

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, October 4, 1948, Room 101, Law Building

The Senate convened at 3:40 pm on Monday, October fourth, Room 101, Law Building. Twenty-eight members were present with President McCormick presiding.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF MAY 17, 1948: Dr. Carpenter asked that the minutes of May seventeenth be corrected as follows: The work "such" as appears as the last word of the last line of page 39 should be deleted. With this one correction, the minutes of the May seventeenth meeting were approved.

*REPORT ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT: The Secretary Pro Tem reported to the Senate that the following amendment to the Faculty Constitution had been approved by the General Faculty by a vote of 167 to 36:

"That Article III, Paragraph A, Subparagraph 3, be changed to read 'The deans and the Registrar;' and that Article III, Paragraph A, Subparagraph 4, Subsubparagraph a be changed to read 'Fifteen elected by the faculty at large.'"

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY GRIEVANCES, ORGANIZATION OF: The Secretary Pro Tem reported to the Senate that the Senate Committee on Faculty Grievances held their organizational meeting on June 12, 1948. The following members were chosen by lot to serve for the following terms: Professor Emil L. Larson, one year; Dean John D. Lyons, Jr., two years; Professor James F. McKale, three years. In accordance with the resolution establishing the Committee, Professor Larson had been designated to serve as Chairman for the balance of the University year, 1947-48, and for the year, 1948-49. Dean Lyons had been elected Secretary of the Committee.

INTERPRETATION OF CONSTITUTION REGARDING MEETING SCHEDULE, DISCUSSION OF: President McCormick explained that the constitution provides for the Senate to meet the first Monday of each month of the academic year. However, the first Monday of September was Labor Day, and in some instances, the first Monday in January will fall during the Christmas holiday period. Dean Clarson suggested that the first meeting of the year be held the first Monday in October. President McCormick stated that this policy had been followed this fall after a conference with Dr. Solve, Faculty Chairman.

Dr. Houghton said that he was sure that the drafters of the constitution intended that the first meeting of the year should be held on the first Monday of the regular session.

Dean Butler moved that the constitutional provision be interpreted as meaning that the Senate is required to meet on the first Monday of October, November, December, January, February, March, April, and May, unless the first Monday in January falls during the holiday period. Other meetings could be called at any time, of course. This motion was seconded by Dean Clarson.

Dr. Roberts suggested that it might be well to amend the constitution so that the second Monday of each month would be the regular meeting day. Professor Andreas Andersen suggested that whenever a holiday falls on the designated first Monday, that month's meeting automatically should take place on the following Monday.

Dr. Houghton explained that that was the intention of the drafters of the constitution.

*Approved by the Board of Regents, October 9, 1948.

Dr. Gray further explained that the intention was that at least one meeting each month of the academic year should be held. He suggested that the interpretation should include the understanding that no less than nine meetings a year would be held.

Dean Clarson then suggested that the President and the Secretary of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Chairman should settle this matter.

A new motion was presented. It was moved that the interpretation of the language regarding the date of meetings as prescribed by the constitution should be that meetings will be held on the first Monday of every month, September through May, with the understanding that the first meetings in September and in January will be held on the first Monday on which classes are held. This was seconded and passed.

CHEATING REVIEW COMMITTEE, REPORT ON: President McCormick then called on Dr. P. G. Hudson, chairman of the special committee to review University rules and policies governing dishonest scholastic work. Other members of the committee were: W.S. Barnes, A.S. Mattingly, L.M. Pultz, and A. L. Slonaker.

Before turning to the report of his committee, Dr. Hudson presented the following request which was submitted to the Faculty Senate by the members of Blue Key, senior men's honorary society:

"In a recent meeting of the Blue Key Chapter, the problem of cheating was discussed. In this regard, the success of the honor system in the Law College was mentioned as a case in point. The facts peculiar only to the law school student body and the school itself as distinguished from other colleges were likewise the subject of lengthy conversation. Yet despite the differences between the Law College and the other colleges, it was thought that the following plan contained the feasibility outweighing those few drawbacks, the result of the differences.

1. First, that the honor system be extended to include one or two of the professional schools. The Mines or Engineering were those considered most appropriate.
2. That if sudden employment of such a system seemed, in the opinion of the Senate, too hasty a move, then that it be used only in upperclassmen's examinations.
3. That with the success desired, the honor system could be gradually extended and broadened in scope until it could at some time in the far future be a major weapon against cheating.
4. The Blue Key did not in its utmost naivete consider possible the use of an honors system faintly practical in several of the lowerclassmen's subjects such as Humanities and Psychology.

