

MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Tuesday, February 1, 1955 Room 101, Law Building

The Faculty Senate convened in special session at 3:40 P.M. on Tuesday, February 1, 1955, in room 101 of the Law Building. Thirty-four members were present with President Harvill presiding.

The minutes of the meeting of January 17, 1955 were approved as distributed to members.

Catalogue material - College of Fine Arts proposal: The following alternative plan of adjusting the group requirements for professional degrees in the College of Fine Arts was submitted for consideration. The original proposal of the College was denied at the last meeting of the Senate.

1. After "with not less than 6 units in each of 3 groups," ADD "and not more than 10 units in Group VI."
2. Change "not less than 6 units in each of 3 groups" to "not less than 6 units in each of 4 groups" and add the following note:

Note: The requirement in Group II and in Group III may be adjusted in consideration of attainment in these fields of study as indicated by the admission credits.

At the request of Dean Crowder, Professor Buchhauser outlined the position of the College of Fine Arts. He explained that the proposed revision of the summary of group requirements, page 143 of the catalogue, would require the student to take "not less than 34 academic units selected from Groups II to VI, with not less than 6 units in each of four groups, and not more than 10 units in Group VI."

He further explained that the note regarding consideration of attainment in fields of study in high school referred to the fields of foreign language and science. The group requirements referred to were listed in the original proposal as follows:

- Group I - English 1a-1b; for men, physical education (2), military science (4); for women, physical education (4).
- Group II - Foreign language
- Group III - Science (astronomy, bacteriology, botany, chemistry, geology, mathematics, physics, zoology - 1 subject)
- Group IV - Social Science (anthropology, economics, history, philosophy, political science, psychology, sociology)
- Group V - Humanities or Literature
- Group VI - Fine Arts history and literature courses.

President Harvill pointed out that under the proposed provision the candidate for degree could conceivably offer no college credit in language or science.

Dr. Humphrey objected to permitting the substitution of high school experience in science for the University requirement in that field.

Mr. Leshner called attention to the University practice of weighing the high school experience, particularly in the fields of science and language. The student is not permitted to duplicate any high school course in language for University credit and in the department of chemistry the student who has completed high school chemistry is not permitted to enroll for freshman course Chemistry 1a. Under the circumstances, he said, the educational experience of the student in high school, while not being equivalent to University courses in terms of credit, should, nevertheless, be regarded as a substantial experience. On this premise, he said, the proposal of the College of Fine Arts was valid.

Dean Roy asked if it would not be sufficient to have the requirement read "with not less than 6 units in each of three groups, II to V, and not more than 10 units in Group VI", with the further provision to eliminate the footnote regarding admission credits. Dr. Solve objected to the distribution of the required fields and called attention to the overlapping of Group VI with major fields of study.

Professor Buchhauser explained that the purpose of Group VI originally was to make it possible to give students additional experience in music, which they otherwise would not have. This group in the School of Music would include History of Music, Survey of Music Literature, and, in the field of art, would include History of Modern Art.

President Harvill reiterated that the question revolved around the other groups, II to V, and is one of determining whether three or four of these groups will be required.

Dean Roy suggested again that the requirement indicate not less than 6 units in Groups II to V, and not more than 10 units in Group VI. This would insure distribution in three out of four groups.

President Harvill explained that it will be necessary for the Senate to take formal action in order to bring the proposals of the College of Fine Arts to the consideration of the Senate. Professor Buchhauser moved that the Senate consider the inclusion of the note regarding admission credits as part of the requirement. This motion was seconded by Dean Crowder.

Dr. Roberts then objected to the footnote because of its indefinite nature. He felt that if any statement were to be included in the catalogue it should state definitely the amount of work in high school language or science that should be completed with reference to the adjustment of the college requirement.

When the question was called for, the motion was lost.

The President then indicated it would be in order to determine whether or not the remaining items in the proposal would be considered. Professor Buchhauser moved to consider the first proposal changed to read: "The student will be required to take general requirements as listed in Group I and not less than 34 academic units selected from Groups II to VI, with not less than 6 units in each of four groups and not more than 10 units in Group VI."

The President explained that the adoption of this motion would mean that the student could leave out only one group such as science or language rather than both of these groups. Dean Garretson suggested that the statement be simplified by requiring 24 units in Groups II to V.

