

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

US  
10/10/77

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL  
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

September 30, 1977

TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE:

The University Senate will meet in regular session at 3:00 p.m. Monday, October 10, 1977, in the Court Room of the Law Building.

AGENDA:

- 1) Approval of minutes of meeting of September 12, 1977.
- 2) Chairman's remarks.
- 3) John Stephenson: Undergraduate Education
- 4) Action Items:
  - a) Proposal for Re-organization of the College of Home Economics, to be approved and forwarded to the administration for appropriate action. (Circulated under date of September 30, 1977.)
  - b) Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I, 3.1.2 and Section I, 3.1.3 pertaining to the term of office of the Chairman of the Senate Council. (Circulated under date of September 29, 1977.)

Elbert W. Ockerman  
Secretary, University Senate

/cet

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL  
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

September 29, 1977

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, October 10, 1977. Proposal to change the University Senate Rules, Section I, 3.1.2 and 3.1.3, pertaining to the term of office of the Chairman of the Senate Council.

Background:

1) The Chairman of the Senate Council serves a term of one year beginning January 1st and ending December 31st. This time frame seriously impedes the business of the Senate. The outgoing Chairman leaves office with much of the work he or she has been associated with incomplete, and the incoming Chairman assumes office at the busiest time of the year faced with the problem of assuming direction of the multitude of activities initiated by the previous Chairman.

Further, the Chairman of the Council is relieved of half-time duties in his/her academic unit. It is generally easier to find replacement personnel for the academic year than for the calendar year.

Proposed changes in Section I, 3.1.3 of the Rules presented below are designed to change the term of office of the Chairman of the Senate Council from January 1 through December 31 to July 1 through June 30.

2) It is the usual case that the Chairman of the Senate Council is serving in his or her third year as a Council member. Thus, when a term of office as Chairman is completed the past Chairman immediately ceases to be a member of the Council. This means that the past Chairman's intimate knowledge of Senate activities is lost to the Council. The Council feels that it is highly desirable to have the immediate past Chairman of the Council continue as an ex officio member of the Council to provide greater continuity in Senate activities. The changes in Section I, 3.1.2 of the Rules presented below will make the Chairman of the Senate Council an ex officio member of the Council for the year immediately following the term as Chairman if she or she would not normally hold elected membership in the Council.

Page 2

Senate Agenda Item: Senate Council Chairmanship  
September 29, 1977

This is a particularly propitious time to make these changes since Professor Wilson, the current Chairman of the Council, will continue in her third year as an elected member of the Council immediately following her year of service as Chairman. Professor Oberst, Chairman-elect of the Council, will assume office on January 1st, but is retiring on July 1, 1979, and will serve for only six months making the change in the term of office for the Chairman particularly convenient.

Action: The Rules Committee and the Senate Council propose the following changes in the Rules of the University Senate effective immediately (deletions in brackets, additions underlined).

I. 3.1.3 Officers (E-04-76) -- The officers of the Senate Council shall consist of a Chairman, a Chairman-elect and Secretary. The Chairman shall hold office from [January 1st] July 1st to [December 31st] June 30th, shall preside at Council meetings, and shall be responsible for the operation of the Senate Council office. The Chairman-elect and Secretary-elect shall be elected [at the first or second Council meeting in March] in May,\*to assume office 14 months later. The Chairman-elect shall assume the duties of the Chairman in his or her absence, and shall succeed to the office of the Chairman on [January 1st] July 1st or at any time that the office becomes vacant. The Secretary shall assume office on [January 1st] July 1st, shall serve for a term of one year or until a replacement is elected, shall keep the minutes of the Council meetings and shall present Council recommendations to the University Senate for action. If for any reason the office of Chairman-elect or Secretary

. . .

I, 3.1.2 Composition -- The Senate Council shall be composed as follows: the elected membership shall include nine (9) members chosen by and from the faculty membership of the University Senate and two (2) members elected by and from the newly elected student membership of the University Senate; the student and faculty members of the Board of Trustees and the immediate past Chairman of the Senate Council, who, if they are not elected members of the Senate Council, shall be ex officio, non-voting members.

\*\*\*\*

\*If approved, the election for Chairman-elect for July 1, 1978-June 30, 1979 shall be held as soon as possible after the new members of the Senate Council are seated. Subsequently, the elections will be held in May, as proposed in the Rules change.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL  
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

September 30, 1977

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting  
Monday, October 10, 1977. Proposal for Re-  
organization of the College of Home Economics,  
to be approved and forwarded to the administra-  
tion for appropriate action.

The University Senate Council and the Senate Committee on Academic Or-  
ganization and Structure recommend that the proposed re-organization in  
the College of Home Economics be approved by the University Senate and  
forwarded to the Administration for appropriate action.

Recommendation:

That the present five departments in the College of Home Economics  
(Human Development and Family Relations, Housing and Interior Design,  
Management and Family Economics, Nutrition and Food Science and  
Textiles, Clothing and Merchandising) be restructured to form three de-  
partments:

Family Studies: Human Development and Resource Management  
Human Environment: Design and Textiles  
Nutrition and Food Science

All existing courses, programs and degrees offered by the existing de-  
partments shall be transferred to the three respective new departments  
and continued by those units.

