

The Chairman announced that the next meeting of the Senate will be a special meeting to be held on January 26, 1970 and that an item on the agenda will be the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Appropriate Balance Among Teaching, Research and Service Functions in the University.

The Senate adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, FEBRUARY 9, 1970

The University Senate met in regular session at 4:00 p.m., Monday, February 9, 1970, in the Court Room of the Law Building. Chairman Plucknett presided. Members absent:

Robert Aug*, Harry V. Barnard, Richard C. Birkebak, Ben W. Black*, Barry J. Bloomfield, Thomas O. Blues*, Wallace N. Briggs*, Donald B. Coleman*, Robert L. Cosgriff*, Alfred L. Crabb, Jr., Eugene C. Crawford, Jr.*, William H. Dennen*, Henry F. Dobyms, Ronald W. Dunbar*, W. W. Ecton*, Joseph Engelberg, Frank J. Essene, Frederic J. Fleron, Joseph B. Fugate*, Jess L. Gardner*, James L. Gibson, Stephen M. Gittleson*, B. R. Gossick, Halbert E. Gulley*, Holman Hamilton*, Denny O. Harris, Dorothy Hollingsworth*, J. W. Hollingsworth*, Alfred S. L. Hu, William H. Jansen*, Louis J. Karmel, Donald E. Knapp*, James A. Knoblett*, Carl E. Langenhop*, Richard S. Levine*, Albert S. Levy*, John H. Lienhard*, Mark M. Luckens*, Gene L. Mason, Leonard McDowell*, William G. Moody*, Jacqueline A. Noonan*, Louis A. Norton*, Blaine F. Parker*, Albert W. Patrick*, Doyle E. Peaslee, Robert W. Penman, Curtis Phipps*, Nicholas J. Pisacano*, Muriel A. Poulin*, Leonard A. Ravitz*, John W. Roddick*, John W. Schaefer*, Ian Shine*, Robert Straus*, William G. Survant*, Norman L. Taylor, Timothy H. Taylor*, Duane N. Tweeddale, H. Fred Vetter*, Jesse L. Weil*, David R. Wekstein*, David C. White, Daniel W. Wingard, Donald J. Wood*, Lawrence A. Allen, Charles E. Barnhart, Glenwood L. Creech, George W. Denmark*, Stuart Forth, Charles P. Graves, Jack B. Hall, Joseph Hamburg, Ellis F. Hartford, Raymon D. Johnson*, William S. Jordan, Jr.*, Joseph L. Massie*, Alvin L. Morris, John C. Robertson*, George J. Ruschell, Sheryl G. Snyder, Joseph V. Swintosky*, William R. Willard*.

The Senate approved the requests of Mr. George Jepson of the Kernel to attend and report, and of Mr. Leo Juarez, graduate student, in his role as an aide to the ad hoc Committee on Appropriate Balance Among Teaching, Research and Service.

The minutes of the regular meeting of January 12, 1970 were approved as circulated.

In the absence of Dr. Cochran, Dr. Herbert P. Riley presented a recommendation that honorary degrees be conferred on seven persons (three having been recommended and approved by the Senate and Board of Trustees in prior years, but for one reason or another were unable to receive the award) at the May 1970 Commencement. The Senate approved the four new persons for the Doctor of Laws as presented for recommendation to the President and

*Absence explained

the Board of Trustees with the request to the press that the names be withheld until the Board has taken action and the nominees have accepted.

On behalf of the Senate Council and with its recommendation, Dr. Ford, Secretary of the Council, recommended the adoption of the proposed changes in the Proposed Revision of the Governing Regulations - Copy Number IV (approved by the University Senate at its reconvened meeting of May 6, 1969 and transmitted to the Joint Faculty-Board Committee on Governing Regulations). The proposed changes in the approved Proposed Revision were circulated to the faculty under date of January 23, 1970. In general, these proposed changes deal with termination of appointments of faculty, procedures to be followed in cases of dismissal of faculty, academic freedom of non-tenured faculty, and termination of appointment of graduate and teaching assistants.

Following discussion, an amendment was introduced to change the first sentence under replaced section 4, page 60, to read:

Part-time, visiting or temporary short-term appointments with explicit terminal dates of one academic year or less, terminate at the expiration of the term without notice.

The Senate approved this amendment.

A further amendment was presented to add the following additional sentence to the end of replaced section 4, page 60, to read:

. . .The written notice of termination of appointment for non-tenured personnel will include a reasonable statement of the reasons for non-reappointment.

The Senate defeated this amendment.

The Senate then approved the original recommendation, as amended, for transmittal to the Joint Faculty Board Committee on Governing Regulations for incorporation in the Proposed Revision of Governing Regulations. The proposed changes, as amended and approved by the Senate, are as follows:

Page 59, B. 2:

Insert after first sentence:

Except as provided in section X, C. 7, time spent on leave of absence shall count as probationary period service unless the University in granting the leave and the individual in accepting it, agree to the contrary.

Page 60:

Replace section 4 as follows:

4. Notification of Termination: Non-Tenure Appointments

Part-time, visiting or temporary short-term appointments with explicit terminal dates of one academic year or less, terminate at the expiration of the term without notice. For those employed

year-to-year on a fiscal or academic year basis, notification of termination of employment at the end of the first year of service shall be given not later than March 1 if the appointment expires at the end of that year or three months in advance if the one-year appointment terminates during the academic year. Notification of termination of appointment at the end of the second year of service shall be given no later than December 15 if the appointment expires at the end of that year or six months in advance if the appointment expires during the year. Notification of termination of appointment after more than two years of service shall be given at least 12 months before expiration of the appointment. Notice of termination of appointment of those on post-retirement appointment shall be no less than six months.

Page 61:

Replace section 5 as follows:

5. Termination of Appointment

a. Reasons for Termination

Except in cases of financial emergency, the termination of a tenure appointment or the dismissal of a person prior to the expiration of a non-tenure appointment shall, in accordance with KRS 164.230, be only for reasons of "incompetency, neglect of or refusal to perform his duty, or for immoral conduct."

