice about that before I come to any decision. Those are fairly serious questions that involve, at least as far as I can see, the question of faculty rights as opposed to administrative preference. It may be you would be happy for me to take myself out of that process, but at least I want to know that. Those are the kinds of questions which will be on my agenda at the Senate Council during this year.

Those are basically the things I want to say to you about the reorganization. Obviously, I would have preferred that the reorganization go on in a much more routine way than it has. I am told by some of my good friends on the faculty there are those out there whose noses are 'out of joint' because they did not feel they were properly consulted. To the degree you are offended, I apologize for that. I do want you to understand I consider it to be an administrative prerogative to recommend to the Board the administrative structure of the University.

I close my comments here this afternoon by saying to you that we have done this. I have taken the reorganization to the Board and the Board has acted on it, and I now propose to make this system work as best I can. I will say to you, there is no way it is going to work without some breakdowns and a few fowl-ups. It will take a full year, in my opinion, for the Chancellors and the President to get this thing shaken down. I do want you to know we spent an enormous number of hours this summer, the three Chancellors and myself, in very close examination of these respective functions, and how they could best work, and how we can become more responsive than we have been. We are going to try to make it work. We are going to try every way we know to make it work. My final plea to you this afternoon is to join us in that effort, helping us to make it work. You can do that, you

know. Let's give it a chance and see if there is some possibility that it might work to all of our benefits. I will tell you this. I will not hesitate to change the system if I find it desirable to change it. There are all kinds of other options available to us. I don't feel we are committed to anything except to get on with our business and make it go. I believe we ought to be bound together by the basically common desire to make the place somewhat more responsive, and I hope that we can. We are going to bend our efforts in that direction, and I don't want you to act in the absence of this appeal for me. I really want you to help us. This Institution has enough problems without our generating unnecessary and inconsequential conflicts from within. I think while we have all the problems of most institutions, we also have all the promise of a lot of institutions. There is no substitute in my mind for us in our immediate future for some realism about where we are, what our problems are, and what our prospects are realistically. There has always been a formidable element in this faculty and did undertake to understand those things and help do what we and all other institutions must do. We are going to do the best we can with what we have. We are going to continue to try to give the State of Kentucky a better University than it has been willing to afford. To the degree that is possible, you will have to play a very, very, very large role. Thank you very much. I hope you have a good year. I am glad to have you back."

The Chairman recognized the new members of the Senate. He also introduced Elbert W. Ockerman, Secretary of the Senate; Martha Ferguson, Recording Secretary; Celinda Todd, Administrative Assistant; Stanford Smith, Parliamentarian; Douglas Rees, Secretary and Chair-elect of the Senate Council. Other members of the Senate Council are Susan Belmore, Robert Bostrom, Glenn Collins, Jim Dinkle, President Student Government; Jeff Dwellen, elected student member; Wilbur Frye, Andy Grimes, Malcolm Jewell, James Kemp, William Wagner, Constance Wilson, Alfred Winer and Vincent Yeh, elected student member.

The Chairman said that some of the Senate and ad hoc committees that have been at work during the Summer are the Rules Committee, chaired by Bradley Canon, ad hoc committee studying the problem of financial exigency, Malcolm Jewell, Chairman; long-range committee working on general education at the University, appointed by the Senate Council and Art Gallaher, Chancellor of the Lexington Campus, chaired by John Stephenson; committee chaired by Jean Pival who is working on the time frame for handling academic disciplinary actions. The committee who has been most busy is the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee because they have been charged with the details on the selective admissions policy, chaired by Robert Altenkirch. The following is the calendar for dealing with the selective admissions policy. The Board has adopted the policy that they want a pool of applicants in place by February and they want the policy in place by next Fall which means that we have to have a policy of some sort adopted by November so that we can start responding to applicants and advertising whatever the policy is to the State. Professor Altenkirch's committee will report to the Senate Council by September 22. As soon as possible after that the Senate Council will circulate to the Senate a proposal so there can be a special meeting of the Senate October 4 for discussion only. The Chairman asked the Senate to invite as many faculty members as were interested to come and participate in the meeting. The committee will respond to questions. October 11 it will be an action item and only item on the agenda for that meeting. It will then go to the Board of Trustees on October 19 and then it goes to the Council on Higher Education so they

can respond in early November.

Professor Ivey said that he was glad to be chairing the Senate and had discovered during the summer there were a lot of opportunities from the job to put his foot in his mouth, and he took full advantage of the situation. He felt it was going to be a very interesting year, and he urged the Senators to come to as many meetings as possible, share the information with the faculty, and to keep in touch with the faculties they represented.

Professor Alfred Winer presented the following Resolution to James Kemp, Chairman of the Senate Council and Senate for the 1981-82 academic year.

"The Senate Council wishes to express its appreciation to Professor James Kemp for his dedicated service as Chairman of the Council and presiding officer of this body for the 1981-82 academic year.

Professor Kemp was the Senate's first chairman from the Animal Sciences Department in the College of Agriculture. His adroitness in dealing with University wide problems reflects admirably upon that Department and College. Professor Kemp effectively and efficiently conducted the day-to-day business of the Senate Council office--but his presence was felt elsewhere as well. When not physically present in the Council office he would eagerly perform his Senate duties while in his office or laboratory in the Agriculture Science Center, South. He was never too busy to be called upon to advise and consent on Senate business.

Professor Kemp's scientific sense for detail is reflected by his role as Chairman of the ad hoc committee charged with reorganization of the Senate--success of which is reflected by fewer Senators in this room today (I hope that is why there are fewer of us in this room today).

Although a quiet and conservative man and never prone to emotional outbursts nor wasted effervescence, Professor Kemp kept the Council humming with his many articulate talents, one of which manifested itself by recitals of poetry either by other authors or more expressively of his own creation to suit a particular occasion. It is our hope that Professor Kemp will continue to dress his thoughts in words by whatever scholarly outlets he deems appropriate. His continued presence in this body for the next academic year as a re-elected representative from the College of Agriculture will hopefully afford him that opportunity.

Jim, we wish you well."

Professor Winer asked that the Resolution be entered into the Senate minutes and that a copy be sent to Professor Kemp in testimony of the Senate's true admiration and deep appreciation for his continuing loyal service. The Senate showed their appreciation by a round of applause.

