

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, OCTOBER 11, 1993

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, October 11, 1993, in Room 115 of the Nursing Health Sciences Building.

Daniel L. Fulks, Chairperson of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent were: Stephanie Atcher, Mark C. Berger*, Antimony Bishop*, Robert L. Blevins, Rick Boland, Peter P. Bosomworth, Douglas A. Boyd, Joseph T. Burch, D. Allan Butterfield*, Laurretta Byars, Bradley C. Canon*, Clyde R. Carpenter, Ben W. Carr, Edward A. Carter, Shea Chaney*, G.L. Monty Chappell*, Donald B. Clapp, Jane Clark, Jordan L. Cohen, Darby Cole, Melissa Cox*, Lance E. DeLong*, Brian DeYoung, Richard Edwards, Raymond Fergie, Michael B. Freeman*, Richard W. Furst, Joseph H. Gardner*, Lorraine Garkovich, William Gibson*, Larry J. Grabau*, William S. Griffith*, J. John Harris, Zafar S. Hasan*, Christine b nice, Robert E. Hemenway, Floyd J. Holler, Chester A. Holmquist, Don A. Howard, Edward J. Kasarskis*, Kenneth K. Kubota, Gretchen LaGodna*, Thomas W. Lester, Thomas T. Lillich*, C. Oran Little, Loys L. Mather*, Jan McCulloch*, Martin J. McMahan, James S. Mosbey, David A. Nash*, Anthony L. Newberry, Jacqueline Noonan*, Judith Page, Barbara Phillips*, Rhoda-Gale Pollack, Thomas C. Robinson, Ellen B. Rosenman, Horst Schach*, Janice Schach*, David Shipley, Thomas J. Stipanowich, William J. Stober*, David H. Stockham, Michael Stover, Phillip A. Tibbs, Miroslaw Truszczynski, Henry C. Vasconez, Mary Walker, Chris Webb, Charles T. Wethington*, Brent White, Eugene R. Williams, Emery A. Wilson*, Mary L. Witt*.

The Chair welcomed everyone to the University Senate meeting.

The Chair stated that the Senate Minutes for September 20 have not been circulated. Since the September meeting was postponed one week, there were only three weeks between meetings.

The Chair made the following announcements:

The Governor's Higher Education Review Commission has met for the first time. The Governor at the first meeting distributed his list of recommendations. The Chair is not sure how far the list has been circulated. The Senate Council received a copy and it was distributed to each member. There are several interesting recommendations coming from the Governor, 14 in fact. The Chair said the President planned to discuss what is going on with the Commission at the next Board of Trustees meeting. The Governor's timetable on response is by the end of the calendar year. Chairman Fulks asked that the Senate make themselves aware. The Senate Council plans to discuss the Commission and the Governor's recommendations with the President at the next meeting of the Senate Council.

* Absence Excused

As a result of some recommendations coming out of the Self-Study and also the SACs review, the Senate Council became interested in the Athletics Board. It was their desire to make contact with the faculty members of the board and establish lines of communication to see to what extent they felt support from the faculty and to what extent they felt they were representing the faculty. The Senate Council initiated some dialogue with the faculty members of the board and they satisfied their

curiosities. The Chair suggested to the Senate that if they have any questions at all concerning athletics, primarily the academic end of athletics, they contact members of the board. There are six official members from the faculty and the faculty representative to the NCAA serves on the athletics board as well. Connie Wilson spoke with the Senate Council last Monday. The members of the Board are: Bill Markesbery from the Sanders Brown Center on Aging, John Piecoro from Pharmacy, Tommy Whittler from Business and Economics, Bob Lawson from the Law School, Connie Wilson from Social Work, Jack Van Nagell, Jr. from the College of Medicine, and Virginia Atwood from the College of Education. They are certainly open to any questions the Senate might have, as have been C.M. Newton and his staff.

The Chairperson then introduced to the Senate Dr. Deborah Powell, Faculty Member to the Board of Trustees to give the traditional fall address to the Senate.

Address to University
as
Faculty Trustee
October 11, 1993

I would like to report to you on the activities of the Board of Trustees during the 1992-93 academic year and a little bit about the coming year.

As you know, last year, because of the change in the way the Board of Trustess members are appointed, almost half of the board was newly appointed or elected. For most of the year, many of us were getting to know each other and getting accustomed to the Board process. The Board of Trustees has 20 members. Three are faculty members, 2 from the Lexington Campus and 1 from the Community College System. The Community College representative is John Sistarnik from Jefferson Community College and the two faculty members last year were myself and Carolyn Bratt. This year the new faculty representative in addition to myself is Loys Mather.

This coming year we have only one other new member of the Board. Jim Rose, who has been a long standing member of the Board of Trustees has been replaced. Otherwise, the Board will be the same this year as last year. Recently the Board held elections and Governor Edward Breathitt has been re-elected to continue as Chair of the Board of Trustees.

The Board meetings, as you probably know if you have attended them, are open to everyone with a very formal agenda. The agenda for the Board meetings is set by the President. Occasionally, special presentations are given to the Board of Trustees. Last year several presentations were given including one on the University Honors Program, one on the College of Pharmacy, and a tour of the University Hospital. This year we have had a presentation already about the new library.

I have tried to think of highlights from the Board meetings last year that might be of interest. In addition to the formal approval of the University budget which takes place every year in June, with a special briefing session for board members before that time, we also approved the biennial budget request this year. This approval was also preceded by a special briefing session.

One of our biggest issues was the question of representation of faculty members on committees of the Board of Trustees. I think Professor Carolyn Bratt reported to the Senate on that last fall. I would like to bring you up to date as to what happened to that process. The Board of Trustees has six committees plus the University Hospital Board of

Directors which is a committee that is also made up of board members. Before last year the University Faculty Trustees were not broadly represented on the committees of the Board and were basically clustered on a committee that is known as the Student Code Committee. Professor Bratt really spearheaded the effort to try to get University Faculty Trustees more broadly represented on committees, especially on the committees that were perceived as important committees of the board, most notably the Finance Committee and the Executive Committee. In response largely to her actions we were appointed to several different committees of the Board including the Student Code Committee, the Hearing Committee, the Nominating Committee, and the Investment Committee last year. This year's committee list is just being released, but I know that one of us will be appointed to the Finance Committee. I think that primarily because of her efforts, the Faculty Representatives are being more broadly represented on committees of the board, where a lot of the work of the board actually takes place. I think that is very positive for the faculty. I think it is crucial that we be on important visible committees of the Board.

