

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, FEBRUARY 16, 1981

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, February 16, 1981, in Room 106 of the Classroom Building.

George Schwert, Chairman, presiding

Members absent: Richard G. Alvey, Rusty Ashcraft*, Michael A. Baer, Charles E. Barnhart, John R. Baseheart, John J. Bernardo, Leslie Bingham, Brack A. Bivins, William H. Blackburn, Jack Blanton, James A. Boling*, Robert N. Bostrom*, Vickey Bowen, Thomas W. Brehm*, Joseph T. Burch, Bradley C. Canon*, W. Merle Carter, Harry M. Caudill, Ralph Christensen*, Donald B. Clapp, D. Kay Clawson*, Lewis W. Cochran, Glenn B. Collins*, William L. Conger*, J. Donald Coonrod, Raymond H. Cox, Clifford J. Cremers*, Charles Cunningham*, Guy M. Davenport*, George Denemark*, David E. Denton*, Philip A. DeSimone, Louis Diamond, Joseph M. Dougherty, Herbert N. Drennon, Phillip A. Duncan*, Anthony Eardley, Roger Eichhorn*, Paul G. Forand, Art Gallaher, Davis Gardner*, John H. Garvey*, Peter Gillis*, Thomas C. Gray*, Andrew J. Grimes*, George W. Gunther*, Hal Haering, Jr., Joseph Hamburg, Curtis Harvey*, S. Zafar Hansan*, Virgil W. Hays, Jack Heath, Andrew J. Hiatt, Raymond R. Hornback, Cathy Howell, Alfred S. L. Hu*, Michael H. Impey, Donald W. Ivey*, Keith H. Johnson*, David T. Kao, Richard I. Kermode, Edward J. Kifer, John Leonard, Thomas P. Lewis*, Thomas T. Lillich, David Listerman, Nancy Loomis*, Tim Mann, Kenneth E. Mariono*, James R. Marsden*, William J. Marshall, Sally S. Mattingly, Jo Ann Maurer, Marion E. McKenna*, Martin McMahon, Susan Meers, Ernest Middleton, H. Brinton Milward*, George E. Mitchell, Jr.*, John M. Mitchell, Brian Murphy, Patricia Montgomery*, Philip J. Noffsinger*, Elbert W. Ockerman*, James R. Ogletree, Clayton Omvig*, Merrill W. Packer, Leonard V. Packett*, Bobby C. Pass*, Jane S. Rowe, Charles Rowell, Wimberly C. Royster, Robert W. Rudd*, Holly Schumacher, Donald S. Shannon, D. Milton Shuffett*, Timothy Sineath, Otis Singletary*, Harry A. Smith*, John T. Smith, Donald Soule, Edward F. Stanton*, Earl L. Steele*, Marjorie S. Stewart, Anne Stiene-Martin, William J. Stober*, Brad Sturgeon, Lee T. Todd*, Harold H. Traurig*, Mark Vickers, William F. Wagner*, Enid S. Waldhart*, M. Stanley Wall, James H. Wells, Wayne A. Wiegand*, Paul A. Willis, J. Robert Wills, Constance P. Wilson, Ralph F. Wiseman*, Cindy Woolum*

The minutes of the meeting of October 13, 1980, were approved as circulated.

Chairman Schwert made the following remarks:

"I have a number of announcements. The Council kept turning papers over in the span between meetings, and I think it is quite possible that the committees who have been meeting to consider the self-study problems have used up most of the energy which we usually use in committee meetings and that may be one reason there is not a great deal in monumental decision-making grist to come before the Senate's mill.

One of the first things I should point out to you is that new members of the Senate Council who have been elected to this office at the beginning of this semester are Professor Harry Caudill, History; Professor Alfred D. Winer, Biochemistry; and Professor Constance Wilson, School of Social Work. The Senate Council has recently been through its process of election. The Chairman-elect for the period July 1, 1981, to June 30, 1982, is Professor James Kemp and Secretary-elect is Professor Donald Ivey.

*Absence explained

One of the actions of the Senate Council which I bring to you for information and to make sure that you have no objection to this action of the Council is that the Council waived the fourth year requirement of the curriculum in the College of Medicine to permit June Frost, a member of the class of 1981, to receive the M.D. degree posthumously at the May Commencement. I assume there is no objection to this action.

