

The University Senate met in special session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, May 10, 1971, in the Court Room of the Law Building. Chairman Rovin presided. Members absent: Lawrence A. Allen\*, Ronald Atwood\*, Robert Aug\*, James R. Barclay\*, Charles E. Barnhart, Henry H. Bauer\*, Harry M. Bohannon, Garnett L. Bradford\*, Betty J. Brannan\*, Russell H. Brannon, Michael Bruer\*, Marion A. Carnes, Clyde R. Carpenter, W. Merle Carter\*, S. K. Chan\*, Richard A. Chapman, Glenn B. Collins, Alfred L. Crabb, Jr., Glenwood L. Creech, Clifford J. Cremers\*, Donald P. Cross, Marcia A. Dake\*, William H. Dennen, R. Lewis Donohew, Robert M. Drake, Jr.\*, John P. Drysdale\*, Ronald W. Dunbar, Ray H. Dutt\*, Paul T. Ferrell, Lawrence E. Forgy, Jr., Ira Fowler, Eugene B. Gallagher\*, Art Gallaher, Jr., Wesley P. Garrigus, Leonard S. Gettes, James L. Gibson\*, Charles P. Graves, Joseph J. Gruber\*, John V. Haley\*, Jack B. Hall, Joseph Hamburg, Holman Hamilton, Mary W. Hargreaves\*, Denny O. Harris\*, Virgil W. Hays\*, Donald L. Hochstrasser\*, Charles W. Hultman, John W. Hutchinson, Robert D. Jacobs\*, Raymon D. Johnson\*, L. Clark Keating, Don Kirkendall, Aimo J. Kiviniemi\*, Donald E. Knapp\*, James A. Knoblett\*, Lois W. Langhorst, Bruce E. Langlois, Richard S. Levine, Kathy Liedtke, John H. Lienhard, Richard Lowitt, John L. Madden, Paul Mandelstam\*, Maurice K. Marshall\*, Leslie L. Martin, Joseph L. Massie, William L. Matthews, Jr., Roger M. McCoy\*, L. Randolph McGee, William R. Merritt, Jr., George E. Mitchell, Jr., Alvin L. Morris, Theodore H. Mueller, Franklin W. Nooe, Paul Oberst, James R. Ogletree\*, Harold F. Parks\*, J. W. Patterson, Curtis Phipps, Herbert G. Reid, Donald A. Ringe, Frank J. Rizzo, Virginia Rogers\*, Robert W. Rudd\*, Betty R. Rudnick\*, John S. Scarborough\*, Rudolph Schriels\*, George W. Schwert, Robert A. Sedler\*, Donald S. Shannon\*, D. Milton Shuffett\*, Otis A. Singletary\*, John B. Stephenson\*, Leonard P. Stoltz\*, Hugh A. Storrow, Robert Straus\*, Robert H. Stroup, Thomas B. Stroup, Sidney Ulmer\*, John A. Via\*, John N. Walker, M. Stanley Wall, Ronald D. Weddle\*, Daniel L. Weiss\*, Harry E. Wheeler\*, Raymond P. White\*, William F. Willard, Constance P. Wilson\*, Miroslava Winer\*, Ernest F. Witte\*, Kenneth R. Wright, Leon Zolondek, and Robert G. Zumwinkle\*.

The minutes of the special meeting of April 27, 1971 were approved as circulated.

On behalf of the College of Engineering Dr. Staley F. Adams presented a Resolution on the death of Professor Robert D. Hawkins and directed that the Resolution be made a part of these minutes and that copies be sent to his family. The Senate stood for a moment of silence in tribute to Professor Hawkins and in acceptance of the Resolution.

Robert Dawson Hawkins was born April 11, 1892 in Lexington, Kentucky and died May 1, 1971 of an apparent heart attack. He was awarded the baccalaureate degree BME from the University of Kentucky in 1915. In addition, degrees of M.E. were awarded by the University of Pennsylvania in 1918 and the University of Kentucky in 1921. After many years of service, he returned for additional study and was awarded the M.S. degree in 1939 from the University of Michigan.

He was an instructor at the University of Pennsylvania from 1916-1918. At various times, he had been employed by the Remington Arms Co., Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co., U.S. Navy Department, Duquesne Light Co., Cary-Reed Construction Co, and Kentucky State Highway Department.