The second issue on which I will report occurred through the Student Code Committee. That happened at the end of the year based a motion that was brought to the Student Code Committee by Student Government. This led to an action of the Board at its June meeting, which recognized that the University would formally add to its policies that it would not discriminate against any student, any faculty, or any staff member because of sexual orientation. This began with an amendment to the Student Code of Conduct that was brought by Student Government to the Student Code Committee and then was broadened by Board action to include not only students but faculty and staff. That nondiscriminatory policy was accepted by the Board at its June meeting last year.

This coming year, I think that the Board will be hearing from the President and from Governor Breathitt about the Governor's Commission on Higher Education which Dan Fulks has already mentioned. Governor Breathitt and President Wethington are the two UK representatives to that commission. I think we are all going to be very interested and quite concerned to know what that group decides. It's report is due in December. The President has distributed the Governor's comments to all the Board Members and stated that he will be discussing this commission with the Board.

Loys Mather and I will be continuing to follow what Carolyn Bratt and I started last year, trying to visit as many of the colleges at the University as will have us come to formal or informal meetings, to talk with faculty in the colleges about the Board of Trustees and to try to hear first hand what concerns you might have. Last year Loys and I or Carolyn and I went to several different colleges and we feel this is better and more efficient for your time than trying to schedule town meetings which usually are held at inconvenient times and inconvenient places. This week Loys and I are going to the College of Fine Arts and next week to the College of Agriculture. We have written to all the deans telling them we would like to come and speak with faculty and I would just like to remind you directly that we are willing and very able to come to any meeting, informal or formal that you might want to setup in your college to talk to faculty first hand about their concerns and about the Board of Trustees and just to introduce ourselves.

The Chair thanked Dr. Powell for her remarks.

The Chair asked if anyone had any questions for Dr. Powell.

Davy Jones (Graduate School) asked if the Executive Committee of the Board and the other committees consider themselves subject to the Open Meetings Law.

Dr. Powell replied that the Investment Committee and the Finance Committee are open meetings and anyone is welcome to attend those. She herself and usually the other faculty members attended the Finance Committee even though they were not on the committee. She thinks they are all regularly constituted committees. The meeting times of the committees are sent out with the announcement of the board meeting approximately two weeks before the board meeting, so if anyone is interested she can give them the times of those meetings the week before the Board meeting. The Executive Committee does not hold regularly scheduled meetings, the Finance Committee always meets before the Board meeting, and the Investment Committee usually does but not all of the time. The Student Code Committee meets very infrequently, usually when there are just action items.

The Chair then introduced Professor Louis Swift, Dean of Undergraduate Studies to present a report on the University Studies Program.

USP Report to the Senate
October 11, 1993

The review of the University Studies Program got underway last fall with interviews by committee members of all the deans and chairs across the campus. With information gained from those meetings we developed a questionnaire regarding University Studies which we distributed to all the faculty, and we held two open fora to get suggestions from the campus community. Members of the committee also visited the Community Colleges at Paducah, Maysville, and Lexington to talk to faculty, staff, and students at those institutions about the strength and weaknesses of the program. We also invited the Registrar, the Advising Network, and faculty members from the departments of Mathematics, Statistics, and Philosophy to our meetings in order to discuss various aspects of University Studies.

The responses we received from these various activities were, as you might well imagine, very varied. Some suggested that we should start de novo and do the project all over again others seemed to be quite content with the new system and felt quite strongly that it was a significant improvement over what we had before. Probably the biggest positive note that was struck was that a much larger portion of the academic departments on campus were now participating in University Studies whereas that was not possible in our earlier system.

Nonetheless, several issues surfaced regularly in our inquiry, and the Committee has been wrestling with them since we started the review process. The first of these is the number of courses in the program. Some have argued that the plethora of offerings militates against the notion of a core curriculum which all students should take as part of their general education.

Several advisors tell us that they have considerable difficulty understanding precisely what is required and explaining the rationale for the various components of University Studies. On the three or four occasions when this issue has been discussed in the USP Committee, the past few years the consensus among committee members has been remarkably

consistent. Although the program is complicated, the fact that we have a large student body with diverse interests and needs and a very diverse faculty skilled in a variety of areas warrants the diversity of offerings. It has been argued that since one of the goals of a general education is to allow students to try new avenues of inquiry and to develop academic interests in a wide variety of areas, the benefits of having a large selection of courses, in the Committee's mind at least, seemed not to be outweighed by the time and energy it takes for advisors to analyze the various parts and use them effectively in advising their students. The alternate route of reducing the choices to a very small number of courses which all students shall take puts additional stress on the resources within departments and assumes that there is only one way of arriving at a liberal education. In short, the Committee has never reacted positively to the suggestion that we do some radical surgery on the number of courses which are available in the program. On the other hand, it has heartily endorsed efforts such as the Modern Studies Curriculum, which aims to provide a highly coherent liberal arts education to a certain segment of our undergraduates.

The Committee has, however, recognized that the availability of courses is sometimes a serious problem for students. This is particularly true in the area of the cross-disciplinary component where a student may take part of the pair during one semester and discover that the other course is not offered on a timely basis. The number of students who come to my office each semester seeking an alternate route when the course they are seeking has not or will not be offered for some time, attests to the fact that this is an issue which we must address. There is a consensus in the Committee that we should stipulate that no course will be in the cross-disciplinary area unless it is offered every year or at least every other year.

The whole issue of maintaining the ties which were originally established in the cross-disciplinary component of University Studies is a serious one. When the courses were first proposed, the syllabi and the covering letter indicated in some detail the ways in which the paired courses would illuminate specific issues and enrich the students' understanding. With changes in faculty, the use of TA's, and the lack of ongoing discussion between instructors, maintaining connections between the courses has been difficult, especially here at the Lexington Campus. I should note that the faculty at the community colleges have been much more successful in sustaining discourse among the instructors in the cross-disciplinary area. In any event, it has been proposed that we establish some sort of a "sunset clause" for the cross-disciplinary offerings and ask the departments on a regular basis to justify the continuance of their courses in the University Studies Program. Indeed, the possibility of having such a "sunset clause" for all the offerings in USP may be a wise step for the Committee to take. In such a context departments which wish to keep a particular course within the general studies program would be asked to indicate what is transpiring in their USP courses and what plans they have for continuing their offerings.

