

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, APRIL 11, 1966

The University Senate met in regular session at 4:00 p.m., Monday April 11, 1966, in the Student Center Theatre. Chairman Pellegrino presided. Fifty-six members were present. The record of individuals in attendance is made a part of the original minutes in the Secretary's Office.

The minutes of the special meeting of March 21, 1966 were approved with correction in line 21, page two, of the word "seven" to "several", correcting the line to read "continued search for several administrative aides for which approval has been given".

Dr. Cochran, Chairman of the University Senate Advisory Committee on Community Colleges, presented the report covering that committee's activities during 1965 and recommended its acceptance which the Senate approved.

The Community College Advisory Committee met with Dean Hartford three times during 1965 to discuss informally such matters as;

- 1) Faculty recruitment and appointment
- 2) Faculty rank and tenure
- 3) Admission policy
- 4) Governing regulations for the System
- 5) Two-year terminal curricula, including one in General Studies
- 6) Music offerings in the System
- 7) Associate degrees and certificates

The only matter referred to the Committee by the President concerned the establishment of a series of faculty ranks and titles for the system and tenure policy. They recommended the use of the regular professorial titles, for those faculty members in the System who qualify, with the same criteria and tenure regulations as on the Lexington campus. It recommended the use of Instructor and Senior Instructor titles for those faculty who fulfill the responsibilities assigned them in a satisfactory manner but who do not qualify for regular professorial rank. It recommended tenure be granted at the rank of Assistant Professor, or upon promotion to Associate Professor or Senior Instructor with a maximum non-tenured period of seven years.

Professor Wells, Chairman of the Honors Program Committee, recommended acceptance of the report as circulated. The Senate approved the recommendation.

The Honors Program Committee has been totally inactive during the past year. No meetings were called prior to the resignation in late May of Dr. Morris as Head of the Honors Program, and none has been called since.

In early summer Dr. Oswald requested that the Honors Program Committee submit the names of two or three individuals qualified to direct the University Honors Program. Several members of the committee were absent at the time, making it impossible to work as a deliberative unit. I failed to submit a list of possible replacements for Dr. Morris until late summer; but then it was much too late for the Administration to act, and ultimately, in late September a supervisory committee consisting of Professor's Kuiper, Diachun and Wells was appointed to guide the operation of the Honors Program for the fall semester, 1965.

Minutes of the University Senate, April 11, 1966 (con't)

Quite naturally the University Honors Program has deteriorated because of this discontinuity in leadership. However, certain steps have been taken.

The University Honors Program is now administratively a unit in the Provost's Office. Dr. Cochran has assumed responsibility, and a new director is being sought with the hope of making an appointment this spring.

A new University Honors Program Committee is being appointed and its responsibilities are being re-evaluated.

Dr. Adler, Chairman of the Curriculum Committee (now discontinued), recommended acceptance of the annual report circulated under date of March 21 to the faculty. The Senate accepted the report.

The Curriculum Committee has devoted itself almost exclusively this year to the consideration of course applications. A system of dividing the work among four subcommittees has made the task easier and more efficient. I know of nothing further to report on this score. It would be possible to count the number of courses we have considered, but this could be determined largely through a study of the Senate Council's notifications of course approvals. Certainly the burden has grown greater this year.

One major problem which it seems to me the Councils henceforth passing on courses will need to solve is that of approving new courses in a vacuum. New programs require approval of financing by the President before final approval by the Senate Council. There is no such requirement regarding courses, yet within a period of a year or two one Department may add far more new courses than would usually occur in a "program". There is nothing in our present arrangements to prevent approval of such courses if they seem academically sound; and yet once approved they then become an almost undeniable basis for budget increases in order that the courses may be taught. Course offerings are exploding all over the University, and it seems to me urgent that a study be made of ways to keep this under control.

Dr. Moore, Chairman of the Library Committee, presented its annual report, stressed the importance of the Library and urged the faculty to consider it the center of its operations. The Senate accepted the report as circulated.

The Library Committee has met three times with Dr. Stuart Forth since he assumed the directorship of university libraries early last fall. These occasions have been filled with discussion of the recommendations of previous committees and the improvement of existing facilities. What could be done immediately has been done, and at the moment prospects are very good for further desirable innovations. This report makes no pretense of completeness and need not, for Dr. Forth will appear before the Senate later this semester and sketch in considerable detail his plans for library development. What follows relates to committee and informal recommendations and to actions current or contemplated:

Minutes of the University Senate, April 11, 1966 (con't)

STATUS AND RETIREMENT

Upon recommendation of the Library Committee and the President, the Board of Trustees recently clarified the status of the library staff, and its members now have the counterparts of academic ranks-- Grades 1 through 4-- and full rights and privileges with respect to tenure, sabbatical leave, retirement, and research funds.

