

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

August 27, 1979

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet in regular session on Monday, September 10, 1979 at 3:00 PM in the Classroom Building, Room 106.

AGENDA:

- 1) Introductions.
- 2) Minutes: April 30, 1979.
- 3) Memorial Resolutions.
- 4) Chairman's Resolution.
- 5) Chairman's Remarks:
 - a) Fostering departmental contacts with Community College units.
 - b) Faculty representation on Search Committees.
 - c) Senate procedures.
- 6) Action Items:
 - a) Withdrawal Policy (circulated under date of August 24, 1979).
 - b) Proposed Rule change: Section ^{VI}IV, 1.1 and 1.2 (circulated under date of August 24, 1979).
 - c) Proposed Rule change: Section I, 4.1.12 (circulated under date of August 27, 1979).
 - d) Proposal to establish definitions for the terms "Center" and "Graduate Center" to be recommended to the Administration for inclusion in the Governing Regulations (circulated under date of August 27, 1979).

/cet

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

Copy 2

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, SEPTEMBER 10, 1979

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, September 10, 1979, in Room 106 of the Classroom Building.

Joseph Krislov, Chairman, presiding

Members absent: Rusty Ashcraft, Charles E. Barnhart, Leslie Bingham, Brack A. Bivins, Jack C. Blanton, Peter P. Bosomworth*, Robert N. Bostrom*, Mike Breen, Thomas W. Brehm, Barbara Bryant*, Joseph T. Burch, Joe B. Buttram*, Michael D. Carpenter*, Pat Cegelka, S. K. Chan, Linda Chen*, Donald B. Clapp, Charlotte Clark, Glenn B. Collins*, Frank Colton, Ken Cornn, Emmett R. Costrich, James E. Criswell, Lynne Crutcher, Paul Davis, Scott Davis, Guy Davenport*, Joseph M. Dougherty, Herbert Drennon, Phillip Duncan, Anthony Eardley, W. W. Ecton*, William D. Ehmann, Dave Elder, Kevin Ellis, Jane Emanuel, Edward G. Foree, Tom Francis, John H. Garvey*, Robert D. Guthrie*, Joseph Hamburg, Curtis E. Harvey, S. Zafar Hasan*, Clyde L. Irwin*, Donald W. Ivey*, Freddie James, H. Douglas Jameson, Keith H. Johnson*, Wesley H. Jones*, Elizabeth A. Kirlin, James R. Lang*, Thomas P. Lewis*, William J. Marshall*, Mark Metcalf, Elbert W. Ockerman*, Alan R. Perreiah, Deborah E. Powell*, E. Douglas Rees, David H. Richardson, Charles Rowell, Wimberly C. Royster, Robert W. Rudd*, John S. Scarborough*, Gary Shenton, Randall B. Smith, Tim Smith*, Wade C. Smith, Charles S. Spiegel*, Lynn Spruill*, Terry Squires, Ralph E. Steuer, Anne Stiene-Martin, Harold H. Traurig, S. Sidney Ulmer, Kevin Vaughn, M. Stanley Wall, James H. Wells, Angene Wilson, Louise J. Zegeer, Robert C. Zumwinkle*

The minutes of the meeting of April 30, 1979, were approved as circulated.

The Chairman introduced the people involved in the Senate and the newcomers. The members of the Senate Council are: Joseph Bryant, English; Jane Emanuel, Allied Health; John Lienhard, Engineering; Daniel Reedy, Spanish and Italian; George Schwert, Biochemistry; James Kemp, Animal Sciences; Donald Ivey, Music; William Wagner, Chemistry; Ex officio Members, Michael Adelstein and Connie Wilson; Mark Metcalf, Student Government President; Michael Breen and Vincent Yeh, student members.

The Committee Chairmen are Philip Noffsinger, Library Committee; Bradley Canon, Rules Committee; Anna Reed, Admissions and Academic Standards; Tony McAdams, Student Affairs, Kathryn Sallee, Teaching, Learning, and Advising; Glenn Collins, Research; Joe B. Buttram, Academic Programs; Joseph Engelberg, Academic Planning and Priorities; Andrew J. Grimes, Academic Organization and Structure; John Thrailkill, General Studies; Malcolm E. Jewell, Special Teaching Programs; Jane Kotchen, Academic Facilities; John Garvey, Extended and Continuing Education; and P. S. Sabharwal, Special Teaching Technologies. The Chairman announced that the first meeting of the Committees would be Monday, October 1.

Chairman Krislov introduced Martha Ferguson, Recording Secretary, telephone number 7-2958. Ms. Ferguson is the person to call to be excused from Senate meetings. The parliamentarian for 1979-80 is Professor Stanford Smith; Sergeant-at-arms, James Alcorn and David Stockham. The Staff Assistant is Ms. Celinda Todd. The Chairman asked the new members to stand and everyone applauded each other.

The Chairman recognized Dr. Otis A. Singletary who gave a word of welcome. The Chairman said that the President is now in his second decade, and we look forward to his being here for many years to come.

*Absence explained

Dr. Singletary spoke to the Senate as follows:

"Good afternoon, members of the Senate. It is my pleasure to be here for a brief visit with you this afternoon, not only to welcome you back but also to touch briefly on a series of matters that I hope will be of interest to you. I appreciate the remark that this is the beginning of the second decade. I remember it was not so long ago that I faced this group for the first time. I'm always reminded of the conversation I had with the Acting President, Ab Kirwan, at the time we were talking about the position. I had been invited for an interview, and I said to Ab that I didn't know why anybody would want to go into a presidency now. The timing is not right. Ab, with that great, good humor, said that there had been only eight presidents in the entire history of the University of Kentucky and nothing like that was going to happen here. I said to him 'Ab, I'd feel a lot better about that if I hadn't known five of them personally.'

