

Minutes of the University Senate, January 9, 1967 (con't)

Council is advised to choose sufficient names so that there is at least some attempt made to include representation from all of the individual units. In order to be a member of such Residence J-Board the student must have been in residence at the University for at least one year and at the housing unit at least one semester and must be a member of a class other than the freshman. (NOTE: Neither the residence requirement nor the class requirement shall apply where the housing unit is composed solely of freshmen.) Furthermore, the House Council should establish procedures with regard to its recommendations to make sure that any person suggested is willing to serve in such capacity. The Residence J-Board then shall have jurisdiction over all cases involving violations of the rules of conduct occurring within the comprehensive housing unit to which it is connected. The Residence J-Board shall be responsible for determining the guilt or innocence of the accused student and shall have the primary authority for imposing punishment upon the student if it determines that the student has, in fact, committed a violation. Notice of the punishment determined shall be communicated to the resident advisor for action.

Any student who believes that he has been improperly adjudged guilty or who believes that his punishment is too severe for the nature of the offense, shall have a right to appeal from the decision of the Residence J-Board to the University J-Board. Such appeal must be in writing, setting forth the areas of disagreement with the Residence J-Board and must be filed with the University J-Board within 30 days of the announcement of the decision of the Residence J-Board. The University J-Board (whose composition and general structure is set forth *infra*) shall have the right to reverse the decision of the Residence J-Board both as to the existence or non-existence of a violation and as to the scope or size of the punishment to be imposed. However, in the latter case the University J-Board shall have authority only to reduce the punishment, not to increase it.

C. The Punishment - The Residence J-Board may impose any punishment up to and including dismissal from the housing unit. In other words, the discipline may consist of social probation, reprimand, fines, and any other appropriate punishment. It is important, however, that the Residence J-Board understand that it cannot impose traditional University disciplinary punishments, e.g., suspension or expulsion, for violation of housing rules and regulations. It is suggested that the Residence J-Board establish, as much as possible, a system of possible punishments which will be imposed for violations of various rules. The Committee is making no suggestion on this point because it feels that the variety of possible rules which might be violated require greater discretion on the part of the Residence J-Board in order to "make the punishment fit the crime."

3) that the material regarding offenses, procedures, and punishment relating to the community of scholars be adopted;

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, APRIL 10, 1967

The University Senate met in regular session at 4:00 p.m., Monday, April 10, 1967, in the Court Room of the Law Building. Chairman Diachun presided. Members absent: A. D. Albright, Clifford Amyx*, Charles E. Barnhart, John R. Batt, John J. Begin*, Harry M. Bohannan*, Peter Bosomworth*, Thomas D. Brower, Marion A. Carnes*, Lewis W. Cochran, Emmett R. Costich*, Glenwood L. Creech, Tihamer Z. Csaky*, Jesse DeBoer, Melvin DeFleur, John E. Delap*, Wendell C. DeMarcus*, Kurt W. Deuschle, Robert M. Drake, Jr.*, William D. Ehmann*, Ben A. Eiseman, Marsha Fields, W. Garrett Flickinger, Norman H. Franke, James E. Funk, Oliver Gard, Charles P. Graves*, John W. Greene, Jr., Ward Griffen*, Ellis F. Hartford, Thomas L. Hayden, Don Jacobson*, Malcolm E. Jewell, Raymon D. Johnson, Robert L. Johnson, Robert F. Kerley, Donald E. Knapp*, John A. Koepke*, R. A. Lauderdale, Jr., Frank A. Loeffel, James T. Moore*, Alvin L. Morris, R. T. Muelling, Jr., Vincent E. Nelson*, John W. Oswald, Leonard V. Packett, Howard C. Parker*, J. W. Patterson*, Arlon G. Podshadley*, Carson Porter, John T. Reeves, Robert W. Rudd*, Benjamin Rush*, Ivan Russell*, Paul G. Sears, William A. Seay, Doris M. Seward, Roy E. Sigafus*, Wellington B. Stewart, Sheryl Snider, Joseph V. Swintosky, Warren E. Wheeler, Robert L. White, W. W. Winternitz, Kenneth Wright*, Wesley O. Young, Fred Zechman*, Leon Zolondek*.

The Senate approved a request to permit Mr. Frank Browning of the KERNEL to sit in the meeting and report its proceedings.

The minutes of the meetings of February 13-14, February 27, and March 8, 1967 were approved as circulated.

Resolutions were presented on the deaths of Doctors Stanley J. Zyzniewski, Silvio Navarro and Rinaldo Simonini, Jr. by Doctors Carl B. Cone, Wimberly C. Royster, and Jacob Adler with recommendations that the resolutions be spread upon the minutes of the Senate and copies be sent to the families. The Senate stood for a moment of silent tribute in memory, and in acceptance of the resolutions.

Dr. Stanley John Zyzniewski, Associate Professor of History and Acting Chairman of the Department of Slavic and Oriental Languages, died of a heart attack on April 6, 1967. He earned his bachelor's degree at Syracuse University and the degrees Master of Arts and Doctor of Philosophy at Harvard University. He taught at Syracuse University and at the University of Virginia before coming to the University of Kentucky in 1960.

Dr. Zyzniewski studied in Poland in 1958 under a Ford Foundation grant, in Russia in 1962 under a cultural exchange program, and in Helsinki in 1964-1965 under a Fulbright Research Fellowship. In 1967 he received the Alice Hallam publication award for the best article published by a member of the Department of History during the years 1965 and 1966. He was vice-president of the Southern Conference on Slavic Studies. Dr. Zyzniewski gave unreservedly of his time to the interest of the University and the well-being of its faculty and students. He was an enthusiastic teacher, a meticulous scholar, a congenial colleague, and a generous friend.

*Absence Explained

Dr. Silvio Navarro, Chairman of the Department of Computer Science and Director of the Computing Center, was one of the four University faculty members lost in the recent plane crash. He was a native of Cuba. He did his undergraduate and graduate work in the United States, obtaining his Doctorate in Electrical Engineering from Texas A and M in 1955.