ADDITION TO STAFF

Mr. Harold Gordon has been appointed associate director of libraries. He has previously served on library staffs at Cornell, Columbia, and Connecticut.

HELP WANTED

Data-processing systems technician.

BUILDING PROGRAM

The Library Committee of 1965, upon the advice of subcommittees, recommended the construction of an undergraduate library. The new director holds the opinion that the new building should have, in addition to reading rooms for undergraduates, extensive facilities for research, seminars, and some other activities now carried on in the existing plant. Mr. William S. Dix, head librarian at Princeton University, came to the campus early this month to consult with Dr. Forth and administrative officers about the project, and he promises to return as needed. The best opinion is that the new building will be located "right around here," which means that one or another architectural curiosity will vanish--Splinter Hall, Maxwell Place, or the Chemistry-Physics Building. Plans now call for the integration of the new library with the old in order to avoid duplication of books and service departments.

ACQUISITIONS

The most pressing need of the university library, as of all libraries, is book money. Dr. Forth expects a twenty per cent increase for the year 1966-67, but this sum must be stretched over increasing academic needs. For example, new doctoral programs will require support in the amount of perhaps half the increase. It is evident from statistics released by the Association of Research Libraries and attached to this report that the university must allocate to the library a larger percentage of its total budget in order to maintain its present rather respectable position in this area.

INTERNAL CHANGES

The recommendations contained in the report of the special library survey team (December, 1965) are being implemented as rapidly as funds and additional staff become available. These recommendations entail substantial reorganization of the library and cannot be carried out at once.

Minutes of the University Senate, April 11, 1966 (con't)

GROWTH

From time to time the committee has considered the problem of storing little-used books. General agreement about the matter is perhaps now lacking, but the projected library building will relieve the pressure for a few years.

ARL Statistics 1964-65
Volumes in Library

1. Harvard	7,445,072	33. Kansas U.	1,122,158
2. Yale	4,831,738	34. Brown	1,111,240
3. Illinois	3,888,983	35. Florida U.	1,087,665
4. Columbia	3,569,565	36. Kentucky	1,069,908
5. Michigan	3,409,982	37. Oklahoma U.	979,119
6. Calif. -B.	3,113,024	38. McGill	971,110
7. Cornell	2,725,624	39. M.I.T.	959,212
8. Stanford	2,560,334	40. Oregon	954,501
9. Chicago	2,406,142	41. Joint U.	947,941
10. Minn.	2,381,212	42. Colorado	946,435
11. Calif. -LA.	2,197,175	43. Wayne	943,223
12. Toronto	2,158,636	44. Rochester	931,490
13. Princeton	1,992,743	45. Cinn.	888,858
14. Wisconsin	1,897,127	46. Wash. U. St. L.	853,623
15. Penn. U.	1,894,480	47. Utah	852,388
16. Indiana	1,771,900	48. Washington St.	850,000
17. Ohio St.	1,748,943	49. Tennessee	842,833
18. Texas U.	1,724,332	50. Penn St.	816,705
19. Duke	1,716,855	51. Nebraska	789,607
20. Northwestern	1,709,172	52. Oklahoma St.	764,200
21. N.Y.U.	1,535,583	53. Notre Dame	736,354
22. No. Car.	1,533,083	54. St. Louis U.	719,741
23. J. Hopkins	1,399,700	55. Syracuse	716,619
24. U. Wash.	1,390,636	56. Purdue	710,822
25. Virginia	1,367,293	57. Temple	692,106
26. La. State	1,237,171	58. Florida St.	688,545
27. Iowa U.	1,226,254	59. Maryland	673,010
28. Rutgers	1,207,350	60. Boston	639,931
29. Missouri	1,167,000	61. Georgetown	613,256
30. Pittsburgh U.	1,147,105	62. Iowa St.	567,127
31. Mich. St.	1,146,000	63. Connecticut	558,641
32. So. Calif.	1,138,812	64. Texas A & M	497,317

ARL Statistics 1964-65
Institutions Ranked by Volumes in Library
and Type of Support

<u>Private</u>		<u>Public</u>	
1. Harvard	7,445,072	1. Illinois	3,888,983
2. Yale	4,831,738	2. Michigan U.	3,409,982
3. Columbia	3,569,565	3. Calif. -B.	3,113,024
4. Cornell	2,725,624	4. Minn.	2,381,212

Minutes of the University Senate, April 11, 1966 (con't)

