

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

Room 101, Law Building, Monday, December 1, 1952

The meeting of the Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:40 P.M. on Monday, December 1, 1952, in Room 101 of the Law Building. Twenty-seven members were present, Vice-President Nugent presiding prior to the arrival of President Harvill.

The minutes of November 3, 1952, were approved as previously published and sent to the members of the Senate.

Dr. Nugent announced the names of the fifteen members-at-large of the Faculty Senate chosen by the General Faculty in the election which closed November 12, 1952. These members whose terms will begin at the resumption of classes following the first of the year are:

Professor William S. Barnes	*Professor Russell M. Howard
Professor William H. Brown	*Professor Klonda Lynn
Professor Mary E. Caldwell	Professor James F. McKale
Professor Edwin F. Carpenter	Professor Edwin D. McKee
*Professor Russell C. Ewing	Professor William J. Pistor
Professor Emil W. Haury	Professor Lathrop E. Roberts
*Professor George F. Herrick	*Professor Herbert D. Rhodes
Professor Neal D. Houghton	*Serving at present

CATALOGUE CHANGES, REPORT ON: Dr. Nugent asked if there were any comments on the catalogue additions and changes as approved by the Advisory Council on November 5 and 19, and sent to the members of the Senate on November 21 and 24. There being no further comment regarding these reports nor on that of the Catalogue Announcement of the Calendar, approved by the Council on November 26 and sent to the Senate on November 29, these three reports were declared approved subject to the review of the Board of Regents.

GRADE AVERAGE REQUIREMENT FOR BACHELOR'S DEGREE, REVIEW OF: Attention was called to a report received from the Advisory Council as follows:

"Grade Average for Bachelor's Degree, Adjustment in: The Registrar submitted a proposal that in connection with the present average of 3.2000 for the Bachelor's Degree and the average of 3.0000 for courses in the major field and for admission to the College of Law and the College of Education, the zeros after the first digit beyond the decimal point be disregarded and the average be established as 3.2 and 3.0. In this connection, he presented to the Council members the following statement:

"The present scholarship requirement for a bachelor's degree is 3.2000. The recommendation of the committee appointed to study a grade average system rather than the requirement of 80% above "4", submitted to the Senate a recommendation that a general average of 3.3 be adopted. The Senate revised this to read 3.2000. The application of the new requirement has raised the standard of scholarship required for the bachelor's degree if such standard is measured by

the number of students who fail to meet the requirement. There is a public relations problem, however, which has grown out of this requirement based on the fact that the requirement stipulates three zeros after the 3.2. This problem can be solved by disregarding any figures after the 3.2 and accepting the fact that in some cases the average might be 3.2999. Obviously, this is closer to a 3.3 than a 3.2 but it is suggested that the difference between the 3.2000 and the 3.2999 is not significant insofar as a scholarship standard for the degree is concerned. If the requirement were stated in the catalogue as a 3.2, the distinction between this requirement and a 3.3 or lower average would be understood. This would, I believe, eliminate the criticism which we now have in such fine distinctions as that occasioned by the difference between 3.2000 and 3.2145, etc. It is recognized, of course, that a 3.2⁴ is not actually a 3.2 but this is an academic distinction which can be waived insofar as a satisfactory standard of scholarship is concerned and which is not appreciated by the layman. It is suggested that the above interpretation apply also in connection with the average of 3.000 required for the degree in Law, and in the major subject in Education, Fine Arts, Business Administration, and Liberal Arts. (See pp 53 and 91 of catalogue.)

"The discussion indicated that members of the Council felt that the proposed adjustment would be helpful, and on motion voted its approval and to recommend to the Faculty Senate that the general scholarship average of 3.2000 and of 3.000 be adjusted to read 3.2 and 3.0."

Dr. Rhodes felt that the statement which was made in connection with the proposal would lead to a confusion of issues. He then quoted from the above calling attention to the claim that the difference between the 3.2 and the 3.2000 "is an academic distinction which can be waived insofar as a satisfactory standard of scholarship is concerned and which is not appreciated by the layman." He felt that this should be related to the original action of the Senate in establishing the requirement, and that it would be unfortunate to state in the catalogue a requirement of 3.2 when a lower standard of 3.2999 was acceptable. He suggested that if the requirement were published as 3.1 and then interpreted as 3.1999 there would be less change than the one occasioned by the proposal. He stated further that if a change were made in the present requirement, it should be on the basis of the Senate's judgment that the requirement was too high rather than because of any factor of public relations.