Dr. Navarro joined the University of Kentucky as an associate professor in Electrical Engineering in 1959. He became Director of the Computing Center in 1961 and became the first Chairman of the Computer Science Department in 1966.

Dr. Navarro was engaged in many professional activities, notable among which were his membership of the SMSG writing team in computing, and membership of the National Curriculum Committee. This committee was set up by the Association for Computing Machinery with responsibility for proposing guidelines in the development of undergraduate Computer Science programs throughout the country.

To his colleagues in Computer Science, he was a Chairman who possessed energy, enterprise and eminently sound professional judgment. His death is mourned by all who were close to him.

Dr. Rinaldo Simonini, Professor of English Education, came to this University only in the fall of 1966. A man of national reputation, he came to us with significant accomplishments in three fields: Italian and English Renaissance literature; modern linguistics and its application to the teaching of English in the public schools; and educational theory and administration in the field of English. With his baccalaureate degree from Johns Hopkins and his advanced degrees from the University of North Carolina, Dr. Simonini had taught at various colleges in the coastal Upper South, and particularly for twelve or thirteen years served as Chairman of the English Department at Longwood College in Virginia. His many honors included a Fulbright Research Scholarship in Italy, high posts in the National Council of Teachers of English, and the vice chairmanship of the National Association of Chairmen of English Departments. Dr. Simonini came to Kentucky to teach linguistics, but more primarily to provide liaison between the Department of English and the English staffs of the Community Colleges and of the public schools. He performed this essential task enthusiastically and well, as the Community College Office and the staffs at the Colleges will eagerly testify. A man of sound judgment, willing cooperativeness, resourceful ideas, and cheerful good nature, he had already earned for himself among English instructors on this campus and in the field a place as a good friend and a trusted colleague. He will be deeply missed.

Dr. Schwert, Secretary of the Senate Council, presented a recommendation from the Council that the Senate favorably consider recommending to the President and the Board of Trustees that the rule governing a quorum of the Senate be altered to define a quorum as 25 elected members. The motion was seconded. Following discussion in which it was pointed out that the Senate was convicting itself in passage of such a motion, that a reduction in quorum would encourage members further not to attend, and that it was untimely in view of the two actions which the Senate had already taken in appointing a committee to study

Minutes of the University Senate, April 10, 1967 (con't)

the reorganization of the Senate, and in its purgation rule, the Senate approved a motion to table the recommendation.

Resolutions on the deaths of Doctors Jerome E. Cohn and Richard S. Schweet were presented to the Senate by Dr. William R. Willard with recommendation that the resolutions be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and copies be sent to the families. The Senate stood for a moment of silent tribute in memory, and in acceptance of the resolutions.

Dr. Jerome E. Cohn, associate professor of medicine, was one of the four University faculty members lost in the recent plane crash. He was a truly dedicated medical scientist who gave himself fully to each student, patient and program. He was a native of Baltimore, Maryland, a graduate of Johns Hopkins University and the University of Maryland Medical School. He received further training and experience at the University of Maryland, at Johns Hopkins, at Duke and at Bellvue Hospital with emphasis in the field of chest diseases and pulmonary physiology. His training was interrupted by a period of active duty with the United States Navy. Dr. Cohn's academic career, after his extensive training, began at the University of Utah Medical School where he served on the faculty and where he also served as staff physician at the Salt Lake Veteran's Administration Hospital.

Dr. Cohn joined the faculty at the University of Kentucky in 1960 as an assistant professor. He was promoted to associate professor in 1963 and had been approved for promotion of full professor effective July 1, 1967. At the University of Kentucky Dr. Cohn headed a large and growing unit in pulmonary medicine. He attracted extensive outside research grants to support his work and had a number of post-doctoral fellows and students working with him at all times. He taught in the courses offered by both the Department of Medicine and the Department of Physiology and Biophysics, holding faculty appointments in both departments. Also, Dr. Cohn carried on one of the research projects in the University Tobacco and Health Program.

Equally significant, Dr. Cohn served as chairman of the curriculum committee for the College of Medicine and on the very day of his death obtained approval of the Faculty Council of the College of Medicine for a major and far reaching revision in the curriculum.

Dr. Cohn's reputation nationally as a scientist was exemplified by the fact that he was embarking upon a site visit to another institution in behalf of the National Institutes of Health at the time he met his death.

Dr. Cohn was an example of a fine clinician, a talented investigator, a stimulating teacher, and a faculty member with University wide interests. He was just approaching the period of a maximum influence, effectiveness, and productivity in his professional career when he met an untimely death.

The University mourns Dr. Cohn's loss. He leaves a great personal and professional void within the University family. Our sorrow, however, can be but little compared with that suffered by his wife, his children, and other members of his family. In behalf of the entire University faculty, the University Senate hereby extends its condolences to Dr. Cohn's family, its appreciation for his distinguished services and its recognition of outstanding professional and personal qualities.

Richard S. Schweet, professor and chairman of the Department of Cell Biology, one of the four University faculty members lost in the recent plane crash, was also one of the most distinguished scholars on the University campus.

He was born in New York City, graduated from City College of New York and then went to Iowa State College for graduate work in biology. His graduate education was interrupted by four years of military service, following which he obtained a Ph.D. in biochemistry at Iowa State College.

Dr. Schweet's professional career then took him to the Enzyme Institute at the University of Wisconsin and to the California Institute of Technology and the associated City of Hope Medical Center. His talents as an investigator were recognized by being named, among other things, as an established investigator of the American Heart Association and as a Career Research Fellowship of the National Institutes of Health.

In 1960, Dr. Schweet joined Dr. George Schwert as full professor of biochemistry at the University. In 1965, he was named chairman of the newly created University Department of Cell Biology. He was busy in recruiting and developing the staff of this Department, its teaching and research program when he met his untimely death.