It is a pleasure to welcome you back for what I hope will be a good year for all of us and, given the temper of our times, having a good year is not routine any longer. There are a number of items I want to touch on and, to begin with, I want to make some tentative comments on the preliminary data we have on enrollments for the current year. The final figures are yet to come. This information has to do only with the Lexington campus, and as you remember, there comes a time, and that time is September 27, when there will be a number of cancellations for non-payment of fees. The final enrollments will come on the heels of that. These figures are based upon the comparison at the same stage last year. These are tentative and indicate certain things, but there is nothing final or definitive about these figures. The Community College figures are not included, although we think the Community College enrollment will be up some over the last year. The enrollment in Lexington appears to us to be up two and one-half percent, which is interesting considering what is happening around the country. Female enrollment is up over five percent, not quite five and one-half percent. The male enrollment remains percentagewise virtually unchanged. Part-time enrollment is up nearly seven percent. Full-time enrollment is up about one and one-half percent.

You hear so much about the non-traditional student, part-time student, the student who is working--this is happening in many places around the country, and I think UK is no exception. I might say that there have been many who felt that this University has not been particularly responsive to that kind of student. While we like to argue that point, we are pretty well committed to broadening the base of service to those who are interested in pursuing their education on a part-time basis. The part-time female enrollment is up nearly ten percent. First year freshmen increased only slightly; no significant change over last year. Undergraduate enrollments in toto up a little better than three percent--graduate enrollments about one-half a percent. Law, Medicine, Dentistry, as you know, are fixed admissions so they remain unchanged. Our largest college, which is Arts and Sciences, increased about 3.3 percent. Our newest college, Communication, is up about twenty-eight percent. The largest numerical increase is in Business and Economics with close to a nine percent increase. Architecture, Fine Arts, Pharmacy are up and Education remains unchanged. We had some decline in enrollment in Nursing,

Agriculture, Allied Health, Engineering, Home Economics and Social Professions. The division of colleges is up 3.1 percent. Medical Center enrollments are down about four percent. As you know, Medicine and Dentistry have fixed admission numbers. That's what the picture looks like as of now, and I tell you this for your own information. We are not yet ready to release final figures, but it does look like we are going to have from 500 to 550 more students than we had last year.

There are a series of items I want to touch on very briefly that I think are of particular interest to this group. Last April the Senate acted upon recommendations from its Research Committee, and I would like to report to you that within the next thirty days I expect to have met with the Senate Council and hopefully to have ready for the Board of Trustees a proposal for a non-tenured research professor series for this University. Also included in your recommendation was the establishment of a cabinet level administrative unit headed by a Vice President for Research. I do not choose to go that route, at least at this time. I have yet to find any compelling evidence that the title makes any significant difference. We have studied a number of other institutions, some do better than we and some do not do as well. There are examples both ways. What I think you should understand though is that from the standpoint of the research emphasis within the institution what I consider to be important is that that person, who happens to be Dean Royster, does participate in the meetings of the cabinet and does have the opportunity to make his input when these matters are discussed. In any event, I hope to have this in front of the Senate Council in the very near future and will want their reaction before I make a formal recommendation to the Board of Trustees. I think there has been pretty general agreement about the desirability of this institution being able to have some people committed full-time essentially to research without necessarily being committed to a lifetime appointment in this institution.

I would also like to mention to you a thing or two about some of our programs. As you recall, we still have three doctoral programs at the Council on Higher Education: the Ph.D. in Computer Science, Communication and Philosophy. Your guess is as good as mine as to when we are going to hear about this. I am told that they are being considered. It is not impossible that we are going to get some action on them. We have several degree programs included in the Five-Year Plan which has been submitted to the Council on Higher Education. (The Five-Year Plan has some valuable information about this institution and its prospects and at least what we would like to do in the next five years if we can get the support to do it.) We also have several masters degree programs in the Council and another five or six proposed in the Five-Year Plan.

I have another comment I want to make which has to do with a matter we talked a good bit about last year. It has to do with the recruitment of black faculty at this institution. I found myself in the relatively unhappy position of having to explain why we had not done better when, in fact, the President does very little hiring of faculty. I am happy to say to you that we have had what I believe to be the most significant year and most significant response in this University's history as far

as this problem is concerned. If my figures are correct, I think there are ten new black faculty members on this campus, one from the Medical Center and an additional nine from the division of colleges. The reason I'm pointing this out is that it is more than a doubling in the division of colleges. The figure was seven the year before. That isn't going to please a lot of people because the number is small, but it is significant, to me at any rate, because for the first time the word is seeping down where it matters in this institution in terms of trying to get some action in identifying and bringing to this campus black faculty members. I want to thank, not just the Vice Presidents with whom I have dealt primarily, but also the Deans, those of you who are Department Chairmen, and those of you as individual faculty members, and there are many, who have worked very steadily on this matter. I think it has been a significant step forward, and I want to say to you, one, that on behalf of the University I appreciate it and, two, that we must redouble our effort. We have taken our first significant step, and I don't want it to be our last. I'm sure you join me in that. I think it indicates that we can move on some of these things when there is a will to do so.

