

Proceedings of the Faculty Senate

Meeting of Monday

April 1, 1957

New Summer Session course, approval of: Education 302s - The Curriculum for Gifted Children (3-6) I Smith.

Principles and Procedures in processing Petitions, report re: A report of a special committee appointed to study Principles and Procedures in Processing petitions was approved with amendments, as follows:

R E P O R T

To: President Harvill
Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona

From: Committee of Five on college course adjustment: Dean Brown, Dr. Rucker, Dr. Gegenheimer, Professor Stewart, Miss Lynn, Chairman.

Re: Consideration of report of Committee of Eleven

Problem: To consider and make recommendations with respect to a report from the Committee of Eleven containing certain recommendations regarding the principles and procedures to govern adjustments from normal curricula requirements.

Method: By study and discussion of the report of the Committee of Eleven and the material upon which that report was based, consultation with the office of the Registrar, committees on course adjustments, and other administrative and teaching units.

Findings: This report omits the consideration of the evaluation of credits transferred from other schools by students transferring to the University of Arizona, and the adjustment of requirements for such transfer students. This is now handled in a satisfactory manner.

This report omits recommendations concerning the substitution of required major courses for other courses in the major department. The responsibility for these substitutions now rests with the department heads.

This report includes recommendations for the principles and procedure in making all other course adjustments.

This will not apply to substitution of courses necessitated by catalogue changes.

I. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COURSE ADJUSTMENT PROCEDURE

A. In each college there shall be a College Course Adjustment Committee appointed by the dean of the college.

B. The procedure for securing course adjustments shall be as follows:

1. Adjustment of the required course (substitution or waiver) must be initiated by the petition of the student, made out in duplicate, on the proper petition blank. The adviser should take responsibility for seeing that this petition clearly states the type of request and the reason or reasons therefor.

2. The two copies of the petition must have been seen and signed for approval, denial, or consideration by the following authorities and in the following order:

a. The head of the student's major department or the student's adviser in the case of those students who have no declared major. In those colleges which are not divided into departments, the signature of the dean shall serve for this purpose. Any department which so wishes may set up a departmental course adjustment committee; in such event, the signature of the chairman of this committee will serve.

b. The person in charge of the course which is to be waived or for which substitution is sought.

c. The dean of the college in which the student is registered.

3. The two copies of the petition, thus signed for approval, denial, or consideration, shall be sent by the dean of the College to the College Course Adjustment Committee for final decision.
 - a. The College Course Adjustment Committee shall act to approve or deny the request as indicated by the signature of the chairman of the committee. In general, the College Course Adjustment Committee should approve petitions only when at least two of the signatories provided in 2, a-b-c, shall have signed "for approval."
 - b. The College Course Adjustment Committee shall then send the original of the petition to the office of the Registrar for recording and shall file the duplicate copy in the office of the dean of the college.
4. The Office of the Registrar shall notify the following people of the final disposition of the petition:
 - a. The student petitioner.
 - b. The major department or student's adviser.
 - c. The person in charge of the course which is to be waived or for which substitution is sought.
- C. The Advisory Council shall serve as a committee of appeal for any or all signatories.
- D. After each meeting, the College Course Adjustment Committee shall send to the office of the Registrar a consecutively numbered list of petitions acted upon with the name and classification of petitioner, the type of request, and the final action thereon.
- E. The office of the Registrar shall submit to the Senate one week before the May meeting a summary of all cases which have been processed by all College Course Adjustment Committees during the course of the academic year.

Elmer J. Brown
A. F. Gegenheimer
W. Ray Rucker
Harry E. Stewart
Klonda Lynn, Chairman.

The Senate voted that a special committee be appointed to study a Supplementary Statement of Recommendations related to the foregoing.

Tri-mester or quarter plan, report of committee re: The Senate accepted a report of its committee on the tri-mester or quarter plan versus the semester plan, and the committee's report concluded that the advantages of the three-term plan and the quarter plan are more than out-weighed by the general merits of our semester system. The report included the following recommendations:

1. That the summer school program be expanded in order to provide (1) a wider selection of course offerings to the student, and (2) more opportunity for employment of the teaching staff during the summer session.
2. That a study be undertaken to determine the feasibility of including the summer school program as a part of the regular annual university budget.
3. That teaching salaries for summer school be made more commensurate to those which are received during the regular academic year.
4. That our class schedule be re-examined with a view of providing more afternoon and possibly some late afternoon and evening classes other than extension courses.

By-laws Committee, report from: The Senate accepted the report submitted by the By-laws Committee. The report was rendered in response to a request that the committee consider the question of revising the By-laws as they effect candidacy for election.