The rules of the Senate state that the Senate Council will nominate to the President, on request, members of search committees for Deans. In the past this has frequently been done 'off the top of the Senate Council's head.' The Council has decided that in the future when such nominations are requested they will poll the college in question for such nominations and submit these to the President.

Another item of business which has been transacted and which has some meaning to the faculty, concerns two points which a faculty member raised. It is not infrequent that the academic advisor for the Athletic Association calls members of the faculty who deal with undergraduate students to find out what the status is of various athletes who hold Athletic Association scholarships. The first question this faculty member asked was, 'Is it possible that a faculty member by releasing this information violates the student's rights to privacy concerning his academic status?' The second question was whether or not this information can be properly transmitted over the telephone by properly identifying a voice. I took these questions to the office of Legal Council, and Gay Elste drafted a form which the scholarship athletes might sign to give permission for such information to be shared with the academic advisor of the Athletic Association. I had a meeting with Mr. Hagan and Mr. Bradley, and it was agreed that, in the future, athletes who have scholarships will be asked to sign this form giving permission for information about their status in any college to be transmitted to the athletic advisor.

The other problem, whether such information can be properly dealt with over the telephone, wasn't resolved. Apparently, in the past, Mr. Bradley has sent letters requesting information. The rate of return was not high and in order to touch base about the large number of students it was necessary to do this by telephone. If the faculty would return the forms to Mr. Bradley, that would meet the requirement for security of information about class standing.

Next I invite your attention to the fact that the processes of making changes in the academic programs of the University are tedious and many-stepped. The Council has appointed an ad hoc committee to study course processing with the hope that it can resolve the problem of how to inform all the people who need to know without taking so much time and using so much paper. Professor Alfred D. Winer is the Chairman of this committee. Professor Walter Smith, Chemistry; Professor Jane Emanuel, Allied Health; Professor Daniel Reedy, Spanish and Italian; and Mr. Ruby Watts from the Office of the Dean of Admissions and Registrar are the members of the committee. If you have any thoughts on how to resolve this problem, I am sure that one of these members would be glad to receive those ideas.

Another committee that has been appointed since last we met is an ad hoc committee on the composition and structure of the Senate. Professor James Kemp is the Chairman and the other members are Professors Mike Adelstein, Lyle Back, Andrew Grimes, Bob Ogletree, Doug Rees and Don Sands. Again, I am sure they will be glad to hear any thoughts you may have on what the size and committee structure should be of this group to make it operate as effectively as it can.

The next item of information is that the search committee for Ombudsman has been appointed. Professor Criswell is Chairman. Shortly you will be asked for nominees for this important position in our academic structure. I hope you will have lots of ideas for Professor Criswell.

The last point in our remarks is that at our next meeting Professor A. W. Patrick, who is the Chairman of the Sub-committee on Resource Allocation, will tell us about what that committee has found out about the University's technique for allocating funds to its various functions."

The Chairman recognized Professor James Kemp for a motion from the Senate Council. Professor Kemp, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposed change in the University Senate Rules, Section I, 2.5.1 b regarding the circulation of the Senate Minutes. This proposal was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of February 5, 1981.

The proposal reads as follows:

Background:

Professor Robert Rabel suggested to Dean Sands that thought be given to reducing the paper flow in the University by restricting the circulation of the Minutes of the University Senate.

Proposal

Dean Sands forwarded the suggestion to the Senate Council. The Senate Council recommends that paragraph I, 2.5.1 b of the Rules of the Senate be changed from:

- b. To keep minutes of the Senate meetings and to circulate these to all members of the University Senate and faculty and to administrative offices that are concerned with academic affairs.

to indicate that:

- b. Minutes will be circulated to Department Chairmen and Senate members and that, when rules changes are approved by the Senate, a separate memorandum will be sent to the general faculty for information.

The floor was opened for questions and discussion. Professor Gesund said that he did not think it was a modest proposal. He felt the minutes are about the only way the University faculty is kept in touch of what was going on University-wide. He said that many people read them before they put them in the trash. He felt if there were a problem with paper, it might be possible to publish the minutes in the Kernel. He did not feel it was a good idea to cut off the University faculty from the flow of information

which the proposal would do. Chairman Schwert responded that the possibility of publishing the minutes in the Kernel had been investigated and the Kernel did not have a "driving wish" to publish the minutes. The cost would be about twice what it is now.

