

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, February 6, 1956 Room 101, Law Building

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:40 P.M. on Monday, February 6, 1956, in Room 101 of the Law Building. Thirty-six members were present with President Harvill presiding. Mr. Windsor acted as secretary in the absence of Mr. Leshner.

The minutes of the meeting of January 9, 1956 were approved with the following change: Line 6 of last paragraph on page 2, change "an" to "no"; the sentence will then read "The proposal represents in any case no extension of the functions given the faculty by the constitution." This same change will be effective in line 6 of the fourth paragraph on page 2 of the Proceedings as distributed to the general faculty.

Catalogue material, change in: The Senate authorized graduate status for English 123a, b - Workshop Class in Juvenile Writing II (2) - by changing the number of the course to 223a, b. The course will be given as an Extension Division course and possibly as a Summer Session offering. The Senate made no objection to the change, but it was understood it still was to be approved by the Advisory Council.

Committee of Eleven, Recommendation of: President Harvill referred to the communication from the Committee of Eleven received by the Senate at its last meeting, presenting a recommendation that the Senate authorize the selection of a Continuing Committee on Basic Policy Pursuits.

Dr. Gegenheimer moved that the Senate approve the recommendation of the Committee of Eleven with the exception of the last paragraph, which was approved by the Senate at its last meeting, and that the matter be referred to the Committee on By-Laws for the formulation of any by-laws which may be made necessary by the adoption of the recommendation. The motion was seconded by Dr. Solve.

The portion of the recommendation submitted by the Committee of Eleven and referred to in the motion is as follows:

"RECOMMENDATION BY THE COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN TO THE FACULTY SENATE
January 9, 1956

"In accord with the spirit and the recommendations embodied in the Report to the Faculty, made in coordination with the Committee of Eleven on December 9, 1955, the Faculty Senate is now invited to take action to begin the effectuation of a program of more active Faculty cooperation in the shaping and directing of important University policies.

"It is recognized that development of a workable system must necessarily require careful planning and thorough consideration. It is, therefore, proposed at this time merely that the Senate affirm, as a matter of policy, the propriety of effective Faculty participation, by means of appropriate Faculty committees, in the cooperative formulation and execution of University policy, and that the Senate authorize the

"selection of a Continuing Faculty Committee on Basic Policy Pursuits to undertake the making of recommendations to the Senate looking to the launching and step-by-step development of a functioning system of Faculty committees and processes.

"It is proposed that these Faculty committees, as distinguished from traditional administratively-appointed committees, shall be selected by such Faculty processes as the Senate may prescribe, presumably by the Faculty Committee on Committees, and shall function in accord with such policies and directions as the Senate may adopt, but shall be expected to recommend in their respective spheres such improvements as experience may seem to warrant.

"It is proposed that the Senate provide that the Faculty Committee on Basic Policy Pursuits shall consist of the Chairman of the Committee of Eleven, the Chairman of the Faculty, and such number of members as the Senate may provide to be appointed by the Faculty Committee on Committees. It is suggested that appointive members should serve three-year terms, so "staggered" that the terms of one third of the members shall expire each year. Members may be reappointed, but no member may serve more than two terms consecutively.

"It is proposed that this committee be authorized by the Senate to make recommendations designed to develop helpful cooperative Faculty participation in any operations where such participation may appear appropriate, and that it be directed to give attention to such matters as educational policy, University planning, budgeting, recruitment of men for high administrative positions, and to salary, tenure, promotion and retirement problems."

Dr. Solve explained that what was hoped for in the recommendation of the Committee of Eleven was approval of the general idea of a special committee, with the exact formulation to be left to the Committee on By-Laws. It was his feeling that the Senate lacked internal organization and that it was desirable to develop a system of standing committees through which to work. The question of whether or not a central or steering committee as recommended would be established is one, he said, that can be decided when detailed proposals are received from the Committee on By-Laws.

