

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, March 5, 1956 Room 101, Law Building

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:40 P.M. on Monday, March 5, 1956, in Room 101 of the Law Building. Thirty-five members were present with President Harvill presiding. Dr. Burkhardt and Dr. Lynn were present also.

The minutes of the meeting of February 6, 1956 were approved as distributed to members.

April meeting, date for: President Harvill indicated that because of the intervening Easter holidays, the April meeting of the Senate will be held on Monday, April 9.

Catalogue material: The following catalogue material, recommended by the Advisory Council, was accepted by the Senate without dissent: (New courses):

Pharmacy 72-E Drugstore Management Seminar No credit Call
Seminar covering drugstore management and practices.
(Refresher course).

College of Education

Lib.Sci.289 Library Techniques for Research (1) I, II Library Staff
Use of library catalogues, trade bibliographies, indexes, abstract journals and special bibliographies in locating material for advanced research problems. Practice in compiling bibliographies. For students intending to do advanced work.

Music 209-E Operatic Literature: Mozart through Menotti (3) II Akmajian
A detailed thematic exposition of the standard operatic repertory with emphasis on the opera as an expression of lyrical drama. Whenever possible, live performances of key arias and ensembles will be offered. Not available for credit to students who have completed Music 203, 204, 205.

Summer Session 1956

H.Ec. 257s Trends in Clothing Construction (2) I Allen
Recent developments in clothing construction; review and critical discussion of literature and findings in clothing research. Each student will undertake an individual problem. P, H.E. 44. 2R, 6L.

H.Ec. 260s Problems in Furnishings and Accessories (2) I Allen
An advanced course planned to integrate principles of design and techniques for the improvement of physical surroundings of home and classroom. A review of research literature. Each student will undertake an individual problem. P, Art 3a, H.E.115a. 2R, 6L.

Honorary Degrees, recommendations for: Dr. Hawkins of the College of Agriculture reported that a special committee, including Dr. Kemmerer, Dr. Burkhart, and Dr. Vavich, had examined the qualifications of Mr. Elmer Snyder of California, prominent horticulturist who has made valuable contributions in the field of grape culture, and that upon their recommendation the faculty of the College of Agriculture was recommending that Mr. Snyder be considered for the award of the honorary degree of Doctor of Science.

Dr. Burkhart then read the following in support of that recommendation:

"Elmer Snyder, internationally recognized horticultural scientist, has contributed greatly to the national grape industry and to Arizona's expanding production of early table grapes. His achievements in grape variety improvement are particularly noteworthy in view of the fact that the table grape presents a most difficult problem from a breeding point of view. Up to the time of his introductions, no significant improvement had been made in these grapes over a period of several centuries. He was born July 13, 1892 in Ghent, New York. The Bachelor of Science degree was awarded him by Cornell University in 1914, and he was associated with that University for the following year as instructor.

"In 1915 Mr. Snyder was appointed to the United States Department of Agriculture staff, Bureau of Plant Industry, assisting in Grape Investigations in Western United States until 1931. In 1931 he was put in charge of Western grapes investigations and continued in this capacity until retirement, July 1, 1955. He continues his grape interests in consulting capacity with growers. The Superior Service Award from the United States Department of Agriculture was received by him in June 1955.

"As a foremost authority on grape varieties, both for rootstocks and for fruit production, the commercial table grape industries in Arizona and California are largely guided by his advice both oral and through his writings on problems of varieties, rootstocks, propagation, and methods of pruning. The Arizona Grape Growers Association has expressed their high regard for these services.

"The excellent leadership of this eminent and reliable scientist, coupled with his cooperation with growers and University of Arizona staff members has resulted in greatly improving the Arizona grape industry.