Early in its attempts at assessing University Studies, the Committee decided to focus on two aspects of the program, i.e., the writing component and the cross-cultural component. On the latter count we did a survey both last year and the year before of instructors and students enrolled in cross-cultural courses to discover whether this part of USP was having any significant impact on the students' sensitivity to cultures other than their own. I am happy to say that the answer to that question is definitely "yes". To some degree at least the cross-cultural requirement is achieving its objectives. Students, however, have expressed an interest in having a cross-cultural component

in many USP offerings rather than having it confined to a single course.

With respect to writing we are interested in knowing whether the writing component is having any significant effect on students' ability to handle the mother tongue and whether writing helps them to learn the subject matter in the courses they take. As a result of a student survey which will be run this fall (and which I will speak about in greater detail in a minute), we will have a better handle on this issue. As the Committee wrestled with the effectiveness of the writing component in the USP, we faced some very practical problems. Among these was our uncertainty about the faculty's expectations regarding student proficiency in writing and the degree to which those expectations are similar across the disciplines and the conformity (or lack thereof) between these expectations and the expectations of instructors teaching English composition courses. As a way of beginning to get an answer to this question, we solicited the assistance of the English Department last spring. Tom Blues, David Durant, and several others worked out an experiment for testing faculty expectations with regard to student writing. Thirty faculty members from across the campus were asked at the end of the spring semester to read a set of essays produced by students in ENG 102. The purpose here was to determine whether a paper was judged proficient, highly proficient, or non-proficient in light of the faculty's own expectations. The faculty's evaluations then were compared with the grades which were given by the instructors in ENG 102. The final results of this experiment are not yet complete, but preliminary results indicate, I think, that the correlation between faculty expectations and TA grading was relatively high. Some committee members, however, were not so sure about this, and we all await the final report which will include not just the comparative ratings and scores but indications of the kinds of comments that faculty members from across the campus make about their expectations and students' abilities to meet them.

The whole issue of assessment became very real to us as we attempted to clarify for ourselves the actual objectives of the program as a whole. When it was initiated in 1988, the aims set forth for University Studies were persuasive but at the same time so general in description that it was difficult, if not impossible, to use those aims as any kind of workable criteria for measuring student progress. As a result of this fact, the Committee devoted a good part of the second semester hammering out a series of learning objectives for each of the components of University Studies. This was in many ways a much more tedious process than we had anticipated, but, in the long run, I think, it will do much good. We initially focused on the seventy-five learning objectives of KERA but found that those objectives were so numerous and so tied to the teaching methods and content of KERA that they did not readily fit very well into what we were trying to do. We also took into consideration the objectives outlined by the Community College System, which revised its own general education program last fall. The upshot of this effort was that in the end we focused on the individual components of University Studies since in the Committee's mind, at least, those components seemed quite defensible and we drafted four or five learning objectives for each.

This was all well and good, of course, but the important question is whether those objectives are the same as the objectives of individuals who are actually teaching the courses in University Studies. Answering that question is our next step. We will seek to determine in some systematic way whether the objectives we have in mind are desirable, workable, and actually being pursued by instructors as they teach the

courses. Only until we have some kind of a consensus on this score, can we hope to discover whether the things we are trying to achieve are actually being accomplished.

The Committee will not, however, wait until such data are gathered before it makes its final report. We do, however, wish to wait until we have information from a survey of recent alumni which Roseann Hogan in the Office of Planning and Assessment will be conducting this fall. Her survey encompasses a great many questions but will include specific items developed on the basis of the newly established learning objectives, and the responses, we hope, will tell us something about the students' experience with University Studies. We now have two classes which have graduated under the USP, and we think these data will give us some rough idea of what successes we had and what changes need to be introduced.

Finally, the matter of fulfilling the Inference & Communication requirement in the area of Math and/or Statistics + Philosophy has been studied at considerable length by the Committee. There is some feeling among Committee members that the disparate ways of satisfying this requirement, i e a three hour course in Calculus or a six hour sequence in STA plus Logic, seems somewhat inequitable, and we are now wrestling with ways of dealing with that problem.

This, in short scope, is the present state of our assessment. We anticipate being ready to make recommendations to the Senate Council by the end of the semester, and, of course, we anticipate working with the departments on any changes that will significantly affect their involvement to the program.

One final point. I have detected in conversations with a number of people a general sense of satisfaction about the large number of departments across campus which are involved in University Studies. If you remember, one of our goals when we started in 1988 was to acknowledge that general education is the responsibility of the university as a whole. Although approximately 95% of the offerings are offered within Arts & Sciences, other colleges and departments do have a significant role to play, and I continue to think that the entire academic community benefits from their participation in the program.

I will do my best to answer any questions you have.

The Chair thanked Professor Swift for his remarks.

The Chair announced that the Senate Council would be having a breakfast meeting with the area representatives to the State Legislature, Wednesday November 10, 1993. If there are any questions or discussion items, please feel free to contact the council office or any of the Senate Council members.

Chairman Fulks then recognized Professor Ray Cox, Chair-elect of the Senate Council, for the first action item on the agenda. Professor Cox, on behalf of the Senate Council, moved approval of the proposed changes to the University Senate Rules, Section V. These changes are the result of a committee chaired by Professor David Durant. The proposal was circulated under the date of 27 September 1993.

The Chair said that since the proposal was from the Senate Council it needed no second. This is a continuation of the proposal from David Durant's committee that was before the Senate in September. David Durant and Randall Dahl are here to take questions.

Don Leigh (Engineering) said that under 5.1.1 The Marking System W, in the case of an audit where the student fails to have adequate attendance the instructor can initiate a W and this seems to be in contradiction to the added statement. The Chair stated that Dr. Dahl felt this was a technicality, the instructor initiates the withdrawal of the student from the class, the W grade is not assigned by the instructor. Dr. Dahl stated that their understanding of that was that it is a disenrollment in the case of the audit, where the auditor has not met the requirements the instructor has made for withdrawal. Professor Leigh then asked if the instructor did not initiate the recommendation for a W would nothing happen?

The Chair asked for some recommended wording to fix the problem. Professor Leigh said he would omit the sentence.

Professor Hans Gesund (Engineering) stated he agreed with Professor Leigh. There was at least one other case where a judicial board can assign a W and he feels the sentence should be left out, he doesn't see it's need. If it is going to be cleaned up it should be cleaned up all the way and he feels there are other ways a W can occur other than at the student's request.