In conclusion, the plan is long range definitely. In some cases it will likely be never possible. It is most attractive to students seriously interested in their work. Its employment is, in our opinion, feasible now in a restricted way; but publicizing even restricted use may lead eventually to more widespread adoption.

We think that the difficulties to be found as (1) The possibility that

students may find themselves at some time operating under two systems, (2) that there is a less degree of homogeneity in all other colleges than the Law College, and, (3) the years of accumulated practice in the old tradition,--- can all be overcome.

The resolution is submitted respectfully to Dr. Hudson and the Faculty Senate.

James F. McNulty
For the Blue Key"

Dr. Barnes stated that although he felt the Blue Key recommendation was a splendid one, he did not think it wise to complicate matters by considering it at the same time the report of Dr. Hudson's committee was to be considered. He suggested the recommendation be postponed to a later meeting.

Dean Butler reminded the Senate that any college faculty can inaugurate an honor system in that college if it desires. He explained that the Engineering College had adopted such a plan a number of years ago and had followed that plan for some time. He recommended that the members of Blue Key be informed that their suggestion had been welcomed by the Senate.

Dr. McComick suggested that the logical plan whereby an honor system might be begun in a certain college would be for the individual college faculty to decide whether or not it wished to adopt an honor system; and if so, then submit that college's request to the Faculty Senate. Professor Andreas Andersen said that he believed the plan should begin in the individual college.

Dr. Garretson then moved that the Faculty Senate express to the Blue Key thanks and appreciation for their recommendation and that it be suggested to them that their recommendation go to individual college faculties. If some college faculty then wishes to adopt an honor system, that college will present its request to the Faculty Senate. This motion was seconded and approved.

Dr. Roberts then asked whether the new rules and policies contained in the report by Dr. Hudson's committee, if adopted, could easily be discarded by a college faculty wishing to substitute an honor system. President McCormick said that such a college first would have to obtain approval from the Faculty Senate. Dr. Houghton said that the constitution gives the individual colleges the right to administer such affairs as they see fit. Dean Clarson then asked, if that is the case, whether or not the Senate has any right to prescribe rules as contained in Dr. Hudson's report. Dr. Solve explained that the constitution provided that though the Senate could adopt such rules for the University, any college could be excluded from such rules by Senate approval.

Dr. Roberts asked why the old system whereby each instructor handled the cheating problem in his own way was being discontinued. Dean Butler explained that under the old system, there had been no uniformity. Some members of the faculty had been very lax in handling the cheating problem; others had been unusually severe. It was Dr. Roberts' feeling that the lax members would continue not to enforce the regulations.

The Senate then turned its attention to the report itself as submitted by Dr. Hudson and his committee. At this meeting, the Senate considered only the Introduction and Parts I and II of the report.

These sections as originally submitted by the committee were as follows:

"STATEMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY RULES AND
POLICIES GOVERNING DISHONEST SCHOLASTIC WORK

INTRODUCTION

The administration and faculty of the University are under a duty to discourage and prevent cheating by students and are also under an obligation to the citizens of Arizona to encourage the spirit of honesty in those enrolled in this institution.

The approach to the solution of the problem of cheating may well be divided into three parts. The first part is concerned with the encouragement of the practice of and belief in honesty. The next part is related to the prevention or reduction of cheating in and out of the classroom. The last part is directed to the problem of reporting and handling cases of cheating.

Part I

INDOCTRINATION OF STUDENTS

The development of proper attitudes towards honor and honesty among the students is of great importance. During Freshman Week in September the Dean of Men, the Dean of Women, and the Deans of the various Colleges enrolling freshmen should discuss with their respective freshmen groups the problem of cheating and should acquaint these students in a general way with the methods of dealing with cheating on the campus. In such talks mention should be made of the fact that, in case a student is found guilty, a notation indicating that fact may appear on his record in the Registrar's Office which may affect his opportunity to find a suitable position upon leaving the University.

While the nature and contents of such talks must be left to the best judgment of the Deans, it is strongly suggested that the Deans should emphasize honesty and its value. The policy of the University should be constructive and not threatening.

Instructors are expected to call the attention of their classes, especially of their freshman classes, to the value of honesty.

