

the University community must have confidence that its administrators and faculty members will respect these standards in negotiating emphasis in faculty assignments, in accordance with the University's functions as described in this report.

The Senate adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Kathryne W. Shelburne
Recording Secretary

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, MARCH 9, 1970

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

Clifford Amyx, Robert Aug*, Lyle N. Back*, Henry H. Bauer*, Wendell E. Berry*, Harmon C. Bickley, Jr.*, Richard C. Birkebak*, Barry J. Bloomfield, Herbert Braunstein*, Wallace N. Briggs*, Clyde R. Carpenter, Donald B. Coleman, Robert L. Cosgriff*, Raymond H. Cox, George F. Crewe, William H. Dennen, David E. Denton*, D. F. Diedrich*, John P. Drysdale, Ronald W. Dunbar, Fred Edmonds*, Irving Fisher, Ira Fowler, Herbert Greene, Joseph J. Gruber*, Virgil W. Hays*, Dorothy Hollingsworth*, J. W. Hollingsworth*, Vernon L. James*, Louis J. Karmel*, William F. Kenkel*, Carl E. Langenhop, Albert S. Levy*, John L. Madden*, Gene L. Mason*, Leonard McDowell*, Marcus T. McEllistrem*, William G. Moody*, Dean H. Morrow*, Jacqueline A. Noonan*, Leonard V. Packett*, Harold F. Parks*, Albert W. Patrick*, Robert W. Penman, Curtis Phipps, Nicholas J. Pisacano*, Leonard A. Ravitz*, John W. Roddick*, John W. Schaefer*, Rudolph Schriels*, D. Milton Shuffett*, Malcolm R. Siegel, Raymond A. Smith*, William G. Survant*, Thomas A. Van*, Harwin L. Voss, John N. Walker*, David R. Wekstein, David C. White*, Cornelia B. Wilbur*, Daniel W. Wingard, Donald J. Wood*, Kenneth R. Wright, Lawrence A. Allen, Charles E. Barnhart, Harry M. Bohannon, Betty J. Brannan*, Glenwood L. Creech, Marcia A. Dake*, Stuart Forth*, Timothy R. Futrell*, Harold D. Gordon, Charles P. Graves*, Joseph Hamburg, Raymond D. Johnson*, William S. Jordan, Jr.*, Taft McKinstry, George J. Ruschell, Otis A. Singletary*, Sheryl G. Snyder, John L. Sutton, Joseph V. Swintosky*, William R. Willard*, Ernest F. Witte*.

The Senate approved the request of Jeannie Leedom of the Kernel to attend and report.

The Secretary of the Senate presented the supplemental list of degree candidates who had completed requirements in December, 1969. This supplemental list had been circulated to the faculty under date of February 3, 1970. The Senate approved the supplemental list as submitted for recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

*Absence explained

OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS AND REGISTRAR
SUMMARY OF THE SUPPLEMENT OF CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES

December 20, 1969

GRADUATE DEGREES

M.A.	5
M.A. in Educ.	1
M.S. in Sta.	1
TOTAL	7

UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES

Arts & Sciences

B.A.	3
B.S.	1
TOTAL	4

Agriculture

B.S. in Agri	2
--------------	---

Engineering

B.S. Elec.Eng.	1
B.S. Mech.Eng.	2
TOTAL	3

Education

A.B. Educ.	7
------------	---

Commerce

B.S. Com.	2
B.S. Acct.	1
B.Bus. Admin.	2
TOTAL	5

Home Economics

B.S. Home Ec.	1
---------------	---

SUMMARY

Graduate Degrees	7
Undergraduate Degrees	22
TOTAL	29

SUPPLEMENT

CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES

December 20, 1969

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Lewis Wellington Cochran, Dean

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

Laura Muntz Derr
Richard Lee Engstrom
Michael Ward Giles

Sarah Lee Hamilton
Kenneth Lee Kolson

CANDIDATE FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN EDUCATION

Anna Allen Neal

CANDIDATE FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN STATISTICS

Nimrod S. Buster

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Wimberly C. Royster, Dean

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS

Juvenal Angel Aparicio
Lynn Marie Betzler

John Gregory Powell

CANDIDATE FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE

Richard Lee Burns

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE

Charles E. Barnhart, Dean

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN AGRICULTURE

Edward F. Fegenbush
Lee Ann Phillips

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Robert Mortimer Drake, Jr., Dean

CANDIDATE FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING

Basil Dee Hall, Jr.

