

In any event, these are the things that are in the wind -- the currents that are now at play. They all have, to some effect, importance for us and implications for us, and even at the risk of delaying your meeting longer than you might have wished, I thought that you probably would be interested in hearing from me of what some of these issues are, where they are, and how they are going. That has been my intention, and to the degree that you have found it, in any way, enlightening, I am delighted. Thank you very much.

President Singletary was given a standing ovation by the Senators.

The Senate adjourned at 5:25 p.m. to meet next at 4:00 p.m., Monday, February 16, 1970.

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, MARCH 2, 1970

The University Senate met in special session at 4:00 p.m., Monday, March 2, 1970, in the Court Room of the Law Building. Dr. Thomas R. Ford, Secretary of the Senate Council, presided since the Chairman and Vice Chairman were unable to attend. Members absent:

Clifford Amyx*, Daniel S. Arnold*, Robert Aug*, Richard C. Birkebak*, Barry J. Bloomfield, Collins W. Burnett*, Clyde R. Carpenter*, Robert E. Cazden*, Donald B. Coleman, Carl B. Cone*, Robert L. Cosgriff, Raymond H. Cox, George F. Crewe*, T. Z. Csaky*, David E. Denton, Ronald W. Dunbar*, Frederic J. Fleron, Jess L. Gardner*, James L. Gibson, Stephen M. Gittleson*, Herbert Green, J. W. Hollingsworth*, James F. Hopkins*, Mary F. James*, Louis J. Karmel, Robert W. Kiser*, Nancy Lair*, Albert S. Levy*, Rey M. Longyear*, Richard Lowitt*, Leonard McDowell*, L. Randolph McGee*, William G. Moody*, Theodore H. Mueller*, Thomas M. Olszewsky*, Albert W. Patrick*, Doyle E. Peaslee*, Nicholas J. Pisacano*, William K. Plucknett*, J. G. Rodriguez*, Sheldon Rovin*, John W. Schaefer*, Ian Shine*, Malcolm R. Siegel*, Gerard E. Silberstein*, Robert H. Spedding*, Robert Straus*, David R. Wekstein*, Harry E. Wheeler*, David C. White*, Raymond P. White*, Daniel W. Wingard, Donald J. Wood, Lawrence A. Allen, Charles E. Barnhart, Harry M. Bohannon, Glenwood L. Creech, Marcia A. Dake*, Robert M. Drake, Jr.*, Stuart Forth*, Harold D. Gordon, Jack B. Hall*, Joseph Hamburg, Ellis F. Hartford, Raymon D. Johnson*, Taft McKinstry*, Elbert W. Ockerman*, Wimberly C. Royster, George J. Ruschell, Doris M. Seward, Otis A. Singletary*, Eugene J. Small*, Joseph V. Swintosky*, William R. Willard*, Ernest F. Witte.

The Senate approved the requests of Jeannie Leedom and Jerry Lewis, Kernel reporters, Ken Weaver, Kernel photographer, and Avery Jenkins, Public Relations (UK News Bureau), to attend, report, and photograph. The Senate also permitted Josh O'Shea, an undergraduate student, to present a petition.

The minutes of the regular meeting of February 9, 1970, were approved as circulated.

*Absence explained

On behalf of the College of Education, Dean George W. Denmark presented a Resolution on the death of Dr. William J. Tisdall with the recommendation that the Senate accept the Resolution and that it be transmitted to Mrs. Tisdall with an expression of deepest sympathy. The Senators stood for a moment of silence in tribute to Dr. Tisdall and in acceptance of the Resolution.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

William J. Tisdall

The College of Education lost one of its most personable and professionally competent members when Bill Tisdall died of a heart attack on January 16, 1970. Nearly half of his 40 years were devoted to studying exceptional children and training their teachers.