Another matter which I think is particularly important to the faculty has to do with the retirement resolution which we hope to put before the Board of Trustees at its next meeting, or at the one immediately subsequent. There's been a good bit of delay about this. The Labor Department delayed forever publishing its guidelines for institutions and others as to what you could do. Now given the vagaries of the Federal Government we find they have transferred the authority from the Labor Department to the EEOC (which is the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission), and they are talking about issuing yet another set of guidelines which may undo the ones we have just received from the Labor Department. If that sounds ridiculous, it is. Let me say this for general information: I think the critical decision has been made, and I think the faculty ought to be aware of that. The decision as I saw it was whether or not we were going to exercise the option of not including our faculty in the mandatory retirement age of 70. As you know, there was a grace period in which you did not have to allow your faculty members to stay on until 70. We have made our basic determinations and commitments, and we included in what we put before the Board of Trustees the proposition that the normal retirement age at this University will be 65. The mandatory retirement age will be 70. All faculty members are included. The faculty were exempted as a class until 1982. We are not exercising that option and whatever it's worth to you, we chose not to exercise that option mainly because of the real disadvantage that faculties, including our own, have been placed in in recent years in terms of the cost of living. It seemed to us to be unnecessarily harsh. Given the beating that we are taking in the market in terms of salaries and that kind of thing, it did not seem appropriate for us to insist on that also. You can have arguments on both sides of that question, philosophically and theoretically. Our basic view is that the market place has determined for us that we will not go that route. The details will all be spelled out and resolutions will be adopted by the Board of Trustees but the basic question that affected most faculty was whether or not the University was going to exercise its option to continue to make all faculty members retire at age 65 until 1982. The answer is that we are not going to do that.

Let me mention very briefly two or three capital construction matters. The Law School addition has been completed, and I think they have added some very important, useful space. The dedication of the Fine Arts Building, about which there is a newspaper story today, is going to be in November, regardless of what the story says. The building is a wonderful addition to this campus, because we had been fairly light, in my opinion, in those things that provide interest in the cultural life. I will feel better about the building when we get the landscaping done--it's still looking a little barren. The two hundred new apartment units that we had constructed were open barely in time for school to start. This is another one of those hair breadth tales we hear about each year. We had a last minute surge and the contractor did get them ready. I visited several apartments last week, and I think the students are going to like them. They are having the normal problems that go with moving into a new location. Once again, I think some landscaping will make the environment more attractive. The biggest problem, I gather, at this point is the bussing. If there are any two problems that we have little chance of ever solving at the University of Kentucky, I would say they are parking cars and moving people. The problem grows and grows and our ability to deal with it shrinks and shrinks. Other than that, the capital construction front is relatively quiet, and I know you will welcome that for a change.

The last item I want to comment on is one that is probably the most important to you, to me, and to the institution in general. That is to remind you that this is the year of the biennial budget request to the Legislature. We have put forward our request for funding for the University for the next two years. Our Board of Trustees has approved the budget. It is now in Frankfort. As you know, it goes through the Council on Higher Education, then it goes to the Department of Finance, and then it goes to the Legislature. If history is any indication in these matters, it will be altered from its present form. You ought to know at least what it is we have chosen to emphasize in this particular biennium. The point I want to make to you is that while the figures are large, our concern is not on new programs, not expanding existing programs but on trying to take care of some of the problems inside this institution and in institutions like it that have been created by the most inflationary decade in our history. This budget reflects it all the way through. We have less than one percent of our request for new programs, less than ten percent for expanding and improving existing programs. We have asked for a rather substantial amount of money to try to correct the deficiencies that have been visited upon us for over a decade as this institution has lost relative position. Let me say first of all that we begin with certain fixed costs. They come off the top, no matter what money you get; you have no choice about those things. If the Federal Government legislates a change in the social security payments, we have to meet that regardless. There are things like that that are clear commitments from the institution that I would put in the fixed cost category. We have some money in the budget for debt service, for new facilities we hope to build, but we don't know yet what the outcome will be. There's a good bit of concern in this state about the status of the capital construction program in higher education, and I think a lot of clearing of the air is going to have to take place on that. We have some money in the budget for catch up for the library. This library is the one really good research library in the state. We have also put in a request for current expense money. They estimate

that the cost of utilities will go up twenty percent. What I want to get to specifically, though, in terms of the faculty situation is that we have put in a request for salary increases of 9.5 percent for each year of the biennium. In addition to that 9.5 percent which we have asked for to deal with the anticipated rise in the cost of living, we have also put in a request for catch-up dollars in the salary category and the catch up is based on our survey of our benchmark institutions. It is our best judgment that we are about \$1600 below the median of our benchmark institutions. We are asking that the State bring us to the median of the benchmarks. These are the figures we have in the budget. I do want you to understand from the beginning that we are not unaware of what is happening to faculty salaries. We are making an effort, and we are going to continue to do that. You will read your newspapers, as I will read mine, to find out how the budget makes its way through channels. Basically, what I want you to remember is that when we come down to the point of being asked for choices and priorities, it is our belief that the internal, inflationary problem of the institution is the overwhelming problem and we propose to put any dollars we have into salaries, not into new programs, not into expanding programs, not into anything else. To the degree they honor our priorities, I want you to know that is where our priority is going to be. What that dollar turns out to be remains to be seen. That is the basic theory and logic of the budget request that is at the Council now. I was in Frankfort all morning with the staff on the Council of Higher Education going over our budget request and explaining to them precisely what we had in mind and what our concerns were and attempting to reconcile any differences they may have with ours. It is a long and laborious process of getting that budget worked through the system, but I assure you that we are going to do the best we can.