Background:

Because of the concern for the administrative difficulties resulting from  
the small number of faculty in three of the departments and the difficulties  
in obtaining persons for existing chairmanship vacancies who have credentials  
to qualify for graduate faculty membership and tenure, the Dean's office  
was requested to analyze its operations and suggest restructuring of the ad-  
ministrative component which would reduce the number of departments by at  
least two.

Page 2

Agenda Item: University Senate Meeting, 10/10/77 Home Economics Re-Org.  
September 30, 1977

Background (continued)

The study began in October, 1976 and was completed in February, 1977 by a committee of elected faculty and administrators. Faculty input was sought constantly by the representative faculty members. Graduate students also were consulted and undergraduates were given an opportunity to react to the proposed plan.

It is believed that the recommended changes of reducing the number of departments from five to three will result in more effective administration of the 33 full-time faculty in the College of Home Economics. Interdepartmental and interdisciplinary research and teaching should result as well as strengthened graduate programs. Other advantages will accrue due to less administrative time and more emphasis on teaching, research and service.

/cet

10/14/77

U.S.  
10/10/77

W  
10/24

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

DEAN OF ADMISSIONS AND REGISTRAR

October 14, 1977

Dr. Otis A. Singletary, President  
University of Kentucky  
Administration Building  
Campus

Dear President Singletary:

The University Senate at its meeting of October 10, 1977, voted to recommend to you for presentation to the Board of Trustees the recommendation that the University reorganize the College of Home Economics. The University Senate Council and the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure recommend approval of the proposal.

Recommendation:

That the present five departments in the College of Home Economics (Human Development and Family Relations, Housing and Interior Design, Management and Family Economics, Nutrition and Food Science and Textiles, Clothing and Merchandising) be restructured to form three departments:

Family Studies: Human Development and Resource  
Management  
Human Environment: Design and Textiles  
Nutrition and Food Science

All existing courses, programs and degrees offered by the existing departments shall be transferred to the three respective new departments and continued by those units.

Background:

Because of the concern for the administrative difficulties resulting from the small number of faculty in three of the departments and the difficulties in obtaining persons for existing chairmanship vacancies who have credentials to qualify for graduate faculty membership and tenure, the Dean's office was requested to analyze its operations and suggest restructuring of the administrative component which would reduce the number of departments by at least two.

Dr. Otis A. Singletary, President

October 14, 1977

Page 2

The study began in October, 1976 and was completed in February, 1977 by a committee of elected faculty and administrators. Faculty input was sought constantly by the representative faculty members. Graduate students also were consulted and undergraduates were given an opportunity to react to the proposed plan.

It is believed that the recommended changes of reducing the number of departments from five to three will result in more effective administration of the 33 full-time faculty in the College of Home Economics. Interdepartmental and interdisciplinary research and teaching should result as well as strengthened graduate programs. Other advantages will accrue due to less administrative time and more emphasis on teaching, research and service.

Cordially,

Elbert W. Ockerman  
Dean of Admissions  
and Registrar

EWO:f

Copy 1

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, OCTOBER 10, 1977

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, October 10, 1977, in the Court Room of the Law Building.

Constance P. Wilson, presiding

Members absent: Roger B. Anderson\*, Harry H. Bailey\*, Charles E. Barnhart, R. Paul Baumgartner\*, Robert P. Belin, A. Edward Blackhurst, Jack C. Blanton, Thomas O. Blues, Russell H. Brannon, Joseph A. Bryant\*, Joseph T. Burch, Bradley Canon\*, Donald B. Clapp, D. Kay Clawson\*, Glenn B. Collins\*, Ronda S. Connaway\*, Raymond H. Cox, M. Ward Crowe\*, Guy M. Davenport\*, Robert J. DeAngelis\*, Patrick P. DeLuca\*, George W. Denmark\*, Anthony Eardley, Jane M. Emanuel\*, Calvin Ernst\*, James E. Funk, Art Gallaher\*, Abner Golden\*, John L. Greenway\*, Andrew J. Grimes\*, Joseph Hamburg, S. Zafar Hasan\*, Raymond R. Hornback, Alfred S. L. Hu, Eugene Huff\*, Margaret W. Jones\*, Dave Kaelin, David T. Kao\*, James A. Knoblett, Theodore A. Kotchen, Gretchen LaGodna\*, Stephen Langston, Donald C. Leigh\*, Thomas P. Lewis, Arthur Lieber, John H. Lienhard\*, Austin S. Litvak, George E. Mitchell, Richard Murray, Jacqueline A. Noonan\*, Elbert W. Ockerman\*, Edward O'Hara\*, Peggy O'Mera\*, Merrill W. Packer\*, David Peck\*, Bobbie G. Pedigo, William K. Plucknett\*, Anna K. Reed\*, Billy Renner\*, Wimberly C. Royster\*, Pritam S. Sabharwal, John Serkland\*, D. Milton Shuffett\*, Gerard E. Silberstein\*, Otis A. Singletary\*, John T. Smith\*, John P. Strickland\*, Willis A. Sutton\*, John Thrailkill\*, Harwin L. Voss, M. Stanley Wall, J. Robert Wills, Ralph F. Wiseman\*, Judith Worell\*, and Louise Zegeer\*

The minutes of the regular meeting of September 12, 1977, were accepted as circulated with the correction of the amendment on Page 20 to read: "On Page 2, Item 4 by deleting reference to specific departments and/or disciplines."