"He is also recognized for evaluating rootstocks for nematode and phylloxera resistance. In this connection he also developed the method of grafting buds in which the rootstock vines were established in the field, then worked over above the soil line which largely solved the troublesome cion rooting problem. More recently he and his associates have developed a method of "green grafting" grapes that promises further to speed the propagation of varieties of resistant rootstocks. He demonstrated that White Emperor disease is a result of a virus which is transmitted when infected vines are used in propagation and thus emphasizes the great importance of taking propagation wood only from vines known to be free of disease and of good type. Mr. Snyder developed the now popular method of treating spurs of grape vines with zinc sulphate for correcting zinc deficiency in grape vineyards.

"One of the chief contributions that Mr. Snyder has made for Arizona agriculture was the introduction of the new Cardinal grape variety developed by him in the grape breeding program while associated with the United States Department of Agriculture. Three other grape varieties of commercial importance, including Calmeria and the Black Rose, were developed by him. The earliness of the Cardinal grape has developed a very specific high premium market nationally and has resulted in an extended marketing period for table grapes for Arizona. Concurrently, consumers of fresh table grapes throughout the nation also benefited from this new varietal introduction. This introduction, made in 1946, has stimulated the commercial production of fresh table grapes and other deciduous fruits in Arizona.

"Mr. Snyder's scientific accomplishments are verified in the 55 scientific publications which he has to his credit. These publications deal with the various aspects of grape culture, variety improvement, and propagation.

"It is therefore recommended that Mr. Snyder be awarded the honorary Doctor of Science degree by the University of Arizona at the spring commencement exercises this year."

Dr. Kemmerer moved that Mr. Elmer Snyder be recommended by the Senate to receive the honorary degree of Doctor of Science. This motion was seconded by Professor Tate.

Dr. Roberts asked if there were not some provision for allowing recommendations of this sort to be tabled until another meeting, but after reference to the minutes the secretary explained that the report regarding the processing of honorary degrees as adopted last April indicates that recommendations for such degrees should be presented to the Senate at the regular March meeting in time to allow for ample discussion by the faculty. However, there is nothing in the report to indicate the recommendation should be tabled at the March meeting and returned to the Senate at a later meeting.

When the question was called for, the motion carried; and the President explained that this recommendation will be presented to the faculty at its next regular meeting. (Note: The next Faculty meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, March 13, at 4:40 P.M.).

President Harvill then cautioned members of the Senate that this action should be regarded as confidential since it was not desirable that any statement regarding honorary degrees be published until the commencement season.

Dean Chapman asked if there were a definite policy in the number of honorary degrees to be awarded and President Harvill replied that in general it has been the policy to be conservative in the award of honorary degrees. It is not the intention to avoid such awards, but in order to have such degrees significant, they should be relatively few in number.

Dr. Picchioni presented a statement regarding Mr. Newell Stewart, an outstanding personality in the field of pharmacy, and reported that the College of Pharmacy faculty recommended Mr. Stewart to receive the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws. He moved that this recommendation be approved, and Dean Brewer seconded the motion.

The statement supporting the recommendation read as follows:

"Newell Williamson Stewart was born at Sistersville, West Virginia, on February 14, 1900. Following graduation from high school there in 1916, he attended the Army-Navy Preparatory School in Washington, D.C., for one year and then entered the University of West Virginia as a student of engineering in 1917. This phase of his education was interrupted by service with the 6th Battery, Trench Artillery, American Expeditionary Forces, overseas during 1918 and 1919. A brief interval of travel and work in the Arabian oil fields was concluded in order to return to the University of West Virginia in 1921 as a student of pharmacy. He was graduated with the degree, Pharmaceutical Chemist, in 1923. He was registered as a pharmacist, was married, and served as a pharmacist in West Virginia until 1926, when he moved his family westward to establish a drug store in Phoenix, Arizona. In 1942, he gave up the retail pharmacy to serve full time as Secretary of the Arizona Board of Pharmacy, a position which he had held intermittently in 1937 and 1940. In the period from 1942 to 1953, he served concurrently as Secretary of both the Board of Pharmacy and the Arizona Pharmaceutical Association. In 1953, Newell Stewart accepted the position of Executive Vice President of the National Pharmaceutical Council at the Rockefeller Center in New York City where he has distinguished himself in intra- and inter-professional relations among the health professions.

