

## Minutes of the University Senate, October 11, 1976

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, October 11, 1976, in the Court Room of the Law Building. Chairman Malcolm Jewell presided. Members absent: Gerald G. Ashdown\*, Ruth Assell\*, Lisa K. Barclay\*, Charles E. Barnhart, R. Paul Baumgartner\*, Robert P. Belin\*, Jack C. Blanton, Wilbur C. Blout\*, Richard R. Clayton\*, Lewis W. Cochran\*, Glenn B. Collins, Ronda S. Connaway\*, Samuel F. Conti, Donald P. Cross, Nancy Daly\*, Guy M. Davenport\*, William H. Dennen\*, Marcus L. Dillon\*, Herbert N. Drennon, Anthony Eardley, Bruce S. Eastwood\*, W. W. Ecton\*, Calvin B. Ernst\*, Kathryn Fair, R. Fletcher Gabbard\*, Claudine Gartner\*, James L. Gibson, Abner Golden, Merlin Hackbart\*, Joseph Hamburg, Thomas Hansbrough, Andrew J. Hiatt\*, Beth Hicks\*, Raymond R. Hornback, Raymon D. Johnson\*, Robert W. Kiser\*, James A. Knoblett\*, Thomas P. Lewis, John Lihani\*, Austin S. Litvak\*, William E. Lyons\*, James R. Marsden\*, Kenneth M. Martin\*, Levis D. McCullers\*, Susan A. McEvoy\*, Marion E. McKenna\*, Gwen E. Mead\*, Bill Miracle\*, Jacqueline A. Noonan\*, Terry Norris\*, Elbert W. Ockerman\*, Merrill W. Packer\*, Doyle E. Peaslee\*, Anna K. Reed, Robert W. Rudd\*, John S. Scarborough, D. Milton Shuffett\*, Gerard E. Silberstein, Otis A. Singletary, John T. Smith\*, John B. Stephenson, Marjorie S. Stewart\*, William J. Stober\*, Joseph V. Swintosky\*, Leonard P. Tipton\*, Lee T. Todd, Marion Wade\*, Thomas J. Waldhart, M. Stanley Wall, Constance P. Wilson\*, Judith Worell\*, Fred Zechman, Norman F. Billups\*.

The minutes of the regular meeting of September 13, 1976, were accepted as circulated with the correction of deleting Tom Clark's name from the members absent list and replacing Dr. Clawson's name with Dr. Bosomworth's in the last line of the third paragraph on page 9.

Chairman Jewell presented the following Memorial Resolution on the death of William F. Starr. Dr. Jewell directed that the Resolution be made part of these minutes and that copies be provided to the members of Professor Starr's immediate family. Following Dr. Jewell's presentation of the Resolution the Senators were asked to stand for a moment of silence in tribute and respect of Professor Starr.

Professor William F. Starr died on August 29, 1976, after a very short illness. He joined the faculty of the College of Business and Economics in 1967 to start a new career after having retired as a Colonel in the U.S. Army with a service of 25 years.

A native of Peoria, Illinois, he graduated from West Point in 1941 and received his master's degree from Harvard in 1950. Colonel Starr was a veteran of World War II, attend the U.S. Army War College in 1955, served as Commander of the Pirmens Army Depot in Germany from 1956 to 1958 and also served as chief of staff with the U. S. Army Plans and Systems Division from 1962 to 1963. He was commanding officer of the Lexington Blue Grass Depot from 1963 to 1965.

\*Absence explained



Soon after Professor Starr began his teaching career at the University of Kentucky, he attracted the attention of faculty and students alike through his dedication to teaching. He developed the concept and appropriate materials for the capstone course in the undergraduate program, Ba 439--Business Policy. More than 1500 young people had the opportunity, during the nine years of his service to the University, to share with Professor Starr the excitement of learning. The students came to his class expecting high standards and fair treatment. They were never disappointed.

The students benefitted from Bill Starr's presence in many ways. He was receptive and available for counseling about many matters that confront young people. He knew their concerns as they anticipated their initial career decisions. He was able to speak of these concerns from a broad base of personal experience. Many graduates, indeed more than his share, kept in touch with him after they graduated.

