

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, February 14, 1972 in the Court Room of the Law Building. Chairman Flickinger presided. Members absent: Staley F. Adams\*, Arnold D. Albright, Lawrence A. Allen\*, Kurt Ansel\*, Daniel S. Arnold\*, Charles E. Barnhart, Henry H. Bauer\*, Harmon C. Bickley\*, Harold R. Binkley\*, Wesley J. Birge\*, Harry M. Bohannon\*, Garnett L. Bradford\*, Betty J. Brannan, Mary R. Brown, Lowell P. Bush, S. K. Chan\*, Jose M. Concon\*, Carl B. Cone\*, Alfred L. Crabb, Glenwood L. Creech, Dan M. Daffron\*, Stephen Diachun\*, Ray H. Dutt\*, Lawrence Forgy, Jr., James E. Funk\*, George H. Gadbois\*, Eugene B. Gallagher\*, Richard E. Gift\*, Charles P. Graves, Jack B. Hall, Joseph Hamburg, Jesse G. Harris\*, Charles F. Haywood, Donald L. Hochstrasser\*, Fred E. Justus\*, Don Kirkendall\*, Bruce E. Langlois, Robert G. Lawson, Thomas J. Leonard\*, Charles T. Lesshafft, Kathy Liedtke, Paul Mandelstam\*, Roger M. McCoy\*, William C. McCrary\*, Ernest P. McCutcheon\*, George E. Mitchell\*, Theodore H. Mueller\*, Paul Oberst, James R. Ogletree\*, Albert W. Patrick\*, J. W. Patterson\*, Nancy J. Patton\*, Curtis Phipps\*, Paul M. Pinney, Nicholas J. Pisacano, E. Douglas Rees\*, Herbert G. Reid, Virginia Rogers, Robert W. Rudd\*, John S. Scarborough, Donald S. Shannon, D. Milton Shuffett\*, Otis A. Singletary\*, Eugene J. Small\*, Eldon D. Smith, Raymond A. Smith\*, Hugh A. Storrow\*, Robert H. Stroup, Dennis D. Stuckey\*, Timothy H. Taylor\*, Nancy K. Totten\*, John A. Via\*, M. Stanley Wall, Charles A. Walton\*, Ronald D. Weddle\*, David R. Wekstein\*, Harry E. Wheeler\*, William R. Willard, Joseph W. Wilson, Alfred D. Winer\*, Miroslava B. Winer\*, Ernest F. Witte\*, Kenneth R. Wright\*, Robert G. Zumwinkle\*.

The minutes of January 31, 1972 were approved as circulated with one correction to change the third paragraph on page four to "six candidates" in lines two and six.

Dr. Thomas B. Stroup, Chairman of the Library Committee, presented a report of that committee followed by a motion that the Senate adopt a resolution for presentation to the Administration of the University. The Senate accepted the annual report and approved the resolution, which had been given to them preceding the meeting, for presentation to the Administration. The report and resolution follow:

I believe it was Herbert Riley who remarked wisely a few years ago that nothing was wrong with the University libraries that dollars would not remedy. I believe the Senate Library Committee would agree with such observation. (Some of us might name other areas of the University's activities wherein dollars might not suffice.) And dollars have been recently forthcoming to remedy, in a year or two, the most obvious need of the libraries: space--addition to the plant. As you all know, funds are available, plans are laid, bids have been made, contracts let, and work will soon begin on the addition to the Margaret I. King Library. For this accomplishment we all say, "Deo gratias et gratias tibi Singletary et Forgy." I understand that the bids have been sufficiently low to allow funds for rehabilitating parts of M.I.K. Buying, processing, binding, cataloging, archives, special collections, and exhibit gallery, stacks, administrative offices, general work space, and even an art library will be provided. Moving these out of the present building will provide shelving for an additional 300,000 volumes and space for 700 additional readers. For these provisions, however modest in view of the need, the University is duly grateful to those who have so wisely provided--and at a time when dollars are hard to come by.

\*Absence explained

The Library Committee are aware, however, of other needs than space. We solicit your interest and beg your indulgence for a little while. Then we will ask your support of a resolution.

As you all know, the libraries receive from time to time gifts of books, manuscripts, papers from private donors, and money from the Library Associates; as you may not all know, it has for some years received funds from other non-state sources for special purposes. Title IIA of the Higher Education Act has since 1968 contributed a total of over \$90,000 for the Law Library, the Agriculture Library, microfilms of newspapers, musicological materials, and gaps in general collections. These funds probably are no longer available. Similarly the National Science Foundation has contributed nearly \$45,000 for the improvement of our mathematical library resources. These are no longer available. Funds from private donors are often restricted, not to be used for general purposes.