5. Stanford	2,560,334	5. Calif. -LA	2,197,175
6. Chicago	2,406,142	6. Toronto	2,158,636
7. Princeton	1,992,743	7. Wisconsin	1,897,127
8. Penn U.	1,894,480	8. Indiana	1,771,900
9. Duke	1,716,855	9. Ohio St.	1,748,943
10. Northwestern	1,709,172	10. Texas U.	1,724,332
11. N.Y.U.	1,535,583	11. No. Car.	1,533,083
12. J. Hopkins	1,399,700	12. U. Wash.	1,390,636
13. Pittsburgh U.	1,147,105	13. Virginia	1,367,293
14. So. Calif.	1,138,812	14. La. State	1,237,171
15. Brown	1,111,240	15. Iowa U.	1,226,254
16. McGill	971,110	16. Rutgers	1,207,350
17. M.I.T.	959,212	17. Missouri	1,167,000
18. Joint U.	947,941	18. Michigan St.	1,146,000
19. Rochester	931,490	19. Kansas U.	1,122,158
20. Wash. U. St. L.	853,623	20. Florida U.	1,087,665
21. Notre Dame	736,354	21. Kentucky	1,069,908
22. St. Louis U.	719,741	22. Oklahoma U.	979,119
23. Syracuse	716,619	23. Oregon	954,501
24. Temple	692,106	24. Colorado	946,435
25. Boston	639,931	25. Wayne	934,223
26. Georgetown	613,256	26. Cinn.	888,858
		27. Utah	852,388
		28. Wash. St.	850,000
		29. Tennessee	842,833
		30. Penn St.	816,705
		31. Nebraska	789,607
		32. Oklahoma St.	764,200
		33. Purdue	710,822
		34. Florida St.	688,545
		35. Maryland	673,010
		36. Iowa St.	567,127
		37. Connecticut	558,641
		38. Texas A & M	497,317

ARL Statistics 1964-65
Volumes Added (Gross)

1. Harvard	257,631	33. M.I.T.	64,367
2. Calif. -LA.	193,576	34. Pittsburgh	64,296
3. Stanford	181,745	35. Penn St.	63,654
4. Calif. -B.	165,594	36. N.Y.U.	62,264
5. Cornell	152,822	37. Tennessee	59,253
6. Illinois	150,466	38. Missouri	58,777
7. Toronto	145,413	39. Syracuse	56,593
8. Wisconsin	135,792	40. Kansas U.	54,417
9. Michigan U.	134,811	41. Florida U.	52,268
10. Yale	128,281	42. Purdue	51,925
11. Columbia	123,311	43. Iowa U.	51,864
12. Rochester	121,691	44. Oklahoma U.	51,666
13. Chicago	109,390	45. Temple	51,593
14. Michigan St.	97,660	46. Connecticut	51,219
15. No. Car.	96,336	47. So. Calif.	47,177
16. Penn. U.	89,880	48. Wash. U. St. L.	42,600

17. Minn	88,896	49. Georgetown	42,443
18. Ohio St.	88,173	50. Joint U.	40,370
19. Virginia	87,719	51. Notre Dame	39,961
20. J. Hopkins	83,140	52. Kentucky	38,345
21. Princeton	78,733	53. McGill	37,913
22. Texas U.	76,023	54. Boston	34,709
23. Utah	75,628	55. Brown	34,197
24. La. State	74,861	56. Oklahoma St.	33,470
25. Oregon	74,342	57. Florida St.	32,851
26. Rutgers	72,781	58. St. Louis U.	29,452
27. Maryland	70,768	59. Nebraska	28,825
28. Duke	70,465	60. Wash. St.	24,672
29. Colorado	69,936	61. Cinn.	20,976
30. U. Wash.	69,741	62. Iowa St.	20,091
31. Northwestern	68,796	63. Texas A & M	19,579
32. Wayne	65,490		
		64. Indiana (not reported)	

ARL Statistics 1964-65
Professional Staff (FTE)

1. Harvard	190	33. So. Car.	54
2. Illinois	175	34. Syracuse	54
3. Michigan U.	165	35. Kansas U.	52
4. Calif. -B.	164.39	36. Kentucky	51
5. Toronto	161	37. M.I.T.	50
6. Cornell	138.5	38. Mich. St.	50
7. Calif. -LA	132.1	39. Wayne	47.2
8. Yale	130	40. Iowa U.	46.75
9. Columbia	127.3	41. Brown	46.5
10. Indiana	114	42. Wash. U. St. L.	42.66
11. Minn.	108	43. Boston	42
12. U. Wash.	102.25	44. Joint U.	41.5
13. Stanford	99.5	45. Notre Dame	41.5
14. Wisconsin	98.5	46. Nebraska	41
15. Ohio St.	81.67	47. Tennessee	41
16. Penn U.	81	48. Missouri	39
17. La. State	68	49. Oregon	39
18. Maryland	67	50. Purdue	37.8
19. N.Y.U.	67	51. Florida St.	37
20. Penn. St.	63.62	52. Utah	36.75
21. Florida U.	62.6	53. J. Hopkins	35
22. Northwestern	62	54. Virginia	30.5
23. Texas U.	61.75	55. Cinn.	28.5
24. McGill	61	56. Oklahoma U.	28.5
25. Princeton	61	57. Pittsburgh U.	26.5
26. No. Car.	60	58. Oklahoma U.	25
27. Chicago	59.8	59. St. Louis U.	24.5
28. Rochester	57.5	60. Wash. St.	24.5
29. Rutgers	57	61. Connecticut	23.5
30. Duke	56.5	62. Texas A & M	21
31. Colorado	55.5	63. Iowa St.	20
32. Temple	55.5	64. Georgetown	18