The motion to consider was not seconded. Professor Buchhauser then changed his motion, which was accepted by the chair as a motion to approve, to have the statement read that the student will be required to take 24 academic units selected from Groups II through V, with not less than 6 units in each of three groups, with the elimination of Group VI.

Dr. Roberts emphasized at some length the importance of retaining the academic core of studies in the Fine Arts program. He recalled Dean Crowder's statement at the last meeting regarding the transition made in the nature of Fine Arts program, especially in connection with the closing of conservatories. He pointed out, however, that students coming into the University should be willing to follow the University practice. He recalled that the 1936-37 catalogue of the College of Fine Arts listed for the degree of Bachelor of Music in Theory 8 units of foreign language, 16 units for majors in piano, 16 units for majors in band and orchestra, 16 units for majors in voice, with 47 electives. Today the program includes 8 music electives and 8 academic electives. The Bachelor of Fine Arts candidate had from 58 to 62 electives and now has 19 drama electives and 5 free electives. This illustrates the trend away from academic requirements. It was his opinion that no sufficient argument has been heard to warrant the adoption of the Fine Arts proposal. The suggested revision allows the student to omit either science or foreign language in the college program. It was his feeling that such a change should not be allowed. As a member of the Coordinating Committee when the Fine Arts College was founded, he pointed out that the University President and the Dean of the College at that time gave assurance that the college would retain the liberal arts tradition in its required program. In his opinion it would be a serious mistake academically to diminish the liberal arts core.

Dean Roy stated that in other professional areas of the University the situation with respect to group requirements is no different from Fine Arts. In the more popular programs in the Fine Arts college the academic distribution is a reasonable one and much similar to that of Liberal Arts. The present proposal is not an ideal one; however, the situation is one which has been recognized in other professional fields within the University, and accepted, and under the circumstances it should be possible to find some reasonable adjustment in this case. The Fine Arts experience, he stated, may be regarded as just as valid an approach as foreign language or scientific subjects. It will be just as valid to insist that engineers have 8 units of Fine Arts or Humanities as to require Fine Arts students to have 8 units of science or any other particular phase of work in the University.

Dr. Roberts replied to Dean Roy by saying that we should distinguish the problems of securing a distribution of work from that of permitting freedom of electives. It is desirable to have the student take something in each field of activity. It is true that the engineers do not obtain the broadest academic training which is regrettable, but this is compensated for in part, at least, by the fact that they are qualified to make a good living. This is not true, Dr. Roberts said, for those who take degrees in music and drama. The proposal, he said, will permit the student to leave out one field of work entirely while at the same time not improving his professional training.

Dr. Solve objected to taking action on the proposal because of lack of time to consider it properly and the fact that it had not gone through usual channels. He moved that a written ballot be taken on the motion. His motion was seconded by Dr. Gegenheimer, who stated that enough time had not been allowed to consider the proposal and that it had not been submitted through proper procedures. Professor Buchhauser explained that the proposal had been submitted to the Senate through the action of the Advisory Council.

The President explained that since the original proposal had been considered by the Senate through the usual channels, the adjustment had been regarded in the Council as a matter which could be referred directly to the Senate for consideration.

The question was then called for and the motion to vote by ballot was carried.

Dr. Carpenter expressed the opinion that it is not accurate to take the appraisal of the Fine Arts college, at least of its professional courses, as the essential equivalent of professional courses in engineering. The difference is that fine arts of themselves are essentially liberal or liberalizing fields. Practitioners should not be denied a liberal education. The question was whether or not music should be played and taught by people who are acquainted with only one activity, or if drama should be practiced by people not well informed. He quoted from the catalogue of the Yale School of Fine Arts and the Graduate School which indicated that a liberal program of academic work is essential in the preparation in Fine Arts.

At this point the ballots were distributed and Dr. Galbraith and Dr. Blitzer were appointed as tellers.

Dr. Gegenheimer asked that all present appear at the faculty meeting on Thursday to hear the AAUP report on retirement. The President reported that notices had been distributed regarding the meeting to be held at 4:40 P.M. on Thursday in the Liberal Arts auditorium. He called attention, also, to the prospective visit of the Netherlands Ambassador who will speak to an assembly of faculty members and students on February 10 on the subject "Confidence in International Affairs."

The tellers reported to the President, who announced that the motion had lost by a vote of 21 to 12.