The first action item was a change in the University Senate Rules regarding accele-

rated programs. Chairman Ivey recognized Professor Douglas Rees for the presentation from the Senate Council. Professor Rees, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposed addition to the Senate Rules, Section V., 2.1.1, regarding accelerated programs. This proposal was circulated to members of the Senate under date of August 17, 1982.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Vice Chancellor Sands wanted to know if the proposal preempted departments in this area or could departments offer another exam which might be more appropriate rather than AP or CLEP. The Chairman said that presumably this just added to the examinations which would be accepted. Dean Ockerman said that departmental examinations would still stay in the whole scheme of things. There would be no change in departmental examinations or in correspondence. This was simply an expansion of the 1972 accelerated programs package and assists substantially in an effort to attract more superior students to the University.

There were no further questions and the proposal which passed unanimously reads as follows:

Proposal:

The Senate Council, with the advice of the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, recommends the following addition to Section V., 2.1.1 and restatement of Section V., 2.1.4 of the University Senate Rules:

- V. 2.1.1      The College Board College Level Examination Program Subject and General Examinations, the College Board Advanced Placement Examinations, the American College Testing Program Proficiency Examination Program Subject Examinations, and courses evaluated by the American Council on Education for which credit recommendations are made under the Program on Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction are recognized as appropriate credit for meeting degree requirements.\*
- V. 2.1.4      No more than half of the credit toward an undergraduate degree may be earned by any combination of CLEP Examinations, PEP Examinations, PONSI courses, Departmental Examinations, and Advance Placement Examinations.
- V. 2.1.1      Renumber as V. 2.1.3.
- V. 2.1.3      Renumber as V. 2.1.5.

\*Colleges and/or departments in consultation with the Admissions and Registrar's Office shall determine and publish appropriate cut-off scores for the CLEP, AP, and PEP examinations.

Rationale:

There has been no expansion in terms of acceptance of credits from the type of examinations indicated above since 1972. This places us behind nationally and even in terms of our own University System, since the Community Colleges accept all the credits represented above. There are, in fact, only three institutions in the state which do not accept the full complement of programs outlined above. Approval of this recommendation will provide many more options for the traditional student as well as addressing the needs of non-traditional students.

All these programs are backed by solid educational enterprise. All the instruments and vehicles are faculty-based, developed and monitored. If the Senate accepts the general policy of giving credit for the various accelerated programs, it will be up to the dean to apply courses and credits toward degree requirements.

Implementation Date: Spring Semester, 1983.

Note: The proposed changes will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

Again the Chairman recognized Professor Douglas Rees. Professor Rees, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposal to establish a combined Bachelor's/Master's degree program--University Scholars Program. This proposal was circulated to members of the Senate under date of August 18, 1982. Professor Rees said that the main thrust was to permit or set up the circumstances in which students with special wishes can take advantage of what the University has to offer by combining a bachelor's and master's degree. Professor Rees pointed out that under "Degree Requirements and Curriculum" number 3 had a change. Plan "A" should be changed to Plan "B".

Chairman Ivey said that Dean Royster would respond to any questions. The Graduate Council and the Graduate Faculty have approved the proposal.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Professor Gesund said the proposal stated that the master's program should be in the field of the undergraduate major. He pointed out that some programs did not have an undergraduate major and wanted to know if would cause any problems. Dean Royster said that the proposal stated "should be" not "must be." Professor Gesund proposed an amendment for Item number 3 to read:

"...undergraduate grade point average (UGPA) should be greater than or equal to 3.7 ..."

There was no second on the amendment.

Professor Harris questioned the implementation date, and it should be Spring Semester, 1983.

Professor Pival found the statement on page 2, number 3 to be ambiguous. She suggested an amendment to read:

"The student must complete at least 36 hours of graduate level courses in the combined program, 15 credit hours of which must be at the 600 level or above for a Plan B master's degree. Students pursuing Plan A must complete at least 30 hours of graduate level courses in the combined program of which 12 credit hours must be at the 600 level or above."

The amendment was seconded and passed unanimously.

Professor Kemp questioned those programs that required only 24 hours of course work in the Plan A. He said there were programs that would not require more than 24 hours. Dean Royster said that the proposal added 6 hours to all the programs. He added that it did not require more 600 level courses. Professor Weil wanted to know the rationale for adding requirements for the master's degree program. Dean Royster said that part of it had to do with making the two programs mesh and getting students started earlier in their programs which permitted them to take more courses as seniors and count graduate courses taken as undergraduates toward the master's degree. Chairman Ivey said the confusion came when a student could count courses both for the undergraduate and graduate degrees. Dean Royster pointed out that the rule now did not allow students to count any undergraduate work toward a graduate degree. This proposal would permit a student to count the whole senior year.

Professor Thrailkill said that part of the problem might be, for instance, in number 1 on page 2 the proposal stated "The requirements for the bachelor's degree will be unaffected." He said that if an undergraduate program requirements were written in such a way where there were a lot of graduate courses in the program it was fine, but if not, the departments would be unable to change any undergraduate requirements without changing the whole program. Chairman Ivey asked if any of the geology undergraduate requirements included any possibility of 500 and 600 level courses or if they had any electives. Professor Thrailkill said that they had a few.

Professor Weil wanted to know if the rationale was that the hours would be harder. Dean Royster said that it was assumed if the student took more 500 level courses as a senior he/she would be more capable of taking advanced courses at the graduate level. Dean Royster added that the idea was to get good students to stay at the University and go on for the master's degree. Professor Weil understood that but he did not understand adding 6 more hours to the requirement. The proposal, as amended, passed unanimously and reads as follows:

Background:

There are students at the University of Kentucky, some of whom are particularly gifted and highly motivated, whose well-defined academic and career plans include graduate or professional study. The University Scholars Program offers these students the opportunity and the challenge of integrating their undergraduate and graduate or professional courses of study in a single continuous program culminating in both a baccalaureate and master's degree. The time devoted to such a program would be determined by the student's needs; however, it would normally be less than that required in a conventional program.

Admissions:

1. The program is open to undergraduates with senior standing who have completed at least 90 hours of course work and should have satisfied all general studies requirements. Application to the program should be at the end of the student's junior year.
2. The master's program should be in the field of the undergraduate major.
3. The undergraduate grade point average (UGPA) should be greater than or equal to 3.5 in the student's major and 3.2 overall.
4. 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.
5. The Graduate Record Examination (GRE) must be taken prior to entering the program.
6. Application to the program will follow the current procedures for application to Graduate School, subject to the above conditions, 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.

Degree Requirements and Curriculum:

1. The total number of credit hours for the combined program may be 12 fewer than the total required for both the bachelor's and master's degrees. (The requirements for the bachelor's degree will be unaffected.)
2. Students in this program should not take more than 16 credit hours per semester. Permission to exceed that number must be given by the Director of Graduate Studies and Dean of the Graduate School.
3. The student must complete at least 36 hours of graduate level courses in the combined program, 15 credit hours of which must be at the 600 level or above for a Plan B master's degree. Students pursuing Plan A must complete at least 30 hours of graduate level courses in the combined program of which 12 credit hours must be at the 600 level or above.