Professor Jewell said he realized we were in an age of lowered expectations, but he found it difficult to believe that the University could not afford the paper it took to keep the members of the faculty informed of what was going on. He said that of the thousands of pieces of paper that crossed his desk he did not think the minutes should be thrown away first. He further stated that when he was not on the Senate he liked to know what was going on and when rules were changed he liked to know the logic for the change and the arguments for and against them. He also liked to read the President's speech. He didn't think the University was suffering from too much communication but from a lack of communication.

A Senator asked what the savings would be each month. Chairman Schwert said that the cost was around \$300 per set of minutes which was around \$2,000 a year. A Senator said that much in resources had been wasted in debating. Chairman Schwert said there was never going to be a way to save debate in that group, but they could save paper. Professor Bosomworth asked if the Public Information Office had been contacted to see if the minutes could be incorporated in any of their publications such as the Communi-K. Chairman Schwert responded that would certainly be a valid way of solving the problem. He said that Professors Jewell and Gesund had pretty well laid out the issues for the Senate. Chairman Schwert called for a vote. The motion to change the circulation of the Senate Minutes was defeated.

The Chairman recognized Professor James Kemp for a motion from the Senate Council on the second action item on the agenda. Professor Kemp, on behalf of the University Senate Council, recommended approval of the proposal to drop the requirement for each BGS senior to submit a final evaluation of the program. This is applicable to students enrolled in the old program only. This proposal was circulated to members of the University Senate under date of February 4, 1981.

The Chair pointed out there is now a continuing Bachelor of General Studies Degree. The rule in question existed during the time when this was regarded as an experimental or trial period for the BGS. Dean Sands thought this requirement could be thrown away with little loss of meaning and a great diminution of form-filling. There was no debate. The proposal passed unanimously and reads as follows:

Background:

On April 10, 1972, the University Senate approved the BGS as an experimental degree until June 1, 1980. One of the degree requirements was:

"In the final semester of the degree program, . . . the student will communicate to his advisor the results, benefits, and values of his work These communications must be made in some durable medium (e.g., the written word) . . ."

On September 8, 1980, the University Senate approved several revisions and permanent status for the BGS degree. An evaluation of the program is no longer a requirement. Dean Sands requests that the requirement of a critique of the program be waived for students now in process in the program.

Implementation Date: Spring Semester, 1981.

The Chairman asked Professor Kemp to read a Resolution from the Senate Council for consideration by the Senate. Professor Brock moved to amend the Resolution to state that "Current budget restrictions are limiting the programs of the University. We believe that further reductions in financial support of the University must result in a substantial lessening of educational opportunities offered by the University to the Commonwealth." Professor Olszewsky seconded the motion. The amendment passed unanimously. The amended Resolution also passed unanimously and reads as follows:

"On behalf of the faculty of the University of Kentucky, the University Senate endorses and wholly supports the position taken by President Singletary at a recent meeting of the Council on Higher Education. Current budget restrictions are limiting the programs of the University. We believe that further reductions in financial support of the University must result in a substantial lessening of educational opportunities offered by the University to the Commonwealth."

The last action item was the consideration of the honorary degree candidates. The Chair recognized Dean Margaret Jones from the Graduate School who presented the candidates. The Chair reminded the Senators that until the candidates were approved by the Board of Trustees the information was to be regarded as confidential. Following Dean Jones' presentation, the Senators voted to accept the four candidates for recommendation to the President.

Professor Harriett Rose, Director of the Counseling and Testing Center, gave a Report: UK Freshmen, Then and Now.