The Chair asked Professor Durant if removing the sentence would be a problem. Professor Durant stated he felt they were trying to avoid it being done at the end of the semester. Professor Gesund said that you could not have this sentence being in conflict with other provisions.

Professor Don Leigh moved that the added statement be removed. Professor Gesund seconded the movement. The motion to amend the proposal by deleting the sentence that reads: A grade of W is not assigned by the instructor but is recorded by the Registrar as a result of student action to drop or withdraw as provided in 5.1.8 passed.

Professor Bill Lubawy (Pharmacy) stated he had sent an E-mail note about the section under 5.2.2, Student Load. He asked if that had been resolved in anyway. He suggested that the line that reads: The professional colleges and the Graduate School may set lower maximum loads which are consistent with their degree requirements be changed to the professional colleges and the Graduate School may set different maximum loads which are consistent with their degree requirements. The reason for this is that students in the College of Pharmacy and the College of Medicine take clerkship courses during the summer that are different than the maximum offered and he realizes that deans may set different limits individually, it seems unusual to set them for the entire class. The Chair stated he did not see a problem in changing the wording to take care of the problem. He is not sure it is a problem because in the calendar section of the Senate Rules, the professional schools are given the authority to set their own calendar and the issue being dealt with here is the limit in the number of weeks in the term. Students may not take more credit hours than there are weeks in the term. He does not have a problem personally in changing the word lower to different. That is really not part of this proposal, that is the existing wording, this would be an additional change. They could be more explicit by saying, these units have the authority to increase the length of their terms and therefore the corresponding maximum credit load.

Professor Dan Reedy (Graduate School) stated that one of the issues may be SACS accreditation guidelines, if it is changed to different it could mean that there could be a larger number of hours. He feels the hours can be lower but there is a maximum in SACS accreditation guidelines of no more than one credit per week of full-time class work. That is why there are four hours allowed in the four week session and nine permitted in the eight week.

Chairman Fulks asked Professor Lubawy if the provision in the calendar accommodated this. Professor Lubawy then withdrew his suggestion to be brought up later. The Chair said he felt this was covered under the calendar section of the Senate Rules.

Professor Gesund said he did not understand the last sentence under 5.1.3.2 on page 2. He asked what the sentence had to do with anything that preceeded it. The Chair said the problem they were addressing there is that the Senate Rules require that I grades be initiated by the instructor and if the instructor is out of town or out of the country then the way the rules are written now there is no way to initiate the I grade. Professor Gesund asked what the instructor was supposed to initiate. He said that earlier in the paragraph they were adding except under exceptional circumstances, the student will initiate the request for the I grade and why wasn't the student the one who was asking for the extension. The Chair said the student was to initiate the request but the contract comes from the instructor. Professor Gesund said nowhere did it say the instructor was to initiate the request for an extension. But then it said if the instructor is not available that the chair or the dean may petition for the extension but it does not say anywhere that the instructor is suppose to initiate the extension.

Professor Durant said he felt this was to take care of situations where the instructor is out of town during the time when the student is trying to complete the incomplete. If you make the instructor, who is not available, ask for an extension of the I grade, because the instructor is not available that would be impossible. They tried to set it up so there would be some way for students, when instructors are not available, to complete the I grades to get an extension. Professor Gesund said that no where have they said that the instructor is supposed to initiate, it only says that the student is responsible for asking for I grades and presumably for a time extension. It does not say anywhere that instructors are responsible for requesting extension of time on an I grade. Professor Durant said he did not think it would be appropriate for instructors to ask for an extension. Professor Gesund asked why it was appropriate if the instructor is out of town for the chair or dean to request the extension. Professor Durant replied except in the case that the instructor is not available for the student to complete the I grade. Professor Mike Cibull (Medicine) said that was the reason for asking for the extension. Professor Gesund said it did not say that and asked why the student did not request it. How is the department chair or the dean to know that there is a problem, unless the student first brings it to their attention? The Chair stated that for clarification it is the Chair of the Senate Council that can grant the request and this is stating that the request to the Chair of the Senate Council must come from the department chair or the dean. The student obviously will have to initiate the request to the chair or the dean. The student does not go to the Senate Council with the request.

Professor Bill Lyons (Arts and Sciences) said he thought that what needed to be understood was what the language was trying to do has to do with the fact that the contract was made at the time the incomplete is awarded. A form is made out and the student and the faculty member agree that a set of things must be completed in order to remove the I grade. There is also usually a time period specified. This is not to open up opportunities to extend that time period, the problem was that very often there are instructors who are not available for a student to turn in the term paper or take an exam. The language was to simply provide in those kinds of situations an opportunity for the student to fulfill the contractual requirements for the incomplete. He does not feel the language is that confusing, it is simply limiting the conditions under which a student may seek out the chair in lieu of the instructor who is not available to make a decision to extend so the student may complete the

requirements. Professor Gesund said that perhaps it is the English because he does not understand how you could extend a grade. He can see how you can extend the period required to complete the work. But not how you extend the grade?

The Chair stated that was an editorial problem and could be changed to extend the contract period for the I grade.

The question was called and motion passed to cease discussion. In a unanimous voice vote the Senate approved the proposed changes to University Senate Rules, Section V, Attending the University. The proposal reads as follows:

Background:

The ad hoc Committee to Review Section V of the Senate Rules, chaired by Professor David Durant, has proposed several changes to the Senate Rules. A portion of these proposed changes was offered for consideration by the University Senate at its meeting on 20 September. The remainder of those proposals are listed below.

Proposals: (Add sections in bold and underlined; delete strike-overs.)

5.1.1 THE MARKING SYSTEM

W Denotes withdrawal from class. It may also be assigned by the University Appeals Board in cases involving a violation of student academic rights. (US:9/10/79) It is valued at zero (0) grade points and zero (0) credit hours.

Rationale: For consistency, change the definition of W by adding the final sentence.

S Represents the final grade in courses carrying no academic credit. It is valued at zero (0) grade points and zero (0) credit hours. Satisfactory work in progress, or final grade in courses carrying no academic credit.

IP Represents satisfactory work in progress in courses carrying no academic credit. It is valued at zero (0) grade points and zero credit hours.

Rationale: Change the definition of S and add IP so that each grade represents only one meaning.

