

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
Monday, December 6, 1954 Room 101, Law Building

The Faculty Senate convened at 3:40 P.M. Monday, December 6, 1954, in Room 101 of the Law Building. Twenty-five members were present with President Harvill presiding.

On motion by Dr. Roberts, with a second by Dean Patrick, the Senate approved the minutes of the November 1, 1954 meeting with the following changes:

Page 2, second sentence, change to read: "Upon motion by Dean Roy, seconded by Dr. Roberts, the Senate voted to continue.....".

Page 4, paragraph 3, change to read: "After some general discussion the Senate, upon motion by Dr. Roberts, seconded by Dean Garretson, voted to table this matter until the next meeting."

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: President Harvill reported a vacancy in the Senate occasioned by the death of Professor Bialk of the College of Pharmacy. Professor Bialk passed away in Tucson on December 1. He assisted in establishing the College of Pharmacy at the University in 1947 and, at the time of his death, was the oldest member of the College of Pharmacy faculty in point of service. Dean Brewer reported that the faculty of the College of Pharmacy recommended Dr. Albert Picchioni to succeed Professor Bialk as a member of the Senate. Dr. Solve moved that the recommendation be approved. The motion was seconded by Dr. Roberts and carried.

Faculty membership, proposals re listing of: The President called attention to a report distributed at the November meeting of the Senate outlining the membership of the voting faculty of the University. This report was based on action taken by the University Senate in 1951 and indicated that the voting faculty consists of those persons listed in the catalog under Administration, Teaching and Research, and Library Staff.

Dean Carlson asked that the head residents of the women's dormitories be considered for the voting privilege and, in response to a request from the President, explained that the work of the head residents is really an extension of the work of the Office of the Dean of Women. Personnel sought as head residents are those who are trained in guidance work or who have successful teaching experience. In order to attract properly qualified persons it is desirable to offer them faculty status. As a matter of fact, Dean Carlson understood that such appointees would have faculty status, in connection with the recent selections of head residents. The Dean explained that she was unaware that the faculty status as originally recommended for head residents had not been allowed when formal action was taken by the Senate in 1951.

The President explained that regulations require that head residents of men's dormitories be members of the faculty or be employed in some capacity in the University. It is desirable in all cases that head residents be members of the regular faculty. The nature of the work is such that the University needs well prepared people; better results can be obtained by selecting persons who are eligible for membership in the voting faculty. Other categories have been mentioned also in this connection, said the President. These include additional members of the library staff, as well as some of the persons in the Registrar's office, particularly those handling admissions and the certification of degree candidates.

Dr. Haury inquired as to what listing would be included for the Arizona State Museum. President Harvill replied that it was the general feeling to include in the faculty all members of the research organization of the Museum. It was Dr. Humphrey's impression that the Committee had already reported on this matter of voting membership and that recommendations had been presented for consideration.

Dr. Harvill explained that a special Senate committee (Barnes, Solve, Carpenter) had been asked to discover just who constituted the faculty as it now exists, but the committee had not been appointed for the purpose of submitting recommendations. They had conferred with the President, as a result of which the President's office had submitted a report to the November meeting of the Senate.

Dr. Carpenter stated that it had been suggested that the University might have two voting lists or categories, one designed to include as many members as possible in the voting faculty even though some might have duties not wholly academic but which would insure a proper representation in faculty and staff meetings, with another more restricted voting list made up of those members of the faculty and staff who should have the privilege of voting upon the award of degrees. There was some feeling, he explained, that the privilege of voting upon degrees should be reserved for those who are directly concerned with the preparation of the students as degree candidates.

Dr. Mary Caldwell suggested that the head resident's group might select a person to represent them in the Senate just as do the various colleges, but President Harvill pointed out that it would first be necessary that the head residents be given status in the voting membership of the faculty.

Dr. Solve felt that there was some merit to the point of extending the voting privilege in connection with the selection of officers of the faculty so as to give as many persons as possible a voice in the government of the University. He felt also that Dr. Carpenter's point about a more restricted voting list in connection with the award of degrees was well taken. Dr. Solve then moved that a new committee be appointed which would go over the whole matter of voting lists, with the report of the 1951 committee in mind, in addition to the points made here; and that this committee present a complete report at the January meeting of the Senate. This motion was seconded by Dr. Haury.