Let me tell you again that I am pleased to welcome you back, to see you here, and I hope you are ready for what is going to be a really fine year for all of us. Thank you very much."

The President was given an ovation, and Chairman Krislov thanked him for his remarks.

Professor Joseph Bryant, Department of English, presented the following Memorial Resolution on the death of William Hugh Jansen.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

William Hugh Jansen, 1914-1979

William Hugh Jansen, who died in Lexington on June 13, 1979, was a native of Stamford, Connecticut. He received his undergraduate training in that state, studying at both Trinity College and Wesleyan University and graduating from the latter in 1935; he taught for two years at the Williston Academy in Massachusetts, listing as his subjects English, French, mathematics, and sports; and from 1937 to 1949 was a student, teaching assistant, instructor, administrator and finally assistant professor at Indiana University, where he took his Ph.D. in folklore in 1949. Bill Jansen, as he was known here and throughout the world, thus was both a student of the great pioneers in his field, among them the late Stith Thompson, and a junior member of their distinguished number. His dissertation, Abraham "Oregon" Smith, published by

Arno Press in 1977, was one of the first in folklore to be written anywhere in the United States; and even in its unpublished form it brought him attention internationally. Publishers pestered him continually about the work until he at last allowed it to be printed, two years before his death.

Aside from his appointments at Indiana (Instructor 1942-48 and Assistant Professor 1948-49), both of which he received while working on his degree, Bill Jansen's only academic home was here at the University of Kentucky. He taught for thirty years on this campus and saw the discipline of folklore grow from an oddity in the eyes of many academic people to an established part of the academic curriculum at Kentucky and elsewhere in this country. His part in establishing folklore as a recognized discipline consisted, in addition to teaching it brilliantly in his own classroom, of lecturing at other colleges and universities in this country (Kentucky State, Berea, Western Kentucky, Ball State, Ohio State, Purdue, Michigan State, Indiana, and the University of Michigan), serving as General Editor of the Bibliographical and Special Series of the American Folklore Society (some twenty volumes), writing articles of his own (about fifty), reviewing the works of others (more than 100 items), and serving editorially in one way or another on five regional and national folklore publications. Bill's special interest was oral narrative, and he was widely known among folklorists for having identified the S-X factor, whereby students are alerted to the social, political, ethnic and psychological values of folk tales as well as to their aesthetic values.

In addition, Bill Jansen has represented his discipline and Kentucky at the University of Ankara, at the Bandung Institute of Technology, and at meetings and conferences in Israel, Canada, Germany, Greece, Romania, Finland, and the British Isles. He was a Fulbright Lecturer, a Ford Foundation Faculty Fellow, a Senior Fellow of the National Endowment for the Humanities, a full member of the International Society for Folk-Narrative Research, a Fellow of the American Folklore Society, and a Delegate to the American Council of Learned Societies. In 1965 he was a member of President Lyndon B. Johnson's White House Conference on the International Cooperation Year. It is no wonder, therefore, that his colleagues elected him the University's Distinguished Professor for 1974 and no accident that he delivered in December of that year one of our more memorable Distinguished Professor lectures, "The Rationale of the Dirty Joke." It was also no accident that on that occasion he made one of his most persuasive comments about the importance of folklore:

It is popular these days for doom-sayers to wonder what will happen as energy shortages leave the pleasure car in the carport, the TV inoperative, the reading lamps dim, and the drive-ins closed. As for me, I wonder what will happen if we fail to cultivate the opportunity presented by our oral

tradition to entertain and to be entertained
within a community of ourselves small enough
to be comprehended by ourselves.

Kentucky Alumnus, p. 15

If we do fail in this effort it will not be because Bill Jansen failed to point the way. He left us forever, almost one month to the day after his formal retirement, and is survived by his wife, the former Violet E. Schraft, two children, two grandchildren, and a host of friends from Lexington to Bandung and back, all of whom remember his love of life and his charity for every human being.

(Prepared by Dr. Joseph A. Bryant, Jr., Chairman, English Department)

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

Jerry D. Brandenberger, 1932-1979

Jerry D. Brandenberger, Professor of Physics, died suddenly and unexpectedly while on leave from the University of Kentucky's Physics and Astronomy Department at Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory in New Mexico. He died on Sunday, August 5, 1979 at 47 years of age. Jerry completed his undergraduate work at the William Marsh Rice University of Houston, Texas and his graduate work at the University of Texas in Austin, Texas. He was awarded the Ph.D. degree in 1962, with dissertation in nuclear physics. He joined the faculty of the University of Kentucky in the Fall of 1963, just after completing a three-month appointment in the fast neutron physics program of Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory. Jerry had been invited to become a member of the nuclear physics team developing a program of research and education at the then new 6 MV Van de Graaff accelerator. He accepted the shielding and detection systems used from 1967 to the present. He became an internationally respected scientist in instruments and methods, with outstanding expertise in radiation detection and electronic systems for fast neutron physics. In 1970 the Wright Patterson Air Force Laboratories sought Jerry's aid in the development of their fast neutron physics program, and he and others operated a successful neutron scattering program at Wright Patterson from 1971 to 1973. This was in addition to his continued research in the Kentucky laboratories.