5.1.3 EXPLANATION OF CERTAIN GRADES

...

...

5.1.3.2 Grade I (US: 9/14/87)

The grade I means that part of the regularly assigned work of the course remains undone. It shall be given only when there is a reasonable possibility that the student can complete the work within the allowable period of time for removal of an I grade and that a passing grade will result from completion of the work. Except under exceptional circumstances, the student will initiate the request for the I grade. An I grade shall not be given when the student's reason for incompleteness is

unsatisfactory to the instructor. A grade of I must be replaced by a regular final letter grade not later than 12 months from the end of the academic term in which the I grade was awarded or prior to the student's graduation, whichever occurs first. In the event the grade of I is not replaced by a regular final letter grade within the allowable period, the University Registrar shall change the I grade to a grade of E on the student's permanent academic record and adjust the student's grade point standing accordingly. A graduate who had an I grade on his or her academic record at the time of graduation (and which grade was subsequently changed to an E by the Registrar) may be allowed a maximum of 12 months following the end of the term in which the course was taken to satisfactorily complete the course and receive a grade change. If the instructor is not available, the department chair or dean of the college may petition the chair of the Senate Council to extend the contract period of the I grade.

Rationale: The first change is to make the implicit practice explicit. The second change is to take care of such situations as have arisen with instructors who have gone abroad or are otherwise not available.

...

5.1.3.3 Grade S
The grade S may be recorded for students in courses of research, independent work, or seminar-type, if at the end of a semester the student, because of the nature or size of the project, has been unable to complete the course. The project must be substantially continuous in its progress. When the work is completed, a final grade will be substituted for the S. Grade S may be recorded also as a permanent mark in courses carrying no academic credit. This grade may not be given to a student who has done unsatisfactory work or to one who has failed to do a reasonable amount of work.

5.1.3.4 Grade IP
The grade IP may be recorded for students in zero-credit courses of research, independent work, or seminar-type, if at the end of a semester the student, because of the nature or size of the project, has been unable to complete the course. The project must be substantially continuous in its progress. When the work is completed, a final grade will be substituted for the IP. This grade may not be given to a student who has done unsatisfactory work or to one who has failed to do a reasonable amount of work.

5.1.3.5
5.1.3.4 Grade W
The grade W shall be given to students who officially withdraw from a class or classes under conditions described in Section V., 5.1.8.2 and 5.1.8.3. It may also be assigned by the University Appeals Board. See also Section VI., 6.5.1.2 (b). (US:10/8/79)

...

5.2.2 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.

Rationale: Because the phrase is confusing and adds nothing substantive. (Under a later provision, Deans may allow students to carry extra credit hours.)

...

* The 19 credit hour limit applies to courses taken on an audit basis as well as other courses. (RC: 2/6/80)

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 eight-week summer session and four (4) credits in the four-week intersession.

Students may be enrolled in a maximum of nine credit hours of classes meeting concurrently during an eight-week summer session. For this purpose, a course meeting for a four-week period during the eight-week session must be counted double.

Thus, a student may enroll in two consecutive four-week (three credit hour) classes plus one eight-week class, or as many as three eight-week (three credit hour) classes. A student would not, however, be able to enroll in two four-week (three credit hour) classes meeting concurrently.

A student may be permitted by the dean of his/her college to carry such extra credit hours as in the dean's judgment, based upon the student's past performance, the student can complete successfully. (US: 11/8/82)

A student on academic probation shall take no more than fifteen (15) credit hours in a semester, three (3) credit hours in the four-week intersession, or seven (7) credit hours in the eight-week session.

Students in the combined Bachelor's/Master's degree program (University Scholars) 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. (See Section V., 5.4.1.6 and Section IV., 4.2.5.4) (US: 9/13/82)

The professional colleges and the Graduate School may set lower maximum loads which are consistent with their degree requirements.

The maximum allowable load to be carried during any summer term for graduate students shall be nine (9) credit hours in the eight-week summer session and four (4) credit hours in the four-week intersession. The maximum load for graduate students in any combination of the four and eight week sessions shall be twelve (12) credit hours.

A student may be registered simultaneously at the University of Kentucky or a Community College and at another institution only

with the approval of the dean of the college in which the student is registered at the University of Kentucky or a Community College, the credit hours obtained at the other institution being considered a part of the student's maximum load. If the simultaneous registration has not been authorized, the transfer of credit from the other institution may be denied.

...

5.2.4.7 FINAL COMMON EXAMINATIONS SCHEDULED FOR THE SAME TIME

Rationale: To separate this topic from the separate common examinations.

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 must be requested of the appropriate instructor in writing at least two weeks prior to the scheduled examination. A student enrolled in a course where a common exam is scheduled may also enroll in a class scheduled in the time slot of the common exam. (US:4/14/80)

Rationale: To make explicit the intention of the provision.

5.2.4.7.1 COMMON EXAMINATIONS

If a student has a course scheduled at the same time as a common exam and the student has given written notice of the conflict to the instructor at least two weeks prior to the common exam, the student shall be entitled to an excused absence from the conflicting common examination. (US: 4/9/90)

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 days of the month, week and the time at which the exam will be given in the official Schedule of Classes. (US: 1/12/90)
2. Provide an opportunity for students missing such exams with a valid excuse to make up the missed work.

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 over a time block at least one and a half times the length of the examination. (US: 2/12/90)
3. Give two examinations at widely disparate times, but not the morning after the evening examination. (US: 9/13/82; 2/12/90)

- * Any department giving a common examination must give a make-up exam or develop some other arrangement for students with excused absences to gain credit as if they had taken the common exam; a department may not apply a "drop the lowest score" policy to common exams missed with an excused absence. (RC: 11/24/82; upheld by US: 2/13/83)

5.2.4.8 Policies Regarding Other Examinations

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 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. (US: 9/13/82)

...

5.3.1.1 Repeat Option (US: 11/14/83; US: 4/13/87; US: 11/14/88; US: 4/23/90)

A student shall have the option to repeat once as many as three different courses which have been completed with only the grade, credit hours and quality points for the second completion used in computing the student's academic standing and credit for graduation. A student also may use the repeat option when retaking a course on a Pass-Fail basis (provided the course meets the requirements for being taken Pass-Fail), even though the course was originally taken for a letter grade. If a failing grade (F) is earned on the second attempt, the original grade will continue to be used in calculating the grade point average and the second attempt shall constitute exhaustion of one of the student's three repeat options under this provision.