President Harvill announced that the next meeting of the Senate is scheduled for Monday, January 3, the day the University reopens after the Christmas and New Year's holiday.

Dean Roy stated that the motion might well include provision for definite recommendations on the part of the Committee rather than merely suggestions, and Dr. Solve explained that he assumed that the Committee would make recommendations in connection with its report.

In response to inquiry by the President, Dr. Solve suggested a membership of five if the committee were appointed. The question was then called for, and the motion carried. (Note: Committee appointed December 11, 1954 - Dr. F. W. Galbraith, Chairman; Mr. H. R. Baker; Dr. Herman Bateman; Dean Karen L. Carlson; and Dr. M. T. Solve).

Honorary degrees, policy re: President Harvill asked if the Senate wished to discuss the question of policy regarding the award of honorary degrees, reference to which was made at the May 3 and November 1 meetings.

Dr. Carpenter recalled that in the spring Dean Garretson had proposed a review of our procedure in connection with the approval of candidates for honorary degrees.

It seemed desirable, he said, that the Senate provide for a longer time in which to consider proposals. Dean Garretson explained that when honorary degrees were last considered there seemed to be some question regarding the amount of information supplied to the Senate regarding candidates as well as the limited time provided for consideration of the information. It was his thought at the time that some means might be provided to the end that the Senate could be more in agreement before the time for actually voting on candidates, but after reviewing the matter further he had concluded it is practically impossible to set up any sort of specific list of requirements for the award of honorary degrees. It is a highly personal matter in spite of all that can be done and many things must be taken into consideration. He did agree, however, that it was important to take sufficient time to consider the awards.

The President agreed that the time element was important and that it might be well to have the Senate set a definite limit on the date for submitting recommendations for the award of honorary degrees.

Dr. Carpenter remarked he thought a deadline had been established in the past but it might have been limited only to the Liberal Arts College. It was his impression that a procedure provided for reference of recommendations to a special committee. The President explained that ordinarily proposals for the award of honorary degrees have been referred to departments concerned and from there submitted to college faculties.

Mr. Leshar reported that the Advisory Council some years ago had provided that recommendations for the award of honorary degrees be submitted not later than March 1 of the year in which the degree is to be awarded. He stated that for many years there was no restriction as to the award of honorary degrees and only in recent years had it been customary to refer the matter to a particular department or college in consideration of the general background of the degree candidate. It was his feeling that provision should be made so that departments were not in a position to discourage such awards without the action being considered further. (Note: A check of the records made after the meeting showed that the General Faculty had taken action as indicated above but that this action was voided by the adoption of the Faculty Constitution which provides for the award of honorary degrees. No time limit is provided in the Constitution.)

Dr. Roberts also emphasized the need for having sufficient time for proper consideration of degree candidates. He suggested that candidates be proposed at one meeting of the Senate but that no vote be taken until the following meeting so that in the interim the qualifications could be considered in detail. It seemed to him logical for a committee to be appointed to study the matter. He then moved that a committee be appointed to submit recommendations to the Senate regarding the procedure for the award of honorary degrees. This motion was seconded by Dr. Carpenter.

Dr. Barnes called attention to the Faculty Constitution setting forth procedure for the award of degrees, Article III, E, 4, "Functions of the Faculty Senate", which reads as follows: "To approve proposals for honorary degrees prior to their presentation to the General Faculty, nominations to come from one of the College Faculties." Dr. Barnes saw no objection to having a Senate committee pass on the question of awarding honorary degrees; it was his feeling, however, that such a committee would review the matter after the college faculty had acted.

The question was called for, and the motion carried.

A.A.U.P. Committee on Department Heads, report of: The attention of the Senate was called by the President to a report of the A.A.U.P. Committee on Department

Heads as submitted through the Committee of Eleven. This report had been distributed to the members of the Senate at the November meeting.

Dr. Humphrey moved that the report be approved and that it be adopted as a matter of general policy. Dr. Haury seconded the motion.