In addition to teaching medical, dental, graduate, and post-doctoral students at the University, Dr. Schweet was an active supporter of the newly created School of Biological Sciences and served on its first executive committee. He was a recipient of the University of Kentucky Alumni Award for distinguished research. He provided much of the leadership for the Thomas Hunt Morgan Symposium on biology, a distinguished event which was held on this campus last fall.

Dr. Schweet's national recognition was demonstrated by the caliber of participants in the Thomas Hunt Morgan Symposium, by several positions on editorial boards of leading scientific journals, by his service on the Fellowship Review Board of the Public Health Service, and by the offers he received for positions from other institutions.

Dr. Schweet had arrived professionally and was approaching the peak of his career when he met his untimely death. The University has lost an outstanding scholar with broad scientific and academic interests. He will be missed sorely but our sorrow can be only a fraction of that experienced by his family. In behalf of the entire University faculty, the Senate extends its

Minutes of the University Senate, (April 10, 1967 (con't))

condolences to Dr. Schweet's family, its appreciation of his valuable services to the University, and its recognition of his outstanding attainments.

The annual report of the Library Committee which had been circulated to the faculty under date of April 3, 1967 was received by the University Senate as presented.

The Library Committee has held one spring meeting on March 24, 1967. Discussion was devoted to the following subjects:

(1) A new lending code proposed by the Director of Libraries, Dr. Stuart Forth.

Comment: A review of long standing problems in lending books drew comments on faculty who will not return books, faculty fines, length of loan period, proxy signature cards, and so forth. Dr. Forth also commented on the increasing problem of the use of library resources by townspeople, high school students, faculty from other institutions, etc.

Action: The Committee recommended that the Director of Libraries explore the possibilities of establishing an annual charge of ten dollars or less for non-University users.

(2) The proposed new bio-medical library.

No action taken.

(3) Book funds.

Comment: Dr. Forth reported on the availability of book funds, noting that the Library had received very good support this year, that many "back sets" were acquired, that few departments had been "cut off" as yet and that next year's budget would likely be a good one.

No action taken.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Herbert P. Riley
Donald Ringe
Richard Thurston
Robert L. Donohew
Walter Langlois
John M. Patterson
Steven E. Puckett
S. Sidney Ulmer, Chairman

Minutes of the University Senate, April 10, 1967 (con't)

Motion was made and seconded that the two (2) reports of the Rules Committee which had been circulated to the faculty under dates of March 7 and 24, 1967 be considered as one report for consideration by the Senate. Motion was then made to amend the Recommendation under Item 4, Page two, of the Report dated March 24th, to substitute the word "earned" in line 4 for the word "accumulated". The Senate approved this amendment. The Senate then received the combined report and approved the recommendations contained in these reports with this one amendment.

The Senate Rules Committee presents this report in three parts to the University Senate with the request that a different action be taken relative to each part.

A. Current election practices for certain elective bodies

The Rules Committee requests that this part of the report be accepted by the Senate to be spread on the minutes as representing current practices:

The Secretary of the Senate is charged with administering elections for four deliberative bodies of the faculty--the University Senate, the Senate Council, the Undergraduate Council, and the Non-Voting Faculty Member of the Board of Trustees. Following are the current practices in determining who is eligible to serve in and to vote for the various elected bodies. They rest on several sources: the Governing Regulations (1960); the Rules of the University Senate (1964); a report on the "Role of the University Faculty" approved by the Faculty on May 11, 1959; a report of a special committee dated March 26, 1960, set up by an open meeting of the general faculty on March 24, 1960, to adopt procedures for electing the non-voting members of the Board of Trustees in accordance with the sense of the faculty as reflected at that meeting; the booklet, "Beginning a Second Century", dated October, 1965, detailing the academic plan and adopted by the Senate on November 22, 1965; and Election Committees' instructions for the past several years.

In compiling lists of College or Area faculty who are eligible to be elected to the University Senate, Undergraduate Council, or Board of Trustees, the following criteria shall be applied:

1. He must have the rank of Assistant Professor (or equivalent) or higher.
2. He must be engaged in full time teaching and/or research.*
3. Except for Department Chairman, he must have no official administrative title.
4. Faculty members of the Community Colleges are ineligible.
5. Eligibility is determined as of the time of the election rather than the time of assumption of office.

*For the Senate only, the Division of Libraries is specifically included in the groups having proportional representation even though they may not be engaged in full time teaching and/or research.

Minutes of the University Senate, April 10, 1967 (con't)

Those eligible to vote are the same as those eligible to be elected.

The only criterion for eligibility to be elected to and to vote for the Senate Council is to be an elected member (full time teaching and/or research) of the Senate at the time of the election (or be nominated by at least fifteen Senate members).

For all of the above elections the Secretary of the Senate compiles the lists of eligible faculty from lists certified by the various deans. The Senate Rules Committee serves to advise and make rulings in cases of question.

B. Senate rules relative to term of office and vacancies in the Senate Council and Undergraduate Council.

The Rules Committee recommends the Senate approve the following changes in the Rules of the Senate of March, 1964:

1. Page 26, under heading "Selection, Terms,---", 2nd sentence beginning "Council members may---". Delete this sentence and replace with "Council members are not eligible to succeed themselves until a lapse of one year from the expiration of their terms."
2. Page 26, under heading "Selection, Terms,---", 3rd paragraph, beginning "The terms of Council members,---"; delete all of the paragraph except the first sentence and replace with "If a member of the Senate Council should at any time during his term become ineligible for election to the Senate by reason of assuming an administrative title his seat shall be declared vacant. In event of a vacancy the Chairman of the Council shall appoint as successor that eligible nominee who at the last Council election received the largest vote without being elected to serve until the next Council election, at which time a person shall be elected to serve for any portion of the term which remains."
3. Page 26, under heading "Selection, Terms,---", 2nd paragraph after the sentence ending "---to be filled." insert "However not more than twice the number of names from any one college than there are vacancies for that college shall remain on the ballot."
4. Page 168 of "Beginning a Second Century" adopted by the Senate at its November 22, 1965, meeting, under 3. (b), after second sentence ending "---three year members.", insert "Those eligible to serve in and vote for the Undergraduate Council shall be the same faculty members of the undergraduate colleges who are eligible to be elected to and vote for the University Senate. If a member of the Undergraduate Council should at any time during his term become ineligible to serve, a vacancy shall be declared. To fill each vacancy the Undergraduate Council shall appoint a member from the eligible faculty to serve until the next election."