Bill Starr's efforts also resulted in the reactivation of an undergraduate student association, The Society for the Advancement of Management. He kept it going during the time when the Department's primary focus was on graduate training. He scheduled meetings and arranged for speakers, recognition dinners, and field trips. At no time did Bill ever concern himself with whether the effort was recognized by the "reward system." He knew that the effort was its own reward. The impact of Bill Starr's ability and sincerity on students cannot be overestimated. They and we will miss him; he was a good friend.

The Chairman reported to the Senate as follows:

There are a very few comments that ought to be made about what we are doing behind the scenes in the Senate Council. The Senate Council considered a series of proposed amendments to the Governing regulations which have been submitted to the Board of Trustees but have not yet been acted upon. One of the jobs of the Senate Council is to study these and give any comments to the President. In most cases these simply put into the regulations things which were already in practice at the University such as the increased life insurance program. One specific amendment that required a little more discussion and which we gathered more information about concerns the amendments to the parts of the University regulations regarding recruitment, appointments and promotion, specifically stating that the University shall not discriminate against an employee or applicant for employment because of physical or mental handicap regarding any position for which the employee or applicant for employment would be qualified. This provision regarding handicaps is in fact a requirement of the Federal Government which appears in contracts which the University has to sign, and we indicated to the President that we could see no objection to it.



I mentioned last time that we are talking about a proposal to set up a committee to study the summer school policy at the University to consider whether there should be new direction in the policy and what priorities might be developed for the summer school and to survey as widely as possible the sentiment of the University faculty and students, and administrators concerning how they regard the summer school program at present and what changes might be made. The Senate Council has now decided to do this and has decided to do it by means of an ad hoc Committee. It may have representation on it from some of the existing Senate committees, but we felt that the existing committees had plenty of work to do and this did not fit into this charge of any existing committee. Let me repeat again that we would be eager to have volunteers for this committee. I realize that for faculty members to volunteer for a committee is an act of bravery but some of you, I am sure, have strong interests in the summer school program, and we would be very interested in getting names sent to us from you or from your colleagues. This committee is not limited to Senators. We would like to be able to set it up within a week or two. If you know of someone who might serve, I wish you would get in touch with me.

One other comment about what is on the schedule--we have received from the Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards the Proposal for the Graduate School probation rule about the Graduate faculty last May, and it will in all likelihood be coming to the Senate in November.

The first item on the agenda concerns the proposal regarding the eligibility for election of faculty members to the Board of Trustees.

Dr. Jewell recognized Professor Paul Oberst. On behalf of the Senate Council Professor Oberst presented a motion to adopt proposed changes in the University Senate Rules (I, 5.2) concerning eligibility for election of faculty members to the Board of Trustees. This was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of September 29, 1976, and reads as follows:

1, 5.2 Election of Voting Faculty Members of the Board of Trustees  
(paragraph 2)

Faculty members eligible to serve as an elected member of the Board of Trustees shall be those who meet the voting qualifications and who are members of the teaching and research faculty at the time of election and service. Teaching and research faculty are those whose primary assignment is in those areas. For purposes of this section assignment as (Department Chairman) chairman of a department or division shall not exclude one who holds such a position from eligibility to serve as an elected member of the Board of Trustees. Faculty members with administrative titles above that of department or division chairman, such as institute directors and assistant or associate deans, shall not be eligible to serve as elected members of the Board of Trustees. Faculty members of the Board of Trustees shall be eligible for reelection.

Note: New portion is underlined; portion to be deleted in parentheses.



Dr. Jewell made the following remarks concerning the proposal:

This would apply to service on the Board of Trustees by faculty members representing either the University system or the members of a Community College. Last May we made a distinction between eligibility to serve, which is limited to members of the teaching and research faculty. The major thrust of this proposed change is to refine and exclude from the teaching and research faculty, for service on the Board of Trustees, persons who are above the rank of Department Chairman, specifically the Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, and Institute Directors.

Professor Ford criticized the proposal as being inconsistent and arbitrary. He noted that the rule defined teaching and research faculty as those whose primary responsibility was in that area, and argued that it was inconsistent to exclude those with such responsibilities who also held the title of assistant dean or director of an institute. He felt that the faculty member should be able to decide, through the election process, whether or not a particular faculty member holding an administrative title should be elected to the board.