Dr. Barnes asked if it was the plan to submit the matter to the General Faculty if and when it has been referred to the Committee on By-Laws and approved by the Faculty Senate. President Harvill explained that in the past the By-Laws Committee has merely presented matters to the Faculty Senate for approval. Dr. Barnes wished to know whether or not in this case it is part of the plan to have the proposals voted on by the Faculty Senate and then by the General Faculty.

It was Dr. Gegenheimer's understanding that any matter adopted by the Faculty Senate becomes effective unless a petition signed by twenty members of the faculty is presented within a certain period of time (fourteen days).

Dr. Houghton explained that the first group of By-Laws was referred to the General Faculty for approval, but since then By-Laws have been approved by the Senate only.

Dr. Barnes stated that the Faculty Constitution leaves unanswered the problem of whether or not the By-Laws as approved by the General Faculty can be changed by a vote of the Faculty Senate. If this motion is passed, he stated, and later is implemented by Senate and Faculty approval, it is then true that the proposal will permanently transfer from the Faculty Senate a large part of the initiating power it formerly possessed because the basic committee proposed will be a permanent one, apparently going beyond the control of the Faculty Senate, although this point is debatable, he said. If it is a permanent body, beyond control of the Senate, then it will have been vested with the power to initiate important matters which are properly the function of the Faculty Senate. It seemed to him that the recommendation indicated a move more or less to by-pass the Senate since the responsibility for initiating and formulating policies would now be in the hands of the special committee or other standing committees.

Dr. Barnes' opposition was supported by Dr. Nugent, who emphasized especially the drastic change in the initiation of legislation and the effect on the position of the Senate in this regard. He indicated his opposition to the recommendation for this reason. He added that he did not feel there was a need for increased machinery to handle the business of the University. It was his judgment that it was not necessary to set up standing committees but, rather, that the procedure which the Senate has followed has been entirely adequate; that when it is necessary or desirable to consider any particular matter, a special committee can be set up for the purpose.

Dr. Roberts, on the other hand, was unable to see the logic of Dr. Barnes' argument. He felt that the proposal was merely an extension of the functions of the Senate and not a restriction of such functions. It merely authorizes and approves a policy of setting up continuing committees which will report to the Senate. That body will take such action as it sees fit. He referred to the desirability of calling upon the reservoir of talent in the University faculty. He stated that the proposal would encourage the utilization of the wisdom and judgment of more faculty members in considering matters of general interest. To this President Harvill asked if it was suggested that the existing machinery does not provide a way in which the wisdom of the faculty can be utilized. He suggested that such a central committee as was proposed indicates a less democratic arrangement than the one now provided by the Senate. He expressed surprise that there seemed to be a feeling that there were so few means available at present for getting things done. He referred to the practice of appointing committees upon recommendation both of the Senate and of the Committee of Eleven. He recalled the difficulties encountered by the Committee of Eighteen which was organized some years ago to consider areas of University development. There was a question as to the effectiveness of this committee and it was not continued. He suggested also that the responsibilities of a central committee would soon become unduly burdensome.

Dr. Blitzer remarked that in his contacts with individual members of the faculty he found a disturbing apathy regarding their relation to the academic life of the University. He felt that such standing committees as were suggested would provide opportunity for participation in the academic life of the University on the part of more faculty members, and that this would be effective in developing the position of the University. He explained that his reference was to faculty members who have been with the University for perhaps five or more years.

Dr. Galbraith asked whether the personnel of the standing committees proposed would be drawn from the Senate itself and headed by Senate members or from the University faculty in general. To this Dr. Houghton replied by saying that we do not have here a system of faculty committees as distinguished from administrative committees. If the proposed committees are to be similar to those found in some other institutions where the faculties have played a helpful role, the membership presumably would be appointed by the Committee on Committees. The proposal for a particular committee would first come from the central, or steering committee as it has been called. We do not have, for instance, he explained, a faculty committee on salaries or a faculty committee on budget matters, but these are common in many university organizations. Such committees would provide the opportunity for greater faculty participation and would be able to undertake matters which have not been initiated by the Senate. He remarked that in a period of eight years the Senate has not done things which the faculty understands it is capable of doing. He believes that the Senate needs advice looking into new fields of operation as the University develops.