Professor Rose spoke to the Senate as follows:

"At the risk of covering information you already have, I am going to talk a little about what the ACT measures and how it measures it, because people who have not dealt with freshmen as advisors are unfamiliar with it. The ACT consists of four sub-tests: English, which deals with correct speech and writing, English usage and does not concern itself with the memorization of rules, but the ability to recognize effective writing, punctuation, grammar, sentence structure, diction, style, logic and organization; the Mathematics Usage test which is largely computational, covers first-year algebra and some geometry, and is a very easy test; the Social Studies reading test in which the information being asked is available in the form of paragraphs which the student reads and then is asked to answer questions; the Natural Science test which is constructed in the same way but requires a little more prior knowledge. The tests are about 52 questions long but are standardized so that scores range from 1 to 36, with a mean of 20 and a standard deviation of 5. For purposes of organization ACT uses these categories, which are equivalent to the normal curve: 26-36; 21-15; 16-20 and 1-15. We would expect then 16 percent of the distribution to fall between 26-36; 34 percent between 21-25; another 34 percent between 16-20 and another 16 percent from 15 down. In 1969 we looked much better than that, as we should have looked since we are what is called a type 4 University, that is, a Ph.D. granting institution. In 1979 we looked considerably worse than that in our distribution.

When we look at mean scores, it appears that not too much has happened. English has dropped two points, 40 percent of a standard deviation. Math has dropped in its mean a good deal. Social Studies

has dropped three, flirting with four points. Natural Sciences has declined much less. It's important to know that it is possible to score as follows just by chance. You can get a 7 in English, an 8 in Math, a 7 in Social Studies, and a 14 in Natural Sciences by chance. The final score, by the way, is a simple average of the 4 standard scores and is called Composite.

When you are confronted with a student who has a 5 Composite score and someone asks you, 'What is the matter with this kid?', your only conclusion can be that he tried. Had he not tried and just marked, he would have probably gotten a 9. The right answer counts in all cases. The wrongs do not subtract from the rights. All ACT is concerned with is how many of those 52 items were answered correctly. The decline in mean scores is bothersome. It is, of course, what has happened all over the country, and we don't look any worse than other universities. But what is really striking is the decline from the top category to the bottom category. Kentuckians speak a peculiar form of English so we have never looked great in it. We look worse now. Even females of whom only 5 percent scored in the bottom category ten years ago now have 18 percent. The men who were never very good in English had 10 percent in the bottom and now have 24 percent. Math has dropped alarmingly--not only is the top category much reduced, the bottom category is much enlarged from 8 percent to 23 percent for the men and from 15 percent to 34 percent for the women. What to me is the most alarming of all is the decline in social studies, because what that says is 38 percent of the women and 30 percent of the men are reading below the tenth grade level. The information is there, it's in front of them; they are unable to use it, and to answer appropriately. That is 1,056 freshmen students who cannot read a book or paragraph and get out of it the information they need. We have gone from 5 percent of the men in the bottom category on Composite to 18 percent and 9 percent of the women to 24 percent. At the same time the high school grades have accelerated. They are looking at the same students we are, but where those men students in English who got a 2.8 ten years ago, they now get a 3.01. Where the girls got a 3.16 they now get a 3.26. In Math where they are doing only the simplest work, similarly the high school grade point average has ascended. I direct you to look at the Social Studies grades. Also, the high school grade point average has also gone up unbelievably; as has the college grade point average when I look at English 101 for ten years. In 1971 the mean ACT Composite for English 101 was 21.2. The average of the grades in English 101 was 2.14. In 1979 the ACT Composite was 18.5 or one-half a standard deviation lower, and the grade point average was 2.33 or .19 higher. In Math 113 (allow me to congratulate you gentlemen), you stayed right where you should have been. The quality of the student is the same, the grade point average is the same.

Other striking things about our freshmen after ten years are the changes in vocational planning away from education to business, more attention to the health professions, and fewer people being undecided. Of these students, among whom 1056 cannot read, 876 aspire to a Ph.D., an M.D., a J.D. or similarly elevated degrees. Their family income level has grown too. Ten years ago only 9 percent thought their family income exceeded \$20,000. Now 40 percent say so. I really have a little trouble thinking that 40 percent of the freshman class has a family income above \$20,000, but maybe it is true. Where 10 years ago we had 20 percent below \$7500,

we now have 5 percent. What this means I leave to you, but I think we both have pretty good ideas about it. We very often hear that a different population of students is coming to the University now, and that's very true. We have several very different populations who are coming. I hasten to tell you before we use them for scapegoats that in this whole analysis there are only 128 blacks, and among those 1056 students who could not read only 77 of them were black. The rest of the blacks were distributed among the other three categories.