Not only do we stand to lose from foundations and governmental agencies, but we will stand a loss because of the increased and increasing prices of books and periodicals. The cost of an average book rose \$3.00 between 1968 and 1970, and the cost of a subscription to an average periodical rose the same amount during the same period. The price of binding has increased proportionately: our library pays for binding \$8,000 more this year than it did in 1969/70, an increase of about 8%. Similarly the cost of supplies has risen for our libraries by nearly 4% from 1969 to 1971. And at the very same time that operations have grown, requiring more supplies, funds spent for supplies have dropped from \$59,373 in 1969/70 to \$54,953 in 1970/71, with only \$54,272 budgeted for 1971/72. The average annual increase for salaries has dropped from 9.1% in 1970/71 to a budgeted 4.2% in 1971/72. For 1971/72 no funds were budgeted for equipment, making it necessary for \$52,160 to be allocated from non-recurring funds to meet the severe need. There have been no regularly budgeted funds for equipment (i.e., shelving, microform cabinets, typewriters, etc.), a serious matter considering that roughly \$25,000 per year is needed. On occasion, book funds have had to be used for this purpose.

Now these reductions have occurred during a time when the student body has increased by 10% and the faculty by 15%, during a time when the circulation of books has been increasing by 15% per year--at a time when the backlog of uncatalogued books and periodicals has grown to an estimated 14,000 volumes (not including thousands of uncatalogued microforms all but unavailable to students and faculty), at a time when no additions have been made to the professional staff of the libraries. (No additions to the staff have been made since 1968/69.) These reductions in support have occurred at a time when many of the university libraries with which we are often compared have been improving their standing. For example, the University of Georgia has increased its personnel from 155 to 214 in the last two years, ours from 135 to 163 in the last four. Its books budget was \$1,335,906 in 1970/71, whereas ours (with additions from non-recurring funds added) was \$876,791. (Georgia got nearly half a million dollars more for books than we did.) Moreover their collection now surpasses ours by ten thousand, whereas in 1968 ours surpassed theirs by more than a hundred thousand. (One might observe: now, who wants to be compared to Georgia.)

What I have been trying to point out is that our library support has decreased at the very time when most it needs to be increased. To take care of special and pressing needs at the very present our libraries should employ librarians with specialized training in musicology, law, foreign languages, reference, the sciences (mathematics, biology, and geology, especially), and they also need a map librarian. Our libraries have for the last five years, moreover, consistently paid beginning salaries to professional librarians below the national average. We have noted that frequently new programs have been set up, even graduate programs, without taking into consideration the library needs for such programs. (At the present a program in African studies is being considered, another in Latin American studies.) Library needs even for undergraduate work in these fields would require a very considerable increase in funds for books and people. So much for a few of our needs.

You will have noticed that I have mentioned certain non-recurring funds received from time to time to supplement budgeted library funds. For example, the book and binding fund for 1971/72 is \$762,070 of which \$300,000 were not budgeted but came from non-recurring funds. Similarly in 1970/71 only \$462,068 were budgeted but \$330,974 were added to the book fund from non-recurring funds. For these funds, and they are numerous, the Library is grateful, and we all say, "Benedicite omnia opera de Bud Cochran." Without them the University libraries could not keep going. But non-recurring funds may not always be depended on. Someday someone may not be so kind and regardful as in the past; some day he might not come to the rescue or bail out the Director of Libraries. It would be far easier for the Director of Libraries to make plans if he knew for certain a year or two in advance that he would have those funds with which to buy books, or to contract for supplies, or to hire that brilliant and well-trained reference librarian.

The Committee understands that for the next biennium the budget request for libraries is the same number of dollars as that granted for the present biennium. Such budget will not, of course, provide for proper growth; it will indeed reduce by at least five per cent the funds available to buy books and materials and by ten per cent our services--circulation, interlibrary loan, bibliographic searching, proper reading of shelves, reference etc. Besides, it makes no provision for the care of the new addition which we hope will be in use before the end of the next biennium.

In view of these conditions, your Committee moves that you adopt the following resolution and have it presented to the Administration of the University:

The University Senate highly commends the Administration for providing the sorely needed addition to the Margaret I. King Library and for moving swiftly towards its construction. It recognizes with gratitude the wisdom of this move to encourage and provide for the primary functions of the University. In view of the increased calls for library services, however, and especially the vastly increased and increasing costs of books and periodicals, the Senate requests that regular adjustments be made in library appropriations consistent with the growth in the student body, faculty and programs, to assure the libraries an adequate budget, one which will truly reflect the equivalent

value of the present funds now allowed for library uses.