In response to action of the Senate, a copy of the Committee's report is distributed to all members of the Faculty herewith.

Disqualification standards, recommendation re: The following recommendation, received from the College of Business and Public Administration, was referred to the committee presently studying delinquent scholarship reports:

"The Faculty of the College of Business and Public Administration at its meeting on January 31 recommends to the Senate that it appoint a committee to study the advisability of providing standards based on cumulative averages to be used as a basis for the disqualification of students in addition to the present requirement of scholarship failure in 40-50% of the student's load."


C. Zaner Leshner, Secretary

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BY-LAWS

March 4, 1957

This report is submitted in response to a Senate request following the January meeting of the Senate for a re-examination of the present method used to nominate and elect the elective officials of the Faculty organization, particularly the propriety of devising a plan to allow nominees to decline to stand for election.

Your Committee has given considerable attention to the matter, consulting with other members of the Faculty, and especially with those who were members of the committee which framed the Faculty Constitution. And,

since we have found apparent general approval of the existing method, it is deemed proper briefly to indicate here the basic reasons for evolving the plan and to state the basic principles which it seeks to embody.

The framers of the Faculty Constitution properly left many details, including the formulation of a plan for conducting elections, to be supplied by By-Laws. There had been some recent previous satisfactory experience, however, with selection of Faculty committees by a plan which allowed relatively unrestricted voting on a nominating ballot, followed by election from the nominees of a limited number of persons to constitute the desired committee. That method had been used to elect a Faculty Committee on the Future of the University. It had also been used to elect the committee which framed the Faculty Constitution, and that Committee, acting under special Faculty authorization, arranged for use of that method for conducting the first election under the Faculty Constitution in the fall of 1947. Then, in the spring of 1948, the Senate and the General Faculty accepted that basic method as the regular plan for future elections and adopted Section 10 of the By-Laws, setting forth the step-by-step process in detail. Some necessary amplification and improvement came later, but the basic principles have been retained.

These basic principles include:

- (1) Complete freedom for the individual Faculty voter to propose eligible persons as nominees
- (2) Opportunity to elect from a restricted, but ample, list of nominees
- (3) Keeping each stage in the voting process a simple one
- (4) Ready availability of information as to eligibility and ineligibility of incumbent officials, directed toward maintaining some degree of continuity, coupled with assurance of some turnover
- (5) The assumption that the process would and should be essentially a "draft", largely because it was hoped that
- (6) Members of the Faculty, few of whom would be willing to "run" for election, might with less reluctance, "stand" for it.

It appears to have been recognized from the beginning that perhaps any workable method based upon and embodying these principles would not be too easy to devise and, like any other method, would be subject to criticism. Inquiry reveals that perhaps most criticism has been directed at (1) the allegedly excessive amount of balloting, and (2) the policy of providing all members of the Faculty with statements of eligibility and ineligibility of incumbents, for immediate re-election, which may seem to amount to a species of electioneering in behalf of eligible incumbents.

It should be explained that apparently both these lines of criticism were anticipated, and perhaps it may be admitted that both may have some degree of validity. However, nobody seems able to come up with essentially better or simpler ways for helpfully guiding Faculty members through the necessary electoral function, in harmony with all the basic principles on which our system

is designed to operate. It all seems to be perhaps part of the price of seeking to have some degree of effective Faculty democracy, which was the goal of the movement which led to the adoption of the Faculty constitution.

The question recently raised in the Senate which very properly called forth this reexamination is also a legitimate one. And, perhaps fortunately for your Committee, Professor Haury, who raised the question, has in consultation, graciously refrained from insisting that a plan be recommended for systematically permitting persons nominated for Faculty offices to decline to stand for election. We have found nobody who could suggest a practical way to do this, compatibly with the basic principles on which we have sought to operate.

The consensus among people consulted seems to be that any systematic plan to seek special individual consent of nominees before placing their names on election ballots would be perhaps to invite wholesale declinations and a virtual breakdown of our electoral system, as it was designed to function. As one member of the committee which drafted the Faculty Constitution puts it in writing, "Either we must assume that all Faculty members are willing to contribute time and energy for the general good or that there is a limited number who will contend for the power and honor of office", the latter alternative posing a situation generally felt to be undesirable.

Your Committee frankly has no remedy to offer for the situation in which, necessarily, only half of the nominees in some elections can be elected, and in the case of College representatives in the Senate and the Chairman of the Faculty, only one in five. It is suggested, however, that the matter should be viewed positively. To be nominated is a commendation; not to be elected should not, under our system, be considered a defeat.

Respectfully submitted,

Edwin F. Carpenter
Harry Krumlauf
Neal D. Houghton, Chairman.
