

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, December 9, 1974, in the Court Room of the Law Building. Chairman Smith presided. Members absent: Lawrence A. Allen, Ruth Assell*, C. Dwight Auvenshine*, Charles E. Barnhart, Jackie Barry, Robert P. Belin*, Robert S. Benton*, Harold Binkley*, Peter P. Bosomworth*, Robert N. Bostrom*, Garnett L. Bradford, Herbert Bruce*, H. Stuart Burness, John L. Butler*, Carl Cabe, Michael Clawson*, Bruce Combest*, Foy Cox, Clifford J. Cremers, James E. Criswell*, Tim Cunningham, Vincent Davis*, Patrick P. DeLuca*, Mary Duffy*, Anthony Eardley, Robert O. Evans*, Thomas Field, Doane Fischer*, Thomas R. Ford*, Lawrence E. Forgy*, James E. Funk, Art Gallaher, Jess L. Gardner, Claudine Gartner*, James Gibson, Ward O. Griffen*, Elaine Grubbs, George W. Gunther*, Jack B. Hall, Joseph Hamburg, Jesse G. Harris, Allan C. Hauth, Richard Hayes, Rita Hawkins, Beth Hicks*, Raymond R. Hornback, Patricia E. Horridge, Eugene Huff*, Charles Hughes*, Charles W. Hultman*, Roy K. Jarecky*, Raymon D. Johnson, James Kemp*, Gregory Kendrick, William Kenkel*, William Kennedy, Paul K. Kim, James B. Kincheloe*, A. Virginia Lane*, Albert S. Levy*, Gene P. Lewis, Donald Madden*, Donald R. March, Susan A. McEvoy*, Randolph McGee*, Carolyn D. McKinney, William G. Moody, Alvin L. Morris, David Mucci, Roger M. Nooe, Thomas M. Olshevsky*, Wimberly C. Royster*, Robert W. Rudd*, Kathryn Sallee*, D. Milton Shuffett*, Pam Sievers, Brad Smith, Herbert Sorenson, Don Soule, Earl L. Steele*, William Stober*, Joseph V. Swintosky*, Sherrell Testerman, Leonard P. Tipton*, Harwin L. Voss*, M. Stanley Wall, Daniel L. Weiss, Kennard W. Wellons, Rebecca Westerfield*, Constance P. Wilson*, Miroslava B. Winer*, William W. Winternitz, Randy Wynkoop, Robert G. Zumwinkle*.

The minutes of the meeting of November 11, 1974 were approved as circulated.

Chairman Smith made the following remarks to the Senators:

There are a number of items to report to you from the Chairman's Office. Perhaps the one that has the most pleasure associated with it is to remind you that tomorrow afternoon from 4:00 to 7:00 o'clock the Senate will be hosting its annual reception for the Board of Trustees. In addition, the guests at that meeting will include the officers of the Senate, the Recording Secretary, the Parliamentarian, the Secretary, the Sergeant-at-Arms, and so on. You are all cordially invited to come and participate. You will have an opportunity to meet with Board of Trustees members if you have not met them before, or to renew old acquaintances with them. In the past it has been a very successful event. In order to defray expenses there will be a modest fee of \$3.00 a head which provides you with several hours of free beverages, rather considerable hors d'oeuvres, and, of course, some of the finest company available in the institution. So we encourage all of you to join us tomorrow afternoon.

In looking over our agenda for today, and those documents which have begun to pile up, the Senate Council has determined that it will be necessary to have a meeting of the Senate in January. The only other alternative is to let things continue to pile up and end up with two or three meetings in April and May. Therefore, I am announcing at this time, and you will receive written notice, that there will be a special called meeting of the University Senate on Monday, January 20, 1975, at the usual time and place.

There are a number of items in the works that I would like to inform you of, simply to keep you up to date. Standard Nine which you have previously received will be coming back to you with appropriate modifications;

*Absence explained

we have received from the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee a report dealing with the general question of the philosophies and policies of this institution concerning admissions and enrollments, and that will be coming to you in the future; the A & S reorganization is progressing; and there are a rather substantial number of committee reports of one kind or another -- changes in the Rules, or policy positions -- in addition to what we have on the agenda today. As a result, this is the kind of thing that goes into the reasons why we are having a special meeting.

Since the last meeting the Senate Council has been fairly busy. Among other things, it is a pleasure to report to you that, with the very able assistance and rather massive work of our Committee of Associate Deans, we are in the final stages of completing an advising booklet which will contain a one or two-page description of every program in the institution as presently officially approved, and will include information on the number of hours, courses, other than those with common numbers, and so on, from the Community College System that will transfer back to this campus and be given specific credit or substitution credit in degrees or degree programs.

We have met with the Community College Senate Council at a social event where we discussed generally matters of mutual concern. We have received and transmitted to committees a number of reports, most notably, the report on minorities, prepared by Mr. Gaines for the President; and the Council Office has recently completed, and will be submitting to the President within the next few days, a summary report of the status of all proposed graduate programs -- where they are in the procedure between the graduate faculty and the Council on Public Higher Education -- and what we will be working out with the President later this month are details on exactly where we stand and where these programs are going.

Most of you have probably received your ballots. For the record, I would report to you that we have completed another round in the election being conducted to select a faculty member for the Board of Trustees. The original ballot was sent out to you with six names. Nobody received a majority vote on that ballot. The three individuals receiving the highest plurality of votes were Professors Brower, Sears, and Sedler. The second ballot has been issued with those three names on it and you should have received that. The deadline for receipt of those ballots by the Secretary of the Senate is Thursday, December 12, at 4:00 p.m. We will continue to keep you informed when that election is completed.

There is one other item to call to your attention and, hopefully, ask you to call to the attention of your colleagues. We do this every year and every year we still have problems, namely, the fact that the University Senate has a number of rules and regulations pertaining to final examinations. If you are giving a final examination where it is appropriate in your course, you are supposed to give it at the time scheduled by the Registrar. It can be moved but you have to have the agreement of the students involved, the department chairman and the Dean, and to check with the Registrar. There are pragmatic reasons for doing that sort of thing. Also, we have recently passed some rules and regulations dealing with the situation where the student has more than two examinations on a given day. In that particular instance the student

has the privilege of having the examination with the highest catalog number rescheduled. Where two exams share common course numbers, the one whose departmental prefix is first alphabetically will be rescheduled. So you are strongly encouraged, insofar as possible, to be consistent with the Rules of the University Senate in this particular regard.

This is the end of the official report. This is my last opportunity to preside over this body and I thought I might take a few minutes of your time to transmit to you a few of my own comments and thoughts looking back over the year just past.

First of all I would like to say that it has been a privilege, an honor, and an education to serve in this office. I have learned a lot. I suppose it is impossible to sit in this office and ever be the same again. Perhaps it would be worthwhile to pass some of that on to you. There are a lot of people to thank. The Senate is a large and complex body. There are a lot of people who contribute to its work besides the person who stands up front here. I just happen to be the visible part. Certainly, the whole Senate Council puts in a number of hours a week attempting to address issues on behalf of the faculty. Notable among that group, all of whom are hard-working, are my successor, the Chairman-elect, Professor Krislov, and those individuals who have served as secretaries of the Senate Council, Professor Eichhorn and Professor Wilson. There is another unsung body of heroes that does a fantastic amount of work for which it doesn't receive any public image or credit and I would like to thank these members, personally, and on your behalf. These are the Committee Chairmen. A number of them come to mind. All of them work hard. But a few of them have been grossly overburdened. One thinks of Sid Ulmer, Ray Cox, and Harry Barnard on the Rules Committee. They recodified the whole Rules of this body, constantly working with very complex material. One thinks of Jane Emanuel and Bill Peters of the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee who are constantly reviewing Rules, reviewing studies, and, while they are at it, conducting major policy studies; Betty Rudnick of the Student Affairs Committee, who is involved in representing the faculty and this body with the Student Affairs Division of this institution; Willis Sutton and the General Studies people dealing with very complex issues that still need to be addressed continually; an unsung bunch of heroes that you don't hear much about: John Robertson, Chairman, and some 16 Associate Deans, the Assistant Vice President of the Community College System, and several representatives of the Registrar's Office who meet about once a month with me and other individuals on the Senate Council and help us in a variety of problems. All of these people, and many other chairmen who have not had the casework load, are what really make this body tick. And insofar as it accomplishes anything on behalf of the faculty, they are perhaps the ones to thank. I certainly could not have done whatever we accomplished this year without their assistance. We may have made some mistakes but whenever this has happened, it has been my fault. So I would like to say personally and on behalf of my colleagues "Thanks to all of you."

There are two or three other things I would like to say about the Senate and about this University and I have said a number of them before in smaller groups. As nearly as I can determine, this Senate, and its associated Councils and committees, constitutes what is legally one of the most powerful faculty governance systems anywhere in this country. That is

not to say there aren't other faculties who, individually and effectively, wield power on their institutions. They do. But in terms of the formal structures that exist of legally delegated authority and responsibility, this body and its components constitute one of the most powerful and, as nearly as I can determine, despite our internal problems, most effective governing systems anywhere in this country. We have a problem though. We don't use it very effectively. It is too easy to sit back and not read the documents or listen to the committee reports, or something else, and then say "The Senate is out to get us." "The Senate did this to us." It is interesting. It depends on which side you are on at the moment. Either the Senate has helped you get something done or the Senate has jumped on you -- depending on how you want to look at it. But this Senate, its Council, its committees, are the legally-constituted and powerful voice of the faculty in this institution. So far as I know, it has been the attempt on my part and that of my colleagues, the Council, and the Committee Chairmen, to speak for the faculty. We are accused of not doing that occasionally. I would suggest to you that you look at the record. As an example, less than 30 hours after we received a petition from a group of Senators dealing with an issue, the Krislov Recommendation, we had met with the President, he had frozen all the actions he had taken pursuant to our earlier recommendation, and this item was scheduled on the agenda for this meeting. This is a body which has a structure which can move -- it can move very effectively -- in the interests of the faculty.

I think there are some general comments about the institution that can be made. And I think I would leave you with one word perhaps and that word is "different." If there is one thing I have become aware of over the year in looking at this institution, it is how complex it is. How many different objectives or different components it has. And, given that we have different objectives or goals in various places, how many different ways there are of attempting to gain those goals or objectives. I think there is too great a feeling that somehow because somebody else is doing something different from what we are in unit X, or Y or Z, they are bad. Or that they are good and we are bad. This is a pretty fine institution and we are pretty good at most of the things we do. We are simply different. We should spend a little less time in worrying about the fact that because someone else is different from us, that makes him bad or, alternatively, makes him good and makes us bad, and, simply realize he is different. He has different objectives, different criteria, and different ways of evaluating.

And finally, to pick up on the last sentence I just made, we are pretty good by any criteria you want to pick: numbers of publications, Ph.D. production, where our students go, and what they do. I came to this institution 13 years ago. It was less than half its present size; there were considerably fewer than 100 Ph.D.s per year; it had less graduate programs; far less extramural support; far less buildings. It was known or had been known to that time as "The Country Club of the South." It isn't anymore. By any criteria you pick, this institution ranks in the top few institutions in the country. There are individual differences here and there, strong points and weak points, but we are good. To steal a phrase for the moment, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself". Some of us who have been around a long time and have watched things go by are afraid our standards will slip, we are afraid our quality isn't good enough, we are afraid we don't quite measure up. I have come to the conclusion that we don't need

to have those worries. The question is "How good, how high, how far?" Because, by all the external criteria, we are pretty good. We have made it past the hurdles we are worried about. Our only question now is whether we are going to be Number One or Two or Three or Ten or Twelve, in this country; not whether we are going to be in the top few dozen any more. We are good, we are powerful, we are moving, we are progressive, and all of us in this room and the rest of our colleagues have been a part of making this institution something today that is far different than the one 13 years ago. We should each take some pride in our accomplishments and we should each continue to go forward with considerable faith in what 10 or 12 years have demonstrated: the fact that we are making progress, that we know where we are going, and that we will continue to make progress.

Again, it has been a pleasure to serve. Thank you for the opportunity. Best wishes and good luck and I hope all of us will look forward to more years of continued success at this institution.

The first item of business on the agenda was a motion placed on the agenda over the signatures of ten Senators requesting that the Senate reconsider Recommendation 5 of the Krislov Report.

Chairman Smith then called on Professor Paul Eakin, Department of Mathematics, to make a motion. Professor Eakin expressed appreciation to Chairman Smith and the Senate Council for the alacrity with which this was handled. He indicated that editorially he wished to remove the word "dangerously" from the resolution as it was circulated to the faculty under date of November 27, 1974. He then read the Petition, as follows:

Acting on Recommendation 5 of the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate Tenure and Promotion which was passed by the Senate on April 22, 1974, President Singletary issued a July 9, 1974 memorandum on "Establishing Standards for Performance." After serious consideration of the implications of this directive we are compelled to ask the Senate for a careful reconsideration of the recommendation. We feel that the Senate erred by not being much more careful in defining precisely what purpose these standards are intended to serve. We feel that the purposes as defined and implied by both the Singletary memorandum and the original resolution are subject to different levels of interpretation. We feel that as faculty members we cannot in good conscience participate in the articulation of these written criteria and standards unless there is a clear understanding of their purposes and implications. In addition, some of us feel that there are compelling philosophical grounds upon which to base a motion to rescind the original Senate recommendation.

We urge the University Senate to adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas Recommendation Five of the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate Tenure and Promotion as amended and passed by the Senate on 22 April, 1974 is ambiguous, the University Senate hereby rescinds its adoption of that recommendation and respectfully requests of the President of the University that he suspend all actions taken pursuant to the recommendation."

Dr. Eakin stated that the signers of this petition and those who agreed with the signers, did not, in any way, wish to impugn the motives of Professor Krislov, President Singletary, or the people who voted for this recommendation but that they felt the document had an identity of its own that was totally independent of the motive of those who passed it; that they felt the recommendation was ambiguous, one evidence being the attempts by various departments to comply with it; that the attempts of the departments had run a gamut of different interpretations, some being very rigid, others claiming that they had interpreted it in accordance with the Governing Regulations; and that if the people who passed it felt that something was necessary, they should be much more specific about their intentions and that they should bring forth to this body a much more well-defined recommendation than that that was passed.

Professor Sedler rose to speak in support of the motion on the floor to rescind Recommendation 5. He stated that his first reaction in the initial consideration of the Recommendation had been that it was a relatively innocuous recommendation that might provide some guidance to incoming faculty members; that he had approached it from the perspective of one who was serving on the Social Sciences Area Committee; that he had determined that it would impose no possible legal liability on the University since its standards are sufficiently ambiguous; that universities have broad discretionary powers relating to appointments, reappointments, and tenure decisions. He stated further that his primary concern had been that the recommendation was not intended to dilute the standards that the Area Committees had theretofore been applying; that with respect to the suggestion that it would inform the area committees of the appropriate criteria, standards, and minimal levels of performance in the various academic areas, he had not been aware that there was a problem at least in his Area Committee; that he had thought the University standards were very clear; that his Area Committee had had no difficulty with the appropriate disciplines, disparate as they were, in identifying what were the standards; but that the more he had read the various points that had been written concerning the attempts to apply the recommendation, the more he had considered the question; that it seemed to him the term "dangerously [before its deletion] abmiguous", was well stated; that when one spoke of minimal standards but people were expected to exceed them, one was creating an inherently unworkable document because, basically, there would be no standards at all or they would vary tremendously in content and that this would create a great deal of confusion and disappointment. So, on further reflection, he wished to join in the proposal that the recommendation be rescinded.

President Singletary spoke to the Senate as follows:

There are several comments I would like to make. First of all, I wish to call your attention to that part of the motion which was just read that calls upon me to do something I have already done, which is to suspend all action. You may leave it the way it is. It doesn't matter. If you want to ask me to go on and do what I have already done, that is fine. The fact is, it has been suspended and I want to assure you, as you consider this, that it is going to remain suspended until some clarification comes out of this body as to what you intended or what you meant and what it is that you would like to pass on to me in the way of an expression from this group.

I want to say some other things that I think need to be said. I have read some but not all of the great amount of paper work that has been generated about this particular issue and I am amazed at a number

of things. I think I would like to comment on a few but I would like you to be aware of the mechanics of this. The report that came from an ad hoc faculty committee to the Senate Council -- which I had several discussions with the Senate Council about, and which later came to this floor without substantial debate and certainly without significant vote -- could leave one in my position with the assumption that the faculty was in favor of this. I want to make it clear to you that at the time I acted, I acted on the assumption that I was doing something -- and I want this point clear -- it was something I was not particularly keen about. I will come back to that. It appeared to me that I may have been the only person on the campus that had any reservations about it although I think Professor Cox and maybe a few others did have some concerns. Nonetheless, we issued a set of instructions to the two concerned Vice Presidents, and, through them, to the operating units, attempting to implement what we understood was the faculty's wish. Then a very interesting thing happened. "On the way to the office" I began to get some very interesting comments from people. I got a number of telephone calls, conversations of one kind or another, several letters from departments that I think expressed very sensible concerns, the petition which you have read that did not come to me but I did see a copy of, all indicating that there was considerable concern, on the part of the faculty, about what the faculty wanted. And this was my reason for immediately suspending the action up to then because it was not clear to me just exactly what the faculty did want.

My own position is simply this and I want you to understand it. As of this moment, or up to the time I suspended it, I thought I was doing what you wanted. It appears that there is some question about whether you want it or not. I now request that whatever else you do today, clarify what it is you want and then let me consider how we can do it.

In the various expressions several things came through. Some were very profound expressions of concern because they agreed with the ones I had originally. There were some others that were pragmatic and practical all the way to one Chairman saying to me "My people just say that they can't do this and they are not going to do it." And that presents an interesting situation. Another one said to me "We have already done it." Another professor said to this gentleman "Well, what did you do about that part where you specify how much research you have to do?" His reply, I believe, was "We put in there that the research required for promotion or tenure will be what this department determines that standard will be." It seems to me that we could save ourselves a lot of writing if that is done. What I am saying is that once the concern was known, we did stop any further movement until this could be placed on the agenda. There was one concern, though, in some of the correspondence -- and this is really what I want to make known to you -- that suggests that somehow, after all of this has worked out, there is some insidious plot, on the part of the administration, to lay hold on the promotion and tenure area. There are many who say that we already have that. What I wish to say to you, plainly and unequivocally, is this. The administration position -- and I want you to use this as a background against what you did -- is that we are willing, pretty generally, to consider what you want done. This is clearly a faculty matter. It ought to originate in this body, and it ought to be postulated in this group. I want to say to you that no member of this administration has had any designs on anything. I want to back away from that and say a kind of personal thing. When I met with the Senate Council before this document ever came

to this floor, I had reservations about it, as Stan Smith was good enough to point out to you in an earlier document that he distributed. My concerns were then what they are now. I think that minimum standards tend to become the standards very shortly. I think still further, and this is the philosophical objection I have, that there is a drift or a trend to want to be more and more specific, to get things written down with a degree of specificity, and that while it may be desirable in some ways, it can also be very undesirable in others, because whether you like it, or whether I like it, or whether anybody likes it, universities are places where people make lots of judgments about other people and I underscore judgments. I am not going to pretend that it is fool-proof. I am not going to pretend that there cannot be cases of abuse. But we do have procedures for dealing with those and I want you to understand what the administrative view is.