Dean Roy presented for consideration, subject to approval of the Coordinating Committee and the Faculty of the Liberal Arts College, a proposal to change Chemistry 1a-b from a 4-4 to a 5-5 unit course with 3 lectures, one two-hour laboratory period and two one hour quiz periods. The adjusted course is one for students who have not had high school chemistry. Students with one year of high school chemistry, however, may be admitted if the high school work was completed five years or more prior to enrollment in college chemistry or if the high school record and placement test indicate the need for such admission. Those in the lowest four deciles of the freshman class or the lowest one-third of high school class, and who have had high school chemistry, would be admitted to Chemistry 1a-b for 4 units each semester rather than 5. The change, Dean Roy stated, was proposed in order to reconcile several problems in connection with registrations in chemistry. It is hoped to bring the accomplishment of the student in 1a-b closer to that of 2a-b, since both courses are prerequisite to the same upper-division work. It is hoped also to lower the failure rate by giving more attention to students in small sections and at the same time affording an opportunity for the student who has completed his high school chemistry considerably prior to enrollment in the University to prepare for subsequent work. Dean Roy moved that the proposal be considered at this time. The motion was seconded by Dean Eckert.

Dr. Roberts reported that there was a precedent for the arrangement in the Department of Physics where Physics 10 is a 5-5 course and carries 3 lectures, one two-hour laboratory period and two one-hour recitation periods.

Dr. Barnes called attention to the lack of a similar arrangement in any other science department and took exception to the proposal of Chemistry 1a-b as being similar to Physics 10a-b. The latter is a sophomore level course which requires

calculus, with high school Physics, as a prerequisite. He asked if we were to have parallel situations in all basic, elementary science courses. Dean Roy replied that the question had been raised before and that this proposal was made in order to solve some of the problems peculiar to the Department of Chemistry.

It was Dr. Blitzer's opinion that to make the Chemistry 1a-b course a 5 unit course without increasing the level of attainment would serve to lower standards. He also pointed out that the increase in the value would lower the number of elective units available, and raised a question as to whether the content of the course merits a total value of 10 units.

Dr. Roberts replied by explaining that he had reviewed the practice obtaining in many other state institutions, and found there were almost as many practices as there were colleges offering courses in chemistry. He said, however, the same plan obtained at the University of Illinois. He did not feel the standards of work would be lowered. He admitted, however, that the plan was experimental in nature, but that the Department would like to give it a trial. He emphasized the importance of the value of teaching the students in small groups and explained that it was just as necessary to have such an arrangement as it is to teach small groups in such courses as calculus.

Dean Eckert supported the proposal explaining that he felt it would be to the advantage of students in the College of Agriculture to have a course in General Chemistry arranged on the 5-unit basis.

Dean Chapman asked if the student who completed the course would cover any more subject matter than has been required. He pointed out that the students who complete Chemistry 1a-b as well as those who complete 2a-b are admitted to Chemistry 10 and asked if the department was in effect assigning 2 units of high school credit to the course. In reply Dr. Roberts explained that although they have been allowing students from both 1b and 2b to enter Chemistry 10, the department acknowledges that this practice is not defensible and explained that it is one reason why it is desirable to adjust the present course.

Mr. Marcoux suggested that the course would appear to include a refresher for students deficient in high school chemistry and the University should not allow credit for this part of the work, with the result that the course would logically include 8 credits the same as 2a-b. Dr. Roberts replied that Chemistry is not required of many students in high school and there would be no reason to penalize the student for this fact. When the student takes chemistry in the University he should be allowed to apply the full value of the course on his degree.

In reply to the President's request for a statement of the question, Dean Roy stated his motion was meant to cover approval of the course. The question was called for and the motion carried.

President Harvill then asked if there were any other questions in connection with consideration of the catalogue material and Dr. Roberts raised a point about the new summer session courses listed in the announcement of this meeting. These include Botany 136s, Plants Useful to Man, and Botany 114s, Plants of the Desert; they are listed for two credits each and carry graduate credit. The prerequisite in each case is listed as 8 units of science, and for graduate credit 8 units of science and 12 units of education. He asked if these courses carry graduate credit for Botany majors. Dr. Humphrey explained that the courses do carry graduate credit but not for majors in botany.

President Harvill explained that both he and Dr. Nugent would be out of town on Monday, February 7th, and asked if there would be any objection to postponing the regular meeting date until the 14th. No objection was voiced and it was understood that the next meeting of the Senate will be scheduled for Monday, February 14, at the usual time and place.

Meeting adjourned at 5:40 P.M.


G. Zaner Lesher, Secretary