Professor Ford offered an amendment to strike the second underlined sentence, which would leave the rule exactly as it was except for clarifying the chairman to include the chairman of a department or division.

Dr. Jewell noted that the words "such as institute directors and assistant or associate deans" were not part of the original proposal from the Rules Committee, but were added by the Senate Council.

Dr. Smith pointed out the problems faced by the Rules Committee in trying to make decisions on eligibility for a large number of persons, and the desire of his committee to get some clear guidelines from the Senate. He noted that there seemed to be no disagreement about excluding Vice President from the list of those eligible to serve on the Board, and only limited question about Deans, but that the question of Associate or Assistant Deans created problems because of the wide variety of activities that they performed and variations in the size of their administrative load.

A question was raised about why it was necessary to specify that chairmen were excluded from service on the Board. Professor Smith explained that this resulted from an earlier controversy over excluding them and an interpretation by the President that they should not be excluded.

After some further discussion, the Ford amendment was approved.

The Senate then approved the statement as amended, which had the effect of substituting the words "Chairman of a Department or Division" for "Department Chairman."

Dr. Jewell recognized Professor Paul Oberst. On behalf of the Senate Council Professor Oberst presented a motion to adopt a proposed change in the University Senate Rules (V. 1.5) regarding procedures for auditing courses. This was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of September 29, 1976, and reads as follows:



Replace V, 1.5 with the following: "Audit ~~Any change from audit to credit by a student regularly enrolled in a college must be accomplished by the last date of last registration and any change from credit to audit must be made by the last date to drop a course without a grade.~~ Any change from audit by a student regularly enrolled in a college must be accomplished by the last date to drop a course without a grade in any given term. No credit can be given for a class audited nor is a student permitted to take an examination for credit. No instructor is authorized to admit anyone as an auditor to any of his classes unless the auditor has registered as such."

Note: New portion is underlined; delete portion that is bracketed.

There was no discussion and the Senate voted to approve the proposal as presented.

This change will take effect with the Spring, 1977, semester.

The next item on the agenda was the one which was tabled at the September 13 meeting.

Dr. Jewell recognized Professor Paul Oberst. On behalf of the Senate Council Professor Oberst presented a motion to adopt proposed addition to the Senate Rules relating to Admissions (IV) to ban discrimination to admissions. This was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of September 29, 1976, and reads as follows:

The Senate Council recommends addition of the following statement to Section IV of the Senate Rules regarding admissions:

"An applicant for admission to the University or to any college or academic program in the University shall not be subjected to discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, marital status, national origin, age, or beliefs."

Dr. Jewell remarked that this was not exactly the same language originally proposed the last time nor was it exactly the same as the amended language which was adopted the last time. It was still a third effort to find language acceptable.

During the discussion that followed, questions were raised about the meaning of the term "beliefs" in the proposal, and about the meaning of the term "national origins." Dr. Jewell stated that the ban on discriminating on the basis of national origins was not interpreted by the federal government as preventing a university from giving preference in admissions to residents of the state. Dean Royster stated that the University does discriminate on the basis of national origin, because it limits the number of foreign students that are accepted.

The following proposed amendment was made and seconded:

"An applicant for admission to the University shall not be subjected to discrimination based on race, color,



religion, sex, marital status, national origin, age, or beliefs. In addition an applicant for admission to any college or academic program in the University shall not be subjected to discrimination based on any factors irrelevant to their performance in that college or program."

Question was called on the proposal on voting on the Amendment.

The Senate approved the proposed amendment with a vote of 57 to 47.

Motion was made and seconded to eliminate the word "beliefs."

Motion was made and seconded to send the proposal back to the Council and direct it to list all criteria that are to be used rather than list those which are not going to be used for admissions purposes.

The motion carried.

Chairman Jewell announced that the final item on the agenda was the procedure for review of graduate programs.