Some sidelights came out that I want to touch on before I sit down. I am told that this body is not representative of the faculty. The Senate passed this; the faculty didn't. I find that I have no choice but to assume that as long as this Senate is elected by the faculty, it is the representative body of the faculty. For those who believe that this body is not representative of the faculty, whether they are Senators or not -- and I assume there are some non-Senators here -- let me say that any solution for that problem resides in the faculty itself, and it runs to two things: pay more attention to the elections when they take place; pay more attention to the business that comes on the floor of this body. It really won't work for it to come down to what, in many ways, is sort of titillating but is also mind-boggling -- the thought that one of the men, whom I really know well and value on this faculty, said to me: "We expect you to protect us from the Senate." I want to tell you exactly what I think. I think this is a matter between some members of the faculty who are not on, or may be on the Senate, and some other members of the faculty who are on the Senate. I see this as a faculty matter and I urge you not to drag the old business of your "oppressive administration" into this. I wish you would consider what you want and don't speculate about what I or "my minions back there" want. We are willing to hear what you want. And whatever else you do, please address yourself to the fundamental question, that being: Do you want to be more specific now in trying to state the standards for promotion and tenure or not? I call to your mind that you have, already in existence, a document that I am proud of, in the institutional sense, and it was written by a faculty committee of this body. It's a very fine statement. The argument before you is not whether we have something in writing about promotion and tenure. It is whether you are going to take portions of that particular document which already address these questions, and make those sections more specific. I did not like it then. I do not like it now. I have made it a point -- and some of you don't like this -- not to come on this floor and tell you during your debates what I think or what I am going to do, because I think it is not very sporting to come down here and argue with you about something that will then come to my office for me to deal with in another context. I would not have made this statement now about this particular thing except for the fact that there is a lot of misinformation being circulated.

There is an issue in front of you and it is a very simple one. This Senate has taken an action. Some people do not think it was a wise action and they want it rescinded. And that is what you ought to

address yourselves to. If you vote to rescind it, good. It will drop. If you vote to go ahead with it, then I will give consideration how to do that in some way where a memorandum I write will not, in fact, become the "bone of contention." I really want you to know that I had no intention in that memorandum except to get this thing started. The language in my memorandum that troubled some people had to do with the phrase that minimum standards should be exceeded in some if not all cases. I wish to tell you that this language is directly out of the tenure and promotion document that we already have. There is nothing new, startling, or subversive in it. The real question is "Do you want to be more specific?" All of those other arguments are arguments that you should have had years ago when you were adopting the other document we now have, which is the basic document, and I think a very fine one.

I don't think there is anything else I should say except to urge you to deal with this. I don't think there is any problem in coming here and saying "O.K. The Senate passed something and enough people don't like it." You reconsider it and you may vote it down. This is not the end of the world. Or you may pass it again, in which case it is going to come to me in some form and then I will decide how to deal with what is clearly an institutional problem. I don't want to go into that now. You could spend the rest of your afternoon and several other afternoons in here arguing about many of the things I have seen in the literature circulated that I happen to think appears to be irrelevant to the question in front of you. The question in front of you is "Do you want to move to those more specific statements?"

Thank you.

Professor High made the following remarks to the Senate:

The Department of Philosophy has been one unit that has issued a statement, now circulated -- you just received it today -- circulated to the faculty under date of December 5, 1974, objecting to the implementation of this. I want to state most clearly that the statement drawn by the Department of Philosophy, in no way is directed toward any concerns that might imply that the administration is taking away tenure and promotion decision questions. In fact, part of our concern, which was a unanimous statement from the Department of Philosophy, is summed up in paragraphs 3 and 4 of that statement and with some on the next page. Interestingly enough Professor Sedler and President Singletary have mentioned those concerns: how minimal standards, if made other than what we currently have as stated in our Administrative Regulations, very quickly become adequate standards. Secondly, there may be a point then of non-utility to this type of exercise aside from whatever else may be the ambiguities contained in such a document.

Professor Westley made the following remarks:

I want to congratulate the President for doing the sporting thing of coming on this occasion and I want to do the even more sporting thing of contradicting him. It seems to me that what he described as the issue was not the original issue; that the rubrick was "Standards of the Discipline." Everything that has come out since then has said "Standards of Performance." I feel that the point of Recommendation 5 has been missed almost from the very beginning. The question is "Shall variances be taken into account

which relate to differences that exist among the disciplines?" I tried to find out whether, in my discipline, there is a standard that is, in any way, unique or different. I think in some ways for all of us our disciplines are unique. So I did an actual study on this. I just had to apologize to all these people for having troubled them. It was easily found out that there are far more variances within the discipline than there is variance from department to department here in this University, so I guess the answer I got is that there is not a distinctive standard for Journalism and, therefore, would not have anything to propose along that line. But it seems to me that the whole reaction to this has been a reaction to "standards of performance." And the issue seems to have become "Should the standards be more explicitly stated?" I don't think that is in line with the intention of Recommendation 5 at all, which was to allow specifically for variances from discipline to discipline. I wound up thinking that if this issue can cause this much confusion, we ought to go with a system that applies the same general standard across the board even though I also found from my national study that our standards are at least as high as any and more rigid than any.

I would just as soon see Recommendation 5 go down the drain, too.

Professor Goldman spoke next:

I guess I am the first one speaking today who does not want to see Recommendation 5 go down the drain. I think it would be worthwhile to turn to the page in the circulation of December 5, 1974 which specifically sets forth Recommendation 5. Professor Westley is correct in saying that we have lost sight of what Recommendation 5 is all about. There is only one point in Recommendation 5 that talks about "minimum", and that is "minimum research requirements." Under paragraph (1) (c) it says "The minimum research requirements for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor."

The point that has been made is the fear that the minimum will become the standard. I think that assertion is an insult to the entire teaching profession. It suggests that all any of us are here to do is to work up to the minimum that is necessary to gain promotion, gain tenure, and from there on we can coast along. The person who appears to be working in that direction is the person for whom we usually try to make the judgment: "No, this individual is not one we want to give tenure to because what that individual has been doing to date, that individual will not continue to do." So the attempt to describe a minimum for research productivity does not create, for any decent faculty, a source of concern. It is not going to become the standard. Of course, if the standard was high enough, perhaps we would not have anything to worry about anyway.

I think the real basis of concern is twofold: One, when people in various departments have come to approach the task of doing what Recommendation 5 calls upon each discipline to do, they have discovered that it is not easy. It requires a great deal of work. It requires us to start articulating something that, in the past, too often, we pretended was there, but now none of us are really sure it is there. And two, that we really need to know what we are dealing with when we make judgments for promotion and tenure. I think it is very important that we do know what we are dealing with. And, as difficult as this exercise might be,

it is a very important one for all of us to go through to establish such values - to have these standards articulated so that people coming into the department will know what it is that is expected of them; and that when we make judgments on promotion and tenure, we do so with a sense of being objective, and that we are not just making "gut" reactions.

If you will turn to another part of the document dated December 5, 1974, I think you will find another dimension of concern -- sources of concern close to the objections that have been raised. At the top of the third page several questions are raised: Whether if we establish standards satisfying Recommendation 5 described for the discipline -- the means by which we judge teaching, the means by which we judge research, the balance or varieties of balance between research, teaching and service as sought in a faculty member in each of the disciplines -- that this might preclude us from making decisions based on some other factors. Some such factors are listed here. (a) Whether the department should invest its resources in an individual's area of interest? (b) Whether an individual's continued presence on a faculty would have a detrimental effect on the program? Et cetera. What this suggests is that often decisions--recommendations from a department with respect to promotion and tenure--are being made not on the basis of an individual's academic accomplishments, not on the basis of what individuals are doing in the classroom, but on the basis of some other factors. I think that some of these factors listed here are perfectly relevant factors with respect to the question of tenure, not with respect to the question of promotion. I think what these questions point out is that we are not in agreement in what we are doing and why we are doing it when we are making promotion and tenure decisions. I think, as an institution, it is important that we do, at least on a discipline by discipline basis, come to some sort of terms with respect to what are the criteria that we are addressing when we have to review a file and decide whether to promote the individual. So I would like to see us continue with Recommendation 5 and go through the difficult process of trying to articulate the criteria by which we make these judgments.

At this point in the debate President Singletary interjected a footnote concerning Professor Westley's concern that debate had been directed to standards of performance when it should have been directed to standards of discipline. The President called attention to Recommendation 5 entitled Defining Standards for Tenure; and that item (1) under that Recommendation reads: "(1) Departments or individual educational units shall set up reasonable standards of performance . . ." and that they had taken that word directly out of that Recommendation.

Professor Gabbard made the following remarks:

I think the writing of minimum standard performance is unnecessary; that it places an unnecessary burden on whoever is asked to do it. Secondly, I think the philosophy underlying the writing of minimum standard performance is faulty in its concept. Let me deal with the second point first.

The underlying philosophy of writing minimum standards for performance, as I understand it, is that the Professors in this University need some kind of a recipe, or road map if you like, by which they may achieve academic success. I do not believe that such a recipe is either desirable or possible. I think that the road to academic success is clear. That road is the road of scholarship, it's the road of service to the institution, and to the community. Now let me turn to the first point.

I think that writing the minimum standards of performance is unnecessary. It is unnecessary because we already have a mechanism in operation dealing with matters of appointment, promotion, and tenure. The mechanism is the Area Committees. These Committees operate under guidelines which can be made clear through channels to the faculty members. Another component of the channels is that the Vice President and the Deans of this University have, as a part of their responsibility, to make it clear what the guidelines or standards are. And finally, the faculty itself is directly involved in making recommendations for promotions, tenure, and appointment.

For these reasons I urge you to vote for the motion on the floor.

Professor Wells:

I also would like to urge you to vote for the motion before the Senate.

I would like to pick up on a comment made by Stan Smith earlier that this is a pretty darn good institution. I would like, for a moment to direct your attention to the question of why is it a pretty darn good institution. Twelve years ago you could not make that statement. The progress that Stan referred to has taken place largely over that period. And if one will think about it, it has taken place since the current Governing Regulations, and the recommendations to the Area Committees by the faculty, the department chairmen and the Deans, went into effect in this institution. Over that period of time literally hundreds of faculty members, chairmen, and deans have been educated in how to evaluate faculty performance, how to make judgmental decisions, and how to respond to the challenge which was made when these Governing Regulations were first amended. I think the magnificence of their response to those Governing Regulations and the clear superiority of the way the Regulations work -- the area committees, the judgmental decision-making -- are proof of the quality of the people we have here today. Twelve years ago this institution was in the backwaters of the land-grant college system. Today, it is competitive and many would consider it one of the leaders. Further, many departments can say they are among the best in the country. The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, a few days ago in a meeting, said that in his College -- and I am sure that other Deans can make similar statements -- there are faculty members who would be a credit to any institution in the country. And the reasons, to a large extent, that those people are here are because they knew they were coming to an institution in which people were willing to make judgmental decisions, in which people have high standards, and work in a framework in which they are allowed to make high standards and I want to say that if this body wishes to turn away from that, if this body wishes to refine that mechanism, then it seems to me that the argument to destroy it, to cut it into pieces, has to be overwhelming. I haven't heard such an argument. All I hear is a bunch of nitpickers.

I would like to make one further remark about the statements of President Singletary. I applaud his remarks. I just wish he had made them a long time ago to this body, for what he has given us is a model of this administration of this University, and his credo as the President. And I believe what he said that your leader is the Senate and the Senate Council. If we are going to have leadership from the faculty's point of view, it has to come from this body, it has to come from the Senate Council.

I submit that Recommendation 5 of the Krislov Report cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be considered an example of leadership. I suggest to you that a recommendation which was passed by a minority of the committee, cannot be considered to be an act of leadership. I think that the report stands for what it is. It is condemned by President Singletary, it is condemned by a leading law professor, and I condemn it too.

Professor Valentine:

It is very difficult to stand up here against a distinguished law professor and the President of the University. I am one of those people for which I think the Krislov Report was intended. This is my second year. I am a Senator. I am a non-tenured faculty member, and I am looking for something like this Recommendation 5. When I came here I was told only that if I got somewhere between six and eight publications in my first four years, I was pretty safe. The fact that I try to be a fine teacher and that it is very important to me to be a good teacher seemed to have no attention paid to it.

There is also a statement made about service to the institution, and research. No mention is made of teaching. I want to do research, too. I think it is very important. I am not against that. But I am looking for something which says to me that if I do these kinds of things, and more, then I have -- if not a road map -- at least a map of the United States, to see. It is not an individual road from here to there; therefore, I am speaking in favor of this kind of thing at the risk of the untenured faculty member "taking on the lion."

Professor Krislov:

I feel somewhat obligated, on behalf of the ad hoc Committee, which consisted of the two academic Vice Presidents, two Chairmen, two students, and several faculty members, to defend Recommendation 5. I want first to correct one misstatement. If I remember it, there was very little debate or disagreement with this proposal within the committee. I would like to give you the reasons that I think the ad hoc committee adopted Recommendation 5.

The Recommendation came from a member of the committee, a faculty member in the English Department, who said that his department had, in fact, drafted something like this. We were all impressed because we had found that when we talked to people, they had various conceptions of what tenure should be awarded for. Some people said that every promotion should be better than the previous one. Some people said "I look at the existing faculty and if the candidate compared favorably, okay." Some people said "Well, I look at the associate professors and if the guy's in there, that is okay, too." It seemed to us that if people had different concepts, there would be a great deal of benefit and a great deal of value in having them sit down and exchange their views and come to some agreement. That was objective number one.

In our examinations we also found that several people had what some of us might regard as subjective considerations. Professor Goldman referred to the documents from the Math Department which raised some questions which I would think of as not being legitimate questions for a department to consider in awarding tenure. For example, the question was raised: "Suppose

the department does not want to invest resources in that field." It seems to me that that is an administrative decision; that a man should be told "We don't want to teach Area X. You can only teach Area X. You may be the greatest person in the world, but we don't teach Area X." That is a more objective way of handling that problem and it is a truthful way. Instead of telling the world that you did not give that man tenure, you tell the world that you stopped producing Edsels, or whatever you are producing. The point I am trying to make is that many of us have ideas and considerations that may be subjective, and I would like the departments to consider that and to spell out what conduct they regard as desirable. I believe that when that is done, we will minimize subjective considerations.

Contrary to Professor Sedler's assertion that the area committees have no trouble in applying standards, we had considerable evidence that many area committees are overtaxed in applying standards. The number of special ad hoc committees appointed is an indication of this. Our committee naturally concluded that a third purpose would be guidance for the area committees. Several of our members were area committee members and they strongly supported it.

It is indeed ironic that the administration has been accused of trying to regain control over tenure and promotion through Recommendation 5. On the contrary, I think the Committee felt that the standards would serve as instructions to the Deans, the Vice Presidents, and the President. After all, omniscience is not required for filling these jobs and the instruction might be very useful. The fact the administration accepted it indicates that they would be willing to follow the instruction of the departments and the faculty.

Since we adopted this I think there are two other reasons that we should reject this petition. First of all, an enormous amount of work has been done around campus and some departments have completed this task. I don't know the quality of it and I don't know whether these documents are going to be accepted by the administration. But it would seem to me incredible that the Senate would not permit those departments to go forward. Those documents will be reviewed by the administration and if they are of any use, they may serve as a guideline to all of us. After all, maybe somebody knows how to do this.

The second aspect is in line with the comment that was made a moment ago by our non-tenured colleague. The Senate and the Senate Council have received comments, and the Chairman spoke to this issue on one occasion, regarding the administration's rejection of giving reasons in writing for non-award of tenure. Many non-tenured members, and some tenured members of this body, raised the issue of reconsideration of that issue. I think the non-tenured members of the faculty are going to be doubly disappointed that now the Senate, itself, is acting to rescind what appeared to be a reasonable action.

These are my reasons for urging you to defeat the motion. Thank you very much.

Professor Ulmer:

Mr. Chairman, I find the comments of the last four speakers of great interest but I regret to say that they run to matters other than those covered in the resolution being offered. I would like to call the attention

of the Senators to the resolution and to the fact that it refers to the ambiguity of Recommendation 5. It does not refer to any of these philosophical questions that have been debated in the last 20 minutes. I would hope, therefore, that when we vote on the resolution, we can vote on that question, namely, "Is Recommendation 5, as it now stands ambiguous or not and is that sufficiently serious to warrant support of the resolution?"

I would think, too, that it might be wise, given the widespread and intense concern over Recommendation 5, as it now stands, that we not be hasty, that we be willing to take the time, if we are interested, to draft some further recommendation regarding these matters of tenure, inviting all those who wish to have input into that process, to have it. I believe the input generated will be a little more interested this time than last when Recommendation 5 was part of a more extensive document.

So I would hope that the Senate would support the Resolution on that basis.

Professor Rea:

We are being called on, however, not to judge whether it is ambiguous but to discuss whether or not we shall rescind it. We might have several reasons for doing this. It seems to me that we were called on to accept some standards here and I can think of three very good reasons for not doing so. I have heard them all stated here in various languages. Reason number one: We really have no standards; Reason number two: We have but we wouldn't want anybody to know what they are; Reason number three: We might find ourselves unable to verbalize them.

Dr. Longyear:

I want to speak in favor of retaining Recommendation 5 after originally having opposed it last spring. From the standpoint of drawing up these standards at several meetings this fall, I think it was an extremely valuable experience for all of us. Admittedly, we are a relatively small group; but we do know the people who are full professors and associate professors here as well as at other major universities. We know what they have done in order to attain these ranks. So from this standpoint, I think it was a very valuable experience. It is very helpful for the junior faculty in showing where their priorities lie. I will say, too, that there was no pressure whatever brought to bear by any administrative officer upon us in preparing our guidelines. It is important to have these guidelines in the event that there are people who do meet and exceed these minimum guidelines but who may be destroyed through a kind of academic infighting or factionalism, which we hope we will not see on this campus. I think it is of imperative importance that these road maps be here for the guidance of the junior faculty, and that the junior faculty know that promotion and tenure are attained through the meeting of certain kinds of objective standards.

Professor Charron:

What I have to say is not of substance but just of essence. I think we are faced with the problem of those who are "in" and those who are "out." The "outs" would like to know the best way to get in and the "ins" possibly, would like to make it more difficult for the "outs" to do so. In different institutions, and even here, I have seen the administration caught in

between when "ins" are trying to keep some "outs" out; and the administration sometimes is forced to do things it did not want to do, because of regulations, overregulated advisory committees, and so on. I do feel that Recommendation 5, the way it is worded, does not answer the need of the "outs" to know how they can get in and leaves too much to the interpretation of the "ins" on which standard you get the "outs" in or keep them out. I urge you to rescind Recommendation 5.

Professor Ivey:

The problem in these debates is that I really agree with everybody. I would like to know how those departments that have been unable to articulate their standards justify their decisions to the persons they turn down? Or don't they feel they have to do this? I would like to know how one goes about communicating the reasons for his decision if he doesn't know what the criteria are.