Dr. Carpenter denied that the proposal deprived the Senate of some of its functions as indicated by those who oppose it. The committee will have certain areas in which it is expected to function, he said, but nowhere is it specified that this functioning shall be done only by the committee. Nothing in the proposal would prevent a member of the Senate from suggesting a special committee on any matter of interest. The proposal, he said, does not take any responsibility from the hands of the Senate, but merely sets up a functioning group to stimulate action along certain lines.

Dr. Barnes replied that a sharp distinction should be drawn between the proposed Committee on Basic Policy Pursuits and other committees set up by faculty action. There is no objection, of course, to the Faculty Senate from time to time creating temporary committees to handle problems as they arise. This has been done for eight years, he explained. His objection was to the establishment of a permanent standing committee on basic pursuits which, in its function, would definitely encroach upon the functions of the Senate. He said, if it does not, it provides an unnecessary duplication of organization.

Dr. Gegenheimer stated that the appointment of many temporary committees over a period of years indicates the need for a standing committee to which matters that have been considered might have been referred. He mentioned in this regard the report of the AAUP Salary Committee last year. A standing committee could have considered the matter on the basis of its experience in that particular field, whereas a special committee would have to take time to inform itself on the matter.

Dr. Nugent again joined with Dr. Barnes in disapproving a committee which would take over the authority and freedom of action of the Senate, but Dr. Carpenter again emphasized that the proposed committee would in no way restrict any action which might be initiated in the Senate.

Dr. Houghton added that the proposal provides for machinery to be functioning in the consideration of fields of operation in which the Senate might be interested if matters were brought to its attention, but that the proposed committee has no power to take any final action and that it is merely an agency for bringing recommendations to the Senate.

Dr. Galbraith, in support of Dr. Blitzer's statement, also referred to the general apathy on the part of many faculty members. This was evidenced, he said, at the last meeting of the general faculty when many members left before the close of the meeting. He felt that something was needed to stimulate interest on the part of faculty members and while he was not certain that the proposal was the best one for this purpose, he saw no objection to it since it seems to be an attempt to interest the faculty in matters of general concern.

Dean Brewer took exception to this position, stating that he did not think it was a case of apathy on the part of the faculty in general. He was interested, however, in the real purpose of the recommendation. What disturbs him, he said, is that this central steering committee or Central Committee, as Dr. Houghton pointed out, is dedicated to "trouble."

Dr. Houghton stated that his use of the word "trouble" was merely a case of his own ineffective sense of humor.

At this point President Harvill addressed a question to some of those who had prepared the report of the Committee of Eleven, asking how the proposed committee would proceed to insure unnecessary duplication of time and effort in considering matters in the basic committee and other standing committees and special committees to be appointed.

Dr. Solve said that it was hoped to have a good basic policies committee, but that its work could only be as good as its membership. What we lack now, he said, is a continuity of view and of action. Here in the Senate we are concerned, he said, with individual problems, but do not think of ourselves so much as being in a position to formulate policies for the future, something which a basic committee could be charged with doing. Everything the committee would do comes back to the Senate but doesn't prevent the initiation of matters by the Senate. This would help to develop interest in the faculty as a whole and might help to get the Senate working on a continuing program. The committee system would help to implement action. He explained that the motion as he understood it was to approve the principle and includes a referral to the By-Laws Committee, after which the Senate will have a chance to vote on the formulation of the plan. He called for a vote on the motion, and asked for a record vote. He explained that the By-Laws Committee is a committee of the Senate.

In connection with the call for a record vote, Dr. Houghton quoted from the By-Laws as follows: "Upon request of seven or more members of the Senate when the voting stage on any matter has been reached, the vote shall be taken by roll call, allowing each member's vote to be recorded. Such recorded votes shall be included in the abstracted proceedings of the Senate which are distributed to members of the faculty." A show of hands indicated a preference for a record vote.

At Dr. Nugent's request, the Acting-secretary, Mr. Windsor, read the complete recommendation as submitted by the Committee of Eleven to the Faculty Senate under date of January 9, 1956 (with the exception of last paragraph upon which action was taken at the last meeting) (See minutes of January 9, 1956 meeting for copy of Recommendation by the Committee of Eleven to the Faculty Senate).