In the instance of termination because of a financial emergency the faculty member may have the issues reviewed by the University Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure with the right of appeal to the President and Board of Trustees. The faculty member shall be given notice as soon as possible and never less than 12 months' notice. The released faculty member's place shall not be filled by a replacement within a period of two years, unless the released faculty member has been offered re-appointment and a reasonable time within which to accept or decline it.

b. Procedure

Dismissal of a faculty member with continuous tenure or of a non-tenured member before the end of his specified term of appointment shall be preceded by discussions between the faculty member and an appropriate administrative officer or officers looking toward a mutual settlement. In the event of failure to arrive at an agreed upon settlement the President shall be responsible for the preparation of a reasonably particularized statement of charges which shall be furnished to the faculty member and the University Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure. The committee shall make an informal investigation for the purpose of attempting to effect an adjustment and, in the case of failure, to recommend to the President whether, in its opinion, dismissal proceedings should be undertaken. Its opinion shall not be binding upon the President.

If the President initiates dismissal proceedings, the individual concerned shall have the right to be heard initially by a University Senate ad hoc Hearing Committee (Privilege and Tenure).

The faculty member shall be informed in writing by the President of the specific charges against him at least twenty days prior to the hearing. At least seven days prior to the hearing, the faculty member must answer the charges in writing. The faculty member may waive the hearing. If he waives the hearing, but denies the charges against him or asserts that the charges do not support a finding of adequate cause, the hearing tribunal shall evaluate all available evidence and rest its recommendation upon the evidence in the record.

The committee, in consultation with the President and the faculty member, will exercise its judgment as to whether the hearing should be public or private. During the proceedings the faculty member will be permitted to have an academic advisor and counsel of his choice. At the request of either party or the hearing committee, a representative of a responsible educational association shall be permitted to attend the proceedings as an observer. A full stenographic record of the hearing or hearings will be taken and made available to the parties concerned. The burden of proof that adequate cause exists rests with the institution, and shall be satisfied only by clear and convincing evidence in the record considered as a whole. If the faculty member's competence is in question, the testimony should include that of qualified faculty members from this and/or other institutions of higher education.

Upon the conclusion of the hearing, the committee shall report to the President that adequate cause for dismissal has or has not been established, by the evidence in the record. It may, in addition, recommend that, although adequate cause for dismissal has been established, an academic penalty less than dismissal would be more appropriate, giving supporting reasons for the recommendation. If the President rejects the report, he will state his reasons in writing to the committee and to the faculty member, and provide an opportunity for response before transmitting the case to the Board of Trustees.

A decision adverse to the faculty member may be made only after an opportunity for an additional hearing before the Board of Trustees as required by KRS 164.230. The Board will either sustain the recommendations of the committee and the President or return the proceedings to the President and the committee with specific objections. The committee will then reconsider, taking into account the stated objections and receiving new evidence if necessary. The Board of Trustees will make the final decision after a study of the committee's reconsideration.

c. Suspensions

Until the final decision upon termination of an appointment has been reached, the faculty member will be suspended, or assigned to other duties in lieu of suspension, only if immediate harm to himself or others is threatened by his continuance. Before suspending a faculty member, pending an ultimate determination of his status through the hearing machinery, the President will consult with the University Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure. Salary will continue during the period of suspension.

Pages 61-63:

Replace section 6 as follows:6. Academic Freedom of Nontenured Faculty

If a faculty member on a non-tenure appointment or a member on post-retirement appointment alleges that a decision not to reappoint him was caused by considerations violative of academic freedom, or that he was given less advance notice than that specified in these regulations, his allegations shall be given preliminary consideration by the University Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure, which will seek to settle the matter by informal methods. His statement shall be accompanied by a statement that he agrees to the presentation, for the consideration of the Senate committees, of such reasons and evidence as the University may allege in support of its decision. If the difficulty is unresolved at this stage, and if the committee so recommends, the procedures set forth in 5 (b) shall be applied, except that the faculty member making the complaint is responsible for stating the grounds upon which he bases his allegations, and the burden of proof shall rest upon him. If he succeeds in establishing a prima facie case, it is incumbent upon those who made the decision not to reappoint him to come forward with evidence in support of their decision.

Page 63:

Replace section 8 as follows:8. Administrative Personnel

Administrative personnel who hold academic rank are subject to the foregoing regulations in their capacity as faculty members. Where an administrator alleges that a consideration violative of academic freedom significantly contributed to a decision to terminate his appointment to his administrative post, or not to reappoint him, he shall be entitled to the same procedures as nontenured faculty who have alleged violation of academic freedom.

Page 63:

Replace section 10 as follows:10. Graduate Student Academic Staff

In no case shall an appointment of a graduate or teaching assistant be terminated before the end of the period of appointment without the individual being provided with the opportunity to be heard before the University Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

Likewise a graduate or teaching assistant who has established a prima facie case to the satisfaction of the committee that a consideration violative of academic freedom significantly contributed to the non-reappointment shall be given a statement of reasons by those responsible for the non-reappointment and an opportunity to be heard by the committee.

Add the following section:

11. In no case shall a member of the academic staff who is not otherwise protected by the preceding regulations which relate to dismissal proceedings be dismissed (termination before the end of a period of appointment) without having been provided with a statement of reasons and an opportunity to be heard before the University Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

Likewise a member of such an academic staff who establishes a prima facie case to the satisfaction of the University Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure that a consideration violative of academic freedom significantly contributed to his non-reappointment shall be given a statement of reasons by those responsible for the non-reappointment and an opportunity to be heard by the committee.

Add the following section 12: (This is section 10 now existing on Page 64)

12. Change of Assignment

When it is to the best interests of the institution, and if the professional status of an individual is not seriously jeopardized thereby, a change in the duties assigned to an individual may be made without such a change of assignment being regarded as a violation of his tenure rights.

Page 73:

Change last line to read:

Current reading:

The leave shall not affect unfavorably the tenure status of a faculty member except that the time spent on such leave from academic duties does not count as probationary service.

Change to:

".....duties will not count as probationary service unless otherwise agreed to."

On behalf of the Senate Council and with its recommendation Dr. Ford recommended the adoption of the proposed change in the Rules of the University Senate (Revised and Updated July, 1969). The proposed change had been circulated to the faculty under date of January 23, 1970. These changes involve expanding the role of the Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure to cover hearings on cases of dismissal and also establishes a Senate Hearing Panel to deal with cases of dismissal.

