

## MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, NOVEMBER 14, 1966

The University Senate met in regular session at 4:00 p.m., Monday, November 14, 1966, in the Court Room of the Law Building. Chairman Diachun presided. Members absent: Jacob H. Adler, Jack N. Baldwin, Charles E. Barnhart, Barbara Bates, John R. Batt, Wendell E. Beals, John J. Begin, Harold R. Binkley, Harry M. Bohannon, Thomas D. Brower, A. J. Brown, Lester Bryant, Dana G. Card, Cecil C. Carpenter, David B. Clark, Lewis W. Cochran, Jerome E. Cohn, Emmett R. Costich, Glenwood L. Creech, Marcia Dake, Melvin L. DeFleur, Wendell C. DeMarcus, Kurt W. Deuschle, Robert M. Drake, Jr., J. H. Drudge, James M. Edney, Ben A. Eiseman, Herman A. Ellis, Norman H. Franke, Hugh Scott Fulmer, James E. Funk, Wesley P. Garrigus, Peter Gillis, Arthur C. Glasser, J. W. Greene, Jr., Robert H. Greenlaw, Ward Griffen, Jack Hall, Ellis F. Hartford, Thomas L. Hayden, Hubert P. Henderson, A. J. Hiatt, John W. Hill, James C. Humphries, W. M. Insko, Jr., Robert D. Jacobs, Malcolm E. Jewell, Raymon D. Johnson, Johnson, Robert F. Kerley, James B. Kincheloe, Donald E. Knapp, Wasley Krogdahl, Carl F. Lamar, R. A. Lauderdale, Jr., Leslie L. Martin, Herbert F. Massey, Marcus T. McEllistrem, L. Mae McPhetridge, Alvin L. Morris, R. J. Muelling, Jr., Vernon A. Musselman, Elbert W. Ockerman\*, James R. Ogletree, John W. Oswald, Blaine F. Parker, J. W. Patterson, Doris P. Pearce, James H. Powell\*, James Prestridge, John E. Reeves, J. T. Reeves, Wimberly C. Royster, Benjamin F. Rush, Ivan Russell, George W. Schwert, ~~Don Cash Seaton~~, William A. Seay, Doris M. Seward, Roy E. Sigafus, C. Leland Smith, Wellington B. Stewart, Paul Street, Thomas B. Stroup, Lawrence Thompson\*, Lee H. Townsend, M. Stanley Wall, Daniel L. Weiss, Warren E. Wheeler, Robert L. White, William R. Willard, W. W. Winternitz, Kenneth Wright\*, Wesley O. Young, Fred Zechman.

The minutes of October 10, 1966 were approved.

The Chairman presented a request from Mr. Frank Browning, a KERNEL representative, to be permitted to sit in the meeting and report its proceedings. The Senate approved the request.

The Chairman reported that pursuant to instructions from the Senate at its October meeting, a Program Subcommittee of the Senate Council had been established and programs for the year had been planned; that the December meeting will have on the agenda a report by President Oswald of some of the University's major issues, to be followed by a question and answer session. He stated that the faculty may mail questions to the President or to any member of the Senate Council prior to the meeting in addition to questions which may be asked from the floor of the meeting.

The Chairman urged the faculty to send to the Senate Council any recommendations they might have of qualified candidates to fill terms which are expiring on the following standing Senate Committees: Advisory Committee on Community Colleges, Advisory Committee on University Extension, Honors Program Committee, Library Committee, and Rules Committee.

Mr. Carson Porter, President of Student Government, was recognized. He stated that he, together with Mr. Howard Shanker, editor of the proposed teacher-class evaluation program questionnaire, wished to report the intention of Student Government concerning this program. Following the report Mr. Shanker recommended that the University Senate go on record as endorsing the program and accepting the recommendation that Student Government be permitted to take fifteen minutes of class time on one specified day in order to distribute the questionnaires to the students and let them mark them. The Senate approved endorsement of the program and the allocation of class time as requested.

