

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, March 7, 1955
Room 101, Law Building

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:40 P.M. on Monday, March 7, 1955, in Room 101 of the Law Building. Thirty-one members were present with President Harvill presiding.

The minutes of the meeting of February 14, 1955 were approved as distributed to members.

Catalogue items, additional: Several catalogue items reported in the announcements of March 1 and March 4 were accepted by the Senate.

Honorary Degrees, report of committee on: Copies of a report prepared by a special committee headed by Dr. Desmond S. Powell had been sent to members of the Senate. There was general discussion of the report, which read as follows:

"REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE
ON
PROCEDURES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HONORARY DEGREES

"The Committee began by examining the study called "Honorary Degree Policies of 34 States, as of 1953-54" by Logan Wilson, President of the University of Texas. Contained therein are the following items of which this committee approved:

- "1. Most of the universities listed restrict the number of honorary degrees to 2, to 3, to 4, or to 5 per year. (The adoption of any such number does not mean that any degrees need be given in a specific year). The committee favors a conservative policy.
- "2. Most of the universities choose their nominees chiefly from persons of achievement who have some close connection with the university or with the state or region.
- "3. Some universities exclude faculty members, members of the board of regents or trustees, and elected incumbents of public office during the time of their incumbency.

"In addition to the above the committee recommends the following:

- "4. Recommendations for honorary degrees should be presented to the Senate at the regular March meeting. This should allow ample time for discussion by the faculty.
- "5. The vita of each nominee should be written by someone sufficiently conversant with him so that a full justification of the award can be made.
- "6. The presentation of honorary degrees to commencement speakers should be discouraged.
- "7. The presentation of honorary degrees other than the doctorate should be discouraged.

"8. The policy of departmental approval of nominees should admit of qualification. There might be cases where more than one department should be concerned. It should be possible, also, to re-consider any nominee who has not received departmental approval, if cause can be shown.

"Except for numbers 3, 4, and 5, the above are presented as general methods of procedure. The committee believes that exceptions to the others might occur and that therefore it would be wise to avoid rigid rules and specific criteria.

A. W. Buchhauser
L. W. Casaday
C. R. Hausenbauer
M. G. Vavich
D. S. Powell (Chairman)."

Dr. Roberts raised a question in connection with item No. 4. He felt that the recommendations for honorary degrees should be presented in writing to the members at one meeting of the Senate, discussed in a general way, and held over until the following meeting for final action. The wisdom of providing all members of the Senate with a copy of the qualifications of a nominee was questioned. Dr. Nugent suggested that the statement could be read to the Senate when first presented and held for action, without the necessity of distributing copies to all members.

In connection with the presentation of honorary degrees to commencement speakers, it was generally agreed that the award of an honorary degree in recognition of the selection as a commencement speaker should be discouraged; but there was no objection to having the commencement speaker receive an honorary degree for merit.

It was also suggested that reference to the Board of Regents be deleted from item No. 3, but it was pointed out that in this connection the report merely constitutes a statement of general practice in colleges and universities.

Also, reference was made to "faculty members" and "elected incumbents of public office" in item No. 3. The University has from time to time awarded a few honorary degrees to members of its faculty and in recent years has awarded an honorary degree to two United States Senators. It was suggested that item No. 3 be deleted from the last paragraph of the report so that it would read: "Except for numbers 4 and 5, the above are presented as general methods of procedure."

On motion by Dr. Nugent, with a second by Dr. Galbraith, the Senate voted that the report be a matter of formal consideration by the Senate and that final action be taken at the next meeting.

A.A.U.P. Salary Committee Report, Report of Senate Committee to consider:

Dr. Herbert D. Rhodes presented a report from a special committee appointed to consider the A.A.U.P. salary report and to make a report on this to the Senate. Copies of his committee report had been sent to members of the Senate.

Lack of time prevented a review of the complete report at this meeting, but the items presented by Dr. Rhodes and discussed by the Senate read as follows:

"Let it be stated at the outset that your Committee feels that the report is in general a sound one, that it is the result of a considerable amount of intelligent effort, that its points have been made fairly and after careful consideration and finally that the subject matter treated is of such importance and concern to the faculty and to the entire university organization that it behooves the Senate to consider it with care. It is your Committee's recommendation that this report be endorsed by the Senate substantially in its present form (but with certain modification) and that its recommendations be endorsed as an expression of approved administration policy. Because of the nature of the subjects treated, it is our further recommendation that the report as endorsed by the Senate be referred to the general faculty for consideration with the thought that the faculty may well wish to urge the adoption of the recommendations contained therein upon the administration as an expression of approved general policy.