A student exercising the repeat option must notify in writing the dean of the college in which the student is enrolled no later than the last day of scheduled classes in the semester in which the repeat is exercised. Students may exercise the repeat option in summer session any day time prior to the scheduled day time for the final examination. (RC: 11/18/92)

Rationale: Because final examinations come on the last day of the term in summer sessions, the Registrar cannot enforce the rule as it now stands.

If a student officially withdraws from the second attempt, then the grade, credit hours and quality points for the first completion shall constitute the grade in that course for official purposes, and the second attempt shall constitute exhaustion of one of the three options to repeat a course under this provision, unless at the time of withdrawal, permission to attempt again the same course shall be granted by the instructor and the dean of the college in which the student is enrolled.

- * The repeat option may be exercised only the second time a student takes a course, not a subsequent time. (RC: 7/1/87)
- * A student may exercise the repeat option by taking a special exam (as provided in 5.2.1.2); if the request for the exam is approved, the student may request that the grade in the course be recorded under the repeat option. (RC: 1/27/84)
- * There is no relationship between the academic bankruptcy rule (IV - 4.1.1) and the repeat option. To the extent that a student has used any or all of his/her repeat options in the first enrollment, he/she no longer has them available during a subsequent enrollment. If not previously used, they are available during the subsequent enrollment. (RC: 9/29/82)
- * Attendance at a community college is the equivalent of attendance at the Lexington campus for purposes of exercising the repeat option. (RC: 9/28/82)

5.3.1.2 Quality Point Deficit

The academic probation and suspension systems that are used to determine a student's academic standing University-wide are based on quality point deficit. The base for determining the deficit is the number of quality points which would result from multiplying the number of hours attempted by two. Deficit is the difference, if any, between this base and the number of quality points earned.

...

5.3.1.4 Removal from Probation

The following undergraduate student shall be removed from probation by the dean of his/her college except as provided for by specific college probation policy as described in 5.3.2.:

Rationale: To institute present practice.

- a. A student on scholastic probation who has not earned 90 semester hours (senior standing), and who at the end of a semester or session has reduced his cumulative deficit to five quality points or less.
- b. A student on scholastic probation who has earned 90 semester hours (senior standing) and who at the end of a semester or session has a cumulative grade point standing of 2.0.

5.3.1.5 University Academic Suspension Policies

The following undergraduate student who has not previously been academically suspended shall be subject to academic suspension from the University, but a dean may continue a student on scholastic probation if the individual case justifies it:

- a. A student who acquires an additional deficit in excess of five (5) quality points during any semester or session while on scholastic probation.
- b. A student who has a cumulative deficit in excess of 15

- quality points at the end of any semester or session while on scholastic probation.
- c. A student who has been on scholastic probation for three consecutive semesters.
 - d. A student who, while on scholastic probation, demonstrates that he/she cannot or will not do satisfactory work, except as listed in e below.
 - e. A student who, at the completion of his/her first semester at the University, earns a semester grade point average less than .60 may be subject to academic suspension, without first having been placed on probation. This provision does not pertain to students who have transferred from the community college system. (US: 4/23/90)

Rationale: To make explicit the present practice.

A student who is under academic suspension from the University may not enroll in any courses offered by the University of Kentucky, nor take any examination for University of Kentucky credit while on academic suspension or probation.

A student who has been academically suspended from the University a second time shall not be readmitted to the University except in unusual circumstances and then only upon recommendation of the dean of the college in which the student plans to enroll and approval of the University Senate Council.

Once reported to the University Registrar an academic suspension may be rescinded by the dean only in the event of an error in the determination of the student's eligibility for suspension, an official grade change that alters the student's suspension eligibility, or exceptional circumstances. In such cases a written notice of rescission documenting the basis for the action must be filed with the University Registrar by the dean imposing the original suspension. (US: 10/16/89)

5.3.1.6 Reinstatement

After they have remained out of the University for at least a semester and a summer session (a semester for a student academically suspended at the end of a summer session), students who have been academically suspended from the University may only be reinstated by the dean of the college in which they plan to enroll when they present evidence that they are capable of performing at the level required to prevent being suspended a second time.

Students who have been academically suspended shall, upon reinstatement, be placed on scholastic probation and be subject to final academic suspension from the University if:

- a. They acquire any additional deficit during any semester or session while on scholastic probation.
- b. They have not reduced their deficits by eight (8) quality points or eliminated them by the end of the second semester following their reinstatement.
- c. They have failed to meet the requirements for removal

from scholastic probation by the end of the third semester following their reinstatement.

Once reinstated students have been removed from scholastic probation, they shall be subject to the same conditions for subsequent academic suspension as students who have not previously been academically suspended.

Students should refer to IV - 4.1.1 for information on the academic bankruptcy rule that applies to students who are readmitted after an interruption of two or more years. [RC: 11/20/87]

4.1.1

5.3.1.7

READMISSION AFTER TWO OR MORE YEARS (ACADEMIC BANKRUPTCY)

- a. Undergraduate students who have been readmitted through the usual channels after an interruption of two or more years, and who have completed at least one semester or 12 hours with a grade point standing of 2.0 or better after readmission may choose to have none of their previous University of Kentucky course work counted toward graduation and toward the computation of their grade point standings. (US:4/12/82) The calculation of the grade point average after readmission begins with the semester of readmission. [RC: 11/20/87]
- b. In addition, the dean of the student's college may permit such a readmitted student who has elected not to count past work, to receive credit for selected courses without including those grades in the computation of the student's grade point standing. (US:4/12/82)
- c. Part-time as well as full-time students can take advantage of the academic bankruptcy rule. Students need not have been originally suspended from the University to qualify for this option. Attendance at a community college in the UK system is equivalent to attendance at UK itself for the purposes of this option. A student can petition for academic bankruptcy for work done at a community college. [RC: 11/20/87] This option is not available to a student who transfers in more than 24 credit hours taken at another institution during the first two years after leaving the University of Kentucky. (Rules Committee Interpretation: 1983-84)
- * A student who has completed at least 12 hours of work with a GPA of 2.0 or better would be eligible for academic bankruptcy even if he/she received an E in one or more of the courses. (RC: 1/30/86)
- * If a student has completed a degree and re-enrolls, he/she may not apply the academic bankruptcy rule to courses taken for the degree already completed. (RC: 11/12/84)
- * The Academic Bankruptcy option may be used only once. (RC: 2/1/89)

Rationale: Moved section on bankruptcy to Section V from Section IV because

it is a more convenient and relevant location since bankruptcy may be invoked only after readmission and a period of re-enrollment.

