

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

US  
2/13/78

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL  
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

February 2, 1978

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet on Monday, February 13, 1978 at 3:00 p.m. in the Court Room of the Law Building.

AGENDA:

- 1) Approval of the minutes of the December 12, 1977 University Senate meeting.
- 2) Memorial Resolution.
- 3) Dr. Wimberly C. Royster, Remarks on Graduate Education and Research at the University of Kentucky.
- 4) Action Items:
  - a) Proposed Admissions Procedures for the College of Nursing, Section IV, 2.1.6 of the University Senate Rules. (Circulated under date of January 31, 1978.)
  - b) Presentation and action on Honorary Degree Candidates: Dr. W.C. Royster.

/cet  
/cet

Elbert W. Ockerman  
Secretary



UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL  
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

January 31, 1978

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday,  
February 13, 1978. Proposed admissions procedures  
for the College of Nursing to replace Section IV, 2.1.6  
of the University Senate Rules.

The University Senate Council and Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic recommend the following admissions procedures for the College of Nursing. If approved, the procedures will be effective beginning with the Fall Semester, 1978.

Undergraduate Admission Requirements: College of Nursing

Applicants meeting the following criteria will be considered for admission by the College of Nursing Admissions Committee:

- 1) Licensure to practice as a registered nurse in Kentucky.
- 2) Completion of an Associate Degree Program in Nursing from a college accredited by one of the six regional academic accrediting associations. Exception: The registered nurse who is a graduate of a diploma program will be considered for admission after earning a minimum of 60 college credits\* which meet the following requirements:

English	6 semester credits
Natural Sciences	10 semester credits
Behavioral Sciences	6 semester credits
Nursing	28 semester credits
Electives	10 semester credits

\*These credits may be earned from a regionally accredited college by taking the courses or by examination (i. e., challenge or equivalency).



- 3) An overall grade point average of 2.0 or higher on a 4.0 quality point scale in all course work attempted as computed by the University of Kentucky Admissions Office.
- 4) A state of health such that the applicant will be able to carry out the duties of the professional nurse. After acceptance for admission the applicant will be required to obtain a physical examination, update immunizations, and obtain a tuberculin test or X-ray as appropriate.

Procedures for Applying:

All applications for admission must be received by the College of Nursing no later than March 1. All applicants will be notified regarding admission by April 1. Those accepted for admission must notify the College within 30 days, in writing, of their intent to enroll.

There will be a maximum of 130 students per class and Kentucky residents will be given preference. In the event of a surplus of applications from Kentucky residents, the class will be randomly selected from these applicants. If there are available spaces remaining after all qualified Kentucky residents have been admitted, out-of-state students will be randomly selected to fill the class. It will be the goal of the College not to exceed 15 percent of out-of-state students.

Part-Time Study: Students who are working toward the completion of the BSN degree on a part-time basis must plan their course of study with the appropriate College of Nursing personnel or committee.

Candidates for the degree who do not complete all requirements within a five year period after admission will have their records reevaluated and may be required to repeat or take selected courses.

Rationale for Random Selection Process:

The faculty of the College of Nursing is recommending the procedure of random selection of students in the new program for several reasons:

- 1) There are no standardized tests, such as those available in law, medicine, and dentistry, by which to select students for nursing programs.
- 2) There are no criteria available to identify the impact of experience in nursing on an applicant's ability to pursue baccalaureate study in nursing.
- 3) Unlike all other baccalaureate programs in the University, the nursing program will have a student body composed entirely of persons with two



Page 3

Agenda Item: University Senate, February 13, 1978  
January 31, 1978

years of professional training and at least one year of professional practice. The average age of the students in the Associate degree program is 22, and it is expected that most applicants for the new baccalaureate program will be between the ages of 22 and 30.

- 4) Grade inflation in academic institutions, which has been increasing in recent years, will militate against the student who graduated five or more years ago. The use of the grade point average will, therefore, favor the newer graduate without reflecting a difference in actual ability.
- 5) The College of Nursing faculty wishes to conduct research on the identification of criteria for predicting success in an upper division program of the type we are initiating. We believe we have the resources to collect and analyze the data but an initial random selection is necessary to this research.
- 6) Other programs such as California State College, Sonoma, and the University of Nebraska, Omaha, use the random selection method because of the current lack of specific criteria.

We are proposing to use this method, if there are more than 130 applicants, for a period of three years during which we will collect and analyze student data to determine appropriate criteria. We will submit a report to the Senate no later than the end of the Fall Semester 1980 and recommend an alternate admissions program on the basis of our research findings.

/cet



UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
COLLEGE OF NURSING

UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Applicants meeting the following criteria will be considered for admission by the College of Nursing Admissions Committee:

1. Licensure to practice as a registered nurse in Kentucky.
2. Completion of an Associate Degree Program in Nursing from a college accredited by one of the six regional academic accrediting associations.  
Exception: The registered nurse who is a graduate of a diploma program will be considered for admission after earning a minimum of 60 college credits\* which meet the following requirements:

English	-	6 semester credits
Natural Sciences	-	10 semester credits
Behavioral Sciences	-	6 semester credits
Nursing	-	28 semester credits
Electives	-	10 semester credits

\*These credits may be earned from a regionally accredited college by taking the courses or by examination (i.e., challenge or equivalency).

3. An overall grade point average of 2.0 on a 4.0 quality point scale in all course work attempted as computed by the University of Kentucky Admissions Office.
4. The applicant's state of health must be such that the applicant will be able to carry out the duties of the professional nurse. After acceptance for admission the applicant will be required to obtain a physical examination, update immunizations, and obtain a tuberculin test or X-ray as appropriate.

Procedures for Applying

All applications for admission must be received by the College of Nursing no later than March 1. All applicants will be notified regarding admission by April 1. Those accepted for admission must notify the College within 30 days, in writing, of their intent to enroll.

There will be a maximum of 130 students per class and Kentucky residents will be given preference. In the event of a surplus of applications from Kentucky residents, the class will be randomly selected from these applicants. If there are available spaces remaining after all qualified Kentucky residents have been admitted, out-of-state students will be randomly selected to fill the class. It will be the goal of the College not to exceed 15 percent of out-of-state students.

