

President to determine whether or not it should be open to the Press. This motion was seconded.

At this point call for adjournment was made from the floor. By a hand count of 73 to 51 the Senate voted for adjournment.

The Senate adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, OCTOBER 12, 1970

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, October 12, 1970, in the Court Room of the Law Building. Chairman Plucknett presided. Members absent: Lawrence A. Allen*, Albert S. Bacdayan, James R. Barclay*, Charles E. Barnhart, Robert A. Beargie*, Robert H. Biggerstaff*, Frederick Bollum*, Thomas D. Brower, Mary R. Brown*, Herbert Bruce*, Clyde R. Carpenter*, Ralph S. Carpenter*, Maurice A. Clay*, William B. Cotter*, William H. Dennen, Robert M. Drake*, Eugene B. Gallagher, Charles P. Graves, Ward O. Griffen, Willis H. Griffin, John V. Haley*, Jack B. Hall, Joseph Hamburg, Richard Hanau*, Rebekah Harleston*, Charles F. Haywood*, John W. Hutchinson*, Mary Frances James*, Raymon D. Johnson, Irving F. Kanner*, Donald E. Knapp*, James A. Knoblett*, James F. Lafferty, Bruce E. Langlois*, Harold R. Laswell*, Thomas J. Leonard, Arthur Lieber*, Donald L. Madden*, Maurice K. Marshall*, William R. Merritt, Blaine F. Parker*, Bobby C. Pass, Albert W. Patrick, John T. Reeves, John C. Robertson*, John W. Roddick, Alex Romanowitz, Gerald I. Roth*, Betty R. Rudnick*, George Ruschell, John S. Scarborough*, George W. Schwert*, Ian Shine, D. Milton Shuffett*, Raymond A. Smith*, John B. Stephenson, Leonard P. Stoltz*, Robert Straus*, Thomas B. Stroup, Betty A. Taylor*, John Thrailkill*, John N. Walker*, M. Stanley Wall, Charles A. Walton*, James H. Wells*, Harry E. Wheeler*, Alfred D. Winer, and Robert G. Zumwinkle.

The Senate approved the requests of Jane Brown, Kernel reporter, and Dick Ware, Kernel photographer, to attend, report and photograph the meeting.

The Chairman announced the appointment of Dr. Charles Elton to fill the newly approved office of Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and announced further that Professor David Larimore would act as his assistant.

The Chairman reminded the Senators of the special meeting of the Senate to be held at 3:00 p.m., October 29, 1970, for the purpose of considering the agenda items which were postponed from this meeting.

The Chairman then introduced to the Senators Dr. Otis A. Singletary, President of the University of Kentucky. The text of Dr. Singletary's address follows.

*Absence explained

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and good afternoon, members of the Senate and guests. It is a pleasure to be here and to have a chance to say some things to you about the year past and the year and years ahead. I thought it might be worthwhile to spend this time in reviewing some of the things that have happened on this campus in the past year and to project a bit about some of the things that are discernible, I think, in our relatively immediate future.

In talking about the past year I must say that I am always stunned when I find people -- and I find them frequently -- who have the feeling that either nothing or not much is happening on the campus -- a view not widely shared from my desk. I thought I might very well take the time to review and, in some cases, amplify some of the things that have happened here in the past year because -- particularly in terms of positions, et cetera -- I think they have not been clearly or widely understood. For example, I think the question of administrative reorganization that has gone on in this last year probably needs to have some additional things said about it and I would like to take this opportunity to do it.

Last year, you may recall, when I first spoke here I told you that I had no immediate plans -- no preordained structure in which to shape the administration and that I wanted some time to look at it and see how it worked and did not work, and, after some time, to make the changes that I thought I wanted to make. In April of this year we did indeed reorganize, at what is called the "cabinet" level, and I would like to say something about some of these changes.

As you know, we retained several of the vice presidencies as they had existed: business, external relations, student affairs, and the Medical Center. But we created some new positions and abolished some old ones and I think perhaps it might be worthwhile to say just a little more about each of these four positions that were created or changed.

The Vice President for Administration, for example -- as you know, Dr. Alvin Morris is filling that position. That is not to be seen as an executive vice presidency. It was never envisioned that way by me or by Dr. Morris. I would describe it as more a staff office in the President's Office, and I see Dr. Morris as doing a wide range of things, most of them ad hoc, as they come up. He has been very helpful to me this year in taking specific assignments and seeing that they got done. I see him also as a link in terms of continuity. When I am gone from the campus it is desirable to have one focal point where the institutional responsibility can be placed, and I see him in that role. He was, for a while, serving also as advisor to me for matters having to do with the Medical Center and its varied activities. What I am saying is that it is, essentially, as I see it and as Dr. Morris sees it, a staff job in the President's Office.

The position of Vice President for Academic Affairs is also a new one -- Dr. Cochran's position. That job is seen as the administrative office at the head of what we recognize as the Division of Colleges, with the academic deans reporting directly to him. I see that office as the focal point for all internal academic matters and I am pleased to say that we have been able to divest him of his roles as Graduate Dean, Provost, and whatever other titles were circulating around up there, and that he can give full time to this position. Needless to say, we see it as a very important one.

You may recall that we created a vice presidency for the Community College System. This came as the result of a recommendation from this body and I think it was a very wise one. The Community College System has now grown, both in size and complexity, to the point where I think it fully warranted having someone at the vice presidential level inside the University administration. Dr. Hartford retired from that position and Dr. Stanley Wall was appointed.

The Vice President for Institutional Planning -- Dr. Albright's title -- is one that is brand new in design and concept. I think that it gives us a potential now to have some place in this University where someone can do two things that are going to become increasingly important to us: one, to take the longer-range look and to concentrate on the planning function and area; to be deciding in advance what are the alternatives and how we might approach them; what perhaps we ought to consider doing. And second, and equally as important, is the evaluation function. Many institutions like ours are doing all kinds of things and assuming that they are good. This is not necessarily true and I think, particularly in view of the history of this institution in its last decade, it probably is high time we begin to examine rather carefully and critically some of the things that we decided to do and that we assume are going very well. It would be nice to confirm these, but, if not, we should then raise some questions and alternatives.

