

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

Room 101, Law Building, Monday, January 5, 1953

The meeting of the Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:40 P.M. on Monday, January 5, 1953, in Room 101 of the Law Building. Thirty-one members were present with President Harvill presiding.

The minutes of December 1, 1952, were approved as previously published and distributed to members of the Senate.

NEW MEMBERS, WELCOME OF: President Harvill welcomed to the meeting the fifteen members-at-large who had been newly elected, reelected, or reelected after a period of absence from the Senate, namely: Professor William S. Barnes, Professor William H. Brown, Professor Mary E. Caldwell, Professor Edwin F. Carpenter, Professor Russell C. Ewing*, Professor Emil W. Haury, Professor George F. Herrick*, Professor Neal D. Houghton, Professor Russell M. Howard*, Professor Klonda Lynn*, Professor James F. McKale, Professor Edwin D. McKee, Professor William J. Pistor*, Professor Herbert D. Rhodes*, Professor Lathrop E. Roberts.

The President then called attention to the Report of the Faculty Elections Committee on Regularly Scheduled Elections, 1952-53 Academic Year, which had inadvertently omitted the names of Professors Haury and Roberts.

Announcement of the elected members of the Committee of Eleven was then made: Professor William S. Barnes, Professor Bartley P. Cardon, Professor Edwin F. Carpenter, Professor Russell C. Ewing, Professor Emil W. Haury, Associate Professor Philip G. Hudson, Miss Patricia Paylore, Professor William J. Pistor, Professor Herbert D. Rhodes, Professor John T. Shirer, the eleventh member being the recently reelected Chairman of the Faculty, Professor Melvin T. Solve.

CATALOGUE MATERIAL, POLICY RE HANDLING OF: The President informed the Senate members that they were to receive, and in fact had already received from some colleges, mimeographed summaries of all proposed changes for the new biennial catalogue which are being submitted by the various colleges of the University. A summary of Council action which alters proposals which have come from the colleges will later be distributed to the Senate members. The Senate then will convene to consider the new catalogue material.

TREE RING LABORATORY STAFF, FACULTY STATUS OF: President Harvill announced that it had been brought to his attention that it had not been in order for the Senate to refer to the By-Laws Committee the matter of whether or not the Tree Ring Laboratory staff should be granted faculty status. Dr. Houghton stated that this was purely an administrative matter, and President Harvill announced that he would give attention to the question at the earliest possible date.

GRADE AVERAGE REQUIREMENT FOR BACHELOR'S DEGREE, RECONSIDERATION OF: President Harvill reported to the Senate a resolution which had come from the faculty of the College of Law urging that the Faculty Senate authorize the College of Law to adhere to its present standard of 3.0000 for admission to and graduation from that college rather than publishing the requirement as 3.0 and interpreting it as 3.0999. The President also read to the Senate a letter from

* Not eligible for reelection.

Mitchell Vavich, secretary of the Committee of Eleven, reporting that it was the unanimous desire of that body that the Faculty Senate reconsider its action of December 1 which had lowered the University graduation grade average requirement for a bachelor's degree from 3.2000 to 3.2999 (from 3.0000 to 3.0999 for the LL.B.).

Dr. Thomas then rose to explain that at the December 1 Senate meeting he had not realized that the proposed changes were to apply to College of Law requirements. The Law faculty upon learning that requirements for the Law College had also been altered by the Senate's action had reviewed the matter and were of the definite opinion that inasmuch as Law graduates seek to pass state bar examinations from coast to coast and seek public positions of high level, it would be undesirable to lower standards to any degree and that it certainly would not be wise to lower the Law requirement by virtually a full one-tenth of a point or to almost 3.1. Dr. Barnes then endorsed Dr. Thomas' remarks in full. He reminded the Senate that when the old "80% above 4" graduation requirement was discontinued for the University at large, it had first been proposed that the average be 3.3000 and that he had made the motion to raise the requirement to 3.2000. For that reason he would be particularly reluctant to see the standard now lowered.

Dr. Thomas then made a motion seconded by Dr. Barnes that so far as the College of Law was concerned the present admission and graduation grade average of 3.0000 be retained. Dr. Rhodes then stated that he could see no reason for special consideration to be given to the Law College. He agreed wholeheartedly with the wish of the Law faculty to maintain their high standards, but he felt that other college faculties were entitled to the same privilege. He felt that faculty members of other colleges also would like to see the present graduation standard retained. President Harvill reminded the Senate that it was the privilege of all groups of faculty members to make recommendations to the Senate. Dr. Rhodes asked whether Dr. Thomas' motion could be amended. President Harvill called attention to the fact that the original action by the Senate December 1 had consisted of two separate motions, one involving the general University graduation requirement and the other involving the graduation requirement for the Law College and the admission requirement for the Colleges of Law, Education and Pharmacy. Dean Patrick then moved that Dr. Thomas' motion be postponed.