"As an Arizonan, Newell Stewart brought honor to himself and the profession of pharmacy through his civic efforts as chairman of the Phoenix Community Chest and Retail War Loan Drives, as a leader in church and youth work, as a member of the Board of Directors of Memorial Hospital and as mayor of Phoenix during the term, 1940-42.

"His service to Arizona pharmacy as a leader in the effort to raise professional standards from a status of question to one of example for other state pharmacy groups is highly worthy of recognition. This achievement was attained through his activity in the Arizona Pharmaceutical Association from 1926 to 1953, serving as its president in 1937 and as its executive secretary and the editor of its official bulletin, the Arizona Pharmacist, from 1942 to 1953. During this time he was one of the "guiding lights" in the movement to develop a school of pharmacy at the University of Arizona in order to raise the standards of practice in the state. Following the establishment of the Pharmacy College, he was appointed Lecturer in pharmacy jurisprudence because of his position as secretary of the Board of Pharmacy and his knowledge of the state laws pertaining to pharmacy. He became affiliated at this time with the American Association for the Advancement of Science and Rho Chi, the pharmacy scholastic honor society.

"On the national level, Newell Stewart brought honor and recognition in the profession to the state of Arizona through his official services as President of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy in 1948-49 and as Vice Chairman and Chairman of the House of Delegates of the American Pharmaceutical Association from 1949 to 1951 and as President of the American Pharmaceutical Association in 1954-55.

"In view of his outstanding contributions to Arizona as a citizen and to Arizona pharmacy as a state and national leader, the faculty of the Pharmacy College wishes to recommend to the Faculty Senate that his efforts be recognized through the awarding of an honorary degree of Doctor of Laws."

Dr. Roberts suggested that it was desirable to have more time to consider the recommendation and moved that it be tabled, explaining that his motion was to table the motion until the next meeting of the Senate. Dr. Carpenter seconded the motion.

When the question was called for, the motion was lost.

The President then referred to the recommendation of the faculty of the College of Pharmacy as open for consideration and Dean Brewer reviewed further the accomplishments of Mr. Stewart, explaining that in 1954-55 he headed the organization of some 107,000 pharmacists in this country. Dr. Picchioni also explained further Mr. Stewart's outstanding contributions to the field of pharmacy.

Dr. Gegenheimer felt that the award of the degree of Doctor of Laws, which in his judgment outranked that of Doctor of Science, was not in order; and suggested instead that the degree of Doctor of Pharmacy as an honorary degree would be more appropriate. He moved to amend the motion to change the degree to Doctor of Pharmacy. The motion was seconded by Dr. Roberts.

In response to a question by Dean Garretson, Dean Brewer explained that the Doctor of Pharmacy degree is an earned degree in some institutions, and it was indicated also that the degree of Doctor of Science is an earned degree.

It was Dr. Roberts' feeling that the burden of proof in support of a recommendation should be on the people who propose the degree and that the Senate should not necessarily vote the degree on the basis of a list of accomplishments read. He again suggested the desirability of additional time to discuss the matter with members of the Pharmacy college.

Mr. Leshar pointed out there is nothing in the report which the Senate adopted last year to indicate any specific plan of selecting a particular honorary degree for an individual. He thought it deplorable that over a long period of years this institution had been so conservative in the award of honorary degrees. Little has been done, he said, to recognize the achievement of many who have made important contributions to the development of the state. There should be no distinction made, he said, in the value attached to an honorary degree. In this instance, if the candidate is to be recognized for his contribution to the field of pharmacy, we should do no less than to give him the honorary degree of Doctor of Science or Doctor of Laws.