Professor Just:

I was one of the people that voted against all nine items that came before this Senate last spring, because I felt every one of them was ambiguous. I find it rather remarkable that a year later the only item in which the faculty is being asked to straighten out the ambiguity, now (the faculty) maintains that it can't straighten (the ambiguity) out. All the other items, to which we do not have to address ourselves, as individual faculty, can still stay and still remain ambiguous. The one item which I thought would clear up the ambiguity, and I voted for, was to give written reasons for dismissal because I felt that perhaps when people were forced to give written reasons, they would straighten out the ambiguity. Now you should look at the others. Please, look at them. I suggest that you look at every one of these criteria if you are going to vote against this one and I am in favor of voting this one down. You must logically reconsider them all.

Dr. Jaros:

It seems to me that no matter how one looks at each individual promotion and tenure situation, it is going to have to involve a judgment. What I am concerned about is that the proposal for minimum standards moves in the direction of substituting a mechanistic formula for a judgment. I trust that is not the intention of the people who drew the original document. Nonetheless, it seems to me there is sufficient concern that this is what the implication of this proposal is -- the substitution of a mechanistic formula. That certainly cannot be and should not be the aim. I trust it is not. I hope it is not. The fact that many departments find they are unable to comply with this request suggests to me that we really are not sure what it is we are expected to do. Are we expected to draw up a mechanistic formula? I don't know. Our Department did not know. I think the thrust of the proposal to rescind is communicating precisely this message. What is it that this proposal urges departments to do. I don't know what this urges departments to do. Let us rescind it and move more specifically to address this problem.

Dean Hardy:

I apologize for rising this late in the debate. It seems to me there are two things that are involved here. One of those is communication

of standards in various disciplines, to advisory committees and the administration, and some collective verbalization by individual faculties. If you want to do that, you don't have to have this kind of standard in order to be able to do it. You can do it. The Law faculty in 1967 communicated and sent forward to the Vice President, for use by the Advisory Committee, a description of what a typical law professor's meandering through his career would look like. That communication is perfectly available without any official action being taken.

The other thing that seems to me is involved here is the idea of giving people guarantees as to what will get them promoted. I suggest to you that that is one of the most dangerous things you can do. It concerns me very greatly because, as an administrator, I can certainly see someone coming in to the office and saying "I have met these minimum standards." -- the mechanistic standard that was just described -- "Why didn't you promote?" "It is our collective judgment that on a quality basis [or some other basis] it just wasn't good enough. You have met the minimums but you didn't go far enough above the minimums." How far above the minimums will get someone promoted? For those who desire the security of having written standards, I rather think this will make their lot more difficult and more painful, rather than easier. And so I think, not only on the same basis, legalistic though it is, that Professor Ulmer has suggested, that these philosophical questions are not precisely the question we are voting on; nevertheless I suggest, for philosophical reasons, the action previously taken should be rescinded.

Professor Goldman:

I think the time has come for us to look at Recommendation 5 systematically. The last two statements, I think, focus on two words in item (1) out of a total of five different items in Recommendation 5. And the entire Recommendation seems to be mischaracterized as a result of focus on these two words. The first thing that needs to be said is directed to the standard that sets forth "normal balance" and I emphasize the word "normal." It is not a minimum standard, it is not a fixed standard, it is not a mechanistic standard. It is a guideline instead of a standard: "The normal balance between teaching, scholarship, creative productivity, and service in the discipline."

The second item, "The means for determining quality of teaching.", is talking about a procedure; not a mechanistic, minimum kind of score or some particular type of device to satisfy this requirement.

The third, and this is the one that seems to be creating all the problems: "The minimum research requirements for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor." Dr. Ulmer raised two concerns that went to the proposal that is on the floor: One group is those who want to do away with the whole process of trying to, on a discipline by discipline basis, set forth more detailed standards; the other group is those who seem to be focusing on what they consider to be an ambiguity created here. Does this mean that there has to be a mechanistic formula for the amount of research? I assume that the real fear is that we are going to come up with some quantitative figure as to what must be produced in the way of research. I think that feeling was not the intent when we voted in favor of this Recommendation last spring. If you will look to the other paragraphs of Recommendation 5, the standards have to be justified in terms of

standards used outside of school, to disciplines nationwide, and these standards must then be submitted to review in terms of satisfying the general University requirements. I don't see any danger in anyone setting up a mechanistic interpretation of that phrase "minimum research requirements" in terms of a minimum number of pages of research being published. The next item, "The means for determining the quality of scholarship . . ." deals with a procedural guideline: How we go about making that judgment (and that surely has to be a judgment), how we go about making that judgment as to whether this is good, bad, or mediocre research. "The kinds of scholarship and creative productivity most acceptable in the discipline." is the last item. This, again, is descriptive. It is not setting any kind of mechanistic, minimum standard. I think if we look at what Recommendation 5 is, the fears of ambiguity will evaporate.

Professor Simon presented a motion that the Senate vote on the question on the floor. The Senate approved this motion.

A Senator asked for a hand count of the vote that was about to be taken on the main motion on the floor. Chairman Smith stated that the Rules of the University Senate, Section I-4, 2.3 Meetings, (c) specifies that there may be a roll call vote on the request of the Senate or at the direction of the Chair. He stated that there had been much said on this issue; that the Senate would be voting for a second time within nine months; and, therefore, it was the decision of the Chair to direct a roll call vote on this issue.

Chairman Smith then restated the motion on the floor that the Senators were ready to vote on. It is also restated here:

"Whereas Recommendation Five of the Report of the ad hoc Committee to Evaluate Tenure and Promotion as amended and passed by the Senate on 22 April, 1974 is ambiguous, the University Senate hereby rescinds its adoption of that recommendation and respectfully requests of the President of the University that he suspend all actions taken pursuant to the recommendation."

The Senate approved the motion to accept the Petition for forwarding to President Singletary by a roll call vote of 82 to 42. The results of the roll call vote follow:

Michael Adelstein	N	Norman Billups	N
Lawrence Allen		Harold Binkley	
Gerald Ashdown		Joan Blythe	
Ruth Assell		Peter Bosomworth	
Dwight Auvenshine		Robert Bostrom	
Lyle N. Back	Y	Garnett Bradford	
Harry H. Bailey	Y	Thomas Brehm	Y
John Banwell	N	Sam Brown	
Lisa K. Barclay		Herbert Bruce	
Harry Barnard	Y	Joseph Bryant	Y
Charles Barnhart		Frank Buck	Y
Jackie Barry		James Buckholtz	N
Jerry Baskin	N	H. Stuart Burness	
Robert Belin		John Butler	
Robert Benton		Carl Cabe	

Jean Charron	Y	Thomas Hansbrough	Y
Michael Clawson		Merrell Hansen	N
Elizabeth Clotfelter	Y	Bobby Hardin	Y
Lewis W. Cochran	Y	George Hardy	Y
Henry Cole	N	Mary W. Hargreaves	N
Anthony Colson	Y	Jesse Harris	
Frank Colton	Y	Allan Hauth	
Bruce Combest		Richard Hayes	
Ronda S. Connaway	Y	Virgil Hays	Y
Foy Cox		Rita Hawkins	
Alfred Crabb	N	Andrew J. Hiatt	Y
Clifford Cremers		Martha Hicks	
James Criswell		Nancy Holland	N
Ward Crowe	Y	Elizabeth Howard	N
T. Z. Csaky	Y	Patricia Horridge	
Tim Cunningham		Eugene Huff	
Vincent Davis		Charles Hughes	
John Deacon	Y	Hope Hughes	
Patrick DeLuca		Charles Hultman	
George W. Denemark	N	Robert Ireland	
Stephen Diachun	Y	Donald Ivey	N
Ronald Dillehay	Y	Roy K. Jarecky	
John Dittrich	Y	Dean Jaros	Y
Bette Dollase		Joseph R. Jones	N
Herbert Drennon	Y	Margaret Jones	Y
Vincent Drnevich	Y	John Just	Y
Mary Duffy		James Kemp	
Ray H. Dutt	Y	Gregory Kendrick	
Paul Eakin	Y	William Kenkel	
Anthony Eardley		William Kennedy	
W. W. Ecton		Paul Kim	
Fred Edmonds	Y	James Kincheloe	
Roger Eichhorn	Y	Don Kirkendall	Y
Michael Etzel	Y	James Knoblett	
Robert Evans		Joseph Krislov	N
Thomas Field		Virginia Lane	
Doane Fischer		David Larimore	N
Paul Forand	Y	Sara Leech	Y
Thomas R. Ford		Albert Levy	
Michael Freeman	Y	Gene Lewis	
James E. Funk		Gordon Liddle	N
Fletcher Gabbard	Y	Arthur Lieber	Y
Art Gallaher		John Lihani	N
Jess Gardner		Rey Longyear	N
Claudine Gartner		Charles Ludwig	N
Hans Gesund	Y	William Lyons	Y
James Gibson		Donald Madden	
James Gladden	N	Paul Mandelstam	Y
Alvin Goldman	N	James Marsden	
Zakkula Govindarajulu	Y	William L. Matthews	
Ward O. Griffen		Michael McCord	Y
Elaine Grubbs		Levis McCullers	Y
George Gunther		Susan McEvoy	
Merlin Hackbart		Randolph McGee	
Joseph Hamburg		Marion McKenna	Y
Holman Hamilton	Y	Carolyn McKinney	

Gregory McNulty	N	Stanford Smith	Abstained
William Miles		Herbert Sorenson	
Mary Minter	N	Don Soule	
George Mitchell	Y	David Spaeth	N
William Moody		Lynn Spruill	Y
James T. Moore		Earl L. Steele	
Joe Moore	Y	John Stephenson	Y
Brian Motley		J. Truman Stevens	Y
David Mucci		Marjorie Stewart	Y
Robert Noble	N	Anne Stiene	Y
Roger Nooe		William Stober	
James Ogletree	Y	Ted Suffridge	Y
Thomas Olschewsky		Willis Sutton	N
Leonard Packett	Y	Louis Swift	Y
Blaine Parker	Y	Joseph Swintosky	
Harold F. Parks	Y	William C. Templeton	Y
Bobby C. Pass	Y	Sherrell Testerman	
Anne E. Patterson	Y	Carlene Thacker	N
David Peck	N	Leonard Tipton	
Carl Peter	Y	Carl Tower	N
William Peters	Y	Harold Traurig	N
Jean Pival	N	Sidney Ulmer	Y
Richard Rankin	Y	Kristin Valentine	N
John Rea	N	Harwin Voss	
Barbara Reed		William Wagner	Y
Opal Reynolds	Y	Thomas Waldhart	N
Donald Ringe	N	John Walker	
Frank Rizzo	Y	Stanley Wall	
Thurlof Robe	Y	Richard Warren	Y
Wimberly Royster		O'Neal Weeks	N
Robert Rudd		Jesse Weil	N
Betty Rudnick	N	Daniel Weiss	
Kathryn Sallee		Kennard Wellons	
Donald Sands	Y	Rebecca Westerfield	
William Sartoris	N	Bruce Westley	Y
Kenneth Schiano		Paul Willis	Y
Rudolph Schriels	Y	Constance Wilson	
Robert Sedler	Y	Miroslava Winer	
D. Milton Shuffett		William Winternitz	
Pam Sievers		Judith Worell	N
Sheldon Simon	Y	Kenneth Wright	N
Gerard Silberstein	Y	Randy Wynkoop	
Peter Skelland	Y	Roy Yarbrough	Y
Brad Smith		Fred Zechman	Y

Chairman Smith announced that by action of the Senate in delegating its authority to the Senate Council, the candidates for degrees at the December 21, 1974 graduation date, as circulated to the faculty under date of November 13, 1974 with a subsequent addition of one name circulated under date of November 20, 1974, were approved by the Council for transmittal to the Board of Trustees, and are on file in the Registrar's Office.

Kristin Valentine	N	Rebecca Westerfield	
Harwin Voss		Bruce Westley	Y
William Wagner	Y	Paul Willis	Y
Thomas Waldhart	N	Constance Wilson	
John Walker		Miroslava Winer	
Stanley Wall		William Winternitz	
Richard Warren	Y	Judith Worell	N
O'Neal Weeks	N	Kenneth Wright	N
Jesse Weil	N	Randy Wynkoop	
Daniel Weiss		Roy Yarbrough	Y
Kennard Wellons		Fred Zechman	Y

Chairman Smith announced that by action of the Senate in delegating its authority to the Senate Council, the candidates for degrees at the December 21, 1974 graduation date, as circulated to the faculty under date of November 13, 1974 with a subsequent addition of one name circulated under date of November 20, 1974, were approved by the Council for transmittal to the Board of Trustees, and are on file in the Registrar's Office.

The Chairman announced that the next item on the agenda was a proposed change in the Rules of the University Senate, Section V-3, 1.5 Audit, circulated to the faculty under date of November 26, 1974. He then called on the Secretary of the Senate Council, Dr. Roger Eichhorn, to present the motion:

The University Senate Council and the Senate Standing Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards recommend approval of the proposed change in the Rules of the University Senate, V, 1.5 pertaining to Audit, to be effective immediately.

Dr. Ockerman addressed the Senate as follows:

Mr. Chairman, may I speak against this motion. I recognize the change is the underscored part. I think there are a number of things that have not been taken into consideration when we build into the system of grade reporting this kind of action. For example, by this mechanism we are suggesting that the student not be notified of what action has been taken until the conclusion of the semester, which I think is somewhat unfair. Secondly, there are a number of considerations, admitting that some of this machinery should be cleared up perhaps at an earlier time. They involve students that would probably get us into difficulty as we looked across the course of the semester and waited until the end of the semester, to take this particular action. If we are getting into changing further this regulation, which we are not considering for the moment, it is not suggested that the Committee could have standardized the time when we do complete a number of transactions. For example, if we did want to change the time of audit to credit and credit to audit, we could make it uniform, making it probably the last day of registration. This would conform with the present rules under changing Pass-Fail to Pass-Fail or changing out of Pass-Fail, that would conform with the last day for the combination drop-add to transactions to take place. It seems to me that we are not accomplishing anything; in fact, we are probably creating more difficulty for a number of students and are still not getting consistency in enforcement of the action by this motion.

On question, Dr. Ockerman said he was suggesting that this proposed change be referred back to the Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards for further consideration.

Following discussion, motion was made to send this back to the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee. The Senate approved this motion.

Motion was made to adjourn and the Senate approved this motion. The Senate adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary

OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS AND REGISTRAR

CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES

December 21, 1974

GRADUATE DEGREES

Ph.D	35
Ed.D.	7
D.B.A.	2
M.A.	29
M.S.	36
M.S. Agr.	4
M.S. Agr. Eng.	2
M.S. Ch. Eng.	6
M.S. Civ. Eng.	4
M.S. E.E.	4
M.S. Me. Eng.	2
M.A. Edu.	33
M.S. Edu.	15
M.S. Acct.	4
M.B.A.	10
M.S.L.S.	18
M.S.H.E.	4
M.F.A.	2
M.S. Nur.	3
M.S. Cl. Nu.	1
TOTAL	221

PROFESSIONAL DEGREES

Juris Doctor	41
PharmD.	2

UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES

Arts and Sciences	
B.A.	124
B.S.	23
B.M. Mus. Edu.	11
B. Gen. Stu.	42
B.M.	1
TOTAL	201

Agriculture

B.S. Agr.	50
B.S. For.	7
TOTAL	57

Engineering

B.S. Ag. Eng.	6
B.S. Civ. Eng.	31
B.S. Chem. Eng.	4
B.S. Elec. Eng.	15
B.S. Mech. Eng.	19
TOTAL	75

Education

B.A. Edu.	166
-----------	-----

Business and Economics

B.B.A.	55
B.S. Acct.	48
B.S. B&E	4
TOTAL	107

Architecture

B. Arch.	9
----------	---

Allied Health

B. Hlth. Sci.	17
---------------	----

Home Economics

B.S. H.E.	48
-----------	----

Pharmacy

B.S. Phar.	38
------------	----

Social Professions

B.A. Soc. Work	38
----------------	----

Nursing

B.S. Nursing	1
--------------	---

SUMMARY

Graduate Degrees	221
Professional Degrees	42
Undergrad Degrees	757
TOTAL	1020

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Wimberly Calvin Royster, Dean

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Douglas Eldon Barnett	Jay Steuart Merriam
Ichen Chana	Ernest Donald Metivier
Chihung Chu	John Ker Munro, Jr.
Mary Coulson Corley	James Wilbur Nelson
Alfonso C. Delfierro, Jr.	Jerold Newburger
John Galbraith Duncan	Robert Eugene Pulse
William Elliott Ellis	James Richard Ramsey
Carroll Bruce Fitch, Jr.	Carroll David Kawn
Don F. Flatt	Phillip Lowell Russell
Paul Calvin Hager	Pearl Black Rutledge
James Lewis Hamilton	Michael D. Scholusser
David Dale Lanier	Marilyn Verena Schuler
Sandi Lieb	Shirley M. Snarr
Carla Yvonne Lowenberg	Salomon Ayzenman Stavchansky
Laura B. Luszeynska	Russell Wayne Sutton
Robert Franklin Maddox	Roger Dean Walker
Cornelia Thompson Makita	Lana Sue Weckbach
	Richard E. Zartman

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Faurest Earl Coogle	Catherine Voelker Morsink
Richard Kenan Crosby	Charles Douglas Wade
Marie T. Doyle	Robert Anthony Wieseman
Elizabeth Anne Kirlin	

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Larry Richard Domer	Michael John Ryan
---------------------	-------------------

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

Alison Fae Alexander	Patricia Hedley Howard
Melvin Slay Arrington, Jr.	Barbara Ward Howenstine
Robert Andrew Batts	James Andrew Kingsbury
John Fredrick Bowman II	Sue Carrol Lake
Hallie Karen Brinkerhoff	Patricia Mary Mellen
William Bennett Cogar	David Foster Miller
Helen Crabtree	Jean Shank Miller
Graciela Delosreyes Delamo	Sam Stowe Petty
John Thomas Dever	William C. Pfeifle
Eva Roianm Dixon	Philip Arnn Reemes
George William Finch	David A. Smith
Elizabeth Whitton Haley	Kathryn R. White
Paul A. Hasak, Jr.	James Darrell Wyss
Allan Clarence Hauth	
Nathaniel Brandon Haynes	
Dorothy Marie Hope	

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

Loreta Chew Ang
Geza G. Bruckner
Rayford Stephen Cantrell
Elizabeth Ann Coy
Paul Edward Cranley
Mamerto D. Damasco
Walter James Deister, Jr.
Dennis Lee Duvall
Gary Martin Hill
Chaiwat Hongngam
Robert Allen Jones
David Charles Jordan
Arlene Ruth Kindel
Charas Kitbamroong
Nongporn Allapach Kitbamroong
Mary Lucille Lageman
Kreg Allen Leymaster
Stuart Taylor Martin