\*Absence explained

He was past master of Lexington Lodge No. 1, F & AM and of Oleika Temple Shrine. He was a member of Central Christian Church, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, American Society for Engineering Education, Kentucky Society of Professional Engineers, American Association of University Professors. He was a member of Delta Tau Delta social fraternity, and Pi Tau Sigma and Iota Alpha Phi and Tau Beta Pi honorary fraternities. He was a Kentucky Colonel.

Professor Hawkins returned to his Alma Mater in 1918 as an instructor in the Mechanical Engineering Department. He served the University as assistant, associate and full professor for 44 years. He was chairman of the Department of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics from 1949 until his retirement in 1962 at the age of 70.

He was recognized in many "Who's Who" publications such as, "Who's Who in Engineering", "Who's Who in Kentucky", "Who's Who in America", "Who's Who in American Education" and the "American Men of Science".

Professor Hawkins was deeply concerned and involved with civic affairs of the community. He was a charter member of the Lexington-Fayette County Planning and Zoning Commission in 1928. His service with the Board consisted of 31 continuous years with the last 12 years as Chairman.

Professor Hawkins married Martha Weakley, when they were both students at the University of Kentucky. He was a dedicated family man and is survived by three daughters and nine grandchildren. Not only did he have a principal interest in the University, but he had a sincere interest in all University sporting events. His primary hobby, though, was the extensive travels that he and his wife made throughout the world. With his passing, the University has lost a true friend, engineer, educator, public servant and an institution in the College of Engineering.

The Senate permitted the following students to attend the meeting: John S. Nelson, Mark Neil Paster, Rebecca Westerfield, Pam Mackay, and Richard Conte.

On behalf of the Senate Council, Dr. Staley F. Adams, its Secretary, presented the following policy concerning the seating of the 17 student senators and requested that it be incorporated into the section entitled "Terms; Vacancies" of the Rules of the University Senate. This proposal had been circulated to the faculty under date of May 5, 1971. The Senate approved the policy for incorporation into the Rules:

Current student Senators (17) shall serve terms through the last meeting of the University Senate of the Spring Semester of 1972. After that, newly elected student members of the Senate shall take their seats at the first meeting of the Senate in the Fall, or, at any special meeting called during the preceding summer.

Dr. Garrett Flickinger, the Academic Ombudsman, made the following report to the Senate:

Let me say first that I am very pleased to be able to reiterate what I said at the initial meeting when I spoke to you -- that I have had very good cooperation on the part of faculty and the administration in handling these complaints. There have been a few cases of recalcitrance but, generally, the attitude has been one of cooperation. I certainly appreciated this and I know the students have.

I can report at this time that I have had, as of last Friday, 120 cases involving some 145 students. The difference in the number of cases and students is that several of the cases involved more than one student. I will try to give you some breakdown on the nature of the complaints I received.

As you might expect, a large portion of the complaints were complaints on grades. This can be broken down into six subdivisions -- the first one having to do with the drop-add provisions and withdrawals by the student after the normal free period. Usually the complaint was that the student chose to drop and the instructor said "Fine. You will get an E." where the student thought he ought to be able to drop with a W. In most cases, after discussion with the student, he became aware of the fact that he was, at the time, not passing the course and one could argue that the instructor was quite correct in deciding that since he wished to drop the course, he would have to take an E. On the other hand, there were a couple of cases of students who had tried to withdraw and the instructor tried to convince them not to withdraw and the student was trying to make the decision when an exam was held. The student did not take the exam and the instructor took the position that at this point he dropped failing. I was able to negotiate properly these two cases so that the students did drop with a W. I did not think it was quite fair and the instructor, after some discussion, felt the same way.

There were a number of complaints on standards of grading. This had several different aspects. In some cases the standards were not clearly announced. You will remember that in accordance with the Students' Rights section of the Code instructors are supposed to announce within the first three class periods what the standards are for which they will be judged in that particular course. This generally means not only that the instructor has to indicate the grading items but that, generally, he should also include some idea of the weight to be given to the various items. He might have three term papers or classroom quizzes -- how much does this count on the final grade? How much does the final exam count?