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN MECHANICAL ENGINEERING

Charles Thomas Holbrook
Thomas Bell Wilson, Jr.

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

George W. Denmark, Dean

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS IN EDUCATION

Thomas Crittenden Blair
Robert Jerome Gedris
Diane F. Goodwin
Leslie Ann Hall

Anne Thornton LaMaster
Joel Gene Nelson
Phyllis Ann Tarter

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS

Charles Foster Haywood, Dean

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN COMMERCE

Allen Hershell Aboff
Gerard Allen Murphy

CANDIDATE FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN ACCOUNTING

Charles Fletcher

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Herbert Lee Brown
Ronald Wesley Taylor

SCHOOL OF HOME ECONOMICS

Betty Jean Brannan, Dean

CANDIDATE FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN HOME ECONOMICS

Linda Nell Pendley

On behalf of the Senate Council, Dr. Ford, Secretary of the Council, recommended the adoption of the five recommendations under Roman numeral I, page 1, in the final Report of the Senate Advisory Committee on Community Colleges concerning courses and grades (this Report was circulated to the faculty under date of February 27, 1970); that a copy of these recommendations be forwarded to the President for implementation; and that a copy be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification into the Rules, and into Copy IV of the pending Revision of the Governing Regulation, where appropriate.

Dr. Ockerman then spoke to the five recommendations and presented support for the following suggested changes which the Senate might wish to consider:

that recommendation no. 2 be deleted;
that a period be placed after the word "continued" in the second line of recommendation no. 4 and the remainder of that sentence be deleted;
that the effective date for implementation of the recommendations (recommendation no. 5) be changed to become effective with the 1970 Fall Semester.

Following extensive discussion of the five recommendations and these suggested changes amendment was made to delete recommendation no. 2. The Senate approved the deletion thus necessitating renumbering of the remaining four recommendations.

After further discussion amendment was introduced to place a period after the word "continued" in the second line of recommendation no. 4 and delete the remainder of the sentence. By a vote of 50 to 48 this amendment was defeated.

Amendment was then presented to change the effective date for implementation of the recommendations, contained in recommendation no. 5, to become effective with the Fall Semester of 1970 /this was interpreted to apply to the first offering of any course_. The Senate approved this amendment.

The Senate then approved the adoption of the recommendations, as amended, for forwarding to the President for implementation, and to the Rules Committee for codification into the Rules and into Copy IV of the pending Revision of the Governing Regulations, where appropriate.

The recommendations as amended and approved read as follows:

1. The Community College System shall be permitted to originate and/or offer courses in addition to those offered on the Lexington campus.
2. Courses taken in the Community College System which are not offered on the Lexington campus shall be evaluated for transfer credit to the Lexington campus on the same basis used for courses from any other institution.
3. The present practice of transferring grades along with credits shall be continued for those courses which are offered on the Lexington campus with transfer credit from the Community College System.
4. These recommendations shall be put into effect with the Fall Semester of 1970.

On behalf of the Senate Council, Dr. Ford recommended the adoption of the four recommendations under Roman numeral II, page 3, in the final Report of the Senate Advisory Committee on Community Colleges, concerning administrative recommendations; that a copy of these recommendations be forwarded to the President for his consideration; and that a copy be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification into the Rules, and into Copy IV of the pending Revision of the Governing Regulations, where appropriate.

Following extensive discussion amendment was presented to delete recommendation no. 4. The Senate defeated this amendment.