Upon request, the secretary reported Dr. Gegenheimer's motion as follows: "That the Senate approve the recommendation of the Committee of Eleven with the exception of the last paragraph which was approved by the Senate at its last meeting, and that the matter be referred to the Committee on By-Laws for formulation of any by-laws which may be made necessary by the adoption of the recommendation."

President Harvill explained that the motion was to refer to the By-Laws Committee the proposal of the Committee of Eleven and to bring to the Senate for its consideration a plan which would provide for greater faculty participation in the affairs of the University.

Dr. Houghton added that the Senate was asked to approve the first five paragraphs of the recommendation and refer the matter to the Committee on By-Laws for such specific By-Laws as may be needed. It was Dr. Gegenheimer's understanding that favorable action on the motion would bind the Committee on By-Laws to such a plan as would include on the basic committee the Chairman of the Faculty and the Chairman of the Committee of Eleven, and that the By-Laws would indicate the number of members to serve and the length of their terms.

At this point President Harvill asked if the Committee of Eleven had given consideration to the question of having the Basic Policy Pursuits Committee elected by the faculty, to which Dr. Houghton replied in the negative. President Harvill explained that the proposed committee takes on broader functions even than the Committee of Eleven and since the Constitution provides for the election of the Committee of Eleven, he wondered if the question of election of members of the basic committee had been considered.

Professor Conley explained his understanding to be that the Senate was concerned with the general policy involved in the proposal rather than the specific details in implementing the plan, but there seemed to be some confusion as to what was intended. It was Dr. Barnes' understanding that if the motion passed the principle involved should not be reviewed but the Senate could debate details of any plan referred to it by the By-Laws Committee.

Dr. Houghton added that if the motion were passed the Committee on By-Laws would doubtless feel that the content of the recommendation was approved and the substance of the complete statement would be included in a relatively short draft for the By-Laws. He pointed out that other than the paragraph providing for the organization of the Basic Policy Pursuits Committee, the statement covers matters of policy.

Dr. Nugent asked that the question be clarified as to whether the vote would be on the matter of principle with respect to establishing a special committee or on the statement of the recommendations, to which Dr. Houghton replied that the vote would be on the matter of approving the general proposition as stated.

Dean Patrick moved that the Senate except from Dr. Gegenheimer's motion that part of the report which provides for the organization of the steering committee. The motion was seconded by Professor Conley.

Dean Patrick explained that the paragraph which he proposed to strike begins "It is proposed that the Senate provide that the Faculty Committee on Basic Policy Pursuits shall consist of the Chairman of the Committee of Eleven, the Chairman of the Faculty, etc.etc." He then moved to strike the fourth paragraph (first page of the statement of Recommendations). He explained he was proposing an amendment that the Senate accept all of the statement except the provision that states how the faculty committee on Basic Policy Pursuits shall be constituted.

President Harvill added that Dean Patrick's motion refers to that part of the original motion relating to the method of selection of the committee on Basic Policy Pursuits.

Dean Brown asked if paragraph five, that is the first paragraph on page 2 of the original Recommendation, would remain the same. To this the President replied that this merely indicated the nature of the matters with which the Basic Policy Pursuits Committee would be concerned, and, therefore, need not be considered.

Since there seemed to be some confusion as to the paragraph to which reference was made, Dean Patrick indicated a desire to re-state his motion and moved that the motion for the adoption of the Recommendation of the Committee of Eleven be approved except that all of the statement be deleted other than the second paragraph (page one of the original statement of Recommendations) reading as follows: "It is recognized that development of a workable system must necessarily require careful planning and thorough consideration. It is, therefore, proposed at this time merely that the Senate affirm, as a matter of policy, the propriety of effective Faculty participation, by means of appropriate Faculty committees, in the cooperative formulation and execution of University policy, and that the Senate authorize the selection of a Continuing Faculty Committee on Basic Policy Pursuits to undertake the making of recommendations to the Senate looking to the launching and step-by-step development of a functioning system of Faculty committees and processes." Dr. Galbraith seconded Dean Patrick's motion.