\*Absence explained

Professor Oberst, chairman of the program for the meeting, opened the program with some brief remarks. He stated that Campus Planning Week, which the Advisory Committee on Campus Planning had gone to considerable effort to bring to the faculty, the students, and the staff, had been very disappointing from the standpoint of attendance by the faculty. He stated that the Committee had been trying to inform itself for a year or more on various aspects of campus planning, that it had had a long evening session with the City-County Planning Commission and the Urban Renewal Commission to discuss planning problems of the University in the light of planning problems of the city and of urban renewal; and that they had had a very useful meeting which was attended in spectacular fashion by those groups.

Professor Oberst said that the Program Committee of the Senate Council had turned to the academic plan, Beginning a Second Century, in attempting to raise some issues or problems of planning which might be of interest to the Senate; that the Committee had taken two of the recommendations, encompassing academic and physical planning, numbers 13, addressed to the University Senate, and 16, addressed to the Administration; that the two members of the faculty most identified with these proposals would speak on their observations and two members of the Advisory Committee on Planning would speak to the Advisory Committee's observations. Professors Amyx and Axton addressed themselves to the program from the standpoint of Campus Planning and Professor Schwartz and Cone addressed themselves to the proposed South Campus. Their remarks follow in that order.

Professor Amyx:

The President's Committee "To Improve the Academic Environment of the Faculty" was concerned with the whole broad spectrum of faculty environment and welfare. We foresaw a real impact on the academic welfare of the faculty in the manner in which the Campus plan was maturing. There are three paragraphs in our report to the President which may now be considered "old history", since we considered the Campus plan very soon after its announcement and in the light of its first impact on the faculty. There were some negative comments which we felt compelled to report, though these may have been based essentially on misinformation, from the kind of "block plan" which appeared in the color model in the Courier Journal. We did expect that there would be a radical change in the campus with a move toward the "density" concept of the campus, and there was some concern about the effect of the proposed office-tower classroom structures. We suspected that this promised a sacrifice of older, more or less informal, or "peripatetic" kind of instruction, and we suspected that some faculty members would regret the loss of intimate student-faculty relationship which might be involved in smaller college structures.

There was no one on our committee, and there was an architect on our committee, who felt that there should be any rejection of the present campus plan, nor did the committee feel impelled or competent to suggest specific modifications in the plan. We wanted to suggest that both planners and faculty pay the closest possible attention to instructional and academic needs in the various areas as early as possible, and we suggest that a system be set up--a very close consultation on faculty preferences--directly at the level of the faculty involved.

Minutes of the University Senate, November 14, 1966 (con't)

As far as I can see that seems to be happening. The appointment of the Committee under the Chairmanship of Dr. Langlois, for example, to make broadly-based recommendations on the new General Library. This is early consultation. The planning of the new Fine Arts Building has gone ahead at what I would call a normal pace against the contingencies of, let's say, the removal of the stadium. We felt that it ought to be the goal of the assigned architect, in every case, to escape a kind of banal institutionalized architecture, and the only way one can do this is to consult with individual faculty members, not only at the initial stages of planning, but throughout the stages of planning. I want to make this as sharp as possible by adding to our report just one paragraph which I think will make an emphatic note.

The formation of committee such as the new one for the General Library, I think will be helpful. And it will be very helpful, in turn, after having decided on the functions, and the goals, and the quality, and the space needs (and the student and faculty comforts and relationships) in very abstract terms, the faculty and the students could see, in a very concrete way, what the architect proposed to do with the building. As most artists and architects know, there is no very great power of visualizing how buildings will look and will work, even among professionally-oriented people in a given field. I would hope, for example, that every member of our own Art Department might be able to see and make comments on drawings or models for the new Fine Arts Building before the building is actually detailed. No doubt this puts a considerable burden on the architect. But I believe that this kind of continuous collaboration is valuable, and that only in this way does a faculty member have a chance to see the way in which he proposes that his work be done. What I'm asking is that the faculty member here be regarded as, in some sense, a client of the architect.

I regret, Professor Oberst, that I'm not speaking precisely to Section 16 here. The implications for Section 16 occur in another part of our report, and only obliquely, where we asked for planning which would make it possible, especially at the junior and senior level, for increased contact, at what I call a kind of "apprentice work" stage, between students and faculty. That kind of thing is possible only in the context of what I've been talking about here-- a fairly close collaboration, prior to detailing, between the planning architect and the faculty member who has the concrete knowledge about how the situation can and shall work.