With three degrees in special education from the University of Illinois, he held faculty appointments at the Pennsylvania State University, University of Pittsburgh, and the University of Kentucky. Although his students will have recollections of the dynamic way in which he conducted his classes, he will be remembered professionally for his involvement in numerous innovative projects in our field. Among these were included the first high school level class for EMR children in Champaign, Illinois; the first study of productive thinking in retarded children; the first large scale study of the feasibility of early school admission for gifted children; the first comprehensive examination of the effect of type size on reading achievement in partially-seeing children; the first study on divergent thinking in blind children; one of the first special education instructional materials centers; the first residential school for culturally disadvantaged gifted children; the first chairman of the special education department at the University of Kentucky; and most recently, the first project to train Peace Corps Volunteers in special education.

As a member of the University of Kentucky's College of Education faculty, Dr. Tisdall was one of the most active members of the University community. Through his efforts to bring all of the university's resources to bear on solving the problems of the less fortunate, he served as Chairman of the President's Committee on University Facility for Handicapped, an interdisciplinary group working toward the development of a center to study the problems of children who could not afford private medical care. He also served the University as a member of the President's Advisory Committee on Buildings and Campus Development, the University Senate, the Board of Directors of Lincoln School, the Search Committee of the University Art Gallery, the Committee on Faculty Involvement in Public Relations, and over a dozen committees in the College of Education.

His professional service extended far beyond the campus of the University of Kentucky as a Research Consultant to the Research Division of the Bureau of the Handicapped of the U. S. Office of Education, a Research Consultant to the Department of Mental Health of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, a Member of the Committee on Certification Standards for Teachers of Emotionally Disturbed Children, a Consultant to the Legislative Committee on Efficiency and Economy of the Kentucky Legislature, and as a Program Consultant to numerous school districts.

Under Dr. Tisdall's leadership the Lincoln School idea became a reality. His involvement in its founding earned him the respect and admiration of fellow professionals years his senior; but more importantly his scholarly activities in the area of the gifted, disadvantaged were acknowledged throughout the nation.

Dr. Tisdall's enthusiasm and tireless efforts on behalf of the Lincoln School were key factors in the successful development of the program. Faculty and students were especially close to "Dr. T" because of his sincerity and friendliness. It was a heart warming experience for all who shared his friendship, knowledge, and expertise, while he served as Director of the school and chairman of the Board.

Although the loss of his professional presence will be felt by many, this cannot compare with that felt by those who were privileged to know him personally. He was an accomplished musician, an avid pilot and boatsman, a fanatical chess player who would on occasion stoop to subterfuge to win, and a conversationalist who was at home in virtually any type of situation. His wry, yet often irreverent, wit and storehouse of stories were either a source of delight or of consternation.

May the University Senate accept this resolution in respect for a life devoted to teaching and in deepest sympathy with his wife and friends. The joy and vitality he brought to us will be missed by many.

Since Dr. Ford was serving as chairman, Dr. Timothy Taylor presented a recommendation that the Senate approve a change in the Rules of the University Senate (Revised and Updated July, 1969), page 17, Changes in Courses, sub-head a. This proposed change had been circulated to the faculty under date of February 18, 1970. The Senate approved the recommendation as circulated, which is as follows:

- a. New courses and programs, and changes in courses and programs are recommended to the college faculty by the academic unit most immediately connected with the course or program. The proposals are circulated to members of the college faculty by the initiating academic unit at the time of submission.

Following permission by the Senate to permit any member of the ad hoc Committee on Appropriate Balance Among Teaching, Research and Service Functions in the University to speak to the Report, the Senate resumed consideration of the report of that Committee which had been placed on the floor in the Senate meeting of February 9, 1970 for acceptance and transmittal to the President, and to which the Senate had made one amendment.

Following discussion, amendment was made and approved to change the last sentence in the first paragraph under Mechanism and Implementation Procedure on page 18 of the Report to read as follows:

". . . This mechanism is in operation in some academic units. It is recommended for general implementation.

At this point in the consideration of the Report Mr. Josh O'Shea presented the following petition to the Senators:

We, the students of the University of Kentucky, fully support the recommendations of the ad hoc Committee on Appropriate Balance Among the Teaching, Research and Service Functions in the University. Implementation of these recommendations is necessary to the improvement of the educational system at the University.