Dr. Jewell recognized Professor Paul Oberst. On behalf of the Senate Council Professor Oberst presented a motion to adopt proposed addition to the Senate Rules (1, 3.21) concerning procedures for review of graduate programs. This was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of October 5, 1976, and reads as follows:

I, 3.21 (c) Review of Programs

It (the Graduate Council) shall review all graduate programs and suggest measures designed to maintain acceptable levels of academic quality. In pursuit of this charge, the Graduate Council may recommend appropriate actions to the Graduate Dean. For the purposes of this section, such recommendations may include (1) suspension of programs for a maximum of two years, (2) lifting of suspensions, and (3) termination of programs in accordance with the procedures specified below.

All recommendations by the Graduate Council and decisions by the Graduate Dean relative to suspension of programs, or the lifting of suspensions, shall be communicated to the Chairman of the Senate Council No later than the second year of any program suspension, the Graduate Council shall review the suspension and recommend to the Graduate Dean the reinstatement or termination of the program.

A decision to suspend a program on academic grounds may be appealed by the Director of Graduate Studies in the program. The appeal in all such cases shall be made, including justification, to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for review. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall appoint a committee of graduate faculty members including a member of the Senate Council to review the case. They shall limit their review to the materials submitted and procedures followed by the Graduate Council.



The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall discuss the recommendation of the Appeals Committee with the Graduate Dean and Chairman of the Senate Council (and the Vice President for the Medical Center for those programs based in departments in the Medical Center) and recommend final action to the President.

Any recommendation by the Graduate Council to the Graduate Dean to terminate a program, whether or not previously suspended, shall also be communicated to the Chairman of the Senate Council. If the Graduate Dean approves a recommendation to terminate a graduate program on academic grounds, he shall submit a recommendation for termination to the Graduate Faculty for review. If the Graduate Faculty concurs, it shall forward its recommendations through the Senate Council to the University Senate, which shall have the final authority for recommending such termination to the President."

Dr. Jewell pointed out that the proposal was the result of a long series of discussions between the Senate Council and Graduate Council, and was designed to clarify the responsibilities of these two bodies, of the senate, and of the Graduate Faculty. He noted that some question had arisen concerning the role of the Vice President for the Medical Center in appeals concerning graduate programs in the Medical Center. He recognized Professor Krislov who offered an amendment to the third paragraph, to insert the following before the final sentence in that paragraph:

"In making the appointment, he shall consult with the Vice President for the Medical Center for those programs based in departments in the Medical Center."

There was no discussion and the amendment was seconded and approved.

Professor Kemp pointed out that the agenda item had not been circulated ten days in advance, as required by Senate rules.

Dr. Jewell acknowledged that this was correct, and that before considering the item it would be necessary to suspend the rules, requiring a two-thirds vote. The Senate voted against suspending the rules, and the item will appear on the agenda in November.

At Professor Weil's suggestion, the Senate briefly discussed the item, without taking any further action on it. A senator stated that he felt a second suspension should be permitted, partly because of the difficulty of reinstating a program once it has been terminated. Dr. Jewell noted that the Senate Council was concerned that repeated suspensions would have the same effect as termination.

The Senate adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Martha M. Ferguson  
Recording Secretary



UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL  
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

September 29, 1976

TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE:

The University Senate will meet in regular session at 3:00 p. m. Monday, October 11, 1976, in the Court Room of the Law Building.

AGENDA:

- 1) Approval of minutes of meeting of September 13, 1976.
- 2) Information Items:
  - a) Summary of Senate Council activities.
- 3) Action Items:
  - a) Proposed change in the Senate Rules (I, 5.2) concerning eligibility for election as faculty member of the Board of Trustees (circulated under date of September 29, 1976).
  - b) Proposed change in Senate Rules (V, 1.5) concerning date for changing from credit to audit or audit to credit (circulated under date of September 29, 1976).
  - c) Proposed addition to the Senate Rules relating to admission (IV) banning discrimination in admissions. (Circulated under date of September 29, 1976). Postponed from meeting of September 13, 1976.
  - d) (Tentative.) Proposed addition to the Senate Rules (I, 3.21) concerning procedure for review of graduate programs. (To be circulated.)

*Elbert W. Ockerman*

Elbert W. Ockerman  
Secretary, University Senate

Note: If you are unable to attend this meeting, please contact Martha Ferguson, 7-2958.