SUMMARY:

I. Action Items:

- A. Proposal for Reorganization of the College of Home Economics, to be approved and forwarded to the administration for appropriate action. (Circulated under date of September 30, 1977.)  
Motion passed.
- B. Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I, 3.1.2 and Section I, 3.1.3 pertaining to the term of office of the Chairman of the Senate Council. (Circulated under date of September 29, 1977.)  
Motion passed.

II. Senate Council Activities and Informational Items

- A. Update on activities of ad hoc and Standing Committees of the Senate: Numbering; Academic Organization and Structure; Summer School; Evening School; Evaluation of Procedures; and Ad Hoc Committee of Assistant and Associate Deans.

\*Absence Explained



B. Admissions and Academic Standards Proposals

1. College of Architecture
2. College of Dentistry

C. Summer School Report, Professor Stephen Langston, Chairman

D. Evening School

E. Appointment of Procedures Committee

III. Professor John Stephenson, Undergraduate Dean

Report: Undergraduate Education at UK: A Look at the Near Future

Chairman Wilson summarized the Senate Council activities and informational items as follows:

1. The Assistant and Associate Deans Ad Hoc Committee has been reestablished and is meeting regularly to discuss concerns of mutual interest to them and the Senate Council.
2. Professor Malcolm Jewell, Chairman of the Committee on Numbering has completed the report to the Senate Council with some suggestions for changes in the Senate Rules. In addition, Chairman Jewell is working out a procedure to simplify the method by which courses (both numbering and description) can be corrected and brought into conformity with the rules.
3. The Committee on Academic Organization and Structure is reviewing the academic questions related to financial exigency.
4. The Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards is reviewing a proposal from the College of Architecture to eliminate the Spring admission of students. The admissions policies of the College of Dentistry are being reviewed.
5. Professor Langston will present the final report on the Summer School to the Senate Council on Wednesday, October 19.
6. The evaluation and proposals on the Evening School are being studied by the Committee on Special Teaching Programs.
7. An Ad Hoc Committee to examine procedures in privilege and tenure, academic area committees, the hearing panel, faculty code, and other such structures is in the process of being appointed.

B. Admissions and Academic Standards Proposals

1. College of Architecture
2. College of Dentistry

C. Summer School Report, Professor Stephen Langston, Chairman

D. Evening School

E. Appointment of Procedures Committee

III. Professor John Stephenson, Undergraduate Dean

Report: Undergraduate Education at UK: A Look at the Near Future

Chairman Wilson summarized the Senate Council activities and informational items as follows:

1. The Assistant and Associate Deans Ad Hoc Committee has been reestablished and is meeting regularly to discuss concerns of mutual interest to them and the Senate Council.
2. Professor Malcolm Jewell, Chairman of the Committee on Numbering has completed the report to the Senate Council with some suggestions for changes in the Senate Rules. In addition, Chairman Jewell is working out a procedure to simplify the method by which courses (both numbering and description) can be corrected and brought into conformity with the rules.
3. The Committee on Academic Organization and Structure is reviewing the academic questions related to financial exigency.
4. The Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards is reviewing a proposal from the College of Architecture to eliminate the Spring admission of students.
5. The admissions policies of the College of Dentistry are being reviewed.
6. Professor Langston will present the final report on the Summer School to the Senate Council on Wednesday, October 19.
7. The evaluation and proposals on the Evening School are being studied by the Committee on Special Teaching Programs.
8. A committee to examine procedures in privilege and tenure in academic areas and to hear panel faculty code and other such structures is in the process of being appointed.

Professor Wilson introduced Professor John Stephenson, Professor of Sociology, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Chairman of the Undergraduate Council, editor of Images, and probably one of the most creative people on campus.

Professor Stephenson spoke to the Senate as follows:

"I have been invited by the Senate Council to share with the Senate some of my thoughts on the state of undergraduate education at the University. I would like to use this opportunity more to look at the future of undergraduate education than to review the past or merely assess the present, although I will try to do all three in the next twenty minutes. Let me at least begin with the future in view of the fact that, like it or not, that is where we are all going to be living soon.

Earlier this year I was made aware of some projections about the future of higher education in the South. These data were assembled for the Southern Regional Education Board by David Spence. David was kind enough to share his projections with me, and I would like to put some of them before you now.

According to the SREB figures, enrollments in the nation will increase between 1975 and 1980 by 6.5%, whereas between 1980 and 1985 they will decline by 4.1%. This increase-followed-by-decline is a projection most of us are well aware of. What I had not seen before were figures for the South and for Kentucky, projections which take into account the effects of net migration, such as the current so-called Sunbelt movement. For the 14 SREB states, postsecondary enrollments are projected to increase by 11.5% between 1975 and 1980, and then to decline by 2.0% between 1980 and 1985. In Kentucky specifically, enrollments are projected to increase by 7.8% in the first period and to decline by 7.4% by 1985. Only Florida, Arkansas, and Maryland are projected to increase in enrollments between 1980 and 1985.