Professor Axton:

I suppose you might say that what I am chiefly interested in is something that comes under the general heading of amenities, which I regard as essentials; that is, we can build and provide for the space needs but if we do not also provide for the spiritual needs and the quality of life to be led in a given state, we have not done our job.

This has been one of our chief topics on the President's Advisory Committee on Building and Campus Development. We were involved last spring in a week-end-long conference with the planners and other staff and faculty people on precisely this, as well as other topics. We had, I think, a very lively interchange of views at that time. I have been grouching about the question of what kind of implications for faculty-student relationships are going to occur when an 18-story office tower is erected that is separate from a 3,500 student-station classroom building. Within the office tower I still have some reservations about the concept that went into its initial planning. I still have the feeling that it is more convenient for those people who are going to be administering the structure than it is for those who are going to have their offices in it.

Our principal interest, overall, however, lies in the fact that, as an advisory committee to the President, we are charged with representing the faculty's opinion and thought on this and other matters, and we are very deeply concerned to see that we get from all of you the kind of critique and commentary that we need in order to fulfill our representative functions. We tried with Planning Week to stimulate faculty, staff, and student participation in what is called the planning process, that is to say, to get your views and responses before us for our consideration. In part, this is really an educative process. A plan, really, is not a three-dimensional model, and we had hoped that Planning Week, which went on between October 3 and October 10, would have been more widely attended than it was. I think perhaps a good many people got around to the exhibit but distressingly few got to our open meetings. I was hoping there that we might actually talk with some of you. Many comments by people indicate that a great many don't understand what a master plan is and what it is not. This is a very widely-held misapprehension. When any information about the Office-Tower Classroom complex is considered newsworthy enough to run a picture, our campus newspaper, the Lexington newspapers, and the Courier in Louisville, want the picture that is the little cardboard-scale model which is about 2½ inches high and which really has nothing whatever to do with what the actual building is going to look like. The idea, I suppose, is, that a three-dimensional model of a campus plan really tells what the campus is going to look like ten or fifteen years hence. This is not the case at all. It is merely a model of the volume requirement, with some idea of the relationships between volumes and spaces, and volumes and volumes. So we have a real educative process and as we said during Planning Week and I hope, will say repeatedly, we on the Committee stand ready to meet with any faculty groups, organizations, or groupings, to pursue this matter further.

The second thing we are trying to do in this line--we are considering anyway--is the development of a very brief brochure, possibly with a tear-out response page to it, which will outline the subjects of discussion that rolled out of Planning Week, and inform you about them.

We feel a very important function can be performed simply by letting you know that we are in existence and that we look forward to and encourage your response to be funneled in our direction. The tear-out response page in the brochure, we hope, will be used by those of you who are interested in learning more about the campus development plan; that you will respond to it and send it in to us so that we can contact you and get together with you or your group. We think this is essential, and we plan to use all of our facilities to meet with you during the next several months as long and as deeply as you feel necessary, in order, first to understand what the plan is and is not, and secondly, on the basis of that understanding, to get your assessment and evaluation of it. We are also carrying on this informational function in the Alumni Bulletin in the next issue, there will be one article on the campus plan from our Committee and other article, from Bob Kerley's point of view.

In addition to this, we have been discussing, from the point of view of amenities, and more particularly from the point of view of the relationships and potential possibilities for contacts between and among faculty and staff and students, some questions about the present concept of the essential campus. Principally, I think our point of view is that the central campus ought to be a hub of University community life; that perhaps there ought to be grouped more densely than the present master plan appears to call for, some of those functions which will bring people to the hub of the campus in the normal course of their lives. Perhaps the Student Center, the Faculty Club, the major auditorium, possibly even a block of retail shops or retail facilities, might eventually be located there. This is the kind of thing that we feel needs to belong in the core or the hub of the campus, and that utmost attention be paid to providing for the whole spectrum of spatial provisions that will minister to the different kinds of relationships that exist between and among faculty, staff, and students. This might get down to the relatively simple matter of providing little places where faculty and staff could stop in for a cup of coffee or a sandwich and where there would be a table where they could sit down and talk.