Another area involved misunderstandings; there were problems of communication between the instructor and the student, the instructor frequently knowing what he meant but the student getting a different version. Then there were several complaints involved with the fact that prior exams or papers were not returned, that is, the students were given grades but were never given the exam or

the paper back. I do find this a little bit difficult to understand. It seems to me that we are not just playing with grades; we are providing an education. Therefore the exams and papers ought to be returned. I was able, generally, to provide this although there were a couple of cases where the exams simply had been thrown away rather than returned. Then there were some problems in terms of make-ups. There are legitimate excuses for failing to take an exam and some kind of provisions for a make-up should be made.

I had about 20 cases where the students did not think they were properly judged -- that the grade received was not the grade they should have gotten. Many of these felt they had worked harder than the grade gave them credit for. I explained in all of these cases that I cannot interfere and will not interfere with the fair judgment of the instructor; and in most cases, after talking with the student, I think he or she felt a little bit better in believing that perhaps just hard work does not necessarily mean an A grade.

There were six cases of alleged discrimination by the instructor or grading based on matters other than performance in class. I am happy to say that only two of these had any kind of meritorious claim and that these were both settled.

There were two cases of accusation of violation of the rules as to proper notice being given of examination schedules, and these were satisfactorily resolved.

There were two cases of violation of the Rules as to audit or pass-fail students. In both these cases I had to request the assistance of the department chairmen to solve the matter. An audit student is not required to do the same work that a regular student is required to do. In the case of a pass-fail student the minimum D grade is regarded as a pass and these are part of the University Rules and cannot be changed by individual instructors.

I received several complaints on teaching that can generally be brought down into three different categories. In most of the cases on teaching about all I could do was offer the student my shoulder as a crying towel. I had a number of discussions on this basis. There were at least five cases of accusations of teachers who were contemptuous of students and showed it. I must say that I do regard this, if true, as something that an educator should not be indulging in. We may, indeed, sometimes feel that our students are deserving of this but we certainly do not show them this reaction.

I had several complaints of teachers who were either non-communicative -- that is, could not actually communicate -- or were clearly uninspiring. And then there were two complaints of teachers who are using outdated material in the classroom -- the yellowed notes. I think this is not too bad, if there are only two. Then there were some complaints on courses. At least two

complaints stated the courses were not covering the material that the Catalog said they would cover. There was one rather substantial complaint in this area that is being worked on. There were two complaints that particular courses taken were either disorganized or completely unproductive. There were eight complaints that courses were not scheduled properly or were not adequately staffed. Not scheduled properly means that the schedule was changed arbitrarily by the instructor -- as to time or meeting place -- without the proper authorization from the Registrar's Office and the Dean of the College. There were some 10 complaints of changes in exam schedules without proper notice and without proper approval. Again I would remind you that any change in the classroom meeting place or the time of a class or of the final exam must be done with the approval of the department chairman, the dean of the college, and the Registrar's Office. There were some changes made in terms of exams that were given at a different time than the normal scheduled class period. This was during the regular course of the year. This is a question of notice. Here the dean's permission is required though not the Registrar's. These were generally handled but I would caution you that it seems to me, if only in fairness to the student, that if there are to be exams given at times other than the regularly scheduled class meeting -- by this I mean regular exams during the course of the semester -- they ought to be indicated in advance; by the time of registration if not by the time of advance registration so that the student can make his appropriate plans. Some of these were scheduled at night and this does create some problems.

There were some 11 complaints regarding transfer of grades or credit, either internal or external; problems involving transfers from community colleges, transfers from other institutions. One in particular was where the Registrar's Office had made an agreement with a student concerning a required course taken at a school of equal caliber. Under the agreement the student, with a grade of D in the course, was told that the D grade would not transfer and that the credit for that course would not transfer, but it was decided that she would be regarded as having satisfied the requirement of that course toward the degree. There was a change in personnel some place along the line and she came ready to graduate and was told she could not graduate. This was cleared up. I might say, as a matter of fact, that the Registrar's Office has been most helpful in clarifying all these matters of the transfers of grades and credits.