Amendment was then presented to delete recommendation no. 3 from the Report. The Senate defeated this amendment.

The Senate then approved the original recommendations to adopt the four recommendations and forward to the President for his consideration and to the Rules Committee for codification into the Rules and into Copy IV of the pending Revision of the Governing Regulations where appropriate.

The four recommendations as approved read as follows:

1. The title of the chief administrative officer of the Community College System should be changed from that of Dean to Vice President.
2. The title of the chief administrative officer of an individual community college should be changed from Director to some such title as Executive Dean.
3. Consideration should be given to the establishment of a professorial title series encompassing the following: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor, Community College System.
4. Members of the faculty of the Community College System should be permitted to work toward a doctoral degree on the Lexington campus.

Dr. Blaine Parker stated that he would like to commend students at the University for showing interest in business being brought before the Senate, such as the Report of the University Senate Advisory Committee on Appropriate Balance Among Teaching, Research, and Service Functions in the University. He pointed out, however, that the wording in the petition concerning that Report to which the 1,900 students had affixed their signatures had been somewhat misleading. He then read what was contained in the petition that the students had signed, the principal part of which was as follows:

"On Monday, March 2, 1970, at 4:00 p.m. the Faculty Senate will consider a proposal which could greatly affect your learning. A Faculty Committee is presenting a Report on the appropriate balance between 1. teaching; 2. research; and 3. service. It recommends that each individual faculty member be able to establish his own ratio among these three and be rewarded in money, promotion, and tenure on the basis of each. Doesn't this make sense? Presently, one is rewarded only on the basis of his research (that is, his publications). Now, being a good teacher is not worth anything to a faculty member. In order to become a more effective teacher, he might have to give up his research time."

effective teacher he might have to take away his time from research. Research now equals money. Should it? . . ."

The Senate adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, APRIL 13, 1970

The University Senate met in regular session at 4:00 p.m., Monday, April 13, 1970, in the Court Room of the Law Building. Chairman Plucknett presided. Members absent: Staley F. Adams*, Lawrence A. Allen, Daniel S. Arnold*, Robert Aug*, C.E. Barnhart, Henry H. Bauer*, Norman F. Billups*, Richard C. Birkebak, Ben W. Black*, Harry M. Bohannon, Betty J. Brannan*, Herbert Braunstein*, Wallace N. Briggs*, Marion A. Carnes*, Clyde R. Carpenter*, Maurice A. Clay*, Donald B. Coleman, Carl B. Cone*, William B. Cotter*, Eugene C. Crawford Jr.*, Glenwood L. Creech, M. Ward Crowe*, Tihamer Z. Csaky*, David E. Denton, D.F. Diedrich*, Robert M. Drake Jr.*, Ronald W. Dunbar*, W.W. Ecton*, Roger Eichhorn*, Frederic J. Fleron, Joseph B. Fugate*, Jess L. Gardner*, Milton E. Gellin, James L. Gibson*, J.J. Gruber*, Jack B. Hall*, Joseph Hamburg, Holman Hamilton*, Ellis F. Hartford, Virgil W. Hays*, Dorothy Hollingsworth, J.W. Hollingsworth*, John W. Hutchinson*, Donald W. Ivey*, Vernon L. James*, Ramon D. Johnson, Louis J. Karmel*, James A. Knoblett*, James F. Lafferty, Harold R. Laswell*, Richard S. Levine*, Albert S. Levy*, Mark M. Luckens*, Paul Mandelstam*, W.L. Matthews Jr., George E. Mitchell*, William G. Moody*, Dean H. Morrow*, Jacqueline A. Noonan*, Louis A. Norton*, Leonard V. Packett*, Blaine F. Parker*, Robert W. Penman*, Curtis Phipps*, Nicholas J. Pisacano*, Muriel A. Poulin*, Leonard A. Ravitz*, John C. Robertson*, W.C. Royster*, G.J. Ruschell, John W. Schaefer*, George W. Schwert, Doris M. Seward, Gerard E. Silberstein, Otis A. Singletary*, Raymond A. Smith*, Robert H. Spedding*, Robert Straus*, H.E. Swim*, J.V. Swintosky*, Thomas A. Van*, David R. Wekstein, David C. White, W.R. Willard*, Daniel W. Wingard, Donald J. Wood, Kenneth R. Wright, Harry E. Wheeler*.

The Senate approved the requests of Jeannie Leedom, Kernel reporter, and Bob Brewer, Kernel photographer, to attend, report, and photograph; John Nelson, Howell Hopson, and Buck Pennington, members of the University Student Advisory Committee, to attend and engage in debate on student participation in academic affairs; and Gerald Thornton, president of the Environmental Awareness Society, to attend and speak to the resolution concerning Environmental Awareness Day.

The minutes of the special meeting of March 2 and the regular meeting

*Absence explained

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, MARCH 9, 1970

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

Clifford Amyx, Robert Aug*, Lyle N. Back*, Henry H. Bauer*, Wendell E. Berry*, Harmon C. Bickley, Jr.*, Richard C. Birkebak*, Barry J. Bloomfield, Herbert Braunstein*, Wallace N. Briggs*, Clyde R. Carpenter, Donald B. Coleman, Robert L. Cosgriff*, Raymond H. Cox, George F. Crewe, William H. Dennen, David E. Denton*, D. F. Diedrich*, John P. Drysdale, Ronald W. Dunbar, Fred Edmonds*, Irving Fisher, Ira Fowler, Herbert Greene, Joseph J. Gruber*, Virgil W. Hays*, Dorothy Hollingsworth*, J. W. Hollingsworth*, Vernon L. James*, Louis J. Karmel, William F. Kenkel, Carl E. Langenhop, Albert S. Levy*, John L. Madden*, Gene L. Mason*, Leonard McDowell*, Marcus T. McEllistrem*, William G. Moody*, Dean H. Morrow*, Jacqueline A. Noonan*, Leonard V. Packett*, Harold F. Parks*, Albert W. Patrick*, Robert W. Penman, Curtis Phipps, Nicholas J. Pisacano*, Leonard A. Ravitz*, John W. Roddick*, John W. Schaefer*, Rudolph Schriels*, D. Milton Shuffett*, Malcolm R. Siegel, Raymond A. Smith*, William G. Survant*, Thomas A. Van*, Harwin L. Voss, John N. Walker*, David R. Wekstein, David C. White*, Cornelia B. Wilbur*, Daniel W. Wingard, Donald J. Wood*, Kenneth R. Wright, Lawrence A. Allen, Charles E. Barnhart, Harry M. Bohannan, Betty J. Brannan*, Glenwood L. Creech, Marcia A. Dake*, Stuart Forth*, Timothy R. Futrell*, Harold D. Gordon, Charles P. Graves*, Joseph Hamburg, Raymon D. Johnson*, William S. Jordan, Jr.*, Taft McKinstry, George J. Ruschell, Otis A. Singletary*, Sheryl G. Snyder, John L. Sutton, Joseph V. Swintosky*, William R. Willard*, Ernest F. Witte*.

The Senate approved the request of Jeannie Leedom of the Kernel to attend and report.

The Secretary of the Senate presented the supplemental list of degree candidates who had completed requirements in December, 1969. This supplemental list had been circulated to the faculty under date of February 3, 1970. The Senate approved the supplemental list as submitted for recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

(See supplemental list in Registrar's Office)

On behalf of the Senate Council, Dr. Ford, Secretary of the Council, recommended the adoption of the five recommendations under Roman numeral I, page 1, in the final Report of the Senate Advisory Committee on Community Colleges concerning courses and grades (this Report was circulated to the faculty under date of February 27, 1970); that a copy of these recommendations be forwarded to the President for implementation; and that a copy be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification into the Rules, and into Copy IV of the pending Revision of the Governing Regulations, where appropriate.