"While your Committee endorses the report in general, it wishes to present certain remarks and recommendations of its own which the Senate may wish to consider.

"1. Page 4, line 7 to 10 inclusive. This is the first positive recommendation in the report. This Committee recognizes the existence of the problem as outlined above. It feels strongly that merit should be clearly recognized by both salary increase and promotion and endorses the recommendation of lines 7 to 10 as stated."

Dr. Rhodes pointed out that the first positive recommendation in the A.A.U.P. report is that funds available for salary increases this year be used to grant all over-due promotions and that the floors be raised only if additional funds are available. In no case should increases be allowed that will prevent or delay promotions. The Committee (Senate) feels strongly, said Dr. Rhodes, that merit should be clearly recognized by both salary increases and promotions, and endorses the recommendations of line 7 to 10 as stated in the A.A.U.P. report. This point, he explained, is in connection with certain cases where salary floors of the different academic ranks have been raised at such a rate that promotions normally expected were delayed and the member retained in the same academic status.

Dean Park emphasized the importance of raising the general salary scale by increasing floors and President Harvill pointed out that it would be a real problem to increase both the salary and the teaching rank.

The question was raised as to what was meant by "over-due" promotion, and it was suggested that this be interpreted as meaning one which would normally be given at a particular time for merit.

Dr. Solve suggested that the Deans of the colleges could determine whether or not there are cases which should include ~~both a promotion in academic rank and increase in salary at the same time.~~ President Harvill asked that the Deans prepare such information in order to report to the Senate at its next meeting as to the number of such cases that might have to be considered.

consideration both of raising the salary floor and giving merit increase in salary at the same time.
(See minutes of meeting of April 4, 1955 for this change.)

"2. Table III, page 5. The Committee recognizes that Table III contains only a limited number of data and may be suspected of presenting an incomplete picture. These institutions are representative western institutions, however, most of which are in the same general category as the University of Arizona. Although we actually compete for faculty with most of the colleges and universities in the country, it is institutions such as these with whom our competition is greatest. Although all of us have not seen the data, we are assured by a member of the A.A.U.P. Committee that Table III is a quite representative selection."

Dr. Carpenter suggested that presentations such as those in Table III should not be limited to western institutions but that comparison should be made also with institutions in other areas, including those in the east. Dr. Rhodes explained that his Committee had considered this point but felt that the position of the University could be illustrated to best advantage by comparing its position with that of other western institutions. President Harvill stated that were the comparison to be made generally with state universities, Arizona's position would compare more favorably with other institutions. He then quoted figures for the current year, on the basis of arithmetic averages, as follows:

University of New Mexico - Instructors \$3923; Assistant Professors \$4857; Associate Professors \$5570; and Professors \$6913. University of Oregon - Instructors \$4048; Assistant Professors \$5003; Associate Professors \$6206; and Professors \$7898. Oregon State - Instructors \$4031; Assistant Professors \$4872; Associate Professors \$5956; and Professors \$7573. University of Washington - Instructors \$4354; Assistant Professors \$5120; Associate Professors \$6206; and Professors \$8328.

"3. Page 6, paragraph B (including Table IV). While the Committee recognizes clearly the validity of the argument presented in this section and agrees entirely with the sentiment expressed and the conclusions stated, it feels that the argument may have little force with those whose main financial concern lies with the expenditure of the taxpayer's dollar rather than with the over-all cost to society of higher education. The concept of the total "social cost" and loss of wages (which were never earned) may be so ethereal in contrast to the very real expense of the University in terms of actual dollars which are actually appropriated and actually spent that we feel the argument of Section B may be suspect in the eyes of those not familiar with such a line of reason. Since a weak point detracts from the strength of the whole, the Committee recommends the deletion of section B in its entirety."

There was some discussion as to the desirability of deleting the above section but no formal action was taken in this regard.

At this point the Senate was reminded that it was time to close the session and further consideration of the report was held over until the next meeting.

Mr. Leshar asked if there would be a report by a special committee appointed to consider the question of changing the scholarship requirements for graduation. The President replied it was his understanding that the committee's

report was not related to preparation of the catalogue for the next biennium and that there was no urgency in considering the matter. Dr. Merritt , Chairman of the Committee, explained that it was regarded as a complex problem and that in spite of the fact that some information is available as the result of the work of Dean Roy's committee of several years ago, the Committee is not ready to submit a report at this time. Further comment indicated that the committee would report at some future time.

The President announced that the next regular meeting of the Senate would be held on Monday, April 4.

Meeting adjourned at 5:45 P.M.


C. Zaner Lesher, Secretary