There were six cases of plagiarism. I would say at this point, for my colleagues in the English Department with whom I hope I am still on speaking terms, that I have not deliberately tried to be difficult with them and I would assert, contrary to a view that seems to be running through the English Department, that to the best of my knowledge I have never plagiarized. What I had attempted to indicate was that when I was in school the way I took notes it would have been possible, as I think with other students, to have plagiarized, but to the best of my knowledge and ability I never did and so I swear to you that as far as I know I never plagiarized. Let the record speak. I do feel that the punishments being given for plagiarism have been greater than I felt proper or justified under

the circumstances. I particularly feel this way in view of the reports of the multi-million dollar business we now have in the sale of term papers. And by the way there is an entrepreneur on this campus. I have seen his brochures on the sale of term papers mailed to me by the Deans of Students at two other institutions. Now, at least the student who plagiarizes has read the material. He has attempted to do the research and that is deserving of something. It is also, I think, much easier to plagiarize and much more understandable than is cheating on a final exam. This is not to say I do not think plagiarism should be punished. The question is how hard the punishment should be. To drop a student from a course with an E because of one paper is a very heavy penalty. He not only loses the credit but his overall grade point average is rather drastically affected. In each case I tried, in my dealing with the English Department and with other departments, to see if in fact this could be regarded as a clear case of intentional plagiarism. I can say I did find one such clear case and supported that particular department. This was a clear case of intentional plagiarism. In the other cases, however, I felt there was not an intentional desire, in fact, to plagiarize. I have had five cheating cases. My recollection is that in all of them I upheld the decision of the department and instructor involved. They had them documented. There were two cases of alleged cheating but with no documentation. In one case an attempt was made to use statistical probability. I indicated I did not feel I could justify or agree with an E for the course on the basis of cheating based merely on the statistical probabilities of a student achieving a given grade. It seemed to me it needed more in the way of documentation. In both cases of lack of documentation the instructor did decide he didn't have enough documentation. But the student, in one case at least, agreed with the instructor that the particular paper would not count one way or the other, the student feeling that he or she could do as good work anyway and the instructor concerned about giving the student the grade when there were indications of cheating. Finally, I had a number of what I call miscellaneous items, some of which I will not mention simply because they would be too obvious as to the personnel. I did have some cases of advice to the faculty. Four members of the faculty came for such advice on a number of different matters such as changes in courses, changes in exam schedules, the proof that might be needed on a cheating case, et cetera. I also had a very large protest signed by five hundred plus students on the graduation fee which I turned over to the administration and the Publications Board.

Approximately five students came in to discuss with me the fact that they had been dropped from the University and what they should do about it. We had a very pleasant talk. There were four cases of very bad advising of students that really got trapped because of some very bad advice. Again I served as more of a crying towel.

I had several cases involving the smoking memorandum which I sent to you. I am really quite serious. I am almost a chain smoker myself, but I do think that there are people who are

physiologically nauseated by heavy concentrations of cigarette smoke and some of our classrooms are very low-ceilinged. Now I would also ask you to look around. There is a sign in the back of this room, for instance, that says "No Smoking". We have all been somewhat lax about conformance. If you will look at some of the chairs, you will see what can happen with cigarette smoking. This is a very expensive auditorium and the chairs, in many cases have nice fat holes burned in them from somewhat careless cigarette ashes. And there have been considerable complaints of smoking in some of the older buildings in classrooms where the danger ought to be obvious. So again I reiterate the request made in that particular memorandum.

I have three recommendations which I will pass on to the Senate and the Senate Council in the hope that perhaps something can be done in terms of changing or amending the Rules. The first is to add "intimidation of a faculty member" to the list of academic offenses. I had a case of intimidation of a faculty member by a student. Since there was no academic offense involved the only offense that could be invoked against the student would have been on the disciplinary side. I think it ought to be added. I think that there ought to be a penalty on the grade for attempting to intimidate or bribe -- I haven't had one of those yet but it might come -- a professor to give a grade.

Secondly, I would suggest that in the Rules regarding the right of the instructor to penalize the student for violation of an academic offense, there be a clarification concerning the giving of an E for the course. You will remember that the instructor can give an E for the paper or the exam in which the academic offense occurred, or an E for the course, or he can recommend to the Dean that the student be dropped. The Appeals Board and I have taken the position that to give an E for the course without dropping the student can occur only when the cheating or whatever the academic offense is, occurs on the final exam or the final term paper. Otherwise, it doesn't make much sense to talk about dropping the student with an E. It makes the two of them too close together. It is somewhat difficult for the student if on the second term paper he is told that he is going to get an E for the course for cheating but is not being dropped. It is somewhat difficult to imagine that he will feel very serious about continuing to prepare for that course. I think this ought to be clarified to make sure that we are doing what you want us to do.