In all of this we also had the decision to do away with the concept of an Executive Vice President which meant that I took the Budget Director into my office, the implication being that each Vice President becomes an executive vice president for his area. This is somewhat different and at times a difficult adjustment, but it is going to be made and it has to be made.

Closely paralleling the administrative reorganization of the vice presidencies are the administrative appointments that have been made during the year, particularly those of fairly recent vintage. I am sure you have had a chance by now to meet the new Vice President for Student Affairs, Dr. Zumwinkle. I am delighted that he is here. I know that he is working hard at what can only be described as a difficult job. He is an interested and concerned man. He has a remarkable degree of patience I am happy to say, and I look forward with some optimism to what he is going to be able to do in that role.

We have recently named a new Vice President for the Medical Center, Dr. Bosomworth. Peter Bosomworth was the unanimous choice of the Committee, as I recall, and comes to this position with a good deal of experience inside the Medical Center. The functions and responsibilities in that area were of such a nature that we needed somebody now, and someone already familiar with the Medical Center. Every indication up to this point, and he has been in the job a very short time, confirms that as being a wise choice. Dr. Willard, who has resigned as Vice President of the Medical Center to come into my office as a special advisor in the health affairs field, has a range of assignments. We must now, with the University of Louisville coming into the state system, begin to devise ways in which they and we can work together toward the elimination of unnecessary duplication and this type of thing in this very costly area. He has already begun to hold joint meetings with the University of Louisville staff to discuss the common approaches that we might take. In addition to that I think he is uniquely fitted to help us make the

case in the state, that I have not seen adequately made in my short time here, about the real value of that Medical Center to this Commonwealth. I think he can also be particularly helpful to me in dealing both with the Council on Public Higher Education and the Legislature in terms of programs and the future of the Medical Center -- making a good case for its needs.

We have recently appointed a Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Mr. John Stephenson. That position has been available for some time on this campus. It was created some years ago but has never been filled for a number of reasons, one, because there was never any clear description of what the job was, and secondly, because I suspect no one could ever be persuaded to take it. We are still not very clear what the job is but we have persuaded John Stephenson to take it and I am duly appreciative of that. There is no magic in this and it would be unfair to Dr. Stephenson to assume that his appointment is suddenly going to take care of all the problems that one hears about in the area of undergraduate education. It is essentially a staff position in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. He will also preside over the Undergraduate Council and will have certain programs reporting directly to him administratively. The important thing, as I see it at this point, is that it establishes once again a focal point in the central administration for the concerns or the input -- students, faculty, etc. -- in those areas of curriculum and of advising and of teaching that are the overriding concerns of undergraduate education.

We have also recently appointed an acting Dean of the Graduate School. Dr. William Dennen has agreed to take it on for the year as Acting Dean and is already at work. The Committee that was originally appointed to search for this position is continuing its labors and it is our hope that this can be settled in the current academic session.

The Academic Ombudsman has been appointed. You all know that Professor Garrett Flickinger agreed to take this for this first year and I am pleased at that decision on his part and I think he will do a good job in a very difficult area. You, as members of this body, have spent considerable time in discussing and making decisions about this particular function and here again I would say that it is a focal point where a student on this campus has some specific place to go to find out what he can do or what is available to him and I am very hopeful that this is going to be a contribution to our campus.

Perhaps some of you do not know it but there is a faculty member on special faculty assignment, half-time, to my office. I asked Dr. Paul Sears to serve in that capacity this year which he agreed to do and he is already proving his helpfulness to me in all kinds of ways.

The Vice Presidency for Business Affairs is still in an acting situation. There is a committee at work on it and I am hopeful that within the next few weeks we can find a more or less permanent solution. What I am trying to say to you is that in the course of the year there has been a considerable amount of time and thought and activity going into the question of what kinds of administrative offices, officers and people we want. We have tried to fill most of our key positions and to do it with as little trauma to this institution as is possible. You may consider it gratuitous but I suspect that we do not need another upheaval having to do with people in administrative positions. I am also certain of the fact that finding the

people and structuring the jobs are one thing but now the primary job in front of us is getting this new machinery to work the way we want it to work and the way we hope it will work.

I will move now to say something about some developments that may have gone unnoticed in the area of the schools and colleges. There has been considerable reorganization in a number of our colleges. Dean Barnhart of the College of Agriculture has made some rather dramatic changes, particularly in terms of his county agent and extension services. There is a committee at work in the College of Arts and Sciences looking at the question of restructuring that College. I do not know at this moment precisely where that study is but I will look forward to learning about it from Dean Royster. There is a new Dean in the College of Home Economics and considerable reorganization in that area plus the bringing in of some new department chairmen. We have established a College of Social Professions and the role of Dean Witte, particularly in the development of the new graduate program which is off to a good start this year, has been significant. In the College of Allied Health Professions we have seen a new thrust in the area of training instructional personnel in these various areas. As you probably know, there is a great shortage in these areas and the grant which you may have read about a month or longer ago -- the Kellogg Foundation Grant -- identified this institution as the training point for a five-state region for a program for training this kind of person. The Allied Health people, in cooperation with the College of Education and the Community College System, have put together what is a very interesting program.

In addition to these things some physical facilities have been shaken loose. The Animal Sciences Building is now under way. There is a health, physical education and recreation facility on the drawing boards. It is not going to have everything we originally hoped to have in it in terms of space or facilities but it is going to be something we don't have now. I say again that one of the real deficiencies on this campus is the shortage of recreational space and facilities for what can clearly be described as a burgeoning student body. We are about ready to move on the construction of another "surge" building, one of the research facilities we have which, in terms of office space and laboratory space, will be divided between Arts and Sciences and the Medical Center. The Veterans Administration Hospital which is being built adjacent to and eventually will be contiguous with our own hospital is underway and is going to give us a capability about double the number of beds we now have in our own hospital. Further, it can help us to increase the size of the Medical School class, one of the pressing problems of this country.