When the question was called for, the motion, on a show of hands, passed.

The President explained that the vote amended the original motion by Dr. Gegenheimer to retain the spirit of the recommendation submitted by the Committee of Eleven, but to eliminate detailed provisions with regard to procedure for establishing the proposed committee. Dr. Gegenheimer's motion as amended reads: "That the Senate approve that part of the Recommendation of the Committee of Eleven covered by the second paragraph on page one of the statement of Recommendations and that the matter be referred to the Committee on By-Laws for formulation of any By-Laws made necessary by the adoption of the Recommendation." He asked if there were any further discussion of the motion as amended.

Dr. Houghton suggested that it would be helpful to include the first paragraph of the statement of Recommendations as introductory to the second paragraph. The President indicated that a motion to amend further would be necessary.

Dr. Roberts felt that matters were becoming confused and that he would like to review the original motion as amended, with the thought of moving to approve the first two paragraphs of the statement of Recommendations and referring the matter to the Committee on By-Laws for implementation.

Dr. Gegenheimer asked if he could withdraw his motion and was advised by the chair that he could not.

Dr. Carpenter then moved, as an additional amendment, the restoration of paragraph one of the statement of Recommendations. Dr. Blitzer seconded this motion.

Dean Patrick opposed Dr. Carpenter's motion, since he felt that acceptance of paragraph one would indicate Senate endorsement in its entirety of the Report to the General Faculty of December 9, 1955.

When the question was called for, the motion to pass the amendment carried. The adoption of this second amendment changed the original motion to include only the first and second paragraphs of the statement of Recommendations of the Committee of Eleven.

The President then presented the motion as finally amended and the secretary read the roll of the Senate membership for the vote. As a result of this vote, it was found that the motion passed with twenty-three votes recorded in favor and thirteen against. The record of the vote is as follows:

Affirmative: Batemen, Blitzer, Bogart, Brown-Wm.H., Caldwell, Carpenter, Conley, Galbraith, Gegenheimer, Hall, Haury, Houghton, Hudson, Kemmerer, McKale, Patrick, Paylore, Powell, Roberts, Roy, Slonaker, Solve, Vavich.

Negative: Barnes, Brewer, Brown-E.J., Carlson, Chapman, Crowder, Crowell, Garretson, Hull, Lyons, Nugent, Park, Picchioni.

Absent: Hawkins, Leshner, Tate.

Abstaining: Harvill (Chairman).

Dr. Gegenheimer's motion as amended and adopted reads as follows: "That the Senate approve that part of the Recommendation of the Committee of Eleven covered by the first and second paragraphs on page one of the statement of Recommendations and that the matter be referred to the Committee on By-Laws for formulation of any by-laws made necessary by the adoption of the recommendation."

Paragraphs one and two of the statement of Recommendations read as follows:

"In accord with the spirit and the recommendations embodied in the Report to the Faculty, made in coordination with the Committee of Eleven on December 9, 1955, the Faculty Senate is now invited to take action to begin the effectuation of a program of more active Faculty cooperation in the shaping and directing of important University policies.

"It is recognized that development of a workable system must necessarily require careful planning and thorough consideration. It is, therefore, proposed at this time merely that the Senate affirm, as a matter of policy, the propriety of effective Faculty participation, by means of appropriate Faculty committees, in the cooperative formulation and execution of University policy, and that the Senate authorize

"the selection of a Continuing Faculty Committee on Basic Policy Pursuits to undertake the making of recommendations to the Senate looking to the launching and step-by-step development of a functioning system of Faculty committees and processes."

Welcome of New Member: President Harvill, upon attention being called to the presence of Dr. McKale as a member of the Senate, welcomed him and wished for him a pleasant and fruitful period of membership. Dr. McKale has previously served as a member of the Senate and his present tenure covers the period of the second semester in the absence of Dr. Chas. F. Wallraff who is on leave.

The Senate adjourned at 5:40 P.M.


D. L. Windsor, Secretary Pro tem