As controlling a factor as overall enrollment size is, it is not the only thing that is going to change. The kinds of postsecondary institutions these students choose to attend will also change somewhat. Fewer will attend private institutions, as we might all guess, and more will attend two-year institutions, according to the SREB projections for the South.

Moreover, there may be a slight decline in the proportion of students seeking first degrees (baccalaureate and first professional degrees), and only a slight increase in the proportion seeking graduate degrees. The increase will come in the proportion of non-degree students.

So, in general, we are looking at a future for the South and probably for Kentucky in which there are fewer students choosing to attend four-year institutions with definite degree objectives in mind. One clear implication of this presumed fact is that colleges and universities generally will be giving much more attention to the problem of retaining the students

who do come to them. Another which seems fairly clear is that institutions will have to come to a new understanding of the objectives and needs of those students who are not the usual degree-seekers. Who are they, what do they want, how are they to be best served? A third implication is that sooner or later, competition for students among institutions in the same general market areas will intensify. In fact, one of the more competitive universities in Kentucky was chastised only a few weeks ago for its aggressive advertising campaign aimed at recruiting students through the mass media.

The SREB projections also show that the nature of our student population is likely to change in other ways in the future. In fact, the composition of the student body is already changing. For one thing, it is older. In 1965, only 20.5% of college enrollees in the U.S. were over 24 years of age, compared to 33.6% in 1975. In the South, 14% of the population was made up of 18- to 24 year-olds in 1975. That figure will drop to 10.4 by 1990. The implications for universities like this one are fairly clear. The needs and goals and learning styles of adult learners are going to have to be better understood and programs modified accordingly. The increasing proportion of older students anticipated in the future also explains the increase in non-degree-seeking students--more than likely they are the same.

They are also probably the same students who attend colleges and universities part-time rather than full-time. In the South in 1974, 33% of college enrollment was made up of part-time students. That figure is expected to grow to 43% by 1985. We are talking here about students, both men and women, who are older, have families, are working full-time, and who want to upgrade job-related skills or simply improve themselves educationally in general. We can also anticipate somewhat stiffer guidelines for re-licensure in some of the professions, a trend which will send additional numbers of adults back to school on a part-time basis.

Another trend underscored by the SREB study is the increased proportion of women enrolled in postsecondary institutions. A good bit of the change in this respect since WW II has come since 1970, but the change over the last 25 years is dramatic, at least in comparison to most demographic changes. The proportion of women among those enrolled in 1951 in the South was 36.5%, compared to 47.0% in 1976. The reasons for this trend are not difficult to identify, and they are likely to continue their influence for the next few years at least.

Again, a number of these women students will be older than what we think of as the normal 18-22 year-old "coed." As I have said elsewhere, the presence of these persons on our campus is likely to make a noticeable difference in the general learning atmosphere, as well as differences in the programs we deliver and ways we deliver them.

Of course, the accuracy of projections such as these cannot be determined until 1985 or later. Many things can happen to change the assumptions on which these trends are based--economic shifts, radical demographic

changes, wars, and fickle public attitudes are the stuff of which futurists' bad dreams are made.

On the other hand, some of the changes predicted are determinable from the simple fact that, barring something like a nuclear holocaust, we know how many people are going to be around in 1985 and 1990 in certain age categories. In addition, many of the projections are merely amplifications of trends that common sense and simple observation tell us are happening. At any rate, I think being aware of these trends can help us think about what we might want to plan for in the immediate future.

Now I would like to make a few comments about the future of undergraduate education at the University of Kentucky. What can be said about undergraduate programs at UK? What are our problems, what are our opportunities?

As a whole, I think the University has shown itself surprisingly adaptable. It has shown, by and large, that it can meet the changing needs of its client groups. At least this has been my observation over the eleven years I have been here. The University's enrollment has grown from 13,850 to over 22,000 since 1966. Baccalaureate programs have increased both in number and flexibility. Courses and course sequences have gradually incorporated such techniques as modularization, self-instruction, video feedback, and "fall-back" sectioning, so that teaching-learning processes are more easily adapted to the backgrounds, ability levels, and goals of individual students. It is strikingly clear to me that the campus as a whole is much more interested in the quality of teaching and learning than was the case in 1970, and I believe this is true at both graduate and undergraduate levels.

I have been impressed also by our willingness to experiment, even, in some instances, when we don't personally believe the experiment will result in success. For example:

--the BGS, now under review, was initiated only a few years ago.

--the Developmental Studies Program was begun in an effort to prevent our open-door admissions policy from becoming a revolving-door policy.

--the University Year for Action program, which has since become the Office for Experiential Education has helped many of us learn a great deal about a new form of teaching and learning which has become an important component of many curricula on campus.

--Various teaching improvement programs, such as the Mini-Grant program begun by Dan Reedy when he was Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the University-wide orientation for new graduate teaching assistants, the reorganization of the Office for Instructional Resources, the creation of required departmental graduate courses in teaching, and the greatly increased number of departments which have appointed faculty members as Directors of Undergraduate Studies to serve as counterparts of the Directors of Graduate Studies.