President Harvill explained that 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. It has been used as a sort of general guide, he stated, and not as a set of regulations. It was his understanding that it constitutes a statement of recommended policy.

Dr. Solve stated that in most instances he approves of the report. It was not intended that it be followed literally, he said, since, because of the great variation in the number of people in different departments, it would not be practicable. He referred specifically to Item No. 6 under Part A, page 4 of the report, "New Appointments." It would be extremely difficult, he pointed out, in a large department such as the English department with more than thirty members to review effectively material related to appointments in a general departmental meeting.

Dr. Houghton asked if the distinction could be made between very large and smaller departments and pointed out that in some instances members of the department learned about appointments only through the newspaper.

Dr. Schneck stated that he saw no real objection to the report if it is nothing more than a set of recommendations. He supported Dr. Solve's point and emphasized the need of some individual action in connection with staff appointments. In any case, he said, responsibility rests upon the department head. The feeling of the department can be obtained, he stated, by conference with individual members rather than through a general meeting of the department. He approved the general idea; in fact, he was one of the committee that drew up the original report, Dr. Carpenter and Dean Brown being the others. He went on to say, however, that the majority of members of Liberal Arts were completely unaware of the existence of the report until the statement of the A.A.U.P. committee appeared. The present statement, Dr. Schneck said, makes one important omission. In the original report it was provided that when a member of a department went directly to the Dean or the President about a departmental matter this should come to the notice of the head of the department. This was considered by the A.A.U.P. committee, he explained, but objection was made to this on the ground that it could be interpreted as requiring the faculty member to obtain permission of the head of the department before he could see the Dean or President. It was not a question of giving permission, Dr. Schneck stated, but rather one of seeing to it that the head of the department was informed.

Dr. Humphrey said he felt most of the objections could be met by perusal of the report. On page 4 there are listed specific responsibilities for department heads. Nine items are listed including new appointments. This does not mean that appointments are actually to be made by everybody in the department, but the head would take action after discussing these new appointments with members of the department. Since the matter is of concern to all members it is well to discuss qualifications, including personality of the prospective appointee, before taking action. Part B of the report, he explained, includes items which are to be discussed by the head of the department with individual department members.

Dean Patrick, in connection with the listing of Item 5, "Selection or rejection of Graduate Students, in department conference", pointed out some

practical difficulties, especially in connection with the consideration of candidates during the summer months. Such information must be obtained by mail in many cases because of the absence of members of a department. If departmental meetings can be arranged and information provided within a short time, he saw no objection to the plan but felt it was impractical that the selection of graduate students require the approval of every member of the department. In this connection, Dr. Humphrey explained that the statement was not intended to be a set of regulations but rather a statement of principles which were designed to encourage the smoother functioning of the average department. It presumably did work in the College of Liberal Arts and would be helpful if kept in mind as a set of working principles.

Dr. Schneck again pointed out that the recommendations did not prove effective in the College of Liberal Arts because they were forgotten so quickly. It was intended that the report constitute a set of regulations and that it be definite legislation; however, it was forgotten almost at once and it has been violated in many ways.

Dr. Haury stated that he had found the original report which appeared in 1939 quite usable as a set of principles.

Dr. Carpenter read from Principle No. 4, page 3 of the report: "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." He saw no reason for interpreting this as going behind the back of the department head. It was his feeling that such practice could be discouraged by the Dean and that there is nothing which encourages any kind of insubordination in the report as it now stands.

Dr. Schneck emphasized that his objection is not to what the report states but what has been deleted from the original report by action of the A.A.U.P. committee.

Dean Garretson asked if the word "suggestion" might not be used instead of the word "policy", and Dr. Humphrey again explained that it was not the intention to have the report stand as a regulation or to be so interpreted. The statements constitute recommendations to the faculty and nothing more.

Dr. Harvill asked if there was any feeling that the motion as stated included something more than was indicated by Dr. Humphrey's interpretation. To this Dr. Schneck replied in the affirmative, the motion having referred to a matter of general policy. He then asked Dr. Humphrey if he would agree that the report constituted a set of recommended principles rather than a policy, and Dr. Humphrey restated his motion as follows: "That we go on record as favoring the adoption of this report as a set of recommended principles to be passed on to the general faculty." It was explained that this meant that the report would be mimeographed and issued to the faculty.

