

The University of Arizona
Proceedings of the Faculty Senate

Meeting of Monday

December 4, 1967

PRESENT: Anthony, Armstrong, Blecha, Blitzler, Brewer, Carlson, Chadwick, Cole, Coleman, Damon, Davis, Dees, Delaplaine, Gegenheimer, Hall, Harris, Hull, Livermore, Lynn, Marcoux, Martin, Massengale, McMillan, Mees, Murphy, Myers, Paulsen, Paylore, Quinn, Roy, Shields, Sorensen, Spicer, Steelink, Svob, Thompson, Voris, Wilson, and Windsor. Also attending the meeting were Associate Dean Curtis Merritt, Assistant Dean Richard Edwards, and Mr. Arthur T. Grant.

ABSENT: Allen, Ares, Bingham, DuVal, Forrester, Gaines, Harvill, Johnson, Kassander, Kemmerer, Krutzsch, Little, McCaughey, McDonald, Patrick, Resnick, Rhodes, and Robinson.

VOTE ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FACULTY CONSTITUTION, ANNOUNCEMENT OF: The secretary reported the results of the recent mail ballot on the proposal of the Faculty Senate that the Faculty Constitution be amended, deleting subparagraphs a and b of Section III, A, 4 and substituting new subparagraphs a, b, c, d. The proposed amendment was approved by a margin of 689 Yes votes to 143 No votes. The amendment must be approved by the Board of Regents before it becomes operative.

APPOINTMENT OF AD HOC CATALOGUE REVIEW COMMITTEE, ANNOUNCEMENT OF: The secretary informed the Senate that President Harvill has appointed an ad hoc Catalogue Review Committee which will function as a high-level review committee to study problems associated with the catalogue process and to make a report of findings and recommendations. Dr. Neil R. Bartlett, Chairman of the University Coordinating Committee, and Dean Herbert Rhodes of the Graduate College, had informed the President that under the system which now exists, both the Coordinating Committee and the Graduate Council found themselves so overburdened during the fall of the last "catalogue year" that it was difficult to undertake an adequate review of all the materials submitted for action. It is felt that unless substantial changes are made in the present procedure, this situation is likely to become more critical. President Harvill has requested that the ad hoc committee study the entire process of submittal and review of curriculum material and the development of catalogue copy and make such recommendations as seem appropriate. The President has expressed the hope that the report of the committee may be made by late spring of 1968 so that a revised procedure may be instituted for the preparation of the next biennial catalogue.

Dr. Bowen Dees has been asked by the President to serve as Chairman of this committee. Other members will include Dr. James R. Anthony, Dr. Manfred Bottaccini, Dr. Clifford Lytle, and Mr. David Windsor; from the Coordinating Committee, Dr. Donald L. Bryant, Dr. Bobby L. Reid, Dr. Roald K. Wangsness; and from the Graduate Council, Dr. Carl H. Ketcham, Dr. William J. McCauley, and Dr. Curtis B. Merritt.

CATALOGUE MATERIAL: The following catalogue material was accepted: New Courses Medicine: Microbiology 301, Medical Microbiology (6) II Staff; Medicine: Physiology 301, Human Physiology (8) II Staff; and the following changes: Agricultural Engineering 201s, Advanced Problems in Farm Machinery (2) change to 6201C, Modern Concepts of Farm Machinery Management (1-2) for Western Regional Extension Winter School; Medicine: Physiology 302, Neurosciences (3) II add "Identical with Anatomy 301"; Speech 54, Fundamentals of Broadcasting (2) I,II change to Speech 54ab (2-2) Yr. (Identical with Journalism 54ab); Speech 208, Radio-TV Production (3) I, change to Speech 208ab (3-3) Yr. (Identical with Journalism 208ab)

ACADEMIC ADVISING, DISCUSSION RE: Senate members reviewed with Dr. Richard Edwards the report of the Committee on Academic Counseling published a year ago. Dr. Edwards was Chairman of that committee.

The committee had consulted extensively with members of the faculty and with students. Committee members had corresponded with nineteen other institutions considered comparable to the University of Arizona.