--a continuing series of changes in library programs, all aimed at improving services to users, all carried out in an attitude of experimentation.

--the Individualized Program of Study in the College of Agriculture, and also their new special program for assisting returning students to expedite degree completion.

--and the various programs that have emerged from the Vice President's Commission on the Freshman Year, such as the Freshman Seminar Program, the two-day Summer Advising Conference, and the "continuing orientation" seminars (although there are still many improvements needed, such as increasing the variety of offerings available to Freshmen).

These changes show an unusual degree of institutional self-confidence, and they always pleasantly surprise me because in my early days here I concluded that UK was an anxious, status-conscious middle-ranked university holding onto its ill-defined traditions for dear life as the seas swelled up around her in the late 1960's. We are somewhat more mature now, and while we enjoy our successes enormously, we are not afraid of occasional failure if we have given some experimental program a good try.

What is in UK's future as far as undergraduate programs are concerned? Much of what SREB has projected about higher education in the nation and the region certainly applies specifically to UK:

--first, the composition of the student population is going to change, and is in fact already changing. We can expect more female students, more older students, and more part-time students. (You may not know that last year, according to one count, there were more than 1600 women students over the age of 25 on campus, most of whom were undergraduates).

--second, we can anticipate the prospect of decline in first-year enrollments. This change may not be far off. This trend means that we will want to study problems of retention in order to keep at the University of Kentucky more of those who initially enroll here. Among other things, that means improving undergraduate advising, giving more attention to individual student needs and learning goals, and minimizing confusion, poor communications, and conflicting policy interpretations. It also means improving, as we are able to, the conditions under which the faculty teach and the students learn, especially in those areas presently understaffed. (Incidentally, for your information, our rate of return of freshmen to the sophomore year is probably around 75%, which is the national average. In addition, of students beginning UK in 1971, 48% had not graduated by Fall, 1977. In one college, that figure is as high as 61%. An unknown proportion of these students may have been best served by leaving, of course. We know little about them or about the rest, although a study is now underway).

Among the concerns to which I think we need to address ourselves in the coming year or two, I would rank the following among the highest in priority. Some of them represent old problems which have not been

completely solved. Others represent new problems we did not face five or ten years ago. Still others represent new opportunities to take the lead in serving changing higher educational needs. I merely list these items, and give them in no special order:

--1. We must find ways to improve the situation in those areas where enrollments have outdistanced growth in numbers of faculty. There is not much doubt that we have lost ground overall in the student/faculty ratio University-wide over the past ten years or so. In addition, there continue to be shifts in student choices of majors and of individual courses, a situation which invariably creates a lag in the allocation of teaching resources. It does not take long for sudden enrollment increases to take their toll on the quality of teaching and learning, so I would place high value on improvement of this situation in selected departments, and I am encouraged that the University's biennial budget request gives this problem very high priority.

--2. We should continue to give attention to issues concerning the quality of student learning and to issues concerning the quality of faculty teaching and advising:

(a) The mean ACT composite of entering freshmen declined from 22.1 in 1968 to 20.2 in Fall, 1976. Meantime, the average grade awarded to UK increased from 2.5 in 1965-66 to a high of 2.8 in 1973-74. (It has since levelled off at 2.7 in Fall and 2.8 in Spring). The average GPA increased from 2.42 in Fall, 1965 to 2.65 in Fall, 1976. These contradictory trends need to be monitored and reported--perhaps annually to the faculty. (Each of us may wish to place his own interpretation on the data, but they should nonetheless be known to us).

(b) The Faculty Code has had unknown effects on the assurance of basic student entitlements to quality teaching. Its presence may have made some differences, but there still exist from time to time some basic problems in classroom teaching which the Code does not seem able to handle. I believe the effects of the Faculty Code need study, and this, among other things, is being looked at by the Pisacano Committee on Ethics and Academic Responsibilities. I might mention also that the problem of the extent of student cheating is also being looked into by this committee.

(c) Efforts to involve students in the serious and careful evaluation of teaching and advising are being met with varying degrees of success. We have long passed the point where students greeted the opportunity to evaluate the faculty with enthusiasm and righteousness. On the other hand, it is clear that when students take this task seriously, they do have an effect on decisions that are made on promotions, tenure, and salaries. Let me merely say that there is a job here for student organizations to undertake in motivating students to take the task seriously, rather than just exhorting the faculty to do a more conscientious job.

--3. I am uncertain how this is done, but I believe we should give

more attention to the quality of the educational experiences of our best students. We are able, through the Honors Program, the Merit Scholarship Program, and the hard work of many individuals, to recruit a number of very able students to the University of Kentucky. What their experiences are like while they are at UK, I really do not know. I can tell you, however, that the University has not produced a single Danforth Fellow in the memory of anyone I have talked to about it. I can also tell you how difficult it is to get faculty to assist in identifying outstanding undergraduates for almost any purpose, whether Danforth, ODK, Phi Beta Kappa, or the Oswald Undergraduate Research and Creativity Program. We simply do not know enough of our own best students, and I believe that as departments and individual faculty members we must take responsibility for correcting this problem. Perhaps thought could be given to instituting or improving departmental honors programs or to creating opportunities for student involvement in faculty research. But I do think it is, in part, a departmental problem.