Admission to specific nursing courses will be determined by the availability of resources and facilities.



Part-Time Study: Students who are working toward the completion of the BSN degree on a part-time basis must plan their course of study with the appropriate College of Nursing personnel or committee.

Candidates for the degree who do not complete all requirements within a five year period after admission will have their records reevaluated and may be required to repeat or take selected courses.

Rationale for Random Selection Process

The faculty of the College of Nursing is recommending the procedure of random selection of students in the new program for several reasons:

1. There are no standardized tests, such as those available in law, medicine, and dentistry, by which to select students for nursing programs.
2. There are no criteria available to identify the impact of experience in nursing on an applicant's ability to pursue baccalaureate study in nursing.
3. Grade inflation in academic institutions which has been increasing in recent years, will militate against the student who graduated five or more years ago. The use of the grade point average will, therefore, favor the newer graduate without reflecting a difference in actual ability.
4. The College of Nursing faculty wishes to conduct research on the identification of criteria for predicting success in an upper division program of the type we are initiating. We believe we have the resources to collect and analyze the data but an initial random selection is necessary to this research.
5. Other programs such as California State College, Sonoma, and the University of Nebraska, Omaha, use the random selection method because of the current lack of specific criteria.

We are proposing to use this method, if there are more than 130 applicants, for a period of three years during which we will collect and analyze student data to determine appropriate criteria. At the end of this period we will submit a report to the Senate Council of the research findings.

MEM/gb  
1/11/78



MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, FEBRUARY 13, 1978

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, February 13, 1978, in the Court Room of the Law Building.

Paul Oberst, Chairman, presiding

Members absent: Roger B. Anderson, Harry H. Bailey, Charles E. Barnhart, Robert P. Belin, John J. Bernardo\*, Jack C. Blanton, Thomas O. Blues\*, Russell H. Brannon, C. Frank Buck, Joseph T. Burch, John L. Butler\*, W. Merle Carter\*, Donald B. Clapp, Ronda S. Connaway\*, Samuel F. Conti, Donald P. Cross\*, M. Ward Crowe, Guy M. Davenport, Robert J. DeAngelis, Patrick P. DeLuca\*, George W. Denmark, William H. Dennen, Stephen Diachun, Donald F. Diedrich, Ronald C. Dillehay, Marcus L. Dillon\*, Joseph M. Dougherty, Anthony Eardley, W. W. Ecton\*, Roger Eichhorn\*, Jane M. Emanuel\*, Calvin Ernst\*, Donald A. Falace\*, Thomas R. Ford\*, James E. Funk\*, Art Gallaher\*, Joseph H. Gardner\*, Abner Golden\*, Andrew J. Grimes\*, Joseph P. Guiltinan\*, Joseph Hamburg, S. Zafar Hasan\*, Raymond R. Hornback, Donald W. Ivey\*, Gerald Janecek, Keith H. Johnson\*, Dave Kaelin, Joe Kelley, Elizabeth A. Kirilin\*, James A. Knoblett, Gretchen LaGodna, Stephen Langston, Ike Lawrence, Eddie Leach, Thomas P. Lewis, Austin S. Litvak\*, Peter Malpass, Paul Mandelstam\*, Marcus T. McEllistrem, Susan A. McEvoy\*, William G. Moody, Catherine Morsink, Robert C. Noble\*, Jacqueline A. Noonan\*, Clayton Omgvig\*, Patti Owens, Ronda S. Paul, Bobbie G. Pedigo, Jean Pival\*, William K. Plucknett\*, Anna K. Reed\*, Billy Renner, Leann Ring, JoAnn Rogers\*, Robert W. Rudd\*, Ramona Rush\*, Pritam S. Sabharwal, John S. Scarborough\*, Jo Schladale\*, Phillip Phillips, D. Milton Shuffett, Timothy W. Sineath, Otis A. Singletary\*, John T. Smith\*, Don M. Soule\*, Lynn Spruill, John B. Stephenson, Marjorie S. Stewart\*, Willis A. Sutton\*, Joseph V. Swintosky\*, Paula Totten\*, John N. Walker\*, M. Stanley Wall, Ralph F. Wiseman\*, Judith Worell\*

The minutes of the regular meeting of December 12, 1977, were accepted as circulated.

SUMMARY:

I. Action Items:

A. Proposed Admissions Procedures for the College of Nursing, Section IV, 2.1.6 of the University Senate Rules. (Circulated under date of January 31, 1978.) Motion passed.

B. Presentation and Action on Honorary Degree Candidates: Dr. Wimberly C. Royster Motion passed.

II. Senate Council Activities and Informational Items

A. Ombudsman Search Committee Appointed

B. Department of Human Communications changed to Department of Communications

\*Absence explained



- C. Library of Congress Classification System Recommended
  - D. New Senate Council Members Announced
  - E. Senate Council Chairman and Secretary Announced
- III. Resolution Commending Constance P. Wilson, Past Chairman
- IV. Memorial Resolutions

Richard S. Allen, 1896-1978, Professor Emeritus, Physiology and Biophysics  
William Jackson Carey, 1931-1978, Anesthesiologist, Medical Center  
John B. Roberts, 1905-1977, Professor Emeritus, Agricultural Economics

V. Reports on the Weather

- A. Dr. Lewis Cochran, Vice President for Academic Affairs
- B. Dr. Peter Bosomworth, Vice President for the Medical Center
- C. Dr. Robert Zumwinkle, Vice President for Student Affairs
- D. Mr. Thomas Padgett, Director of Public Safety

VI. Dr. Wimberly C. Royster, Dean of the Graduate School: Report to the Senate

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

1. The Senate Council appointed an Ombudsman Search Committee. The members are Daniel Reedy, Chairman, Patrick DeLuca, Donald Diedrich, Robert Gunnell, and two students, Brad Beck and Mark Koopman.
2. The proposal to change the name of the Department of Human Communications to the Department of Communications has been approved by the Committee on Organization and Structure and has been forwarded by the Senate Council to Vice President Cochran for appropriate administrative action.
3. The Library of Congress classification system recommended by the Library Committee has been funded by the President, and the Senate Council would like to recognize the good work of the Library Committee which went into the proposal.
4. Three new Senate Council members who have taken office are: Daniel Reedy, John Lienhard and George Schwert. Jim Lobb, Student Council Member, replaces Don Prather.
5. The Senate Council had an election on February 1 for Chairman of the Senate Council. Joseph Bryant was elected to take office on July 1, 1978. Daniel Reedy was elected Secretary of the Senate Council to take office immediately.