A short summary of the policies regarding cheating should be placed in the Handbook of the students. The University Committee on Dishonest Scholastic Work should confer from time to time with responsible student groups for the purpose of securing the support and cooperation of the student body in building a constructive attitude towards honesty.

Part II*

PREVENTION OF CHEATING

The prevention of cheating is more important than the punishment of the

*Parts II and III are not applicable to colleges which have officially adopted an honor system.

discovered cheater. Fair, swift, and certain punishment of a known offender is a deterrent to other students inclined to cheat, but this alone is not sufficient. In our heterogeneous student body there will probably continue to be, in spite of all appeals to honesty, a small proportion who will attempt to cheat when an opportunity is afforded to do so. Both the faculty and administration, working together, can do much to reduce cheating to the irreducible minimum by adopting more effective methods of proctoring and of reporting cases of cheating.

A. The instructor or a properly qualified substitute should always remain in the classroom during all examinations and tests, except in graduate courses in which the instructor has adopted the honor system with the consent of the Dean of the Graduate College. During the course of such tests and examinations the instructor and his assistants, if any, are expected carefully to supervise the conduct of the examination.

B. Students should be discouraged from bringing texts and notebooks to final examinations. In all examinations and tests the members of the class should place all books and notebooks at some place in the classroom designated by the instructor. Generally not more than one student at a time should be allowed to leave the room during the examination or test, and then only in case of necessity.

C. Where practicable, instructors are urged to place the students in alternate seats or rows. Where this is not possible, the instructor is urged where feasible to give alternate sets of examination questions to the class. The University recognizes that due to lack of stenographic and mimeographing assistance alternate sets of examination questions cannot be given by all instructors.

D. On all final examinations each student should be given a mimeographed, typewritten, or printed copy of the questions. On all hour tests the University encourages, although it does not require, the same practice.

E. The University will furnish bluebooks or answer sheets to all instructors for final and hour examinations. The instructor is expected to furnish the bluebooks or answer sheets to his class on all final examinations and hour tests and to require his class to use only such bluebooks or answer sheets. The instructor may obtain these supplied from the head of his department. (This paragraph was changed by subsequent action as reported below.)

ALL P. 17

F. All tests should be adequately proctored. For tests one class period in length or longer the recommended minimum number of proctors is:

<u>Size of Class</u>	<u>No. of Proctors</u>
0-50	1
51-100	2
101-200	3
More than 200	4 or more.

The head of the department and his staff members should meet from time to time to arrange for the equitable distribution of the work of proctoring. If application of the above schedule should result in having each member of a department serve as proctor in one third more examinations than his own classes necessitate, arrangements should be made by the Head of the Department with the University administration for the furnishing of sufficient additional qualified

help. (This paragraph was changed by subsequent action as reported below.)

G. The University Committee on Dishonest Scholastic Work shall cause to be mailed to each new member of the teaching faculty a copy of the **Statement of the University Rules and Policies Governing Dishonest Scholastic Work.**

H. Near the beginning of each academic year, the Head of each Department shall call the attention of the members of his staff, especially new members, to these Rules and Policies. The Deans of the Colleges and the Heads of the Departments shall supervise the administration of these Rules and Policies, except for the handling of cheating cases by the Committee."

Dr. McCormick asked why the committee to handle cheating cases was no longer to be referred to as the Committee on Student Examinations and Reports but was to be named the University Committee on Dishonest Scholastic Work. Dr. Hudson said that the committee had felt that a frank, unveiled title, which immediately made known the work of the committee, would facilitate the effectiveness of the committee's work. Dr. McCormick replied that particularly in cases where the work of the committee must be explained to parents, it is less embarrassing to be able to refer to the committee by a less forthright name. Dean Clarson explained that it was unjust to some students to call the committee the Committee on Dishonest Scholastic Work, since the committee reviews the cases of innocent students as well as guilty ones; and in the case of innocent students, there has been no dishonest work. Dr. Barnes stated he was sure the committee had no objection in the change of the University committee's title.

Dr. Gray reminded the Senate that many cases which come before the University committee involve neither examinations nor reports. Dr. Roberts agreed with this remark, saying that considerable dishonesty occurs in laboratory work. He suggested that the committee be designated the University Committee on Scholastic Work. Professor Andreas Andersen then moved that the committee be called the University Committee on Scholastic Work. This was seconded by Dr. Gray. President McCormick then suggested that a more exact title might be the University Committee on Examinations and Scholastic Work. Professor Andersen and Dr. Gray accepted this amendment to their motion. Dean Harvill pointed out that the work of the committee was the important matter, and what the committee was called was not of primary importance. Dean Slonaker said that the work of the committee would be far more effective if its title was frank and aboveboard. Dean Butler pointed out, in answer to Dean Clarson's objection, that innocent people appear in criminal courts; and although the courts are so designated, the accused are not considered criminals until after the disposition of the case.