A discussion on point of order ensued, Dr. Thomas raising the question of whether or not his motion, should it be postponed and should a substitute motion be defeated, could then be represented. President Harvill was of the opinion that Dean Patrick's motion to postpone consideration amounted to a motion to table the motion and that a 2/3 or perhaps a 75 per cent majority vote was necessary for passage. Dr. Houghton then suggested that Dr. Thomas' motion, seconded by Dr. Barnes, be withdrawn, eligible for resubmission at any time and this was done. Dean Patrick withdrew his motion also.

Dean Patrick then made a new motion calling for reconsideration of the entire question of the grade average requirement for the various bachelor's degrees, including the LL.B., and the requirement for admission to the College of Law, Pharmacy, and Education. Dr. Rhodes seconded Dean Patrick's motion. Dean Patrick then stated that he would like also to include in his motion action which would refer to the various faculties this entire matter. After discussion as to whether or not it was necessary to refer the matter to the faculty, Dean Patrick withdrew the second portion of his motion. Mr. Marcoux then raised the question as to whether or not this matter more properly belonged under the jurisdiction of the Advisory Council. President Harvill

read a section of the Constitution which made it clear that this matter was properly the business of the Senate. Dr. Solve then called for the question and the proposal for reconsideration carried without opposition.

Dr. Mary Caldwell asked for a further explanation of the entire issue for the benefit of new Senators not present at the December meeting. Dr. Pistor stated he felt the matter might more properly be considered at a time when the Registrar could be present since in the December meeting the Registrar had pointed out that the problems involved were ones of public relations and that these were factors to be considered as well as the question of whether or not academic standards were being lowered. At President Harvill's request Dean Roy then reviewed for the Senate the approach of a special committee of which he was chairman which had recommended to the Senate in 1949 that the new graduation requirement be established. He explained that the 3.2000 standard had been established on an experimental basis. Dean Roy also presented figures indicating how many students had completed degree requirements during the past two years under the present graduation requirements, how many students failed to graduate under this requirement but who did qualify under the old 80% above "4" rule, and how many students presented grade averages below 3.2000 but above 3.3000.

Dean Brown suggested that perhaps our requirement should be 3.0000, but that failing grades should not be included in the computation. Dr. Haury suggested that inasmuch as the matter was being reconsidered, it might be worthwhile to investigate the desirability of establishing a new grading system which would eliminate the problem of fractions or decimals. President Harvill called attention to the fact that it was possible that over a period of time too strict a graduation requirement could work to the disadvantage of the University in that it would discourage students from attending this institution and reduce enrollment.

Dr. Carpenter pointed out that from the point of view of mathematics no interpretation of a grade average of 3.2 could be made which would go beyond 3.25. Thus, 3.2 could not be interpreted as 3.2999.

Dr. Roberts suggested that perhaps two problems were involved here. First, the particular graduation requirement that is to be established so far as grade average is concerned should be decided; next, it should be decided on what basis the average is to be figured, including the issue of whether or not failing grades are to be included in the computation. He stated that he had found general faculty reaction opposing any lowering of the present graduation standard. He pointed out so far as public relations are concerned there still would be the necessity of explaining to parents and to students the fraction of one ten-thousandth which is the difference between 3.2999 and 3.3000. Professor Cunningham then moved that Dean Roy's committee of 1949 be reactivated to review the entire matter of a grading system, scholarship requirement for graduation, etc., and report at the first Senate meeting in February. The motion was seconded by Mr. Marcoux and passed.

SOCIAL SECURITY, UNIVERSITY PARTICIPATION IN: To Dr. Roberts' question as to whether or not a social security contract was now covering University employees, President Harvill replied that such a contract had been signed on December 31. Employee participation will involve a salary deduction of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the

first \$3600 earned during the calendar year. The president explained further that the Board of Regents was sincerely interested in obtaining legislative action which would provide an adequate supplemental retirement system for the University and State Colleges. Such a supplemental plan, combined with social security, would provide the University with a retirement system comparable to other institutions in the country of like kind.

MORNING CLASS HOURS, READJUSTMENT IN SCHEDULE OF: Dr. Roberts raised the question as to whether or not it might not be in order for the Senate to be giving some preliminary thought to the possibility of abandoning the University's present plan of scheduling five forenoon classes and scheduling only four. It was his understanding that the present system had been adopted only when a serious shortage of classroom space had developed, and since more classroom space is now becoming available under the building expansion program, he felt it might be desirable again to schedule only four class hours each morning, thus precluding the necessity of beginning class work at 7:40. President Harvill stated that some faculty members and students prefer 7:40 classes. Dean Park pointed out that such a schedule would make it necessary to hold many night classes in Engineering. Mr. Windsor said if such a schedule were adopted it would result in greater difficulties so far as avoiding conflicts in students' class schedules were concerned.

Dr. Roberts then moved that a Senate committee be appointed to make a study of this matter. The motion was seconded by Dr. Solve and passed.

The Senate adjourned at 5:15 P.M.

David L. Windsor

David L. Windsor
Secretary Pro Tem.