Mr. O'Shea stated that the petition had been signed by 1,900 students in the University without aid from the Kernel or any other organization that might have given it publicity. The Senators applauded the petition.

After further discussion of the Report an amendment was made to delete all material in the Report beginning on page 15 to the end of the Report. The Senate defeated this amendment.

Motion was made to amend the third line in the second paragraph under "THE MODEL" at the top of page 16, to delete the phrase ". . . or individual projects. . ." The Senate approved this amendment.

Motion was made to amend the last sentence in the second paragraph under "THE MODEL" at the top of page 16, to add the phrase ". . . the department has the responsibility . . ." so that the sentence reads ". . . The chairmen ultimately have the responsibility of discussing with the departmental faculty their individual roles in the departments' efforts and goals, and the department has the responsibility of providing the necessary decisions so that the goals may be attained in the most effective manner." The Senate approved this amendment.

Motion was made to amend the first sentence of the first paragraph under "THE MODEL" on page 15 of the Report to delete the first three words, "Individual faculty members . . ." and substitute the words "Departmental faculty . . ."

Motion was then made to amend this amendment to change the first sentence to read:

Individual faculty members or faculty of academic units initiate and review programs of instruction, research, and service that are believed necessary and/or desirable within their area of specialization (department) and make recommendations concerning these through their chairmen to the director of their school and/or the dean of their college"

The Senate approved the amendment to the amendment.

The Senate then approved the amendment, as amended.

A recommendation was presented to substitute the following Report for the Report of the ad hoc Committee on Appropriate Balance Among Teaching, Research, and Service Functions in the University:

Each faculty member should be provided with the opportunity to discuss the division of his activities with the cognizant administrative officers.

The Senate defeated this recommendation.

By a vote of 75 to 35 the Senate then accepted the Report as amended, for transmittal to the President of the University. The Model in the Report, as amended and accepted, reads as follows:

THE MODEL

Individual faculty members or faculty of academic units initiate and review programs of instruction, research, and service that are believed necessary and/or desirable within their area of specialization (department) and make recommendations concerning these through their chairmen to the director of their school and/or the dean of their college. The dean and directors consider the various recommendations submitted from the component departments in light of the roles of their college and generate a college-wide program embracing those programs necessary to the discharge of the responsibility of that college. In turn, the dean's recommendations of programs are reviewed by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and/or the Vice-President for Research to form the recommendations for the entire University; these recommendations in turn are reviewed by the President and the Board of Trustees of the University.

Acting with knowledge of budgetary considerations and the defined goals to be achieved by the University, the President discusses with the vice-presidents which programs or activities are to be initiated, continued, or curtailed and reaches decisions on the basis of the best information available to him. The vice-presidents in turn repeat this process with the appropriate deans. The deans and directors similarly discuss with the chairmen the programs, activities and responsibilities of the various departments and provide the necessary decisions where appropriate. The chairmen ultimately have the responsibility of discussing with the departmental faculty their individual roles in the departments' efforts and goals, and the department has the responsibility of providing the necessary decisions so that the goals may be attained in the most effective manner.

In this process, however, such bodies as have been delegated special responsibilities -- e.g., the Senate, the college faculties, or specially created committees or commissions -- are involved as their roles relate to decisions under consideration, providing counsel to the administration or making such decisions as are required under the charges given them.

Assumptions Inherent in the Model

This model is fundamental to staffing the University and discharging the responsibilities of the University. As it must, the model assumes (1) that without faculty initiative, programs are unlikely to be successful, (2) that recommendations will be based on careful considerations and logical decisions about the program needs and priorities, and (3) that decisions similarly will be the result of adequate consultation and thorough consideration regarding the programs and any limitations necessarily imposed; i.e., decisions will be arrived at in a just manner.