Minutes of the University Senate, April 10, 1967 (con't)

C. Governing Regulations relative to non-voting members of the Board of Trustees and the University Senate

The Rules Committee requests that the University Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees the following amendments to the Governing Regulations of December, 1960:

1. Page 5, at the end of the paragraph under "2. Membership", add "If a non-voting member of the Board of Trustees at any time during his term becomes ineligible to serve by reason of an administrative appointment his seat shall be declared vacant for the duration of his ineligibility. In the event of a vacancy the Senate Council shall appoint that eligible faculty member who at the last election received the largest vote without being elected. If a replaced member becomes eligible to serve before the expiration of his term, he shall resume his seat."
2. Page 8, under "III University Senate", 2nd paragraph, delete the last sentence beginning with "To fill a vacancy---" and insert "If a member of the Senate should at any time during his term become ineligible to serve, (e.g., by reason of assuming an administrative title, resignation, or an official leave which precludes attendance), a vacancy shall be declared by the Dean of the affected college. To fill each vacancy the Senate Council shall appoint that member from the eligible faculty who at the last election received the next highest vote to serve for the duration of that member's ineligibility."
3. Page 8, under "III The University Senate", after the first sentence insert "Only elected members of the Senate and the three student members shall be voting members."

The Senate Rules Committee recommends that the following eight changes be made in the March, 1964 Rules of the University Faculty.

- Item 1. Under "Admission Requirements, Undergraduate Colleges, 1 Admission to Freshman Class, a.) Resident Students, 1., Page 6:

This item now reads: "that he has at least fifteen units of acceptable high school work and the recommendation of his high school principal"

Recommendation: Delete the words "at least fifteen units of acceptable high school work and"

Reason: The reference to 15 units is out of date, since Kentucky high schools now require 18 units for graduation. However, any reference to numbers of units is confusing and misleading.

Minutes of the University Senate, April 10, 1967 (con't)

Certification of graduation from an accepted high school is the basis for admission.

Item 2. Under the same heading, Item 2, Page 6:

This item now reads: "that he submit the results of a University classification test to the office of the Dean of Admissions. Those scoring below the 25 percentile must come to the campus accompanied if under 21, by a parent or guardian for an interview with the Dean of Admissions, unless special arrangements are made."

Recommendation: That this be restated as follows: "that he submit the results of a University classification test to the office of the Dean of Admissions. Those students whose academic records and test scores indicate that they will have difficulty in maintaining minimum University standards shall be given special counseling by the office of the Dean of Admissions at the time they apply for admission."

Reason: Evidence has shown that the interview does not in itself act as a deterrent to these students, but that a warning letter is a more effective counseling advice. Interviews are still encouraged, however, as well as other kinds of counseling utilizing the services of high school counselors and the University Counseling office.

Item 3. Under 2, "Admission to Advanced Standing", 2nd paragraph, page 7.

This item now reads: "Work done at a fully accredited college or University is recognized credit hour for credit hour. In order to be classified as fully accredited, a college must be a member of a regional accrediting association. Advanced standing from an unaccredited college may be obtained by special subject examinations."

Recommendation: That this item be revised as follows: "Baccalaureate degree credit work taken at a fully accredited college or university is recognized credit hour for credit hour. In order to be classified as fully accredited, a college or university must be a member of a regional accrediting association. Advanced standing from an unaccredited college or university may be obtained by special subject examinations or by validation under conditions set forth by the office of the Dean of Admissions and the office of the Dean of the College within the University in which the student will enroll."

"Technical, terminal and other kinds of course work which is not demonstrably offered for baccalaureate degree purposes will not be accepted by the University as transfer work to be

counted towards a baccalaureate degree, and cannot be validated for such a purpose. Students who have engaged in such course work may, after enrollment, petition to be examined in University courses in the related subject areas."

Reason: The proliferation of technical, terminal, and other types of educational programs with other than baccalaureate degrees as their goal requires this kind of restatement. Course work should be accepted for degree credit by the University of Kentucky only when the institution offering the work clearly and unequivocally endorses its degree value.

Item 4. Under same heading, 3rd. paragraph:

The paragraph now reads: "Credit hours accepted from junior colleges will be limited to a maximum of 67".

Recommendation: That this be expanded as follows: "Credit hours accepted from junior and other two year colleges or branches will be limited to a maximum of 67. This maximum shall be reduced by hours earned at other schools or by other methods. Once a student has earned 67 credit hours by any method or methods, no further work taken at a junior or two-year college or branch can be accepted for transfer credit. In evaluating an applicant's record to determine his admissibility, however, all course work which has been attempted will be considered."

Reason: This item needs expansion both to clarify the terms for accepting junior college work and to put the transfer of junior college work on the same basis as that for transferring Community College work as stated on page 10.

Item 5. Under 3, "Admission as a Special Student.", Page 7.

Recommendation: The elimination of the category of "Special Student" and the conditions for such students to become degree candidates; and instead, the addition under 1. "Admission to the Freshman Class" of the following: "c.) a student may be admitted to the freshman class if he does not have a high school diploma, is at least 21 years of age, and can demonstrate by tests and other evidence that he is prepared to do the work required."

Reason: The requirement that such a student maintain a 2.5 grade point average for 67 hours seems unnecessary and unfair. There are no apparent valid reasons for not allowing such a student who has performed as well as other students to continue his work towards a degree.

Item 6. Heading, "Acceptable Standards in English, " Page 16.

Transfer students have not been tested upon entrance for several years. However, the English Department is currently studying the entire matter of establishing proficiency in English for beginning freshmen, transfer students, and Community College students coming to the Lexington campus. Until the English Department reports on these matters and makes its recommendations, it is recommended that the first paragraph of this section be held in abeyance.