Dr. Ockerman then spoke to the five recommendations and presented support for the following suggested changes which the Senate might wish to consider:

*Absence explained

that recommendation no. 2 be deleted;
that a period be placed after the word "continued" in the second line of
recommendation no. 4 and the remainder of that sentence be deleted;
that the effective date for implementation of the recommendations
(recommendation no. 5) be changed to become effective with the 1970
Fall Semester.

Following extensive discussion of the five recommendations and these suggested
changes amendment was made to delete recommendation no. 2. The Senate approved
the deletion thus necessitating renumbering of the remaining four recommendations.

After further discussion amendment was introduced to place a period after the
word "continued" in the second line of recommendation no. 4 and delete the
remainder of the sentence. By a vote of 50 to 48 this amendment was defeated.

Amendment was then presented to change the effective date for implementation
of the recommendations, contained in recommendation no. 5, to become effective
with the Fall Semester of 1970 /this was interpreted to apply to the first
offering of any course/. The Senate approved this amendment.

The Senate then approved the adoption of the recommendations, as amended, for
forwarding to the President for implementation, and to the Rules Committee for
codification into the Rules and into Copy IV of the pending Revision of the
Governing Regulations, where appropriate.

The recommendations as amended and approved read as follows:

1. The Community College System shall be permitted to originate and/or
offer courses in addition to those offered on the Lexington campus.
2. Courses taken in the Community College System which are not
offered on the Lexington campus shall be evaluated for transfer
credit to the Lexington campus on the same basis used for courses
from any other institution.
3. The present practice of transferring grades along with credits
shall be continued for those courses which are offered on the
Lexington campus with transfer credit from the Community College
System.
4. These recommendations shall be put into effect with the Fall
Semester of 1970.

On behalf of the Senate Council, Dr. Ford recommended the adoption of the
four recommendations under Roman numeral II, page 3, in the final Report of
the Senate Advisory Committee on Community Colleges, concerning administrative
recommendations; that a copy of these recommendations be forwarded to the
President for his consideration; and that a copy be forwarded to the Rules
Committee for codification into the Rules, and into Copy IV of the pending
Revision of the Governing Regulations, where appropriate.

Following extensive discussion amendment was presented to delete recommendation
no. 4. The Senate defeated this amendment.

Amendment was then presented to delete recommendation no. 3 from the Report. The Senate defeated this amendment.

The Senate then approved the original recommendation to adopt the four recommendations and forward to the President for his consideration and to the Rules Committee for codification into the Rules and into Copy IV of the pending Revision of the Governing Regulations where appropriate.

The four recommendations as approved read as follows:

1. The title of the chief administrative officer of the Community College System should be changed from that of Dean to Vice President.
2. The title of the chief administrative officer of an individual community college should be changed **from** Director to some such title as Executive Dean.
3. Consideration should be given to the establishment of a professorial title series encompassing the following: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor, Community College System.
4. Members of the faculty of the Community College System should be permitted to work toward a doctoral degree on the Lexington campus.

Dr. Blaine Parker stated that he would like to commend students at the University for showing interest in business being brought before the Senate, such as the Report of the University Senate Advisory Committee on Appropriate Balance Among Teaching, Research, and Service Functions in the University. He pointed out, however, that the wording in the petition concerning that Report to which the 1,900 students had affixed their signatures had been somewhat misleading. He then read what was contained in the petition that the students had signed, the principal part of which was as follows:

"On Monday, March 2, 1970, at 4:00 p.m. the Faculty Senate will consider a proposal which could greatly affect your learning. A Faculty Committee is presenting a Report on the appropriate balance between 1. teaching; 2. research; and 3. service. It recommends that each individual faculty member be able to establish his own ratio among these three and be rewarded in money, promotion, and tenure on the basis of each. Doesn't this make sense? Presently, one is rewarded only on the basis of his research (that is, his publications). Now, being a good teacher is not worth anything to a faculty member. In order to become a more effective teacher he might have to take away his time from research. Research now equals money. Should it? . . ."