The Chairman asked the Senate for a waiver of the 10-day circulation rule so that it might consider the Report of the ad hoc Committee on Accelerated Programs, circulated to the faculty under date of February 2, 1972. The Senate concurred in this proposal.

The Chairman then called on Dr. Sheldon Rovin, Chairman of the ad hoc Committee on Accelerated Programs, who reported that there had been a few amendments proposed and that as they took up each Recommendation he would read the proposed amendments. With the approval of the Senate Council, and on behalf of the Committee, he then recommended approval of Recommendation #1, COLLEGE LEVEL EXAMINATION PROGRAM, which reads as follows:

COLLEGE LEVEL EXAMINATION PROGRAM: The University Senate of the University of Kentucky shall endorse and adopt the use of the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) to the end that:

(a) Any eligible student wishing to take a CLEP examination for credit shall be allowed to do so, or if a department refuses to allow a CLEP examination to be taken in lieu of a course or courses, it shall justify its refusal to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and Vice President for Academic Affairs or Vice President for the Medical Center as appropriate.

(b) Credit shall be given to students obtaining a satisfactory score on CLEP examinations. The respective departments shall determine what scores are satisfactory and in which courses the credit shall be given.

\*(c) Any cost for the CLEP examination will be met by the applicant.

(d) Implementation of (a) and (b) shall include requiring departments to file a list of courses available under CLEP with the Dean of Admissions and Registrar.

The floor was thrown open for discussion and extensive debate followed.

In answer to a question of explanation of why justification for refusal should be made to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and Vice President for Academic Affairs rather than the respective colleges, Dr. Rovin stated that an amendment to make this change had been received. He then presented the proposal to amend paragraph (a) to read:

(a) Any eligible student wishing to take a CLEP examination for credit shall be allowed to do so, or if a department refuses to allow a CLEP examination to be taken in lieu of a course or courses, it shall justify its refusal to the Dean of the respective college with copies to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and Vice President for Academic Affairs or Vice President for the Medical Center as appropriate.

\*Have financial or administrative implications

Call for the question was made and approved. The Senate then voted approval of the amendment to paragraph (a).

Debate to this point had been centered on the position taken by a Senator that he could not support the granting of credit for testing. Following continued debate addressed to this position, motion was made to amend paragraph (a) to remove the words "for credit" from that paragraph: to change the first sentence in paragraph (b) to read: (b) No credit shall be given to students obtaining a satisfactory score on CLEP examinations but the results may be used to determine advanced standing for the student.", and to change the word "credit" to "examination" in the second sentence of (b).

Following expressions of objection to the amendment, question was called. The Senate voted to call the question and then defeated the proposed amendment.

Question was again called to vote on Recommendation #1 as amended. The Senate voted to approve call for the question following which it approved Recommendation #1, as amended. That Recommendation, as amended, and approved, reads:

COLLEGE LEVEL EXAMINATION PROGRAM: The University Senate of the University of Kentucky shall endorse and adopt the use of the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) to the end that:

(a) Any eligible student wishing to take a CLEP examination for credit shall be allowed to do so, or if a department refuses to allow a CLEP examination to be taken in lieu of a course or courses, it shall justify its refusal to the Dean of the respective college with copies to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and Vice President for Academic Affairs or Vice President for the Medical Center as appropriate.

(b) Credit shall be given to students obtaining a satisfactory score on CLEP examinations. The respective departments shall determine what scores are satisfactory and in which courses the credit shall be given.

\*(c) Any cost for the CLEP examination will be met by the applicant.

(d) Implementation of (a) and (b) shall include requiring departments to file a list of courses available under CLEP with the Dean of Admissions and Registrar.

On behalf of the Committee, Dr. Rovin moved adoption of Recommendation #2 following which he presented a proposed amendment which had been submitted to the Committee. Recommendation #2, as circulated, reads:

COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD ADVANCED PLACEMENT PROGRAM: The University Senate shall expand the use of the CEEB-AP Program and grant credit in all instances of its use as follows:

(a) The Registrar shall be authorized to grant credit for CEEB-AP scores of 3 or better. In cases where these exams are not clearly related to University courses, the Registrar shall consult with the respective departments to determine the course and number of hours.