Minutes of the University Senate, April 10, 1967 (con't)

Item 7. "Classification," Page 16:

Recommendation: that the reference to 28 credit hours for sophomore classification be changed to 30 credit hours to agree with the rules of the Council on Higher Education.

Item 8. "Classification of Transfer Students," Page 17.

This item now reads: "A student who transfers to the University as a junior and ranks in the lowest quarter on the entrance tests will be classified as a junior conditionally. The continuance of junior classification will depend on the student's making a standing of 2.0 or more on his first semester work."

Recommendation: That this item be deleted from University Senate Rules.

Reason: Entrance tests have not been administered to transfer students for several years. The extreme difficulty of administering and scoring such tests in time to make the results available to advisors, and the obvious lack of need for them make it seem advisable to recommend the deletion of this rule rather than the enforcement of it.

Dr. Axton, Chairman of the Honors Committee, presented the following report which was received by the Senate as presented.

- I. Revision of rules governing eligibility and participation:
- A. A composite score of 28 on the ACT and a high school cumulative GPA of 3.5 or better shall be required for admission of incoming freshmen to the UK Honors Program.
 - B. Beginning in the second semester freshman class and continuing thereafter, eligibility for invitation and participation in the Honors Program shall be a rank in the upper ten percent of the student's class and college - but with a cumulative GPA of no less than 3.2 in the Freshman and Sophomore years and of no less than 3.4 by the end of the Junior year.
 - C. Students who do not qualify under paragraph B) above may petition the Honors Program Director for Admission, such petition to be accompanied by letters of recommendation from two or more professors on the Lexington campus. Admission shall be determined by a majority vote of the Honors Program Committee, at a meeting to which the Director of the program has been invited and asked to make his recommendation on each participating student.
 - D. All students who qualify under paragraphs A) and B) above, shall be identified and tendered a formal, written invitation to participate in the Honors Program by the Director.
 - E. In addition, the Committee has called for the development and distribution of an illustrated brochure describing the UK Honors Program as a further means of recruiting qualified students into the program.

Minutes of the University Senate, April 10, 1967 (con't)

F. Together with the Director, the Committee has helped to sponsor studies of the following matters:

1. a survey of student attitudes toward the Honors Program, to determine where and how the Program might be made more attractive to qualified students;
2. to determine what effects participation in the Program has on students' attitudes and habits of thought;
3. to determine if there are other, more accurate methods of identifying qualified Honors Program candidates than those presently in use.

II. Other activities of the Honors Program Committee:

A. Curriculum.

The Committee approved and forwarded to the Academic Senate Council (where it was also approved) a proposal by the Honors Program Director to extend the Honors Colloquium idea into the Junior and Senior years and to provide an opportunity for carefully selected Honors Students to participate with credit in up to fifteen (15) hours of independent study during the undergraduate years. In addition, the Committee and Director are presently engaged in conversations with the Academic Council of the Arts and Sciences College concerning implementation of a proposal for three experimental courses in that college, one each in the Humanities, the Social and Behavioral Sciences, and the Physical Sciences.

B. Administration

The Committee has recommended the appointment of an interim Acting Director during the absence, in the Fall, 1967, semester, of the present Acting Director, and has forwarded to the Provost a list of faculty members deemed acceptable for this post. Naming of a permanent Director has been deferred until Fall, 1967. The Committee has also called for the appointment of a Visiting Professor in Honors for the Spring, 1968 Semester, who shall be available not only for direction of a Colloquium, but also as a resource and advisory person to the UK Honors Program Director and Committee. Such a person, with responsible experience in a successful Honors Program at another institution, may be selected from a list of possibilities already forwarded to the Director and Provost from the Committee.

C. Long-Range goals.

Development of a long-range operating philosophy for the Honors Program is going forward, but it is unlikely to be completed by the end of the 1966-1967 academic year.

Respectfully submitted,

The Honors Program Committee

David Booth
Joseph Engelberg
Steven Diachun
John Haley
John Kuiper

Minutes of the University Senate, April 10, 1967 (con't)

Ellis Brown
W. F. Axton, Chairman

The Senate Advisory Committee on Student Affairs had no further report than that which had already been presented to and approved by the Senate at its meeting of February 27th.

The Advisory Committee on Community Colleges had no report.

The following letter from Dr. Michael Furcolow, Chairman of the Senate Advisory Committee on University Extension, was read by Dr. Diachun:

Agricultural Research Center
S205
Campus

Dear Doctor Diachun:

Enclosed is a report of the University Extension Committee of 1966 which was chaired by Dr. Humphries. The report of the new committee is not ready as the committee members have not yet been able to meet. Please forgive the delay in this report.

Sincerely,

Michael L. Furcolow, M.D.
Chairman, University Extension
Committee

The report of the University Senate Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics which had been circulated to the faculty under date of March 30, 1967 was received by the Senate as circulated.

Only two items warrant reporting this year regarding the relationship of the athletic program to the academic program. The first is the Southeastern Conference requirement that the minimum ACT score for a grant-in-aid is now 17 in place of the previous 16. The second item concerns recent action on the part of the Southeastern Conference admitting freshmen to all varsity athletic teams other than football and basketball. This new provision was put in operation this spring. Freshmen who do compete as a part of the varsity team will not be eligible their first or fourth year of participation in NCAA events (NCAA ruling).

Aubrey J. Brown, Acting Chair-
man
University Senate Advisory
Committee on Intercollegiate
Athletics

As a direct result of the recommendation which the Senate approved at its March 8th meeting that an early report be solicited from the Committee on Evaluation of Teaching, a report and faculty evaluation questionnaire was circulated to the faculty under date of April 6th at the request of the Senate Council. The questionnaire was explained fully to the Senate by Dr. J. E. Barrows, Office of Institutional Studies. Following extensive

discussion and defeat of a motion to send the questionnaire back to the Committee for restudy, the Senate voted to receive the report and questionnaire as circulated.