The Senate approved the recommendation as presented for transmittal to the Rules Committee for incorporation into the Rules. These changes as approved for inclusion in the Rules, read as follows:

10. The University Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure is charged with giving preliminary consideration to the following matters as referred to it by the President, the University Senate, or individual staff members of the University: cases of appointment termination for cause of a faculty member who has tenure; cases of dismissal of a faculty member during a limited appointment; cases of nonrenewal of a probationary appointment with less advance notice than specified by the Governing Regulations; cases of allegation by a faculty member on a non-tenure appointment that a decision for non-reappointment violates his academic freedom as a faculty member; cases of allegation by a University administrator that a decision to terminate his appointment to his administrative post, or not to reappoint him, violates his academic freedom; cases of termination of a tenure appointment, or the dismissal of a person prior to expiration of a non-tenure appointment, because of a financial emergency; and all similar cases. The function of the committee in all such cases is to attempt to effect an adjustment and, in cases of failure, to recommend to the President action to be taken.

The committee may, upon request, advise individual staff members on the interpretation of University privilege and tenure regulations, with copies of the interpretations being sent to the University Senate Council, the Chairman of the Department, the Dean, and the President.

The committee also may consider allegations of a faculty member who believes that his privilege as a scholar has been abridged or abused. The faculty member should address a statement to the chairman of the committee setting forth in detail the reasons why he believes his privilege has been abused. The committee will review the statement and determine whether conditions warrant further investigation. Upon investigation the committee will make recommendations to the faculty member and file a copy with the President. Recommendations may be made also to the President with a copy sent to the faculty member.

The committee is also charged with making a continuing study of privilege and tenure regulations, making recommendations to the University Senate.

University Senate Hearing Panel (Privilege and Tenure)

A University Senate Hearing Panel of fifteen members shall be appointed for staggered three year terms by the President from a list of nominees recommended by the Senate Council. From this panel an ad hoc Hearing Committee shall be chosen to hear a case arising from dismissal of a faculty member with continuous tenure or of a non-tenured member before the end of his specified term of appointment, or of one arising from allegation of the violation of the academic freedom of a nontenured faculty member or of an administrator. This committee shall consist of 5 members chosen by lot from that panel. A member shall remove himself from a case, either at the request of a party or on his own initiative if he deems himself disqualified for bias or interest. Each party shall

have a maximum of 2 challenges without stated cause. If the panel should be exhausted before an acceptable committee has been obtained, 5 supplementary members shall be appointed to the panel by the same procedure from which members of the committee may be selected. The committee shall select its own chairman.

The committee will conduct the hearing and report its findings as described in the Governing Regulations, Section X, B, 5, b. In addition the committee will adhere to the following procedures:

1. The faculty member will be afforded an opportunity to obtain necessary witnesses and documentary or other evidence, and the administration will, in so far as it is possible for it to do so, secure the cooperation of such witnesses and make available necessary documents and other evidence within its control.

2. The faculty member and the administration will have the right to confront and cross-examine all witnesses. Where the witness cannot or will not appear, but the committee determines that the interests of justice require admission of his statement, the committee will identify the witness, disclose his statement and if possible provide for interrogatories.

3. The hearing committee will not be bound by strict rules of legal evidence, and may admit any evidence which is of probative value in determining the issues involved. Every possible effort will be made to obtain the most reliable evidence available.

4. The hearing committee will grant adjournments to enable either party to investigate evidence as to which a valid claim of surprise is made.

5. The findings of fact and the decision will be based solely on the hearing record.

6. Except for such simple announcements as may be required, covering the time of the hearing and similar matters, public statements and publicity about the case by either the faculty member or administrative officers will be avoided so far as possible until the proceedings have been completed, including consideration by the Board of Trustees.

On behalf of the Senate Council, Dr. Ford recommended that the Senate accept the Report of the ad hoc Committee on Appropriate Balance Among the Teaching, Research and Service Functions in the University, and that it be transmitted to the President of the University upon acceptance by the Senate. The Report had been circulated to the faculty by the Senate Council under date of January 28, 1970.

Amendment was introduced to place a period after the word "assignments" in line 3, arabic 5) on page 20 of the Report, and strike the remainder of that paragraph. The Senate approved this amendment.

The Chairman then interrupted the discussion of the Report to permit President Singletary, who had entered the meeting, to address the Senators. The Chairman recommended that the Senate meet on February 16, 1970 at 4:00 p.m. to continue its discussion of the Report, and the Senate approved this recommendation.

Following is the text of President Singletary's presentation.

At the time I asked to have a few minutes with you this afternoon I did not know that a meeting of the Council on Public Higher Education was being scheduled in Louisville, from which we have just returned. I apologize for coming in this late and will try to make my remarks as brief as I possibly can.

It is my intention to talk to you about some of the issues that are before us, or that are before the Legislature that have to do with us, and to give you a progress report about where these matters stand. I think they are matters that have some concern for the institution, and it seemed to me, now that the Session is something over a month old, it might be worthwhile for us to take stock.

When I talked to you right after the beginning of the school year, I mentioned a number of things that I said I thought would come up in this legislative session, and indeed a number of them have. I will very briefly mention them and say something about their status.

I would begin by talking about the Community College situation. As you know, sometime ago there was a consultants' report that was presented to the Council on Public Higher Education as a result of a rather intensive study of the Community College situation in Kentucky. A number of recommendations are in that report. I won't attempt to belabor them but I will say that from the very beginning my concern was that this report had a "drift" to it that I thought needed very careful examination, the drift being that while everybody would agree that our Community Colleges have some very serious problems, the solution to these problems will come simply from transferring them from one administrative structure to another. I have never believed that. I do not believe it now.

After reading the report, we met with the Directors and the members of the Advisory Committees from the various Community Colleges, and to the charges of absentee landlordism, et cetera, we have repeatedly taken the position which is, fundamentally, that we would feel a lot better if the community colleges say they are being mistreated, rather than the visiting dignitaries. Indeed, one of the strongest things in favor of some continuation of the present arrangement, at least at the moment, is that it is nearly the unanimous view of the community colleges that they would prefer to stay within this system.