Dr. Roberts expressed doubt about Principle No. 4. He quoted the last sentence, "This is not intended to interfere with conferences between department members and the Dean or President." He said that he would object to this if it meant that members of the department could complain directly to the Dean or President without the head of the department being aware of it.

It was the President's feeling that in such a case the administrative officer in question should make it clear to the faculty member that the head of

the department should be informed. He asked if there was general agreement on this point and affirmative replies were heard. Dr. Humphrey asked if the wording were not sufficiently explicit on that already; the head should act for the department in all official matters and in relationships between the department members and the Dean. He agreed that a restricted interpretation could be put on the second sentence relating to conferences between departmental members and the Dean or President.

Dr. Schneck stated that the report was not explicit enough in making provision for the head of the department to be aware of conferences between the departmental member and the Dean or President. The provision, he said, was included in the original report in 1939 and contained also in Dr. Carpenter's report made last spring to the A.A.U.P. committee, but it was deleted at that time by the local chapter. Dr. Carpenter explained that the reason for this action was the statement made it seem no member of the department could confer with the Dean or President without explicit permission of the head of the department.

Dr. Barnes asked if the statements would apply to colleges such as the College of Law, Pharmacy or Education, where the departmental organization is merged into the college group. Dr. Humphrey replied that he was not sure of the answer but that insofar as the principles were applicable at all, they would apply to such situations. President Harvill pointed out that for the purpose of administering the set of principles in question the college faculty would function as a departmental group.

Dr. Houghton reminded the Senate that the recommendations originated in the teaching faculty and that in the course of having them considered they were referred to the President and the Committee of Eleven, which includes both teaching members of the faculty and heads of departments. All of the members of the original committee, he thought, were heads of departments and he was, therefore, surprised that there could be so much question about the manner in which the recommendation had been stated. None of the objections had been made by heads of departments previously.

President Harvill explained that in his consideration of the matter he regarded it as one which was of concern to the faculty as a whole and one which should be submitted through the constitutional channels provided for discussion and treatment of such a matter. Meetings of the general faculty, however, do not afford the same kind of opportunity for free discussion and deliberation as is afforded the Senate. This explained the reference of the matter to the Senate. He reminded the Senate also that the report of the A.A.U.P. committee had been submitted through the Committee of Eleven, and asked for any further discussion.

Dr. Schneck suggested that Dr. Humphrey accept as an amendment to his motion the statement which provides that it be understood if it is a departmental matter the head of the department should be made aware of the fact that the conference has been arranged. Such a statement, it was understood, would not be interpreted as requiring permission of the head of the department. ~~Dr. Humphrey seemed reluctant to agree to this proposal.~~

Dr. Carpenter then moved the adoption of Dr. Schneck's amendment. This was seconded by Dr. Rhodes, and the motion carried.

The President then referred to the motion that the Senate go on record as favoring the adoption of the report as a set of recommended principles to be passed on to the general faculty.

Dean Roy stated that he felt it was important that the statement be regarded merely as a clarification of the spirit in which departmental affairs should be conducted. (See minutes of meeting of 1/3/55 re deleting this statement).

ducted. It is an expression of an ideal manner in which matters may be administered. However, he said, actual circumstances often make it impractical to follow the principles in detail.

At this point Dr. Carpenter suggested that in connection with the statement of Item 6, Page 4, "New Appointments", some qualification regarding the date of action and the size of the department be provided. Dean Patrick then suggested that such provision could be included as a parenthetical statement as a part of the title "Part A. In Department Conference:" under Principle No. 5, and on motion by Dr. Carpenter, with a second by Dean Patrick, the Senate voted to add the words "insofar as time and number and availability of staff permit" after the statement in "Part A. In Department Conference" on page 4 of the report.

The President asked if the Senate were ready to vote on Dr. Humphrey's motion as restated, "That we go on record as favoring the adoption of this report as a set of recommended principles to be ~~passed on~~ to the general faculty". The vote was taken and the ~~motion~~ carried. (See page 135 for copy of report as adopted.) ~~transmitted~~ (See minutes of 1/3/55 meeting for this change).