FACULTY EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

The Student Centennial Committee is interested in getting an expression of faculty opinion about what constitutes effective teaching in a university setting. We have, therefore, devised a short questionnaire to administer to a random sample of the teaching faculty at the University of Kentucky to assess their ideas on this matter. We hope we will ultimately be able to construct a teaching-evaluation instrument from these ideas and then turn it over to the faculty for later voluntary use by individuals who are interested in getting student reactions to their teaching.

It should be made very clear at the outset that it is the intention of this committee that future use of any teaching-evaluation instrument that results from this work will be solely up to an individual faculty member. It should be equally clear that only the individual faculty member will administer, score, and see the results of his questionnaire, if he ever decides to use it in his class. What he decides to do with the results is up to him.

At this point we are simply interested in getting an expression of faculty judgment on the salient criteria of good teaching and passing this information on to the faculty. Once the Student Centennial Committee has constructed these criteria in accordance with the faculty's judgment, it will prepare an instrument incorporating these criteria. What individual faculty members do with this information will be their responsibility.

INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain your evaluations of a number of activities related to university teaching. On the following pages are presented descriptions of wide variety of behavioral incidents that take place in a teaching setting. We are asking you to rate each of these incidents on the scale you find beneath the behavioral description in terms of their degree of importance to the teaching-learning process.

Here is how you use the scale:

If you feel that the behavior described is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your x-mark as follows:

important x : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ unimportant

OR

important ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : x unimportant

Minutes of the University Senate, April 10, 1967 (con't)

If you feel that the behavior is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your x-mark as follows:

important ___ : x : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : unimportant

OR

important ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : x : ___ unimportant

If the behavior seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but not really neutral), then you should x-mark as follows:

important ___ : ___ : x : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ unimportant

OR

important ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : x : ___ : ___ unimportant

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seems most characteristic of the behavior you are judging, which best seems to express your feeling about the behavior. If you consider the behavior to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the word, or if the scale seems to you to be completely unrelated to the behavior, then you should place your x-mark in the middle space. In other words, the middle space means that the behavior is neutral or that you have no opinion about it in this context. When you rate an item in this way, please add a note stating what the middle category means to you.

important ___ : ___ : ___ : x : ___ : ___ : ___ unimportant

IMPORTANT: (1) Place your x-marks in the middle of spaces, not on the boundaries:

 THIS NOT THIS
 ___ : ___ : x : ___ : x : ___

- (2) Be sure you check every behavior -- do not omit any.
- (3) Never put more than one x-mark on a single scale.
- (4) The scale terms (important - unimportant) representing the continuum extremes are randomly alternated; so please rate each item carefully.

Below the printed list of behavioral descriptions a space is provided for the faculty member to list any other behavioral incidents which he feels are important in the teaching-learning process and which are not found on the list.

Remember, we want your sincere evaluations of these behaviors. You may work as fast as you wish, but please give us your true impressions.

A space is provided at the end of this questionnaire for any comments or reactions you might have regarding this project or the questionnaire. There is also enough space between the items for you to add any comments about particular items as you go through the questionnaire.

QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR TEACHER EVALUATION

Name of Professor _____

College and Department _____

Course Name and Number _____

Date _____

Approximate Rank of Student in the University:

(Upper 25%, Upper 50%, Lower 50%) _____

INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain your evaluations of your professor regarding a number of activities related to university teaching. On the following pages are presented descriptions of a wide variety of behavioral incidents that take place in a teaching setting. You are asked to rate your professor on each of these incidents on the scale you find beneath the behavioral description.

Here is how you use the scale:

If you feel that the performance of your professor is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your x-mark as follows:

high x : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : low

OR

high ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : x : low

If you feel that the performance of your professor is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your x-mark as follows:

high ____ : x : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : low

OR

high ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : x : ____ : low

If his performance seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but not really neutral), then you should x-mark as follows:

high ____ : ____ : x : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : low

OR

high ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : x : ____ : ____ : low

Minutes of the University Senate, April 10, 1967 (con't)

2

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon how effective and competent you feel your professor is in each category. If you consider your professor to be average in a category, then you should place your x-mark in the middle space.

high _____ : _____ : _____ : x : _____ : _____ : _____ low

IMPORTANT: (1) Place your x-marks in the middle of spaces,
not on the boundaries:

THIS NOT THIS

_____ : _____ : x : _____ x _____ : _____

- (2) Be sure you check every category -- do not
omit any.
- (3) Never put more than one x-mark on a single
scale.
- (4) The scale terms (high - low) representing the
continuum extremes are randomly alternated; so
please rate each item carefully.

Remember, your sincere evaluations of your professor are desired.

Minutes of the University Senate, April 10, 1967 (con't)

QUESTIONNAIRE

Assuming each statement describes an important factor in the teaching-learning process, how would you rate your instructor on each, using a scale from low to high where low means, in your judgment, an absolute absence of such factor and high indicates the ideal.

1. Encourages viewpoints which differ from his own.

high _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : low

2. Is available for consultation outside class.

low _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : high

3. Assignments are appropriate to objectives of course.

low _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : high

4. Is consistent in grading.

low _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : high

5. Effectively uses supplementary aids in classroom presentation.

high _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : low

6. Conveys grading criteria to students.

low _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : high

7. Uses dramatic techniques in presenting materials.

low _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : high

8. Tests cover basic course material rather than fringe areas.

high _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : low

9. Course content agrees with catalogue description.

low _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : high

10. Speaks distinctly at the proper rate, tone, and volume.
low ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : high
11. Maintains balance between lecture and discussion.
low ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : high
12. Lectures and assignments are not repetitious.
low ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : high
13. Makes tests reasonable in terms of coverage and length.
low ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : high
14. Is considerate of students.
high ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : low
15. Stimulates students to do critical and independent thinking.
low ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : high
16. Recognizes own limitations.
low ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : high
17. Makes clear the objectives of the course to the students.
high ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : low
18. Generates students' interest in the discipline.
high ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : low
19. Clearly interprets abstract ideas and theories.
high ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : low
20. Recommends suitable reference materials.
low ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : high
21. Has understanding for students and their problems.
low ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : high