Some other things that are not as visible as buildings either under construction or being planned, is the adoption of the Governing Regulations last May. I understand this is the first major revision since 1960. Copies have recently been distributed. We have begun what will probably be a more difficult task, that of creating something called Administrative Regulations. I kept reading in the Governing Regulations about what was in the Administrative Regulations but I never could find the Administrative Regulations so finally I asked where they were and was told there weren't any. I would like to think that we can move toward the creation of a companion document to include those regulations which are already around but which need to be pulled together and codified as well as some others which need to be prepared to fill in the gaps. The Student Code has been revised not once but twice as I am frequently reminded and as I recall, the first revision was completed just in time to

begin on the second.

We have implemented certain recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Community Colleges. I said earlier that we moved in the area of creating a Vice Presidency. We also have been able to do something in the area of giving the Community Colleges more autonomy in their academic programs. I think it was one of the really important things that the Senate did last year, that of recognizing the special needs and special concerns of our Community College System.

We have received the Senate Report on Balance Among Teaching, Research and Service. You may not be aware that I have appointed a committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Albright to look at this whole question of evaluation of performance, teaching, research, and service. There are deans, department chairmen, faculty members, and students on this committee and the charge they have is to take a look at what we now have and suggest ways that it might be improved. I have received a large number of suggestions individually and it is my feeling that while the concept of evaluation is still one that has considerable support, there is less and less affection attached to the instrument or instruments currently being used to do it and I fear the day when we are not going to have enough administrative machinery to deal with the size of the appeals that come in.

We have made a considerable degree of progress in the institutional self-study. As you know, we are coming up now for our ten-year review with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Dr. Morris Cierley and the committee he chairs have given a considerable degree of attention and a considerable amount of work to preparing, not for just the report, but also for the visit which takes place here in the second week of February 1971. I think the document is not just going to be useful in some abstract way. I intend to use it as one way to obtain a better understanding of the problems of the University than I have thus far been able to do.

I have also appointed members to the new University Senate Hearing Panel on Privilege and Tenure which was recommended earlier by this Senate.

Last year was also a budget year, a legislative year, and we gave a considerable amount of time to that, the result being that it was possible for us to stay in the ball game for a while anyway with some increase in faculty salaries and some small amount for program development, and that is about it. We did swallow hard that large chunk of debt service that I told you about a year ago when I was here and I am still having pangs of indigestion over that. We have also survived since we received that first budget cut. As you know, the state did not realize or has not, at this point, realized the level of income that it anticipated, so it levied a cut-back against institutions through out the state system and, in our case, it came down to a figure of \$631,000. When we took the \$631,000 out of this institution we, fundamentally, had two choices. One was to go in and take away the unfilled positions or to take what little cushion we had in the way of contingency reserve and try not to touch the College and Departmental budgets. We decided on the latter. The result is that we really are out of any more venture capital at the moment. A far more frightening thing to me, although I don't guess you need to stay awake nights too -- let me do that -- is the fact that right now we are operating this institution with a contingency or reserve fund of 0.4 of one per cent of our budget. I

daresay no other enterprise of this kind in the country would undertake this kind of foolhardiness. The fact of the matter is that something like the change that is coming has already come; we just haven't had to pay the bills yet. Just in the new coal contracts the cost of coal, among other things, has gone up rather dramatically. Somehow to find the dollars not in the budget becomes then a kind of pressing problem. It is not, essentially, your problem, at least not directly. But what I am saying is that for years we have had a very comfortable position of having a reserve or contingency that would take care of these things in the normal routine. We stand at the moment somewhat indisposed.

I would also mention the recent decision approved by the Board of Trustees to assume the cost of the basic life insurance program. That amounted to two things: one, a kind of modest pay raise which I hope you do not object to; and two, a decision not to get into a legal battle which we might well have won on the grounds of making it a requirement as a condition of employment -- as a policy matter -- not particularly wanting to win that battle for in the process we might have jeopardized an insurance program that benefits the overwhelming majority of members of the faculty. It is a program that has been heartily endorsed by the faculty welfare committee.

These are some of the things that have been going on and I do not think it worthwhile to spend more time on them. I would prefer to say something about the things that I suspect we must do and I would like to create a context within which to make these remarks.

It is a kind of cliché nowadays to remind anyone that these are stressful times in higher education. The range of problems that confront institutions, both internal and external, is very serious. The result is that we seem to be preoccupied with troubles and problems. I guess they are inescapable since they are what one faces every day. However, I think that we should not lose sight of the fact of the very real accomplishments of higher education in this country. I think we can make a case that for all the criticism about conformity and all the rest of it, we have knowingly, and, in some ways, purposefully created a generation of young people who have both the desire and the ability to do some thinking for themselves and they are not reluctant to tell one about it. I think we might do well to remember that for all our shortcomings we also lead all the nations of the world in educating the highest percentage in the college age group and in the development of graduate study, professional education, and research. I think we can even argue that we are moving fairly steadily -- although the pace does not please many -- toward the ideal of higher education for all who can, in fact, benefit from it. I believe anyone would agree that the universities have made fantastic contributions to society in terms of its economy and in terms of the services that the public has sought and expected from us. In spite of all the shrill cries about repression and conformity I would argue that the University community allows more dissent, takes freedom of the mind and spirit more seriously, and labors harder to create an environment in which free expression can take place, than does any other institution in our society. I think we tend either to lose sight of these things or not to appreciate the magnitude of the achievement.