I do not know what effect our Committee's existence has had on the next matter, but the new contract with the Detroit planning consultant firm of Crane and Gorwic places a very great emphasis upon the development of a non-academic program analysis and particularly on the residential, the social, the cultural, and the recreational programs--something that we feel particularly strong about because it is in these areas that the matter of amenities lies most clearly and directly. We have not yet had a chance really to have our voice heard early enough in the planning process to have any impact upon the design of the residential structures. I have a good many reservations about some aspects of the new dormitory complex that is going up behind the Medical Center, though certain other of my pet ideas seem to be incorporated in it.

In particular, I am distressed that there is not a more adequate provision for study spaces on each floor there. There are two lounges and I like the idea of breaking down each floor into two more or less self-contained units comprising about two dozen students with their own facilities. But I do believe that if we are in quest of excellence one of the ways of doing it is to provide for study spaces.

In order for our committee to represent the faculty point of view in the planning process we need to speak with them more at length and more fully in the coming year in order to know what people really need and want. Without this kind of dialogue between our committee and the faculty we are not qualified to say what the amenities are. I am not at all sure that what I would think were amenities for students would be what students would think were amenities. These are matters that we need to talk about with people and we hope that this will be simply one more step in discovering what that quality of life is that you want your buildings to serve. Thank you.

Professor Schwartz:

The main concern of the South Campus Committee was to consider, in part, the question: "What physical structure would provide the best environment to educate the lower division student?" I would first like to summarize the report, and then give my evaluation of it as seen from this perspective.

This report recognizes the dual responsibility of the University to foster the growth of individual departments, which can encourage graduate education and research, and, at the same time, develop the best possible organization for lower division education. Under the present structure our lower division program may well suffer as the University continues to grow. While the big university commands the resources, both financial and personal, to support a strong graduate and research enterprise, this same bigness hinders the education of the lower division student. He is too frequently caught in an impersonal, specialized environment at a time when he needs meaningful personal relationships centering around broadening intellectual concerns.

The solution to the dilemma presented in the committee report was a modified residential college plan. During the first two years of his university experience the student would reside and develop intellectually in a small college environment. Here he would have significant contact with students with similar academic concerns and problems, and in a situation more responsive to his particular needs. He would become a meaningful part of an identifiable academic entity.

The University is committed to the development of strong departments fostering a vigorous graduate and research program. But it is also expecting and planning for an enrollment of 9000 lower division students by 1975.

While the fostering of a strong graduate program demands large size, disciplinary specialization, the effective education of lower division students requires an almost opposite structure and campus atmosphere.

Strong undergraduate programs must make provision for at least 4 elements:

1. An academic community of identifiable character
2. An atmosphere promoting individual identity
3. An academic orientation through facilitation of student-faculty contact focused on broad intellectual interests
4. And a transition from the paternalistic and non-academic high school atmosphere to the independence and academic orientation of higher education.

The South Campus report suggested a combination of the worthwhile elements of the residential college pattern with the strengths of the large university structure. Although details are to be worked out on entering the University, the student would enroll in one of the several undergraduate residential colleges, each composed of about 1500 students. He would be assigned a room in a residence unit of 250 students, sharing with them certain common facilities including a distinct library-lounge area and a common service and academic building. The total complex would constitute the student's college. The 1500 students would be taught at the college by about 20 full time and 10 part time faculty, plus graduate students mainly for Freshman English and language sections. Up to 80% of his freshman class work and as much as 50% of his sophomore work would be in resident college instruction. Therefore, by the end of the student's lower division years he would have had an opportunity to become thoroughly adjusted to the larger University while still remaining somewhat apart from the main campus population.

The total University then, would be divided into two adjacent parts. The central area would house the professional schools and the disciplines, with their faculties, upper division and graduate students, necessary laboratories, specialized equipment and research libraries. Immediately adjacent would be a series of residential colleges serving mainly the freshman and sophomore student population.

#### ADVANTAGES

The work of the lower-division residential college would be designed to promote those elements which should constitute the best type of educational experience for lower division students. Some of the advantages of this kind of program are:

1. allowing for bigness where size means strength in faculty and specialization and smallness, where desirable, where it is important for lower-division student growth.
2. provide the new student with a sense of identity with his own college, so that he is not overwhelmed by non-academic distractions and problems, and thereby better prepare him for the intellectual demands of the larger university.
3. eliminate the impersonal, hotel-like atmosphere which generally characterizes the conventional dormitory.

4. provide a close integration between the academic and residential aspects of the college in order that the intellectual discourse generated in the classroom and library may be extended beyond them.
5. provide physical facilities more conducive to student-faculty contact outside the classroom.
6. provide a kind of academic community which would attract and retain more top quality students.

#### PROBLEM CONSIDERATIONS

In a relatively lesser category there is (1) the problem of transportation. Movement back and forth might create some congestion, would cost a considerable sum over a school year, and more seriously, could consume time. The time spent in transportation might be a more serious factor for staff than for students. This is one reason for the committee recommendation that the hard core of the faculty would be attached, at least by semester of year, to the South Campus facility.

(2) The central problem, crucial to the success of such a plan relates to the University's commitment to the support of the scholar as a teacher as well as a researcher. The duties of a teacher-scholar in a lower division program of this kind would inevitably command such a percentage of a faculty member's time that this opportunity for research productivity would be reduced. Unless the University is prepared to indicate by salary, promotion, travel funds, etc., that it fully values the dedicated performance of the teacher, the faculty cannot but look upon service on the South Campus as a personal and professional sacrifice. If a South Campus faculty became second class citizens in the academic community, isolated from the main campus professionally and intellectually the total concept would fail. Unless the University is prepared to make a commitment to teaching without reservation it will merely be transporting the existing problem to another area.

#### FACULTY

The present practice of reward through promotion and merit increase with regard to teaching falls short of what would be needed for the development of a truly outstanding faculty in a residential college. The teacher-scholar, as opposed to the scholar-teacher, has simply not been fully accepted by the basic disciplines. Although in the professional areas through the special-title series there is recognition of non-research positions. There is no recognized place for the dedicated high quality teacher. This is not to imply that the University will want to concentrate its resources on the full time teachers who has no talent or inclination toward scholarly productivity. Rather it suggests that, if we are to serve adequately the 9000 lower division students we expect by 1975 we must realize the need on the campus for a cadre to respected teacher-scholars.



These faculty, active participants in their departments, would see as their main objective the education of the lower division student. They would stay abreast of their fields through reading, attendance at national and regional meetings and summer research. However, their main concern would be the student. They would also have to view informal out-of-class student-contact as essential to student growth and schedule their time accordingly.

During the tenure of a student at the University he would ideally be intimately associated with two types of professors. Initially he would spend much of his time with the teacher-scholar who would be interested mainly in the student's broad intellectual development. Then following the lower division years the student would, in addition, be exposed in depth to his chosen discipline through association with an active research scholar in that area. We have reached a point where the somewhat distinct needs of these two levels of a student's intellectual maturation must be recognized and techniques developed to evaluate and reward effective activity in both.

The role of Administration in this system is two-fold. First it must determine the best procedures for evaluating and rewarding faculty activity. Second, it must maintain the balance in numbers of faculty types essential to serve both the lower division-education and graduate-research obligations, while building a strong University. Only when this is accomplished will our lower division program be a distinguished one.

#### SUMMARY

While the residential college idea is old, the new elements of the pattern proposed here concern the attempt to reconcile it with, and build upon, the graduate and more specialized segments of a larger university. Hopefully this pattern will provide a breakthrough for lower division education badly needed in a specialist-oriented and depersonalized multiversity.