Professor Marcoux suggested that instead of changing the required average, it would be better to disregard failing grades of "5" when courses are repeated and credit established.

Dr. Muir suggested that a feasible adjustment would be to round out the average as is frequently done in handling decimals by listing the average in terms of 3.25.

Dean Brown reminded the Senate that last year some 50 students graduated under the 80% above "4" requirement with averages lower than a 3.2. Registrar Leshar stated that had a requirement of 3.2 rather than 3.2000 obtained, 4 additional seniors would have graduated in 1951, and 11 in 1952. He also emphasized the need of stating the requirement in terms understood by the layman and pointed to the practical value of the proposed change while acknowledging that the establishment of a 3.2 average would be an arbitrary arrangement.

At this point President Harvill appeared and took the chair.

Dr. Schneck favored the proposal to eliminate the zeros after the first digit in a general average, but suggested that it would be better to state the requirement as "better than an average of 3." Dr. Cardon emphasized the need of including all the work attempted by the student in the required average and of continuing to observe a requirement once it is established.

President Harvill felt that the public relations factor need not weigh too heavily in establishing a proper requirement for graduation.

Dr. Thomas suggested that there were two questions involved; first, that of deciding whether or not a change were to be made in the present requirement; and next, to set the definite figures for a new requirement. In connection with the first question he moved that the new catalogue provide for a statement which would require the degree candidate to have an average higher than a 3.2 or 3.3 as may be decided. The motion was seconded by Dr. Schneck. Dean Roy commented that for the catalogue to carry such a statement it would be the only one so published in connection with scholarship requirements since such requirements customarily are stated in terms of a specific average. The motion lost.

Dr. Nugent stated that it may be difficult for parents to appreciate the fine distinction in averages which include figures beyond the 3.2, but suggested that the requirement might be stated in terms of an average of 3.1999.

Dean Roy moved that the graduation requirement be set at an average of 3.2, the averages to be figured to 3.3 with anything less than a 3.3 falling within the requirement. The motion was seconded by Registrar Leshar and passed. //

The question was raised as to whether this action would affect the average required in the major field and for admission to the Colleges of Pharmacy, Education, and Law. President Harvill pointed out that the action affected only the general average required for graduation.

Registrar Leshar moved that the principle applied in connection with the adjustment of the average required for graduation be applied in connection with the requirement in the major field and for admission to the College of Pharmacy, the College of Education, and the College of Law, and for graduation from the College of Law, and that in these instances the average be stated as 3.0. This motion was seconded by Dr. Gray and was passed.

Dr. Thomas asked if the question of adjusting the average for the College of Law would be referred to the faculty of that college for consideration. It was agreed that the question was one for consideration on a university level and that the action of the Senate would govern.

Another question was raised as to when the adjusted requirement would be put into effect. The Registrar stated that it was his understanding that unless special action were taken the adjusted requirement would be published in the next biennial catalogue and made effective in connection with graduation in May, 1954.

EXCHANGE PROFESSORSHIPS, ADDITIONAL REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON: At the request of the President, the Secretary presented a summary of rules and regulations

affecting exchange teaching in Wayne University as filed by Dr. Buehrer following his report to the Senate for the Committee on Exchange Professorships. (See minutes of November 3 Faculty Senate Meeting.)

The statement of rules and regulations from Wayne University reads as follows:

"Eligibility

A teacher may be assigned to perform teaching duties in another state of the United States, a foreign country, or a territory of either, when:

1. the Board of Education has granted him a continuing contract, and
2. he has been employed at least five years by the Board of Education, and
3. he has not been assigned outside the district during the five years immediately preceding, and
4. the President of Wayne University approves in exchange the services of a teacher from the other state of the United States, the foreign country, or the territory of either.

