

Minutes of the University Senate, October 21, 1968 (Cont'd)

C. STUDENT PARTICIPATION

Rules of procedure in educational units of the University should provide for consultation with students in the development of educational policies.

Insert the following under XII. MISCELLANEOUS, on page 77, and re-letter all subsequent sub-heads on pages 77-81:

A. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

The University of Kentucky shall insure equal opportunity for all individuals within the University, without regard to race, color, religion and national origin, thereby protecting their interest in personal dignity and encouraging their full contribution to and benefit from the educational process.

Dr. Weaver stated that he would recheck the validity of the final paragraph on page 79.

Insert the word "or" immediately preceding the word "cultural" in the second line of page 79 and again immediately preceding the word "charitable" in the third line, page 79.

Dr. Weaver was given an ovation in appreciation of the excellent job he had done in revising the Governing Regulations.

The Senate adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Kathryne W. Shelburne
Recording Secretary

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, NOVEMBER 11, 1968

The University Senate met in regular session at 4:00 p.m., Monday, November 11, 1968, in the Court Room of the Law Building. Chairman Sears presided. Members absent: Frederick J. Bollum*, Eugene B. Bradley*, Herbert Bruce*, Virgil L. Christian, Jr.*, Emmett R. Costich, D. F. Diedrich, Henry F. Dobyns, W. G. Duncan*, W. W. Ecton*, Fred Edmonds*, Roger Eichhorn*, Irving S. Fisher*, Eugene B. Gallagher, Art Gallaher*, Jess L. Gardner, Wesley P. Garrigus*, Ward Griffen, Robert D. Haun*, A. J. Hiatt*, Harris Isbell, William H. Jansen, Donald E. Knapp, John A. Koepke*, Robert A. Kuehne, James F. Lafferty*, Nancy Lair*, Karl O. Lange*, R. S. Levine, M. J. McNamara, Ray Marshall*, Gene L. Mason, Dean H. Morrow*, Ronald E. Phillips*, William R. Proffit*, Stephen Puckette*, John L. Ragland*, John T. Reeves, Mary Ellen Rickey, Donald A. Ringe, Arthur W. Rudnick, Jr.*, Myron G. Sandifer*, Norman L. Taylor, Timothy H. Taylor, W. C. Templeton*, William J. Tisdall*, Duane N. Tweeddale*, William S. Ward, Ralph H. Weaver*, Gilbert T. Webster, D. R. Wekstein*, Raymond A. Wilkie, Fred Zechman*, John V. Haley, Lawrence S. Thompson*, Albert D. Kirwan*, A. D. Albright, William R. Willard*, Robert F. Kerley, Glenwood L. Creech, Lewis W. Cochran, Harry M. Bohannon, Leonard V. Packett, Marcia Dake*, George W. Denmark, R. M. Drake, Jr., Joseph Hamburg, Ellis F. Hartford, Raymon D. Johnson*, J. P. Noffsinger*, Elbert W. Ockerman*, William A. Seay, John L. Sutton, Wallace Bryan, Sheryl Snyder.

Dr. Holman Hamilton presented Resolutions on the death of Dr. David Lloyd Dowd. The members of the Senate stood for a moment of silence in acceptance of the Resolutions and in tribute to Dr. and Mrs. Dowd.

*Absence explained

David L. Dowd

David Lloyd Dowd was born in Cleveland, Ohio, on May 25, 1918. He received his A.B., M.A., and Ph.D. degrees from the University of California, Berkeley. An instructor in history at Lake Forest College and later at the University of Nebraska, he served seventeen years on the faculty of the University of Florida as assistant professor, associate professor, and professor of history. For five years, he was his department's vice-chairman and director of graduate studies. During that period, he also was visiting professor of history at San Diego State College and at Tulane University. He joined the Department of History at the University of Kentucky in 1966. On the night of October 25, 1968, Dr. and Mrs. Dowd were killed in an automobile accident near Wellington, Ohio.

Such is the unadorned outline of the life of a man whose scholarly achievements and influence were remarkable and whose standing in the historical profession reflected great credit not only upon himself but upon this university which was so fortunate as to have him on the roster of its distinguished scholars. A member of Phi Beta Kappa and of Phi Alpha Theta, and a life member of the American Historical Association, David Dowd was also closely identified with the Society for French Historical Studies, the Société d'Histoire Moderne, the Société de la Révolution Française, and the Historical Association of Great Britain. He was especially active in the work of both the Southern Historical Association and the American Historical Association, and since 1966 served on the Board of Editors of the Journal of Modern History. Among the institutions where Professor Dowd had been welcomed as a guest lecturer are Washington State University, the University of Texas, the University of Dakar, the University of Montpellier, and the University of Bordeaux. The American Philosophical Society, the Social Science Research Council, and the Department of State all recognized his accomplishments and potential in various grants and fellowships including the Fulbright award for teaching at the University of Toulouse.

One of Dr. Dowd's major interests was the life and impact of Jacques-Louis David. His first book, published exactly twenty years ago, is entitled Pageant Master of the Republic: Jacques-Louis David and the French Revolution. Other works include Napoleon: Was He the Heir of the Revolution?; Jean Ribault, and The French Revolution (published first in this country and later in British, Italian, French, Swedish, and Dutch editions). There were many contributions from his pen in such journals as The American Historical Review, The American Archivist, The Art Quarterly, and the Bulletin of the Société de l'Histoire de l'Art Français, as well as chapters in multi-author books.

Although Professor Dowd's association with the University of Kentucky was comparatively brief, his scholarship was quickly recognized in all quarters of the campus and he occupied various posts of leadership including membership on the University of Kentucky Press Committee and in the University Senate. Colleagues, graduate students, and undergraduates alike were thoroughly aware of his high standards in the lecture room, in the seminar, as director of master's theses and doctoral dissertations and as one who--because of his experience and learning--was well qualified to contribute significantly both to the depth and to the breadth of those who sought his direction. They will long remember his warmth and genuine concern as much for their personal as for their academic welfare. His devoted wife, Mrs. Lyla B. Dowd, was a gracious lady who herself for a time was also a member of the faculty. Thoroughly at home in the Russian language, she taught Russian here in the academic year of 1967-68. She also was a gifted musician who, for many years in Gainesville and more recently in Lexington, proved a skillful teacher in her art.

The deaths of Professor and Mrs. Dowd, cut down in the very prime of life and under unusually tragic circumstances, constitute a grievous loss to the entire University community. Be it accordingly resolved that this expression of profound sorrow be incorporated in the minutes of the University of Kentucky Senate and that

the sincere sympathy of the University of Kentucky family be extended to the Misses Irene and Sandrette Dowd, the young daughters of the deceased.

The Senate approved the requests of Mr. Kerry Powell of the Lexington Herald and Miss Dana Ewell of the Kernel to sit in the meeting and report its proceedings.

The Senate approved the request of Miss Debbie Clark, a student, to sit in the meeting.

The minutes of the meeting of October 14, 1968, were approved as circulated.

Professor James Criswell, Chairman of the Rules Committee, presented a brief progress report and the proposed changes in the Rules of the University Senate which had been circulated to the faculty under date of November 1, 1968. He stated that while the recommendations he would present were the first changes to come out of the present committee, the committee had met weekly for the past six weeks to work on changes relating to probation, drop, and reinstatement and other matters; and that it was hoped that these changes could be considered by the Senate within the next few weeks. He stated that the committee members were a dedicated group who are vitally interested in the welfare of the University and he expressed his appreciation for that dedication.

The recommendations for change in the Rules and the action taken by the University Senate follow:

that the general requirements for admission to the University in the School of Architecture be deleted in entirety since they are no longer applied. The Senate approved this recommendation;

that the third paragraph under Requirements for Graduation, page 6 of the Rules, be changed to read as follows in order to incorporate the rule which was approved by the University Senate at its meeting of October 14, 1968:

Two semesters of English Composition (6 credits) are required of all students unless they can demonstrate proficiency. The above requirement will be reduced to three credits for University students who receive a grade of B or above in English 105, Advanced Freshman Composition. Students must enroll in English Composition each semester they are in attendance until the requirement is satisfied. Postponement of this requirement or withdrawal from English Composition is rarely permissible and must be approved by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Motion was made and approved to amend the above paragraph to insert the word "Full-time" at the beginning of sentence three, so that the third sentence will read "Full-time students must enroll in English Composition each semester they are in attendance until the requirement is satisfied". The Senate then approved the original motion as presented and amended;

that the following be incorporated into the Rules in order to include action which was taken by the University Senate at its meeting of October 14, 1968:

insert after phrase E under The Marking System, page 8:

F - Represents failure in a course taken on a pass-fail basis

Minutes of the University Senate, November 11, 1968 (Cont'd)

insert after phrase I under The Marking System, page 8:

P - Represents a passing grade in a course taken on a pass-fail basis

insert the following statement immediately following Grade W and preceding Audit under The Marking System, page 8:

Courses Taken on a Pass-Fail Basis. Undergraduate students above the freshman level and not on academic probation may select a maximum of four elective courses, with certain restrictions, to be taken on a pass-fail basis. Credit hours successfully completed under this option will count toward graduation but will not be used in calculating grade-point standing. Courses taken on a pass-fail basis shall be limited to those considered as elective in the student's program and such other courses or types of courses as might be specifically approved by the Senate for a college or department. Prerequisites for such courses may be ignored at the student's own hazard. The student is expected to participate fully in the course and take all examinations as though he were enrolled on a regular basis. Students may not change from a pass-fail basis nor from a regular basis to a pass-fail basis after the last date for entering an organized class.

The Senate approved these three insertions into the Rules.

Question was raised of the Senate's interpretation of the phrase "maximum of four elective courses" contained in the statement Courses Taken on a Pass-Fail Basis. It was the consensus of the Senate that its interpretation is literal.

that the paragraph under Official Withdrawal from a Course, page 12 of the Rules, be changed to read as follows in order that the circumstances under which official withdrawal can be made near the end of a semester might be clarified. The Senate approved this change.

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

that the section headed Name and Composition under University Senate Council, page 18 of the Rules, be rewritten to incorporate the rules which were approved by the University Senate at its meeting of September 9, 1968. The Senate approved this action.

Name and Composition -- The University Senate Council shall be composed of nine persons elected by the University Senate from its own membership, plus those faculty members of the Board of Trustees who are not already elected members of the Council.

Of the elected members no college may have more than three members. Faculty members of the Board of Trustees who are not already elected members of the Council shall be designated as ex officio non-voting members of the Council.

that the section headed Selection, Terms and Make-up of the Council under University Senate Council, pages 18-19 of the Rules, be changed to incorporate the action approved by the University Senate at its meeting of September 9, 1968. The Senate approved the change.

The Council shall select its officers annually, at its first meeting following the annual election of new members. Five elected members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of Council business.

On behalf of the Senate the Chairman thanked Professor Criswell and the members of the Rules Committee for this excellent work.

Professor Ogletree, Chairman of the University Senate Program Planning Committee, presented the following brief report on the results of the recent survey sent to the faculty soliciting assistance in study groups, and investigating some of the educational issues facing the University.

The Senate Program Planning Committee is assigned responsibility by the Council to organize and schedule the events to come before this body. This year's experience in the Senate has been somewhat different from past years, opening with the long, lengthy debates on the rules changes which you have just now approved, our debate on the speaker policy, and our debating of the new codified Governing Regulations. Let me also add that in the working of the Council and in the working of this Senate there are many excellent committees that are producing in terms of the development of a strong institution on this campus.

The Council, in appointing and charging the Program Planning Committee this year, approved a motion of circularizing the Senate to determine what it considered to be the major issues, problems, or concerns that are germane to this body. Possibly because of timing the initial response was a little disappointing; but out of these responses some 30 major issues were identified. These were then subjected to a small ad hoc committee from the Program Planning Committee and codified under 10 headings. These were circulated to the entire faculty of the University and from this circulation there were 230 of our colleagues who indicated their willingness to serve on one or more ad hoc committees, or as sub-parts of standing committees, to deal with one or more of these issues.

Let me read you briefly an analysis of the respondents. Seven responded by indicating they were too busy to take on an added burden and, in giving their reasons, and knowing them, it was well understood why they were too busy; 39 identified one topic, 55 identified two; 40 identified three; 25 identified four; 17, six; 10, six; three, seven; three, eight; one, nine; and six said they would be willing to work on any or all 10 of them. It was most gratifying to the Senate Program Planning Committee to know that we do have a backlog of talent, resources, and people who are concerned with some problem or issue that might appear before this body. At the present time there are 42 people who have indicated that they want to engage or be engaged in a study of the role and function of the University Senate. Thirty-five indicated they wanted to study the role of the faculty in extension programming; 66 indicated they wanted to become engaged in a study of the relationship of Community Colleges to this University; 85 indicated they wanted to become involved in student involvement in determining academic policy; 40 would like to work on the process of revising the Student Code; 62 want to look at the faculty role and responsibility in public relations; and 65 want to work in terms of criteria and processes for establishing priorities in academic programming. In the area of appropriate balance between teaching, research, and service 230 members

responded, of which 138 identified this as an area in which they were interested; 49 indicated they wanted to work on the attraction of superior students and academic programming; and 49 in the implications of education and television in our programming.