22. Has up-to-date knowledge of the subject.
low ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : high
23. Generates awareness of social responsibility related to his field.
high ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : low
24. Personal appearance.
low ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : high
25. Prepares beforehand for each class meeting.
high ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : low
26. Encourages class participation.
low ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : high
27. Professor's announced objectives agree with what is actually taught.
high ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : low
28. Indicates that he enjoys teaching students.
high ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : low
29. Class presentations are well-organized and clearly presented.
low ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : high
30. Manifests wide knowledge in areas beyond his specific subject field.
high ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : low
31. Stimulates intensive study of course material.
high ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : low
32. Uses tests as an aid to learning.
low ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : high
33. Has no distracting mannerisms, such as looking out the window,
clearing throat, etc.
low ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : high

34. Stimulates meaningful discussions inside or outside of class.

low ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : high

35. Stimulates independent study of related materials.

high ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : low

36. Uses language appropriate to the level of study.

high ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : low

37. Test questions unambiguous.

high ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : low

38. Relates course content to other fields.

low ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : high

39. Answers class questions clearly and understandably.

low ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : high

40. Considers range of ability in class presentation and in assignments.

low ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : high

Item					
Response		# of Respondents			
1	1	2			
	2	2			
	3	0		N	= 141
	4	5		Mean	= 6.27
	5	11		Median	= 7.0
	6	44		SD	= 1.19
	7	77			
<hr/>					
2	1	0			
	2	1			
	3	1		N	= 143
	4	1		Mean	= 6.47
	5	8		Median	= 7.0
	6	48		SD	= .88
	7	84			
<hr/>					
3	1	1			
	2	0			
	3	0		N	= 143
	4	4		Mean	= 6.55
	5	7		Median	= 7.0
	6	32		SD	= .68
	7	99			
<hr/>					
4	1	0			
	2	0			
	3	0		N	= 142
	4	7		Mean	= 6.41
	5	12		Median	= 7.0
	6	39		SD	= .89
	7	84			
<hr/>					
5	1	4			
	2	4			
	3	8		N	= 140
	4	9		Mean	= 5.47
	5	30		Median	= 6.0
	6	51		SD	= 1.61
	7	34			

Item

Response

of Respondents

1 6
2 2
6 3 6
4 5
5 17
6 51
7 55

N = 142
Mean = 5.80
Median = 6.0
SD = 1.48

1 3
2 14
7 3 9
4 28
5 41
6 32
7 11

N = 138
Mean = 4.67
Median = 5.0
SD = 1.53

1 2
2 1
3 7
8 4 6
5 20
6 52
7 53

N = 141
Mean = 5.90
Median = 6.0
SD = 1.37

1 8
2 12
9 3 9
4 15
5 30
6 43
7 25

N = 142
Mean = 4.94
Median = 5.0
SD = 1.82

1 0
2 3
10 3 1
4 9
5 17
6 53
7 60

N = 143
Mean = 6.07
Median = 6.0
SD = .96

Item

Response		# of Respondents	
11	1 7	N = 141 Mean = 5.34 Median = 6.0 SD = 1.57	
	2 4		
	3 5		
	4 15		
	5 29		
	6 49		
	7 32		
12	1 3	N = 138 Mean = 5.43 Median = 6.0 SD = 1.50	
	2 6		
	3 5		
	4 20		
	5 22		
	6 45		
	7 37		
13	1 1	N = 141 Mean = 6.20 Median = 7.0 SD = 1.27	
	2 3		
	3 1		
	4 7		
	5 14		
	6 39		
	7 76		
14	1 1	N = 141 Mean = 6.45 Median = 7.0 SD = 1.00	
	2 2		
	3 2		
	4 1		
	5 7		
	6 36		
	7 92		
15	1 2	N = 142 Mean = 6.77 Median = 7.0 SD = .96	
	2 0		
	3 0		
	4 0		
	5 0		
	6 20		
	7 120		

Minutes of the University Senate, April 10, 1967 (con't)

4

Item	Response	# of Respondents
16	1 2	N = 143 Mean = 6.17 Median = 6.0 SD = 1.37
	2 2	
	3 1	
	4 8	
	5 9	
	6 50	
	7 71	
17	1 2	N = 143 Mean = 6.12 Median = 7.0 SD = 1.47
	2 7	
	3 0	
	4 2	
	5 15	
	6 43	
	7 74	
18	1 0	N = 142 Mean = 6.30 Median = 7.0 SD = 1.20
	2 2	
	3 2	
	4 6	
	5 9	
	6 45	
	7 78	
19	1 1	N = 142 Mean = 6.30 Median = 7.0 SD = 1.09
	2 0	
	3 2	
	4 3	
	5 7	
	6 48	
	7 81	
20	1 2	N = 142 Mean = 5.99 Median = 6.0 SD = 1.37
	2 2	
	3 4	
	4 8	
	5 18	
	6 46	
	7 62	

Minutes of the University Senate, April 10, 1967 (con't)

Item

5

Response		# of Respondents	
21	1	1	
	2	3	
	3	4	
	4	3	N = 141
	5	15	Mean = 6.19
	6	38	Median = 7.0
	7	77	SD = 1.15
22	1	0	
	2	0	
	3	0	N = 143
	4	1	Mean = 6.83
	5	3	Median = 7.0
	6	15	SD = .46
	7	124	
23	1	6	
	2	5	
	3	5	N = 140
	4	19	Mean = 5.48
	5	20	Median = 6.0
	6	35	SD = 1.80
	7	50	
24	1	10	
	2	10	
	3	6	N = 142
	4	11	Mean = 5.11
	5	30	Median = 6.0
	6	41	SD = 2.00
	7	34	
25	1	2	
	2	0	
	3	3	N = 143
	4	7	Mean = 6.42
	5	7	Median = 7.0
	6	24	SD = 1.22
	7	100	

Minutes of the University Senate, April 10, 1967 (con't)