4. Each student must have an undergraduate and a graduate advisor. A jointly planned program must be prepared for each student.
5. In order to participate in the University Scholars Program a department must submit to the Graduate School a plan and illustrative examples of typical programs.

Rationale:

The advantages of this program are:

1. A savings of time and money--not all students will shorten the total period of study (some, indeed, could wish to lengthen it) however, most will reach the final degree sooner;
2. The coherence of a single, planned, undergraduate/graduate program.
3. More comprehensive advising required for the longer-range goals of the graduate degree.
4. Increased motivation with immediate involvement in the longer-range academic and professional goals.
5. Resources of the graduate or professional school available to the student at an earlier point in his or her career.
6. Earlier opportunities to engage in advanced work in a discipline of interest.

Neither the fixed time periods traditionally associated with the baccalaureate and many graduate and professional degrees nor the sharp break between undergraduate and graduate level study serve any significant purpose for these students. Indeed, these traditional features may cause only delay and lack of coherence in their courses of study. It seems clear that both the pace of the student's study and his or her term-by-term curricular choices are better determined by the final academic goal than by partial short-range objectives.

Implementation Date: Spring Semester, 1983.

Note: The proposal will be sent to the Rules Committee for codification.

The Chairman recognized Professor Rees for the final agenda item. Professor Rees, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposed addition to the University Senate Rules, Section V, regarding examinations other than final examinations. This proposal was circulated to members of the Senate under date of August 16, 1982.



The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Professor Rea said that he hoped Item 2 meant other than final exams and wanted to add the words "other than final exams." The Chair ruled that was acceptable. Professor Weil wanted to know if paragraph two, Item 1 meant that the faculty member must get the Department Chairman's approval to give a take-home exam. The Chairman said that if the exam were given out during the regular scheduled class period, that would be giving an exam. Motion was made and seconded to add "take-home exams." The addition passed unanimously.

The Chairman said that the current rule which covers common examinations states, "A student for whom two examinations have been scheduled for the same time shall be entitled to have the examination for the class with the higher catalog number rescheduled. In case both classes have the same number, the one whose departmental prefix is alphabetically first will be rescheduled. This rescheduling will be requested of the appropriate instructor in writing at least two weeks prior to the scheduled examination." That was adopted by the Senate on April 14, 1980.

Vice Chancellor Sands said that he thought the policy statement passed by the Senate in 1980 took care of the problem such as providing an exam to be spread out over a time period so that students could come in at the beginning or ending of a time period.

Motion was made and seconded to amend the proposal to delete item 2, number 3. Professor Pival spoke against the amendment. She said the first year she was Ombudsman there were 35 courses giving common exams at time schedules other than the times in the schedule book. The majority were 100 and 200 level courses. There were cases where students had to drop out of school because they were unable to keep their jobs during the examinations. She was very much opposed to the amendment.

Professor Gesund spoke in favor of the amendment. He said the important point was that Item 2, Number 3, wasn't going to work. He didn't feel the problem could be solved with one section when 1200 students were involved. Professor Smith pointed out there were more sides to the story than one. He said there were students who had problems and conflicts and that was unfortunate. On the other hand, there were very good reasons for giving common exams. They address another question which is of even more concern to the students and that is the fairness and accuracy where they are evaluated in their courses. He supported the amendment to delete item 3 in the proposal. Professor Plucknett believed the amendment should be supported in the name of academic excellence. He didn't believe students would suffer under the proposal by deleting item 3 and urged the adoption of the amendment. Professor Smith said students had a choice of taking an exam or doing other things. He thought it was unreasonable to restructure major efforts at the University affecting thousands of people because a relatively small number of individuals are unwilling to face unpleasant choices. Student Senator Yeh wanted to add a "C" portion rather than delete item 3 which provided that no student could enter an exam after a student had left. The Chair ruled the amendment out of order. Student Senator Yeh said that he was offering a substitute amendment. Professor Smith said that the motion on the floor was to amend the proposal by deleting Item 3 and to convert the University Senate Policy Statement adopted by the Senate on May 10, 1980, to a Senate Rule by replacing "should" with "must." The previous question was moved and passed. The Chairman said that the Senate would be voting on whether or not to eliminate Item 3 altogether. The motion passed. Student Senator Yeh moved, and the motion was seconded, to add the following amendment as Item 3.

Item 3: Departments must adopt at least one of the following policies for administering common examinations or some alternate arrangement to be approved by the dean of the college in which the course is given:

1. Provide a prime time course section that does not participate in the common examinations.
2. Spread each examination out over a time block (e.g, 4:15-6:00 p.m., or 7:00-10:00 p.m.) with the requirement that no student can enter after the first student has left.
3. Give two examinations at widely disparate times (perhaps 7:00 a.m.,) but not the morning after the evening examination.

Professor Wilson asked if the policy statement was just going to be made more visible. The Chairman said it was to make it a rule and not just a policy statement. The amendment passed. The proposal, as amended, passed unanimously and reads as follows:

Proposal:

Following the recommendation of the Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards, the Senate Council proposes the following additions to Section V of the Senate Rules:

Item 1: Policies regarding examinations other than the scheduling of final examinations in university courses will be set by the instructor of the course and/or by the department offering the course. These policies will be communicated in writing to students during the first or second meeting of the class each semester.

Exams other than final exams, make-up exams and take-home exams must be given during a regular scheduled class meeting time unless approved by the department chairman or a common exam has been scheduled for all sections of the course.

Item 2: Departments electing to give exams, other than final exams, in a course to all sections of the course at a common time shall be required to do the following:

1. List the day of the week and the time at which the exam will be given in the official Schedule of Classes.
2. Provide an opportunity for students missing such exams with a valid excuse to make up the missed work.

Item 3: Departments must adopt at least one of the following policies for administering common examinations or some alternate arrangement to be approved by the dean of the college in which the course is given:

1. Provide a prime time course section that does not participate in the common examinations.
2. Spread each examination out over a time block (e.g, 4:15-6:00 p.m., or 7:00-10:00 p.m.) with the requirement that no student can enter after the first student has left.
3. Give two examinations at widely disparate times (perhaps 7:00 a.m.,) but not the morning after the evening examination.

Rationale:

Some of the greatest hassles between faculty and students are those that involve conflicts in the scheduling of examinations. These proposed regulations are an attempt to erase some of the confusion concerning who is responsible for what, and where the limits of individual choice should be drawn. The need for such clarification was suggested initially by the Academic Ombudsman and referred to the Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards.