5.3.1.8

5.3.1.7 Individual College Academic Probation and Suspension Policies

Suspended Students Transferring between Colleges or Programs

A student suspended from a college or program may transfer to another college or program which has a 2.0 grade point average admission requirement for transfer students, even if the student has a GPA lower than 2.0, provided he or she is not subject to the provisions for suspension from the University (Section V - 5.3.1.5). However, the student must meet all other admission criteria established by the college or program [see Section IV - 4.2.4]. If the student would have been placed on academic probation by the college to which he or she is transferring had he or she been previously enrolled in that college, then the college may place the student on probation at the time of admission. (US: 4/14/86)

5.3.2

UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGES-PROBATION AND SUSPENSION POLICIES

Individual colleges may establish policies regarding academic probation and suspension with regard to a student's academic standing within the college in addition to the University-wide policies given here. If a college establishes such a policy, the policy must be approved by the University Senate, and the policy shall be made available in writing to the students. [See this Section 3.1.3 and 3.1.5.] (US: 4/25/84)

Rationale: Moved from section 5.3.1.7 because it was out of place there.

5.4.0

DEGREES, HONORS, GRADUATION

A Commencement Convocation shall be held annually.

5.4.1

RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

For an undergraduate degree a minimum of thirty (30) of the last thirty-six (36) credits presented for the degree must be taken from the University, but not necessarily on the Lexington campus.

Any request for waiver by veterans or other students must be presented for approval to the dean of the student's college. Students who wish to satisfy the above requirement with credit earned through such methods as independent study by correspondence, special examination, CLEP, and other methods which limit the opportunity for active exchange between students and instructors must have the prior approval of their department chairman and college dean.

5.4.1.1

Application for Degrees

To be eligible for a degree, a student must file an application with the dean of the college from which the degree is to be awarded within thirty (30) days after the beginning of the semester or fifteen (15) days in the Summer Session in which the student expects to complete his/her work.

5.4.1.3

Double Major (US: 4/10/89)

An undergraduate student earns a double major when he or she completes all university, college, and departmental

requirements in one department--the Primary Major--and all departmental requirements in a second department--the Secondary Major. If there is a generic relationship, work in the Primary Major may be applicable to the Secondary Major. The student must indicate his or her double major to the Registrar and to the student records office in his or her college(s). He or she must have an advisor in each major. The student who completes the requirements for a double major receives a degree from the college of his or her Primary Major and has the successful completion of the Secondary Major entered on his or her transcript. A Secondary Major may be completed after the degree for the Primary Major has been awarded. A double major does not result in an additional degree. (US:3/8/82; 4/10/89)

* The Rules Committee has held that a secondary major from another college must fulfill only the departmental requirements for a major and is not expected to meet the college requirements as well. In addition, the pre-major requirements are considered to be a part of the major requirements for purposes of the rule and must be fulfilled by secondary majors. (RC: 11/16/89)

...

5.4.1.4
5.4.1.6

Second Bachelor's Degrees

A student is eligible to qualify for a second bachelor's degree in a different major. The student must complete all university, college, and departmental requirements for both degrees. Courses taken towards fulfilling one degree may also count towards fulfilling parallel requirements in the other, but the student must complete a minimum of at least 144 hours for both degrees. The student may elect to receive the degrees simultaneously if college and departmental degree requirements can be met simultaneously. (US:3/8/82; 4/10/89)

5.4.1.5
5.4.1.4

Concurrent Enrollment in Graduate Programs

Concurrent enrollment for degree purposes in more than one graduate program is permitted only with the approval of the student's Graduate Advisor(s), Directors of Graduate Studies in the programs, and the Dean of the Graduate School.

5.4.1.6
5.4.1.5

Masters Degree Following Doctorate

Subsequent to the receipt of a doctoral degree, a student is not eligible to receive a master's degree based on the work which led to the doctorate. (US: 9/10/84)

Rationale: The section on "Second Bachelor's Degrees" is moved behind "Double Majors" to be close in proximity because the distinction between these two is important. The sections following it were renumbered accordingly.

5.4.2 COMMENCEMENT HONORS

1. Students shall be graduated "With Highest Distinction" who attain a grade point average of 3.8 or higher for at least three years of work at the University of Kentucky

(excepting correspondence study).

Rationale: To make Kentucky congruent with normal tripartite division of honors.

...

2

1. Students shall be graduated "With High Distinction" who attain a grade point average of 3.6 or higher for at least three years of work at the University of Kentucky (excepting correspondence study).

3

2. Students shall be graduated "With Distinction" who attain a grade point average of 3.4 to 3.6 for at least three years of work at the University of Kentucky (excepting correspondence study).

4

3. Students with a minimum of two but less than three years of work at the University shall receive the appropriate commencement honors if they attain a grade point average of 0.2 greater than the above.

5

4. The degree with honors from a professional college shall be based solely upon work done in the professional college.

6

5. The bachelor's degree with honors in a student's major or a degree with honors from a professional college will be conferred upon a student whom the faculty of the student's department, or college in the case of a professional college, and the dean of the student's college recommend receive the degree. A student may be required to complete work in addition to that required for the bachelor's or professional degree to receive a degree with honors. (US: 12/13/82)

7

6. All students in the Honors Program of the University who do not have a grade point standing of 3.5 or better but are in the top ten percent (10%) of their college's class are eligible to graduate in the Honors Program if they satisfy the other requirements and have approval of the Honors Program Director.

8

7. Work done in the University of Kentucky Community College System shall be counted as work at the University of Kentucky in calculating the grade point average for honors. [RC: 11/20/87]

*

A student who has invoked the academic bankruptcy rule (IV - 4.1.1) during his/her University career shall be considered, for the purposes of commencement honors, as having attended the University only for those hours earned subsequent to readmission. (RC: 6/21/83)

- * A student need not be enrolled full-time to fulfill the years of work necessary to receive commencement honors. Two years of work means 60 credit hours; three years means 90 credits. (RC: 5/8/85)

5.4.3 REQUIREMENTS FOR GRADUATION

To be eligible for any degree, a student must have completed the requirements as approved by the University Senate, except that curriculum substitutions may be made by the college affected if not inconsistent with these Rules. Curriculum requirements must include, in addition to specified credits, a specified grade point average which shall in no case be less than 2.0.