Moving down to this campus I think it is fair to say that we have our

fair share of these problems and I do not intend to detail them here. You are probably as familiar with them as I am. I will simply say that it is foolish to think that we are going to be allowed to stand aside from the powerful currents that are sweeping across this nation. But, once again, for all the troubles and for all the problems that I know and you know, perspective requires us to point out that the University of Kentucky is today a viable institution. We have not only survived our troubles; I would argue that we have come out of them in better shape than most institutions and I think we would do well to remember this. I go beyond this to say that I think there is a reason this is true and this reason is to be found in the people who make these institutions what they are. It is my belief that the overwhelming majority of faculty members and students want this University to be relevant in the best sense of that word; they want it to be effective in what it purports to do; and they want it to do its job reasonably well. I think there is general agreement, as I talk to people, that this University should be kept open and far beyond that, that it should be kept functioning as an educational institution, and far beyond that, that just possibly we might make it a better institution than we found it and I think this is an important goal to keep in front of us and to remember.

To be somewhat more specific, I think we must find ways here on our campus to do a number of things and the first category I would lump in the statement of finding ways to continue to deal with the same old problems that have not gone away is the problem of numbers. The problem of numbers has not disappeared and this campus alone had 1,600 or so new students this fall. This is the equivalent of creating a new college every year. And yet, although you can find somebody that will give you a projection to tell you whatever it is you really want to hear, I gather we are going to be at this business for a good while yet of deciding what in the name of Heaven we are going to do with the youngsters who are in the pipeline. Whether they need to come to the University is a different question. The question is "Will Kentucky continue to provide the opportunity for education beyond high school." Along with this old problem we are still going to have the problem of dollars, except this problem is going to become increasingly difficult. State appropriations are not going to grow anywhere near the way they have in the past decade. I see no way for this to happen. The competition for the state dollar is very fierce, and not just among institutions of higher learning. I think we are going to see in the next Legislative Session a great push from other sections of the state. For example, the public schools are going to be very active and are going to have a very high priority. I see no way for us to take much comfort from the fact that the state will either be able or willing to provide the kind of increased funds that will be necessary for us to go on doing the kinds of things we want and need to do. The same is true of the federal programs. We are going to continue to get a considerable number of federal dollars but I will tell you something else. This is going to be remembered as the age of the cut-back and the stretch-out, and, in cutting back, particularly in the scholarship and the loan area, it will wipe out the plans and possibilities for a number of people. I do not see in the immediate future any great change in the federal picture because I do not believe that the present administration in Washington places higher education in a very high priority in terms of dollars. So, as we look down the road we have no reason to do anything but be concerned about that source. Student fees have been increasing and are going to continue to increase. There is no way not to do it. Yet we have to be careful not somehow to get to the point where all the time

we are talking on the one hand about providing educational opportunity, we are pricing that opportunity out of the market. That is a continuing problem every year.

Private funds -- There is a word that can be said about private money in the University of Kentucky and I guess I would start it by saying that while I see this as no area in which many of our fundamental problems will be solved, there are some areas in which a little frosting can be put on the cake -- or at least on the corners of the cake -- through a better and more effective solicitation of private dollars. Whatever else I am satisfied of, I am satisfied of the fact that there is no real tradition in Kentucky of private giving to this public university. That does not mean that nobody has. It just is not widespread. Dr. Creech had a study done a year ago that confirmed what we thought we already knew and that is that in almost every measurable category - alumni giving, gifts, grants and bequests, corporate giving, you name it - the University of Kentucky consistently rated at the bottom of all the benchmark institutions around us. That does not just mean Illinois and Indiana, but it also means West Virginia and Tennessee. So we have been giving some thought to what to do. I will call to your attention the study that has just been completed called the Brakeley Study. About a year ago the Development Council sought the assistance of this private firm to do a feasibility study for us and to make some recommendations. I won't bore you with all the details. They did a good deal of telling us what we already knew. But they confirmed, very generally, what we know and now I believe we have a plan in front of us from which to begin working in this area. I suspect, although we will be visiting some universities in the next few weeks or months to look at the foundation structure, we are probably going to move at this University to one umbrella foundation under which we can carry our various gift-receiving enterprises. Then we can get to work on some specifics. We can get to work on how to increase the alumni annual giving and I tell you it can be increased; how we can improve and widen the membership in our University Fellows and that can be done; and how we can get some corporations -- even those in Kentucky who, through their various foundations, give money to institutions of higher learning sometimes outside the state. I say again this is not going to solve any big problem but the interesting thing about private dollars in an institution like ours is that it gives us a little cushion, a little margin, to do some things that could not be done even if we had the state dollars, because of the various kinds of restrictions that are frequently placed on the tax dollar. Many of these are things that an educational institution needs to do.

It is not just a problem of numbers and dollars. It is going to continue to be a problem of people. I keep hearing that the academic market is getting glutted and I think it is true that jobs are not going to be anywhere near as easy to come by as they have been, particularly good jobs, in the kind of institution one wants. Nonetheless the problem is still going to be, I think, how it is one gets and how it is one holds the kind and quality of person one wants for his University faculty. I don't see that letting up just because we are perhaps producing more Ph.D.s in a number of fields than can be positioned, as they have been for the last decade.

Another problem that is going to become right acute in the next two years is how this University finally is going to fit into the state pattern and into the system of higher education in the Commonwealth. There is under way now -- you have seen several references to it in the papers -- a study which is being conducted by the Council on Public Higher Education.

It was a mandate of the last Legislature. There are two questions they are directed to answer and both these questions have implications, directly or indirectly for this University. The first, very simply, is "How and under what terms and conditions will the University of Louisville come into the state system?" There is no longer any question of its coming in and there is no longer any question of its coming in as an independent institution with its own Board. The question now is "Can this state afford two full-blown universities?" I think the answer to the Louisville question can only be given in context of what we do here and I think that it is probably responsible for what now is something in the nature of a role and scope study that the Council on Public Higher Education is undertaking, involving all the public institutions, but one precise focus of which is U of L and UK. I think they will be looking very hard at programs we duplicate and I think they will be making some decisions about whether they be done in Louisville or they be done here. It is too soon to identify these but I suspect that they are an inevitable consequence of that study.