Implementation Date: Spring Semester, 1983.

Note: The proposed changes will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Elbert W. Ockerman  
Secretary of the Senate

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL  
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

August 16, 1982

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday,  
September 13, 1982. Proposed addition to University  
Senate Rules, Section V.

Proposal:

Following the recommendation of the Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards, the Senate Council proposes the following additions to Section V of the Senate Rules:

Item 1: Policies regarding examinations other than the scheduling of final examinations in university courses will be set by the instructor of the course and/or by the department offering the course. These policies will be communicated in writing to students during the first or second meeting of the class each semester.

Exams other than final exams and make-up exams must be given during a regular scheduled class meeting time unless approved by the department chairman or a common exam has been scheduled for all sections of the course.

Item 2: Departments electing to give exams in a course to all sections of the course at a common time shall be required to do the following:

1. List the day of the week and the time at which the exam will be given in the official Schedule of Classes.
2. Provide an opportunity for students missing such exams with a valid excuse to make up the missed work.

Page 2  
Senate Agenda Item: Course Examinations  
August 16, 1982

3. Follow one or both of the following procedures:
  - a. Provide a prime time course section (i. e., between 8 a. m. and 5 p. m., Monday through Friday) that does not participate in the common examination.
  - b. Give two examinations at widely disparate times.

Rationale:

Some of the greatest hassles between faculty and students are those that involve conflicts in the scheduling of examinations. These proposed regulations are an attempt to erase some of the confusion concerning who is responsible for what, and where the limits of individual choice should be drawn. The need for such clarification was suggested initially by the Academic Ombudsman and referred to the Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards.

Implementation Date: Spring Semester, 1983

\*\*\*

Note: If approved, the proposed changes will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

/cet

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL  
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

August 17, 1982

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday,  
September 13, 1982. Proposed addition to University  
Senate Rules, Section V., 2.1.1.

Proposed:

The Senate Council, with the advice of the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, recommends the following addition to Section V., 2.1.1 and restatement of Section V., 2.1.4 of the University Senate Rules:

- V. 2.1.1 The College Board College Level Examination Program Subject and General Examinations, the College Board Advanced Placement Examinations, the American College Testing Program Proficiency Examination Program Subject Examinations, and courses evaluated by the American Council on Education for which credit recommendations are made under the Program on Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction are recognized as appropriate credit for meeting degree requirements. \*
- V. 2.1.4 No more than half of the credit toward an undergraduate degree may be earned by any combination of CLEP Examinations, PEP Examinations, PONSI courses, Departmental Examinations, and Advance Placement Examinations.
- V. 2.1.1 Renumber as V. 2.1.3.
- V. 2.1.3 Renumber as V. 2.1.5.

\* Colleges and/or departments in consultation with the Admissions and Registrar's Office shall determine and publish appropriate cut-off scores for the CLEP, AP, and PEP examinations.

Page 2

Senate Agenda Item: Accelerated Programs  
August 17, 1982

Rationale:

There has been no expansion in terms of acceptance of credits from the type of examinations indicated above since 1972. This places us behind nationally and even in terms of our own University System, since the Community Colleges accept all the credits represented above. There are, in fact, only three institutions in the state which do not accept the full complement of programs outlined above. Approval of this recommendation will provide many more options for the traditional student as well as addressing the needs of non-traditional students.

All these programs are backed by solid educational enterprise. All the instruments and vehicles are faculty-based, developed and monitored. If the Senate accepts the general policy of giving credit for the various accelerated programs, it will be up to the dean to apply courses and credits toward degree requirements.

Implementation Date: Spring Semester, 1983.

Note: If approved, the proposed changes will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

/cet

# Accelerated Programs

## Background

The Senate Council, with the advice of the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, recommends the following addition to section V.2.1. of the Senate Rules;

**XX**

V.2.1.1. The College Board College Level Examination Program Subject and General Examinations, the College Board Advanced Placement Examinations, the American College Testing Program Proficiency Examination Program Subject Examinations, and courses evaluated by the American Council on Education for which credit recommendations are made under the Program on Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction are recognized as appropriate credit for meeting degree requirements.\*

Section V.2.1.1. shall be renumbered as V.2.1.3. and Section V.2.1.3. renumbered as V.2.1.5.

Restate V.2.1.4. as follows: No more than half of the credit toward an undergraduate degree may be earned by any combination of ~~GLEx~~ CLEP Examinations, PEP Examinations, PONSU courses, Departmental Examinations, and Advance Placement Examinations."

\*Colleges and/or Departments in consultation with the Admissions and Registrar's Office shall determine and publish appropriate cutoff scores for the CLEP, AP, and PEP examinations.

## Rationale

There has been no expansion in terms of acceptance of credits from the type of examinations indicated above since 1972. This places us behind nationally and even in terms of our own University system, since the Community Colleges accepts all the credits represented above. There are, in fact, only three institutions in the state which do not accept the full complement of programs outlined above. Approval of this recommendation will provide many more options for the traditional student as well as addressing the needs of non-traditional students.

All these programs are backed by solid educational enterprise. All the instruments and vehicles are faculty-based, developed, and monitored. If the Senate accepts the general policy of giving credit for the various accelerated programs, it will be up to the dean to apply courses and credits toward degree requirements.



3/19/82

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0033

DEAN OF ADMISSIONS AND REGISTRAR  
GILLIS BUILDING

March 19, 1982

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. James D. Kemp, Chairman  
University Senate Council

FROM: Bert Ockerman *Bert*

On behalf of my colleagues Dr. Stephen Langston, Dr. James Chapman, and Dr. Louise Dutt I am transmitting to you a proposal to extend the accelerated programs package as approved by the University Senate, March 13, 1972. We all strongly support this proposal and feel that it is in the best interest of the University and hundreds of present and potential students.

I am fully aware of the crowded calendar of the Senate Council and the Senate. However, I hope that this proposal can be referred to the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee before the end of the current academic year.

EWO:b

Enclosure

cc: Dr. Ward Crowe

Accelerated Programs Proposal

submitted to the  
University of Kentucky Senate

by

Dr. Elbert W. Ockerman  
Dean of Admissions and Registrar

Dr. James P. Chapman  
Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs

Dr. Louise G. Dutt  
Director of Testing  
Counseling and Testing Center

Dr. Stephen L. Langston  
Dean of University Extension

March 18, 1982

### Introduction

The proposal which follows concerning the University of Kentucky's policy for accelerated programs is submitted to the University Senate. A request is made for the adoption of a formal statement which broadens the University's current policy on credit-by-examination and credit awarded for extrainstitutional learning. Following approval by the Senate, that statement would permit enrolled students to receive credit, where applicable and as determined by the appropriate departments, for (1) the College Board's College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) Subject Examinations and General Examinations, (2) the Proficiency Examination Program (PEP) tests of the American College Testing Program (ACT), and (3) for non-collegiate sponsored instruction programs evaluated and endorsed by the American Council on Education (ACE).