I said further that I think the problems in the Community College System, in terms of lack of full scale programs, et cetera -- the same problem all institutions in the state face -- do not result from administrative structure or lack of sympathy or concern but from shortage of resources in dollars. It is my view that until the state puts those resources into the community colleges, we will have to continue to build programs as slowly as we have. It will not matter, in my judgment, what kind of administrative superstructure they have. For instance, nobody

is going to create a series of comprehensive community colleges in this state without a great deal more being done than has been done up to now. It is my view, as of this moment -- and I may read tomorrow morning's paper and find out just how wrong I am -- that probably no legislation is going to be introduced in this Session along that line; and, to the degree that this is true, I think it is true because the community colleges have made known to the Legislature their own preferences and wishes. At any rate, I would be the first to say that anything can happen. We have a long way to go -- and so this is a box score in about the third inning.

A second problem is that of the organization, at the state level, of higher education in Kentucky. There are several Bills now before the Legislature and they are quite different. One is the so-called Superboard with the concept of it being named a Board of Regents for the state, having a very strong Chancellor at the head of the System, and with specific and strong powers of centralized authority in that Board. There is, I think, a great deal to be concerned about in whatever direction we choose to go. I have tried, again, to say to them, as I have said to you -- and will continue to say -- that there are two, rather than one, interests involved; that we should not let the pressure of dollars and of economy, as well as other things, blind us to the fact that there are two problems. The problem that all are concerning themselves with is the obvious one of the public interest, and, indeed, they have the right to do that; but I have the feeling that not much attention is being paid to the concept of preserving a kind of autonomy for the institutions that will continue to make it possible for them to do what they have been created to do and what they are uniquely fitted to do. My position up to now has been that I would favor a strengthening of the present Council on Public Higher Education and delegate to it specific coordinating functions, as opposed to governing functions. I think the governing functions -- the internal operation of the institutions -- should remain in the hands of the Boards of Trustees or Regents and that the proper function for a state-level Board is that of coordination and of concern with statewide planning and these kinds of functions. I do not know how the legislation will go. There is quite a bit of talk now and I think it is going to be a matter of touch and go. I will say to you that it is a problem that we, as an institution, and you as faculty members of this institution, should not be oblivious to or indifferent toward, because the kind of structure that is created and the specific authority that is granted to it will have a direct effect on the way we are able to conduct our business and, indeed, on what decisions we are going to be allowed to make in the years ahead.

A third issue that is far from settled is one that has been much in the Press in my time here -- that having to do with the University of Louisville and its entrance into the state system. There are two separate issues involved: one has to do with dollars, and the other with authorization. I think the dollars issue is, at least temporarily settled as part of the budget bill. The University of Louisville was, I think, receiving something in the vicinity of six million dollars in state funds prior to this Session. The Executive budget added two million to that, and subsequent legislation asked for an eleven million dollar addition of which I believe five million has

been generally agreed upon. In the Bill that now stands I think the total state dollars for the University of Louisville will be something in the vicinity of 13 million dollars. We have had no public position about this nor have we objected to this in any way. I think this is a political problem in the largest sense of that term, and, if I may say so, in the best sense of that term -- the decision on the part of the elected leadership in this state to take another institution into the System, or to help it or to protect it or to do whatever it wishes. I have said from the very beginning, however, that I do not think it proper for the Legislature, or anybody else, to take additional institutions into the public system without providing additional funds, because if that is the way we are to go, it can have only one result -- the money will have to come from the existing institutions and there is only one way to do that and that is to lower the quality from whatever position is already enjoyed and I think I need hardly say to you that none of us are in that position in this state at this time. So the money situation, I think, is probably fairly clear although that, too, could be not so clear in another week, or day, depending on what other Bills may be introduced.

A knottier problem is that of authorization for the University of Louisville. There has recently been introduced Senate Bill 117 that does a number of things, two of which I think are of major concern. First, there is a statement to the effect that in coming into the state system the University of Louisville will continue to be the primary agency for urban research. I have very mixed feelings about this and I have made these known no later than today. My first reaction is that you cannot continue to be something you have not been. And, secondly, that I do not expect us to sit idly by while primary responsibilities, particularly in an area as important to all universities as urban affairs, are lightly or casually assigned to someone else. It is my private belief that we are already heavily engaged in a number of areas that could be called urban research. It is my further belief that the federal government in the years ahead is likely to put substantial amounts of money into this field. I would not like to have this University cut off from that nor seriously limited in that by a rather obscure phrase in a law that was either hastily or badly drawn. I leave that to your judgment. Nonetheless, this is the question. I have said today that we do not intend to support or accept that wording -- and we shall see. I do not know what will happen to Senate Bill 117 but if that wording remains in it, I take it that I will have no alternative but to oppose it with whatever strength we can muster.

There is a larger implication in that same Bill that I do not think is my question to raise, but I think it is someone's question to raise and I suspect that it is properly the position for the Council on Public Higher Education -- that is, the authority of the authorization for the University of Louisville to come in with a full range of undergraduate, graduate, and professional education. I don't remember the exact words, but I would hope and I don't think this has to be a hostile view -- that as the University of Louisville comes into the state system the questions can be asked without malice. And there are two fundamental ones: 1) Does the state need two full-blown universities at this time? and 2) Can the state afford two full-blown universities at this time? If the answers to these questions are both affirmative, then I think it would be very graceful of me to raise no further objections. If the answer to either of these questions is negative, I think a much harder look ought to be taken on what the specific terms are under which that

institution becomes a part of the System. These are my concerns at this moment and I cannot tell you what will happen on that Bill. I can tell you that its future will be a matter of very real interest to us.