Minutes of the University Senate, April 11, 1966 (cont)

ARL Statistics 1964-65
Total Staff (FTE)

1. Harvard	486	33. Wash. U. St. L.	135
2. Toronto	461	34. No. Car.	134
3. Michigan U.	412.72	35. Temple	128
4. Calif. -B.	393.67	36. Brown	127.5
5. Yale	390	37. Tennessee	127.5
6. Columbia	362.8	38. So. Calif.	124
7. Cornell	352.5	39. Rutgers	121
8. Illinois	348	40. Iowa U.	119.25
9. Calif. -LA.	298.85	41. Kansas U.	118.5
10. U. Wash.	279.25	42. Wayne	117.9
11. Stanford	266.5	43. Michigan St.	114
12. Indiana	238	44. Missouri	112
13. N.Y.U.	238	45. Kentucky	106
14. Wisconsin	226.5	46. J. Hopkins	105
15. Penn. U.	218	47. Virginia	100.5
16. Ohio St.	215.17	48. Boston	98
17. Minn.	209	49. Nebraska	87
18. Princeton	202	50. Notre Dame	96.5
19. Chicago	193.5	51. Oregon	90
20. McGill	173.5	52. Florida St.	83
21. Maryland	166	53. Joint U.	82
22. Texas U.	164.87	54. Pittsburgh U.	79.5
23. Purdue	160.66	55. Oklahoma U.	70.75
24. Penn. St.	159.76	56. Cinn.	70.5
25. La. State	156	57. Utah	70.25
26. Florida U.	153.4	58. Wash. St.	68.33
27. Duke	148	59. Oklahoma St.	62
28. Syracuse	142	60. Iowa St.	60.5
29. M.I.T.	140.5	61. Connecticut	57
30. Northwestern	139.66	62. St. Louis U.	57
31. Rochester	139.5	63. Texas A & M	46
32. Colorado	135.63	64. Georgetown	36

ARL Statistics 1964-65
Total Books and Binding

1. Texas	\$3,813,068	33. Northwestern	\$496,735
2. Calif. -LA.	1,475,737	34. Kansas U.	485,975
3. Harvard	1,433,351	35. N.Y.U.	484,939
4. Calif. -B.	1,381,015	36. Tennessee	483,696
5. Illinois	1,183,408	37. Florida U.	480,646
6. Columbia	1,130,525	38. McGill	468,812
7. Indiana	1,051,056	39. Wash. U. St. L.	459,823
8. Cornell	1,047,226	40. Kentucky	419,015
9. Toronto	981,692	41. Syracuse	413,410
10. Wisconsin	964,822	42. Pittsburgh U.	359,634
11. Michigan U.	896,295	43. Rochester	348,697
12. Stanford	814,131	44. So. Calif.	339,335
13. Minn.	726,998	45. Virginia	329,241
14. Maryland	723,315	46. Oregon	327,473
15. La. State	701,644	47. Utah	316,882
16. Chicago	692,648	48. Notre Dame	314,396

Minutes of the University Senate, April 11, 1966 (cont)

17. U. Wash.	669,407	49. Temple	313,647
18. Colorado	668,698	50. Brown	313,391
19. Penn. St.	642,953	51. J. Hopkins	306,295
20. Yale	642,291	52. Oklahoma U.	301,116
21. Rutgers	610,586	53. Nebraska	292,754
22. No. Car.	600,924	54. Joint U.	289,442
23. Princeton	595,666	55. Iowa St.	279,970
24. Michigan St.	587,218	56. M.I.T.	279,496
25. Purdue	581,488	57. Wash. St.	279,312
26. Ohio St.	580,732	58. M.I.T.	240,649
27. Penn U.	580,125	59. Boston	237,731
28. Iowa U.	569,131	60. Florida St.	233,472
29. Duke	560,578	61. Cinn.	209,340
30. Connecticut	548,468	62. Texas A & M	184,327
31. Wayne	546,093	63. St. Louis U.	169,148
32. Missouri	523,793	64. Georgetown	168,399