### Rationale

This proposal is being submitted in response to the growing interest throughout higher education in accelerated programs which allow students, especially adults 25 years of age and older, to earn credit for college-level achievement derived from a variety of sources. Many colleges and universities across the nation have begun programs and created policies to provide additional means for adults to earn undergraduate credit. The American Council on Education has applauded these efforts and has urged other institutions to develop new programs or upgrade existing ones.

The Committee on Higher Education in Kentucky's Future (a.k.a. the Prichard Committee) has responded to this challenge by strongly recommending that institutions within the Commonwealth develop creative and dynamic programs which meet the needs and interests of this state's increasing population of adult students. The Committee contends that despite Kentucky's tradition of continuing education, public colleges and universities have made only limited progress in attracting more adults to higher education. In its report to the Council on Higher Education, the Committee recommends that appropriate funding be granted in the future of those institutions which demonstrate a strong commitment to programs directed toward non-traditional students.

At the University of Kentucky the Admissions and Registrar's Office, the University Extension, and specific academic units continue to receive inquiries from adult students interested in accelerated programs. These students are seeking opportunities to earn credit-by-examination or be awarded credit for extrainstitutional learning. By broadening the University's existing policy on accelerated programs, additional means would be available to adults desiring to earn credit for previous education and experience.

#### Review of Current Policy

At present students may earn accelerated credit through (1) the College Board's Advanced Placement Program (APP), (2) College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) Subject Examinations, and (3) Special Departmental Examinations.

At the February 14 and March 13, 1972 University Senate meetings, the College-Level Examination Program was adopted for use at this institution. Since that time only twenty of the forty-seven CLEP Subject Examinations and none of the five General Examinations have been recognized by the academic units in awarding undergraduate credit.

In addition, beginning freshmen are given the opportunity to earn credit through the American College Testing Program's (ACT) examination. By receiving a specific score on the ACT English sub-test, a student may be granted credit which can be used in satisfying the University's Freshman Composition requirement.

The College of Nursing also provides the opportunity for eligible students to earn credit through ACT's Proficiency Examination Program (PEP). Persons who are graduates of diploma registered nursing programs may be given permission by the College to take specific PEP nursing tests. These tests are used in place of special examinations as a means of evaluating experience. Credit earned through these tests will assist eligible students in meeting prerequisites to the upper division nursing program. No other PEP tests are used in awarding credit at this institution.

Special Departmental Examinations may be taken by enrolled students in most undergraduate courses as another means for earning credit. These examinations are given to eligible students who have formally applied to take the test with the department chairman whose academic unit offers the course. Providing the chairman feels the students are adequately prepared and familiar with the subject material covered in the examination, a test will be scheduled.

The University grants only limited credit to enrolled students for extrainstitutional learning. Veterans who attended service schools while on active duty may be considered for an award of credit for successful completion of these schools. This credit is given on the basis of recommendations made by the American Council on Education's Office on Educational Credit and Credentials (OECC). In many cases, however, there is some reluctance on the part of several University of Kentucky colleges in accepting this credit, as applicable, toward the fulfillment of graduation requirements. This institution does not award any other credit for non-collegiate sponsored education programs.

#### Program Descriptions

The College Board's College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) consists of over fifty different tests usually ninety minutes long. The CLEP Subject Examinations measure achievement in material normally presented in specific college courses. These tests stress concepts, principles, relationships, and application of course material. The five CLEP General Examinations measure achievement in the liberal arts areas of English composition, humanities, natural sciences, social sciences, and mathematics. They deal with material which is covered in courses at the lower division level as a part of an institution's general studies requirements. Unlike the Subject Examinations, the General Examinations attempt to assess a student's broad knowledge of the liberal arts.

Proficiency Examination Program (PEP) tests offered by the American College Testing Program (ACT) are available for students in Arts and Sciences,

Business, Criminal Justice, Education, and Nursing. Forty-six individual subject examinations in these areas were developed by the University of the State of New York under the aegis of the New York State Board of Regents to measure subject matter proficiency.

The CLEP Subject and General Examinations, as well as the PEP tests, are being taken by more students across the nation than ever before. Figures for 1980-81 reflect that approximately 37,000 General Examinations and 80,000 Subject Examinations were completed by CLEP candidates. Over 23,000 PEP examinations are taken annually by students through this ACT-sponsored program. Also more than 2,000 colleges and universities currently grant credit to candidates who submit the results of these tests and the number of institutions is growing each year.

These figures show the tremendous popularity of the two testing programs and the willingness of many institutions to grant accelerated credit for satisfactory results. They also reveal the confidence which colleges and universities have in the development process and content of both the CLEP and PEP examinations. Educators are aware that the tests are developed over a period of from eighteen to twenty-four months by faculty committees comprised of subject matter specialists working together with examination experts from the College Board and the American College Testing Program. They understand that the tests are updated periodically to keep up with changes in education. Furthermore, they recognize that there is a great degree of reliability and validity to the examinations. These tests are administered to large numbers of students of varying achievement levels and the statistical information gathered is then compared to data on persons who

completed the appropriate courses. Every effort is made to insure the integrity of the two testing programs.

The American Council on Education has been involved in the review and evaluation of extrainstitutional learning for many years. Their Program on Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction (PONSI) within the Office on Educational Credit and Credentials has evaluated over 2,000 courses offered by approximately 140 organizations drawn from business, government, and industry. These courses appear with evaluation information and credit recommendations in The National Guide to Education Credit for Training Programs (1980 and 1981 Supplement). The Guide to Credit by Examination is intended for use as a companion to this publication to assist colleges and universities in recognizing learning which did not occur at their institutions.

The Office on Educational Credit and Credentials has also evaluated since 1945 nearly 6,000 service school courses offered to active duty personnel serving in the U.S. Army, Air Force, Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard. The Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services (1980) like the other publications mentioned contains evaluation information and credit recommendations which are most useful to institutions in awarding credit.

The American Council on Education firmly believes that college-level learning is not confined to an institution's classrooms. Through their evaluation programs they are encouraging colleges and universities to create policies which permit students to be considered for credit for non-collegiate sponsored instruction.



Proposal Recommendations

It is recommended that the University of Kentucky:

1. Adopt an institutional policy which formally recognizes (a) the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) Subject and General Examinations, (b) the Proficiency Examination Program (PEP) tests of the American College Testing Program (ACT), and (c) the non-collegiate sponsored instruction programs evaluated and endorsed by the American Council on Education (ACE).
2. Following the adoption of this policy, grant credit to enrolled students, where applicable and as determined by the appropriate academic units, for satisfactory results achieved through these accelerated programs.
3. Involve faculty in establishing minimum scores to be earned by students in order to receive credit for CLEP and PEP examinations.
4. Periodically review this institution's accelerated programs policy and make appropriate changes as necessary to insure that sufficient opportunities exist for students to earn credit-by-examination or be awarded credit for extrainstitutional learning.

#### ACCELERATED PROGRAMS RECOMMENDATION

V. 2. 1. 1. The College Board College Level Examination Program Subject and General Examinations, the College Board Advanced Placement Examinations, the American College Testing Program Proficiency Examination Program Subject Examinations, and courses evaluated by the American Council on Education for which credit recommendations are made under the Program on Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction are recognized as appropriate credit for meeting degree requirements.\*

Section V.2.1.1. shall be renumbered as V.2.1.3. and Section V.2.1.3. renumbered as V.2.1.5.

Restate V. 2.1.4. as follows: "No more than half of the credit toward an undergraduate degree may be earned by any combination of CLEP Examinations, PEP Examinations, PONSI courses, Departmental Examinations, and Advance Placement Examinations."

\*Colleges and/or Departments in consultation with the Admissions and Registrar's Office shall determine and publish appropriate cutoff scores for the CLEP, AP, and PEP examinations.

1.8 Grades for Students Who Withdraw or are Dropped

No grade will be recorded for a student who officially withdraws or is dropped from a class during the first ten (10) class days of a term. After these dates, students who officially withdraw or who are dropped from a class are to be given W or E, as reported by the instructor of a class, or P by the University Appeals Board. (See 5.1.1, (b), Section VI.)

A student may officially withdraw from a course by permission of the dean of the college in which he is registered, provided however that no student shall be permitted to withdraw within five weeks (two weeks during the summer term) of the final examination period except for urgent reasons related to extended illness or equivalent distress. The dean shall report withdrawal from class to the Registrar. (See 2.1.3, this section.)

1.9 Grade Point Average

Grade point average is the ratio of the number of points gained to the number of credits attempted, W, P, S, and I being ignored.

1.10 Not in Class

Students who have been entered by the Registrar into the official class roll, but have never attended class, and who have not officially withdrawn, shall be reported NOT IN CLASS. The names of such students shall be deleted from the official roll by the Registrar. (See 3.2, Section IV, 1.3.4, 2.4.1, and 2.4.3, Section V.)

2.0 Credit, Classification, Loads, Academic Standards

2.1 Credit Hours

In general, undergraduate courses are developed on the principle that one semester hour of credit represents one hour of classroom meeting per week for a semester on the part of the student exclusive of any laboratory meeting. Laboratory meeting, generally, represents at least two hours per week for a semester for one credit hour.

Credit for short courses of less than eight weeks shall be limited to one credit hour per week.

2.1.1 Credit for Work Done by Correspondence -- Not more than thirty (30) credit hours of the total required for an undergraduate degree may be gained by correspondence. No more than one-third of the requirements for a major may be gained by correspondence.

No credit will be given in the Graduate School or in the professional colleges for courses done by correspondence.

2.1.2 Credit by Special Examination\*

- a. Entrance Examination -- An individual academic unit may require, in addition to the freshman classification test, with the approval of the Senate, entrance or classification tests to be taken by its applicants for admission to its programs.
- b. Special Examination -- Any full-time or part-time student enrolled in the University, and in good academic standing, shall have the right to request a special examination for credit in any course offered in the University System, regardless of whether he has audited the course, is currently enrolled in it, or has studied for it independently.
  1. Application for a special examination must be made in writing. Undergraduates will address requests to the chairman of the department in which the course is given, or to the office of the academic unit responsible; graduate students, to the Director of Graduate Study in the department in which the course is given. Approval of requests from undergraduate students rests with the department chairman; from graduate students, with the Dean of the Graduate School acting upon recommendation of the Director of Graduate Study.
  2. The request for special examination may be denied by the department chairman or the office of the administrative unit responsible, or the Dean of the Graduate School acting upon the recommendation of the Director of Graduate Study, if it is decided that the student has not furnished evidence that he is reasonably prepared to take the examination, or that the course is of such a nature that credit by examination is inappropriate. (The fact that a student has failed the course within the last semester may be regarded as evidence that the student is unprepared to take a special examination.)
  3. The instructor may schedule the examination at his convenience, but must offer it within a reasonable time after the student has submitted his request.
  4. The examiner shall inform the Registrar of the student's grade in the course. A student currently enrolled in the class who successfully completes a special examination shall be formally removed from the official roll, unless the student is dissatisfied with the results, in which case he may continue in the course and be graded in the usual manner. The instructor then may or may not include the results of

---

\* This is the initial codification approved by the Senate. For further details see the University Senate minutes of March 13, 1972.

- the special examination in computing the final grade.
5. Credit earned by special examination may be counted as residence credit by the dean of the student's college. The limits on maximum loads are waived in cases where the excess is due to special examination credits.
  6. The student, with the department chairman's consent, may take the special examination on a Pass-Fail basis, including any course not otherwise available under the Pass-Fail option. Credit derived in this manner shall not reduce the number of courses permitted under the Pass-Fail rules. (See 1.4 and 2.3, this Section.)

#### 2.1.3 Credit for Students who Withdraw to Enter Military Service

A student who, after completing the eighth week and before completing the twelfth week of the semester, withdraws and within ten (10) days enters the Armed Services of the United States, shall be entitled to receive credit and residence for one-half of each course in which he is passing at the time of his withdrawal. The grade reported shall be that attained in the course up to the time of withdrawal. Where such withdrawal occurs upon completion of the twelfth week of the semester, or later, such students shall be entitled to receive full credit and residence under like conditions. For the eight-week Summer Session the minimum attendance requirements shall be four and six weeks respectively. If, with the credit and residence time granted, the student has fulfilled all requirements for a degree, he shall be recommended for that degree by the Senate of the University. If a comprehensive examination is required for graduation, this requirement shall be waived. (See 1.8, this Section.)

#### 2.1.4 Other (CLEP, CEEB-AP)

No more than half of the credit toward an undergraduate degree may be earned by any combination of special examinations, College Board Advanced Placement Examinations, the College Level Examination Program, and correspondence courses. (The maximum that may be earned by correspondence is 30 hours.) (See 2.1.1, 2.1.2, this Section.)