In response to a question, Dean Brewer stated that while the faculty recommended the degree of Doctor of Laws, he felt Mr. Stewart would be honored by the award of the honorary degree of Doctor of Pharmacy.

It was Dr. Galbraith's opinion that the award of this degree suggested a difference in values among the colleges of the University; and that if the candidate is worthy, the award should be a Doctor of Science or Doctor of Laws degree.

The question was called for on the amendment to substitute the Doctor of Pharmacy degree for Doctor of Laws in the recommendation by the College of Pharmacy faculty. When the vote was taken, the motion lost.

The question was then called for on the original motion to recommend that the degree of Doctor of Laws be awarded to Mr. Newell Stewart. When the vote was taken, the motion passed.

College of Business and Public Administration Committee. At the request of the President the secretary read a report from Fred O. Bogart, Chairman, Faculty Elections Committee, under date of February 6, 1956, giving the result of the election held in the College of Business and Public Administration to select a Temporary Committee of Five in connection with the election of a Dean. The five members receiving the highest number of votes, arranged in order to votes received, were reported as follows: Herbert J. Langen, Russell M. Howard, Donald S. Klaiss, Glen W. Strickler, Andrew W. Wilson.

Committee of Eleven, report of change in membership of: The secretary read a report from the secretary of the Committee of Eleven, stating that Professor Alethea Mattingly had been elected to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Professor Emil Haury.

Scholarships, report re: President Harvill reported briefly on the status of scholarships, particularly activity or athletic scholarships, as established by the Board of Regents and awarded under the policy approved two years ago. He wished to have this matter one of record in the minutes of the Senate, and called attention to the very satisfactory work done by the group of athletes who have received scholarships during the past year. He reported that the average of members of the baseball team was 2.75 for all students holding scholarships; for basketball players holding scholarships the average was 2.87; and for members of the football squad it was 2.84. This average is based upon the units carried throughout the academic year. The statement is made particularly to clarify a misunderstanding that scholarships as reported were based only upon credits actually completed rather than upon the number of credits carried. For members of the track and tennis squad, he added, the average was 2.87. The President explained that scholarship awards are made by the Committee on Scholarships and Awards and are made in consideration of a number of factors. In some cases, need is the most important single consideration. This applies to many scholarships given by the University, including some of those awarded to women. Character and general activities are also considered. In the case of athletes, the relative degree of athletic achievement may be a deciding factor rather than scholarship standing as such, as long as the minimum requirement in scholarship is met. This is the basis upon which the awards have been set up by the Board of Regents who require that awards to athletes be made in keeping with the policies established by both the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

By-Laws Committee, report of: Dr. Houghton, Chairman of the By-Laws Committee, asked that Dr. Carpenter report for the Committee on the preparation of a proposed by-law related to the organization of a Continuing Committee on Basic Policy Pursuits. Dr. Carpenter's report, with two minor corrections, was read as follows:

"REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BY-LAWS
March 5, 1956

"Pursuant to Senate Direction on February 6, your committee recommends as By-Law Number 16:

"That a Continuing Faculty Committee on Basic Policy Pursuits be established with the organization and functions herein prescribed:

"a. Membership, Selection, and Organization

"The Committee shall consist of: (1) six members elected by the Senate from persons nominated by the University Committee on Committees, and (2) the Chairman of the Faculty who shall serve ex-officio and shall be without vote except in case of tie votes. Initial terms of the elected members shall be: two for one year, two for two years, and two for three years. Thereafter, members shall be selected for three years, except to fill unexpired terms. No member shall serve more than two terms consecutively. The Committee shall select its chairman each year. The Chairman of the Faculty shall be ineligible for the Chairmanship of the Committee.

"Initially and whenever vacancies may occur, the University Committee on Committees shall nominate to the Senate twice as many persons as are to be elected. The primary consideration for nominations shall be apparent promise of capacity to grasp and actively to promote basic requisites for effective University functioning, with some regard for reasonable distribution among the main fields and pursuits of University scholarship, namely, the sciences, social studies, humanities, technology, and professionalism.

"Election by the Senate shall be by ballot, each member of the Senate being permitted to vote on any ballot for as many nominees as may be elected on that ballot. No voter shall give more than one vote to any name on any ballot.

"In the event that six or more nominees receive a number of votes in excess of one-half of the membership of the Senate present and voting, the six nominees receiving the highest numbers of votes shall be declared elected. If the identity of any of these six nominees should be ambiguous because of tie votes, these ties shall be resolved by succeeding ballots, which shall include the names of all unelected persons on the original list of nominees. In the event that fewer than six members receive a majority of votes as defined in this paragraph, those receiving such a majority shall be declared elected and the remaining vacancies shall be filled by succeeding ballots taken at the same session of the Senate and subject to the foregoing rules for majorities and ties.

"b. Duties

"The Committee is authorized and directed to undertake as its continuing responsibility, 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 by means of which the Faculty may offer its active cooperation in the shaping and direction of important University policies.

"In order to make judicious recommendations to the Senate, the Committee is authorized to make use of such sources of assistance, advice, and information as it may see fit to utilize in the study and consideration of fields for appropriate active Faculty concern.

"Among the kinds of policy deemed appropriate for reasonably expeditious Committee study and recommendation are included such matters as educational policy, university planning, budgeting, recruitment to faculty and administrative positions, salary, tenure, promotion and retirement.

"Respectfully submitted,

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

Dr. Carpenter explained that the committee had been rather careful to specify by the mode of balloting that the persons who shall serve on the new committee shall each one be elected by an actual majority of votes cast in the Senate, that no persons are accepted only by plurality and receiving only a minority of votes in the Senate. He added that there were no limitations among members of the faculty on those who may be nominated by the Committee on Committees. In response to a question by Dean Roy, he stated that no provision is now made to have nominations made from the floor of the Senate. It would seem to him, he said, that the Senate would not be obligated to accept the panel proposed by the Committee on Committees, but in that case the entire matter should be referred back to the Committee on Committees. If the Senate should elect some of the members proposed in the panel by the Committee on Committees and substitute some of its own, he said, it would rather qualify the work of the Committee on Committees. He said, in reply to a question by President Harvill, that there is no limitation placed on members of the teaching faculty, extension, research divisions and administrative staff; in other words, the list of the faculty is the possible list of nominees.

President Harvill explained that he had asked in a previous meeting of the Senate about the distinction between the committees that recommend policy and those that carry out policy, reference being made to some existing committees appointed by the President that are part of the administrative machinery of the institution. Dr. Carpenter said that the proposal does not effect these committees. It was the President's judgment that the Co-ordinating Committee, for instance, is selected by appointment through his office and is a unit in administrative procedure. Such a committee is not effected, it was understood, by the new plan.

The President then emphasized that a number of existing committees serve the administrative processes of the University and that when recommendations of policy are adopted, the administration of such policy is carried out through existing channels or through committees set up by the regular administrative machinery of the University, and Dr. Carpenter agreed that this was the case. It was his understanding that such committees as will be set up under the new Standing Committee will be exploratory and advisory in nature. Their reports will be made to the Senate, which has the responsibility of deciding whether to accept the recommendations and act upon them or to do otherwise.

President Harvill then called attention to the original statement of the proposal to establish a Basic Committee which reads: "It is, therefore, proposed at this time 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 explained that if we were to go beyond the recommendation of policies in adopting the new plan, it would be necessary to refer the matter to the Board of Regents inasmuch as the Board understands that administrative matters of the University, as previously explained, are in the hands of administrative officials. It is understood, however, that the new plan provides a method whereby the University faculty may have greater participation in the formulation of policies.

Dr. Houghton agreed with the status of the committee as indicated by the President. He suggested that there might be some change in the function of the Committee if over the period of years the administration found that processes were being developed which would be helpful to the present policy. It was his feeling that the plan contemplated in no way the taking over of any administrative policies.