Jerry's major interests were in distinguishing direct scattering from absorptive processes in neutron induced reactions, and in an accurate mathematical representation of precision and accuracy which led to his withholding publication until every source of ambiguity or error had been carefully examined, and until he was confident that his results would not need subsequent correction. His experiments were published in Nuclear Instruments and Methods, Nuclear Physics, and the The Physical Review, as well as other journals. His capacity for work and zeal for research were inspiring to all who knew him, as well as the humor he brought to the many unexpected technical problems always to be encountered in a research laboratory. He was the first at Kentucky to introduce modern electronic

systems and methods into undergraduate teaching, having reorganized the senior electronics courses. He was completely at home, and deservedly confident, in any laboratory.

His developing circulatory problems, which culminated in his first major heart attack in 1975, began a period of frustration and suffering, for one so passionately dedicated to research and innovation. In 1976 he seemed to be making a good and full recovery, and began to turn his attention to problem areas in applications of nuclear technology. This led him to seek once again a post at Los Alamos, this time in the nuclear safeguards program. While on leave there, his work was recognized anew in his 1977 promotion to Professor. He was preparing to return to his post in Kentucky at the time of his death. His quiet nature, his sharp wit and sense of history, and most of all his confident power in the laboratory will be missed by those he leaves behind.

Jerry had a strong sense of history and tradition, and a sharp wit which he turned often to the many contradictions he saw in the contemporary scene, to the delight of his auditors. During the 1970's he suffered a great deal because his passion for work had to be blunted by his medical problems, a suffering shared by his family. He was married to Ann Morris Brandenberger in 1960 and was the father of three children, Jerry Duke, 16; Sarah Morris, 15; and John David, 12. The family will continue to live at 401 Grand Canyon Avenue, in White Rock, New Mexico. He is survived also by his parents, Stanley S. and Evelyn Duke Brandenberger of Houston, Texas, and by a brother, Stanley George of Dallas, Texas. We join the family in their sorrow at Jerry's death, and wish them a speedy and whole recovery from this period of grief.

(Prepared by Marcus T. McEllistrem, Physics and Astronomy)

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

Rudolph Schrils, 1936-1979

Rudolph Schrils, Associate Professor of Physics at the University of Kentucky, died unexpectedly on May 28 at age 42. Born in Curacao, Netherlands Antilles in 1936, Rudy received a B.S. degree in physics from the University of Florida in 1958 and the Ph.D. from the University of Colorado in 1963. After serving as an Instructor in the Physics Department of Yale University in 1963, he joined the Physics Department of the University of Kentucky in 1964.

Rudy Schrils was bright by anyone's standards and he made a number of important contributions to the field of theoretical physics. His primary research interest was in particle or high energy physics and in nuclear structure. He was a constructive critic and kept reminding us of the need to take care with basic principles.

Rudy's great love and great gift was in his communication with other people. He was a wonderful companion, a great lecturer, an outstanding teacher, and a good tennis player. Rudy loved people; and people loved him in return. He loved to compete and he relished victory.

Among his greatest cares was his affection and interest in students of all levels. He cared for students and was always willing to counsel with them. It was for this reason that he held such a lasting interest in the undergraduate program in the Department of Physics and Astronomy and the driving reason behind his long service as Director of Undergraduate Studies in that Department.

Since he gave so much to his students, it seems appropriate to close this Memorial Resolution by quoting from a statement by one of his students, John Woodring, about the favorite professor, Rudy Schriels:

"Dr. Rudolph Schriels...was a dedicated scholar, an inspiring teacher and a good friend. For a generation of students, he was the symbol of what we wanted to become. He nurtured us through difficulties, berated us for our laziness, teased us about our faddishness and always cared for us. He was our Dutch Uncle. We will remember him holding court in the Physics Department Conference Room with a circle of students eagerly listening to 'why an electron is a particle and a photon is not' or perhaps 'how the Dodgers would finally, this year, beat the Yankees.'...Rudy loved life and enjoyed everything he did and he taught us to do the same. Rudy was a man who appreciated a good joke, even more if aimed at him, a pat hand at poker, and a good passing shot on the tennis court; and, he possessed an abundance of all three. He always had time for even the weakest students. He gave something special to each of them. We all lead more productive and happier lives for having known him, but it will not be nearly so much fun without him."

Mr. Chairman, I request that this Memorial Resolution be made a part of the minutes of the University Senate and that copies be sent to members of Professor Schriels' family.

(Prepared by Fletcher Gabbard, Physics and Astronomy)

Chairman Krislov directed that the Resolutions be made a part of these minutes and that copies be provided to members of the immediate families. The Senators were asked to stand for a moment of silence in tribute and respect to Dr. Jansen, Dr. Brandenberger, and Dr. Schriels.

Chairman Krislov recognized Professor John Lienhard, who presented the following Resolution on Professor Joseph A. Bryant.

A RESOLUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE, SEPTEMBER 10, 1979

Dr. Joseph A. Bryant, Jr., has just completed a year as Chairman of both the Senate Council, and the Senate. Those of us in the Council have found him to be very considerate of disparate voices and viewpoints. He repeatedly served as the balance wheel that helped us arrive at reasonable solutions of sticky problems. Within the Senate he has provided a model of literacy and reasonableness that we might all emulate. Under his leadership, the Senate dealt with a variety of tough issues, including a significant re-affirmation of the importance of our research function in the University.