ARL Statistics 1964-65
Other Operating Expenditures

1. Harvard	\$944,651	33. Penn. U.	\$73,063
2. Yale	542,309	34. Wash. St.	73,024
3. Calif. -IA.	276,994	35. So. Calif.	71,318
4. Calif. -B.	260,122	36. Tennessee	68,667
5. Stanford	220,441	37. Texas U.	67,365
6. Columbia	207,891	38. Oklahoma St.	65,755
7. Cornell	193,137	39. Indiana	64,343
8. Chicago	187,765	40. Virginia	64,104
9. U. Wash.	180,009	41. Pittsburgh U.	63,089
10. Michigan U.	175,599	42. Brown	62,969
11. N.Y.U.	166,413	43. Rutgers	58,704
12. Toronto	163,810	44. Duke	57,938
13. Wisconsin	155,918	45. Michigan St.	57,625
14. Illinois	151,146	46. Utah	54,600
15. Wash. U. St. L.	147,849	47. St. Louis U.	54,437
16. McGill	144,512	48. Joint U.	53,957
17. Ohio St.	134,263	49. Florida St.	52,003
18. Princeton	120,932	50. Oregon	51,177
19. Missouri	109,206	51. Nebraska	47,433
20. La. State	109,088	52. Maryland	47,036
21. Wayne	108,025	53. Iowa U.	44,633
22. Penn. St.	104,383	54. Notre Dame	41,115
23. Rochester	103,851	55. M.I.T.	39,006
24. Colorado	100,945	56. Kentucky	36,966
25. Northwestern	100,627	57. Texas A & M	34,960
26. No. Car.	100,158	58. Boston	34,724
27. Florida U.	98,706	59. Temple	31,158
28. J. Hopkins	93,233	60. Oklahoma U.	29,539
29. Syracuse	92,855	61. Connecticut	27,901
30. Purdue	85,723	62. Iowa St.	20,606
31. Minn.	75,197	63. Georgetown	14,042
32. Kansas U.	73,490	64. Cinn.	11,400

Minutes of the University Senate, April 11, 1966 (cont)

ARL Statistics 1964-65
Relative Standings by Categories

	<u>Volumes In Lib.</u>	<u>Volumes Added</u>	<u>Total Staff (FTE)</u>	<u>Books and Binding</u>	<u>Other Operating</u>
Boston	60	54	48	59	58
Brown	34	55	36	50	42
Calif.-B.	6	4	4	4	4
Calif. -LA.	11	2	9	2	3
Chicago	9	13	19	16	8
Cinn.	45	61	56	61	64
Colo.	42	29	32	18	24
Columbia	4	11	5	6	6
Conn.	63	46	61	30	61
Cornell	7	5	7	8	7
Duke	19	28	27	29	44
Florida U.	35	41	26	37	27
Florida St.	58	57	52	60	49
Georgetown	61	49	64	64	63
Harvard	1	1	1	3	1
Illinois	3	6	8	5	14
Indiana	16	--	12	7	39
Iowa St.	62	62	60	55	62
Iowa U.	27	43	40	28	53
J. Hopkins	23	20	46	51	28
Joint U.	41	50	53	54	48
Kansas U.	33	40	41	34	32
Kentucky	36	53	45	40	56
La. State	26	24	25	15	20
McGill	38	52	20	38	16
Maryland	59	27	21	14	52
M.I.T.	39	33	29	58	55
Mich. St.	31	14	43	24	45
Mich. U.	5	9	3	11	10
Minn.	10	17	17	13	11
Missouri	29	38	44	32	19
Nebraska	51	59	49	53	51
N.Y.U.	21	36	13	35	11
No. Car.	22	15	34	22	26
Northwestern	20	31	30	33	25

Minutes of the University Senate, April 11, 1966 (cont)

Relative Standings by Categories -2-

	Volumes in Lib.	Volumes Added	Total Staff (FTE)	Books and Binding	Other Operating
Notre Dame	53	51	50	48	54
Ohio St.	17	18	16	26	17
Oklahoma U.	37	44	55	52	60
Oklahoma St.	52	56	59	56	38
Oregon	40	25	51	46	50
Penn. St.	50	35	24	19	22
Penn. U.	15	16	15	27	33
Pittsburgh U.	30	34	54	42	41
Princeton	13	21	18	23	18
Purdue	56	42	23	25	30
Rochester	44	12	31	43	23
Rutgers	28	26	39	21	43
St. Louis U.	54	58	57	63	47
So. Calif.	32	47	38	44	35
Stanford	8	3	11	12	5
Syracuse	55	39	28	41	29
Temple	57	45	35	49	59
Tennessee	49	37	37	36	36
Texas U.	18	22	22	1	37
Texas A & M	64	63	46	62	57
Toronto	12	7	2	9	12
Utah	47	23	57	47	46
Virginia	25	19	47	45	40
Wash. St.	48	60	58	57	34
Wash. U. St. L.	46	48	33	39	15
U. Wash.	24	30	10	17	9
Wayne	43	32	42	31	21
Wisconsin	14	8	14	10	13
Yale	2	10	5	20	2