We are now in the process of passing on to the Senate Council for their consideration the names of individuals who have identified themselves with topics or with issues, with recommendations of a smaller group to serve as committees, and the remainder serving as a reservoir for the appointment of smaller ad hoc committees to deal with these questions. Along with this will go a recommended charge to the groups which, in essence, will be asking them to analyze the problem, to gather information, and to prepare a written position paper which will go to the Council and from the Council to the Senate for deliberation, discussion, debate, and/or decision regarding the policy formation, which will then in turn, be transmitted to the administration.

Coming before the Senate from the Rules Committee in the immediate future will be some additional rules changes on which the Senate will not have made prior decisions. Also, hopefully, there will be a report from the deans' committee, which is working on a topic, and possibly in December you will be asked to consider the question of registration of freshmen and sophomores in colleges other than Arts and Sciences. This is now before the Undergraduate Council for its consideration.

Thus, looking toward the close of this calendar year the agenda is not light, and the programs are not sterile.

The Chairman thanked Professor Ogletree for the excellent report.

Dr. Gordon Sweet of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools spoke on the background and philosophy of a self-study. He stated that a state university must plan, present, and program the next decade to anticipate the growth of the student body, the cost of higher education, the development of new schools and programs, at the same time selling the public on the need for their support; that he had found one of the best approaches to promoting public understanding is through an effective sensible self-study containing good planning content. He stated that in a total university study the picture could not be projected unless all aspects of the university are a part of it -- the schools within the colleges, special programs, community colleges, divisions, departments; and that a self-study should recognize its obligations in the areas of the student--his rights and involvement--the faculty--its rights and involvement--communications--between students, students and faculty, students and administration--institutional management for the best use of the facilities and resources, student personnel services, study and evaluation of off-campus programs.

Dr. Kelly portrayed by use of slide projections the functions that will need to be observed. The slides showed the organization should be comprised of a Steering Committee, and Editor, a Research unit, the principal committees, and the branches.

He stated that the Steering Committee should have a chairman provided with some professional and clerical assistance; that it should be kept small, that it should be charged with responsibility and authority to see that the self-study is put on schedule, kept on schedule, and that it arrives at its end at about the proper time for the visiting Committee to come to the campus.

He stated that the Editor should be responsible for taking the work of the Steering Committee and putting it together, making final decisions on content, polishing the language, and making the report readable,

He stated that our Office of Institution Studies should serve as the research function and should be available to the various committees for provision of data which would enable the committees to make decisions and arrive at projections for the future of the University.

He stated that the principal committees are the committees that represent the study of the institution in the light of the Standards of the College Delegate Assembly. In commenting about Standard I he stated that the whole basis of accreditation and membership in the Association is the identification by an institution of its reason for being, its role in the world of higher education, its purpose; that the remainder of the Standards should reflect what we have said about ourselves in Standard I. He stated that there should be, University-wide, a committee for each of these Standards as they appear in the Standards of the Delegate Assembly.

He also called attention to Roman numeral XII which is a chapter rather than a Standard. This 12th chapter has to do with projections for the future of the institution. He stated that we needed to pay some attention to what is the present status of this institution, what is wrong with it, what is right with it, but beyond this, and of far more importance if the study is to be of any real use to us, we should project what this institution is to become in the future, how all the components will relate to all the others--a blueprint for the future--and that they were asking for a recapitulation in a XIIth Chapter of all the projections that have been made, from the departmental level through the total University level.

He stated that the branches, which in our case are the community colleges, the schools, the divisions, and the departments, should conduct their own separate, subordinate self-studies, to be finally incorporated into the total report of the institution. He said that each little bailiwick on the campus ought to engage in some evaluation of what it is doing and of how what it does relates to the whole.

In summary, he indicated that these self-studies of the branches should be drawn together into the larger schools and divisions and then into the principal committees and from there into the various parts of the finer report to be edited and acted upon by the Steering Committee; and he stressed that the completed document, while required by the Association, is an evaluation and guide for the use of the institution through the next decade.

The Chairman thanked Doctors Sweet and Kelly for taking time out of their busy schedule to appear before the Senate to present these blueprints for a self-study.

The Senate adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Kathryne W. Shelburne
Recording Secretary