I have a lot of thoughts on reasons for this decline. First are social problems, and the assignment of the schools to be the agency to make up for all the social ills of a hundred years. That's part of it--then the abandonment of standards in high school. For instance, I came back to graduate school in 1960. Then people were saying we had to stop the amount of dropout from high school. So we stopped the dropout from high school. We now have high school graduates who cannot read, and a number of them come on to the University of Kentucky. Now we are getting similar pressures to stop the dropout from college. If we do that the same way we have done it for high school, we will soon have graduates from the University of Kentucky who cannot read. Do not think that all of them leave us at the end of the freshman year. That is not true. In the Counseling Center we operate a reading and study skills component--we call it learning skills. Peg Payne, the Coordinator, came to me the other day and said, 'There's a senior in my office who cannot read and cannot write. The Chairman of her department sent her over here, because they couldn't let her graduate like this.' I said, 'Has she been here all along?' The reply was, 'Oh, yes.' This year we are beginning to have students who are voluntarily referring themselves because of their alarm about their own inability to read. That is a change. We've had them that couldn't read before, but they were not alarmed about it. I guess that is progress.

I have looked also at the same decade of graduates from the University of Kentucky, not with the same care and not analyzing quite as well, but it doesn't hurt quite as much either. In 1971 the ACT mean of those people who graduated was 23. In 1980 the ACT mean of those people who graduated was 22.1, so we are kind of respectable in that area. We dropped .9. Within specific degree programs, there have been some more spectacular drops.

What do I want you all to do about it? I don't know. I just know that if we go along the way we have been, not requiring anything of students, we are cheating them. We are saying, 'You poor little thing, you're incompetent, we will let you by.' I don't believe they are incompetent. I think nobody makes them do anything, and when you don't make them do anything, they don't. We will have a generation of college students who do not have jobs, which they are promised, and we will have a rebellious, disheartened, social problem generation of college students. I don't think that is what they are entitled to. I think you should, because you set academic policy, start requiring things of students. Thank you."

A Senator asked Professor Rose to give some of her speculations in her role as a psychologist.

Professor Rose responded as follows:

"I have been speculating for years. In the first place, something we are not in charge of is television and the passivity of turning on a program and being entertained. Our succumbing to that ethos in our teaching and our presentation has already happened in high school. Students learn all kinds of things, but they don't learn from books. How one gets through this world not reading is hard for me to understand.

Another big problem has been, in my opinion, not the integration of schools, but how we treated the integration of schools, how frightened teachers were, and how they accepted being told they didn't know how to teach this new kind of student or what was 'relevant.' I don't think those black parents who fought like crazy for equal opportunity for their children meant they wanted less or that they wanted everybody's opportunity to be similarly lowered. I think they wanted their children educated. And when we say they are educated and hand them a degree which has no substance, we are not contributing to their American dream or to our own either.

Another thing, we have unbalanced the system considerably. Although we are now educating better than 50 percent of the high school graduates, only 20 percent of the jobs require a college education. That hasn't changed. Nobody has made the other 30 percent of the jobs upgrade their standards to where it does require a college education. Industry is taking some of our graduates. Others come to me with their feelings of disappointment after having been interviewed, and interviewed, and interviewed and not gotten a job. I look at them, and the counselor part of me wants to build up their self-esteem, and the other part of me says inside my head, 'I wouldn't hire them either.' They don't have the habits that make good employees.

I think we succumbed in the 60's to what college students said, and perhaps it had to be at that time. I can remember being on the Rules Committee one time when we got the probation and drop rules eased. Our purpose was not to allow people to stay in college indefinitely who couldn't 'cut it', it was only to give them a chance to get over the shock of their freshman year. I'm not sure that's the way it worked out, as with many good intentions which get diluted as time goes on. Whatever it was, then we listened to what students wanted and told us what they ought to study. That was twelve years ago--three college generations ago. It's time for us to stand up to what we really know--that an educated populace is an important asset and a necessity for any country.