Dr. Hudson called attention to By-Law number 11, providing for a standing University Committee on Committees; By-Law number 12, which provides for a standing Senate Committee on Faculty Grievances; and the proposed By-Law number 16 which provides for a Continuing Faculty Committee on Basic Policy Pursuits, and asked if there were a significant difference in terminology as related to the status of the new committee as a Faculty Committee or as a Senate Committee.

Dr. Houghton thought there was no intention to make the wording significant, that is, as to whether it would be a Faculty committee rather than a Senate Committee. The statement, he said, was based on the assumption that everything done in the Senate is a matter of faculty business. The Senate represents the faculty and its actions are subject to referendum of the faculty.

Dr. Barnes stated that the initial report to the Faculty Senate seemed to draw a distinction between faculty committees and administratively-appointed committees, but he did not know whether or not any distinction was intended. Dr. Houghton explained that this was the distinction the President is making between committees appointed by the President on the one hand and other committees which are appointed in different ways.

President Harvill again stated that administrative committees, that is those having to do with administrative matters, are selected by the President. Other committees will not be considered in connection with administration but rather with the recommendation of policy. As an example, Dr. Barnes cited the Committee on Dishonest Scholastic Work. This is a committee appointed by the President, dealing with administrative matters.

At this point, Dr. Harvill took occasion to compliment the members of the Dishonest Scholastic Work Committee for the work they have done.

Mr. Leshar called attention to a letter addressed to members of the Senate by Dr. Nugent and asked if he might, as a matter of record, read the letter in the absence of its author. The request was approved by the President. The secretary then read the letter in which Dr. Nugent stated his judgment that the members of the permanent "Steering Committee" of the Senate should be elected by the Senate itself. He felt that the members should not be appointed by the President of the University, nor should they be ex-officio or appointed by the Committee on Committees, the members of which are appointed by the Chairman of

the Faculty. He added that approval by the Senate at this time of a Continuing "Steering Committee", the members of which are ex-officio or are appointed by the Committee on Committees, would constitute an undesirable and unwarranted delegation of duties. It was his personal belief, he said, that members of this Continuing Faculty Committee on Basic Policy Pursuits, or any such "Steering Committee" should be selected by the Senate itself.

Mr. Leshner said he agreed with Dr. Nugent and that the proposal of By-Law 16 usurped the function and authority of the Senate. If there is to be a permanent standing committee, he said, it should be one selected by the Senate in the sense that nominations are made on the floor of the Senate and elections completed by the Senate, with the understanding that committee reports would, of course, be submitted to the Senate for consideration. He was concerned, he said, with the inference made in previous meetings that the Senate or other University agencies had failed to give consideration to many important University problems over a period of years and called attention to some of the matters considered from time to time as illustrating the method by which the Senate approaches its responsibilities and privileges. Mention was made of the policies effecting student body and special assemblies; all curricular matters as published in the University catalogue, including development of degree programs; scholarship requirements for graduation, adjustments in academic calendar, et cetera; faculty and staff group insurance; retirement plans; general development of the University, in respect to planning; faculty salaries; student rating of instructors; state controlled higher education; bookstore practices; classification of staff members; exchange professors and students; research program; location of Student Union Building; policy regarding Ditch days; dishonest scholastic work; the grading system, delinquent report policies; adjustment in registration procedures; the parking problem; administrative policies within departments; faculty promotions; Committee on Committees; additions to By-Laws; sabbatical leaves, emeritus status of faculty members; policy regarding outside work; and honorary degrees. There is nothing in the new plan, he said, which does not duplicate the function of the Senate as illustrated by these matters. It was his feeling that the Senate has done a great deal of work and its accomplishment has been notable. He then moved the deletion of the phrase "from persons nominated by the University Committee on Committees" in the second and third lines of the first paragraph, (a), of the proposed by-law.

Dr. Barnes seconded the motion, pointing out that if it passed there would have to be some adjustment in the statement in the second paragraph of the proposed by-law.

Dr. Carpenter explained that the University Committee on Committees was established in the Senate by By-Law, like the one proposed, for the purpose of compiling into a permanent body of information the interests and capabilities and the availabilities of various members of the faculty to serve on various kinds of committees. This sort of thing could not be done by any one person and it could not be made by any one group unless the group itself is sufficiently widespread in its professional locations on campus to permit of reasonable personal acquaintance with members of the faculty. He felt that to pass the motion to amend the by-law would be to deprive it of one of its most effective pieces of machinery.

It was Dr. Solve's judgment that the advantage of the Committee on Committees is that it has helped to equalize the load of committee work. The selection of the Basic committee as proposed would make it possible to obtain a wider distribution of the committee work load.

Mr. Leshner, on the other hand, argued that unless the proposed standing committee is made an essential part of the Senate it will be a direct duplication not only of the Senate functions but of the Committee of Eleven and will violate the purpose of these groups. In order to make it essentially a part of the Senate, it is necessary that the nominations and elections be conducted in the Senate. This does not mean, he said, that the faculty generally cannot be represented in such a committee. The nominations might conceivably be of people who might not be Senate members, or members of any committee. It was his judgment that the proposal is in direct conflict with the faculty constitution. He added that in the course of its career the Senate has been served by at least ninety different members of the faculty, that it is a democratic group representative of the faculty at large and elected by the faculty, and there is plenty of opportunity for proper nominations of candidates for the proposed committee. The Senate should not permit its function to be taken from it and allocated to the Committee on Committees, which is appointed by the Chairman of the Faculty.

Dr. Barnes supported Mr. Leshner's argument, stating that the Senate will have wider and broader knowledge of the capabilities of six people on the faculty than would six members of the Committee on Committees. He did not question the value of the work of that committee but it was doubtful, in his opinion, if the six members would know well as many people as will the forty members of the Senate, who are a much more representative cross-section of the University faculty than is the Committee on Committees.

President Harvill took occasion at this point to commend the Committee on Committees for its work and stated the committee had been very helpful. The proposed basic committee, however, was not comparable to any other committee we have had in the past. It takes on functions, he said, which are even broader than those of the Committee of Eleven, which is elected by the entire faculty.

It was Dr. Roberts' feeling that the Committee on Committees would be better able to analyze the situation with respect to the availability of faculty members and to make more effective selections than would the Senate. At the same time the Senate need not accept either in whole or in part the nominations of the Committee on Committees, but could reject the entire report of the committee. We should not lose sight, he said, of the fact that complete control of the action of the committee is in the hands of the Senate.

Dr. Carpenter then quoted By-Law 11 as follows:

"That a standing University Committee on Committees be established with the organization and functions herein prescribed:

- "a. Membership and organization. This Committee shall be composed of six members of the faculty, appointed by the Chairman of the Faculty. Not more than two members shall be appointed from any one College faculty. The initial appointments shall be: two for one year, two for two years, and two for three years. Thereafter, appointments shall be made for three years, except to fill unexpired terms. No member shall serve two consecutive terms. The Committee shall elect its chairman from those of its members whose unexpired terms are the shortest.

"b. Duties. The Committee on Committees shall appoint the members of all committees created by the General Faculty or by the Senate, except when, and to the extent that, action creating such committees specifies otherwise.

"Upon request of any administrative official in the University, the Committee shall also recommend persons for appointment to existing committees or new committees whose appointments lie within the discretion of such requesting official.

"All appointments and recommendations made by the Committee on Committees shall be made in conformity with the conditions prescribed by the action calling for them and in harmony with principles which may at the time be applicable to such committees.

"c. Effective date of this plan. This plan shall become operative upon its approval by the General Faculty."

He explained that the provision which he quoted indicates that in passing this by-law it was intended to create a committee to function smoothly and to do the job we now seem to do in a haphazard way. He did not agree with Dr. Barnes that the Senate made up of forty members could more effectively than the Committee on Committees select the nominees. It was the sort of job, he said, that must be done by quiet and personal consultation, with conferences among many people, and this would not be possible in the Senate meeting.

Mr. Leshner referred to the emphasis given by Dr. Roberts to the fact that elections will be held in the Senate and that it is important to have the Committee on Committees handle the nominations. He stated that the important thing to remember is that we are asked to set up a standing committee, the functions of which duplicate the functions of the Senate and when the nominations come from the Committee on Committees, it is not a Senate committee in the real sense. Why, he asked, should we hesitate to have the Senate make the nominations; why would not the Senate have plenty of time and plenty of talent in its membership to consider such nominations, and why should not there be opportunity for members of the Senate to discuss these with numerous members of the faculty before selections were made.

Dean Slonaker suggested that as a means of adjusting the situation provision be made to have nominations made from the floor of the Senate.

At this point Dr. Carpenter called for a record vote and a show of hands indicated that such a vote was in order, on the motion to delete words "from persons nominated by the University Committee on Committees", lines 2 and 3, paragraph "a" of the proposed By-Law.

The secretary then read the roll and recorded the votes as follows:

Affirmative: Barnes, Brewer, Brown-E.J., Carlson, Chapman, Crowell, Garretson, Haury, Leshner, Lyons, Park, Patrick, Picchioni, Roy, Slonaker.

Negative: Bateman, Blitzer, Bogart, Carpenter, Galbraith, Gegenheimer, Hall, Houghton, Hudson, Kemmerer, McKale, Paylore, Powell, Roberts, Solve, Tate, Vavich.

Absent: Brown-Wm.H., Caldwell, Conley, Crowder, Hull, Myers, Nugent.

Abstaining: Harvill(Chairman).

The result showed fifteen votes in favor of the motion to amend the proposed By-Law and seventeen votes against the motion, which was lost.

Dean Lyons said he was impressed by the arguments made on both sides of the question and by the suggestion made by Dean Slonaker regarding nominations from the floor of the Senate. It was not true, in his opinion, to say that where the nominations are made by the Committee on Committees the faculty Senate has the major choice. It would be awkward to vote to have the Senate return a report to the Committee on Committees, which it would seem could work more systematically on the selection of nominees than the Senate. It was his feeling that Dean Slonaker's suggestion resolves the difference in the points of view and that the way to handle the matter would be to provide for additional nominations from the Senate floor.

He then moved to amend the second paragraph of section "a" by inserting after the first sentence the following "that additional nominations may be made from the Senate floor" so that the statement would read "Initially and whenever vacancies may occur, the University Committee on Committees shall nominate to the Senate twice as many persons as are to be elected. Additional nominations may be made from the Senate floor. The primary consideration for nominations shall be.....". The assumption was that this amendment would require other corrections in the By-Law. Dr. Barnes seconded the motion.

Dr. Harvill indicated that under Roberts' Rules of Order, under which we are proceeding, it is provided that nominations can always be taken from the floor, but after Dean Lyons' motion was seconded by Dr. Barnes, Dr. Houghton pointed out that Roberts' Rules shall govern except when Senate rules provide otherwise.

Dean Lyons felt that the rule allowing nominations from the floor may be eliminated by the sentence to which reference was made; that is, "six members elected by the Senate from persons". It is not clear that additional nominations could be made from the Senate floor. The first sentence in the statement seems to restrict the election to those nominated by the University Committee on Committees.

At this point President Harvill explained that the Senate had been in meeting considerably past its hour of adjournment and that there were other questions to raise in connection with the discussion. Under the circumstances, he ruled that the question would be held until the next meeting of the Senate. The meeting adjourned at 5:55 P.M.


C. Zaner Leshner, Secretary