Finally, I did have about seven cases involving students in the Graduate School. I would like to suggest to the Graduate School that it might be wise to make some studies as to the possible changes in handling your particular problems in the Graduate School dealing with the academic offenses and setting up some kind of procedure for adjudication within the Graduate School structure. Let me urge that you might at least make some kind of study of this problem. I would be happy to make my records, which are not confidential, available to the appropriate Graduate School officers. I found the greatest difficulty in dealing with the

problems in the Graduate School was knowing who to negotiate with. There is the department chairman, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Associate Dean of the Graduate School, ~~the Dean of the~~ College, the adviser, and the Committee for the graduate student, et cetera. It becomes somewhat difficult to find who makes the final decision.

This is my report for the year. I will say that I have thoroughly enjoyed my year in service and that I am only asking not to be reappointed next year because the Law School has difficulty in relieving me from teaching duties. I have found it somewhat difficult this year to use this as an extra-curricular activity. It does need a full half-time slot and trying to teach a full-time load and carry full-time teaching responsibilities, plus the Ombudsman job, has become more than I can handle.

Thank you for your courtesy.

Dr. Flickinger was accorded an ovation in recognition of his work as Academic Ombudsman.

On behalf of the Senate Council, Dr. Adams presented a proposal to delete the first paragraph under Section IV, RULES RELATING TO STUDIES, Absences in the Rules of the University Senate and replace it with the following new paragraph. This proposal had been circulated to the faculty under date of May 5, 1971.

F. Attendance:

Attendance by the student shall not be mandatory. However, in cases where attendance is essential for demonstration by the student of his degree of mastery of course materials, such attendance may be appropriately weighted in determining the student's final course grade. Where infrequent attendance disrupts the class, the student may be dropped for excessive absences and the instructor shall report his grade as W. In all cases the instructor shall announce on the first or second day of class his policy regarding class attendance.

Following extensive discussion in which the Senators expressed concern that this proposal removed from them the option of requiring class attendance by a student, Professor Roger Eichhorn presented a motion to table the proposal and the Senate approved the motion.

Mr. Scott Wendelsdorf, President of Student Government, presented a proposal from the University Student Advisory Committee (USAC) and its Subcommittee on ROTC that a University-wide ad hoc committee be established to study the proper role for ROTC at the University of Kentucky; that this committee be composed of two administrators and one representative of the Military Science programs (to be appointed by the President of the University), three faculty members (to be



appointed by the University Senate Council), and three students (to be appointed by the Student Government); that this committee be charged with investigating the desirability of establishing and implementing, on an inter-departmental and inter-collegiate basis within the University a program of Military Studies, such program to provide the academic component of U.S. Army Officer Training and U.S. Air Force Officer Training at U.K. along lines indicated in the report written by Dr. Ellwood Hammaker for the Arts and Sciences ad hoc Committee on ROTC; that this committee be charged with investigating other supplementary or alternative proposals for strengthening ROTC programs at the University; and that this committee report its findings to the University Senate Council no later than October 1, 1971.

This proposal was circulated to the faculty under date of May 5, 1971.

Following a statement by Mr. John Nelson, a student, advancing his reasons for proposing the foregoing resolution, Dr. Thomas Olszewsky stated that since the College of Arts and Sciences was already involved in a study of the ROTC role and, initially, it regarded this question as a college matter, he wished to make a motion that the proposal presented by Mr. Wendelsdorf be tabled until the regular November meeting of the Senate in the fall.

Mr. Wendelsdorf stated that he thought the issue should be discussed further and called for a roll call vote on whether or not to table the proposal. The Senate defeated the motion for a roll call vote.

The Senate then voted to table the motion to the regular November meeting of the Senate this fall.

The Senate adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Elbert W. Ockerman  
Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

DEAN OF ADMISSIONS AND REGISTRAR

May 5, 1971

To the University Senate

A special meeting of the University Senate will be held at 3:00 p.m., Monday, May 10, 1971, in the Court Room of the Law Building. As provided in the Rules of the University Senate, the 10-day circulation period for notice of meeting is hereby waived.

Items on the agenda will include the proposal relative to the seating of the student Senators, circulated to the faculty under date of May 5, 1971; a report from the Academic Ombudsman; the proposal to change Section IV, F. Absences, in the Rules of the University Senate, circulated to the faculty under date of May 5, 1971; and a proposal from the University Student Advisory Committee relative to ROTC, circulated to the faculty under date of May 5, 1971.

Elbert W. Ockerman  
Secretary