The last thing that I will mention very briefly is that of the budget itself. I mention it briefly not because it is not important, because it is. It is vital to us. The executive budget, as it was finally presented, was a rather remarkable cutback from the dollars we had originally requested. It was not altogether surprising to us but it is always traumatic when one sees the size of the cut. It is also true that, as finally agreed upon, the executive budget was right down to the marrow -- not just to the bone -- but to the marrow. I have described it as being not only not an expansion or improvement budget but not even a continuation budget -- and it isn't. It is a budget that this institution can live with if we take the position that we will be engaged in the practice of "getting by somehow", but it is not a program that allows us to do any significant planning. And the new millions of dollars that are in it -- and there are 15.2 at the present time -- are monies that are committed pretty generally to fixed costs, with the exception of some flexibility to try and provide some new positions to deal with an expanded enrollment that should go somewhere between 3,500 and 4,000 students in the system in the next two years. It won't meet that -- we will not be able to hire new professors in anything like the present ratio, but we clearly are going to have to have some as we absorb the shock in other places. Beyond that, there is the question of there being any dollars for us to consider the question of merit and cost-of-living increases for faculty and staff. And that is about it: that is the budget, pretty much, in terms of new money. So what I am saying to you, as the budget stands now, is that it is a lot less than desirable but any further tampering with that budget, any further cut in that budget, and we will have moved from a budget that cannot be described as an expansion or improvement budget, to a budget that can be described as a disaster budget. We have made this known every way and in every place that we can. I do not detect any attempt by the Legislature to punish us or to single us out. It is my further belief, and I give it to you for what it is worth, that given the number of dollars that has been allocated for higher education in the next two years, we have been fairly treated -- and we will find our ways to live with this. What I am saying is that they have just about cut us as deep as it can go and we are trying our best to see that no further cut is made.

Later on in the spring when we know what our figures are I will look forward to talking with you more fully about what we can look forward to in the next two years. There isn't much I can say now. There hasn't been much I could say. I think there are some things we are going to be able to do and there are some things we are not going to be able to do and I will be the bearer of those glad tidings when we know more about it than I can say to you that we honestly know now.

In any event, these are the things that are in the wind -- the currents that are now at play. They all have, to some effect, importance for us and implications for us, and even at the risk of delaying your meeting longer than you might have wished, I thought that you probably would be interested in hearing from me of what some of these issues are, where they are, and how they are going. That has been my intention, and to the degree that you have found it, in any way, enlightening, I am delighted. Thank you very much.

President Singletary was given a standing ovation by the Senators.

The Senate adjourned at 5:25 p.m. to meet next at 4:00 p.m., Monday, February 16, 1970.

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, MARCH 2, 1970

The University Senate met in special session at 4:00 p.m., Monday, March 2, 1970, in the Court Room of the Law Building. Dr. Thomas R. Ford, Secretary of the Senate Council, presided since the Chairman and Vice Chairman were unable to attend. Members absent:

Clifford Amyx*, Daniel S. Arnold*, Robert Aug*, Richard C. Birkebak*, Barry J. Bloomfield, Collins W. Burnett*, Clyde R. Carpenter*, Robert E. Cazden*, Donald B. Coleman, Carl B. Cone*, Robert L. Cosgriff, Raymond H. Cox, George F. Crewe*, T. Z. Csaky*, David E. Denton, Ronald W. Dunbar*, Frederic J. Fleron, Jess L. Gardner*, James L. Gibson, Stephen M. Gittleson*, Herbert Green, J. W. Hollingsworth*, James F. Hopkins*, Mary F. James*, Louis J. Karmel, Robert W. Kiser*, Nancy Lair*, Albert S. Levy*, Rey M. Longyear*, Richard Lowitt*, Leonard McDowell*, L. Randolph McGee*, William G. Moody*, Theodore H. Mueller*, Thomas M. Olszewsky*, Albert W. Patrick*, Doyle E. Peaslee*, Nicholas J. Pisacano*, William K. Plucknett*, J. G. Rodriguez*, Sheldon Rovin*, John W. Schaefer*, Ian Shine*, Malcolm R. Siegel*, Gerard E. Silberstein*, Robert H. Spedding*, Robert Straus*, David R. Wekstein*, Harry E. Wheeler*, David C. White*, Raymond P. White*, Daniel W. Wingard, Donald J. Wood, Lawrence A. Allen, Charles E. Barnhart, Harry M. Bohannon, Glenwood L. Creech, Marcia A. Dake*, Robert M. Drake, Jr.*, Stuart Forth*, Harold D. Gordon, Jack B. Hall*, Joseph Hamburg, Ellis F. Hartford, Raymon D. Johnson*, Taft McKinstry*, Elbert W. Ockerman*, Wimberly C. Royster, George J. Ruschell, Doris M. Seward, Otis A. Singletary*, Eugene J. Small*, Joseph V. Swintosky*, William R. Willard*, Ernest F. Witte.

The Senate approved the requests of Jeannie Leedom and Jerry Lewis, Kernel reporters, Ken Weaver, Kernel photographer, and Avery Jenkins, Public Relations (UK News Bureau), to attend, report, and photograph. The Senate also permitted Josh O'Shea, an undergraduate student, to present a petition.

The minutes of the regular meeting of February 9, 1970, were approved as circulated.

*Absence explained

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

DEAN OF ADMISSIONS AND REGISTRAR

ADMISSIONS
ORIENTATION
RECORDS
SCHOOL RELATIONS

February 2, 1970

MEMORANDUM

TO: University Senate

FROM: Secretary, University Senate

The regular meeting of the University Senate will be held at 4:00 p.m., Monday, February 9, 1970, in the Court Room of the Law Building.

Items on the agenda will include a presentation of the candidates for honorary degrees at the 1970 Commencement; the report of the ad hoc Committee on Appropriate Balance Among Teaching, Research and Service Functions in the University; proposed changes in the Proposed Revision of the Governing Regulations relative to privilege and tenure; a proposed change in the Rules of the University Senate relative to revision of the charge to the University Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

KWS/mb

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

January 28, 1970

TO: University Faculty
FROM: University Senate Council

The University Senate Council has accepted for presentation to the University Senate at its meeting on Monday, February 9, 1970, the attached Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Appropriate Balance Among the Teaching, Research and Service Functions in the University.

3-2-70

75-37

Adopted

jp

Attachment

REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE
ON APPROPRIATE BALANCE AMONG
THE TEACHING, RESEARCH AND
SERVICE FUNCTIONS OF THE
UNIVERSITY

January 26, 1970

R. L. Anderson
Russell Brannon
Halbert Gulley
Donald Ivey
Robert Kiser
Arthur Lieber
Robert Sedler
Paul Street, Chairman
Roy E. Swift

(The Committee are grateful to two graduate students,
George McLoughlin and Leo Juarez, for their help
in the conduct of this study)

CHARGE TO THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON
THE APPROPRIATE BALANCE AMONG THE TEACHING,
RESEARCH, AND SERVICE FUNCTIONS IN THE UNIVERSITY

The University Senate, by authority of the Governing Regulations of the University of Kentucky, is charged with the responsibility of determining the broader academic policies of the University. The Senate is also delegated a number of other specific functions which, for the most part, are supplementary to the principal function of academic policy formulation.

There are many issues, problems and concerns relative to the Senate's discharging its responsibility. One of these is that of the appropriate balance among the teaching, research, and service functions in the University. In order that the University Senate may be better informed of the various considerations relating to this issue, the Senate Council appoints this ad hoc committee and charges it as follows:

1. To examine the basic assumptions on which "teaching", "research" and "service" are considered the tripartite functions of an individual professor, a department, a college and a land-grant university.
2. To review the criteria used by the various departments and colleges in arriving at the relative importance of each of these three functions for an individual, a department and the college.
3. To examine the practices and policies regarding the use of these and/or other functions as a basis for assigning rewards to individuals, departments and colleges.
4. To examine problems relative to these functions and their appropriateness (or lack of it) to personnel in the various types of positions in such areas as Clinical Sciences, Performing Arts, Extension work and others. If these functions are inappropriate, what criteria should be employed in assessing effectiveness?
5. To examine the concept of "balance" among these three functions as resident within an individual, a department, or both.
6. To prepare a written report of findings and recommendations (on the above and any others) for consideration and appropriate action by the University Senate Council and/or University Senate including a suggested policy statement relative to an appropriate balance among the teaching, research and service functions in the University.

[Delivered with cover letter to Committee
dated January 13, 1969]

PROCEDURE OF STUDY

In attacking its assignment, the Committee on Appropriate Balance among Teaching, Research and Service in the University:

- 1) Counseled among themselves, both regarding views of the problem of its study and approaches to its assignment. (Also, they collected some views out of the literature on higher education, circulating selected excerpts among the committee.)
- 2) Held a conference with the Executive Vice President, the Provost, and the past and the current chairmen of the Senate Council to gather their views.
- 3) Invited the deans of the various colleges of the University to provide statements of their views and practices, and reviewed those for whatever advice they might represent to the committee.
- 4) Solicited responses from all University faculty through a questionnaire to which some 425 replied.
- 5) Solicited views of students, through the University Student Government, which used a questionnaire directed to student leaders to gather their views.
- 6) Held a "hearing" for open discussion of the problem, inviting faculty particularly and announcing in the University newspaper that it was open to students.
- 7) Synthesized the information gathered by such means and counseled together toward consensus in effecting this report, which sets forth the following:

Some of the documents which provided substance for this report are included in an appendix which is available in the Office of the University Senate Council. These include a report on a survey of opinions of UK student leaders regarding "appropriate balance", a summary of results of the questionnaire returns from the faculty, and a copy of the faculty questionnaire with the frequencies of responses indicated.

THE MISSION OF THE UNIVERSITY

In defining the mission of the University of Kentucky, this committee submits the following propositions:

1) A university is an instrument of society for the special purpose of generating and disseminating knowledge in that society.

Defining appropriate balance among the teaching, research, and service functions of a university, therefore, requires the determination of that combination of emphases among the three which will make a particular university most effective in accomplishing that purpose, considering its particular setting and resources.

2) The University of Kentucky is the original state university, the only lang-grant institution of the state, and the only one in the state with legal responsibility for graduate education for the doctorate.

3) The University of Kentucky has the essential "university" responsibility for generating and disseminating knowledge. This committee, therefore, has viewed its assignment as determining the proportional emphasis which should be given to each of the university functions in order to make the University most effective in fulfilling its essential responsibility as a university.

4) Teaching, research and service functions are here defined from the perspective of scholarship. Teaching is perceived as scholarship directed toward the student, research as scholarship directed toward the discipline and service as scholarship directed toward the public at large.

5) Effective teaching requires attention to both the substantive content of the discipline and to the student, considering his background, capacities, interests and needs. The advising of students, therefore, should be regarded as an integral part of teaching.

6) Teaching and research are not separate and competitive. Depending on the nature and purpose of the research and the effect that it has on the University's performance of its teaching function, the two may conflict -- but do not necessarily. If research is defined as scholarship directed toward the discipline, it follows that since the source of substantive instruction is also the discipline, scholarship directed toward the discipline is generally supportive of teaching. In graduate education, where research is in great part the substance of instruction, the supportiveness of research for teaching becomes especially obvious. Since the University of Kentucky has exclusive responsibility for graduate instruction at the doctorate level in Kentucky, it follows that the University of Kentucky would give a higher priority to research than it might were it not in such a position.

7) An important distinction concerns research as it does not relate directly to teaching. Historically, universities have had

considerable responsibility for research, for increasing society's fund of knowledge through intellectual investigation, though other institutions, both commercial and public, have for some years performed a research function. If the State of Kentucky is to assume its share of the "burden of scholarship", it is appropriate that it do so in part through its land grant university.

8) The research functions of the University may be classified, therefore, as: (1) research that immediately supports teaching (2) research that does not immediately support teaching but does so indirectly by strengthening the discipline and by contributing to the store of societal knowledge; and (3) research that carries out a university service function. Since there are other agencies responsible for research unrelated (or at least incidental) to teaching, the University will serve its mission most effectively by comparative emphasis upon the kind of research that is the most supportive of the teaching function.

9) Research, as a university function, is not perceived as limited to formalized hypothesis-testing procedures, employing only objective observation and involving only patterned experimentation -- important though the disciplines of scientific scholarship are. Rather, the term research, for purposes of the University mission, should comprehend all scholarly investigation.

Artistic composition or performance, historical or philosophical exploration, to the extent they represent scholarship directed to the discipline, are properly designated as research.

10) Neither teaching and service, nor research, and service, should be regarded as separate and competitive functions.

Properly, service is not incidental but is actually an extension of the teaching and/or research function. Research, service, and teaching are mutually supportive. Service supports the other two in at least two ways:

(a) By providing a laboratory for student and staff observation and research -- e. g. , in medicine and dentistry, when patient care is demonstrated, or in agriculture, education, and commerce where field studies provide experience for students and opportunity for staff growth.

(b) By advancing knowledge beyond the campus through informal instruction -- an extension of the teaching function, represented, for instance, in organized extension, resident instruction and continuing education programs.

11) University faculty members have no special responsibility beyond that of other people to function as "citizens" by serving on boards of community organizations, participating in charitable activities and the like. The University cannot and should not require such activities of its faculty members, and their general civic participation has nothing to do with the service

mission of the University as such. Nonetheless, the matter of individual contribution to public service is significant. University faculty members as individuals are called upon to make available their expertise outside the University -- to give speeches, to consult with governmental and community bodies, to serve as consultants in professional in-service conferences, to take leadership roles in organizations of scholars, and the like. To the extent that University faculty members voluntarily undertake such assignments and apply the scholarship of their respective disciplines in so doing, the University itself is also performing its service mission, although in an unstructured and informal manner. Such individualized public service becomes relevant for professional evaluation, and should be rewarded, just as should service in organized programs of the University.

12) Obviously, some kinds of university services are more directly supportive of, and/or more clearly an extension of, teaching or research -- and therefore more effective in furthering the mission of the University. Inasmuch as other institutions exist for meeting the purely service needs of society -- medical and legal agencies, research institutes, etc. -- whereas only the University can meet the need in the State for the kind of program that characterizes higher education, the University will serve best by emphasizing only those functions to which it is suited. Therefore, to the extent that the University does

operate organized programs of public service, these should ordinarily be identified with teaching and/or research functions. As a practical matter, the service function will be more important in some units of the University than in others as it will variously provide resources relevant to the teaching and research needs of respective units.

13) In order to perform all three of its functions, it is necessary that there be internal "university service"; that is, faculty members must serve on intramural committees, perform special assignments, or provide special services, regularly or on call, within the University. While service should be considered in evaluating the contributions of individual faculty members to the total university, it obviously cannot be considered a service function of the University itself. Rather, such "intramural" service may be assumed to contribute to any or all three university functions. Therefore, although "balance", as it relates to the mission of the University, concerns only three elements, individual evaluation of faculty members concerns four. If, in evaluations, "intramural" service is combined with "University" service defined in this paper, the resulting definition obviously is one of convenience.

In summary -- the University of Kentucky has the essential mission of a university: to generate and disseminate knowledge. Like all universities, it functions through teaching, research and service in order to do so.

Teaching, research and service are all of one piece. As properly exercised in a university, they are mutually supportive of each other, and a university properly commits its resources to them in proportion as they are mutually supportive. This is to say: Teaching as it generates enthusiasm for more knowledge, research as it implements that enthusiasm, enlarging the substance of what is taught and increasing the potential for doing so, and service as it disseminates knowledge beyond the campus and provides laboratories for teaching and research are, in such respect, best fulfilling a university's mission.

CURRENT PRACTICES AND VIEWPOINTS

The committee sought to obtain information of what administrative practices relating to balance among teaching, research and service are current in the University, what current perceptions are of those practices, and what opinions prevail regarding what the balance should be and how it should be implemented. In doing so, the committee gathered information from the administration, the faculty, and the students. The intent was to obtain information and opinions of value as advice to the committee.

SYNTHESIS OF VIEWS OF DEANS, FACULTY AND STUDENTS

It is clear that present practices in evaluating faculty members vary widely within the University. The missions assigned to faculty members differ from college to college because of the nature of the college, the unit's emphasis on research, teaching, or service, and for other reasons.

Methods of assigning merit also vary from unit to unit. Individual colleges have interpreted the procedures recommended by the Executive Vice President in ways designed to allow adaptation to the goals, resources and personnel of the college. Colleges tend to give departments, and in some cases, professors themselves, wide latitude in applying the evaluation percentages.

In general, the deans of the colleges believe the present system provides some flexibility for adapting procedures to particular cases,

but some of them favor greater flexibility than now exists. One element mentioned is the reliance by area committees primarily upon publication in refereed journals as a criterion for assessing every faculty member's competence and suitability for promotion.

Faculty members surveyed agree that the present system needs greater flexibility. Not only would most faculty favor an "appropriate balance" achieved within individual departments by allowing individuals to influence their own emphasis on teaching, research and service, but also a majority feel that quality teaching based upon scholarly pursuit of excellence in the discipline should in individual cases be adequate basis for promotion irrespective of publications. At the same time, a majority believe that most research contributes to improvement of teaching. Some feel, however, that research competes with teaching. A majority indicate that most research should lead to publication in refereed journals, but a strong minority want research considered more broadly, perhaps by giving more recognition to non-published scholarship directed to improvement of teaching, improved teaching materials, etc. (The problems inherent in the objective evaluation of such research are recognized by the committee.)

The survey showed that most faculty members would like greater rewards for teaching and a concomitant decrease in emphasis on research-publication for everyone.

Students express an even stronger wish for change in the present system than do deans and faculty. They clearly want more emphasis on high-quality teaching and greater reward for improvement of faculty-student interaction. Repeatedly, in their responses in the survey, they singled out advising as a neglected area of faculty-student relationship.

Students view the first function of the University as one of contributing faculty time and interest to their educational development. A majority apparently feel that faculty interest in research-publication, together with the merit-system bias in favor of research-publication, has led to faculty neglect of teacher and student relationships. While many students recognize the importance of research and scholarship to the reputation of the University, most students would like teaching and advising given first rank in merit evaluation, with service and research receiving secondary consideration.

In summary, there is agreement within the UK academic community that change in the direction of greater flexibility in individual and departmental assignments would be desirable. Probably a majority of faculty and students would favor greater emphasis on the rewards for teaching, together with some relaxation of the insistence that every faculty member publish every year or two in refereed journals. This is not to say that there is popular feeling that research is not important or that the University should not continue to seek research grants or should not continue to strive for excellence in research.