Chairman Oberst recognized Professor Daniel Reedy, Secretary of the Senate Council, who presented the following Resolution on Professor Constance P. Wilson.

A Resolution of the University of Kentucky Senate, February 13, 1978

WHEREAS Connie Wilson, the first woman chairman of the Senate Council, has effectively and efficiently performed her duties on the Council and as presiding officer of the Senate; and

WHEREAS she has brought her sterling personal qualities of ebullience, charm, and friendliness to that office; and

WHEREAS she has contributed significantly to improving communication among the various divisions -- educational and administrative -- of the University; and

WHEREAS she has worked diligently to increase the effectiveness of the Senate's committee system, to champion the rights and privileges of the faculty, and to establish an orientation program for new faculty members;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate shall express its appreciation by approving this resolution and directing that it shall be placed in the Senate Minutes and a copy shall be sent to her.

Chairman Oberst presented the following three Memorial Resolutions on the deaths of Richard S. Allen, William Jackson Carey, and John B. Roberts. Professor Oberst directed that the Resolutions be made a part of these minutes and that copies be provided to the members of the immediate families. Following Professor Oberst's presentation of the Resolutions, the Senators were asked to stand for a moment of silence in tribute and respect to Professor Allen, Dr. Carey, and Professor Roberts.

#### MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

Richard S. Allen, 1896 - 1978

Professor Richard S. Allen was born in Pekin, Illinois, November 9, 1896. After a lifetime of teaching, about forty-three years, he died January 6, 1978, at the home of his son in Evansville, Indiana. He was the son of William Henry Allen and Margaret Olt. His father was a physician in the horse and buggy days and he early instilled in his young son the love of biology and medicine. Professor Allen's mother died when he was quite young and his older sister, Sybil, helped to raise and encourage the young Allen in his beginning academic career.

Richard Allen always had a strong bent for things medical and he delighted in encouraging the young neophyte who anticipated studying medicine. He often compared this opportunity to finding gold in mines in being allowed to shape the career of the young person before his education was later refined in a more professional setting.



Richard Allen received his B.S. degree from the University of Chicago in 1922. In 1927-28 and 1936-37 he pursued graduate work in the Physiology Department at the University of Chicago under the tutelage of Professor Anton Carlson, who was internationally recognized as the Dean of American Physiology.

In 1921 Professor Allen spent a year as a physical chemist with the Western Electric Company. He was always very proud of his service in the U. S. Army and served in 1918-1919 with the Heavy Field Artillery Division.

In 1925 Professor Allen received his Master's Degree in Physiology from the University of Rochester. As a young graduate student in the Department he was a member of the American team that attempted to isolate insulin from the pancreas. Instead Dr. John R. Murlin, his graduate director, obtained evidence for a second hormone which he named glucagon and whose biological importance he did not then realize.

On August 23, 1924 Richard Allen married Leone McLaughlin, who survives him. They celebrated their golden wedding anniversary in 1974.

Professor Allen is also survived by his son, Dr. William Henry Allen II, who graduated from the University of Rochester School of Medicine and who currently is a practicing neurosurgeon in Evansville, Indiana.

In 1927 the Allens moved to Lexington when the University of Kentucky was comparatively a small institution. He became a member of the Department of Anatomy and Physiology, which was then chaired by Dr. Joseph Pryor who at the same time was the University physician. Professor Allen was quickly promoted to Associate Professor, then Professor, and became Head of the Department in 1931. He held this position for 29 years. In 1960 the Department of Anatomy and Physiology was dissolved and fused with the Department of Physiology, now Physiology and Biophysics. Professor Allen continued to teach in this Department until his retirement in 1967.

Professor Allen directed and advised the early academic years of many young people who are now practicing physicians in Kentucky and elsewhere. He was always affectionately known as "Doc Allen" by his students as well as his colleagues. Many mountain boys who came as premedical students to the University were counselled and made to feel at ease by him and he always made the shy, introverted student feel that someone was interested in him. In his classes Professor Allen was well liked. He was a "down-to-earth" person and teacher especially encouraging the timid student to "come out of his shell" and participate in the discussion.

Professor Allen was never too busy to talk with a student and his office always had an open door. Particularly he seemed to have the ability to stimulate students to go further into graduate work in physiology.



A number of Ph.D. physiologists probably would never have gone into graduate work except for his encouragement and always optimistic attitude that he had about the problems of life and living.

Professor Allen was for many years an active member of the American Legion and devoted several years, as Chairman of the Junior Athletic Committee, to encouraging young boys to play in the Legion's Junior Baseball League. He was a member of the Baptist church. Also he was a member of the Association of American Medical Colleges, the A.A.A.S., the American Genetic Association, Sigma Xi and Alpha Epsilon Delta. He is listed in Who's Who in America and American Men of Science.

In addition to his wife and son he leaves two grandchildren, Chad and Windy.

(Prepared by Dr. J. W. Archdeacon, Professor Emeritus, Physiology and Biophysics)

#### MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

William Jackson Carey, 1931 - 1978

Our medical school is a young one. Although all of us there deal with serious illness and death on a daily basis, we have been fortunate that we have had so little serious illness and so few deaths among our active faculty.

One of our colleagues in Anesthesiology, Dr. William Jackson Carey, died on January 9, 1978. In our concern about so many of the day to day problems which beset us all, we have not had an opportunity to honor his memory appropriately. We would like to tell you a bit about Dr. Jack Carey, how he lived, and how he died.

He was a native of Kentucky, having been born in Louisa in 1931. He attended Centre College and Morehead State University before entering the University of Louisville Medical School. He served his residency in Anesthesia at the University of Kentucky Medical Center and joined the faculty of the College of Medicine as an Assistant Professor of Anesthesiology in 1969. From the beginning, Jack had a vision of anesthesiology more than that of a specialty which confined its activity to the operating room, but rather as a specialty which could use its special training and expertise to help formulate plans for emergency medical care.