Joe's even-handedness in the Senate stayed strong, even when he tumbled into the midst of an intense controversy--one in which some people suggested that when we don't require a book on this campus, we virtually ban it from use. During the storm, Joe continued to exemplify the words that Kenneth Clark used at the end of his television series on the meaning of Civilization. Clark summed up by saying, in part:

"I believe that order is better than chaos, creation better than destruction. I prefer gentleness to violence, forgiveness to vendetta. On the whole I think that knowledge is preferable to ignorance, and I am sure that human sympathy is more valuable than ideology....I also....believe in courtesy, the ritual by which we avoid hurting other people's feelings by satisfying our own egos."

These are conservative ideas and, in that Joe Bryant embodies them, he is a conservative man. Clark goes on to characterize our contemporary dilemmas using Yeat's words: "The best lack conviction, while the worst are full of passionate intensity." Joe has not been full of passionate intensity, and he is indeed a man of conviction. He has provided us all with a good example, as well as with effective leadership.

Be it therefore resolved that we, the members of the Senate, offer Joseph A. Bryant, Jr. a vote of appreciation for his year of very hard work on our behalf.

Dr. Bryant was given a hand of applause.

Chairman Krislov made the following remarks on the activity of the Senate Council during the summer.

"Many students at the University of Kentucky take their freshman and sophomore work at a Community College System. Many of these students either transfer here or go on to other universities. It is extremely desirable that these classes resemble the content of the courses on campus. For many years the Community College people tried to monitor by various methods. They have representatives on the Undergraduate Council and the General Studies Committee and they try to keep up with changes in textbooks, etc. As you would suspect, on a diverse campus such as this, they are not always informed of all the changes and subsequently there are some problems. We have had several this past year and in discussion with the Community College Council members there was some feeling that there should be more communication. The Community College System has agreed to finance the travel of their people in various disciplines to the campus in Lexington for meetings with Department Chairmen, Undergraduate Chairmen, coordinators or the entire faculty of a department when some change is

contemplated in the 100-200 level course. Those of you in various disciplines who are contemplating some change in the direction of those courses should contact the Community College System and try to arrange a meeting. Obviously, if all 40 or 50 departments have curriculum changes next year, it will be very difficult to finance the meetings. Perhaps over the years there can be a constant checking of the course materials and textbooks, and the result will be an improved course content at the freshman and sophomore level. There will also be an improved transfer student who is going to be taking advanced courses at this campus. I hope many of you will try to take advantage of this.

The second topic which will come before the Senate is something that began during Chairman Wilson's administration and that involved an effort to provide some sort of direct input of faculty into the Search Committees for both the Department Chairmen and Deans. The proposal that came to the Council in late summer will be put on the agenda shortly. It provides for the direct election of some members of the Search Committee by the faculty in a unit. There was some question about the attitude of the various deans and we have solicited them. The Deans were divided on the issue. There were four in favor, four against, one had no comment and one seemed to be saying there were advantages and disadvantages.

The third topic I want to point out is that we are trying to provide for the implementation of the rule on amendments to agenda items. The rule requires that amendments be submitted in writing. Last year and previous years, the Council has had difficulty in knowing exactly what was being voted upon or what was voted on. We are trying to ask your indulgence in presenting in writing amendments following the circulation.

The Sergeant-at-arms circulated a substitute Page 2 of the withdrawal policy because of a typographical error, and the Chairman asked for a unanimous consent to substitute the circulated page for the August 24 agenda item. There was no objection.

Chairman Krislov recognized Professor William Wagner, Secretary of the Senate Council, who presented a motion to adopt the proposed revisions in the University Senate Rules, V, 1.8.1 and 1.8.2, Withdrawal Policy. This proposal had been circulated to members of the University Senate under the date of August 24, 1979. If approved, the proposed change will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

The Chairman asked the Parliamentarian, Professor Stanford Smith, to tell the Senate where they stood in light of all the motions that have taken place in regard to the proposal. Professor Smith said that the last meeting of the Senate considered the withdrawal policy and a number of motions, amendments, actions, etc. happened, and now V, 1.8.2 is a part of the Rules of the University Senate. The proposal received in the mail and the Substitute Page 2 are also part of the Rules of the University Senate. He said that there was a motion on the floor to substitute the one circulated.

Professor Wilson asked for a clarification on what was different about the rule that was passed out and the one previously circulated. The Chairman said that the typographical error made in the original circulation had the paragraph as the title proposed interpretation of V, 1.8.2 when in fact, that was a proposed change. The floor was opened for questions and discussion.

Professor Thrailkill proposed a substitute motion which was seconded. He made three points concerning the motion. First, he said his reason for changing the meaning of "W" from "withdrew passing" to "withdrew" had already been done by an earlier act. The second was that he believed that a student should not withdraw after just a week or two in the semester for academic purposes. He said that when a student withdrew the second half of a semester it should be only for non-academic reasons. Third, he said that he did not like the "WP" and "WF" which had a complicated meaning. He added that it was costly and unnecessary to create the two new grades, and it was presently unfair to students because some instructors will give a "W" and others an "E." That situation would continue with the "WP" and "WF." The amendment would eliminate the instructor having to assign a "WP" or "WF" to those who withdrew for non-academic reasons. He said that if a student were in academic difficulty the last half of the semester, quite often it was because of non-academic reasons. He felt that the "WP" and "WF" were academic penalties.