\*Have financial or administrative implications

(b) A department may authorize the Registrar to grant credit for grades below 3 or allow credit for additional courses for scores above 3.

\*(c) The Office of Admissions shall publicize acceptance of CLEP and CEEB-AP in the Kentucky high schools as extensively as possible, and when feasible, make available materials for students to study for this testing.

\*(d) The program shall be utilized in the Community Colleges as extensively as possible.

(e) Implementation of CEEB-AP shall include requiring department to file a list of courses available under CEEB-AP with the Dean of Admissions and Registrar.

The proposed amendment which he presented was to change the first sentence of (a) to read: "The Registrar shall be authorized to grant credit for CEEB-AP scores of 3 or better except where a department indicates that such a score is insufficient in which case the department shall determine what score is required."

Dean Royster, who had submitted the amendment to the Committee, stated that the Committee's wording differed somewhat from what he had submitted. He then read his amendment as follows:

(a) Each academic department may approve the use of a CEEB-AP examination for credit in one or more of its courses. Each concerned department shall file a statement of its policy on CEEB-AP examinations with the dean of the college who will send to the Dean of Admissions and Registrar the list of courses and acceptable scores available under the Advanced Placement program.

On behalf of the Committee Dr. Rovin reported that Dr. Royster's wording was acceptable, and it became the amendment on the floor. He stated that this proposed amendment would replace (a), would negate the need for (b) and (e), and would necessitate the renumbering of (c) and (d) to become (b) and (c).

Following discussion, question was called and the Senate voted to stop debate on the amendment.

By a hand count of 50 to 32 the amendment was approved.

Recommendation #2, as amended, reads:

(a) Each academic department may approve the use of a CEEB-AP examination for credit in one or more of its courses. Each concerned department shall file a statement of its policy on CEEB-AP examinations with the dean of the college who will send to the Dean of Admissions and Registrar the list of courses and acceptable scores available under the Advanced Placement program.

\*(b) The Office of Admissions shall publicize acceptance of CLEP

\*Have financial or administrative implications

and CEEB-AP in the Kentucky high schools as extensively as possible, and when feasible, make available materials for students to study for this testing.

\* (c) The program shall be utilized in the Community Colleges as extensively as possible.

Dr. Paul Sears pointed out that it was inappropriate for the Senate to legislate requirements within the Community College System. He then presented a motion to amend paragraph (c) in the amended version of Recommendation #2 to read: "It is recommended that the program be utilized in the Community Colleges as extensively as possible."

Dr. Rovin stated that this change was acceptable to the Committee and did not need to be voted on.

The Senate then voted approval of Recommendation #2, as amended, which reads as follows:

COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD ADVANCED PLACEMENT PROGRAM: The University Senate shall expand the use of the CEEB-AP Program and grant credit in all instances of its use as follows:

(a) Each academic department may approve the use of a CEEB-AP examination for credit in one or more of its courses. Each concerned department shall file a statement of its policy on CEEB-AP examinations with the dean of the college who will send to the Dean of Admissions and Registrar the list of courses and acceptable scores available under the Advanced Placement program.

\* (b) The Office of Admissions shall publicize acceptance of CLEP and CEEB-AP in the Kentucky high schools as extensively as possible, and when feasible, make available materials for students to study for this testing.

\* (c) It is recommended that the program be utilized in the Community Colleges as extensively as possible.

On behalf of the Committee, Dr. Rovin moved acceptance of Recommendation #3, which reads as follows:

\*SELF-INSTRUCTION COURSES FOR CREDIT:

(a) Accredited courses offered by other institutions which are available in package form may be used by University of Kentucky students and accepted for credit.

(b) Faculty members are encouraged to develop package courses within their own disciplines or departments for greater cooperative use with other institutions of higher learning.

Chairman Flickinger then presented an amendment, which had been received by the Committee, to add to the end of paragraph (a) the phrase "upon approval of the

\*Have financial or administrative implications

Administrative implications

course by the appropriate academic unit." so that paragraph (a) would read:

(a) Accredited courses offered by other institutions which are available in package form may be used by University of Kentucky students and accepted for credit upon approval of the course by the appropriate academic unit.

This proposal was seconded. Following an explanation of the definition of the word "package" as used in this Recommendation, question was called and approved. The Senate then approved the amendment to paragraph (a) as presented by Dr. Flickinger.

Motion was made and seconded to change the first part of paragraph (a) to read: "Courses offered by other accredited institutions. . .". Upon determination that this could be treated as a minor editorial change and upon receiving acceptance of this change by the seconder of the motion, Dr. Rovin stated that the change was acceptable to the Committee and would be done.

