

A. A. U. P.
University of Arizona Chapter
Report of the Committee on Heads of Departments

Preamble

The University of Arizona Chapter of the A.A.U.P. is mindful that the traditional essence of a University is a democracy of scholars. This is the form in which universities have been inherited by Western Civilization, and indeed most of those great and venerable universities whose roots go farthest back into time still elect their administrative officers from among their faculties for temporary terms.

We recognize of course that this practice is not in the American tradition, and we pause but a moment to muse that the nation which offers itself to the world as a model of democratic living does not cast its centers of free thinking into the democratic pattern.

Nevertheless, we believe strongly in the democratic way of life, and we believe that our practices of conduct and operation are most effective when they conform as closely as possible in principle to those of democracy. With these thoughts in mind, we should like to bring to the general attention of the university community a set of principles for departmental administration which were drawn up in 1939 at the initiative of Dean Emil R. Riesen, of the College of Liberal Arts, by a Committee of Department Heads appointed by him. These principles were adopted by a formal vote of the Liberal Arts faculty, and they have formed the guiding principle for the conduct of some of the happiest and most vigorous departments in that College.

It will be observed that the chief officer of the department is cast more in the role of chairman (without limit of tenure) than of head. Indeed it seems to us quite inappropriate that, in an enterprise which exists entirely for the exploitation and development of ideas, one person in a group should be designated by the title "head": And this objection is no mere play upon words. Nevertheless, in the following presentation we have retained the term "head" which is for us conventional if not logical.

In promulgating this set of principles, we have changed the order somewhat. We have changed the wording primarily to remove restricting applications to the Liberal Arts College, but we believe that we have changed the spirit and intent of the statements not at all.

Following certain of these statements is a brief amplifying note written by your Committee. These notes may be recognized by their deeper indentation.

I. General Principles.

Principle #1. Formal differences in academic or administrative rank do not imply corresponding differences of authority in matters of scholarship.

Principle #2. The ultimate administrative responsibility for the successful conduct of the department rests upon the Head of the Department. This implies that his office clothes him with sufficient discretionary

*See page 186 -
Apr. 6, 1955 Proceedings.
This is date this report was
forwarded to general faculty.*

authority (but not arbitrary authority) to make his responsibility effective.

But the general responsibility for the successful conduct of the department and for its reputation for scholarly achievement rests upon each member of the department.

Principle #3. So far as is possible departmental policies and affairs should be decided upon after discussion in departmental meetings.

Your committee believes that departmental meetings should be held regularly. The best frequency will of course depend upon the size and nature of the department. But once-a-semester budgetary meetings are certainly not adequate. And conferences held by the Head individually with each member are no substitute for a convocation in which all members, regardless of rank and seniority, feel completely free to express their views among themselves for mutual support and criticism.

Principle #4. The Head is the official representative of the department and in that capacity should act for the department in all official departmental matters and in relationships between the department and the Dean. This is not intended to interfere with conferences between department members and the Dean or President. However, if such conferences involve departmental matters the head of the department should be made aware of the fact that the conference has been arranged. This is not to be interpreted as requiring the staff member to obtain the permission of the head of the department for the conference.

Principle #5. A well conducted department is one in which vigorous discussion and exchange of judgment are achieved, and a minimum of supervision and administrative authority is exercised.

This implies that basic departmental actions and policies should, wherever possible, be supported by general consent. This points up an area of inconsistency and compromise between Principle #2 and Principle #5. The wise and tactful handling of this area of compromise is one of the most critical tests of a successful academic administrator. In a large measure it will determine the extent to which he will win the respect and loyalty of his staff and the respect and admiration of his colleagues. In particular we recognize that Principle #2 must sometimes take precedence over Principle #5. But when it does so the department head should realize that the burden of justification rests upon his decision, and that he stakes this justification upon the test of time.

II. Specific Responsibilities of the Department Head

The following compilation and classification of the responsibilities of the Department Head are taken directly from the Liberal Arts Report. Your Committee has included one recommendation (Under Part C, Item 3) and two additional items (Part A,

Items 5 and 9.) No significance is to be attached to the order of items within each Part.

Part A. In Department Conference (insofar as time and number and availability of staff permit):

1. Organization and co-ordination of the academic work of the department.
2. The quality and progress of the department work as a whole.
3. Group consultation on content of courses for the purpose of the co-ordination of the department's work.
4. Adequacy of the whole program of work and of departmental research, the latter as distinguished from individual research.
5. Selection or rejection of graduate students.
6. New Appointments.
7. Allocation of the services of staff members, assistants, and clerical staff.
8. Library purchases.
9. Decisions upon major purchases especially those of a capital nature. The allocation and programing of major equipment.