Dr. Plucknett, Chairman of the Rules Committee, reported briefly on those items which it now has under consideration, namely, clarification of the various rules governing faculty elections. He urged the faculty to communicate with the Committee concerning any suggestions or changes it wished to have considered during its deliberations. As this consideration relates to the constituency and election rules for the University Senate, set forth in the Governing Regulations, President Oswald reminded the Senate of the appointment of a joint committee of the Trustees and faculty, recommended by him and approved by the Board of Trustees at its meeting of March 6, 1965, charged with the task of separating Board policies from administrative rules, and the preparation of an Administrative Manual to contain the latter. The Senate accepted the report of the Rules Committee as circulated.

Minutes of the University Senate, April 11, 1966 (cont)

The Committee held seven meetings during the year. Called meetings during the summer failed to produce a quorum (one-half of the Committee).

Among the recommendations made to the Senate which were later accepted by the Senate were:

1. Change in grading system to permit a grade of "S" to be a permanent grade for undergraduate non-credit courses.
2. Raising standards for entering out-of-state beginning students.
3. Change in probation rules to minimize hardship cases for readmitted students (after being dropped once) who show significant improvement in their standings.
4. Provide for review by the University Senate Council of special cases involving students who have been dropped twice from the University.
5. Establish a University Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics which shall report annually to the Senate.
6. Raised entrance requirements for the College of Law.
7. Raised academic achievement standards for students in the College of Law.
8. Specified that the faculty advisers to student organizations shall have the rank of Assistant Professor or above.

Among the recommendations made to the Council but held in abeyance pending the adoption of "Second Century Academic Plan" were:

1. Change in name, organization, method of selection and duties of the Senate Committee on Student Organizations to give it more responsibility.
2. Change in the number of members and basis for representation of the Senate Curriculum Committee.

The Rules Committee rejected a request by the Medical Center to permit a grade intermediate between B and C with point credit of 2.5.

The Committee has now under active consideration the methods of election to the University Senate, the Senate Council, and the faculty representatives on the Board of Trustees as to those eligible to serve, those eligible to vote for membership, method of voting, etc., with the view to clarifying existing practices, some of which are not explicit in the present rules or governing regulations. It also has under consideration a change in the rules governing student use of alcoholic beverages.

Minutes of the University Senate, April 11, 1966 (cont)

The Chairman presented to the Senate a request to permit Mr. Ronald Herron a student, and reporter for the Kernel who was present, to remain in the meeting. The Senate approved this request.

Dr. Flickinger, Chairman of the Committee on Student Organizations and Social Activities (now superseded by the University Senate Advisory Committee for Student Affairs), recommended acceptance of the 1965 report circulated to the faculty. The Senate accepted the report.

The Committee on Student Organizations and Social Activities considered and handled approximately six separate items of business during the course of the last year. These items of business were as follows:

1. Consideration of the Role of the Committee. The basic, if not sole, function of the Committee in the past had been to recognize various campus organizations. The members of the Committee felt that such a function was not truly worthwhile. Since the Committee had established in its own mind the general criteria for recognition, its time was spent conferring with the sponsors of each organization in order to acquire the necessary information upon which recognition was based. This was regarded as essentially an administrative rather than a Committee assignment. Therefore, the Committee recommended its own abolition. However, at the same time the Committee felt that there were many aspects of student life which needed investigation by the faculty for the purpose of determining policy. Accordingly, while recommending its abolition, the Committee also recommended that a new Committee be formed to work with the Vice-President for Student Affairs in making such investigation and advising the Senate on possible policy determinations to be made. These recommendations were forwarded to the Faculty Council and were included and adopted by the Faculty Senate as part of the academic plan.

2. Rank Requirements for Faculty Advisors. At its final Spring meeting, as a result of some actual experiences regarding faculty advisors, the Committee recommended that the Faculty Rules be amended to require a Faculty Advisor to have a rank of Assistant Professor or above. This recommendation was based on the belief of the Committee that those holding the rank of Instructor, a rank which under the new tenure rules can be held no more than three years, lacked any feeling of continuity with the University and therefore with any organization with which they might become advisors. It was also felt that some organizations were formed as a result of the impetus of a particular instructor and therefore if the assistance of someone of higher rank could not be secured, the organization could at best be regarded as a probable ad hoc organization that would cease to operate should the instructor leave. Such lack of continuity frequently leads to irresponsibility. It was on this basis that the Committee made its request, which was approved by the Faculty Senate.