The University community is divided on the importance that should be assigned to service. Perhaps this outcome has resulted because "service" includes many different types of activities and may need to be defined and rewarded according to the functions and assignments of particular colleges, departments and individuals.

A MODEL AND RECOMMENDATIONS

To make its proposals graphic, the committee submits herewith a model of how it perceives the balance among teaching, research and service functions might properly operate in a university, and, with a few detailed recommendations added, how it might properly operate in the University of Kentucky.

THE MODEL

or faculties of academic units

Individual faculty members initiate and review programs of instruction, research, and service that are believed necessary and/or desirable within their area of specialization (department) and make recommendations concerning these through their chairmen to the director of their school and/or the dean of their college. The dean and directors consider the various recommendations submitted from the component departments in light of the roles of their college and generate a college-wide program embracing those programs necessary to the discharge of the responsibility of that college. In turn, the dean's recommendations of programs are reviewed by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and/or the Vice-President for Research to form the recommendations for the entire University; these recommendations in turn are reviewed by the President and the Board of Trustees of the University.

Where are decisions made? All at the top, or up + down the line?

Acting with knowledge of budgetary considerations and the defined goals to be achieved by the University, the President discusses with the vice-presidents which programs ~~or individual projects~~ or activities are to be initiated, continued, or curtailed and reaches decisions on the basis of the best information available to him. The vice-presidents in turn repeat this process with the appropriate deans. The deans and directors similarly discuss with the chairmen the programs, activities and responsibilities of the various departments and provide the necessary decisions where appropriate. The chairmen ultimately have the responsibility of discussing with the departmental faculty their individual roles in the departments' efforts and goals, and of providing the necessary decisions so that the goals may be attained in the most effective manner.

the department has the responsibility
^

Describes head, not a chairman

In this process, however, such bodies as have been delegated special responsibilities -- e. g., the Senate, the college faculties, or specially created committees or commissions -- are involved as their roles relate to decisions under consideration, providing counsel to the administration or making such decisions as are required under the charges given them.

Assumptions Inherent in the Model

This model is fundamental to staffing the University and discharging the responsibilities of the University. As it must, the model assumes (1) that without faculty initiative, programs are unlikely to be successful, (2) that recommendations will be based on careful considerations and logical decisions about the program needs and

priorities, and (3) that decisions similarly will be the result of adequate consultation and thorough consideration regarding the programs and any limitations necessarily imposed; i. e., decisions will be arrived at in a just manner.

In the final analysis, reliance must be placed upon the faculty members and the chairman of each unit to achieve a proper balance in each unit and articulate this balance at the next level. The responsibility for maintaining some appropriate University-wide balance must lie with the deans and higher administrators, and with bodies which have been charged with the responsibility for certain kinds of decisions -- e. g., the Senate and the college faculties -- in matters related to their respective charges. General policy decisions regarding University-wide balance are ultimately made and implemented through negotiation extending downward through vice-president, college, and school levels, for example, to departments and individual faculty members.

The ultimate general allocation of resources in terms of University-wide balance is top administrative responsibility in the model and is one to be implemented through counsel at all levels.

Assignment of Roles and Balances

Within this model, it is possible to define the role of the University and assess an appropriate balance among the instructional, research and service functions of the University. It is possible further to establish these same features for every administrative unit at every level. But it is expected that there will be a rather substantial variation in the balances within each of the departments constituting a school or college, even as there will be within the colleges. Further, it is conceivable that these

balances will be modified with time. We believe it is undesirable to specify an unalterable balance of the various functions for each individual unit or for each individual faculty member of the University.

Mechanism and Implementation Procedure

However, within the model described, it is possible to recognize a suitable mechanism to reach decisions concerning appropriate balance at the departmental level. This mechanism is ^{implemented in some academic units; it} recommended for ^{is} implementation.

Upon definition of departmental goals in consultations between the department chairman and the school director or dean of the college, the chairman will request that each faculty member of his department submit a plan representing the individual's request for a balanced load believed appropriate to him, one which could fall within the ranges possible considering departmental goals and balances.

After review and careful consideration of the departmental program and seeking of any additional advice desired, e.g., that of a departmental executive committee, the chairman would arrange assignments of duties for the next academic year. Subsequent evaluation of the individual faculty member for merit increases and promotions would be based on an assessment of his performance of the assignment for the year.

How about appeal in case of disagreement?

Application of Model

In application of this model, the committee makes the following recommendations:

- 1) The concern in seeking appropriate balance should be toward having the University emphasize programs adapted to the

circumstances of its setting and resources. While such circumstances will change from time to time and the University's program emphases, therefore should be changed, the essential responsibility of a university, to generate and disseminate knowledge, should be kept central.

2) In light of its special role, the University should emphasize research comparatively more than do other universities of the state. It does not follow, however, that the University of Kentucky should attend any less to teaching and service functions.

3) Balance among the three functions should be effected by negotiation among the various levels of administrative and academic units of the University, as described in the model, so that, insofar as possible, the institution may continue as an adaptive system, responsive to changing needs and potentials within and around it.

4) The negotiation process should effect balance by shaping the assignments of individual faculty members at the departmental level. Assignments should be initially defined at the recruitment-procurement stage, and may be redefined through negotiation in light of changing exigencies year by year. Annual appraisals of faculty should reflect the adequacy of individuals in fulfilling their respective assignments.

5) The evaluation of the individual faculty member for purposes of promotion should be based on an assessment of his performance of his assignments, and an excellent performance of such assignments should be the basis for promotion irrespective of the general criteria for ranks as set forth in the "Report on Policies and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Merit", issued by the Office of the President under date of April 27, 1966.

These recommendations can be epitomized in the words "flexibility" and "integrity". In some instances the criteria for promotion and merit increase at the University of Kentucky may have been applied too rigidly. The committee recommends that greater flexibility be required in the application of the criteria for effective research, teaching and service. At the same time, the University community must have confidence that its administrators and faculty members will respect these standards in negotiating emphasis in faculty assignments, in accordance with the University's functions as described in this report.

what standards?