Part B. In Conference with Individual Department Members:

1. Quality of teaching and of the discharge of other professional assignments and duties.
2. The care and use of supplies and equipment by the individual department member, etc.
3. Promotions and increases in salary.
4. Official student-teacher relationships.
5. Campus rules and regulations insofar as they involve the department.

Part C. Routine:

1. Such department reports as are required.
2. Preparation of the department budget after individual and group conferences with the department.
3. Acting as major professor in his department's field. By agreement preferably, the supervision of student's work may be divided among the members of the department. Ultimate responsibility rests upon the Head.

Recommendation of this Committee: In general in the case of graduate work the director of the thesis should serve as the major professor.

4. Care of department property, with cooperation from the members of the department.
5. Expenditure of department funds in line with department policies.
6. Representing the department in such matters as correspondence, care of department records, and routine external relations.

Your Committee recommends that this report be accepted and transmitted to the president of the University and secretary of the faculty with the request for inclusion as an item of business at the next meeting.

Respectfully submitted:

Professor E. Carpenter

Professor E. W. Haury

Professor R. R. Humphrey

Professor C. H. Lowe

Professor A. R. Kemmerer, Chairman.

Proceedings of the Faculty Senate

Meeting of Monday

December 6, 1954

Senate, announcement of change in membership of: President Harvill expressed his appreciation to those members of the Senate whose terms expire at the close of the Christmas holidays. Members leaving the Senate at that time are - Ewing, Herrick, Howard, Kelley, Lynn, McKale, Pistor, Rhodes and Solve.

Senate membership, Election to: Following recommendation of the faculty of the College of Pharmacy, the Senate, upon motion by Dr. Solve, seconded by Dr. Roberts, elected Dr. Albert Picchioni to fill the vacancy created by the death of Professor Bernard A. Bialk, who represented the College of Pharmacy in the Senate. Professor Bialk, who assisted in establishing the College of Pharmacy at the University of Arizona in 1947, passed away in Tucson on December 1, 1954.

Faculty membership, proposals re listing of: The Senate considered at some length the question of who should make up the voting list of the University faculty. In order that the matter might be studied in detail, the Senate, on motion by Dr. Solve, with a second by Dr. Haury, voted that a committee should be appointed for this purpose, the committee to submit a complete report at the Monday, January 3, 1955, meeting of the Senate. (Committee: F. W. Galbraith (Chairman), H. R. Baker, Herman Bateman, Karen Carlson, and M. T. Solve).

Honorary degrees, policy re: Among the functions of the Faculty Senate, as defined in Article III, E, 4 of the Faculty Constitution, is the approval of honorary degrees prior to their presentation to the General Faculty, nominations to come from one of the college faculties. It seems desirable that provision be made for ample time to study recommendations regarding the award of honorary degrees before the Senate takes action. To this end the Senate voted on motion by Dr. Roberts, with a second by Dr. Carpenter, to have a committee appointed to submit recommendations to the Senate regarding the procedure for the award of honorary degrees.

A.A.U.P. Committee on department heads, report of: A report of the A.A.U.P. Committee on department heads as submitted to the President through the Committee of Eleven was considered by the Senate. This report had been distributed to members of the Senate at the November meeting. The report as submitted, with slight changes is essentially a statement of policy that was adopted some years ago by the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts. The report was amended by the Senate by adding the words "insofar as time and number and availability of staff permit" after the statement "Part A. In Department Conference:" on page 4 of the report. The Senate also amended Principle #4 under "I - General Principles", page 3 of the report, to provide that the departmental head should be made aware of conferences between staff members and the Dean or President, it being understood that this will not be interpreted to mean that permission of the department head must be obtained for such conference.

With the above changes effected, the Senate on motion by Dr. Humphrey, with a second by Dr. Haury, went on record as favoring the adoption of the report as a set of recommended principles to be passed on to the general faculty. This means that the report will be mimeographed and issued to all members of the Faculty.

A.A.U.P. memorandum regarding salaries and promotions: The President called attention to a memorandum received from the A.A.U.P. relating to a number of points in respect to University policy on salaries and promotions. He expressed willingness to have the material submitted by the committee prepared in mimeographed form and made available to the Senate, through the Committee of Eleven, prior to its next meeting.


G. Laner Leshet, Secretary