--4. We should be prepared to move toward new class scheduling patterns, making more coursework available on evenings and on Saturdays, making more use of the potential of instruction using broadcast television, and in other ways attempting to meet the needs of part-time, adult students. I am not persuaded that quality has to suffer if we move in such directions, unless, of course, we treat these tasks as "second class" work. My strong feeling is that we must treat such things as evening class offerings as part of regular departmental offerings, and not as something special.

--5. I think we should be prepared to modify baccalaureate programs not only to improve their quality generally, but to bring them more into consistency with the marketplace for graduates. I do not feel, as many seem to, that marriages between the liberal arts and career preparation should be banned. Such program-building requires a loyalty to liberal arts traditions without which a university becomes an inflated and grotesque trade school. There is a proper marriage between career preparation and the liberal arts, although most of us are about as close to rapprochement as were the Capulets and the Montagues.

Some of us are coming to recognize that, to use Whitehead's words, quoted in the CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION recently, "The antithesis between a technical and a liberal education is fallacious. There can be no adequate technical education which is not liberal, and no liberal education which is not technical: that is, no education which does not impart both technique and liberal vision."

--6. This brings me to the sixth and last item in this list of matters to which I believe we should give attention in order to improve undergraduate programs in the immediate future. I think we should be prepared to submit to thorough, campus-wide internal evaluations of baccalaureate programs and that we should be working toward acceptable guidelines for such evaluations now. My strong feeling is that we should prepare evaluation procedures in advance of the time when they are imposed from



outside, either by the state or by accrediting groups.

Such a task requires, in turn, that we generate within the various departments and colleges discussions of the basic purposes of our undergraduate programs. Our continuing failure to recognize the importance of such discussion of purpose has been a source of great disappointment to me, although I understand some of the reasons for this failure. As Derek Bok pointed out in a recent article, "On the Purposes of Undergraduate Education," quoting from a Stanford report, our guiding philosophy of the curriculum might be summed up in this way: "The objective toward which curriculum planning should strive is, to the extent possible, to let the teacher teach what he wants to teach and the student learn what he wants to learn."

Seldom do our curriculum discussions help in deciding on matters of quality, because we find it easier to talk about means, methods, and procedures than about ends, goals, and objectives. But we must return soon to the matter of our purposes in setting up programs in the first place; otherwise, our decisions are likely to be made for us either by students, who have their own purposes in mind, or by the guardians of the state, working away within the ivyless walls of state government buildings. The net result is decisions on programs that are less influenced by the faculty.

In closing:

Now, of course, one of the major unknown factors in determining the future of undergraduate education at UK is whether there will be adequate funding. Your guess is as good as mine on that matter. All I know is what I read in the newspaper. It takes no special genius to understand that new dollars are going to be required to improve student faculty ratios in certain programs, and that new dollars are going to be required if we are to provide more individualized instructional services and advising to students as well as to remedy other problems I have mentioned. Teaching is not one of those economic sectors in which productivity is likely to be increased, at least using measures that economists of higher education like to use. I predict that, if anything, productivity will decrease as effectiveness increases.

I am more optimistic than I was two years ago that the University's funding problems will be understood in Frankfort. On the other hand, this is only October, and we face another long winter before the spring breezes bring news from the state capitol. Let us all hope that that news is good.

Whether it is good news or bad news, change is upon us, and, as the SREB report indicates, the University in 1985 will be no more like the University is in 1977, than it now resembles what it was in the 1960's."

Professor Stephenson was given an enthusiastic round of applause .

The first action item on the agenda was a proposal for the reorganization of the College of Home Economics .

Professor Wilson recognized Professor Paul Oberst. On behalf of the Senate Council Professor Oberst presented a motion to adopt the proposal for Reorganization of the College of Home Economics , to be approved and forwarded to the administration for appropriate action. This was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of September 30, 1977, and reads as follows:

The University Senate Council and the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure recommend that the proposed re-organization in the College of Home Economics be approved by the University Senate and forwarded to the Administration for appropriate action .

Recommendation:

That the present five departments in the College of Home Economics (Human Development and Family Relations , Housing and Interior Design , Management and Family Economics , Nutrition and Food Science and Textiles , Clothing and Merchandising) be restructured to form three departments:

Family Studies: Human Development and Resource  
Management  
Human Environment: Design and Textiles  
Nutrition and Food Science

All existing courses , programs and degrees offered by the existing departments shall be transferred to the three respective new departments and continued by those units .

Background:

Because of the concern for the administrative difficulties resulting from the small number of faculty in three of the departments and the difficulties in obtaining persons for existing chairmanship vacancies who have credentials to qualify for graduate faculty membership and tenure , the Dean's office was requested to analyze its operations and suggest restructuring of the administrative component which would reduce the number of departments by at least two .

The study began in October , 1976 and was completed in February , 1977 by a committee of elected faculty and administrators . Faculty input was sought constantly by the representative faculty members . Graduate students also were consulted and undergraduates were given an opportunity to react to the proposed plan .