5

6

Item

Response

of Respondents

26	1	1	N = 142 Mean = 6.25 Median = 7.0 SD = 1.11
	2	1	
	3	0	
	4	7	
	5	16	
	6	42	
	7	75	
27	1	1	N = 140 Mean = 6.09 Median = 6.0 SD = 1.18
	2	5	
	3	2	
	4	4	
	5	16	
	6	45	
	7	67	
28	1	2	N = 141 Mean = 6.03 Median = 7.0 SD = 1.46
	2	3	
	3	3	
	4	10	
	5	17	
	6	34	
	7	72	
29	1	0	N = 142 Mean = 6.56 Median = 7.0 SD = .95
	2	3	
	3	1	
	4	2	
	5	6	
	6	25	
	7	105	
30	1	10	N = 141 Mean = 5.15 Median = 6.0 SD = 1.64
	2	2	
	3	9	
	4	19	
	5	28	
	6	42	
	7	31	

Minutes of the University Senate, April 10, 1967 (con't)

Item	Response	# of Respondents	
31	1 1	N = 142	Mean = 6.14
	2 2		
	3 2		
	4 5		
	5 15		
	6 53		
	7 64		
32	1 4	N = 142	Mean = 5.62
	2 6		
	3 3		
	4 10		
	5 29		
	6 43		
	7 47		
33	1 4	N = 141	Mean = 4.84
	2 3		
	3 4		
	4 11		
	5 24		
	6 45		
	7 50		
34	1 2	N = 142	Mean = 6.34
	2 0		
	3 2		
	4 2		
	5 10		
	6 48		
	7 78		
35	1 3	N = 142	Mean = 6.03
	2 2		
	3 1		
	4 5		
	5 22		
	6 46		
	7 63		

Minutes of the University Senate, April 10, 1967 (con't)

Item

8

Response

of Respondents

36	1	2			
	2	1			
	3	3			
	4	6			
	5	17			
	6	50			
	7	62			
			N	=	141
			Mean	=	6.07
			Median	=	6.0
			SD	=	1.30

37	1	3			
	2	1			
	3	2			
	4	6			
	5	11			
	6	31			
	7	87			
			N	=	141
			Mean	=	6.28
			Median	=	7.0
			SD	=	1.31

38	1	2			
	2	2			
	3	2			
	4	11			
	5	33			
	6	49			
	7	42			
			N	=	141
			Mean	=	5.74
			Median	=	6.0
			SD	=	1.17

39	1	0			
	2	1			
	3	1			
	4	0			
	5	7			
	6	31			
	7	102			
			N	=	142
			Mean	=	6.62
			Median	=	7.0
			SD	=	.68

40	1	5			
	2	5			
	3	2			
	4	13			
	5	26			
	6	43			
	7	45			
			N	=	139
			Mean	=	5.58
			Median	=	6.0
			SD	=	1.66

Minutes of the University Senate, April 10, 1967 (con't)

Dr. Schwert, Secretary, University Senate Council, presented a recommendation from the Senate Council that, subject to approval by the Registrar, the recommendation of the Special Calendar Study Committee, College of Law, be approved as circulated to the faculty under date of March 31, 1967. Following indication by the Registrar of his approval of the modified law calendar for the 1967-68 academic year, the Senate approved the modified calendar as circulated.

The Recommendations of the Senate Calendar Committee, approved by the Senate March 8, 1967, authorized a study committee to develop a modified calendar for the College of Law, and to recommend it to the University Senate (Minutes of the Senate, March 8, 1967, p. 3, paragraph 2 E).

The study committee, composed of six Law faculty representatives, was constituted. After full consideration of the opinions of Law students and faculty, the committee upon due consideration proposes the modified calendar for 1967-68 set out below; and further proposes, should this modified calendar be approved, adoption of similarly constituted programs for the College of Law for the school years 1968-69 and 1969-70.

The need for a modified calendar arises because (1) the College of Law should be offering 15 weeks of classes each semester in order to meet accrediting association standards, (2) there is need for reading periods, and (3) 10 days are required for final examinations each semester.

Under the modified Law calendar fall semester 1967 classes would begin on Monday, August 28, instead of Wednesday, August 30. There would be a reading period, and the first semester would be slightly extended to allow for a 10-day examination period before vacation. Following Christmas vacation, the second semester in Law would begin on January 8 rather than January 15. There would be a reading period, and final examinations in the spring would end on the date set by the University calendar. This schedule would provide substantially 15 weeks of classes the first semester, a full 15 weeks in the second semester, and would include the reading periods and longer examination periods desired by students and faculty alike. The modified Law calendar includes University holidays and vacations.

Proposed Modified 1967-68 Calendar for the College of Law

Monday, August 28--Start of classes (except for freshmen, who will register that day)

Friday, December 8--End of classes

Saturday, December 9, through Wednesday, December 13--Reading period

Thursday, December 14, through Saturday, December 23--Examination period

Monday, January 8--Start of second semester

Friday, April 26--End of classes

Saturday, April 27, through Wednesday, May 1--Reading period

Thursday, May 2, through Saturday, May 11--Examination period

The special study committee requests approval of this modified calendar by the University Senate at its meeting on April 10. The calendar has the approval of the Law faculty.

Robert A. Sedler, Chairman
Raymond Ellinwood, Jr.
W. Garrett Flickinger
Willburt D. Ham
Robert G. Lawson
Paul Oberst

The Dean of Admissions and Registrar read the following letter relating to action taken by the Senate at its meeting of March 8, 1967 in which it voted to remove Labor Day as an academic holiday from all University calendars.

March 29, 1967

Dear Bert:

Although the Senate included Labor Day as a regular class day in the University Calendar, that Day, by statute and by University policy set forth some time ago in a memorandum from President Oswald to University personnel, is one of the four holidays officially recognized by the University.

Accordingly, in presenting the Calendar the statute and policy should be followed; that is, Labor Day will be a holiday.

This has been discussed with the chairman of the University Senate Council.

Sincerely,

A. D. Albright
Executive Vice President

The Senate adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary