

The University of Arizona  
Proceedings of the Faculty Senate

Meeting of Monday

November 3, 1969

PRESENT: Anthony Ares, Bannister, Bartlett, Bingham, Blecha, Blitzer, Bok, Brewer, Burton, Carlson, Christopherson, Davis, Delaplaine, Dewhirst, Dutt, Forrester, Gegenheimer, Ginsberg, Goodwin, Gould, Green, Harvill, Herber, Hetrick, Higley, Houston, Hull, Johnson, Kassander, Kelter, Kemmerer, Krebs, Little, Lytle, Massengale, Mautner, Mees, Miller, Murphy, H. Myers, Paylore, Rhodes, Richard, Robson, Saarinen, Siegel, Sigworth, Skinner, Spicer, Svob, Tomizuka, M. Voris, W. Voris, White, Wise, Yoshino, Younggren and Zwolinski. Mr. Butler attended the meeting and served as secretary.

ABSENT: Armstrong, Barnes, DuVal, Fahey, Gaines, Krutzsch, Lowe, McMillan, L. Myers, Nigh, Paulsen, Resnick, Roy, Selke, Sorensen, and Windsor.

COMMENT RE VIETNAM MORATORIUM OBSERVANCE: President Harvill related to the members of the Faculty Senate the position of the Board of Regents with respect to reactions throughout the state of the October 15 Vietnam Moratorium observance. In the meetings of the Board there was at no time any objection of the observance of the Moratorium on any of the state campuses. Many members of the Board said that they had no objection to this observance if it was conducted quietly. However, the Board of Regents had received many inquiries about dismissal of classes.

Dr. Harvill said that he had received more telephone calls from students after the Moratorium than about any other event since he has been on campus. He had only received one communication from anyone who took exception to the Board of Regents' statement. The Regents' position was as follows. They believed that there was ample opportunity to observe the Moratorium without dismissing classes. At the University of Arizona the program ran for three days. The Board was not abrasive at any point in its discussion. It was a quiet meeting and no threats were made. The Board did emphasize, however, that measures should be taken to insure that in the future classes meet during such observances.

The Board of Regents is deeply concerned because although Arizona has maintained order on all campuses throughout these troubled times, the Legislature is considering legislation which could be repressive or ill-advised. Punitive measures might be taken if a few students are allowed to disrupt normal campus activities.

Dr. Harvill stated that the University has lost some good friends as a result of the stories that have been circulating in the press about the cancelling of classes. We must do what we can to insure that the Board's directives and the Faculty Senate's action regarding cancelling classes are enforced. Dr. Harvill has asked the deans to report to him instances of classes being cancelled by faculty. He stated that the Board has said nothing about students cutting classes but did indicate that the classes must be held.

Dr. Saarinen asked if the Board's recent statement indicated that professors could not cancel classes for any reason whatsoever. Dr. Harvill replied that the Board's position was that classes should not be cancelled by faculty members without good cause such as illness or attendance at official meetings. What the Board was referring to was a planned program where there is advocacy of missing classes even when participation in the activity in question could be held without missing classes. The Board was not trying to "hit anybody

over the head" but was thinking of higher education in the state and the various friends that we might be losing. Dr. Robson stated that one other thing should be recognized which is more pedagogical than political. Professors do not owe students a certain number of hours of teaching. This to him perverts the meaning of higher education. This is a faculty matter, not an administrative matter, and the faculty should take a stand concerning this. Dr. Harvill stated that it was his feeling that there is not enough of an issue here to cause a breach between the faculty and the Board of Regents.

Mr. Ginsberg stated that the Student Senate had made a resolution concerning this matter. The resolution suggests that the Regents' statement might be an infringement on a professor's right to hold classes or not.

Professor Davis stated that he saw a distinction between cancellation of classes and rescheduling of class or substituting a teacher. He assumed that the faculty still has the prerogative to make adjustments.

Mr. Mautner asked how many classes were simply left untaught. Dr. Harvill replied that the deans have reported to him that very few classes were not held.

CATALOG MATERIAL: The following catalog material was accepted:

New

Committee on Alcohol Studies

Alcohol Studies 305a-305b, Psycho-Pharmacological and Biochemical Problems of the Alcoholic (3-3) Yr. Tucker  
Alcohol Studies 399, Seminar (2) I, II Brewer  
Alcohol Studies 405, Internship (5) I Brewer and Tucker

English 182, Mexican-American Literature (3) II Staff  
History 219, Colloquium on the Mind of Black America (3) II Noyes  
Metallurgical Engineering 203, Elementary Materials Science (2) I Walker (For Continuing Education Only)  
Metallurgical Engineering 204, Materials Science Laboratory (2) II Walker (For Continuing Education Only)

REPORT OF AD HOC FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON POLICY STATEMENT ON FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA: Dr. Harvill recognized Dr. Massengale, Chairman of the ad hoc Faculty Senate Committee on Policy Statement on Freedom of Expression at the University of Arizona. Dr. Massengale stated that the committee had met last spring, during the summer and into the fall. The report which had been distributed to members of the Faculty Senate represented the best thinking of this committee. He also stated that the committee had freely used several publications and documents already in existence at the University of Arizona.

Dr. Gegenheimer stated that he did not feel it was necessary to consider all parts of this new document since some parts of it were already in existence and had been approved. He stated that to get the matter before the Senate he would move that the committee report be accepted. Dr. Zwolinski seconded the motion.

Dr. Harvill asked if there was anything in the report that was a change from the policy which was already in existence. Dr. Massengale replied that there were two items which constituted a change from the Board of Regents' policy relating to political meetings on campus dated May 21, 1966. These changes were: 1) Deletion of item number 4 since it was adequately covered under the Board of Regents ordinance dated July 6, 1968, and 2) Substituting words "The sponsoring" for the word "a" in what was now item number 5. This placed the financial responsibility where it duly belonged.

Dr. Siegel stated that the preamble of the policy statement had been approved previously except for paragraph 4. He then moved that paragraph 4 be deleted since it was difficult to determine what constituted an act of insurrection. Several seconds to this motion were heard. Dr. Kassander stated that this paragraph was included as an almost verbatim statement of what had been proposed previously by Dr. Damon. Dr. Hetrick stated that this was only a small part of Dr. Damon's resolution.

Mr. White said that he also had great difficulty in understanding this paragraph. It was not clear to him who "duly constituted authorities" were and what criteria would be used to determine whether an act was an insurrection or not. Dr. Massengale replied that the duly constituted authorities are the University Administration. Dr. Skinner stated as a member of this committee that he felt that this lack of definition was a weakness. Perhaps the committee should define this further. Dean Brewer suggested that this be amended to read, "Legally constituted authorities who are responsible for putting down acts of insurrection..."

Dean Ares stated that he felt all members of the Senate would agree with the general statement that freedom of expression was imperative on a university campus. However, he was unsettled somewhat by the document as it was now proposed. Instead of a statement regarding freedom of expression this document was a statement regarding restriction of expression. He suggested that the Senate reduce this to a statement that "We are aware of the differences between dissent and insurrection." Dr. Gegenheimer stated that he felt that the last sentence to the preamble did give somewhat of a blanket endorsement to authorities. Therefore, he offered a substitute motion to strike the last sentence to the preamble. This was seconded by Dr. Lytle.

Dr. Robson stated that the second sentence of the last paragraph of the preamble bothered him somewhat. Even orderly processes restrict freedom of expression. After some further discussion the question was called for and the substitute motion carried.

Dean Ares referred to page 2 of the document concerning public lectures. He stated that he did not know what was meant by the statement that the sponsorship of public lectures was the responsibility of the faculty. When the faculty wish to sponsor public meetings, they still must submit to the same approval as student groups. Dean Ares wished to know why it was necessary for the faculty to go through this approval in the same manner as student organizations did. He further asked why we should have the rule that student organizations are not encouraged to sponsor public lectures. He felt that the students should be encouraged to sponsor lectures that are open to the public. He felt that when we talk about free expression it is a dangerous thing to have to start justifying this free expression.

Dean Ares further referred to paragraph 1, page 3. He said he did not understand why a department of instruction that was closely concerned with the topic of a proposed lecture would have to give its opinion about a lecture. He stated that we must realize that students are young adults.

Vice President Johnson replied that by practice the faculty had used the University Lecture Committee. The procedure was an orderly one and not an onerous task. The committee came into being in order to avoid abuse of use of University facilities by various organizations. Vice President Johnson further stated that the policy concerning the restriction on public lectures by student organizations was necessary because use of University facilities would be abused if their use were not restricted somewhat. We have an obligation to retain these facilities for the use of students and faculty. He urged that this policy be retained since many outside groups have attempted through student organizations to use these facilities in a manner which would not be of benefit to the University community. He felt that to use University facilities to sell a point to the Tucson public was wrong.

Dr. Burton asked if under the procedure being followed in the past had a lecture ever been vetoed. Vice President Johnson replied yes, it had when its value to the University community had not been demonstrated.

Dr. Gegenheimer stated that this University Lecture Committee was established when the Regents became concerned about political meetings on campus. Dr. Gegenheimer then replied to Dean Ares that most of the meetings sponsored by the faculty have not been approved by the committee. However, some departments routinely request approval.

Dean Ares stated that we were talking about a delicate problem of freedom of expression and these statements restricted this. One of the roles of the University is to allow freedom of expression and then it is up to the University to deal with whatever criticism may ensue.

Dean Hull asked if deletion of the second clause of paragraph 4, page 2 would satisfy Dean Ares.

Dr. Harvill stated that so many organizations had requested use of University facilities that their use had to be limited, and secondly, if some student-sponsored lectures were open to the public, there would not be space to accommodate the students who wished to attend. Many of these recommendations came originally from the faculty, not from the Board of Regents.

Professor Davis stated that he was concerned about some of the procedures which were indicated in this document. Over the last six years the courts also have become concerned and have told the universities that they do not need to invite off-campus speakers but if they do they must follow proper procedure or methods. He also stated that the phrase "general educational value for members of the Tucson community" was too vague. We need a rewording of these rules and regulations to satisfy their administration. Vice President Johnson replied that the cases which Professor Davis referred to involved whether or not the speaker concerned would be invited to the campus or not. Various university administrations were being selective in inviting speakers to the campus. He further stated that this was not the issue here. The issue concerned going outside the University community.

Dr. Bok stated that since there was so much confusion and questioning of this document, would it not be proper to request that the committee revise pages 2 and 3 in consultation with Dean Ares. Dr. Kassander stated that as a member of the committee he would not like to reconsider this document. The committee had addressed itself to the problem and unless the committee were reconstituted the final document would probably be the same. He suggested that the College of Law representatives to the Faculty Senate submit amendments to this proposed document. Dr. Lytle asked that since the vast bulk of these regulations affect students, were there any student representatives on this committee?

Dr. Massengale replied no; however, he had consulted with students in his college from time to time. Dr. Skinner stated that the committee's assignment was to take various documents presented to it and put them in a form for presentation to the Senate. He also re-emphasized that unless the committee was reconstituted the document probably would not change.

At this point Dr. Hetrick asked to return to the consideration of the criteria of what was a public lecture. Dr. Gegenheimer replied that it was a lecture open to the public and that the University Lecture Committee approved most faculty requests automatically.

Dr. Robson replied that it is true that various departments and colleges have never been held responsible for following the procedures outlined for inviting a speaker to campus. However, if an ad hoc group of professors wished to sponsor an event, they must go through the necessary approval.

Mr. Ginsberg stated that this whole procedure had a definite effect on students. They now have a good working relationship between the Speakers Board and the Vice President for University Relations. He felt that more students should be involved in the discussion of this matter. At this point, Mr. Mautner moved that another committee be reconstituted. Several seconds to this motion were heard. However, the chair ruled that this motion was out of order since there was a motion before the Senate already. Dr. Harvill also stated that the Senate should not find fault with this committee and no one had made a formal suggestion that this be referred back to the committee for further work.

Professor Mees asked if there was not a committee of the Advisory Council working on revisions of the Faculty and Staff Manual which might include a statement on freedom of expression. Dr. Harvill replied that no such committee had been appointed.

Dr. Lytle stated that he appreciated the burdens and difficulties that the committee had encountered but he felt that Dr. Bok had a good idea. Freedom of expression is a very important matter in a University community. He suggested that two students from ASUA be included on this committee. Dr. Kassander felt that it was unfair to refer this back to the committee. The Senate cannot continue to send back documents time and time again.

Dr. Sigworth then moved to amend the portion of the document headed "Rules and Regulations for Public Lectures," rewording that section so as to read as follows:

"The University Lecture Committee is responsible for the scheduling of all public lectures held on the campus. In order to facilitate scheduling of rooms and hours, requests for authorization of public lectures must be made through the Office of the Vice President for University Relations.

"Student organizations are encouraged to sponsor lectures open to faculty and students, and an approved student organization may request the University Lecture Committee to approve its sponsorship of a public lecture, provided the request is received by the committee two weeks in advance of the proposed date, and carries the signature of the faculty adviser of the organization. If the committee considers it appropriate to do so, an academic department may be asked to co-sponsor the lecture.

"To facilitate the handling of the request to open a lecture to the public, the request should include the following information:

1. A statement of the purpose of the lecture and its potential interest to the public. (See below for special rulings regarding political and religious meetings on campus.)
2. Topic of the lecture.
3. Names and qualifications of the speakers, including the name of a faculty member who will act as chairman of a panel.
4. Date, time, and place.
5. Written approval of the faculty adviser.

"A request must be in the Office of the Vice President for University Relations at least two weeks in advance of the lecture date. No substitutions of speakers may be made without prior approval of the Lecture Committee."

Dr. Kassander seconded this motion.

Dr. Gegenheimer then moved that the main motion and the amendment to this motion be laid on the table and be made the first order of business at the next Faculty Senate meeting. Several seconds to this motion were heard. The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

---

David Butler, Secretary pro tem