"Application

Application for exchange teaching service shall be made through the regular channels in the colleges and divisions to the Deans or Directors and thus to the President. The application form shall be accompanied by a statement of the plan, showing the benefit both to the University and to the applicant. Forms are available in the Personnel Records Office.

The application should normally be submitted to the department chairman three months before the end of the term or semester preceding the leave. After consideration and recommendation by the department, the approval of the Dean or Director, the application should be forwarded to the President within fifteen (15) days of its submission to the department.

"Maximum Number on Exchange Teaching Service

The number on exchange teaching service at any one time shall not exceed two per cent of the entire University staff. The number from any one school or division may be limited at the discretion of the President.

If the number requesting exchange teaching service exceeds two per cent, the selection shall be based on:

1. The probable value to the University of the proposed exchange,
2. the length of time since the last exchange service,
3. the amount of seniority.

The Sabbatical Leave Advisory Selection Committee will serve as an advisory committee to the President in selecting members for exchange teaching service.

"Length of Exchange

By state status and Board of Education by-laws, exchange teaching service shall not exceed one year.

"Contract Status

A teacher on exchange teaching service shall be entitled to the same compensation, rights and privileges as if he had been continuously performing his normal duties as a teacher for the Detroit Board of Education.

"Reports

Interim reports and a final report shall be filed according to specifications agreed upon at the time the plan is approved.

"Compensation

A teacher while engaged upon an exchange of teaching service shall be paid the same salary as he would have been paid if he were teaching in Detroit. Such a teacher shall be paid at the same time and under the same conditions as are other Detroit teachers.

"Return from Exchange Teaching Service

Upon return from exchange teaching service, the teacher shall be restored to his former teaching position, or to a position of like nature, seniority, status, and pay. Such teacher shall be entitled to participate in any other benefits that may be provided for teachers generally by rules and regulations of the Detroit Board of Education.

"Future Service

Any teacher assigned to exchange teaching service shall agree to return to service with the Detroit Board of Education immediately upon termination of exchange teaching service and to continue in service with the Detroit Board of Education for a period of at least one year (unless causes beyond his control prevent.)"

Dr. Solve stated that he felt the Wayne University plan was the most effective one and that it might well be copied. He suggested recommending it to the Board of Regents, but that it would not be timely to have such a question submitted to the next session of the legislature. He felt that any recommendation could be withheld for several months with the understanding that it be presented to the Board of Regents after the legislative session. President Harvill supported this suggestion, indicating that inasmuch as the Board would be concerned with a consideration of a proper retirement plan for the University and State Colleges and with other matters, it would be wise to withhold recommendation regarding such professorships for the time being. He added that there had been some indication that help would be given the University in connection with a revision of the state constitution opening the way for the arrangement of foreign exchange professorships. Professor Gillmor stressed the desirability of keeping this matter in mind and not letting it be overlooked because of its postponement at this time.

The Secretary was asked to make it a definite item for the agenda at some Senate meeting subsequent to the legislative session.

TREE RING LABORATORY STAFF, FACULTY STATUS RE: The Secretary reported that no recommendation had been received from the Committee on By-Laws in connection with the interest of the Tree Ring Laboratory to have a member of the staff listed as a member of the faculty.

SABBATICAL LEAVES, APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE ON: President Harvill reported the appointment of the following committee to study sabbatical leaves:
Dr. A. R. Kemmerer, Chairman; Dr. T. F. Buehrer, Dean O. K. Garretson,
Dr. E. W. Haury; Dr. R. L. Nugent, Dr. D. S. Powell.

In connection with the above the President pointed out that in the minutes of October 6, it was stated that in some quarters of the faculty there was an opinion that sabbatical leaves were not particularly appropriate. There had been no intention of giving such an impression. He had not intended to give such an impression in his recommendations about sabbatical leaves, but rather had wished to point out that some members of the faculty felt that sabbatical leaves should be planned on a more systematic basis.

NEW MEMBER, INTRODUCTION OF: President Harvill introduced Dr. Doris Hawkins who was welcomed by the Senate as the representative of the College of Pharmacy.

The Senate adjourned at 4:55 P.M.


C. Zaner Leshner, Secretary