The other point having to do with the Council's study is the future role of the Council, itself. What is it going to be and do? This comes out of that continuing concern about having some kind of "control" over institutions of higher learning -- the coordinating board principle, at work all over the country. "Do you do it different ways?" I think it is a credit to us that we have at least not moved so fast that we can't avoid some of the mistakes that have been made elsewhere. What is the Council going to do with regard to the institutions? What powers are they going to have vis-a-vis the institutions? There is one school that runs very clearly to the theme of one central governing board for all institutions and one group to whom the Legislature gives the money which it parcels out. I need hardly tell you that I find little favor with that position and I think we will have some opportunity to speak to that point before it is over. I think there is a legitimate case for coordination; I think there is a legitimate case for planning; and that no institution can do that, because institutions are like people -- they sometimes confuse their preferences with their rights -- the divine order. There is some sense in the state having a plan, and that is a proper function for a Council. There is some sense in facing the issue about whether academic programs are going to be allowed to multiply simply to please the aspirations of an institution or a department, or even an individual. There is some question about what degree a budget review ought to be engaged in before these things are transmitted to the Legislature. I cannot tell you the answers. They will be visiting this campus within the next few weeks to start collecting the information they want from us. There is nothing new about the dollar problem, there is nothing new about the numbers problem, there is nothing new about the people problem, and there is nothing new about the coordinating problem but they are going on and they are still going to have a very real impact on us and I think it is important that you have some sense of this and when you read these little casual pieces that come out in the press about what the Council on Public Higher Education has done, don't just thumb that page over and take another sip out of your coffee cup. At least have the courtesy to let a little shudder run down your back.

Moving away from the older and sometimes pressing problems, we on this campus are going to have to develop some clearer realization than we now have of the changed conditions under which we operate. I know that some of you are already aware of this and that some of you are not. What I am talking about is that this University is a vastly different institution

than it was ten years ago or even five years ago. It is different in the range of its program, different in terms of the personnel who are here, and it is different in terms of the services it renders. The past decade, if I have any feeling for it, has seen a very, very rapid growth in new programs and services at the University of Kentucky. This has been accompanied by a great expansion of new positions, by a rapid increase in the size of the operating budget. We have been in a state of great growth and expansion with great infusions of dollars and great infusions of new blood and new people. This is the situation that I say to you has changed and changed perceptibly and I would hope that you would begin to appreciate that today we are in an entirely different kind of situation and one that will demand a different solution and different emphases. What I am really saying to you is that the difference, as I understand it and as I perceive it, is that we are going to have fewer new resources -- not that we are going to have less in the way of support but that the rate of increase is simply not going to be there. That was clear in the last budget. I suspect it is going to be clear in the future. It is not just a problem that faces Kentucky; it is true all over the country and many institutions have been hit very hard much harder than we. Some have been made to stand still and some have been cut back. We have not faced these prospects. In other words, there will be fewer new dollars than we are accustomed to and, as I said a moment ago, the recent budget cut is some indication of this. That came fairly early in the biennium and I am frank to tell you that if anything were to happen that we have to face another budget cut in this present biennium, this institution is in real trouble. Then we will really have to cut into the heart and it is going to be painful. Fewer new dollars mean fewer new positions and it means fewer new programs and there is no need for us to skirt this. One reaction to this is "Oh, well, why do you keep giving us this bad news?" I think that you need to face it as I have to face it -- that this is the way it is. I don't relish or take pleasure in it but I think there is a side to this that we may very well overlook which is that it is high time this institution began to consolidate what it has done and take a look at itself to see to what degree its expansion has been good and to what degree it might be made better. The implications of this new situation are perfectly clear. We are going to require much more careful planning than we have ever done before. We are no longer in a period where we can fund a good idea because it happens to be a good idea. Unfortunately, that option is not available. As I have already said, we are going to have to evaluate a good bit of what we are already doing. I say this and I would like for you to understand, that in the future, particularly the immediate future, a decision to do something new is very likely going to entail another decision to stop doing something that we are already doing or it isn't likely that we can pull it off. I think we are going to have to place much greater emphasis on the setting of priorities than we traditionally have. I am well aware that there is a Senate Committee at work on a statement on priorities and I will look forward to receiving that Report. Let me say that I think it is an appropriate function of the faculty to be involved in the issue of priorities, particularly in the academic program, both in terms of what we ought to do and what we ought not to do or maybe even what we ought to stop doing. There are two sides to that coin. I would say that this need not be bad or critical. I think we are in a period already of what can be described as less halcyon days than of yore, but we are not doing all that badly. It is a rather homely parallel but I think we might very well compare ourselves to the fiddler who has only three strings. It doesn't mean that he can't make music

but it does mean that he's got to move his fingers a whole lot faster to get the same results. And I am told that it frequently is accompanied by more sour notes than is otherwise true.

I will say another thing that we might do as a community and that is to face the fact that there is going to be no turning back to some simpler and easier time in this institution's evolution. The University of Kentucky is not going to go back to being essentially an undergraduate institution with a few graduate programs tacked on to it. There are many simplistic views of the University. There are those who say that this University is for the students. Period. There are some who act like it is for the researchers. Period. There are some who think that its only function is to provide service to the larger society. The trouble is that these all amount to an oversimplification and to think that the University is any one of these things is to misunderstand the function and to mistake the purpose of this institution. It has the obligation to do all these things and that is what makes the job difficult because many times they are not only not complementary, they are contradictory and sometimes they pull in opposite directions. I think it is our obligation, the state university in the best sense of that term, to meet the varied responsibilities that this state has given us and I believe we are going to do it.

Within this framework I think we should also realize that we are going to have to pay attention to some fairly specific concerns on this campus -- improvement in the quality and relevance of the academic program. I told some people not long ago in a not altogether unfriendly aside that the present collegiate model of four academic years and 120 credit hours, give or take a handful, is not only older than television, it is older than the automobile and the electric light, and, just for emphasis, that it predates the Russian Revolution, the rise of Hitler, the birth of Martin Luther King, and for additional good measure, the death of God as a movement. It has been around a long time and for all the talk about innovation and change not a great deal happens to it. I would think that this is a matter the faculty ought to take very seriously. I say this because whatever else I believe about the University, I believe the academic program is properly the ultimate business of the academic man, and I want you to attend to that business.