Jack had a vision of emergency medical care which would encompass that critical period from the time the patient was injured until he reached an appropriately staffed hospital. He identified this critical time as one of the most neglected areas in medicine. A time in which well-trained paramedical personnel provided medical care and a time in which major, although brief, disabling injury might be prevented or alleviated by appropriate triage methods.



Dr. Carey spoke extensively on the need for improved education and resuscitation techniques and emergency medical care all over the Commonwealth of Kentucky to laymen and physicians alike. This interest led him to become a Founding Member of the Kentucky Chapter of the American College of Emergency Physicians and the American Trauma Society. He served on a number of state and national committees on emergency medical care.

But if Jack were here today he would state he was most proud of his Major Event Safety Program. He was primarily responsible for recruiting and training the physicians and nurses who provide emergency medical care at all sporting events in the Commonwealth Stadium and Rupp Arena. He was most proud that his team was able to save a heart attack victim at one of the first games played in Commonwealth Stadium. That patient has now survived his doctor.

Dr. Carey died with honor and dignity. His chronic liver disease sapped the very heart of his being. Although extremely weak and ill toward the end, he still coordinated the emergency medical care for major sporting events. He is survived by his wife, Phyllis, and two daughters, Cathy and Mary Beth.

(Prepared by the Dean's Office, College of Medicine)

#### MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

John B. Roberts, 1905 - 1977

John B. Roberts, Professor Emeritus of Agricultural Economics, died at his home, 242 Chenault Road, on November 18, 1977. The University and the Commonwealth have greatly benefited from the efforts of this gifted scientist.

He was a native of Kirwin, Kansas and received undergraduate and advanced degrees from Kansas State University. In addition, he did Graduate work at Harvard University and the University of California at Berkeley.

Professor Roberts joined the Department of Agricultural Economics faculty in 1936. He was widely known for his specialized work in dairy marketing for Kentucky and Southeastern farmers. His keen understanding of the economics of milk marketing and the articulate use of facts earned him the respect of leaders in the industry. As a result, he frequently appeared as an expert witness at government hearings and in the courts. Among his contemporaries in the field of dairy marketing, he would have ranked among the top nationally.

For many years, Roberts also represented the University on regional research projects dealing with technical marketing mechanisms affecting



poultry and other food products. These research projects related primarily to food promotion and merchandising in the North Central and Southern regions of the United States. From these research efforts came numerous research publications.

Professor Roberts' contributions at the state level included serving as a consultant to the Governor's Commission on Agriculture in the 1960's and working extensively with farmer cooperatives in bringing about greater efficiencies in the marketing of milk and milk products.

In the field of international Agriculture he was visiting professor at the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, England in 1967. In addition he was a consultant to the Scottish and British milk boards and conducted research in dairy marketing practices in Holland, Germany and the Scandinavian countries.

He was a longtime member of the Maxwell Street Presbyterian Church.

Professor Roberts is survived by his wife, the former Mary Alice Schnacke; a daughter, Mrs. Barbara Schradling of Pittsburgh; two sons, Robert C. Roberts of Lynchburg, Virginia, and J. Bissell Roberts of Louisville.

The University Community will miss this friendly and competent faculty member.

(Prepared by Robert Beck and James Criswell, College of Agriculture)

Professor Oberst asked Dr. Lewis Cochran, Vice President for Academic Affairs; Dr. Peter Bosomworth, Vice President for the Medical Center; Dr. Robert Zumwinkle, Vice President for Student Affairs; and Thomas Padgett, Director of Public Safety, to make some remarks concerning the weather and how the University "coped with the past month."

Dr. Cochran made the following remarks:

The President was the head of the team which tried to deal with the weather. He had hoped to get back in time to say a few words about it, weather permitting. He asked me to say a few words for him if he did not return in time. I think it would be pointless to summarize for you the experiences we have had. The President did ask me to say for him a word of commendation. Actually he used the word praise for the understanding, patience, tolerance, the good sense and occasionally the good humor of the students on campus, for the faculty who got to work under the most difficult circumstances, for the staff, particularly those essential staff who got to work.

I would like to mention one other unit and that is Mr. Willis and his staff who were able to reopen the library on Friday. There were academic consequences to the University's having been closed. The Law School has made a proposal to the Senate Council for rescheduling for time lost. The Faculty Council of the College of Arts and Sciences has passed a resolution asking for some consideration for makeup time.



Chairman Oberst said that the Senate Council recommends that makeup of lost work due to snow days be arranged when appropriate, feasible or necessary by mutual agreement between the instructor and student.

Dr. Bosomworth made the following remarks:

I think we should be talking about ice today instead of snow but at any rate I would say that the operation of the Medical Center, particularly the University Hospital went along with remarkable smoothness considering the severe conditions primarily because of the help of a lot of citizens here in Fayette County who assisted us in the transporting of people in and out of the hospital to get them to their job stations. The Medical School, with the exception of one day, remained open. The Dental School was open with the exception of two days. The other colleges followed the pattern of the University. Some people worked double shifts and slept at the hospital in order to keep it going. I was very proud of the effort people made and the commitment our faculty and staff had to the effort.

Dr. Zumwinkle made the following remarks:

The Student Affairs' staff concentrated most of its energies during those difficult days on providing social programs and recreational facilities for those students on campus. This meant keeping the Seaton Building and Alumni Gymnasium open all day and evenings. Those buildings experienced very heavy student use. All of the staff were here in the residence halls. The residence halls' staff had an opportunity to show some of the kinds of creativity that you need under those circumstances to keep things going. The Student Center was open all days except one. Fraternity Rush and the Lady Kats basketball game continued as scheduled. The Dean of Students' Office was open each day of the closing of the offices, and they provided useful telephone information service for students. I want to underline a matter that has been referred to also by the two preceding speakers and that has been the role of the students, the students in general and their good humor and general cooperativeness and the student staff in the residence halls, campus recreation, and the Student Center. They were of invaluable help during those days.

Mr. Padgett made the following remarks:

Mr. Blanton asked me to represent him this afternoon and speak briefly on the emergency procedures and activities during the snow emergency. The obvious one, snow removal, required the operation of three shifts seven days a week in the Physical Plant Division. Several employees spent many nights in the Service Building, many as much as a week or more without going home. Although we are comparatively well-equipped to handle snow removal, there were many problems in keeping the equipment in operation due to the duration of the weather conditions. A great deal of credit belongs to the Farm Management Operations of the College of Agriculture for their assistance with equipment and personnel to keep the campus open.



Perhaps the most difficult aspect of operating the campus during the snow was due to the large number of students who were already here. This caused some significant programming and service demands. Food service employees spent 3,800 hours overtime and nearly 8,000 hours in what we call "snow time" which are those days spent working while the University was officially closed. Food service employees also spent many nights in the residence halls unable to travel to and from work. In addition to staffing problems, we had a shortage of food supplies.

In the Public Safety Division, we coordinated communications and emergency services during the period and provided 24-hour transportation for essential employees. Information service is provided through the University Police Dispatcher. And, in times of emergency, the Dean of Students or his representative and myself, are available 24 hours a day on the campus. In summary, a lot that could have happened did not. We had no weather related injuries, no emergency vehicle accidents, and no major property damage. The cooperation from students and employees was tremendous.

Chairman Oberst asked Dean Wimberly C. Royster for his remarks on Graduate Education and Research at the University of Kentucky.

Dean Royster spoke to the Senate as follows:

Chairman Oberst, members of the Senate, and guests, I appreciate the opportunity to discuss the two major administrative responsibilities of the Graduate School - research and graduate education, which in an academic setting are practically inseparable; or, at least, they should be. Inquiry and teaching go together, whether it is in graduate or undergraduate education. The initial remarks will be about research at the University of Kentucky. The latter remarks will concern graduate education. But, before going into these topics, I should mention that the administrative responsibilities of the Graduate School include all graduate programs and most all research institutes and centers, including the Center for Developmental Change, Water Resources Institute, Appalachian Center, Institute for Mining and Minerals Research, Tobacco and Health Research Institute, Kentucky Geological Survey, the Clay Papers Project, and the Office of Sponsored Projects Administration.

#### RESEARCH

Most everyone knows that the research effort at this university has increased remarkably in the past ten years. It has increased in quantity and quality. It is much easier to measure the increase in quantity than in quality, but there are implications of some improvement in quality when one analyzes the growth of research projects and awards.

Ten years ago, that is, FY 1967, the extramural awards to the University obtained through the Research Foundation totaled \$11 million. This past year the awards amounted to about \$25 million. The largest increase of one year over another was in 1974 when the total awards went



from \$16.5 million in 1973 to \$22.9 million in 1974. The largest total awards in the history of the University was \$25.7 million in 1975. We have remained at approximately that level since that time. This year, FY 1978, we have already received awards totaling \$23 million; so with any luck at all, we should crowd \$30 million by June 30, 1978.

It should be mentioned here that these awards are exclusive of tobacco and health and other funds allocated to research of approximately \$4.5 million.

We should note that this increase in award dollars has taken place during a time when R & D (research and development) funds have been tighter than in the past 15 to 20 years. There are some implications here about the quality of the research performance of our faculty. However, before we boast too much, let us look at the source of these funds.

Most of us are aware that practically all of the federal grants are competitive awards. Some State and industry grants are competitive; but, generally speaking, the competition is not with other major universities. In 1974, 80 percent of the University's research awards was from federal agencies. In 1976, only 58 percent was from federal agencies, a drop of \$3.6 million. In 1977, the percentage jumped back to about 65 percent. This may indicate that we are not doing as well competing with other major institutions as we were four years ago.

How do the awards distribute among the University areas? Over the past few years, the Division of Colleges received slightly over 50 percent of the awards, the Medical Center slightly less than 40 percent, and others about eight to ten percent. The distribution by Colleges over the past three years of dollars from all sources puts the College of Medicine in the lead followed by Education, Agriculture, Engineering (not including IMMR State funds), Dentistry, and Arts and Sciences, all receiving well above \$1 million per year.

The distribution of federal dollars in the Division of Colleges (Academic Affairs) for the past three and one-half years is (1) Education, (2) Engineering, (3) Arts and Sciences, and (4) Agriculture in that order. The departments in the Division of Colleges with the largest total federal grants for the past three and one-half years are (1) Special Education - \$5.4 million, (2) Mechanical Engineering - \$1.37 million, (3) Agronomy - \$1.3 million, (4) Chemical Engineering - \$1.13 million, and (5) Biological Sciences - \$1.05 million.

The departments with the largest total number of federal grant awards for the past three and one-half years are (1) Biological Sciences - 43, (2) Mathematics - 38, (3) Mechanical Engineering - 33, (4) Chemical Engineering - 25, (5) Agronomy - 23, (6) Special Education - 22, and (7) Agricultural Engineering - 21.



What does this research effort mean to the University? (1) It supports graduate students, both research assistants and fellowships. (2) It supports research equipment both from grants and from funds which come to the Graduate School derived from extramural grants. (3) It supports research in the University in areas where extramural research funds are very limited. (4) It provides research information and resource materials, new ideas, methods and a service to various federal, state, and local government agencies in the State and to many industrial and farm related groups. (5) It provides for research awards for faculty within the University, such as, the UKRF faculty awards, and the University Research professorships.

On the other hand, a perusal of the data on research awards shows: (1) Much of the extramural research effort in many departments is carried by a relatively small percentage of the faculty in the department, (2) University's acceptance rate is close to double the rate of many other institutions, and (3) in some cases, according to the agencies, the quality of research and the scholarly activity of the faculty is not sufficiently high to compete successfully in some important federal programs, or, to put it another way, we need more first-rate researchers and scholars.