Dianne Elizabeth Miller
David Lee Nickel
Theodore James Mertens, Jr.
Katherine D. Noonning
John W. Pittock III
Apichart Pongsrihadulchai
Herbert D. Rice
Dumre Roongsook
Robert Williams Rosebrough
Jeffrey Howell Schwartz
Donald Michael Smith
Dennis Floyd Stewart
Sarakit Thawinprawat
Mary Louise Thompson
Calvin Ray Vanniewaal
John Ernest Wilbanks
Arunee Wongkobrat
Manouchehr Zartoshti

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN AGRICULTURE

Johnson Olu Adedeji
Louis Wayne Chittenden

Grady Franklin Cook
Somchai Patiyuth

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

Thomas Cromwell Bridges

Chanchai Rojansaroj

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN CHEMICAL ENGINEERING

Ray Edward Barker, Jr.
Richard Leslie Cooper
Glenn Eagley Hilton

Anthony Joseph Zehnder, Jr.
Paul Leon Schwartz
Arvind Vishnvdas Shah

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN CIVIL ENGINEERING

Rondal Gene Allen
Barry Clifton House

S. Dean Perry
Harry Joseph Sterling, Jr.

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING

Ronald Evans Battle
Darell Dean Cronch

Timothy Allen Green
Victor Michael Simi

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MECHANICAL ENGINEERING

Mohan Lal Gupta

Chi Tsuen Young

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN EDUCATION

Wanda Gaye Alford
Arlean Jeanette Arnold
Jim C. Barnes

Mary Elva Bartlett
Linda A. Berezin
Jane Hurt Binford

Candidates for the Degree of Master of Arts in Education - cont

Deborah Ann Bridwell
Rose Leah Caudill
Susan May Davis
Ruth Elizabeth Doan
Judy Sharon Floyd
Carolynn Renee Foster
Lindsay Lee Grace
Babette Mann Huber
Robert Gerald Humphreys
Alice Lepage Martinson
Levi Peterson, Jr.
Sandra Slone Pratt
Carla Tackett Reynolds
Sharron Kaye Rodgers

Winford Frances Salyers
John Raphael Skeese
Loretta Haggard Smith
Penny Kristine Smith
Wanda Harmon Sprinkle
Debra Holmes Starr
Janet Ann Teuton
Charlotte Wurth Thompson
Barrie Jill Walker
Rita Diane Weber
William Thomas Wise
Charlotte B. Wright
Phyllis Bowling Youngblood

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATION

Noe Ardila
Richard Watts Franklin
Ellen Sue Friedman
Ann Reed Gaines
Harriette Ellen Hard
Alan J. Kite
Susan Jo McCown
Bonnie F. Ruschell

Judy Ann Schoettle
Phyllis Ann Simpson
Lynn Rose Smirnow
Anthony Earl Smith
Margaret B. Varble
Larri Glenn Vaught
Julia Damron Voelker

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN ACCOUNTING

Sally Lane Bench
Richard Alan Callahan

Lester E. Downing, Jr.
Jean Hunter Naylor

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

George Thomas Beckett
Robert Lee Caskey
Charles Michael Gwynn
Richard Lee Hayden
Robert Lee Hesch, Jr.

Michael Manuel Kouremetis
Gordon Foster Oates, Jr.
Paul Rodney Powell
Dennis James Schuhmann
Charles Joseph Walters

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN LIBRARY SCIENCE

Nancy Lynn Arn
Janet Irene Bargo
Nancy Bartnik
Lorayne Radtke Burns
Kathleen Ann Colson
James Chancellor Dorsey
Lillah Begley Farmer
Jeffrey Russell Fox
Gary Allen Golden
Barbara Carol Harris

Sandra Kay Ireland
Martha Alleen McInnes
Alan Nichter
Arturo Vigildo Parra
Charles Alden Seavey
Penny Dillard Shelby
Jane Fleming Smith
Sawantha Sherrann Witt

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN HOME ECONOMICS

John Ray Davis
Hyeran Y. Kook

Frances Gabron Morris
Liju Tsai

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF FINE ARTS

Larry Graham Hackley

Dennis Stuart Voss

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN NURSING

Jeanne Suzanne Dotson
Linda C. Hutchison

Phyllis Jane Long

CANDIDATE FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN CLINICAL NUTRITION

Irene Yacura Joseph

COLLEGE OF LAW

George W. Hardy III, Dean

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF JURIS DOCTOR

Thomas William Amann
Steven Earl Anderson
Kenneth R. Andrews, Jr.
Charles Justice Baird
Stephen Capers Baker
Stephen Brooks Bright
John Tyler Carneal
Michael Byrley Colgan
Ansel L. Davis, Jr.
Benjamin Sory Fletcher III
James Gordon Goad
David Goin III
Timothy Tevis Green
Ross Harris
Damon Wilson Harrison, Jr.
Morris Lane Harvey
John Edward Heer III
Alva Adams Hollon, Jr.
A. David Lemaster
Linda Dianne Lowry
Leslie Major

Aubrey Ray Mooney
Michael Jay OHara
Patrick D. Pace
Richard Henry Peek, Jr.
William Dyer Probus
William Maynard Reed
Stephen Patrick Pobey
Thomas Linton Self
Wayne Joseph Simon
Terry Keaton Stevens
William Edwards Taylor
Robert Lee Templeton
Sandra Motte Varellas
Robert Lewis Walker
Larry Alan Wiggins
Thomas Lynn Williamson
Robert A. Wohn, Jr.
Ernie Lee Woods
Joseph John Zaluski
Phelps Lewis Lambert

COLLEGE OF PHARMACY

Joseph V. Swintosky, Dean

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHARMACY

Edward Robert Leist

Timothy A. Pence

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Art Gallaher, Dean

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS

Henry Eugene Abell
Joan B. Arlet
Sharon Kay Arnold

Franklin Thomas Baldridge
Robert Gordon Beamer
Barry Mark Bleach
Larry Brent Boggs

Candidates for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts - cont

Francis Timothy Boldrick	Marilyn Joan McCray
Dennis Randall Bowling	Howard Bensley McNeeley
Maureen Donovan Carman	Rebecca Jo Mechling
Walter Kirkpatrick Catinna	Flora Katherine Messer
Nancy Jo Christensen	Chester Lafferty
Franklin Arthur Collins	Sue Ann Runyon
Rebecca Jean Conyers	Oksana Marta Mostowycz
Evelyn Taylor Cook	Earl Victor Mullins
James Donald Cooper	Leslie Delancey Murphy
Anna Louise Cordon	Joseph A. Nalepa
James Dirk Cotton	Kevin Miles Noland
William B. Craig	Nellie Hamm Owen
Sharon Ann Crissey	Katherine Susan Pattison
Harvey Waymon Daniels	Elizabeth Ann Pesciotta
Gale Marie Davenport	Michael Francis Peters
Lea Brooks Davis	Charles Franklin Ratliff
Patricia Douglas Davis	Connie Lee Ratliff
Nancy Elise Davison	Teddy Paul Raybould
William Gary Demunbrun	Jill Patricia Raymond
Katherine Lynn Dickson	Paul E. Reilender, Jr.
Nancy Ellen Diogoid	Mark Riggs
Leslie Eileen Dodd	Letitia Ann Ritter
Patricia Ann Donohue	Gilbert E. Roberts
Daniel O'Connell Douglass	Gene Powell Rogers
Kenneth Lee Drummer	John Geary Scott
Virginia Ellen Dunn	Patricia Maureen Shea
Danny Ray Ellis	Rose Ellen Sisco
Rhonda Lee Eversole	Carolyn Marie Smith
Vicki Balint Frantz	Nancy Allen Stambaugh
Carol Ann Gilbert	Mary Pauline Stanton
Sherry Forman Graft	Genie Elizabeth Sterett
Gary Martin Green	John Thomas Stigler
Ronald Michael Green	Antim Golden Straus
Sharon Marie Grisham	Robert Joseph Sturdivant
Shelly Ann Gudgel	Granville Lewis Sutherland II
Robert W. Gutmann	James Russell Swanson
Walter E. Harding	Jennifer Ann Swartz
John Winston Harris	David Tharpe Thompson
Eric Jay Hassell	Francis Arron Tongate
Mary Parrigin Hershey	Chari Lynn Tranjan
Lawrence Lee Hewitt	Beverly Jeanne Vanlaningham
Nancy Hopkins	Elizabeth Hundley Vaughan
Glenn John Horton	Susan Ann Vessels
Robert Lon Horton	Jennifer Jo Wallace
Marcy Susan Hymson	Stuart Hunt Warner
Vicki Lynn James	Nicholas Lee Whelan
Susan Elizabeth Kayser	Michael Allan White
Katherine McNeill Kearney	Scott Thomas White
Kenneth Lee Kring	Margaret Leigh Wickstrom
Constance White Krippenstapel	Robert Montgomery Wilhite III
Stephen Dale Little	Brenda Ann Williams
James Edward Mackell	Susan Lynn Wiseman
Christine Ann Maddox	Nancy Elinor Wooderson
Teri L. Marks	Donna Raelin Woodward
Beverly H. Mason	Charles Huff Wright IV
Martyne Mason	Michael Mackager York
Stephen Anthony Massie	Edward F. Younger III
Fred Hollis Mayne	
Nancy Fay McClure	
Rebecca Ann McCraith	

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE

Thomas Carl Ammon
Vernon Cosby Badham III
Carol Jean Baker
Jeffrey Allen Bierman
Michael Wayne Bourque
Michael Brookes Cowley
Doug Charles Fussinger
Roger Michael Gerteisen
Kermit Donald Gibson
Robert Joseph Grachus
Hubert Hall, Jr.
David Williams Hertelendy

Donald Gene Keach
Donna Sue Kersey
Willa Ann Lilly
Barry Carter Moore
Stephen Kent Overall
Harlan Charles Peden II
Edward James Radin
Brian Lindsey Roberts
Raleigh Shepherd, Jr.
Charles Stewart Vose
Susan Kay Warren

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF MUSIC IN MUSIC EDUCATION

Beverly Ann Burhop
Catherine Ann Jones
Carey D. Kuhl
Daniel Eugene Miller
Brenda Belt Overall
Tandy Carol Patrick

Ginny Gagel Reasor
James Ray Redmond
Evelyn Marie Seymour
Jean Anne Shafferman
David James Thompson

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF GENERAL STUDIES

Luanne C. Arterburn
Jeffrey Lyle Aubrey
Clyde Elmer Bolton
John Roger Brown
Regina Culest Bynum
David Ralph Danforth
Daniel Steven Deyoung
Cornelius Deronde Dosker III
Tom Slick Ehlers
Larry Don Farmer
Janet Lynn Frazee
Douglas Kent Gooch
William Eugene Heisler
Paul Stewart Hilts, Jr.
Craig Sidney Howard
Bonnie Page Jacobs
Ernest Stanley Jones
J. Christopher Jones
Leone Marotta Keegan
John Gregg Keeton
Michael Douglas Kegler

Robert Edward Kegley
Debra Ann Kletter
Georgi Anna Ligon
Chandler Scott McEwan
Martin O'Neill Morgan
James Hazzard Patton III
Robert Timothy Picard
Stanley Allen Puckett
Stephanie Powell Reid
Teresa Marie Roberts
Michael Alan Roddick
Robert R. Rose, Jr.
Thomas Dale Saylor
Frank Arthur Seymour
Linda Mooser Stimmel
Katherine Valerie Tancredi
Thomas Anthony Tohill
David Thomas Tuttle
David Badgley Vanhorn
George Stephen Watkins
Michael James Wehle

CANDIDATE FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF MUSIC

Candyce Selley Wyche

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE

Charles Elmer Barnhart, Dean

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN AGRICULTURE

Bendni Dawson Allnutt, Jr.
Esby Keith Barber
Jessica Gay Bell
Harold Craig Bengé
James Michael Becknell
Michael Alfred Boice
Ronald Ray Brooks
Richard W. Caple
William Henry Courtney III
John Samuel Cox, Jr.
Thomas Orion Cox
Richard Myron Dartt
Lynn Elizabeth Dunn
Wayne Maurice Ebelhar
David Michael Finney
Barry Brandon Follett
Carole Johnson Gardner
John Fredrick Giesecke
Danny Joe Grigson
Michael Kent Hagan
Thomas Henry Hart
Terry Lee Heinrichs
Holly Dee Holbrook
James Donald Hoskins
John Cannon Hoskins

Gilda Gail Jennings
Ruth McMurtry John
Rodney Dale Kelly
William Rodes Kelly, Jr.
Theresa E. Kremer
Larry Wayne Marcum
Sandra Lee Margrave
Howard Carter Maupin
James Lee McCoy
Phillip Lee McGlone
Chris Sargent McLemore
Gary Dale Moore
Ray Martin Ragland
Sally May Reed
Paul Walter Robinson
Thomas Hackney Sayre
Marcia Ann Schroder
John Bage Shelburne
Joseph Edward Slack
Larry Hamilton Smith
Paul Sidney Snider
Douglas Lee Southworth
Russell Forrest Tucker
Shannon White
Thomas A. Willett

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN FORESTRY

Rebekah Gene Burke
Walter Ford
Lee F. Jackson
Gary Nolan Phelps

Gene Murray Robinson
Don William Turner
Jimmie Lynn Yeiser

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

James E. Funk, Dean

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

Donald Gayle Colliver
Samuel G. McNeill
Edward Allen Patton

Marshall B. Scott
Thomas Edward Skaggs
Stephen Ray Wyatt

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN CIVIL ENGINEERING

Craig Morgan Avery
William Vernon Azevedo
Sirouss Binaei
Charles W. Buckman, Jr.
David Lynn Burden
Warren Leslie Clifford
Dale Steven Decker

Richard Douglas Dutton
Kenneth Eugene Frazee
Charles Zachary Fuller
William Franklin Gadberry, Jr.
Norwood Garrison
Jack Joseph Gividen
Albert William Gross

Candidates for the Degree of Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering - cont

Leslie Meryl Haney
Gary Wayne House
Barry Lynn Hurst
Daniel Dallas Juett
John Hampton Laboon
Don Alan Lewis
Lin Alan Morris
Stephen L. Mulloy

Ted Allen Pullen
Terrell Lee Register
Mostafa Shayeghi
Robert Cline Smallwood
Djien Hwat So
Sarkis Tergevorkian
James Prewitt Utterback
Philip Fahey Wood
Robert Arnold Yeager

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN CHEMICAL ENGINEERING

James Everett Best
John Francis Dranschak

Harold Dean Jones II
William David Simpson

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING

Enoch Arden Bentley
James Michael Berry
Joseph Dale Blagg
James Hobson Boyd
Joseph Michael Buemi, Jr.
Robert Henry Cook
Robert Tracey Dye
Richard William Grubb

Samuel Dale Hardee
Danny Dale Hardin
Dennis Keith Magruder
David Chris Mason
Ronald Lee Millet
Paul Benjey Rupard
Philip Russell Simmons

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN MECHANICAL ENGINEERING

William Dale Adams
Clinton Dale Campbell
Keith Edgar Coe
David Lee Cotton
Mark Stephen Guignon
Harold James Klosterman III
David Leslie Krimm
Kenneth Harold Mimplitch
Joseph Blanc Mitchell
William Eugene Murphy

Lester Zeal Powell III
Firouz Rahimi
Greg W. Rauen
Charles Allen Rogge
Harry Glenn Starnes
Howard Dennis Stinson
Mitchell Horton Thomas
Doyle Jay Warriner
Robert Alan Young

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

George W. Denemark, Dean

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS IN EDUCATION

Donna Hardin Abner
Sara Hickerson Adams
John Harvey Alvarez
Charles Eric Anderson
Deborah Keleen Ashley
Sherilyn Sue Aubrey
Ralph Milton Ball
Raymond Felix Barga
David Bruce Barnett
Cherie Lynn Bauer
Ann Trower Bentley

Sheldia Rae Bishop
Vickie Carlee Blackburn
Doris Starr Blair
Arthur Ray Blanton, Jr.
Gilda Jane Boggs
Karen Sue Borchers
Janet Carol Botkin
John Wilson Brandenburg, Jr.
Allen Branscum
Charles Herbert Brenneis, Jr.
Sara Rebecca Bright

Candidates for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts in Education - cont

Ann Michelle Brown	Eileen Joanne Heise
Kathy Burchett	Constance Ann Heppler
Vicki Diane Burroughs	Deborah Sue Herdt
Brenda Collins Burton	Harry Glenn Hill
Shelby Thomas Bush III	Peter Hollitt
Jim Randall Bushong	James Cecil Howard
Rose Mountjoy Campbell	Margarette Ann Hubbard
Pauline Carnahan	Barbara Jean Hundley
Pamela Wilkie Catron	Mary Dianne Ison
Barbara Louise Coleman	Jayne Ann Joseph
Belva C. Collins	Cindy Fenton Kelly
Maureen Joe Connell	Bruce Edward Kunze
Alberta Thomas Cramer	Patricia Anne Kwedar
Cynthia Diane Crews	Kelley Lynn Lamaster
Roger Dale Cross	Joyce Conway Lee
Carol Lee Crump	Karen Drue Lee
Kathleen Sue Culley	Homer Paul Lovelace
Lawrence Barnard Cundiff	Gary Stephen Luttrell
Deborah Kay Dariano	Debra Wesner Lynn
Nancy Carpenter Davis	Michael Leo Maguire
Janice Raye Dawes	Diana Lynn Martin
Charles Philip Dean	George Lewis Maxwell, Jr.
Anne McManness Decker	Lynn Hatcher McGary
Saundra Bunch Donovan	Ronald Wayne McKenney
Rebecca Ann Duane	Frank Ronald Medley
Patricia Osborne Dudgeon	James William Metcalf
Karen Diane Duncan	Virginia Rose Miller
Candace Lou Dunham	James Emanuel Mingo
Mary Shearer Dyke	Donna Gayle Mitchell
Andrew William Etzel	Cathy Patrice Mize
Virginia Carol Eubank	Kathleen Ann Mohan
Marilyn Kinder Fellows	Pamela Cropper Moore
Russell Louis Ferguson	Stephen Albert Moore
Gwendolyn Parry Field	Marie Morgan
Deborah Leitch Fleeman	James Marshall Morris
Kathy Dale Fletcher	Phyllis Michelle Mason
Franklin Lyles Foster	Wendy Lee Naegel
Gill Michael Fowler	Rae Inez Neal
Pamela Sue George	Diane Fae Nettles
H. R. Giles	Lynn Douglas Noe
Noreen Dougherty Gooch	Joy Ann Odea
Herbert Wayne Goodman	Karen Marcia Orlandi
Joy Ann Goodrich	Deborah Carol Osborne
Donald Steven Grizzle	Howard Kenneth Osborne
Martha Hutchins Grubbs	Anne Arnold Parker
Robertta Ashmore Gunn	Fred Loy Partin, Jr.
Ewing Moody Hall	Suzanne Ferguson
Charlotte Haydon Hapak	Patricia Lynn Perry
Charlotte Lynn Hardesty	Jane Bilbrey Phillips
Randell Edward Harrison	Ernestine Hale Ping
Elissa Lee Hatcher	Carole Cooper Ramsey
Elizabeth Lynn Hatcher	Sarah Whitley Ratliff
Karen S. Hauck	Susan Jane Richardson
Darrell Lind Hayes	Vicki Lynn Riffe
Rita Ann Hayes	Janet Taylor Rogers
	Nancy Jane Rosenfield

Candidates for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts in Education - cont

Nancy Carol Ross	Richard Kent Vail
Jonnie Jean Rowland	Teresa Ann Vance
Mark Richard Sallee	Rhonda Jean Vandiver
Pamela Short Schapiro	Mary Evelyn Vass
Marion Dawn Sides	Penny Mattill Vaught
Linda Carroll Simpson	Wayde Franklin Walker
Karen Janell Smallwood	James Leslie Wheat
Ethel McCarriar Smith	Sammy Wayne Wheatley
Joseph Russell Snowden	Alison Carol Whedon
Annetta Burden Stewart	Deborah Williams Wheeler
Gerald F. Stribling	Beverly Diane Williams
Sherry Lee Oliver	Malinda Daugherty Williams
Deborah Georgianna Surer	Shelia Layne Williams
Patricia Ann Sewasy	Diana Ruth Wilson
Sue McDonnell Swindle	Julie Scott Wilson
Margaret M. Taylor	Ruby Cress Wrenn
Robert Ray Turner	

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS

William W. Ecton, Acting Dean

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

John Nelson Behen	Joseph Stanley Morley
Gerald Manuel Belcher	Paschal Henry Osborne
Robert Douglas Boggs	James E. Payne III
Roderic McClain Brown	Gary Ray Plunkett
Richard Brooks Brumfield	Lex Coleman Pugh
Mark Stephen Campbell	Stephen James Pulliam
Roger Charles Cecil	David Frank Quam
Dryce Anderson Clarke	Michael Gregory Rains
Bruce Michael Colbert	Richard Willett Russell
John Christopher Colvin	Gayle Coleman Sallee
James Michael Dixon	John William Sears II
Charles Clifford Dykes	Samuel Ronald Simpson IV
Anne Catherine Eby	Thomas Allen Smith
Christopher John Faust	Gregory Alan Speck
Hugh Kevin Fister	Wayne Ogle Stephens
Richard Allen Ford	William Joseph Stevens
Keith Edward Habenstein	John Lee Thompson
Charles Edwin Hamlin, Jr.	Robert Dowell Tye
Robert A. Handsford	Jeffrey Nelson Vogel
Charles David Kelly	Wendell Dean Warner
David Lawrence Lawson	Isaac Daniel Waugh, Jr.
Douglas Lee Luick	Stephen Lee Whalen
Mark Rihn Mathis	Byron Carlyle Wilhoit
Larry Marvin McDonald	Richard Gene Williams
Dennis Lee McGowan	Ralph Vaughn Wilson II
Brian Hartley McKeown	Samuel Paul Wrede
Timothy Kermit Mercer	
Danny Rhea Middleton	

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN ACCOUNTING

Frank Ray Blair	Kenneth Wilson Coyle
Claude Franklin Brown	Kevin Michael Doyle
Marvin Everett Butcher, Jr.	Joseph Keith Ford

Candidates for the Degree of Bachelor of Science in Accounting - cont

Thomas Ray Golden
 Lynn Thomas Gott
 Paul David Griffith
 Chris Grochowalski
 James Benjamin Grow
 David Lee Hancock
 Hugh Helm Hennessy
 Carl Robert Jahnke
 Terry Kenyon Jones
 Steven Mall Joyce
 Charles Michael Kastelhun
 Phyllis Anne Kennedy
 Dale Edward Kimble
 William Gregory Martin
 Clyde Warren Maulden
 John Maurice McGrath, Jr.
 Dennis Vernon Monroe
 Charles Robert Moore, Jr.
 Paul E. Morehead
 James Michael Mulrooney
 Raleigh Gilbert Neal
 Alex Shiuwah Ng
 Eric Hampton Oebriant

Alex G. Parks
 John Hayes Pate
 Ernie Lee Peel
 William Engleman Pence
 David Strother Perry
 Ricky David Puckett
 Daniel C. Reed
 Charles Barton Ritchey
 James Milton Ruth
 Paul William Schweitzer
 Randall Lee Scott
 Ronald Lea Seagraves
 John Alan Sutton
 Eli Stuart Thompson
 Pamela Lynn Torstrick
 George Emil Vranich, Jr.
 James Patrick Welding
 Richard Kennady Williams
 Steven Glenn Wilson

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS

Dennis Neil Gash
 John Chenault Rogers

Geoffrey Harold Rosenberger
 Harry Leslie Merlin

COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE

Anthony Eardley, Dean

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARCHITECTURE

Raul Garcia Banados
 Sharon Gail Blandford
 Steven Rhode Graves
 Michael Richard Johnson
 Gary Norton Pope

Stephen Gilbert Richardson
 Michael Louis Schenck
 Harold Raymond Tate
 John Douglas Walden

COLLEGE OF ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS

Joseph Hamburg, Dean

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF HEALTH SCIENCE

Norman F. Archambo
 Wayne Thomas Ashby
 Gwendolyn Marie Black
 Joann Campbell
 William Nelson Graham
 Patricia Lee Green
 Wendy Anne Halowski
 Phyllis Gail Holladay
 Jo Gray Huff

Kathy Amanda Lay
 Martha Jean Lichtenberg
 Patricia Rayburn Meeks
 John Neal Peebles
 Denise Risner
 Jerry Wayne Roberts
 John Edward Rodman
 James Frank Szegedi

COLLEGE OF HOME ECONOMICS

Marjorie Stewart, Dean

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN HOME ECONOMICS

Cordelia Yatsattie Bemis
Beverly Gayle Bullock
Gera Lynn Burke
Mary Ann Clark
Linda Sue Conn
Mary Benita Considine
Nancy Elizabeth Cornell
Alta Charlene Cracraft
Donna M. Culley
Gwen Marie Davis
Debra Jo Dean
Kathy Rhoades Elifritiz
Paula Susan Eyre
Mary Kathleen Fogarty
Linda Susan Ford
Therese Ann Gelthaus
Laura Marcella Gilbert
Mary Lynn Greathouse
Michele Greene
Joy H. Gwin
Susan Claire Hayhurst
Cynthia Lou Horrell
Karel C. Ivy
Robin Odell Jackson

Judith Lynn Keitz
Janet Eshler Kunnecke
Winnonia Hornsby Kurtz
Mary Reardon Langenbrunner
Catherine Cecilia Laudwein
Evelyn Rose List
Ann Cherrington May
Doralice Harriet McEuen
Sharon Kay Mitchell
Marcia Elaine Oakes
Tricia Ann Owens
Cathy Dee Parks
Gay Weber Renfro
Mary Lynne Reynolds
Pamela Denise Roach
Mary Lee Russell
Rebecca Elizabeth Sinks
Donna Rose Smith
Jennifer Lynn Storm
Nancy Ann Taylor
Susan Stuart Tichenor
Jane Kathryn Wheeler
Nyla Anne Wright
Nancy Jo Ziegler

COLLEGE OF PHARMACY

Joseph Swintosky, Dean

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN PHARMACY

Dennis Ray Anderson
Dale E. Beaty
Barry Anthony Bleidt
Brenda Sebastian Byrd
Jimmie Begley Campbell
Kathy June Crider
Thornton Estol Daugherty, Jr.
Alfred Lawrence Diebold
Donna A. Dixon
Danna Crawley Droz
Dale Ray Godby
Jacob Stephen Goodman
Larry Allen Hadley
Debra Lou Hedger
Stuart Hobbs
Thomas D. Hoppes
Chingchung Lawrence Hsu
Richard T. Hull
Larry Kelsey

Jack Lee Ledford
Ralph Wayne Morris
Edwin Lynn Nickell
Robert Charles Perkins
Verlon Lane Pierce
Steven Keith Ppool
Mary Jacqueline Rice
Debbie Sue Ritchey
Gayle P. Rives
Clarence Fredrick Robertson
E. Howard Saylor
Robert Stanley Scates
Allen Wayne Stirsman
Gerald Lee Stuart
James Dennis Stumph
David James Tanner
Jennifer Trotter
Glenn Lewis Watson
Cheryl Jean Whitford

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL PROFESSIONS

Ronda Connaway, Dean

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS IN SOCIAL WORK

Susan June Abaecherli
Mary Jo Allard
Margaret Smith Ammerman
Harold P. Baker
Mary Ann Blythe
Pamela Louise Burkhardt
George Patrick Byron
Debbie Ann Clark
Linore Mary Dudik
Rebecca Anne Farmer
Luann Wallace Felts
Rickey Anthony Fernand
Sandra Lee Green
Barbara Turpin Hacker
Candace J. Hall
Richard Houston Hedges
Gary Neil Holmquist
Mary Ann Hoskins
Mary Virginia Johnston

Vickie Lynn Jones
Kathleen Ann Kennedy
Anita Carol Largent
Hollis Lee Malone
Susan Norris Mastin
Cathy Graham Mobley
Rebecca June Owens
Connie Nikirk Paynter
Jane Laverne Peters
Mary Frederica Robinson
Pamela Joyce Rowe
Marie Josephine Schlafer
Karl Gustav Sillers
Mary Ann Spurgas
Hope Tuemler
Mary Brittell Wallace
Linda Francine Washington
Joseph Lee Wilson
Robertta Kouns Young

COLLEGE OF NURSING

Marion McKenna, Dean

CANDIDATE FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN NURSING

Kathrine Oshea

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

DEAN OF ADMISSIONS AND REGISTRAR

November 29, 1974

TO MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

The University Senate will meet in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, December 9, 1974, in the Court Room of the Law Building.

Items on the agenda:

1. Approval of minutes of meeting of November 11, 1974
2. Chairman's remarks
3. Discussion and action on Senate's prior approval of Recommendation #5 of the Krislov Report
4. Discussion and action on the proposed Senate Rules change concerning audit credit, Section V-3, 1.5 (circulated to faculty under date of November 26, 1974)
5. Discussion and action on the proposed Senate Rules change concerning free electives and addition to Glossary of Terms (circulated to the faculty under date of November 26, 1974)
6. Acceptance of the Report of the ad hoc Committee to Study the separation of Promotion and Tenure (High Report) (circulated to the faculty under date of November 18, 1974)
7. Acceptance of candidates for degrees at the December 21, 1974 graduation (circulated to the faculty under date of November 13, 1974 with addition of a degree candidate under date of November 20, 1974)

Elbert W. Ockerman
Elbert W. Ockerman
Secretary, University Senate

High school exam's are to be moved.

Dear Hans:

Perhaps you've noticed that U of B is seeking a new chairman and a senior appointment of an established scholar as well. They do have a medievalist up there in Herschel Fey, but you may have something additional to offer; ~~and you may be~~ It may be worth your while to write to Herschel about the position, if you haven't already done so. They ^{do have a tendency to} ~~do want someone you hire young~~ people, ~~in their makeup~~. (Edwards left them for Buffalo.)

Professor John Lihani
Dept. of Spanish & Italian Lang. & Lit.
1127 Patterson Tower
Campus

EF

1-9-U

Here are a couple items for the next issue of La crónica.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

November 18, 1974

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: University Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting
December 9, 1974. Acceptance of the Report
of the ad hoc Committee to Study the Separation
of Promotion and Tenure (Professor Dallas High,
Chairman)

During the University Senate's deliberations of the report from the Committee to Re-Evaluate Tenure and Promotion (Krislov Report) in April, 1974, a number of questions were raised concerning the possibility of separating the administrative actions associated with promotion and with tenure. The Senate Council took the matter under advisement and appointed an ad hoc Committee on April 17, 1974, with a request that they study this issue and make recommendations back to the Council and the Senate during the Fall, 1974.

The Senate Council has received and considered the report of the "High Committee" which is attached. You will note that the final recommendation of the High Committee is contained in a one-sentence paragraph (paragraph 5, page 3) which states "The University of Kentucky should retain the present policy regarding tenure and promotion." This Committee recommendation is not a unanimous recommendation and Part II and Part III constitute a majority position and a minority position pertaining to this recommendation.

At the December 9 meeting of the Senate, the Senate Council will place on the floor a motion to accept the report of the High Committee. This motion, if passed by the Senate, will constitute accepting the majority recommendation as noted above.

Queries concerning what constitutes "the present policy regarding tenure and promotion" or other matters raised in the report should be directed to Professor High, Department of Philosophy, or to the Senate Council office.

Report of
The Ad Hoc Committee to Study the
Separation of Promotion and Tenure

#165

Part I

During a University Senate meeting of April 8, 1974, in deliberation of the report of the Committee to Re-Evaluate Tenure and Promotion ("Krislov Report"), questions were raised concerning the possibility of separating promotion and tenure. The Senate Council took the matter under advisement and in a letter of April 17, 1974 the present committee was appointed by the Chairman of the Senate Council and was provided with the following charge:

"In discussing this matter, the Council recognized four ways in which changes in this area might operate. First, we could maintain the status quo. Second, we could totally uncouple, for all units in the institution, the granting of tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor. Third, we could consider granting tenure prior to promotion to Associate Professor. Fourth, we could consider granting promotion prior to granting tenure. Further the Council recognized two operational levels at which whatever policy is decided upon could be applied. First, any such policy which is to be established could apply University-wide to all units. Second, we could have selective policies of the sort enumerated above, which might apply to some units of the University but not others. If that were the case, your committee report should indicate how we would determine which units would and would not apply to which policies.

In addition to responding to the above mentioned points, the Committee is encouraged to make any additional pertinent points or studies which it feels would assist the Senate in determining the future status of separating Promotion and Tenure.

The Council suggests that in the course of your deliberations, you consult with the deans of the colleges, the Chairmen of the Area Committees, the local AAUP chapter, the Senate Council, the President's Office, and any other parties or groups which you determine have an appropriate interest in this subject."

The Committee began its deliberations almost immediately in an effort to delineate the issues and problem areas. Special care was taken to acquire a clear knowledge of current regulations and practices and some understanding of their evolutionary development.

The Committee attempted to discover answers to the following:

- 1) What are, if any, the significant difficulties with the present system?
- 2) What academic units, if any, have special problems with the present system?
- 3) What consequences, positive or negative, seem likely should any alternatives be adopted?

Prior to a summer recess of the Committee a questionnaire was devised and sent out to 145 persons--Deans, Directors, Department Chairmen, Area Committee Chairmen, and some other individuals. Over the summer the responses were

collected and a raw tabulation was made. A return of 44 percent was realized. (The questionnaire with raw tabulations is attached.) While the questionnaire was not designed to categorize responses, arguments, etc., a tabulation was nevertheless made to indicate the "drift" of opinion. The Committee has not placed heavy weight on the tabulation, but instead, attended to the problems cited, the arguments made, and reasons given for and against any of the proposals once the "drift" of opinion could be seen.

In September 1974 the Committee gave careful study to the survey and continued its deliberations.

1. The following are some of the main difficulties which were cited by respondents and discussed by the Committee:

a. Some units and/or persons view promotion and tenure as two different decisions relating, respectively, to the level of achievement of the individual under consideration and to the commitment of the University that the individual will continue to be an asset to the University and the educational unit's goals.

b. One cannot at present promote an individual to the associate professor rank with the required link to tenure on "soft" money.*

c. Some professions, e.g., law, nationally promote through the ranks more rapidly than the current criteria at the University of Kentucky for promotion appear to allow. This places the affected unit's faculty "out of step" with the general national practice in the profession.

2. Academic units with special problems under the present system were identified. While individuals representing some educational units voiced special problems, among them medicine, education, music and law, it was the opinion of most members of the Committee that the College of Law presented the most serious special problem, the one summarized by item 1.c. above. In most other cases the special problems could not be faced squarely or rectified by separation of tenure and promotion but would require either a better understanding of the present system or would require a major revision of the entire system including changing the criteria for the different ranks.

3. Consequences, positive or negative, which might follow the uncoupling of tenure and promotion were examined. While specific considerations of consequences will be discussed in parts II and III, the majority and minority reports, it should be noted that an uncoupling could have some measure of positive effect on retention of personnel and is likely to have no change or negative effect in other areas of concern.

The Committee reached a ready consensual agreement on the following:

1) The problems caused by the coupling of tenure and promotion are not as widespread as might have been initially suspected.

* This was cited by several respondents. However, in practice such promotions have been made in exceptional cases.

2) The possibility of granting tenure to Assistant Professors, given our present total system, has more disadvantages for everyone concerned, including the Assistant Professor, than advantages, especially (a) if there were a better understanding and use of the special title series and (b) since the prior service rule for the probationary period has been amended.

3) There is some misunderstanding of the present regulations and an important misunderstanding of the special title series. Concerning this problem, the appropriate recommendation seems to call for better information about policies and practices with special effort to be made to alleviate the mistaken notion that the special title series is a form of "second class citizenship."

4) The crucial issue is whether there are needs in some educational units sufficient to warrant granting promotion to the rank of Associate Professor without tenure to persons already in service at the University of Kentucky. (A new appointee can be appointed to the rank of Associate Professor without tenure not to exceed the probationary period limit; a new appointment at the Professor level can be made without tenure not to exceed one year.)

Regarding the crucial and remaining issue the Committee voted on whether, in principle, to recommend separation of promotion and tenure to the extent of permitting promotion to the rank of Associate Professor without tenure in cases where the probationary period had not yet expired. By a majority vote of four to three the Committee disfavored the principle. As a result the Committee recommends the following:

The University of Kentucky should retain the present policy regarding tenure and promotion.

Due to the closeness of the vote on the crucial issue and to the fact that the vote appeared to mirror the division among administrators and faculty surveyed by the Committee, the chairman requested that both majority and minority reports be submitted. The following are those reports on the issue of promoting faculty to the rank of Associate Professor without tenure. (As stated earlier the Committee was in full agreement that, as a policy, tenure should not be granted prior to promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.)

Part II

Majority Report

During committee review, the majority found a number of arguments advanced by members of the faculty and administration surveyed quite helpful in reaching its decision on the question of value of separating promotion and tenure. Perhaps the most compelling one put forth was the contention that de-coupling of tenure and promotion would likely have the adverse effect of diluting the criteria for evaluating promotion and tenure at this university. That is, there was concern that, if promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and award of tenure were to be split into two independent decisions, the criteria for promotion would probably be weakened for the position of Associate Professor without

tenure and that the tenure decision would be made later without additional and more stringent standards being applied. This view was stated cogently and succinctly by one survey respondent in the following manner:

I do not believe that, in general, departments will make two tough decisions on an individual within a two or three year period. They may make one, but more than likely, it will turn out that the department will make no tough decisions. The individual will ease into the tenured ranks through a step or steps, none of which is as critically evaluated as is now the case.

While admittedly grounded in speculation, this argument--the majority believed--highlighted the immediate risks involved in any de-coupling recommendation.

Another reason why the majority was inclined to maintain the current policy and practice lay in the recognition that the present system allows for a significant measure of variation in the standards used for assessing faculty members from different departments and colleges. While the present policy is applied uniformly throughout the university, the criteria employed in assessing each case relating to promotion and tenure varies according to guidelines appropriate to individual fields and disciplines within the colleges of the university. Thus, not one set of criteria governs, but many. For the majority, the salience of this observation for the question under scrutiny resides in its demonstration that, in special cases where the traditions or normal pattern of scholarly development within a field of specialty departs markedly from the general university norms or expectations, the present rules and procedures offer sufficient latitude for equitable disposition.

Despite initial concern within the committee over the alleged existence of widespread problems stemming from the present linkage of tenure and promotion at the University of Kentucky, the majority was eventually convinced that the difficulties associated with the prevailing system were not as pervasive as originally believed. At the same time, the majority did recognize that in the final analysis the merits of the general issue (i.e., whether in principle promotion and tenure should be separated) could not be decided in isolation from an assessment of the specific issue of the impact of the current policy upon the functioning of the university law school. However, the majority was cognizant that persons representing other educational units, in answering the questionnaire, had made favorable responses to the idea of granting promotion to the associate rank without tenure and that an equal number of respondents disfavored the idea. As such this did not constitute strong grounds or a mandate to change the current policy. In the end the majority was of the opinion that the problems over the current policy encountered by the law school presented the most serious and cogent reasons for a change but concluded that these reasons differed significantly from other reasons presented. Many of the other problems posed by other educational units could not, in the opinion of the majority, be rectified by changing policy regarding the coupling of tenure and promotion.

Finally, the majority was persuaded that a further complicated set of regulations would be counter productive for the university as a whole and for affected individuals especially since such a change would only serve a small number of exceptional cases. For example, such a change would not allow for

extensions beyond the seven year limit of the untenured probationary period yet a termination at the end of that period, while holding the rank of Associate Professor, could prove disadvantageous to the individual professor.

It was the belief of the committee's majority that, in view of full recognition of and sympathy toward an appeal for just and fair treatment under any procedure which poses some potential difficulties for some or even one educational unit, such fairness and parity ultimately rests upon the judicious use of the present rules when exceptional cases can be made and special needs should be met. Ultimately administrators and area committees are in positions of exercising judicious and prudential decisions in normal as well as exceptional cases. The majority found no evidence of bad faith in such decisions nor evidence of inflexibility concerning exceptional cases. In any case, the creation of an additional set of rules, procedures and structures to an already massive and complex body of administrative and governing regulations would not relieve the university community of careful and prudential decisions. Rather, it would only postpone them by one step with respect to the entire process of granting tenure and promotion. Therefore, the majority of the committee holds that there are not sufficient reasons to warrant a change in existing regulations concerning tenure and promotion.

Part III

Minority Report

A. Summary -

The Committee minority notes that there is significant support for the proposition that it should be possible to promote a person to Associate Professor while deferring the tenure decision. Evidence of this is found in the responses of those surveyed by the Committee. Among those responding, about half supported the idea of providing for the possibility of promotion without simultaneous grant of tenure. There is no reason to believe that a survey of the entire faculty would produce a different result. Therefore, a specific proposal for Senate consideration is presented at the end of this minority report. This proposal reflects the Committee minority's concept of a sound solution to the issue of promoting without tenure.

B. Academic Rank and Tenure Can and Often Do Reflect Judgments Concerning Different Factors -

For many in academe, professorial rank and tenure status carry separate meanings. Rank denotes a faculty's evaluation of the relative achievement and recognition of an individual within the total academic community of members of a particular discipline. The professorial title, accordingly, is of interest to, and carries weight with, persons who are not affiliated with the individual's own institution. That is, when we promote in rank, we act on behalf of the entire academic community. Therefore, the appropriate factors and extent of documentation used for measuring the requisite achievement and recognition will vary somewhat from discipline to discipline. (Recent changes in the Governing Regulations recognize the presence of such differences.)

Tenure, on the other hand, is granted in expectation of the individual's long term value as a teacher and scholar on the faculty of a particular institution. The appropriate factors, in making a tenure decision, therefore, can include considerations not relevant to one's stature in his discipline. Thus, the individual's special function and value in meeting the institution's program needs can be the critical factor in determining whether to award tenure.

At the University of Kentucky, a well established policy requires that in order for an individual to merit consideration as having long term value to this institution as a teacher and scholar, that individual must show the requisite accomplishments within his or her academic discipline to justify appointment to the rank of Associate Professor. The entire Committee concluded that that minimum standard for weighing one's long term value to this institution should be continued. That is, the full committee rejects the proposition that tenure should be available to Assistant Professors. On the other hand, the Committee minority finds a need to consider a method whereby, in appropriate situations, the promotion to Associate Professor can be separated from the determination of whether to grant tenure.

C. Tying Tenure to Promotion Can Have An Adverse Impact on Some Disciplines -

In some disciplines, promotion to Associate Professor is not generally tied-in to tenure at other institutions. Moreover, in such situations the traditional standards of the discipline for promotion to Associate Professor may not always be adequate to assure that the person who has earned promotion will be of long term value to the academic unit. In such cases, currently, the educational unit concerned is forced either to invoke higher standards for promotion than those generally applied in that discipline, or to promote and thereby grant tenure to someone at a point when a sound evaluation of long term value to this institution cannot yet be made.

However, if the unit imposes higher promotion standards than those generally used in the discipline, absent special financial resources to enable the unit to recruit only the most brilliant young stars, the morale of younger members of the unit will be adversely affected and recruitment is likely to become more difficult. Further, if the unit selects the alternative approach of promoting prior to being fully assured of the individual's long term value to that unit, then it will increase the risk of unwise tenure decisions.

Finally, because the standards for promotion will not fully reflect the real needs of the academic unit in building and maintaining a good faculty, the promotion recommendations coming from the tenured members of the recommending faculty might distort their true and accurate evaluation of the candidate's credentials--some may be unduly harsh in weighing teaching and scholarly accomplishments for fear of the risks of tenure; others may be unduly lenient in weighing those accomplishments for fear of destroying morale and the prospects for maintaining a realistic recruitment program. Among other things, this situation introduces an intradepartmental point of conflict over a matter of considerable importance to all senior members of the faculty--a point of conflict which may needlessly cause interpersonal frictions which might not otherwise arise. Further, it subverts the integrity of the system of evaluating faculty based on known, stated criteria.

In order to eliminate the problems described above, while at the same time maintaining consistent and high standards for promotion and tenure throughout

this University, the Committee minority proposes Senate consideration of the following change to be recommended to the Board, through the President, as a new Governing Regulation. This proposal is designed to allow for separation of the tenure and promotion decisions in those academic units which have demonstrated to their own college, to the University Senate Council and to the President that the special needs of that unit justify such separation, and that separation of promotion from tenure can be accomplished without diluting the University's basic promotion standards.

PROPOSED REGULATION

- 1) The criteria for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and for the grant of tenure normally are the same and, therefore, a promotion to the rank of Associate Professor normally must be accompanied by the granting of tenure.
- 2) In a few academic disciplines, by tradition and widespread practice, the criteria for granting tenure are different from, and more rigorous than, those for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. In such situations the promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is not always accompanied by the granting of tenure. At the University of Kentucky, the promotion to the rank of Associate Professor prior to the expiration of the maximum probationary period need not always be accompanied by the granting of tenure. The decision to propose that tenure be granted may be made at a separate, later time if, based on the following requirements, the academic unit proposing promotion has previously received permission from the appropriate college, the University Senate Council, and the President to propose candidates for promotion to Associate Professor without tenure. In order to obtain such prior authorization to propose candidates for promotion to Associate Professor without simultaneous award of tenure the academic unit must have satisfied the appropriate college, the University Senate Council, and the President that:
 - a) By tradition and widespread practice, the criteria for granting tenure in that discipline are different from the criteria for the promotion to the rank of Associate Professor;
 - b) The recruitment, development and retention of a faculty of the highest competence in that discipline will best be achieved by being able, when appropriate, to promote to the rank of Associate Professor prior to making a tenure determination;
 - c) The unit has developed separate criteria for promotion to Associate Professor and for granting tenure, and the criteria for tenure are more rigorous than for promotion to Associate Professor; and
 - d) The unit's criteria for promotion to Associate Professor satisfy the University's applicable regulations respecting promotions.
- 3) Five years from the adoption of this regulation, the Senate Council shall review and report to the Senate and the President on the impact of this regulation upon tenure and promotion procedures and decisions.

This report in its entirety is respectfully submitted this date, November 1, 1974, by the Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Separation of Tenure and Promotion.

Lewis W. Cochran
Hans Gesund
Alvin Goldman
Joseph Krislov
Betty Rudnick
Ernest Yanarella
Dallas M. High, Chairman

Tabulations of Responses to a Questionnaire Concerning a
Study of the Separation of Tenure and Promotion

1. Given the present regulations and practices regarding tenure, as "coupled" with promotion, do you see any difficulties? If yes, please explain.

	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Ag.</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>A and S</u>	<u>Eng.</u>	<u>Bus.</u>	<u>Ed.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Yes	7	0	8	5	0	2	5	1	28
No	5	5	1	9	5	0	0	1	26
Some	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	6
No Opinion	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	13	5	11	16	5	3	5	3	61

2. What is your response to the idea of granting tenure to Assistant Professors?

	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Ag.</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>A and S</u>	<u>Eng.</u>	<u>Bus.</u>	<u>Ed.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Favor	4	0	0	3	0	1	3	0	11
Disfavor	8	5	11	13	5	2	1	3	48
No Opinion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Total	13	5	11	16	5	3	5	3	61

3. What is your response to the idea of promoting faculty to the rank of Associate Professor without tenure?

	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Ag.</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>A and S</u>	<u>Eng.</u>	<u>Bus.</u>	<u>Ed.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Favor	7	0	9	4	2	2	5	1	30
Disfavor	5	5	2	12	3	1	0	2	30
No Opinion	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	13	5	11	16	5	3	5	3	61

4. Should tenure and promotion be "uncoupled" what impact, if any, do you see that this would have on:

- a. scholarly productivity?

	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Ag.</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>A and S</u>	<u>Eng.</u>	<u>Bus.</u>	<u>Ed.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Positive	4	0	6	0	1	1	2	1	15
Negative	3	3	1	8	0	2	0	0	17
No Change	6	2	4	8	3	0	3	2	28

	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Ag.</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>A and S</u>	<u>Eng.</u>	<u>Bus.</u>	<u>Ed.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Totals</u>
b. work assignments?									
Positive	2	0	3	2	1	1	2	1	12
Negative	2	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	8
No Change	8	4	7	11	2	2	3	2	39

c. faculty recruitment?									
Positive	5	0	3	4	0	1	3	0	16
Negative	5	2	2	7	0	1	1	2	20
No Change	3	3	6	5	4	1	1	1	24

d. retention of personnel?									
Positive	4	4	4	5	0	0	4	0	21
Negative	5	0	4	5	0	1	0	1	16
No Change	4	1	3	6	4	2	1	2	23

e. faculty and/or department morale?									
Positive	4	0	5	3	1	0	3	0	16
Negative	3	1	2	8	2	0	2	2	20
No Change	6	3	4	5	1	3	0	1	23

5. Should tenure and promotion be "uncoupled" what relationship, in your view, would such an action have to the "Special Title Series?" Would the action have the effect of duplicating the "Special Title Series" or displacing it, or other?

	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Ag.</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>A and S</u>	<u>Eng.</u>	<u>Bus.</u>	<u>Ed.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Duplicate	4	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	7
Not Duplicate	6	3	3	6	2	1	4	2	27
Displace	0	0	3	4	0	2	1	1	11
No Opinion	3	1	3	4	3	0	0	0	14

6. Should a separation of tenure and promotion be adopted do you believe that it ought to be mandatory University-wide or at a college, department or school option?

	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Ag.</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>A and S</u>	<u>Eng.</u>	<u>Bus.</u>	<u>Ed.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Totals</u>
University Wide	7	2	7	8	2	2	2	3	33
Non-University Wide	5	3	4	5	1	1	3	0	22
No Opinion	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	5

Professor John Lihani EF
Dept. of Spanish & Italian Lang. & Lit.
1127 Patterson Tower
Campus

1-9-U

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

November 26, 1974

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: Senate Council Office

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting
December 9, 1974. Proposed Change in the Rules of
the University Senate, V, 1.5, re: Audit Credit.

Background:

The Rules of the University Senate provide an opportunity for students to sign up for credit in a course as "audit." The Glossary of the Rules of the University Senate defines an auditor as "One who enrolls for informational instruction only. Regular attendance at class or classes is expected without other participation and without credit."

Over the years, a small but consistently recurring problem has become apparent. It exists where a student signs up for a course for "audit credit" and then is never heard from again. Yet, there is no mechanism in the Rules of the University Senate or in the Registrar's office which permits removal of the student's name from the class rolls or the prohibition of audit credit being given. A few students have found it advantageous to constantly sign up for courses for audit credit, never attend or otherwise participate, and yet have these courses appear on the transcript listed as audit credit.

In order to provide a mechanism which would prevent this misuse, the following Rules changes have been proposed which will permit an instructor to have the student's transcript purged of any indication of the course number or audit credit if, in fact, the student did not attend the class.

Motion:

The University Senate Council and the Senate Standing Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards recommend approval of the proposed

Page 2

Agenda Item, University Senate Meeting, December 9, 1974

Audit Credit

change in the Rules of the University Senate, V, 1.5 pertaining to Audit, to be effective immediately.

Proposed Addition:

V. 1.5 Audit

Any change from audit to credit by a student regularly enrolled in a college must be accomplished by the last date of late registration and any change from credit to audit must be made by the last date to drop a course without a grade. No credit can be given for a class audited, nor is the student permitted to take an examination for credit. No instructor is authorized to admit anyone as an auditor to any of his classes, unless the auditor has registered as such. The instructor will inform all audit students at the first class meeting the number of absences acceptable. If the student does not meet these stated conditions, the instructor is authorized to mark the "not in class" box on the grade card.

[Underlined portion is proposed addition.]

1-1-D

Mrs. Cindy Todd
Senate Council Office
10 Administration Bldg.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

November 26, 1974

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting,
December 9, 1974. Proposed change in Rules of
the University Senate V, 4.3 relating to Free Electives
and changes in the Glossary of the Rules defining Free
Electives and Supportive Electives.

Background:

Most curricula describing degree majors or programs at the University contain some hours which are specified as electives. In many cases these are simply college level courses taken from this or any other approved institution which the student freely selects in order to complete a maximum number of hours for the degree. The particular academic unit involved has no authority nor does it wish to exercise any authority over which courses the students select. In other curricula, the term electives also appears but it is the intention of the academic unit involved that the courses which the student takes be selected from some particular group of courses having some relationship to the subject matter associated with the degree or otherwise supporting the degree program. In this instance, the academic unit expects to have and to exercise some control over the students' choices. The ambiguities arising in the minds of students, faculty members, and advisors in the use of the single term elective to represent two quite different situations has over the years produced a number of difficulties. In an attempt to diminish the ambiguities and concomitant difficulties, the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee proposes a definition of two kinds of electives as specified below. They further proposed including in the Rules of the University Senate, a specific statement concerning what constitutes free electives in academic programs. The presumption would be that all other electives would be supportive electives and subject to control by the academic unit involved.

*Essentially
the distinction
is needed
to avoid
some
difficulties
we have
hard to know
in our field
of concentration
suggested as
electives
that are
supportive*

Page 2

Agenda Item, University Senate Meeting, December 9, 1974
Electives

Obviously, if the proposed Rules change is approved, and the proposed changes in the Glossary in the Rules of the University Senate accompanying the Rules change are approved, it will be necessary for all academic units to specify whether the term elective used in their curriculum as described in the University bulletin are either free electives or supportive electives. In order to provide suitable time for this activity to occur, it is necessary to have a rather extended activation date for this particular Rules change.

*Field or
Concurrence*

Motion:

The University Senate Council and the Senate Standing Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards recommend adoption of the following changes in the Rules of the University Senate V, 4.3 and in the Glossary.

Recommend the following addition:

V, 4.3 Free Electives--If a degree program includes a component of free electives, that component must meet the definition of free electives as set forth in the Glossary of Terms of the Rules of the University Senate.
[To be the last paragraph]

Glossary:

Free Elective--Designated those courses freely chosen by the student without restriction or control except that the course or courses must meet course standards as set by the University of Kentucky.

Supportive Elective--Designates those areas within program requirements that are not specific requirements. The student may select from courses within the limits established by the major department and University requirements.

Professor John Lihani
Dept. of Spanish & Italian Lang. & Lit.
1127 Patterson Tower
Campus

EF

1-9-U

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

November 26, 1974

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: Senate Council Office

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting
December 9, 1974. Proposed Change in the Rules of
the University Senate, V, 1.5, re: Audit Credit.

Background:

The Rules of the University Senate provide an opportunity for students to sign up for credit in a course as "audit." The Glossary of the Rules of the University Senate defines an auditor as "One who enrolls for informational instruction only. Regular attendance at class or classes is expected without other participation and without credit."

Over the years, a small but consistently recurring problem has become apparent. It exists where a student signs up for a course for "audit credit" and then is never heard from again. Yet, there is no mechanism in the Rules of the University Senate or in the Registrar's office which permits removal of the student's name from the class rolls or the prohibition of audit credit being given. A few students have found it advantageous to constantly sign up for courses for audit credit, never attend or otherwise participate, and yet have these courses appear on the transcript listed as audit credit.

In order to provide a mechanism which would prevent this misuse, the following Rules changes have been proposed which will permit an instructor to have the student's transcript purged of any indication of the course number or audit credit if, in fact, the student did not attend the class.

Motion:

The University Senate Council and the Senate Standing Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards recommend approval of the proposed

Page 2

Agenda Item, University Senate Meeting, December 9, 1974
Audit Credit

change in the Rules of the University Senate, V, 1.5 pertaining to Audit, to be effective immediately.

Proposed Addition:

V. 1.5 Audit

Any change from audit to credit by a student regularly enrolled in a college must be accomplished by the last date of late registration and any change from credit to audit must be made by the last date to drop a course without a grade. No credit can be given for a class audited, nor is the student permitted to take an examination for credit. No instructor is authorized to admit anyone as an auditor to any of his classes, unless the auditor has registered as such. The instructor will inform all audit students at the first class meeting the number of absences acceptable. If the student does not meet these stated conditions, the instructor is authorized to mark the "not in class" box on the grade card.

[Underlined portion is proposed addition.]

Professor John Lihani
Dept. of Spanish & Italian Lang. & Lit.
1127 Patterson Tower
Campus

EF

1-9-U

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

November 27, 1974

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: Senate Council

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting
December 9, 1974
Reconsideration of the Senate's prior approval
of Recommendation #5 of the "Krislov Report"

Background:

The Rules of the University Senate I, 2.3 specify that an agenda item may be placed on the floor of the Senate over the signature of 10 Senators. The attached petition was received by the Senate Council on Tuesday, November 19, 1974. At its meeting of December 20, 1974, the Senate Council placed the resolution placed in this petition on the agenda of the University Senate for December 9, 1974. This circulation constitutes the official ten day notice for that action and attempts to provide some background to bring Senators up-to-date with the present situation. The parties who signed the petition and all others who may wish can provide any and all information they wish circulated pertaining to this motion to the Senate Council office. If it is received in sufficient time, we will circulate through the campus mails; if not, we will duplicate it and have it available at the Senate meeting.

During the Fall Semester, 1972, the Senate Council appointed an ad hoc Committee, chaired by Dr. Joseph Krislov, to study tenure and promotion policies and procedures at the University of Kentucky. Over the next year that Committee had many meetings and consulted with many groups. It eventually filed its report with the University Senate Council during the Fall Semester, 1973. That report was presented to the University Senate during the Spring Semester, 1974-- first at a meeting for discussion only, and subsequently at meetings in which formal action was taken. The Krislov Report contained a total of ten (10) recommendations. One of them was a recommendation to the Senate Council; the other nine were recommendations to the Administration. In its final action, all of the ten recommendations were approved by the University Senate, either unanimously or by substantial majorities. The nine recommendations to the Administration were transmitted to President Singletary and he acted on

Page 2

Senate Agenda Item: Petition

November 27, 1974

eight of them. One of those was the so-called recommendation #5, dealing with criteria and standards for promotion and tenure.

As reflected in the report of the Krislov Committee, and early discussion on the Senate floor of recommendation #5, the intent seemed to be that it would be desirable to articulate more clearly than we presently do, for the benefit of junior faculty without tenure and also for the benefit of our colleagues serving on Academic Area Committees, what are considered appropriate criteria and standards and minimal levels of performance in the various academic areas. After discussion on the Senate floor, the initial Krislov recommendation was re-worded at the request of Senators so that it would be mandatory (the word shall was used instead of should) for Academic Area Committees and the Administration to utilize whatever standards and criteria were generated by the academic units. At that point, the intention of the recommendation seemed to be twofold: first, that there would be some articulation of the norm standards and criteria and minimal quality levels expected in a particular academic area; that when articulated and acceptable to the faculty in the units and perhaps to others, these standards and criteria would then be communicated, in so far as possible, to junior faculty so that they would have a clearer impression of what is expected of them and particularly, as indicated by the re-drafting of this resolution, that these would be used to facilitate and coordinate the activity of academic Area Advisory Committees and ultimately deans, vice presidents, the President and the Board, in a manner that would be more consistent with appropriate actions in an academic discipline. At no time in any of the discussions, in the Krislov Committee, on the Senate floor, or between members of the Senate Council, the Krislov Committee and the President or other members of the Administration, was there an intention or indication that recommendation 5 in any way would substantially modify or supercede or interfere with the present existing policies, procedures, or safeguards associated with out broad policies and regulations dealing with tenure and promotion. It was always conceived as a refinement within that structure.

When the Senate completed its action on the Krislov report, the nine recommendations were transmitted to the President and there were, subsequent to that transmission, several meetings between the Chairman of the Senate Council and the Senate Council itself with the President. It was clear that while President Singletary had expressed reservations concerning this and other recommendations contained in the Krislov report, that at the time he received them--given their widespread debate in the Senate--and the substantial majority votes in the Senate, that this recommendation seemed to be the wish of the faculty. In accepting and implementing recommendation 5,

Page 3

Senate Agenda Item: Petition

November 27, 1974

the President made it clear that he was attempting to abide by the wishes of his faculty as expressed through the Senate. The President's memorandum of July 9, 1974, directing the Vice Presidents to request presentation of criteria by the various academic units was based solely on the recommendation of the faculty. Its verbiage is drawn from the Krislov recommendation or from the Governing Regulations of the University or from common accepted usage. There was no intent in that memorandum to in any way change the existing tenure policies and procedures or safeguards. It was simply and straightforwardly an attempt to expedite the wishes of the faculty.

Since that time, the attempts from the various academic units to comply with the President's memorandum and the recommendation of the University Senate have raised a number of questions in the minds of some faculty members who either were not aware of the recommendation initially, but who were perhaps aware and voted for it but now find it difficult to implement. The culmination of these concerns is the attached petition and memorandum, recommending that the University Senate inform the President that they wish to rescind their prior approval of recommendation. This is the matter that will be placed on the Senate floor on December 9, 1974.

PETITION

Acting on recommendation 5 of the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate Tenure and Promotion which was passed by the Senate on April 22, 1974, President Singletary issued a July 9, 1974 memorandum on "Establishing Standards for Performance." After serious consideration of the implications of this directive we are compelled to ask the Senate for a careful reconsideration of the recommendation. We feel that the Senate erred by not being much more careful in defining precisely what purpose these standards are intended to serve. We feel that the purposes as defined and implied by both the Singletary memorandum and the original resolution are subject to different levels of interpretation. We feel that as faculty members we cannot in good conscience participate in the articulation of these written criteria and standards unless there is a clear understanding of their purposes and implications. In addition, some of us feel that there are compelling philosophical grounds upon which to base a motion to rescind the original Senate recommendation.

We urge the University Senate to adopt the following resolution:

Page 4

Senate Agenda Item: Petition

November 27, 1974

OK
2/10
" Whereas Recommendation five of the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate Tenure and Promotion as amended and passed by the Senate on 22 April, 1974 is ~~dangerously~~ ambiguous, the University Senate hereby rescinds its adoption of that recommendation and respectfully requests of the President of the University that he suspend all actions taken pursuant to the recommendation."

Paul Eakin
Michael Freeman
Ted Suffridge
Michael C. McCord
Thomas Olszewsky
Fletcher Gabbard
Z. Govindarajulu
S. Sidney Ulmer
Dean Jaros
Herbert Reid

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

UNIVERSITY SENATE COUNCIL
10 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

December 5, 1974

TO: Members, University Senate

FROM: Senate Council Office

RE: AGENDA ITEM: University Senate Meeting,
Documents related to Senate Agenda Item:
Petition to reconsider recommendation #5
of the "Krislov Report"

The attached letters represent the opinions and comments of various individuals or groups concerning the "Krislov" recommendation #5, the reconsideration of which is on the agenda for the Senate meeting of December 9, 1974. They are circulated for your information and to assist you in preparing for the discussion of that particular agenda item.

Comments or questions concerning any of these documents may be addressed to the authors or may be raised, if you wish, on the floor of the Senate.

/cet

Enclosures

The President's memorandum of July 9, 1974 is based on recommendation five of the Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate Tenure and Promotion which was chaired by Joseph L. Krislov. This recommendation titled Defining Standards for Tenure was amended and adopted by the Senate on July 22, 1974.

We first note that paragraphs (3), (4) and (5) of the President's memorandum use essentially the same wording as the Senate resolution except for the addition of the phrases "reasonableness, goals of the University and College and acceptable quality."

However, there are three obvious differences which would be important in any attempt to resolve precisely what is required by the memorandum. First, the titles are different. Regardless of its content, the title of the Senate resolution is Defining Standards for Tenure. The subject of the President's memorandum is Establishing Standards of Performance. Second, the President's paragraph 2 does not come from the Krislov report or from the minutes of the Senate. There are in the minutes of the Senate no mention of the rationale of the recommendation. Third, the President did not include paragraph (2) of the senate resolution in his memorandum.

We feel that it is impossible from the memorandum or from the Senate resolution to infer in a precise, unambiguous manner what direct functional purpose the standards of performance are to serve.

In paragraph 4 of the President's memorandum and paragraph 3 of the Senate resolution we find that "The standards shall be used as an internal guide to the department in evaluating and advising its personnel" but it will "provide the basis upon which the Area Academic Advisory Committee shall recommend whether the documentation supports the proposed change..." and will "provide guidance for the appropriate administrative officers..."

The indefinite article is used with regard to the department whereas the definite article is used with regard to the area committee. The implication could be made here that although the department may use considerations other than the written standards, a case for promotion can be advanced beyond the department only on the bases of the standards previously enunciated since these are the guide for the area committee. The standards would place no constraints on administrative actions.

Is the use of the indefinite article with respect to the department an affirmation that the standards as written would not be an exclusive list of considerations for promotion decisions? If not, could considerations such as the following be included?

- (a) Whether the department should invest its resources in an individual's area of interest?
- (b) Whether an individual's continued presence on a faculty would have a detrimental effect on the program?
- (c) Whether the department is too heavily tenured and whether refusal to promote an individual could be justified on that basis?
- (d) Considerations of the minority status of an individual and whether the long term advantage of the presence of such an individual may outweigh the individual's failure to exceed all of the standards?

In the President's memorandum, the stated purpose of the establishment of standards and requirements is that they are for the "purpose of continually upgrading the quality and performance of the faculty." Is it recognized, as one might infer from this sentence that as the departments become "continually upgraded" their standards would experience a concomitant upgrading? Thus is it recognized that the standards of performance would be expected to be continually changing in an upward direction? If this is the case, which standards would the department, the area committees and the administrative officers use in evaluating and advising?

One could hardly argue that standards have not varied with time. And we feel it self-evident the current complexities of promotion criteria are of recent origin. Can the standards be written so as to be useful and yet to allow for frequent revision? Granting that standards will vary with time, would an individual be reviewed on the basis of the standards existing at the time of his consideration and not necessarily on the ones used to advise him? Will there be some time interval within which a person may expect to be reviewed on the standards extant as he enters the interval prior to his evaluation? What is a reasonable length for such an interval? Should it hold University

wide or be set by the department? Who is to decide if it is reasonable both from the point of view of the university and of the individual?

The 2nd sentence in paragraph 2 of the President's memorandum is ambiguous: "The standards and requirements in each discipline should represent minimum standards and requirements that should be exceeded in most if not all cases." Were it not for the last six words the meaning would be somewhat more clear, although even then the word "should" introduces ambiguity. Does the wording of this sentence implicitly acknowledge that there may be cases in which an individual would be promoted even though his performance did not meet some of the standards? If this is the case then must the department provide for such cases in its written standards? Will there be established special procedures for presenting such a case to the area committee?

The President's directive and the Senate resolution state that the standards shall "provide the basis upon which the area committees shall recommend whether the documentation supports the proposed change...". Should the standards contain a guide for evaluating the types of documentation relative to the standards that will accompany a proposed change in rank or tenure status? For instance, if a criterion were "good outside letters," should there be a detailed description of the normal practices in writing letters of recommendation in the discipline along with a list of such things as the standard euphemisms which employ technical jargon?

The President's memorandum uses the words "department" and "discipline" in a manner which makes it unclear whether discipline is to have a local or global meaning. That is, does history mean "what the history department at the University of Kentucky does" or is it taken in the much more general context? This is less than an exercise in semantics when one recalls that the President has omitted from his memorandum, paragraph (2) of the Senate recommendation. The Senate resolution clearly states that the discipline is not to be defined by its practitioners at the University of Kentucky. It says that the standards shall be those of the discipline and not those of the department. The Senate resolution could easily be taken to mean that depart-

mental standards may be neither higher nor lower than the average standards of the discipline at equivalent universities. Note that the senate resolution does not say "standards at universities with equivalent departments." In writing the standards for a department, one would have to know whether the President's directive admits the interpretation of the Senate resolution or whether its omission may be taken as an affirmation of the opposite point of view. With reference to departments and discipline there is another problem. That is, there are departments which are large enough to encompass several disciplines whose standards in general may well vary significantly. Must the standards apply uniformly in a department?

Both the President's memorandum and the Senate resolution use the phrase "kinds of scholarship and creativity most acceptable to the discipline." Does this refer to the areas of concentration of the department or does it make reference to the lines of study which are fashionable in the discipline as a whole? If paragraph (2) of the Senate resolution were included in the memorandum one would be forced to conclude that it makes reference to the discipline as a whole. But here the interpretation of the word "discipline" in its most general context is disturbing. It could imply that the university recognizes the existence of unacceptable areas of scholarly inquiry in a discipline. Does the phraseology admit the possibility that a department may elect to concentrate its activity in some areas and not support others?

The broader implications of the existence of written sets of standards are not clear. Is it assumed that the existence of these standards affords some level of protection to a faculty member? If so, is there implied the existence of an agency to which the faculty member may appeal when he experiences a threat from which he is protected? If so, what is the agency and what are its powers?

What would the standards actually mean? What would it mean to a faculty member when he had exceeded all of the standards? Assuming that he had unquestionably fulfilled all of the requirements, what obligation would then be imposed on the department, the college, the university? In particular, does the assertion of the existence of well-defined, written minimal standards imply that the University accepts the proposition that there are, relative to

these standards quantifiable levels of achievement at which the department would be obligated to the individual to promote him/her?

There are obvious questions about the legal implications of vaguely written criteria for promotions. If a faculty recorded written minimal standards and an individual has unquestionably exceeded them and the faculty refused to promote, would the individual members of the faculty be vulnerable to civil proceedings? Is there the possibility that, regardless of the intent of the faculty at the time of their recording, the written standards might de facto become a part of the contract between the individual and the University?

We feel that only when the above questions have been explored and satisfactorily answered could one begin to attempt the construction of a set of criteria and standards. If a number of these are not amenable to simple answers then the resulting document would have to be extremely long, highly technical, and written in the language of a legal document. This could result in the work of the area committees being done by legal or para-legal staffs. It can be argued that the logical conclusion of such a process would be the effective removal of tenure and promotion decision from the tenured faculty of a department and the placing of these functions entirely in administrative hands.

Paul Eakin
Department of Mathematics

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

(606) 257-1861

Establishing Standards of Performance

Members of the Department of Philosophy hereby register a strong and unanimous objection to the establishment of Minimum Standards of Performance as directed in the July 9, 1974 memorandum by President Singletary in implementation of a University Senate recommendation.

We do agree that it is necessary for new faculty members in departments to be acquainted with the expectation that they will make contributions of quality in the areas specified (teaching, scholarship, creative productivity, and service in the discipline). We also agree that it is certainly in the interest of university study that this quality be maintained at a high level and upgraded if necessary. But our criticism applies to the objective of formalizing and specifying this expectation and aim more than it already is in existing regulations (vide UK Administrative Regulations, AR 11-1. 0-1, pp. 10FF.). Our reasons for taking this position are as follows:

1. That the proposed standards "represent minimum standards and requirements that should be exceeded in most, if not all, cases" makes them both utterly useless and quite dangerous. They are useless inasmuch as they can in no way serve as a guide, either for new faculty, or for faculty who must make decisions on promotion and tenure; for in only the rarest cases, if at all, could their fulfillment be taken as sufficient to warrant promotion or tenure. And, indeed, existing practice hardly indicates otherwise.

Secondly, they are dangerous inasmuch as it is precisely implied that, being standards, they are sufficient, though minimal. Compliance with them would precisely seem to imply acceptability; and individuals would seem to be in the right against negative decisions in their regard if they could be shown to have so complied.

2. A "normal balance between teaching, scholarship, creative productivity, and service in the discipline" is a fictional idea impossible to specify as a rule for everyone. No one balance can hold for different individuals. An individual balance suitable to the particular talents in these specified "areas" is alone reasonable; and the determining of this balance is a prudential judgment involving the individual himself and his departmental colleagues.

Our judgment, consequently, is that there is little point in attempting to provide the "standards" called for, and we remain content with the existing guidelines and criteria referred to above.

We can be thus satisfied with those same guidelines and criteria because they represent something more useful than "minimum standards"; they are comprehensive general statements that are adaptable to individual variabilities. This is the way they have been used in our department both in informing new faculty members of what is expected of them and in reaching decisions on promotion and tenure.

We should like to point out further the clear advantage and good sense of a practice of this sort using these more general guidelines and criteria. If one attempts to specify standards in detail, be it in minimal, median, or maximal ways, for example, by identifying by name journals or associations whose acceptance of written contributions is deemed a benchmark confirmation of a person's academic qualities, then either 1) this specification becomes a statement of a requirement to be fulfilled, and there is no longer question here of standards in a genuine sense, or 2) the specification is only an example, so that comparison to it in the matter of someone's particular research product involves the prudential application of the very kind of general statements of criteria we already have. In the first case, the specification is an entirely different thing from establishing prudentially useful standards, and in the second it takes on value and utility only within the context of general statements of criteria such as those referred to now several times. In this latter case to insist on specification, especially if one is asked to give examples of minimal but insufficient performance, is simply to betray a misplaced focus.

To repeat, our judgment is that there is little point in attempting to provide the "minimum standards" called for by the President's implementation of the Senate's action, and we wish to assert that rational use of the existing guidelines and criteria would fulfill any purpose that may have motivated that action.

Respectfully submitted,

The Department of Philosophy
by unanimous agreement

14 February

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

July 9, 1974

To: Vice Presidents P. P. Bosomworth and Lewis W. Cochran

From: Otis A. Singletary *OS*

Subject: Establishing Standards of Performance

Pursuant to a recommendation which I have received from the University Senate, I am asking you to request the submission of a proposal concerning standards of performance from each department or other basic educational unit in your academic sector.

In the development of standards, an essential premise shall be that the University of Kentucky and its academic program can be no greater than the quality and performance of its faculty. The standards and requirements in each discipline should represent minimum standards and requirements that should be exceeded in most, if not all, cases. The establishing of such standards is primarily for the purpose of continually upgrading the quality and performance of the faculty.

Each department or other basic educational unit, in consultation with its dean, shall propose reasonable standards of performance for its discipline which are consistent not only with the University's regulations but also with the goals of the University and the college and which shall include the following: (1) the normal balance among teaching, scholarship, creative productivity, and service in the discipline; (2) the means for determining the quality of teaching; (3) the minimum research or creative productivity requirements for consideration for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor; (4) the means for determining the quality of scholarship and creative productivity in the discipline; and (5) the kinds of scholarship and creativity most acceptable to the discipline.

The standards established for a department or other basic educational unit shall be an internal guide to the department or educational unit in evaluating and advising its own personnel, provide the basis upon which the Area Academic Advisory Committee shall recommend whether the documentation supports the proposed change in rank or tenure status, and provide guidance for the appropriate administrative officers in the advising, evaluating and status change processes.

The standards of performance proposed by a department or other educational unit shall be submitted through normal channels to the dean, the vice president, and the Area Academic Advisory Committee for evaluation and recommendations, and finally to the President for his consideration and approval. This review of the proposed standards shall be for the purpose of assuring coverage of the five items in the third paragraph, consistency with the University's regulations, reasonableness, and acceptable quality.

Recommendation 4: Performance Review and Tenure (cont)

- (2) An individual who is hired with the prospects of becoming a tenured faculty member shall be assigned duties by the department commensurate with making due progress towards meeting requirements (of the department, college, and area) for tenure.
- (3) The annual performance review of non-tenured faculty shall include some discussion with the department chairman of the individual's progress toward tenure in terms of departmental expectations.
- (4) A department chairman shall consult with the tenured members of the faculty regarding the individual's progress toward achievement of tenure. These discussions should occur at the end of the non-tenured faculty member's second and fourth years, but may occur more frequently at the chairman's discretion. The results of that discussion should be communicated to the individual and reduced to writing and maintained in the individual's files.

Recommendation 5: Defining Standards for Tenure

(of performance?)

For transmission to the President for inclusion in the Administrative Regulations or other appropriate implementation.