Professor Olszewsky said that as he understood the substitute motion, it was basically getting away from treating the "W" as though it were an academic grade. Dean Royster asked if a student withdrew the last half of a term upon a petition, would that student not get an earned grade. The Chairman responded in the affirmative.

The substitute motion passed and reads as follows:

1. Change the meaning of "W" from "withdrew passing" to "withdrew."
2. Change Senate Rule V, 1.8.2 to read:
 - (a) A student may withdraw from a class during the latter half of the term upon approval by the dean of the student's college of a petition certifying urgent non-academic reasons including but not limited to:
 - I. Illness or injury of the student;
 - II. Serious personal or family problems;
 - III. Serious financial difficulties.

If such a petition is approved by the dean of the student's college, the student is assigned a grade of "W."

The Chairman recognized Professor William Wagner for a motion from the Senate Council. Professor Wagner, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposed rule change: Section VI, 1.1 and 1.2, Information About Course Content and Standards. This proposed change had been circulated to members of the University Senate under date of August 24, 1979. The Chairman said that this proposal arose with the Ombudsman, Professor Emanuel, it was strongly supported by the Student Government, and the Council was presenting it. The floor was opened for questions and discussion.

Professor Gesund said that there was much that was not handed out in the courses in writing. He added that he wondered why it was necessary to hand out course content in writing. He said the course content was the course description, and it was in the catalog. He asked what was meant by the word "standards" to be used in evaluating performance. He added that the grading system of the University was adequately described in the Univer-

sity Senate Rules. He felt that the rule was vague. Professor Reedy said that it did suggest that when a rule of that nature was contemplated and when it did say it was to be in writing, there must be some form of penalty, of retaliation, of a system of black-listing when it involved one of their number not living up to the letter of the law. He said he did not find that implication in the proposal. He felt there were legitimate questions to be answered in the proposal and those should be discussed very carefully before having a final vote. Professor Just spoke against the motion, because he believed it was poorly thought through in terms of the proposed course content of the University. He said he found it extremely difficult to visualize himself writing what the standards would be in graduate courses. He added that research courses were also listed as courses.

Chairman Krislov asked the Academic Ombudsman, Jean Pival, if she would speak on the issue. Professor Pival said that Professor Emanuel recommended the proposal after the Ombudsman's Office had had five years of frustration. Professor Pival suggested an amendment to change "Standards" to "Criteria."

Professor Westley called for point of order. He said that on the agenda the proposal changed two words in something that was already passed. He said that the Senate could not now make amendments without its going beyond the agenda. Any proposal to amend anything but those words was inappropriate. Professor Pival said that if the parliamentarian felt the amendment was out of order, she would withdraw it. She pointed out that she felt passing the proposal the faculty would be much less likely to have students in the Ombudsman's Office complaining. Professor Leinhard said that the word "Standards" would have to be changed to "Criteia" before he would vote for the proposal. The Chair and the parliamentarian agreed that the Pival amendment was out of order since the Senate was only directing itself to the adoption of the "in writing" phrase. The Chair also believed the amendment was not in order because it was not submitted in writing before the meeting.

After further discussion, Professor Wagner moved, and it was seconded, that the agenda item be tabled and sent back to the Senate Council for further consideration. There was no discussion on the motion, and it passed.

Motion was made to adjourn at 4:50 p.m.

The College of Dentistry Revised Calendar for 1979-80 is being circulated for your information.

Martha M. Ferguson
Recording Secretary

COLLEGE OF DENTISTRY
Revised Calendar, 1979-1980

Summer 1979

May 29 - August 22 Field experience period for students who have completed three years of dental school.

Fall 1979

August 17 Friday - Orientation and clinics begin for third-year students

August 22 Wednesday - Orientation begins for first-year students

August 23 Thursday - Orientation begins for second- and fourth-year students

August 27 Monday - Classes begin for all students

September 3 Monday - Labor Day Holiday

November 22-24 Thursday through Saturday - Thanksgiving Holidays

December 21 Friday - Winter Vacation begins after last class

Spring 1980

January 7 Monday - Classes resume for all students

February 15-18 Friday through Monday - Long Weekend - No classes

April 14-19 Monday through Saturday - Spring Vacation

April 25 Friday - ASDA Day - No classes

May 9 Friday - Classes end for graduating students

May 10 Saturday - University Commencement and College of Dentistry Graduation Program

May 26 Monday - Memorial Day Holiday

May 30 Friday - Classes end for continuing students

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

August 24, 1979

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday,
September 10, 1979. Proposed revisions in the Senate
Rules, V, 1.8.1 and 1.8.2, Withdrawal Policy.

Background:

The history of the withdrawal policy during the last five years at the University of Kentucky is too long to be summarized briefly. Suffice it to say here that the policy approved by the Senate at its meeting of December 12, 1977 has now been implemented for a period of approximately one (1) year. The Rules Committee of the Senate and the Senate Council have both considered objections to the application of certain details and made rulings which have served to fix the interpretation of one or two disputed points. To resolve these disputes the Rules Committee and the Undergraduate Council both submitted proposals for modification of the Senate withdrawal policy and the whole matter was discussed at length on the Senate floor at the meetings of March 12 and April 9, 1979. At the latter meeting, the Senate adopted a number of amendments and they have been incorporated in the text which follows.