259-2958



UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL  
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

September 29, 1976

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, October 11, 1976. Proposed change in University Senate Rules (V, 1.5) regarding procedures for auditing courses.

The Senate Council recommends approval of the following change in audit-credit procedures initiated by the Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards:

Replace V, 1.5 with the following: "Audit - [Any change from audit to credit by a student regularly enrolled in a college must be accomplished by the last date of late registration and any change from credit to audit must be made by the last date to drop a course without a grade.] Any change from audit to credit or credit to audit by a student regularly enrolled in a college must be accomplished by the last date to drop a course without a grade in any given term. No credit can be given for a class audited nor is a student permitted to take an examination for credit. No instructor is authorized to admit anyone as an auditor to any of his classes unless the auditor has registered as such."

Background: This proposed change is parallel to the change made by the Senate in September concerning the date for changing from pass-fail to regular credit or regular credit to pass-fail. It means that students may change their minds about getting credit for a course, auditing a course, or taking a course pass-fail until the final date to drop a course without a grade. In addition to giving the student additional time to change from audit to credit, the proposal should eliminate confusion by providing the same deadline for all of these changes.

This change, like the pass-fail deadline change, would take effect with the Spring, 1977, semester.

/cet



UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL  
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

September 29, 1976

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: Monday, October 11, 1976.  
University Senate Meeting. Proposed change in  
University Senate Rules (I, 5.2) concerning eli-  
gibility for election of faculty members to the  
Board of Trustees.

The Senate Council recommends approval of the following changes in the Rules governing eligibility of faculty members to serve as elected members of the Board of Trustees.

I, 5.2 Election of Voting Faculty Members of the Board of Trustees  
(paragraph 2)

Faculty members eligible to serve as an elected member of the Board of Trustees shall be those who meet the voting qualifications and who are members of the teaching and research faculty at the time of election and service. Teaching and research faculty are those whose primary assignment is in those areas. For purposes of this section as-  
signed as (Department Chairman) chairman of a department or divi-  
sion shall not exclude one who holds such a position from eligibility to  
serve as an elected member of the Board of Trustees. Faculty mem-  
bers with administrative titles above that of department or division  
chairman, such as institute directors and assistant or associate deans,  
shall not be eligible to serve as elected members of the Board of  
Trustees. Faculty members of the Board of Trustees shall be eligible  
for reelection.

Note: Delete parentheticals; add underlined portion.

Background: At its meeting of May 3, 1976, the Senate made some changes in the procedure for electing voting faculty members to the Board of Trustees, including making a distinction between eligibility to participate in the election and eligibility to serve as a faculty member of the Board. The proposed change defines more precisely who is eligible to serve as a faculty member of the Board.



Page 2

Agenda Item: University Senate Meeting, October 11, 1976 (I, 5.2)  
September 29, 1976

The Rules Committee, in its report, described the rationale for these changes as follows: "The first change simply recognizes the equivalency of Division chairman in the Community College System and Department chairman in the University System. It is needed because this section of the Rules is unique in that it applies to the Community College System as well as the University System and hence such equivalency and applicability should be explicitly stated. The second change reflects past and present interpretation of the rules by this and past Rules committees, the President, and the informal opinion of Legal Counsel. It is generally accepted that the dividing line between being a faculty member and hence eligible to serve as an elected faculty member of the Board, and being an administrator and hence ineligible to serve on the Board, is as stated in the proposed change. Every year there are a few cases of uncertainty, new deans who are unaware of previous interpretations, etc. Hopefully, most of these problems will be avoided by stating the situation explicitly as proposed."

The Senate Council, in an effort to further clarify eligibility, added the phrase ". . . such as institute directors and assistant or associate deans," to the statement originally drafted by the Rules Committee.

/cet

Professor John Lihani  
Dept. of Spanish & Italian Lang. & Lit.  
1127 Patterson Tower  
Campus

EF

1-9-U



UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL  
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

September 29, 1976

~~777~~  
renew  
84984

TO: Members, University Senate  
FROM: University Senate Council  
RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting on October 11, 1976. Proposed addition to the Senate Rules relating to Admissions (IV) to ban discrimination in admissions.