- (1) Departments or individual educational units shall set up reasonable standards of performance for their disciplines which are consistent with the Governing Regulations and which shall include the following:
 - (a) The normal balance between teaching, scholarship, creative productivity, and service in the discipline.
 - (b) The means for determining quality of teaching.
 - (c) The minimum research requirements for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor.
 - (d) The means for determining the quality of scholarship and creative productivity in the discipline.
 - (e) The kinds of scholarship and creative productivity most acceptable in the discipline.
- (2) Individual departments or educational units shall obtain outside evidence that the standards set up by their departments are those of their discipline in equivalent universities and not simply those of the members of the department.
- (3) The standards set up by the department or educational unit shall be used for three purposes: First, they shall be an internal guide to the department in evaluating and advising its own personnel. Secondly, they shall provide the basis upon which the area review committee shall recommend whether the documentation supports the proposed change in tenure status or rank. Thirdly, they shall provide guidance for the appropriate administrative officers in the advising, evaluating, and status change processes.

number of
infect?

Antigen?
Do we want
more people

Recommendation 5: Defining Standards for Tenure (cont.)

The standards established by the department shall be submitted to the Dean, the Vice President, and the Area Committee for evaluation of recommendations, and the President for consideration and approval. This review of the established standards shall be for the purpose of assuring that they are consistent with the University's regulations and that they provide answers to the five items posed in paragraph (1) above.

Recommendation 7: Advisory Committee to the Dean

For transmission to the President as a modification in the Administrative Regulations.

(1) Each Dean shall establish a Committee concerned with faculty appointments, termination, tenure and promotion, with the following suggestions:

(a) The Committee is advisory to the Dean and may at his request make recommendations in the above matters. The Committee may be asked by the Dean or a faculty member to hear an inquiry by any faculty member who declares himself dissatisfied with the policies established by his department and/or college concerning appointment, termination, tenure, and promotion.

(b) The Committee may examine departmental standards and when possible arrive at agreements between the Dean and the department about realistic standards by which individual faculty members may be judged. In addition, this Committee may be asked to communicate with the Graduate Council, the Area Committees, the appropriate Dean, and other University officials who establish, interpret, or implement University regulations in this area so as to clarify all standards and policies.

(c) When any matter that comes up before the Committee involves a department represented on the Committee, the Committee member of that department shall disqualify himself.

(d) The members shall be appointed by the Dean after consultation with the appropriate faculty body in that college.

Recommendation 8: Reasons for Non-Renewal

For transmission to the President as a modification in the Administrative Regulations.

In all cases where a faculty member with the rank of assistant professor or higher is not reappointed, the individual shall be notified by his department chairman of the reasons for the decision. Where the decision not to reappoint is one on promotion and tenure, the faculty member shall upon his written request, be informed of the basis of that determination in writing and in a reasonable amount of detail. In instances where promotion and tenure are not involved, oral communication will be deemed sufficient. The college dean shall provide the faculty member's chairman with a written summary of the reasons why reappointment was denied if a favorable department recommendation was overturned at a higher level. The Chairman shall inform the faculty member of these reasons.

12/3/74

December 3, 1974

Dr. Otis Singletary, President
University of Kentucky
103 Administration Building
Campus

Dear President Singletary:

Recently the Executive Committee of the Department of Mathematics began to address itself to the task of defining minimal standards for the various academic ranks as you requested in your memorandum of July 9, 1974. As our discussions proceeded it became clear that the task is much more difficult than first anticipated and, even should it be completed, would not, in our opinion, serve the best interests of our Department or the University of Kentucky.

We understand that other units may have problems and needs which make such written statements necessary and, desirable. However, this is not the case in our Department nor, we think, with other departments in Arts and Sciences. Our difficulties and reservations stem from essentially two independent observations:

- (1) It appears to us that the existence of such written standards would severely weaken and undermine the tenured faculty's privilege (and in fact, responsibility) of having a strong and compelling voice in decisions concerning whom should be given tenure. Many of the criteria used in such decisions are subjective and extremely difficult to put accurately in written form (at least, in a document of reasonable length). Since tenure is not a reward for past action but, rather, a very strong statement by the faculty and administration with respect to expectations for future contributions, there is much more involved than can be specified by any system of mechanical rules. Developing this theme a bit further, we see the preparation of written minimal standards as the first, and probably most important, step in effectively eliminating the faculty from tenure decisions and placing them completely in the hands of persons who may know little or nothing about mathematics.
- (2) It is not clear to us by whom, or in what light, such statements of minimal standards might be interpreted. If the document was solely for the use of the Area Committee as a guide to them as they attempt to make decisions which cut across departmental and

Page 2

President Otis Singletary
December 3, 1974

disciplinary lines, then our statements would be of one form. On the other hand, there is considerable speculation and concern that the document may appear as evidence in a legal proceeding and, for this purpose, the wording should take a completely different form. The point is, that until it is spelled out specifically and concretely what is wanted, how and by whom it will be interpreted and precisely how binding it may be, we feel that we can not, in good conscience, proceed.

In view of the above, and in light of our strong opposition to the preparation of these standards, we request that you reconsider your earlier decision. We fully realize that our request places you in an awkward position and asks you to take a difficult step. In spite of this, we are so opposed to the writing of minimal standards that we believe our action is the only honest one to take and we hope you will agree.

We are aware of your recent decision to suspend your July 9, memorandum pending reconsideration by the Senate and certainly applaud this action. However, we feel it is appropriate to communicate to you our opinion concerning this question and to ask that you permanently suspend the memorandum.

As a final comment, I would like to add that this letter does not reflect the attitude of merely a small handful of influential faculty; but is the shared opinion and position of a great majority of both tenured and non-tenured faculty. In fact, after a recent faculty meeting which was devoted entirely to a discussion of this issue, I formally polled the regular faculty and the result was 35 members supporting the above request and 2 opposed. Naturally, the faculty and I stand ready to discuss this matter at your convenience.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

R.H. COX, Chairman

RHC:pvc

cc: Dr. Art Gallaher, Dean
College of Arts & Sciences

Dr. Lewis W. Cochran, Vice President
for Academic Affairs

✓ Dr. Stan Smith, President of the
Senate Council

UNIVERSITY SENATE 1974-75
(Voting Members)

Adelstein, Michael E. *no*

Allen, Lawrence A.

Ashdown, Gerald

Assell, Ruth

Auenshine, C. Dwight

yes Back, Lyle N.

yes Bailey, Harry H.

Banwell, John G. *no*

Barclay, Lisa K.

yes Barnard, Harry

Barnhart, Charles E.

Barry, Jackie

Baskin, Jerry M. *no*

Belin, Robert P.

Benton, Robert S.

Billups, Norman F. *no*

Binkley, Harold

Blythe, Joan

Bosomworth, Peter P.

Bostrom, Robert N.

Bradford, Garnett L.

yes Brehm, Thomas W.

Brown, Sam

Bruce, Herbert

yes Bryant, Joseph A.

yes Buck, C. Frank

Buckholtz, James D. *no*

Burness, H. Stuart

Butler, John L.

Cabe, Carl

yes Charron, Jean D.

Clawson, Michael

~~Clement, Rick~~

yes Clotfelter, Elizabeth R.

yes Cochran, Lewis W.

Cole, Henry *no*

yes Colson, Anthony

yes Colton, Frank

Combest, Bruce

yes Connaway, Ronda S.

Cox, Foy

Crabb, Alfred L. *no*

Cremers, Clifford J.

Criswell, James E.

yes Crowe, M. Ward

yes Csaky, T. Z.

Cunningham, Tim

Davis, Vincent

yes Deacon, John A.

DeLuca, Patrick P.

Denemark, George W. *no*

yes Diachun, Stephen

yes Dillehay, Ronald

yes Dittrich, John E.

Dollase, Bette J.

yes Drennon, Herbert

yes Drnevich, Vincent P.

Duffy, Mary

yes Dutt, Ray H.

yes Eakin, Paul M.

Eardley, Anthony

Ecton, W. W.

yes Edmonds, Fred

yes Eichhorn, Roger

yes Etzel, Michael

Evans, Robert O.

Field, Thomas

Fischer, Doane

yes Forand, Paul G.

Ford, Thomas R.

yes Freeman, Michael B.

Funk, James E.

yes Gabbard, R. Fletcher

Gallaher, Art

Gardner, Jess L.

Gartner, Claudine

yes Gesund, Hans

Gibson, James

Gladden, James W. *no*

Goldman, Alvin *no*

yes Govindarajulu, Zakkula

Griffen, Ward O.

Grubbs, Elaine

Gunther, George W.

6

5

13

3

11

2

University Senate List 1974-75 - cont

Hackbart, Merlin	<i>yes</i> Just, John J.	McEvoy, Susan A.
Hamburg, Joseph	Kemp, James D.	McGee, Randolph
<i>yes</i> Hamilton, Holman	<i>Kendrick, Gregory</i> Kenkel, William F.	<i>yes</i> McKenna, Marion E.
<i>yes</i> Hansbrough, Thomas	Kennedy, William	McKinney, Carolyn D.
Hansen, J. Merrell <i>no</i>	Kim, Paul K.	McNulty, E. Gregory <i>no</i>
<i>yes</i> Hardin, Bobby O.	Kincheloe, James B.	Miles, William C.
<i>yes</i> Hardy, George W.	<i>yes</i> Kirkendall, Don	Minter, Mary <i>no</i>
Hargreaves, Mary W. <i>no</i>	Knoblett, James	<i>yes</i> Mitchell, George E.
Harris, Jesse G.	Krislov, Joseph <i>no</i>	Moody, William G.
Hauth, Allan C.	LaCharité, Virginia	Moore, James T.
Hayes, Richard	Lane, A. Virginia	<i>yes</i> Moore, Joe
<i>yes</i> Hays, Virgil W.	Larimore, David L. <i>no</i>	Motley, Brian
Hawkins, Rita	<i>yes</i> Leech, Sara H.	Mucci, David
<i>yes</i> Hiatt, Andrew J.	Lester, Robert L.	Noble, Robert C. <i>no</i>
Hicks, Martha	Levy, Albert S.	Nooe, Roger
Holland, Nancy <i>no</i>	Lewis, Gene P.	<i>yes</i> Ogletree, James R.
Howard, Elizabeth B. <i>no</i>	Liddle, Gordon P. <i>no</i>	Olschewsky, Thomas M.
Horridge, Patricia E.	<i>yes</i> Lieber, Arthur	<i>yes</i> Packett, Leonard V.
Huff, Eugene	Lihani, John <i>no</i>	<i>yes</i> Parker, Blaine F.
Hughes, Charles	Longyear, Rey M. <i>no</i>	<i>yes</i> Parks, Harold F.
Hughes, Hope	Ludwig, Charles <i>no</i>	<i>yes</i> Pass, Bobby C.
Hultman, Charles W.	<i>yes</i> Lyons, William	<i>yes</i> Patterson, Anne E.
Ireland, Robert M.	Madden, Donald	Peck, David <i>no</i>
Ivey, Donald <i>no</i>	<i>yes</i> Mandelstam, Paul	<i>yes</i> Peter, Carl
Jarecky, Roy K.	Marsden, James	<i>yes</i> Peters, William
<i>yes</i> Jaros, Dean	Matthews, William L.	Pival, Jean <i>no</i>
Jones, Joseph R. <i>no</i>	<i>yes</i> McCord, Michael C.	<i>yes</i> Rankin, Richard
<i>yes</i> Jones, Margaret	<i>yes</i> McCullers, Levis D.	Rea, John A. <i>no</i>

8 6 8 6 12 6

University Senate List 1974-75 - cont

Reed, Barbara	<i>yes</i> Stewart, Marjorie S.	<i>yes</i> Willis, Paul A.
<i>yes</i> Reynolds, Opal	<i>yes</i> Stiene, E. Anne	Wilson, Constance P.
Ringe, Donald A. <i>no</i>	Stober, William	Winer, Miroslava B.
<i>yes</i> Rizzo, Frank J.	<i>yes</i> Suffridge, Ted J.	Winternitz, William W.
<i>yes</i> Robe, Thurlow R.	Sutton, Willis A. <i>no</i>	Worell, Judith <i>no</i>
Royster, Wimberly C.	<i>yes</i> Swift, Louis J.	Wright, Kenneth R. <i>no</i>
Rudd, Robert W.	Swintosky, Joseph V.	Wynkoop, Randy
Rudnick, Betty R. <i>no</i>	<i>yes</i> Templeton, William C.	<i>yes</i> Yarbrough, Roy
Sallee, Kathryn	Testerman, Sherrell	<i>yes</i> Zechman, Fred
<i>yes</i> Sands, Donald E.	Thacker, Charlene <i>no</i>	
Sartoris, William <i>no</i>	Tipton, Leonard P.	3 2
Schiano, Kenneth A.	Tower, Carl <i>no</i>	
<i>yes</i> Schriels, Rudolph	Traurig, Harold H. <i>no</i>	
<i>yes</i> Sedler, Robert A.	<i>yes</i> Ulmer, S. Sidney	Total voting - 233
Shuffett, D. Milton	Valentine, Kristin <i>no</i>	
Sievers, Pam	Vazquez, Jacinto J.	<i>yes</i> <i>no</i>
<i>yes</i> Simon, Sheldon	Voss, Harwin L.	3 2
<i>yes</i> Silberstein, Gerard E.	<i>yes</i> Wagner, William F.	9 8
<i>yes</i> Skelland, A. H. Peter	Waldhart, Thomas J. <i>no</i>	12 4
Smith, Brad	Walker, John N.	12 6
Smith, Stanford L. <i>abstained</i>	Wall, M. Stanley	8 6
Sorenson, Herbert W.	<i>yes</i> Warren, Richard	8 6
Soule, Don	Weeks, M. O'Neal <i>no</i>	11 2
Spaeth, David <i>no</i>	Weil, Jesse L. <i>no</i>	13 3
<i>yes</i> Spruill, M. Lynn	Weiss, Daniel L.	6 5
Steele, Earl L.	Wellons, Kennard	8 2 42
<i>yes</i> Stephenson, John B.	Westerfield, Rebecca	
<i>yes</i> Stevens, J. Truman	<i>yes</i> Westley, Bruce H.	

12

4

9

8

ATTENDANCE SHEET
December 9, 1974

35-

146 Senators present

✓ Judith Worell
✓ Gordon Litch

✓ Ray P. Cole

✓ Pat Macalister

✓ Donald E. Saults

✓ Anthony C. Colson

✓ Herbert Drennon

✓ Nicholas Ebel

✓ Frank Buck

✓ Thomas W. Bohm

✓ J. W. Hudyt II

✓ Anne A. Wilke

✓ Sara H. Leech

✓ Robert G. Seale

✓ James R. Massada

✓ Carl Hackbart

✓ Arthur Peter ~~III~~ Arny ROTE

✓ Virgil W. Haep

✓ Gerald D. Ashdown

✓ W. F. Wagner

✓ W. P. Lyons

✓ Z. Garmiragulen

✓ Mary Eick Winter

✓ R. W. Wanner

✓ B. Valentine

✓ B. J. Sollars

✓ Geo. F. Mitchell

✓ Carl J. Peter

✓ J. E. Kerlin, Jr.

not Senators

✓ B. Weinstein

eligible

✓ Alvin Goldman

✓ John STEPHENSON

✓ Ronda S. Commaney

✓ O'Neal Weeks

✓ A. Kueker

✓ P. C. Zand

✓ J. K. Hittree

ATTENDANCE SHEET
December 9, 1974

42

W

✓ Marion E. McKinnon
✓ Betty R. Rudnick
✓ Helman-Hamilton
✓ Elizabeth R. Claffelter
✓ S. Silberstein
✓ Jean Piel
✓ Elizabeth B. Howard
✓ M. J. Spruill
✓ J. E. Luch
✓ W. d. Sartoris
✓ Charles Thacher
✓ Willis A. Sutton
✓ Hans Gesund
✓ Vince Dmewich
✓ J. H. Dracm
✓ D. A. Spaul
✓ M. J. Grest
✓ Bruce H. Westley
✓ John Lohman
✓ Mary Wilma Hargreaves

✓ Harold Parker
✓ J. C. Bryant
✓ L. V. Packett
✓ Jean Charron
✓ Maryna Skuraf
✓ T. C. CSAX
✓ Glitch Belland
✓ Frank J. Rizzo
✓ T. R. Robe
✓ Thomas Harsbough
✓ J. W. Gladstone
✓ Michael Freeman
✓ Michael M. Cord
✓ Paul Eiler
✓ J. D. Buckholz
✓ David Peck
✓ Fred Zechman
✓ Bruce H. Westley
✓ R. P. Motley (Brian Motley)
✓ R. A. Rankin
✓ Joan Blythe
✓ Charles Ludwig

ATTENDANCE SHEET
December 9, 1974

32
33

✓ Hope Hughes - Student Senator
✓ Barbara Reed - Student Senator
✓ ~~Richard~~
✓ Jess Meil
✓ Edal Reynolds
✓ William C. Impletton
✓ ~~Pat Felt~~
✓ Robert C. Noble
✓ Blaine J. Parker
✓ James H. Moore
✓ R. M. Longyear
✓ J. J. Just
✓ Ken Schiano
✓ Gary Denmark
✓ David L. Larimore
✓ Nancy H. Helland
✓ Al Croft

✓ Louis J. Sump
✓ Anne E. Patterson
✓ Lewis D. McCullers
✓ W. Ellips
✓ J. A. Rea
✓ Sam Brown
✓ ~~John~~ Sawell
✓ C. B. Tower
✓ John Walker
✓ W. W. Euton
✓ Rudolph Schriels
✓ Harry Barnett
✓ ~~Harvey~~ Tanner
✓ Kenneth Wright
✓ AC Dillehay
✓ Elbert W. Ockerman (ABA)

ATTENDANCE SHEET
December 9, 1974

36

✓ Ray D. Yarbrough
✓ Peter M. Ireland
✓ Joseph Kuth
✓ Joe Moore
✓ E. Gray McNulty
✓ Harold Maurig
✓ Don Juey
✓ Jerry M. Baskin
✓ Ward Crowe
✓ T. Waldhant
✓ Paul D. Sears
✓ Jeanne Rachford ^{new} _{not Senate} _{member}
✓ J. Thurman Stevens
✓ Bill Peters
✓ AG Hiatt
✓ BC Lass
✓ S. Diachun
✓ Peter Skelland
✓ James C. Knoblett

✓ Don R. Kirkendall
✓ Lyle Back.
✓ Anne Stiene
✓ ~~Shirley Smith~~
✓ S. Sidney Ulmer
✓ ~~G. J. Sallace~~
✓ Sheldon Simon _{not member}
✓ Glenn C. Beck _{for Donald March}
✓ Lewis W. Cohen
✓ Frank V. Colton
✓ Fred Edmunds
✓ William E. Adams
✓ W. L. Mathews
✓ O. A. Higginson
✓ H. W. Bailey
✓ Lisa Barclay
✓ Ted Suffridge
✓ Alan Jeros
✓ William Miles
✓ Betty O. Hardie

VISITORS SHEET
December 9, 1974

Stet ~~scribble~~
~~scribble~~

Dallas M. T. High

W. J. Stuman

Susa H. Hottel

Ernest C. Sutt

William F. Adams

A. S. Baidyan

James H. Wells

~~James A. Knoblett~~