The Senate returned to discussion of paragraph (a) as it related to the "package form", and became stalemated in a semantic problem. Dr. Rovin stated that he felt the Committee had the intent of the Senate and the Senate agreed informally to rely on the Committee's judgment to reword the paragraph to reflect the sense of the Senate.

The Senate then voted to approve Recommendation #3, as amended, with a minor editorial change, and subject to rewording as indicated in the preceding paragraph. Recommendation #3, as amended, and changed editorially, reads:

\*SELF-INSTRUCTION COURSES FOR CREDIT:

(a) Courses offered by other accredited institutions which are available in package form may be used by University of Kentucky students and accepted for credit upon approval of the course by the appropriate academic unit.

(See Addendum at the end of the minutes for clarification of "package form" in paragraph (a), which has since been done by the Committee.)

(b) Faculty members are encouraged to develop package courses within their own disciplines or departments for greater cooperative use with other institutions of higher learning.

On behalf of the Committee Dr. Rovin recommended acceptance of Recommendation #4. The Senate approved this recommendation. Recommendation #4 as circulated and accepted by the Senate reads:

EARLY ENTRY INTO THE UNIVERSTIY:

\*(a) The Dean of Admissions and Registrar's Office shall increase efforts and propose experimental programs whereby high school students can attend the University in lieu of their senior year of study in high school. The University shall recommend to the respective Boards of Education that they confer high school diplomas to such students successfully completing the freshman year at the University. Also, the Dean of Admissions and Registrar's

\*Have financial or administrative implications



Office should encourage greater participation of high school juniors and seniors in the UK Summer Program.

- \*(b) The Independent Study Office should be instructed to promote the taking of University courses by high school students for University of Kentucky credit.

On behalf of the Committee Dr. Rovin recommended approval of Recommendation #5 which reads as follows:

SPECIAL EXAMINATION FOR CREDIT:

Definition: A special examination may mean other than a written examination. Instead of a formal written or oral examination it may consist of some arrangement between the student and instructor for the student to demonstrate some skill or capability. In addition, the student may be required to complete term papers or similar projects essential to the course.

Obviously, the structure of some courses would militate against a student obtaining credit via a special examination; for example, a discussion or seminar course which depends upon appreciable student participation. The use of the special examination would be particularly apropos in courses which are not structured for interaction between student and professor such as large lecture courses. Additionally, this plan would be useful in courses essentially comprising dissemination of information. Therefore, it is recommended that:

- (a) the current Senate Rule allowing special examination for credit be expanded and modified as follows:

CURRENT RULE: "A student regularly enrolled in the University may be given a special examination for credit, provided the request for the examination is approved by the Registrar, the dean of the college and the department chairman concerned. Application must be made in writing to the Registrar. Credit for courses taken by special examination shall be considered residence credit.

An auditor in a course may not take an examination in that course for credit. A student who has failed a course may not take a special examination to remove the failure."

CHANGE TO: "Any student, whether full-time or part-time, enrolled in the University shall be given a special examination for credit, provided the request for the examination is approved by the department chairman requested to give the examination, subject to the criteria listed below. Application by the student must be made in writing to this person. It is the responsibility of the examiner to report the credit obtained to the Registrar. It shall be the responsibility of the student to determine that the credit to be obtained is not duplicative of that already earned.

- (a) A full or part-time student in good academic standing may be given a special examination upon written application to the appropriate department chairman, regardless of whether the student has audited the course,

\*Have financial or administrative implications

is currently enrolled in it, or has studied for it independently.

(b) The chairman may deny the student's request only if he decides that the student has failed to furnish evidence that he is reasonably prepared to take the examination, or if the department considers the course to be of such nature that credit by special examination would be inappropriate.

\*(c) The instructor may schedule this examination at his convenience but must offer it within a reasonable period of time of the student's written request so as to permit a student to enter another course under procedures to be formulated by the Dean of Admissions and Registrar, (to include approval of the respective department chairman and instructor). The instructor shall inform the Registrar of the student's grade in the examination, which shall be his grade in the course. However, a student currently enrolled in a course who is dissatisfied with the results of this examination may continue in the course and be graded in the usual manner. (The instructor may or may not include the results of this examination in computing the final grade.)

(d) A grade reported for a special examination shall be counted as residence credit and at the student's option, may or may not be counted as part of the student's regular course load.