The Senate then voted on Professor Andersen's motion, and it lost.

Professor Pultz then moved that the original title, the University Committee on Student Examinations and Reports, be retained. This was seconded. Dean Slonaker objected, saying again that the work of such a committee cannot be as effective as it should be if the name of the committee is not thoroughly aboveboard. He suggested that the committee be called the University Committee on Dishonest Scholastic Work, as it is designated in the special committee's report.

Dean MacCready explained that it would be simpler for those who must deal with parents in such cases to be able to refer to the committee by a frank name. The Senate then voted on Dr. Pultz's motion, and that motion lost.

Dr. Gray next moved that the Introduction and Part I of the report should be approved as presented. Professor A. Andersen said that he thought the public schools

should be informed of our action. He felt that much of the problem of cheating in colleges is a result of lack of training in the public schools. Dean Clarson rose to defend the public schools. He pointed out that he is certain that every public school teacher emphasizes honesty and character building to the utmost. He said that such a proposal as Professor Andersen's was a direct insult to the teaching profession and that such a statement could be made only by one ignorant of the facts. Professor Andersen said he was sure he was not ignorant of the facts, since he is familiar with the situation existing in the public schools inasmuch as his children attend those schools. He was certain that there is room for considerable more attention to character training in the schools and that the children should be more thoroughly indoctrinated against dishonesty.

President McCormick said he felt that the University would be presuming if it attempted to tell the high schools and grade schools of the state that they should do a better job in teaching honesty. Professor Garretson said that he was sure the public school teachers are trying to build character. He pointed out further that the University cannot tell the public schools what they should do if the honesty situation is no better in the University than it has been.

The Senate then voted on Dr. Gray's motion, and it passed. (Intro + Part I ok).

The Senate then turned to a consideration of Part II of the report.

It was pointed out that Paragraph E might not be feasible because of cost. Dr. Pistor explained that in many courses in the College of Agriculture, blank blue books are turned in by students at the time of an examination and are shuffled and then redistributed. Dr. Roberts explained that a similar plan is followed in the Chemistry Department. Blue books are collected in advance, initialed by the instructor, and then redistributed to the students. Dr. Gray said that he for many years has collected the books in advance and punched them, placing the holes in a different location each time.

Dr. McCormick said he wonders if even though the University provided blue books, would not some students soon discover some way of duplicating these.

Dr. Barnes said that the special committee had felt that "cribs" in blue books was one large source of cheating. The committee's suggestion would still leave loopholes, he knew, but he felt that the suggestion would tend to minimize cheating. The committee had felt that the cost was an administrative matter. Dean Clarson pointed out that the plan as suggested had been tried some years before and abandoned.

Dr. Mary Caldwell explained that in her department early in each semester each student turns in five new blue books to the department. For examinations in that department during the semester, as each student enters the examination room, he is handed a blue book with a number on the cover. This number designated the seat in which he will sit for that examination. He writes his examination in the blue book given him. Dr. Caldwell felt that the plan was a very workable one.

Dr. McCormick estimated that should the University assume the cost of providing the blue books, this would amount to some \$4000 a year. Dean Patrick pointed out that at Stanford a similar plan had been adopted and did not work. He stated he favored Dr. Caldwell's plan and moved that Section E be changed to a recommendation for a plan similar to that used by Dr. Caldwell in her department. This was seconded

by Dr. Gray. Dr. Houghton pointed out that no department should be bound to follow any certain plan; rather, these plans should simply be considered as recommendations. Dean Patrick's motion was then voted on, and it passed. (see p. 57)

The Senate next turned to consideration of Paragraph F of the report. President McCormick said he felt that here was the heart of the problem. He felt that the only alternative to an honor system is adequate proctoring. Dr. Roberts said he did not feel it is a question of the number of proctors, but rather one of the vigilance of the proctors. He said he felt that to be proctored by other than the regular lecturer or instructor would be upsetting to many students. Dr. Hudson said the plan has worked at the University of Illinois. Dean Harvill explained that visiting proctors are used in examinations in the humanities and in freshman English.