One of the things that happens when students leave high school and come to college is that we want to acquaint them with the fact there are different ways of thinking, not just 'this is right, this is wrong and they butt up against each other.' We want to give them a sense of relativism, and we bend over backwards doing it. The students learn that, then they progress to the next stage which says 'anybody's opinion is just as good as anybody else's opinion. All knowledge rests on opinion.' They never go on beyond that. I hate for the important decisions that affect all of us in this country to be made by people who absorb everything that's important about the news from two minutes of the news on television, who cannot

read the newspaper and decide what is true and what is false or at least know there are other ways of thinking about it. At any rate, what we do now is very expensive. If we were going to accomplish anything with all the remedial work we are giving them in college, then I would be all for it. But I am afraid it is not going to accomplish anymore than what we offer them in high school, which is electives--take what you like. When you look at the distribution of what our students who are coming into college have had, it is not surprising that they score the way they do. Ladies and gentlemen, I leave you to your job, which is tough."

Dean Langston said that he would like to see the Senate initiate debate and discussion on the issue as to what to do about it. He felt it would be nice if everybody would raise standards. He said he felt the Senate Council should appoint a committee to take issue, work at it for a year and come up with University-wide academic policy. Chairman Schwert said that Dean Langston's point was certainly well put and the reason Dr. Rose was asked to address the Senate was to stimulate some consideration of what is really a very sober problem for the University.

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Martha M. Ferguson
Recording Secretary

Frank B. Stanger Jr.
University Archive
4 King Library Annex

00391

1

On behalf of the faculty of the University of Kentucky, the University Senate endorses and wholly supports the position taken by President Singletary at a recent meeting of the Council on Higher Education. We think it is clear that further reductions in the budget of the University will result in a lessening of educational opportunities and a decrease in educational services offered by the University to the Commonwealth.

Resolution
University Senate
February 16, 1981

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

February 4, 1981

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, February 16, 1981. Proposal to drop the requirement for each BGS senior to submit a final evaluation of the program. (Applicable to students enrolled in the old program only.)

Background: On April 10, 1972, the University Senate approved the BGS as an experimental degree until June 1, 1980. One of the degree requirements was:

"In the final semester of the degree program, . . . the student will communicate to his advisor the results, benefits, and values of his work . . . [These communications] must be made in some durable medium (e. g., the written word) . . ."

On September 8, 1980, the University Senate approved several revisions and permanent status for the BGS degree. An evaluation of the program is no longer a requirement. Dean Sands requests that the requirement of a critique of the program be waived for students now in process in the program.

Proposed Implementation Date: Spring Semester, 1981.

/cet

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

February 5, 1981

TO: Members, University Senate

The University Senate will meet on Monday, February 16, 1981 at 3:00 PM in room 106, Classroom Building.

AGENDA:

- 1) University Senate Minutes, October 13, 1980.
- 2) Chairman's Remarks
- 3) Action Items:
 - a) Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I, 2.5.1 b regarding the circulation of the Senate Minutes. (Circulated under date of February 5, 1981)
 - b) Proposal to drop the requirement for each BGS senior to submit a final evaluation of the program. Applicable to students enrolled in the old program only. (Circulated under date of February 4, 1981.)
 - c) Honorary Degree Candidates: W.C. Royster.
- 4) Report: UK Freshmen, Then and Now. Dr. Harriett Rose.

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

Note: If you are unable to attend this meeting, please call Ms. Martha Ferguson (7-2958) in the Registrar's Office.

2/9/81

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

February 5, 1981

TO: Members, University Senate
FROM: University Senate Council
RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting, Monday, February 16, 1981. Proposed change in University Senate Rules, Section I, 2.5.1 b. If approved, the action of the Senate will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

Background:

Professor Robert Rabel suggested to Dean Sands that thought be given to reducing the paper flow in the University by restricting the circulation of Minutes of the University Senate.

Dean Sands forwarded the suggestion to the Senate Council. The Senate Council recommends that paragraph I, 2.5.1 b of the Rules of the Senate be changed from:

b. To keep minutes of the Senate meetings and to circulate these to all members of the University Senate and faculty and to administrative offices that are concerned with academic affairs.

to indicate that Minutes will be circulated to Department Chairmen and Senate members and that, when rules changes are approved by the Senate, a separate memorandum will be sent to the general faculty for information.

Note: If approved, the proposal will be sent to the Rules Committee for codification.

George,
I wonder if
we can get the minutes
of the Senate published in
the Journal. I do not
want to see a reduction
in the amount of information
circulated to
Faculty.
Andy
Shuman

/cet