Every baccalaureate degree program shall include four divisions or components:

- 1. University Studies
- 2. Pre-major or Pre-professional
- 3. General College Requirements, (if any)
- 4 3. Major or Professional
- 5 4. Free Electives

Rationale: For example, A & S has more foreign language, and disciplinary requirements than are required by University Studies. These are authorized by first paragraph in 5.4.3.)

The Chair recognized Professor Cox for the next agenda item. Professor Cox on behalf of the Senate Council moved approval of the Proposed change in the University Calendar for Spring Semester, 1994 for the senior class in the Bachelor of Science Program in the College of Pharmacy. The proposal was circulated under the date of 24 September 1993. The Chair said since the proposal came from the Senate Council it needed no second. The floor was opened for discussion.

There was no discussion. In a voice vote the proposal passed and reads as follows:

Background and Rationale:

The College of Pharmacy has requested a change in the University Calendar for Spring semester, 1994, for the senior class in the Bachelor of Science program. The change is to begin the Spring semester on Monday, January 3, 1994, and end the semester sixteen weeks later. "Spring Break" would be shifted to the end of the semester, the last week of University scheduled classes. Finals week is unnecessary since the semester course offerings are solely experiential and do not require final examinations.

The College of Pharmacy had a major curricular change three years ago and the present senior class in the Bachelor's program is the second class to complete the new curriculum. In the new curriculum the students take only experiential classes during the Spring semester. In the previous program, both the Fall and Spring semesters were used for those types of courses. Also, previously one of the courses, PHR 870, Clinical Orientation Clerkship was taught half-time for the entire semester and in the new curriculum, it is taught full-time for eight weeks. The students will spend the same amount of time in the course.

The Clerkship course is taught primarily on campus with half of the class in the first part of the semester and the other half in the second half of the semester. The Clerkship course is meshed with existing

programs in the University Hospital and rotating clinical service teams. Changing the calendar will enable the Pharmacy students to join those groups at the appropriate time.

A similar request was approved by the University Senate on October 12, 1992, for the 1992-1993 academic year, with the proviso that the College return to the Senate each year for approval. Annual approval will be necessary until a new entry level program is implemented.

At the beginning of the Fall semester, the students were notified that the Spring semester would start early pending Senate approval.

The Senate Council recommends that the University Calendar for Spring semester, 1994 for the senior class in the Bachelor of Science Program in the College of Pharmacy be changed to begin January 3 and end April 22, 1994.

Chairman Fulks recognized Professor Cox for the last action item. Professor Cox stated the third item was circulated under the date of 28 September 1993. He said there was a change in the item, the first three paragraphs of the item need to be deleted.

Chairman Fulks said that since the proposal came from the Senate Council it required no second. He said that what they were voting on were a couple of proposals concerning student athletes and recommendations concerning nondegree students. These are a result of a year and a half of work by the Admissions Advisory Committee which was chaired at the time by Professor Julie Sebastian who is in attendance to take questions.

Professor Hans Gesund asked how much of the proposal applies to the Donovan Scholars. He said they are covered under it but some of the information is not applicable to them. The Chair stated that he did not know that they made special exceptions for them in the recommendations.

Professor Julie Sebastian (Nursing) stated that the Donovan Scholars are considered an example of lifelong learners and the policy was rewritten to focus on the notion of lifelong learners. One thing they did do was to provide flexibility in the policy, and rather than recommending stringent requirements, for example certain times to turn in transcripts, they did not do that type of thing with the policy. Instead they kept the policy flexible and made recommendations that in general they would like to see student transcript and so forth, recognizing that certain student groups are not well served by those kinds of procedures. Donovan Scholars are a good example of a student group that may not be well served by looking at their transcripts. The policy is very flexible, so they do not disadvantage groups like the Donovan Scholars or certain ones of the evening and weekend students.

Professor Gesund gave the example of the rules governing enrollment of nondegree seeking students. Nondegree students must have prerequisites or have the consent of the instructor. That does not apply to Donovan Scholars and no one may continue to enroll as a nondegree student after earning 24 semester hours in this status without the special permission of the dean of the college in which the student is registered. He thinks Donovan Scholars do not have to register in the college. He feels some of the wording needs to be changed a little further.

Chairman Fulks asked if they wanted to do that, if that was the intent of the committee?

Professor Sebastian stated that in both of those cases they tried to build in an avenue for flexibility for groups like the Donovan Scholars. For example,

in the first statement nondegree students must meet course prerequisites or obtain the consent of the instructor to enroll in the course. That was a way of providing some flexibility. In the second statement adding the phrase with special permission of the dean or the college in which the student is registered, again that is a way of providing flexibility. One of the challenges with the policy was that the policy is designed to meet the needs of so many different student groups. On one hand some students have not been well served by the nondegree policy who get into the University as a nondegree student and which are not prepared to take courses in the University, so what they needed to do was provide some structure in order to admit students in this category who would be well served. On the other hand there are groups like the Donovan Scholars who should not have lots of rules and regulations, because they are simply trying to promote their selfgrowth. They tried in every case to build in flexibility so students who have special needs like the Donovan Scholars would not be disadvantaged.

Professor Gesund asked about nondegree students who are not in the evening and weekend program who must preregister for classes. He does not think this applied to Donovan Scholars. He feels what is needed is for the committee to go through and ease some of the language so that it makes it easier for the Donovan Scholars to comply with the requirements.

Dr. Joseph Fink (Admissions) wanted to emphasize that there are really no roadblocks in front of Donovan Scholars now and this puts no additional roadblock there. They are registered by the people in the Donovan Program Office so all this isn't really applicable. Professor Gesund said that was what he was wondering. He doesn't think it has to apply to them, but if it says in the proposal nondegree students who are not in the Evening and Weekend program must preregister for class, the Donovan Scholar may decide at the last minute that they want to take a class. He feels it imposes a burden that is not necessary on them.

The Chair asked Professor Gesund if it could be left as a recommendation for the committee to review the wording to be sure the Donovan Scholars are taken care of.

In a unanimous voice vote the proposal as presented with a recommendation that the committee will take a look for the Donovan Scholars passed and is attached to the minutes.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:57 p.m.

Randall W. Dahl
Secretary, University Senate