3. Recognition of Duties of Faculty Advisor. While the Faculty Senate approved the Committee's recommendation regarding the rank of Faculty Advisor it did so by close margin and at the same time requested the Committee to reconsider the change. As a

Minutes of the University Senate, April 11, 1966 (cont)

result of its discussions following this charge, the Committee felt that the duties of the Faculty Advisor needed change and redefinition. After considerable discussion a proposal was formulated making changes in the requirement for a Faculty Advisor. Since this proposal is not yet in proper form for action by the Faculty Senate it will only be said that the primary purpose of the changes is to eliminate the supervisory aspects of the Faculty Advisor and to increase the faculty-student contact on a less formal basis.

4. Definition of Effect of Committee Actions on Student Organizations. The Committee had formerly been somewhat loose in its definition of the effect of its approval of a proposed student organization. The word "approval" began to bother several members of the Committee since it carried a connotation of University approval of the purposes of the organization. The whole Committee felt that this was not the intent as to the effect of the Committee's action. Accordingly, the Committee adopted the word "accredited" as being the most appropriate word to define the result of its actions.

5. Formal Requirements for Accreditation. In order to establish a more uniform and logical basis for accrediting campus organizations, the Committee devised a format listing the information required for accreditation. This was then mimeographed and made available to all potential organizations through the office of the Vice President for Student Affairs. The requirements designated by the Committee were as follows: name of organization, purposes of organization, name of faculty advisor, financial obligation of members, qualifications for voting members of organization and qualifications for officers of the organization. The last two items were requested in line with the policy decision by the Committee that it could not accredit any organization when the voting members and/or the officers were other than students, faculty and staff of this University.

6. Number in Status of Organization Accredited. During the course of the year the Committee accredited four political organizations, four departmental organizations, one student government organization, three social organizations, two professional fraternities and one speciality group.

Dean Matthews, Chairman of the University Senate Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, presented an annual, oral report covering three points on intercollegiate athletics policies as they relate to the academic policies of the University which he felt the faculty members on the Athletics Board would consider of interest to the faculty:

1. The structure and role of the Athletics Board,
2. the kinds of things considered by the Board and the faculty representatives on the Board, and
3. the relationship of the University to the SEC and the NCAA concerning standards for eligibility, financial aid to student athletes, and the 1.6 NCAA rule.

Minutes of the University Senate, April 11, 1966 (cont)

Concerning point one, he stated that one of the central aims in a good athletic program which institutions over the country have been moving toward and seeking over a long period is institutional control; that the University of Kentucky has institutional control of athletics which is exercised in two ways: a direct administrative channel from the office of the President to the Department of Athletics and to the Director of Athletics through the Vice President for Student Affairs, and a coordinate channel through the Athletics Board--having two basic functions--that of serving as an advisory board to the President and the students, and as a corporate board for granting approval, as necessary, to the corporate activities of the Athletics Association. He stated that the Board, which was established when the Athletics Association was established in 1946, consists of 12 members appointed by the President of the University, who serves as President and Chairman, two ex officio members designated by the President, and the President of Student Congress; that of these 12 members, eight are members of the faculty, two are appointed from the Board of Trustees, and two from the alumni of the University; that the present membership consists of Loren Carlson, John Douglas, Aubrey J. Brown, Thomas D. Clark, A. D. Kirwan, Douglas Schwartz, Lyman V. Ginger, and D. V. Terrell, faculty members; Ralph Angelucci and Floyd Wright, Board of Trustees members; and Douglas Parrish and James Allen, Alumni members. The ex officio members are the Vice President for Student Affairs who serves as the vice president, and Dean Matthews, by virtue of his designation by the President as faculty representative for the AAUP, SEC, NCAA, and secretary of the Board. Dean Matthews stressed the extent to which the individual faculty members serving on the Board reflect their considered judgments of faculty attitude and expression, as well as their own judgments, in discussions and considerations by the Board.

Concerning point two, he stated that the Board has been continuously concerned with the strengthening of the minor sports program, that a subcommittee has been appointed to study ways of strengthening this program with respect to the coaches, the present University calendar (which has some effect on the season of participation for the minor sports teams), the finding of ways to put more financial assistance into this program, looking at construction and costs, site, and methods of financing a new football stadium (arising from the need to use the present site in the long-range physical development plan), a proper long-range policy for establishment of an employment relationship with head coaches and the members of the coaching staff, and providing funded retirement benefits such as are now available to the faculty under TIAA.