I think we are going to have to make much more effective use of facilities and resources than we have had to in the past. This is another way of talking about the planning and evaluation function I have already mentioned.

I think we must continue our concerns for the Community College System. After all, if it is a partnership, there has to be mutual benefit. It may interest you to know that we have just appointed a task force from the Community College System, made up of some of the directors, some of the faculty members, some of the students, and some of the members of the Advisory Boards to come to us with their recommendations about what things they think need to be done to ease off some of the problems with which they are faced. That group will meet this Wednesday for the first time and I hope some constructive suggestions and actions will come from it.

I think that you are going to have to come to some position very shortly about what you believe to be the proper student role in at least two particular areas. One is the question of student participation in this body; I understand there is a report. I do not know at what state the

Tripartite Committee Report is. But to what degree and in what way you see student participation in the Senate seems to me to be fairly fundamental. On the other hand the report on student participation in the educational units is, I think, to be before you again very soon. In that case, whatever you decide I hope you will decide that there can be some flexibility. I don't think there is any magic in creating some straight jacket so that everybody has to do this thing the same way. I think there ought to be some maneuverability in the various colleges to get at this problem of how best to have student involvement and participation. It is certainly not my role here to tell you what to do about these things but I think you are entitled to know what my own position is.

In my limited understanding of these things I think there are two clearly identifiable movements, one of which I would describe as student power which says the student will decide, and the other, student participation, which says that the student input should be heard. I happen to believe in the second one. I think that the student voice ought to be heard. I have said it before. I think it not only ought to be heard. I think it ought to be listened to. I think it ought to be given serious and open consideration and if you are in the situation where you are no longer pretending that they have nothing to say to you that is worthwhile about their education, then I think you have overcome or you have taken a step toward overcoming one of the things that they feel very deeply. I hope that you will find ways for the students to play an active role in participating in these two areas and I will leave it there.

I think there is no question, as we look to our future, that this university, and most other universities for that matter, are going to have to do a better job in the area of undergraduate education. I don't think there is any way to get around this, try as we might. I also have enough sense to know that this is something that is very easy to pay lip service to and very difficult to pull off and I wish I had some formula to give to you, particularly as it relates to the question of instruction. I think for us there are a few basic problems about undergraduate instruction. One is well nigh universal and that is the problem of evaluating what good teaching is. Everyone knows that this is a problem and nobody has found a solution. There is a great deal of difference of opinion about what good teaching is. In fact, there are plenty of examples of wide differences about what good teaching is. It isn't any one thing. It is something special and unique and it may not limit itself to quantifiable instruments. I don't know this but I do know that this has been a persistent problem and the problem hasn't gone away. I will tell you something else. This is not sufficient excuse for pretending that the students do not have something to say about the quality of teaching they are subjected to and, in my judgment, it should not be used in that way.

Along with that evaluation there is a footnote that I would have to include. I would say that whatever we do in the way of evaluation we have to avoid coming up with what is the reverse effect of the present problem, that of merely describing good teaching as that which results from the absence of research or publication. It does not necessarily follow. Part of this thinking comes from the fact that almost every academic man I have ever known, and there was a time when I certainly included myself in that category, felt that he was a far better than average teacher and this helps explain why our averages on the 4.0 system run about 3.5.

Far more difficult I think, or dangerous, is how it is that in an institution like this you do seriously attempt to do something about the problem of undergraduate instruction, do something constructive, without, in the process, either attacking or sacrificing or denigrating the other important functions of this University. And I am talking about graduate education and research. Too often I hear this argued in the context of "either/or". I think it may well be that emphases can be such as to cause an imbalance. But there is no question in my mind that this University is going to go on with a graduate program and an undergraduate program and that it is going to go on valuing research and publication and teaching. Well, it is a neat trick and I am frank to tell you that I have no way to say "This is how you do it." in a large and complex university. I am simply not yet willing to concede that it can't be done.

Lastly, in terms of things we must do, and this may sound gratuitous, I think we must do what we can to improve the current condition or relationship of the academic world in the rest of society. I have a personal feeling, that, in the larger sense, the town-gown relationship is at an all-time low and I am not just talking about Lexington and UK. I am talking about everywhere. I think that there are lots of reasons for this. Not all of them are due to faculty action or inaction. But whatever the reasons for this I think it is true, and I personally would like to see, some day in the not too distant future, the academic man once again publicly recognized and respected for those characteristics that have been embodied by many, many men and women that you know and I know -- those folk who have, I think, shown all too well what it is to be a first-rate academic man or woman, and the people who have made this profession what it is. I want to see, and I hope you do, the professor once again looked on as a man of character and intelligence, of capacity for independent thought and judgment, maturity, and stability. I want to see him recognized as the traditional seeker of wisdom, or if not that, at least the dedicated servant of a society who is seriously engaged in what is a privileged undertaking, which is the instruction of the young. I would also like to see the academic man once again recognized as the carrier of a discipline, the man with a heavy responsibility of introducing new generations to it and of training new hands through which that discipline might be transmitted to future generations, a man who keeps a very jealous eye on his discipline and attempts to prevent its corruption, whether through design or error or sheer nonsense. I want to see that image of the professor as a man who likes to teach and who enjoys his function as teacher, which, as one person described it, is to operate without the knife on the minds of others. I want to see that image of the professor as a person possessing an original, learned, disciplined mind, as one who likes to study and to write books about what he has learned, as a man who has deliberately and knowingly turned his back on the practical and pragmatic world that this society so greatly values; on the world of affairs and its obvious rewards for the more silent and more modest world of thought.