A.A.U.P. memorandum regarding salaries and promotions: President Harvill called attention of the Senate to a memorandum he had received from the A.A.U.P. relating to a number of points in respect to University policy on salaries and promotions. The first part of the report, he explained, was devoted to general information regarding comparative salaries and the general financial position of the University faculty members. Reference was made to the position of other faculty groups. Another part of the report referred to the need for a permanent personnel policy with relation to promotions. It includes a proposal relating to the number of years of service that would be regarded as appropriate before promotion is earned.

The President then referred to the desirability of having general information distributed to members of the faculty in mimeographed form and pointed out that consideration must be given to the cost of this service. The weekly Information Bulletin issued to members of the faculty is published at the rate of \$500 per year. It was generally felt that it was desirable to continue the publication of this bulletin.

The President asked for opinion as to the policy of presenting to the Senate for general discussion proposals that he receives affecting the faculty. He is interested in considering any proposals that have been submitted by A.A.U.P. committees but indicated that all matters of general policy or procedure affecting the faculty as a whole should be submitted through the regular channels as provided by the Constitution, and the Senate meetings provided for free discussion.

Dr. Humphrey felt that it was desirable that such recommendations as were submitted by the A.A.U.P. to the President be passed on to the members of the general faculty. Such information as was submitted, he felt, would be of general interest. The work of the committee which covered an extended period would, if expressed in terms of a policy, be more effective if it were presented through regular channels.

President Harvill, on the other hand, indicated that it would not be desirable to present matters that suggest policy, particularly regarding promotions, and so forth, to a general meeting of the faculty for disposition at one meeting. He expressed a willingness, however, to have the material submitted by the A.A.U.P. committee prepared in mimeographed form and made available to the Senate prior to its next meeting. Dr. Humphrey suggested in turn that the recom-

mendations of the A.A.U.P. be transmitted to the Committee of Eleven and then to the Faculty Senate. President Harvill saw no objection to this procedure if it seemed to be preferred.

Dr. Houghton said he was sure that members of the A.A.U.P. would be happy to know that the administration has no thought of discouraging the work of the A.A.U.P.

Dean Roy stated that this matter of procedure should be given serious consideration. The effect of his remarks was that the Faculty Constitution provides for the Faculty Senate to make recommendations relative to general University policies and procedures and through its by-laws it has established regulations affecting the membership of the committees. If the Senate is to act on the basis of a committee report, it would seem reasonable that the membership of the committee be representative of the faculty as a whole and that the formulation of the report be done by a committee which derives its authority from the Senate and which has been set up according to the provision of the by-laws. It does not seem sound, he stated, to have policy recommendations come up as committee reports of the A.A.U.P., since that organization is not representative of the whole faculty nor are its committee appointments subject to control established by the by-laws. The A.A.U.P. has representatives in the membership of the Senate and the procedure leading to official University action can be started in the Senate. Apart from any reference to the proposals under consideration, Dean Roy felt that this was a rather basic matter.

It would hardly be feasible, Dr. Houghton said, to undertake to interfere with or prevent the A.A.U.P. at the University of Arizona in doing the kinds of work the A.A.U.P. is doing throughout the nation.

Dr. Humphrey explained that there was no intention on the part of the A.A.U.P. to bypass the machinery set up for faculty action. However, he felt that the faculty as a whole does not seem to get things done. Approximately half of the faculty is represented in the A.A.U.P. and when a problem is presented for consideration, he appoints a committee to undertake the work. He pointed out that the organization recommends that ~~its reports be turned over to the Committee of Eleven~~ referred to the Faculty through the proper channels. (See minutes of 1/3/55 meeting for this change).

President Harvill explained that his office has been engaged in studies of salaries and promotions for some time and that he has received information on these matters from various sources as well as from the A.A.U.P. committee. It was his judgment that a committee to study faculty salaries could be appointed through constitutional channels rather than by the A.A.U.P. and be representative of all of the members of the faculty and staff.

Meeting adjourned at 5:55 P.M.

  
C. Laner Lesher, Secretary

(Note: See page 135 for copy of report of A.A.U.P. Committee on Department Heads adopted at above meeting, as indicated on page 133).