(e) The student may take the examination on a Pass-Fail basis. If he does, he shall not be restricted to the courses available under the Pass-Fail option, and he shall be entitled to take the maximum number of courses under it.

(f) He shall be formally removed from the official class roll of this class by the Registrar after the official granting of credit by special examination.

(g) Community college directors are encouraged to administer special examinations for their students for courses taught in their colleges. Transfer of this credit will depend upon the transferability of the course under normal circumstances."

Dean William Dennen of the Graduate School presented an amendment to insert the word "undergraduate" between the words "Any" and "student" in the first sentence of the proposed change in the Senate Rule allowing special examination for credit. This would limit the special examination to undergraduate students only.

Following extensive discussion of the proposed amendment, call for the question was made and approved. The Senate then voted on the amendment as presented by Dean Dennen, and the Chair ruled that it was defeated. Division of the house was called for and by a hand count of 44 to 37 the Senate defeated the amendment.

Dr. Rovin asked if the Senate would be willing to accept the wording "Director of Graduate Studies" for insertion, where appropriate, in place of the defeated amendment. The Senate accepted this substitution.

\*Have financial or administrative implications

Motion was made and seconded to amend paragraph (c) under the proposed change in the Senate Rule allowing special examination for credit to delete the phrase "within a reasonable period of time of the student's written request . . ." and to substitute the words "at least once per semester . . ." so that the sentence would read:

\* (c) The instructor may schedule this examination at his convenience but must offer it at least once per semester so as to permit a student to enter another course under procedures to be formulated by the Dean of Admissions and Registrar, (to include approval of the respective department chairman and instructor).

Upon approval of call for the question the Senate voted on the proposed amendment and defeated it.

Following discussion, motion was made to re-insert at the end of the first paragraph of the proposed change in the current Rule, the sentence "A student who has failed a course may not take a special examination to remove the failure."

Following further discussion, question was called and approved. The Senate then defeated the motion to re-insert the sentence "A student who has failed a course may not take a special examination to remove the failure."

Further discussion ensued concerning the position of the professional colleges and the Graduate School as it relates to acceleration.

Motion was made and seconded to recess until 3:00 p.m., Monday, February 21, 1972. The Senate voted to defeat this motion, which was not debatable and took a majority vote.

Motion was then made and seconded to refer Recommendation #5 back to Committee particularly for a study on the Graduate School question and a re-writing that would eliminate the need for clarification. The Parliamentarian pointed out that this motion had the effect of postponing action indefinitely which was not permitted under the Rules.

Question was called, but objection was raised.

Motion was then made to amend the motion to refer it back to Committee, to be reported back to the Senate at its next regularly scheduled meeting on March 13, 1972. The Senate approved this amendment.

The Senate then approved the motion, as amended, to recommit to Committee Recommendation #5, the Committee to report back at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate.

Motion was made to adjourn. The Senate defeated this motion.

On behalf of the Committee Dr. Rovin recommended approval of Recommendation #6, which reads as follows:

\*It is recommended that the Administration coordinate accelerated programs under the Dean of Undergraduate Studies with appropriate appointment of directors. (The separate functions related to

\*Have financial or administrative implications

CLEP and CEEB-AP, as well as UK Summer Program for High School Juniors and Seniors operates now within the Registrar's personnel.) Also, an annual report shall be made to the University Senate relative to the progress of the use of Accelerated Programs with recommendation for modification if deemed desirable.

Dr. Flickinger then presented a proposed amendment which had been submitted to the Committee, to change the first sentence to read:

\*It is recommended that the Administration coordinate accelerated programs under the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and that he make an annual report to the University Senate relative to progress of the use of accelerated programs, with recommendation for modification if deemed desirable.

Debate ensued following which motion was made to refer Recommendation #6 back to Committee to be reported back to the Senate at its next regularly scheduled meeting on March 13, 1972.

Dr. Rovin stated that he felt this should be done; that the Committee did not anticipate the kind of dichotomy that had occurred between graduate and undergraduate and that the Committee needed to address itself to this and to make another recommendation to the Senate.

The Senate then approved the motion to refer Recommendation #6 back to Committee to be reported back to the Senate at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

The Chairman announced that Recommendation #7 was being postponed at the request of the Committee in order to make sure that there is full coordination.

Motion was made and approved to adjourn. The Senate adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Elbert W. Ockerman  
Secretary, University Senate

#### ADDENDUM

" (a) . . . ("Package form" means independent or self-paced study which may require supervision by UK faculty but does not include extension or correspondence courses at other institutions.) . . ."

\*Have financial or administrative implications