The Senate adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

3-18-70

TO: Members of the Senate
FROM: Honors Program Director
SUBJECT: Honors Program Pass-Fail Proposal

At the last regular meeting of the Senate a proposal by students in the Honors Program for a change in the rules was tabled. The students have asked me to inform you of the background of their proposal.

But first, we are extremely sorry no representatives from the Honors Program faculty, the students, and the Faculty Advisory Committee were present at the meeting of the Senate to explain and defend the proposition. We have all anticipated that opportunity for many months, but--as sometimes happens--we suffered from a failure of communications and were not present when the Senate considered the matter.

You should be advised that the proposal was student initiated. In the winter of 1968, the Honors Program Student Advisory Committee debated the merits of Pass-Fail and decided to carry a proposal to the students in the program. A number of meetings were held at which aspects of Pass-Fail were debated in depth. Also, programs at other institutions were examined. Finally, the students decided to move, through proper channels, for Pass-Fail privileges for superior students.

In essence they proposed that superior students be permitted to take up to 32 credit hours on Pass-Fail, that none of these hours be in their major subject or related fields (that is, that all be drawn from the elective component of their programs), and that teachers should not be informed that the students were registered for Pass-Fail grades (in short, that the P and F grades be assigned by the registrar on the basis of letter grades turned in by the professors, with grades below C to count as F).

The students then took this proposal to the Faculty Advisory Committee where they met strong opposition. In the first place, the College of Arts and Sciences was in process of formulating its own, faculty initiated, Pass-Fail proposal, and the Faculty Committee first inquired why that system was not satisfactory for superior students. The students defended their proposal eloquently and eventually won support from the Faculty Committee (as a matter of fact there was no dissent from the members present at the time the final decision was made, a meeting at which students were not present to place any pressure on the Committee).

The Faculty Committee then forwarded the proposal to the Senate Council, the proper body, with the verbal request that the students be permitted to explain their case. The Council in due time forwarded the proposal to the Rules Committee. This Committee considered the proposal and in time called representative Honors Program students to defend their position. The students did so again with great vehemence and eloquence. The Rules Committee, however, subsequently decided not to accept the student proposal as written. In its place they substituted the proposal which you tabled.

Without presuming to speak for the Rules Committee, we can say the students believed that the Committee wished to do something less than spell out an exact privilege. Accordingly, they placed responsibility for determining the amount of work to be taken on Pass-Fail, and the courses in which it would be permitted, on the Director of the Honors Program. Their opinion, one presumes, was that while some students might well profit from 32 credit hours on Pass-Fail, others should be more closely restricted, and that sort of restriction should be the direct responsibility of the administrator of the program. The contention raised on the Senate floor that some students might take 100 hours on Pass-Fail and then graduate from the University with no more than 28 graded hours is patently preposterous and should not for an instant be entertained by reasonable faculty members.

A number of students involved in the project were less than pleased with the alteration of their proposal by the Rules Committee; however, they graciously and co-operatively accepted the decision. In essence they believed that the Pass-Fail proposal of the College of Arts and Sciences was insufficient for certain superior students. They preferred to spell out exactly just what their extended privileges might be, but they were cognizant of objections sometimes raised to the Honors approach to education and decided to accept a compromise. That is how they viewed the change in the rules submitted to you.

Throughout a year and a half of negotiations the students were constantly assured on all quarters that they would, at every step of the procedure, be accorded a fair hearing. Not only did they not receive one, they did not receive any hearing at all on the floor of the Senate. It is their feeling, supported by the faculty of the Honors Program, that they deserve better. While their motion was only tabled, we are aware that this process may effectively kill a worthy proposal in any parliamentary body. It is the hope of us all that the Senate will reconsider this matter, giving the students an opportunity to appear before that body to state their case.

October 29, 1969