Why isn't there a higher percentage of departmental faculty applying for support from federal agencies and foundations? Many major institutions require that researchers seek extramural funding for their research before support is forthcoming from the university. Why don't we have more outstanding researchers-scholars? It is my view that more of our faculty in some disciplines can successfully compete on the national scene. Then, are we too comfortable the way things are? Do we not have time available? Are we too concerned with university governance, maybe not by choice but by design, too concerned with university procedures, performance evaluation, etc? Is the University not stressing high quality research and scholarly activity enough? For evaluation purposes, is it willing to "count papers" regardless of quality and not be concerned about its competitive position?

Before we leave the topic of research, we need to understand that the University has made some real progress in the improvement of its research programs. All of us who feel good research programs are necessary for good undergraduate and graduate programs can be nothing less than pleased about it. However, if we plan to continue the improvement of the research programs and compete on the national scene, we must work very hard at it. We must recruit more outstanding researchers-scholars and must develop young scholars through recruitment and proper selection through promotion of the very best we can get.

#### GRADUATE EDUCATION

Vice President Cochran, in his talk before this body, informed you of the status of all new graduate programs; hence, there is no need to repeat the discussion of these programs. My comments will focus on current conditions and existing programs, support for graduate programs,



environment for graduate study, and a brief comment on what may lie ahead for us.

The status of graduate education, especially doctoral education, on the national scene has been unclear for some time. However, currently there appears to be a more clearly defined picture than existed a few years ago. Enrollment shifts which caused upheaval earlier are not as prevalent. Enrollments are beginning to stabilize in most areas of doctoral study but are not as stable at the master's level. It appears that the federal government is beginning to realize again that basic research and basic education are important and is more willing to support graduate education than in the past six to eight years. The President's budget allocates more funds for basic research. Although, in the foreseeable future, the support will not reach a level anywhere approximating the support in the 1960's.

The limited growth in graduate programs and in enrollments has been the result of many factors, among which are the job market, graduate student support, the attitude of both the public and the prospective student toward graduate education, and the moratorium on the starting up of new programs set by the Council on Higher Education. However, in spite of these apparent restraints, the graduate enrollment at the University of Kentucky has increased from approximately 2400 in 1970 to approximately 3700 in the fall of 1977. The enrollment pattern has shifted. Students are enrolling in larger numbers in the graduate professional degree programs at both the master's and doctoral levels.

The University offers, currently, 45 doctoral degree programs, 81 master's degree programs, and a specialist in education program in the Graduate School. As universities of the size of the University of Kentucky go, this is a modest number of advanced graduate degrees.

There are more graduate students enrolled in the University this year than ever before. There is a demand for graduate education. People attend graduate school for many reasons, most of them with degree objectives, but many have no degree objective.

The Graduate School at the University of Kentucky is the largest in the State. We like to think of it as the major graduate institution, and it is, if we consider all kinds of programs. However, many of the other institutions in the State are heavily involved in graduate education. For instance, in 1976 only 23 percent of all the graduate students in the State were enrolled at the University of Kentucky. Graduate students constituted 16 percent of student enrollment at the University of Kentucky, which, on a percentage basis, ranks the University fifth in the State. Morehead, Western, Louisville, and Murray all had a higher percentage of graduate students as part of their total enrollment. The total production of doctorates in doctoral programs has remained about the same over the past five years. There are notably some shifts in the production of doctorates in the past four years in certain areas, the largest increases being shown in the professional graduate doctorates, e.g., business administration and education. There has been an increase in some of the engineering and



agricultural sciences, but this is due largely to the fact that these doctoral programs were just getting geared up for full-scale operation only five or six years ago.

Quality is one of the most distinguishing traits of a graduate program. It is the primary responsibility of the University, the Graduate School and the graduate programs' faculties to improve and maintain the quality of the programs. The quality of most programs has improved in the recent past. The doctoral programs were given a general review and evaluation by consultants retained by the Council on Higher Education. Approximately one-half of the doctoral programs have been evaluated in depth in the past three or four years by the Graduate School.

The quality of most of the doctoral programs was viewed by the outside consultants and internal consultants as adequate to good. Some were viewed as less than adequate and either are being improved or plans are being made to phase them out if they are not improved.

The quality of our graduates should be of utmost importance. The University and the faculty need to be very concerned about the academic environment it provides for its students. Are we providing an environment for advanced learning? An environment which enhances creativity, inventiveness, imagination . . . not stifle them? Is our graduate curriculum an extension of the undergraduate curriculum? Are we more interested in credits amassed than in what knowledge is gained? Are we more interested in specialties than in breadth? I believe it was Pasteur who said, "In the fields of observation, chance favors only the prepared mind." A recent survey of graduate students at another institution in which the students were asked to rate a large number of parameters as to their importance in promoting creativity showed opportunities for independent studies, library, opportunities to take courses in related fields, faculty excitement, and encouragement of new ideas as the most important. Faculty interest in teaching rated 15 out of 42, teaching methods 27, faculty accessibility 24.

Should we consider planning some programs horizontally and at a higher level? That is, shouldn't we develop more programs which cut across disciplines and not only train the student more broadly, but provide the student new ideas and tools to pursue the research from a fresh standpoint?

Obviously, we could hold a symposium on this topic, but let us move along to some concrete terms in which graduate education is supported.

As has been mentioned earlier, the research activity, especially the extramural research activity, of the faculty supports a large number of graduate students. There is a large number of graduate assistantships, somewhere in the neighborhood of 600. There are about 140 academic year fellowships from all sources, the Graduate School supplying slightly over 100 of them. There are numerous research assistantships supported by research grants. In addition, the Graduate School provides graduate student research support.



What do we have to look for ahead? There are going to be more pressures on our programs and faculty. There is already pressure to stretch some of them possibly beyond their limit.

The demand for off-campus graduate courses and programs is currently more than we can meet in several areas. Recently, the University established jointly with Northern Kentucky University a graduate center on Northern's campus. Northern wishes to remain essentially an undergraduate college, except for its master's in education and law school. There is a big demand for graduate courses and programs in this second most densely populated section of Kentucky. We are offering graduate courses in Library Science, Education, and Home Economics, now. Requests are being made for graduate work in Business Administration, Social Work and Nursing. Other areas of the State want University of Kentucky courses. We need to do what we can but we cannot spread ourselves too thinly. But, let us remember, where a void develops it gets filled by something. The Council on Higher Education is looking at the problem of off-campus courses and has made an attempt to cut duplication by sectionalizing the State. It remains to be seen how this will work.