Professor Borgquist stated that he objected to that section of the paragraph which suggested faculty members should add to their duties by having to assist in proctoring other faculty members' examinations. He agreed that we need adequate proctoring, but he did not feel that it was fair to put this additional load on the faculty members. This would be a real imposition, he said. Dr. Roberts pointed out that many faculty members would have classes of their own at the hours of their fellow faculty members' examinations and so could not be available for proctoring. Dr. McCormick said that he did not think that one proctor for every fifty students was an unreasonable figure.

Dr. Barnes said Paragraph F had been a difficult one to draft. In answer to Professor Borgquist, he said that actually no professor would have to help proctor more than one or two examinations in addition to his own. The point was that we must get proctors, and it was felt that the administration should pay some of the expense but that the departments should be willing to accept some of the burden themselves.

Professor Borgquist then moved that all of Paragraph F be deleted following the table of figures. Dean Butler asked if this section, if adopted, would become obligatory. Dr. Barnes pointed out that where the plan is not practicable, the plan cannot be enforced. It is a strong recommendation, however.

Dr. Mary Caldwell suggested that possibly Blue Key would designate certain seniors to be proctors. Professor Borgquist asked if these men should serve without pay. Dr. Caldwell answered yes. Dr. Roberts asked where the proctors would come from in a large college like the College of Business and Public Administration. Dean Brown said he did not know. With present staff he doubts that he could obtain additional proctors, and the problem is made unusually acute he said by overcrowding in classrooms. Until the overcrowding situation can be relieved, he did not feel additional proctoring would solve the cheating problem. Dean Clarkson asked who would be proctors if money were available to hire them. Professor Borgquist suggested graduate students.

Dr. Houghton said that faculty members, after giving the examination, must grade the papers. He felt that additional proctors should be brought in, rather than ask faculty members to double up in proctoring. Dr. McCormick asked how other institutions had handled the problem, and Dr. Hudson answered that his survey had not revealed whom had been assigned the proctoring job at other schools. Dr. Roberts said that he felt the teaching staff was already overloaded and that if additional proctors were to be supplied, they should come from some source other than faculty members, possibly from a corps of graduate students.

Dean Butler then suggested that the final clause of the last sentence in the section to be deleted from Paragraph E. by Professor Borgquist's motion should be retained, commencing with the word "arrangement." Professor Borgquist accepted this amendment to his motion, which was then seconded and passed. Dean Clarson asked who was meant by the phrase "University administration." It was explained that the deans and the President were included in that phrase. Dean Harvill then moved that Part II of the report as amended be approved. This was seconded by Dean Clarson, and the motion carried.

The President then said that due to the lateness of the hour, it might be well to postpone consideration of Part III of the report until the next meeting. This was agreeable to the members of the Senate; and it was agreed that a special meeting would be held on Monday afternoon, October eleventh, at 3:40 o'clock.

CLOSING OF UNIVERSITY GATES, DISCUSSION OF: Dr. McCormick reported that a proposal had come from Blue Key to the Advisory Council that certain sections of the University streets be closed during certain hours of the school day as follows: The hours for restricted use of campus streets would be from 7am to 1pm on Saturdays and from 7am to 3pm on other days. The Third Street entrance to the campus would be blocked off to the center of the campus, and the Second Street entrance would be blocked off to the Engineering Building. Also, the Fourth Street entrance would be blocked off to the end of the parking area adjacent to the Law College, and the east entrance would be blocked off near the cactus garden to prevent through traffic.

This action was prompted by the serious congestion occurring on these streets due to pedestrian and automobile traffic between classes. The recommendation has as yet not been acted on by the Student Board of Control. However, the Advisory Council has approved the recommendation; and although it is not an academic matter, the Council wishes to obtain Senate opinion on the matter before referring it to the Board of Regents. Dr. Pistor moved that the recommendation be approved by the Senate, and this motion was seconded and passed.

STUDENT UNION MEMORIAL BUILDING, SITE OF: Dr. McCormick reported that the faculty recommendation as to the site of the Student Union Memorial Building had been submitted to the Board of Regents at the same time the recommendation of the student body and alumni had been submitted. The press release at the time had indicated that only the student and alumni recommendation had gone to the Board of Regents. The President wanted the Senate to know that the Faculty recommendation was also being given due consideration by the Board of Regents.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 pm.



David L. Windsor
Secretary Pro Tem

DLW:cn