It is believed that the recommended changes of reducing the number of departments from five to three will result in more effective administration of the 33 full-time faculty in the College of Home Economics. Interdepartmental and interdisciplinary research and teaching should result as well as strengthened graduate programs. Other advantages will accrue due to less administrative time and more emphasis on teaching, research and service.

Professor Harris, Chairman of the Committee on Academic Organization and Structure, made the following remarks concerning the proposal:

"The Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure has studied the Proposal for a Change in Structure of the College of Home Economics and has conducted interviews with the Dean, two chairmen of the proposed new combined Departments and two additional faculty members in the College.

The proposal was developed as a consequence of difficult problems in locating and recruiting highly qualified persons to fill vacancies for the position of chairman in two of the five Departments in a College with only 33 faculty members. An additional background factor which emerged in the interviews seems to have been a financial constraint imposed on funding of salaries for a total of five chairmen of departments. The Dean of the College, in consultation with the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, reached a decision to terminate the search for chairmen of the two departments in which a vacancy had existed for approximately two years, and assigned to a Restructuring Committee, composed of both elected and appointed members of the College, the task of developing a plan for reorganization. Although the proposal for reduction to three departments aroused initial apprehension primarily among those persons who were to be added to a department with an incumbent chairman, the faculty voted unanimously in February, 1977, in favor of the proposed reduction to three Departments. The new Departments are as follows:

FHR	Family Studies: Human Development and Resource Management
HED & HET	Human Environment: Design and Textiles
NFS	Nutrition and Food Science

The only potential problems found in this review pertain to the Department of Human Environment: Design and Textiles, and will be addressed in the final section of this report.

The Dean has stated that the reorganization will entail (a) no reduction of budget to the College, (b) no transfer of funds between programs within the new combined Departments, (c) no loss of personnel, positions, or status (i.e. no existing chairman will lose his position), and (d) with the exception of potential problems perceived by the Committee in the area of Textiles, to be discussed, no evidence for potential negative effects on existing curricula or programs.

In addition, it appears that the number of faculty will be more evenly balanced in the three remaining departments, and that precedents exist in the College of Pharmacy and in the Hunt Morgan School of Biological Sciences for the reduction in number of Departments to zero. Neither the Dean nor faculty members anticipate any negative effect on accreditation. A site visit for professional accreditation of the College has been planned for the Spring of 1977.

It is the Committee's opinion that although the combination of the Departments of Human Development and Family Relations with Management and Family Economics constitutes a natural arrangement, and although the Department of Nutrition and Food Science remains unchanged, the alliance of Interior Design with Textiles, Clothing and Merchandising is not at present a natural one, with regard to either academic viewpoint or long range professional objectives. In particular, the marketing emphasis of the present Textiles program seems to have little in common with the professional orientation of the Design division. It appears to the Committee that the restructuring was accomplished more to achieve equivalence of faculty strength than equivalence of student enrollment. According to information provided to the Committee, the new Department of Human Environment: Design and Textiles, would have two-thirds of all undergraduate majors (464 out of a total of nearly 746 majors) but would have only one-third of the total number of faculty members. This is only partially offset by a total of only seven graduate students in Design and Textiles out of a total of 68. There was no evidence presented to the Committee for a common definition of functions for the new Department or for the development of a plan, at present, for the Textiles division. Although the Committee approves the restructuring as an improvement over the present arrangement of five departments, it does wish to convey a serious concern to administrators at all levels that the division of Textiles may not be able to maintain its integrity and may become simply a satellite or appendage to the division of Design. It is not clear what role the division of Textiles will have in relation to the new Textiles program in another state University, or to what extent its functions and objectives might change over a period of years.

Recommendation: The Committee recommends approval of the Proposal for Change in Structure of the College of Home Economics but wishes to qualify this recommendation by expressing a specific concern for the future status, strength, and function of the Textiles program, which is to become a part of the Department of Human Environment: Design and Textiles."

The floor was opened for discussion and questions.

Professor Miller asked if the decision had been made about the question of a Chairman for the department, Human Environment: Design and Textiles.

Dean Stewart replied in the affirmative. She said that there were chairmen for all the departments and all three were men. Dean Stewart introduced the Chairmen: Professor John Crosby, Human Development and Resource Management; Professor Richard Rankin, Human Environment: Design and Textiles; Professor Donald Oberleas, Nutrition and Food Science.

Professor Miller raised the concern that the textiles component might lose its identity.

Dean Stewart said that the involvement would be similar to what it is currently. Under the present structure the Interior Design Department now has student representatives in each class. Textiles has not had the similar type of class representatives but have had involvement. Professor Rankin will keep the department areas separate, but the two areas will meet jointly some of the time. There are plans for more involvement for faculty and students in that area.

Dr. Carey asked about the relationship of the College of Education and Home Economics regarding the education and certification of kindergarten teachers concerning the mandatory state-wide kindergarten program by 1981.

Professor Crosby responded that there was a program pending and hoped that it would be coming to the Senate shortly. The curriculum and instruction content involving the College of Education is both on the undergraduate and graduate level.