The Graduate School currently offers joint doctoral programs with most of the universities in the State. The majority of these programs have been in Education; however, as the regional universities' faculties and master's programs become more stable, more of them are expressing a desire to establish joint doctoral programs. This involves some very sensitive diplomacy in many cases due to the difference in criteria for and definition of graduate faculty at the University of Kentucky and the other institutions.

We are in a "quality-innovation dilemma" with pressures to reduce graduate enrollments in some areas, yet, at the same time, diversify the programs. So what we are supposed to do is to restrict the supply in the name of quality and increase the demand in the name of innovation. Where does this place us?

Last year this body approved the concept of Graduate Centers which was requested for the purpose of improving the management of interdisciplinary graduate programs. Currently, there is one graduate center program, that is toxicology. There is an interdisciplinary program in Public Administration and one is being developed in Rehabilitation. Both programs are administered out of the Graduate School Office.

Interdisciplinary programs are but one way to introduce new ideas and concepts into related fields. It can be done by interested faculty working together, by departments, whose disciplines are related, developing joint programs, or possibly, by other methods. But, the main point to which was alluded earlier, is that there are many disciplines which have developed to the stage where research methods and fundamental knowledge in the discipline can be brought to bear on problems in other disciplines or even open new areas within another discipline. These opportunities are



everywhere around us and can be brought to bear on problems in the environment, energy, governmental services, education, etc. If we do not begin to build this breadth into our graduate programs, we will find our university out of step again and our graduates will have difficulty in meeting the competition. The competition is stiff. It is particularly stiff in the recruitment of good graduate students and for the placement of graduate students. In most disciplines, the outstanding doctorate is in demand. Certainly, we are experiencing this in the recruitment of young doctorates for our faculty. It is still hard to get the real good ones.

Let me conclude by saying that the University's graduate and research programs are better than probably at any other time, but so are many of the major universities with which we compete. We must be continually looking ahead, setting goals, and planning how to strengthen our departments and our programs. All of this doesn't come easily.

Dean Royster was given an enthusiastic applause.

The first action item on the agenda was the proposal concerning the admissions procedures for the College of Nursing.

Chairman Oberst recognized Professor Daniel Reedy. On behalf of the Senate Council Professor Reedy presented a motion to adopt the proposed admissions procedures for the College of Nursing to replace Section IV, 2.16 of the University Senate Rules, circulated to members of the University Senate under date of January 31, 1978, and reads as follows:

The University Senate Council and Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards recommend the following admissions procedures for the College of Nursing.

Undergraduate Admission Requirements: College of Nursing

Applicants meeting the following criteria will be considered for admission by the College of Nursing Admissions Committee:

- 1) Licensure to practice as a registered nurse in Kentucky.
- 2) Completion of an Associate Degree Program in Nursing from a college accredited by one of the six regional academic accrediting associations. Exception: The registered nurse who is a graduate of a diploma program will be considered for admission after earning a minimum of 60 college credits\* which meet the following requirements:

---

\*These credits may be earned from a regionally accredited college by taking the courses or by examination (i.e., challenge or equivalency).



English	6 semester credits
Natural Sciences	10 semester credits
Behavioral Sciences	6 semester credits
Nursing	28 semester credits
Electives	10 semester credits

- 3) An overall grade point average of 2.0 or higher on a 4.0 quality point scale in all course work attempted as computed by the University of Kentucky Admissions Office.
- 4) A state of health such that the applicant will be able to carry out the duties of the professional nurse. After acceptance for admission the applicant will be required to obtain a physical examination, update immunizations, and obtain a tuberculin test or X-ray as appropriate.

Procedures for Applying:

All applications for admission must be received by the College of Nursing no later than March 1. All applicants will be notified regarding admission by April 1. Those accepted for admission must notify the College within 30 days, in writing, of their intent to enroll.

There will be a maximum of 130 students per class and Kentucky residents will be given preference. In the event of a surplus of applications from Kentucky residents, the class will be randomly selected from these applicants. If there are available spaces remaining after all qualified Kentucky residents have been admitted, out-of-state students will be randomly selected to fill the class. It will be the goal of the College not to exceed 15 percent of out-of-state students.

Part-Time Study: Students who are working toward the completion of the BSN degree on a part-time basis must plan their course of study with the appropriate College of Nursing personnel or committee.

Candidates for the degree who do not complete all requirements within a five year period after admission will have their records reevaluated and may be required to repeat or take selected courses.

Rationale for Random Selection Process:

The faculty of the College of Nursing is recommending the procedure of random selection of students in the new program for several reasons:

- 1) There are no standardized tests, such as those available in law, medicine, and dentistry, by which to select students for nursing programs.
- 2) There are no criteria available to identify the impact of experience in nursing on an applicant's ability to pursue baccalaureate study in nursing.



- 3) Unlike all other baccalaureate programs in the University, the nursing program will have a student body composed entirely of persons with two years of professional training and at least one year of professional practice. The average age of the students in the Associate degree program is 22, and it is expected that most applicants for the new baccalaureate program will be between the ages of 22 and 30.
- 4) Grade inflation in academic institutions, which has been increasing in recent years, will militate against the student who graduated five or more years ago. The use of the grade point average will, therefore, favor the newer graduate without reflecting a difference in actual ability.
- 5) The College of Nursing faculty wishes to conduct research on the identification of criteria for predicting success in an upper division program of the type we are initiating. We believe we have the resources to collect and analyze the data but an initial random selection is necessary to this research.
- 6) Other programs such as California State College, Sonoma, and the University of Nebraska, Omaha, use the random selection method because of the current lack of specific criteria.

We are proposing to use this method, if there are more than 130 applicants, for a period of three years during which we will collect and analyze student data to determine appropriate criteria. We will submit a report to the Senate no later than the end of the Fall Semester 1980 and recommend an alternate admissions program on the basis of our research findings.

Proposed Implementation Date: Fall Semester, 1978

The floor was opened for discussion and questions.