I see no reason to be pessimistic. I know that sounds pragmatic. I have known people who invited those things and I think some of you have as well. I don't think we always have to look backward to find these examples. I say to you that this is, basically, a very good faculty. In my year here, I have seen some individuals on this faculty who have been singled out for really superior teaching. I have seen some singled out for their attention to and concern with the advising of students. I have

seen members of this faculty recognized by their peers in the learned disciplines. I have seen accounts of your selection for leadership roles in the various learned societies. I have seen you receive national and international awards and assignments and invitations and all the other aspects of what make a great university faculty. So, I think we need not be pessimistic about this.

Well, time is fleeting. I think I would like to conclude my comments this afternoon with a couple of purely personal observations about topics that seem to be matters of interest, or if not interest, at least speculation.

First of these has to do with the awesome word, communications. If there is any great fault in society today it is that we do not communicate. No matter what the problem is, that is part of the cure. As a matter of fact, I think we have come to believe that a lot of the problems that really aren't the result of non-communication, really are. But that is beside the point. The fact is that whether I think it is an increasing fad or not, I do gather from various sources that there is a feeling in this faculty that communication, and in particular as it affects me and is with me, leaves a great deal to be desired; that I am personally aloof and inaccessible to you. I can only say that I am sorry about that. I will be the last to attempt to judge it. I am aware of the fact that in certain dining room circles I am referred to as "Solitary Singletary". To the degree that this charge is just, I have no recourse but to plead guilty but I would like to say this. It is probably the result of a number of things, my own personality, my own style, or, as my not so friendly friends say, lack of style. Add to that the very real demands of the job and I think you begin to get the picture. I would like to correct one thing, though, and that is the word "solitary". The one thing I don't have is much time alone so I would like for you guys to get a better name than that. I do not think that it is possible for me in the immediate future to convert a "Solitary Singletary" into an "On-the-Spot Otis" but I will try. And, that is about where I would have to leave it. I would further say that it is not a disinclination to be with you and beyond that I don't know of any more I could say.

The second point about which I hear occasional comments is that it is a matter of some interest and conjecture about my own future plans; that there are rumors that I am entertaining job offers of one kind or another. I have not yet been able to determine how much of this is concern for the stability of the institution and how much of it is wishful thinking but I would like to clarify this so that you could find something more interesting to talk about. In the last year I have had several inquiries about jobs and I have given them all exactly the same answer, as near as I can recall, and so I would like to say here, so that there need be no further doubt about this, I am not now a candidate for any other job anywhere and we can just forget that and go on to some more pleasant topics. You may not be happy with that intelligence but at least you have got it. I would go beyond that to say that, in plain fact, I came here in good faith, and for whatever it is worth I am trying as best I can to do this job and I am entertaining no other thoughts. What the future holds, no one can say. Whatever else goes with tenure, the presidency doesn't and I cannot be here most any time. But insofar as I am to have any decision in this, I would say, that given the problems of the contemporary university in this country, the probability is that if a man leaves this job he goes to another way of life. He doesn't

seek this somewhere else. But I really would like for that to be clear. My preference, for whatever it is worth to you, is to stay here and to be part of a successful era in this University's history and I would think that is one thing that we ought to agree on. It is my opinion, and I know of no better way to conclude this statement than this; I think this is a good place. I think you are good people. I think this is a good institution, and I think there is a reasonably good chance that we can make it a better one. I can't do it and these Vice Presidents can't do it but we might be able to do it -- all of us together. Thank you.

President Singletary was accorded a very warm standing ovation by the Senators and visitors present.

The Chairman announced that Dr. Singletary had agreed to respond to any questions from the floor.

Question from Dr. Berry: Mr. President, I would like to say that I am most grateful for your very friendly and candid speech. I was hopeful that somebody else would ask you a few questions as it seems that since you are here somebody ought to. I would be embarrassed, myself, not to since I said that I thought you ought to come and answer them. So if you wouldn't mind, sir, I would like to state a concern that I have which has to do with the particularity of the contact that takes place between us and the students. It seems to me that a great deal of the trouble that all universities are having is that they are growing very fast and the contact between the students and the faculty is steadily decreasing. I notice that we have one class here now of 900 students and it seems to me that something might be done to increase the amount of contact between faculty and student so long as that student's purpose, of course, is a career here. For instance, it might be feasible to provide more courses that last two semesters with the same teacher-- this sort of thing. I was wondering if any work is being done in order to alleviate this problem and make us more known to the students. This is a hard campus to talk on with more hard seats on it than I believe any institution I have been in.

Answer from President Singletary: Let me say that I would have been perfectly prepared for you to ignore me today. That kind of neglect I could have taken. I think your analysis is absolutely right. On any large campus there is nothing peculiar or unique about it. One of the things lost with size is much personal dealing with the student, although certain individual professors manage, somehow, to overcome that. The question of the large class opens up a whole new box. As much as we deplore bigness, whether it is in the classroom or the size of a university, we have got it. I do not see us returning to small classes, although that might be eminently desirable, at the time that the people of this country seem to have a commitment to educate more and more people without providing the resources to do it. I don't see us holding what we have now, although I would make one observation. One of the classes that I know about that teaches 900 gets many, many favorable comments and other classes that I know that average out at about nine, do not. Other things being equal, it is much nicer to have a small class. One of the fads nowadays is to assume it is lousy instruction if one has a large class. For a certain kind of person, a large lecture section is still a very effective way to teach. You can't run the University that way, however. I think the real trouble is that we have been forced, under financial considerations rather than educational decisions, to move in that direction. I see no surcease from

this. I have been told that Dr. Kirwan teaches a very large lecture section in his classes. It can be done. It would be much nicer to have a dozen good students though and sit with them and get to know them. One of the interesting statistics that came back through last year's little questionnaire here is that while many of the students talk to you in your offices, for example, only about 2 per cent had ever been in the home of a professor --just as though you were men from Mars. I understand that with the number of students we have it gets to be not only a matter of time and of convenience but a matter of expense if you are trying to do that. Nonetheless, there was a time in the smaller comfortable days when one could have students in his home and have a very easy and informal relationship with them. I have no answer to the question but I believe that there are many people, some within the range of my voice, who could give a great deal more than they do in the way of giving individual time and attention to the students. I don't know that that would solve the problem but I think it would certainly alleviate it.