In the final analysis, reliance must be placed upon the faculty members and the chairman of each unit to achieve a proper balance in each unit and articulate this balance at the next level. The responsibility for maintaining some appropriate University-wide balance must lie with the deans and higher administrators, and with bodies which have been charged with the responsibility for certain kinds of decisions -- e.g., the Senate and the college faculties -- in matters related to their respective charges. General policy decisions regarding University-wide balance are ultimately made and implemented through negotiation extending downward through vice-president, college, and school levels, for example, to departments and individual faculty members.

The ultimate general allocation of resources in terms of University-wide balance is top administrative responsibility in the model and is one to be implemented through counsel at all levels.

Assignment of Roles and Balances

Within this model, it is possible to define the role of the University and assess an appropriate balance among the instructional, research and service functions of the University. It is possible further to establish these same features for every administrative unit at every level. But it is expected that there will be a rather substantial variation in the balances within each of the departments constituting a school or college, even as there will be within the colleges. Further, it is conceivable that these balances will be modified with time. We believe it is undesirable to specify an unalterable balance of the various functions for each individual unit or for each individual faculty member of the University.

Mechanism and Implementation Procedure

However, within the model described, it is possible to recognize a suitable mechanism to reach decisions concerning appropriate balance at the departmental level. This mechanism is in operation in some academic units. It is recommended for general implementation.

Upon definition of departmental goals in consultations between the department chairman and the school director or dean of the college, the chairman will request that each faculty member of his department submit a plan representing the individual's request for a balanced load believed appropriate to him, one which could fall within the ranges possible considering departmental goals and balances.

After review and careful consideration of the departmental program and seeking of any additional advice desired, e.g., that of a departmental executive committee, the chairman would arrange assignments of duties for the next academic year. Subsequent evaluation of the individual faculty member for merit increases and promotions would be based on an assessment of his performance of the assignment for the year.

Application of Model

In application of this model, the committee makes the following recommendations:

- 1) The concern in seeking appropriate balance should be toward having the University emphasize programs adapted to the circumstances of its setting and resources. While such circumstances will change from time to time and the University's program emphases, therefore should be changed, the essential responsibility of a university, to generate and disseminate knowledge, should be kept central.
- 2) In light of its special role, the University should emphasize research comparatively more than do other universities of the state. It does not follow, however, that the University of Kentucky should attend any less to teaching and service functions.
- 3) Balance among the three functions should be effected by negotiation among the various levels of administrative and academic units of the University, as described in the model, so that, insofar as possible, the institution may continue as an adaptive system, responsive to changing needs and potentials within and around it.
- 4) The negotiation process should effect balance by shaping the assignments of individual faculty members at the departmental level. Assignments should be initially defined at the recruitment-procurement stage, and may be redefined through negotiation in light of changing exigencies year by year. Annual appraisals of faculty should reflect the adequacy of individuals in fulfilling their respective assignments.
- 5) The evaluation of the individual faculty member for purposes of promotion should be based on an assessment of his performance of his assignments.

These recommendations can be epitomized in the words "flexibility" and "integrity". In some instances the criteria for promotion and merit increase at the University of Kentucky may have been applied too rigidly. The committee recommends that greater flexibility be required in the applications of the criteria for effective research, teaching and service. At the same time,

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

The Senate adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Kathryne W. Shelburne
Recording Secretary

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, MARCH 9, 1970

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

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

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

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

*Absence explained

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

DEAN OF ADMISSIONS AND REGISTRAR

ADMISSIONS
ORIENTATION
RECORDS
SCHOOL RELATIONS

February 23, 1970

MEMORANDUM

TO: The University Senate

FROM: Secretary, University Senate

A special meeting of the University Senate has been called for Monday, March 2, 1970 at 4:00 p.m. This meeting will be held in the Court Room of the Law Building.

The purpose of the meeting is to continue consideration of the report of the ad hoc Committee on Appropriate Balance Among Teaching, Research and Service Functions in the University; proposed change in the Rules of the University Senate with respect to procedures to be used in courses which are not housed in departments, as circulated under date of February 18, 1970.

HBA:mb