#### EVALUATION

Looking back over this report with the perspective of the year and a half since it was written I feel that whether or not we build a South Campus residential college is not the main issue. There are two more basic issues that involve the total lower division education process. (1) The first revolves around the question, are there influences within the University environment on a student's intellectual development that can substantially reinforce the values of the classroom, or negate them? Research on this question suggests that there definitely are. It is the student's peer group to whom he looks for support and from whom he receives his basic values. The peer group is equally as important as the professor at least in the early years of college life. When these strong influences can be mobilized to support academic and intellectual concerns and values, then the University will have made a major step in the direction of a more effective lower-division program. There are ways to do this with our present physical plan.

Whether this can be accomplished as effectively as it can in a residential college environment remains to be tested, but if they can, then there is much less reason for a South Campus. I see no indication that in our existing dorms or our new hotel dorms we have even thought about this.

(2) Given the fact that we will have the responsibility for providing a quality education for 9000 lower-division students as well as our upper-division and graduate students we must at some point realize the profound importance of teaching excellence and out-of-class student-teacher contact. We must not only realize it, but must reward it not just in an off-hand way - but in the same way we reward excellence in other areas that we as a University value. When we begin to do this and when it begins to have an effect on the strengthening of the teachers' performance with regard to lower-division students then, again, it may not be necessary to resort to an organizational and administrative structure that is specifically planned with teaching as a goal.

My personal view is that both of these things might be accomplished with our present structure but they will not. These are not new ideas, we have all been aware of them from the first day we were teachers. We have talked about them in groups, in committees and written about them in reports year after year. Nevertheless, we don't as a group act on them and I include both the faculty and administration in this.

I think it will take something as radical and revolutionary as a South Campus to accomplish these simple ideas.

I feel we will have to start fresh with an organization that is not burdened by dusty academic tradition to accomplish these changes and furthermore, the more our collectively conservative hands are involved, the less likely we are to succeed.

Professor Cone:

I do not intend to reply to the last two points that Professor Schwartz made because, important as they are, they are not properly the concern of the Planning and Development Committee it seems to me, and I am supposed to represent the views of that committee. The Planning and Development Committee is not an academic policy committee. Academic policy is made elsewhere and I would like to remind you of that when speaking of the South Campus. But the decision, whether or not there will be a South Campus residential college system, will have to be made elsewhere and then the Planning and Development Committee can have a role to play.

There are two or three facts that I think we might keep in mind, assuming that the South Campus idea is going to be under serious consideration. In the first place there are 400 acres of land available south of Cooper Drive. Tremendous pressures exist for the use of that land.

Minutes of the University Senate, November 14, 1966 (con't)

You can well imagine people in Lexington and in other parts of Kentucky drooling as they drive past those 400 acres and hoping that they can put up for this purpose or that purpose. But if it is decided that there shall be a South Campus, along the lines that Professor Schwartz talked about, that would seem to be the place where it is located, and therefore, it will be necessary to resist those pressures to gobble up that land. I think the Administration is very much alert to that problem and is trying to protect that land. But it would seem to suggest that the University move fairly quickly in appointing the proper authorities to consider the South Campus residential plan and reach some decision about it. If it is decided to go forward with it, and if it then is possible to spell out what the purposes of such a campus are to be and what the program of it will be, then it seems to me that the Planning and Development Committee will have its proper role to play, and perhaps the finest opportunity that has ever existed on this campus for the coordination of academic and physical planning. We really have not had such a fine opportunity previously, I think. The present campus plan had to take account of certain commitments and decisions that had been made many years ago--the location of the library where it now is, Fine Arts where it now is, Funkhouser where it now is. With this reality it seems to me that the campus planners somewhat accepted those and developed and amplified and built around them. But this is the tabula rasa. It can be written upon.

So there is opportunity, the best, I think, we have ever had, for coordinated academic and physical planning. And that, I think, is the hope of the Committee--that it can play its proper role if the decision is made to develop the South Campus residential system.

Following questions from the floor directed to the participants in the program and to Dean Graves, the Chairman thanked them for an interesting, informative, and provocative discussion.

The Chairman reported the final results of the election to the Senate Council as follows: John T. Reeves, Robert W. Rudd, George W. Schwert elected to serve three-year terms expiring in 1969 and Morris B. Cierley elected to complete the unexpired term of Loren Carlson, resigned, whose term expires December, 1967.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Kathryne W. Shelburne  
Acting Secretary