With reference to item three, he emphasized that a good athletics program was not just a matter of internal direction and administrative policy but also involved the institution's relationship with other institutions in the Conference and the NCAA; that these two bodies are voluntary groups of educational institutions joined together to establish minimum standards to govern areas of athletic policy that are of common concern to all; that in effect, these two bodies are the accrediting agencies for the athletic program, having five areas of standards, namely, rules of competition, eligibility to compete, rules governing financial aid, recruitment, and post-season and TV competition; that in the areas of admission, eligibility, and financial aid about which the Senate should be most concerned the same admission requirements apply to student athletes as apply to other students and these requirements are substantially higher than in a number of other participating schools in the Southeastern Conference; that to be eligible for competition the same probation requirement (established by the rules of the University Senate) applies to student athletes as applies to all other

Minutes of the University Senate, April 11, 1966 (cont)

students; that this eligibility is certified to by the Registrar and is substantially higher than the Conference standard; and that grants-in-aid are awarded by the Committee on Student Financial Aid (formerly the University Scholarship Committee), the same committee that awards scholarship and financial aid to all students, and further, that approval by that committee of the recommendations from the coaches and coaching staff is not pro forma.

In commenting on the recent legislation by the NCAA concerning the 1.6 rule he stated that this rule is a simple provision which was added to the NCAA by-laws at its annual meeting in January 1965 and reaffirmed at its annual meeting in New York in January 1966; that its purpose is to provide a minimum academic qualification for the student before he can be given financial aid and in order for him to be eligible to compete or take part in organized practice; that the NCAA is a voluntary membership organization having regulatory and accreditation purposes and has never required any minimum academic requirements for eligibility, admission, or for the giving of financial aid. He quoted the new provision as follows:

A NCAA member institution cannot enter a team in NCAA-sponsored events unless the institution (a) limits its scholarship or grant-in-aid awards and eligibility for participation to incoming student athletes who have a predicted minimum grade point average of 1.6 [on the 4.0 scale] as determined by demonstrable institutional conference or national experience data, and (b) limits its subsequent scholarship and grant-in-aid awards and eligibility for participation to student athletes who have a grade point average, either cumulative or for the previous academic year, of 1.6.

Following questions by some of the Senate members, the Chairman thanked Dean Matthews for his very comprehensive report.

A member of the Senate presented two questions to the Chair which were answered as follows:

Question: Why can't the fall rather than the spring semester grades be used in determining the sequence and order for spring pre-registration?

Answer by the Dean of Admissions and Registrar: The system was determined prior to my assumption of the office and I will be happy to re-study the present method. In addition Dr. Ockerman urged members of the faculty to bring to him any suggestions they might have concerning pre-registration or any other matters.

Question: Is there a committee to counsel with the Registrar to determine what procedures should be followed?

Answer by the Chair: The Senate Council has recently met with the Dean of Admissions and Registrar concerning registration and admissions policies and will meet again with him on pre-registration. The Council plans to bring to the Senate these types of matters for extended discussion next fall.

The Chairman emphasized again that these are the kinds of questions from the faculty that the Council would like to have for exploration and presentation to the Senate; that the Council has been meeting with various members of the University community

Minutes of the University Senate, April 11, 1966 (cont)

that it plans in the fall to continue these meetings and to bring to the Senate floor those persons who can best inform the Senate in answer to its specific inquiries.

Professor Thomas P. Field extended an invitation to all faculty members to attend the Arts and Sciences dinner honoring Dr. DeMarcus to be held at the Alumni House Saturday evening, April 16th.

The Senate adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, MAY 4, 1966

The University Senate met in special session at 4:00 p.m., Wednesday, May 4, 1966 in the Student Center Theatre. Chairman Pellegrino presided. Thirty members were present. The record of individuals in attendance is made a part of the original minutes in the Secretary's Office.

The minutes of the regular meeting of April 11, 1966 were approved.

The Secretary of the Senate presented the list of candidates for degrees at the May 9, 1966 Commencement with the recommendation that they be approved on the condition that they complete degree requirements this semester. The Senate approved the recommendation as presented.

GRADUATE SCHOOL

ALBERT DENNIS KIRWAN, Dean

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

NAME	MAJOR SUBJECT	ADDRESS
James Lloyd Allison	Physics	Oak Ridge, Tenn.
Roy Winford Bahl, Jr.	Economics	Morgantown, W. Va.
Joseph Lee Baird	English	Kent, O.
Robert Norris Baird	Economics	East Cleveland, O.
Bona W. Ball	English	Council, Va.
Jackie David Batson	Biological Sciences	Bessemer, Ala.
David M. Brumagen, Jr.	Biological Sciences	Morehead
Hilbert H. Campbell	English	Hico, W. Va.
David James Caveny	Mathematics	Lexington
Mary Ellen Curtin	Psychology	Lexington
Walter Ames Dickenson	Psychology	Lexington
Donald Gene Ely	Animal Science	Duncan, Okla.
Cloyd Herbert Finch	History	Ludlowville, N. Y.
Constance Taylor Fischer	Psychology	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Donald Lionel Fowler	Political Science	Columbia, S. C.