Motion to approve the proposal for the reorganization of the College of Home Economics passed.

The second action item on the agenda pertained to the term of office of the Chairman of the Senate Council.

Professor Wilson recognized Professor Paul Oberst. On behalf of the Senate Council Professor Oberst presented a motion to adopt the proposal to change the University Senate Rules, Section I, 3.1.2 and 3.1.3, pertaining to the term of office of the Chairman of the Senate Council. This was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of September 29, 1977, and reads as follows:

Background:

1) The Chairman of the Senate Council serves a term of one year beginning January 1 and ending December 31. This time frame seriously impedes the business of the Senate. The outgoing Chairman leaves office with much of the work he or she has been associated with incomplete, and the incoming Chairman assumes office at the busiest time of the year faced with the problem of assuming direction of the multitude of activities initiated by the previous Chairman.

Further, Chairmen of the Council are relieved of half-time duties in their academic units. It is generally easier to find replacement personnel for the academic year than for the calendar year.

Proposed changes in Section I, 3.1.3 of the Rules presented below are designed to change the term of office of the Chairman of the Senate Council from January 1 through December 31 to July 1 through June 30.

2) It is the usual case that the Chairman of the Senate Council is serving in his or her third year as a Council member. Thus, when a term of office as Chairman is completed the past Chairman immediately ceases to be a member of the Council. This means that the past Chairman's intimate knowledge of Senate activities is lost to the Council. The Council feels that it is highly desirable to have the immediate past Chairman of the Council continue as an ex officio member of the Council to provide greater continuity in Senate activities. The changes in Section I, 3.1.2 of the Rules presented below will make the Chairman of the Senate Council an ex officio member of the Council for the year immediately following the term as Chairman.

This is a particularly propitious time to make these changes since Professor Wilson, the current Chairman of the Council, will continue in her third year as an elected member of the Council immediately following her year of service as Chairman. Professor Oberst, Chairman-elect of the Council, will assume office on January 1, but is retiring on July 1, 1979, and will serve for only six months making the change in the term of office for the Chairman particularly convenient.

Action: The Rules Committee and the Senate Council propose the following changes in the Rules of the University Senate effective immediately (deletions in brackets, additions underlined).

I. 3.1.3 Officers (E-04-76) -- The officers of the Senate Council shall consist of a Chairman, a Chairman-elect and Secretary. The Chairman shall hold office from [January 1] July 1 to [December 31] June 30, shall preside at Council meetings, and shall be responsible for the operation of the Senate Council office. The Chairman-elect and Secretary-elect shall be elected [at the first or second Council meeting in March] in May, \* to assume office 14 months later. The Chairman-elect shall assume the duties of the Chairman in his or her absence, and shall succeed to the office of the Chairman on [January 1] July 1 or at any time that the office becomes vacant. The Secretary shall assume office on [January 1] July 1, shall serve for a term of one year or until a replacement is elected, shall keep the minutes of the Council meetings and shall present Council recommendations to the University Senate for action. If for any reason the office of Chairman-elect or Secretary...

I, 3.1.2 Composition -- The Senate Council shall be composed as follows: the elected membership shall include nine (9) members chosen by and from the faculty membership of the University Senate and two (2) members elected by and from the newly elected student membership of the University Senate; the student and faculty members of the Board of Trustees and the immediate past Chairman of the Senate Council, who, if they are not elected members of the Senate Council, shall be ex officio, non-voting members.

\*If approved, the election for Chairman-elect for July 1, 1978-June 30, 1979 shall be held as soon as possible after the new members of the Senate Council are seated. Subsequently, the elections will be held in May, as proposed in the Rules change.

Chairman Wilson said that the Senate Council approved this proposal unanimously. The last three or four Chairmen are in agreement about the difficulties of assuming office in the middle of the academic year.

Professor Jewell, Immediate Past Chairman, said that this was his idea as much as anyone's, and he did not want to exaggerate the importance the Chairman played in the Council, but the Chairman is the one person on the Council who has the least time. A great deal of the work rests upon his or her shoulder. Therefore, much of the term from December to May is used to finish up the work of the preceding Chairman. It was an unsatisfactory arrangement. The Senate Council felt it made sense to put the Chairman of the Council on an academic year basis.

Dean McKenna asked why it was necessary to elect the Chairman and Secretary-elect fourteen months before they take office.

Professor Smith answered that there had to be a provision early enough in the year for the person who would be assuming the chairmanship to talk with his or her Department Chairman or Dean and make arrangements for released time. May was the best arbitrary selection after consideration was given to other alternatives.

Professor Jewell said that two possibilities were discussed; either, three people on the Council who go off in January are going to help elect someone they never serve under or three brand new members on the Council elected in January and right away without experience they will have to decide which of the on-going members would make the best Chairman.

Student Senator Benson moved the previous question, and the motion passed.

The vote in favor of changing the University Senate Rules, Section I, 3.1.2 and 3.1.3, pertaining to the term of office of the Chairman of the Senate Council passed.

The next meeting of the Senate will be November 14, 1977.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Martha M. Ferguson  
Recording Secretary

Claire McCann  
Special Collections Department 03900  
4 King Library  
1