Professor Gabbard said that he would like to speak against the motion. His objection to it was the provision for random selection. He felt that random selection was "no selection" and thought there should be some selection. He said that, however, he was told there was a time press since applications are being received for the Fall 1978.

Dean Marion McKenna, College of Nursing, made the following remarks concerning the proposed admissions procedures.

Because of the time involved, this was sent to the Academic Council of the Medical Center in August of last year so that there would be sufficient time to go through the University. It was forwarded by the Medical Center and Dr. Bosomworth the first of October to the Senate Office. Somewhere in the system it disappeared. In the interim we have had the holidays, snow and whatever. That is the reason for the press. We attempted to get it through in an appropriate time so that it could be adequately considered. To the second question of random selection, there are a couple of things I would like to make note of.



One of which is that never in the history of this University before this point in time has there been admitted to an undergraduate college individuals already proficient in a field. We do not yet know what criteria are specific to determine success in this type of a program. The second thing is the fact that because we do not have any specific criteria to determine the quality of the experience they have and to put in any kind of barrier such as grade point average would be artificial. What we would like to do is to study this for three years and then come back to this body with specific criteria that we would use for selection of our students. We do not intend to use random selection unless we have more applicants than we are able to provide for, which at this time is 130.

Professor Weil asked if it would be possible to abstract from the former program criteria to use temporarily.

Dean McKenna replied that it would not because what they used for that program was an ACT score for freshmen and for the juniors it was simply putting students in grade point averages ascendancy and counting down 130. In recent years it is believed there has been some grade inflation. She said they would be having students who were graduated three or more years ago.

Professor Jewell asked if there was any basis for knowing how many applicants we would be likely to get, 130 out of 140 or 130 out of 300.

Dean McKenna said that she did not know but at this time there are 70 completed applications for the program.

Professor Longyear said that there was an article recently in The Chronicle of Higher Education discussing the lottery practice at Dutch veterinary and medical schools. He asked if there were any provisions for those who had tried and failed but still wanted to be admitted. He said there had been cases where students had missed out for five years in the lottery.

Dean McKenna said that she had not considered that primarily because she did not know how many we would get, and we intended to take in-state students first. She said that she felt the faculty would give serious consideration to it if that were the direction of the Senate.

Professor Lienhard said that he wondered if Professor Gabbard's comments were directed to an earlier version of the proposal in which the three-year reassessment was not solidly built in the document. He said he was opposed to the earlier one but supported this one.

Dean McKenna said that the College of Nursing intended that it had been built in solidly, but the wording was such that the Senate Council did not think it was, so it was changed.

Professor Miller said that professional schools had found it very difficult to select criteria which predict success in both the academic and practice areas. She said that this would appear to be an excellent opportunity to carry out a study that would provide some of this information for us.



Dean McKenna said that one of the ways it had been suggested was by interviews. She said she was not sure what criteria to use in interviewing, because the students would not tell you what you did not want to hear.

Professor Weil asked what criteria was going to be used after three years to judge success, because there would be only the grade point average accumulated.

Dean McKenna said that the College of Nursing was in the process of developing evaluative measures for the program as a whole. One of the things they are going to do is administer National League of Nursing Achievement Tests. She said that they propose to administer these to the students before they begin the program and readminister them afterwards.

Professor Schwert asked if Dean McKenna knew how many of the 70 applications received were in-state.

Dean McKenna said that she did not know, that they were in the Admissions and Registrar's Office.

Professor Silberstein said that the Committee for Admissions and Academic Standards was not in agreement on approving the proposal--ten for and seven against. He said that as one who voted against it, it was his feeling that the committee could not approve a program of study leading to a degree that had no criteria for admissions. He said many of them had been deeply concerned over the idea that students would be selected at random rather than on the basis of GPA and that any student with a straight "A" average who was not selected would have every right to protest to the proper administrative authorities when discovering that someone with a "C" average had been accepted. He said that to him it seemed that the Senate was being asked to buy an academic "pig in a poke."

Professor Skelland supported an earlier statement to the effect that one should take the top ranked 65 and the remaining 65 should be selected randomly--one or two years later one could compare these two groups and see which would come out better. He agreed that comparison between these two groups would provide a better test of the value of random selection.

Dean McKenna said that the problem was only if there were more than 130 applicants.

Professor Bellack said that the work role of the registered nurse who would be applying to the program was being ignored. This would be the only program on campus admitting students who are already licensed to practice a profession. She said that it would be difficult to measure the impact of their role experiences on their ability to complete the program.

Professor Wilson said that the proposal had been worked on thoughtfully and carefully by the College of Nursing and that they were perfectly capable of drawing up a research design that would answer the questions that were being raised.

Professor Kemp said that the proposal was rejected by the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, was sent back to the College of Nursing, and was rewritten. The Committee then recommended approval, and the reasons were that they thought the College of Nursing knew more about admissions requirements for their own field than those outside the College of Nursing. They also felt the time involved was such that the proposal should be recommended to the Senate.



Professor Gabbard moved the following substitute motion:

"The University Senate approves the proposed admissions procedures for the College of Nursing for a period of one year as interim procedures to operate until an alternative plan can be approved. Criteria such as GPA, experience in the Nursing profession, letters of recommendation from professional peers and supervisors would be considered for inclusion in the long range admissions selection plan."

The motion was seconded.

Professor Bellack said that one year from now the College of Nursing would have little more data than they have now, because students would only have completed one semester of the program.

Student Senator Benson suggested that the Senate defeat the motion. He did not feel that one year would be long enough and amending it on the floor would prove disastrous as with the withdrawal policy. He recommended that the Senate listen to the College of Nursing and their expertise and approve the main motion.

The vote on the substitute motion was defeated.

The vote on the original motion passed.

On behalf of the Graduate Faculty, Wimberly C. Royster, Dean of the Graduate School, presented the proposed candidates for honorary degrees at the May 1978 Commencement. Dean Royster presented three candidates with the request that the names be withheld until the Board of Trustees had taken action and the nominees have accepted.

Following Dean Royster's presentation, the Senate voted unanimously to accept the three proposed candidates for recommendation to the President.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Elbert W. Ockerman  
Secretary