The Senate Council recommends addition of the following statement to Section IV of the Senate Rules regarding admissions:

"An applicant for admission to the University or to any college or academic program in the University shall not be subjected to discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, marital status, national origin, age, or beliefs."

Refer to renew

Background: A somewhat similar statement was proposed to the Senate at its September 13 meeting. After some discussion, a motion was adopted to table this question until the next meeting of the Senate. The Council has re-worded the resolution slightly in an effort to state as clearly as possible what the policy should be. This version of the proposal has been approved by the President's office and appears to be an accurate statement of the present University policy regarding admissions to programs. In order to qualify one point, the word "academic" has been inserted before the word "program." Although there was some apparent dissatisfaction with including the phrase "or to any college or academic program in the University" the Council believes that it is important to keep this phrase in the statement of policy.

Motion to eliminate "beliefs"

/cet

Sent back to S.C. to be worded in an affirmative way - not negative

In addition, an applicant based on any factors irrelevant to their performance in that college or program.



"An applicant for admission to the University shall not be subjected to discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, marital status, national origin, age, or beliefs. In addition, an applicant for admission to any college or academic program shall not be subjected to discrimination based on any factors irrelevant to their performance in that college or program."

In addition, prior to voting to send back to committee, the amendment to delete "beliefs" was pending, but never voted on.



UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL  
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

October 5, 1976

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, October 11, 1976. Proposed addition to the Senate Rules (I, 3.21) concerning procedures for review of graduate programs.

The Senate Council and the Graduate Council recommend the following addition to the Rules of the Senate:

I, 3.21 (c) Review of Programs

It (the Graduate Council) shall review all graduate programs and suggest measures designed to maintain acceptable levels of academic quality. In pursuit of this charge, the Graduate Council may recommend appropriate actions to the Graduate Dean. For the purposes of this section, such recommendations may include (1) suspension of programs for a maximum of two years, (2) lifting of suspensions, and (3) termination of programs in accordance with the procedures specified below.

All recommendations by the Graduate Council and decisions by the Graduate Dean relative to suspension of programs, or the lifting of suspensions, shall be communicated to the Chairman of the Senate Council. No later than the second year of any program suspension, the Graduate Council shall review the suspension and recommend to the Graduate Dean the reinstatement or termination of the program.

A decision to suspend a program on academic grounds may be appealed by the Director of Graduate Studies in the program. The appeal in all such cases shall be made, including justification, to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for review. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall appoint a committee of graduate faculty members including a member of the Senate Council to review the case. They shall limit their review to the materials submitted and procedures followed by the Graduate Council.



Page 2

Agenda Item: October 11, 1976  
October 5, 1976

The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall discuss the recommendation of the Appeals Committee with the Graduate Dean and Chairman of the Senate Council (and the Vice President for the Medical Center for those programs based in departments in the Medical Center) and recommend final action to the President.

Any recommendation by the Graduate Council to the Graduate Dean to terminate a program, whether or not previously suspended, shall also be communicated to the Chairman of the Senate Council. If the Graduate Dean approves a recommendation to terminate a graduate program on academic grounds, he shall submit a recommendation for termination to the Graduate Faculty for review. If the Graduate Faculty concurs, it shall forward its recommendations through the Senate Council to the University Senate, which shall have the final authority for recommending such termination to the President."

\*\*\*

Background: The Senate Council has become concerned about the lack of established procedures for review, suspension, and termination of graduate programs. Last year it initiated discussions with the Graduate Council about the development of such procedures. A subcommittee of the two bodies met on several occasions, and subsequently a draft proposal has been negotiated. The draft that is now proposed has been approved by both bodies.

The proposal accomplished several purposes. It imposes a two-year time limit on suspension of programs. It makes it possible for the director of a graduate program to appeal a decision to suspend. It makes it clear that final action on recommending termination of a program must be taken by the University Senate, after approval by the Graduate Faculty. It makes explicit the responsibility of the Graduate Council for reviewing academic programs and making recommendations on their suspension and termination.

It should be clearly understood that this proposal pertains entirely to evaluations of programs, and recommendations for suspension and termination, that are based on academic grounds.

/cet

Professor John Lihani  
Dept. of Spanish & Italian Lang. & Lit.  
1127 Patterson Tower  
Campus

EF

1-9-U