#### 2.2 Student Load

With the exceptions noted below, the maximum load to be carried during any semester by any student in an undergraduate college (including residence and correspondence courses) shall be 19 credit hours or the amount specified in the curriculum for the particular semester, whichever is larger.

The maximum allowable load to be carried during any summer term for undergraduate students (including residence and correspondence courses) shall be nine (9) credit hours in the

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL  
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

Met - See #5,  
Page 2.

A 3-1928



TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday,  
September 13, 1982. Proposal to establish a combined  
Bachelor's/Master's degree program.

Background:

There are students at the University of Kentucky, some of whom are particularly gifted and highly motivated, whose well-defined academic and career plans include graduate or professional study. The University Scholars Program offers these students the opportunity and the challenge of integrating their undergraduate and graduate or professional courses of study in a single continuous program culminating in both a baccalaureate and a master's degree. The time devoted to such a program would be determined by the student's needs; however, it would normally be less than that required in a conventional program.

Admissions:

1. The program is open to undergraduates with senior standing who have completed at least 90 hours of course work and should have satisfied all general studies requirements. Application to the program should be at the end of the student's junior year.
2. The master's program should be in the field of the undergraduate major.
3. The undergraduate grade point average (UGPA) should be greater than or equal to 3.5 in the student's major and 3.2 overall.
4. 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.

5. The Graduate Record Examination (GRE) must be taken prior to entering the program.
6. Application to the program will follow the current procedures for application to Graduate School, subject to the above conditions, 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.

Degree Requirements and Curriculum:

1. The total number of credit hours for the combined program may be 12 fewer than the total required for both the bachelor's and master's degrees. (The requirements for the bachelor's degree will be unaffected.)
2. Students in this program should not take more than 16 credit hours per semester. Permission to exceed that number must be given by the Director of Graduate Studies and Dean of the Graduate School.
3. The student must complete at least 36 hours of graduate level courses, 15 credit hours of which must be at the 600 level or above for a Plan A master's degree. Students pursuing Plan A must complete at least 30 hours of graduate level courses of which 12 credit hours must be at the 600 level or above.
4. Each student must have an undergraduate and a graduate advisor. A jointly planned program must be prepared for each student.
5. In order to participate in the University Scholars Program a department must submit to the Graduate School a plan and illustrative examples of typical programs.

Rationale:

The advantages of this program are:

1. A savings of time and money--not all students will shorten the total period of study (some, indeed, could wish to lengthen it) however, most will reach the final degree sooner;
2. The coherence of a single, planned, undergraduate/graduate program.

Page 3

Senate Agenda Item: University Scholars  
August 18, 1982

3. More comprehensive advising required for the longer-range goals of the graduate degree.
4. Increased motivation with immediate involvement in the longer-range academic and professional goals.
5. Resources of the graduate or professional school available to the student at an earlier point in his or her career.
6. Earlier opportunities to engage in advanced work in a discipline of interest.

Neither the fixed time periods traditionally associated with the baccalaureate and many graduate and professional degrees nor the sharp break between undergraduate and graduate level study serve any significant purpose for these students. Indeed, these traditional features may cause only delay and lack of coherence in their courses of study. It seems clear that both the pace of the student's study and his or her term-by-term curricular choices are better determined by the final academic goal than by partial short-range objectives.

\*\*\*

Implementation Date: Spring Semester, 1982.

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

/cet



File

AUG 31 1982

## AGRICULTURE (12)

Blevins, Robert '83 (AGR)  
 +Boling, James A. '85 (ASC)  
 Bush, Lowell '83 (AGR)  
 Collins, Glenn B. '85 (AGR)  
 Cromwell, Gary L. '84 (AGR)  
 Ely, Donald G. '84 (ASC)  
 +Frye, W. W. '84 (ASC)  
 +Hiatt, Andrew J. '85 (AGR)  
 Kemp, James D. '84 (ASC)  
 Moody, William G. '84 (ASC)  
 Pass, Bob C. '83 (ENT)  
 Ross, Ira '83 (AEN)

## ALLIED HEALTH (3)

Hochstrasser, Donald '83 (AHE)  
 Jaeger, LaVonne '83 (PT)  
 Pisaneschi, Janet '84 (AHE)

## ARCHITECTURE (2)

Graves, Charles P. '84  
 Spaeth, David A. '83

## ARTS AND SCIENCES (38)

Biological & Physical Sciences (17)

Blackburn, William H. '83 (GLY)  
 Buckholtz, James '84 (MA)  
 Campbell, Lois J. '83 (GLY)  
 Eakin, Paul M. '85 (MA)  
 Freeman, Michael (MA) '83  
 (for Sands, Administration)  
 Govindarajulu, Zakkula '84 (STA)  
 Gray, Thomas C. '83 (BIO)  
 Guthrie, Robert D. '84 (CHE)  
 McEllistrem, Marcus T. '85 (PHY)  
 Pattengill, Merle D. '83 (CHE)  
 Prior, David J. '84 (BIO)  
 Purdue, Peter '84 (STA)  
 Smith, Stanford L. '84 (CHE)  
 Thrailkill, John '83 (GLY)  
 Weil, Jesse '85 (PHY)  
 Wood, Constance L. '83 (STA)  
 Yates, Steven '83 (CHE)

Literature & Philosophy (10)

Anderson, Roger B. '84 (SO)  
 Blues, Thomas O. '85 (ENG)  
 Dye, Nancy E. '85 (HIS)  
 Hemenway, Robert '84 (ENG)  
 Janecek, Gerald '84 (SO)  
 +Jones, Joseph '83 (SPI)  
 +Perreiah, Alan R. '85 (PHI)  
 Pival, Jean '84 (ENG)  
 Rea, John A. '83 (FR)  
 Reedy, Daniel '83 (SPI)

Social Sciences (11)

Brunn, Stanley D. '83 (GEO)  
 Canon, Bradley C. '83 (PS)  
 Harris, Jesse G. '83 (PSY)  
 Lowery, Carol R. '84 (PSY)  
 Lowery, David '85 (PS/PA)  
 Lyons, William E. '83 (PS)  
 Nelson, Daniel N. '84 (PS)  
 Roeder, Phillip W. '83 (PS)  
 Rusbult, Caryl E. '84 (PSY)  
 +Ulmer, Sidney '83 (PS)  
 Zentall, Thomas '83 (PSY)

## BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS (15)

Ecton, William '85 (ACC)  
 Freeman, James '83 (BA)  
 (for McAdams, resigned)  
 Gibson, James L. '84 (BA)  
 +Grimes, Andrew J. '83 (BA)  
 Hackbart, Merlin '84 (PA)  
 Hotelling, Harold '84 (BA)  
 +Johnson, Keith H. '83 (BA)  
 Krislov, Joseph '84 (ECO)  
 Marino, Kenneth E. '83 (BA)  
 Marsden, James R. '83 (ECO)  
 Massie, Joseph L. '84 (BA)  
 Nickless, Pamela '83 (ECO)  
 (for Shannon, resigned)  
 Shepard, Jon M. '83 (BA)  
 Tippog, Manuel A. '84 (ACC)  
 (for Bretschneider, resigned)  
 Wallace, Marc J. '84 (BA)

## COMMUNICATIONS (5)

+Applegate, James '85 (COM)  
 Baseheart, John R. '83 (SP)  
 +Bostrom, Robert N. '84 (SP)  
 Kirkhorn, Michael J. '83 (JOU)  
 Waldhart, Enid S. '83 (COM)

## DENTISTRY (4)

Bader, James '84 (CD)  
 +Brehm, Thomas '84 (RSD)  
 Damm, Douglas D. '83 (OPA)  
 Webster, David '84 (CD)  
 (for Okeson, resigned)

## EDUCATION (10)

Angelo, Richard '83 (EDF)  
 Benninga, Jacques '83 (EDC)  
 Bridge, Connie E. '83 (EDC)  
 Clark, Charlotte '83 (EDS)  
 Cole, Henry '85 (EDP)  
 DeMers, Stephen '85 (EDP)  
 +Denton, David E. '83 (EDF)  
 Little, Gordon P. '83 (EDP)  
 Omvig, Clayton '85 (EDU)  
 +Simpson, Kawanna '83 (EDV)

ENGINEERING (11)

Altenkirch, R. A. '84 (ME)  
+Cremers, Clifford J. '84 (ME)  
Deacon, J. A. '84 (CE)  
(for Leigh, Administration)  
Dillon, O. W. '85 (EM)  
+Gesund, Hans '84 (CE)  
Kao, David T. '83 (CE)  
+Kermode, Richard I. '84 (CME)  
Leon, B. J. '84 (EE)  
+Paul, Clayton R. '83 (EE)  
Peters, Leonard K. '84 (CME)  
+Todd, Lee T. '85 (EE)

FINE ARTS (4)

Hamann, Marilyn D. '84 (ART)  
Ivey, Donald W. '85 (MUS)  
Montgomery, Patricia '83 (MUS)  
Peters, Jane S. '83 (ART)

HOME ECONOMICS (4)

Forgue, Ray '85 (FAM)  
+Newburg, David S. '83 (NFS)  
Payne, David C. '84 (FAM)  
Rothgeb, Terry '83 (HED)

HONORS PROGRAM (1)

Rabel, Robert '84

LAW (2)

+Matthews, W. L. '83  
Underwood, Richard '83  
(for Garvey, resigned)

LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SERVICE

Bellardo, Trudi '84  
(for DuMont, resigned)

MEDICINE (14)

Brower, Thomas D. '85 (SUR)  
Diedrich, Donald F. '84 (PHA)  
Flanigan, Robert C. '83 (SUR)  
Frazier, Donald T. '83 (PGY)  
Kotchen, Theodore A. '84 (MED)  
(Lv Sp '83)  
Lucas, Bruce A. '83 (SUR)  
+Mandelstam, Paul '83 (MED)  
Mattingly, Sally S. '84 (SUR)  
Noble, Robert C. '84 (MED)  
+Rees, E. Douglas '85 (MED)  
Sachatello, Charles R. '85 (SUR)  
Sisken, Jesse E. '84 (PAT/PGY)  
Thompson, John '84 (MED)  
+Winer, Alfred D. '83 (BCH)

NURSING (2)

Lee, Gwendolyn '83  
Maurer, JoAnn '83

PHARMACY (3)

Amerson, Ann '84  
Fink, Joseph L. '85  
+Smith, Harry A. '84

SOCIAL WORK (2)

Bell, Joanne I. '83  
+Wilson, Contance P. '85

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES (2)

Dare, Philip '85  
Jones, Cheryl '84  
(for Gilchrist, resigned)

STUDENT SENATORS (23)

Agriculture (1)  
Hahn, Anne T.  
Allied Health (1)  
Kennedy, Peri Jean  
Architecture (1)  
Dwellen, Jeff  
Arts & Sciences (4)  
Freudenberg, Tim  
Holbrook, Wesley  
Kelley, Nancy  
Stathas, Teresa  
Business & Economics (3)  
Goldberg, Michael  
Hisle, Lenda  
Peters, Bryan  
Communications (1)  
Devlin, Kevin  
Dentistry (1)  
Chumbler, Allen  
Education (1)  
Terndrup, Glenn  
Engineering (1)  
Howard, Joseph  
Fine Arts (1)  
Clifford, Dan  
Graduate School (1)  
Yeh, Vincent  
Home Economics (1)  
Warren, Terry  
Law (1)  
Coiner, Andy  
Library & Information Science (1)  
Lyon, Peggy  
Medicine (1)  
Chalk, David  
Nursing (1)  
O'Donnell, Mary Ann  
Pharmacy (1)  
Hislope, Michael  
Social Work (1)  
Wells, Allison

EX OFFICIO

Voting (12)

Bosomworth, Peter P.  
Eardley, Anthony  
Drennon, Herbert N.  
Hamburg, Joseph  
Hasan, S. Zafar  
Lawson, Robert G.  
Leigh, Donald C.  
Packer, Merrill W.  
Royster, Wimberly C.  
Sagan, Edgar L.  
Sands, Donald E.  
Willis, Paul A.

Non-Voting (26)

Baer, Michael  
Barnhart, Charles E.  
Blanton, Jack C.  
Burch, Joseph T.  
Clapp, Donald B.  
Clawson, D. Kay  
Conger, William L.  
Dinkle, James  
Domek, Richard C.  
Dougherty, Joseph M.  
Furst, Richard W.  
Gallaher, Art, Jr.  
Hornback, Raymond R.  
Lacy, William B. (Acad. Ombudsman)  
McKenna, Marion E.  
Mitchell, John M.  
Ockerman, Elbert W.  
Rush, Thomas A.  
Sineath, Timothy W.  
Singletary, Otis A.  
Smith, John T.  
Stewart, Marjorie  
Swintosky, Joseph V.  
Wagner, William F.  
Wethington, Charles  
Zumwinkle, Robert G.

SENATE COUNCIL

Voting

(Members whose Senate terms  
have expired)

Belmore, Susan M. '84 (PSY)  
Jewell, Malcolm '84 (PS)

Jack C. Blanton  
Vice Pres. Business Affairs  
9 Administration Building

0032

1