Question from Dr. Blues: With reference to your report that a health and physical education recreation facility is on the drawing boards, I wonder if that is of higher priority than the need for more study space and library space.

Answer from President Singletary: No, it is not a higher priority than more library space. There are three very high priority items as I see them right now. As most of you know, there are enough letters circulating around and resting in dusty old files promising people facilities at this institution than I am going to honor if I live to be 50, which is year after next. The library is a very high priority, the expansion of the Medical Center is a very high priority, and what I would call a biological sciences building. But I don't want to get into this. Anybody that considers that a promise can drop dead. As we find the resources to do with, these are the areas that I see. In the case of the recreation facility it is not just a question of one being an athletics supporter. I think you would be a good deal more concerned about the recreational facility if you had to put 17,000 to 18,000 healthy and very active young people in these environs without providing some outlets for them. And this institution has not done it very well. The students, as you know, will let you know about these things. We are pretty seriously understaffed and if I could find some very wealthy donor who would like to give us a nice great big building with an olympic size swimming pool, I would be delighted to have it.

Question from Dr. Adelstein: Do you feel it would be politically feasible to consider limiting the student enrollment so that the University could deal only with the numbers of students it could effectively teach. In other words, does the administration consider that there is a model under which this institution will operate or are we to expect to continue to take X number of students.

Answer from Dr. Singletary: Mike, I think if you pick a model now, it has to be an arbitrary figure and then you adjust your program to it. It seems to me that if you are looking for the model, you lost your virtue a long time ago, in terms of the size. If you put your question another way --do we have to go on doing what we are doing now, which is to brace ourselves every year for a great guessing game about how many people are going to turn up, and then try to find some place to put them or somebody to teach

them, the answer is that we cannot go on much longer.

There are some plusses and minuses to that as you well know. From the standpoint of institutional planning, et cetera, it would be nice to say we are going to take X number of students and we are going to level off there. As a matter of fact, I think that is a possibility within the next two or three years. I think whatever else the so-called state plan that the coordinating board will come up with, it will ascribe to the University a particular function and perhaps even a particular size. The danger in that, if I have any feel for what I have seen happen elsewhere, is that when they cut off at size, they tend to think you don't need any more money from then on; that you can go on doing the same thing with nothing more than a kind of inflationary adjustment. Ten years ago the California system was the model, as you know, for the United States. It was the envy of everybody--the great master plan--and the magic figure was 27,500 for reasons not altogether clear, but I think it was because that was what Berkeley was approaching at that time. And that is where they cut it off. If you talk to those people, you will find that the minute they reached the set limit, it got to be a real hassle every year to try and get any more dollars for anything. So, in solving one set of problems we generate another, is the warning I got. However, I think that is preferable in this case. I think that almost anything is preferable to the situation that we are in now where we have had to absorb 1,600 new students without much increase in resources to provide for them.

We can still do some absorbing in this University in some places, but the problem is that where the increase takes place is where we can't absorb any more, in many cases. I would just guess that the role and scope study I mentioned a while ago might very well want to deal with limiting the size of this institution and exerting pressure downward, particularly in the undergraduate programs, on the Community College System. They would see that as the most available and least expensive way for the state to meet its obligation. I would resist wanting to do away with the undergraduate program and I hope that it doesn't become a point--to decide that we need a graduate institution. I don't want to see that happen, but I would not be opposed, I don't think, to a plan to limit and fix the size of the entering freshman class at the University provided they do not, as some ungracious friends are likely to do, come up with a plan that will cripple us the first time we try it. We have to have an insurance policy of some kind. But that is part of what is implicit in that study I mentioned.

Question from Professor Constance Wilson: Dr. Singletary, I want to speak to the "Solitary Singletary" theme. I feel that the issue of communication was not so much that the faculty felt it should overwhelm you with questions but rather that when you came on the scene doors would open to communication with you. When these channels of communication did not open the faculty felt that it had no means to communicate except directly with you.

Reply by Dr. Singletary: I did not bring up the "Solitary Singletary" theme in any petulance. I think I have some grasp of what the problem is. And, as some of you know, I have even tried to begin to do something about it. For whatever it is worth, I will tell you I have not had a dinner in my home and with my children in over two weeks and the reason is that I was at some function having to do with this University--in one way or

another--either here or in some other town. The only thing I would regret is that you think I am sitting over there enjoying myself reading a book I would like to read, or something of this sort. I can understand the frustration of that. I will add one other thing. Part of the problem of this job is that it does tend to isolate you from the people who normally would have been your circle of friends. I would like to say, on Mrs. Singletary's behalf, that she has also done yeoman service when I just could not make it. I have some hope to get to know, not just those of you here, but even some of the younger faculty. Two or three people on this campus have approached me suggesting ways in which I could profitably spend some time getting to know some of these people and I intend to do that as my schedule permits. I don't think I will ever do it in a satisfactory way, but I intend to improve.

Question from Dr. Stanford Smith: When describing the hoped for resurgence of the town-gown relationship, the discussion seemed somewhat classical. I wonder if you would care to comment on the sorts of roles and activities that we might perceivably be engaged in in 1980 that might be different from the 1960's.

Answer from President Singletary: That is a lecture I am not prepared to give, Stan. I will just have to pass that question. I understand that it is a serious question. I just don't think I can give it a serious answer. I don't pretend to know the answer to that. It may be wrong to want to see a warmer and more acceptable image of the academic man. It may be that we are not going to have that--I don't know. But to the degree that it sounds classical, I am flattered. I think there is still room for some classical men in the University.

At the close of the question-answer period President Singletary was given further ovation.

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Elbert W. Ockerman, Secretary
University Senate