Proposed Implementation Date: January 1, 1980.

Withdrawal Rule:

V 1.8.1 During the first week of a course a student may withdraw without leaving a mark of any kind.

During the remainder of the first half of the course the withdrawing student must receive a mark of a "W."

[continued]

Page 2

Senate Agenda Item: September 10, 1979

Withdrawal Rule

August 24, 1979

V 1.8.2 A student may withdraw from a class during the last half of the term upon approval of a petition certifying urgent reasons including but not limited to:

- I. Illness or injury of the student;
- II. Serious personal or family problems;
- III. Financial inability to continue at the University, or;
- IV. Call to military service.

Such petition should be recommended by the student's advisor and instructor and must be approved by the dean of the student's college. The instructor must assign an appropriate grade (see Section V, 1.3) or a grade of P or W may be assigned by the University Appeals Board (see Section VI, 5.1.1b).

Proposed Interpretation of V 1.8.2

During the last half of a course a student may not withdraw without receiving an earned grade, which his instructor will assign, except that for urgent reasons approved by the dean he may withdraw with a "W/P" or a "W/F." Neither the W/P nor the W/F will be calculated in the student's GPA; these marks, like the "W," are for information only.

NOTE: Whenever possible, amendments or motions relative to agenda items on the floor of the Senate for action should be presented to the presiding officer in writing by the person(s) proposing said amendments or motions prior to the opening of the Senate meeting. (University Senate Rules, Section I, 2.3, paragraph 6.)

/cet

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

August 24, 1979

III

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, September 10, 1979. Proposed change in University Senate Rules, VI, 1.1 and 1.2.

Background:

The attached proposal for a change in the Senate Rules was referred to the Senate Rules Committee, which recommended approval. The Senate Council now likewise presents it for approval.

Proposals: (add underlined portions)

- VI 1.1 Information About Course Content. A student has the right to be informed in reasonable detail in writing at the first or second class meeting about the nature of the course and to expect the course to correspond generally to its official description.
- VI 1.2 Information About Course Standards. A student has the right to be informed in writing at the first or second class meeting about the standards to be used in evaluating his performance, and to expect that the grading system described in the University Catalog will be followed. Whenever factors such as absences or late papers will be weighed heavily in determining grades, a student shall be so informed in writing at the first or second class meeting.

/cet

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

August 27, 1979

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday,
Sept. 10, 1979. Proposed change in University Senate
Rules, Section I, 4.1.12.

Background:

Last September the Senate approved a proposal made by the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure to set up a sub-committee on resource allocations, which would consist of six (6) persons, including a chairman designated from the membership of the parent committee and five (5) additional members appointed by the committee. The only restriction on these five (5) was that they should be appointed from those eligible to vote in elections to the Senate. Both the Committee on Academic Organization and Structure and the Senate Council have had considerable difficulty this year in finding people to serve as chairman of the subcommittee. Accordingly the committee itself proposes the following rule change as a solution to the problem. The proposed change is as follows:

Present: (brackets indicate proposed deletion)

That the Senate Council shall designate a [member of the Committee on Academic Organization and Structure as] Chairman of the sub-committee and that five additional sub-committee members shall be appointed by the Committee on Academic Organization and Structure to serve on the sub-committee for staggered terms of three years. The sub-committee members shall be appointed from those eligible to vote in elections for membership in the Senate and should not be representative of any constituency.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

JV

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

August 27, 1979

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday,
September 10, 1979. Proposal to recommend definitions
for the terms "Center" and "Graduate Center" to the Ad-
ministration for inclusion in the Governing Regulations.

Background:

On March 22, 1979 the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure sent to the Senate Council two proposals for modifying the Governing Regulations of the University, Part VII, A-1. These recommendations have to do with the definition of the term "center" which has recently been a source of some confusion among faculty, and particularly those charged with academic planning. At this date the University Senate and/or Senate Council has recommended seven centers for establishment:

- a) The Appalachian Center
- b) The Northern Center
- c) The Center for Developmental Change
- d) The Graduate Center for Public Administration
- e) The Graduate Center for Toxicology
- f) The Multidisciplinary Center for Gerontology
- g) The Sanders-Brown Research Center

The Committee on Academic Organization and Structure has examined these units and, considering them as models, propose that the definition given below becomes the official definition for "center" to be used hereafter. The Senate Council considered the Committee's proposal, asked the Graduate Dean to review it, made one minor modification at his suggestion and voted to transmit it to the Senate with a recommendation to approve and forward to the Administration for implementation.

Current Rule:

V 1.8.2 A student may withdraw from a class during the last half of the term upon approval of a petition certifying urgent reasons including but not limited to:

- I. Illness or injury of the student;
- II. Serious personal or family problems;
- III. Financial inability to continue at the University, or;
- IV. Call to military service.

Such petition should be recommended by the student's advisor and instructor and must be approved by the dean of the student's college. The instructor must assign an appropriate grade (see Section V, 1.3) or a grade of P or W may be assigned by the University Appeals Board (see Section VI, 5.1.1b).

Proposed Change:

V 1.8.2 During the last half of a course a student may not withdraw without receiving an earned grade, which his instructor will assign, except that for urgent reasons approved by the dean he may withdraw with a "W/P" or a "W/F." Neither the W/P nor the W/F will be calculated in the student's GPA; these marks, like the "W," are for information only.

Note: If approved, the proposed change will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.