The committee then submitted seven recommendations, as follows:

1. That stronger administrative support be given to the academic counseling program by
 - a. Placing responsibility for good counseling in the hands of the Dean of each undergraduate College,
 - b. Asking that a strong Academic Counseling Committee be formed in each undergraduate College,
 - c. Appointing a University Academic Counseling Committee to coordinate counseling in the undergraduate Colleges, and
 - d. Placing a statement in the Faculty Policy Manual relative to faculty responsibilities in counseling.
2. That a central counseling office be established in each of the larger Colleges to provide centralized service.
3. That modifications be made to the Freshman and new student orientation program by
 - a. Initiating a summer preregistration and orientation schedule,
 - b. Providing a wallet-size card to the new student as soon as possible which lists advising information, and
 - c. Reviewing the printed material given to a new student and rejecting that which is not absolutely necessary.
4. That the individual faculty adviser be appointed by his Dean based on the principle that advising is an integral part of his duties. Each adviser should have no more than 25 to 35 advisees.
5. That a University Adviser's Manual be developed and supplemented in each College by additional specific pertinent material.
6. That the "Major Professor" signature block on the IBM Number 2 registration card be replaced by an "Adviser-All Students" signature block to insure that every student see his adviser at least twice a year. A student should also be invited in writing to visit his adviser when he receives an excessive absence notice, administrative drop slip, or when his name appears on a delinquent student list.
7. That a statement be placed in the University Catalogue making clear the intent to provide good advising.

The Senate discussed several of the recommendations, to the extent that time permitted, agreeing that the Senate should discuss the recommendations and the full report of the committee further with Dr. Edwards at another Senate meeting as soon as possible. It was the opinion of most members of the Senate that academic advising on this campus is seriously deficient and that means must be found to improve such advising.

REPORT BY ARTHUR T. GRANT RE UNIVERSITY'S BUDGET REQUEST FOR 1968-69: Mr. McMillan introduced Arthur T. Grant, Educational Research Analyst for the University, who had been asked to provide the Senate with certain information concerning the University's legislative request budget for 1968-69, together with other information which had been collected to support the budget request.

Mr. Grant pointed out that beginning in January, 1968, the 28th Arizona Legislature will be giving attention to the University's budget request for the operating year beginning July 1, 1968. He said that the Regents and the administrative officers of the three universities have already had a hearing with the Budget Examiner of the Commissioner of Finance and with the Budget Officer of the Legislature.

Mr. Grant first gave information concerning the anticipated income for the current fiscal year and for 1968-69. The largest source of income will be state appropriations, representing 72% of the total projected budget for 1968-69. In recent years, state appropriations have provided 65% to 67% of the operating budget. This lower figure probably would have prevailed again next year, except for the fact that certain student fee increases have been earmarked for capital improvements.

The next largest portion of income will be student fees, about 21% in 1968-69. Federal funds for the Agricultural Experiment Station and the Extension Service will amount to 3.9%. "Other income," 1-1/2% of the total will come from the counties for their share of the Agricultural Extension Service and from land-grant income for state held properties. "Miscellaneous collections," including such items as farm sales, audio-visual rental income, etc., will provide a little over 1% of the requested budget.

Mr. Grant then reviewed the increases between the 1967-68 budget and the request budget for 1968-69, pointing out that the requested increase in state appropriations amounted to about \$5,600,000, an increase of almost 28% over 1967-68. This is the largest per cent increase since 1957-58. He pointed out that the increase in student fees is not large, only 1.6%, reflecting a small anticipated increase in full-time equivalent enrollment. The budget is planned on an enrollment of 21,622 full-time equivalent students next year, he said.

Mr. Grant explained that federal funds were estimated to increase less than 1%. "Other income" will decrease slightly and "other collections" should show a 12% increase.

The increase in income for the total Educational and General Budget will be 17.6%, Mr. Grant said. Mr. Grant analyzed the request budget in terms of expenditures in the five categories of Salaries, Wages, Operations, Travel, and Capital Equipment. Salaries and Wages together account for 82% of the funds being requested for 68-69. Operations account for 12%, Travel a little over 1%, and Capital Equipment a little over 4%.

The increase between the 1967-68 Salary Item and the requested 1968-69 Salary Item is \$3,990,750, an 18% increase. Part of the increase is for new positions and part is for merit increases. Overall, an 11% amount is being requested for faculty salary increases, and 6% for staff salary increases.

The Wages Item has been increased 17.6% over the previous year, Operations has been increased 16%, Travel 4%, and Capital Equipment 18% over the amounts in the 1967-68 budget.

In terms of the programs of the University, Mr. Grant explained that the respective percentages would be similar to those in 1967-68: 66% for Instruction, 23% for Research, and 11% for Extension and Public Service.

Mr. Grant turned then to material in support of President Harvill's and the Board of Regents' request for increases. He first presented a comparison of the University of Arizona with 48 other land-grant colleges and universities in the nation for the year 1967-68. Arizona ranks sixth from the bottom of the group in terms of dollars of state appropriation for operations per student. Mr. Grant then described the five institutions that ranked below the University of Arizona as follows:

- a. Virginia Polytechnic Institute
1966 Resident Enrollment 8,000
1964 Graduate Enrollment 811
1964 Degrees Conferred: Bachelors 1,363, Professional 12,
Masters 194, Doctors 25.
- b. University of Maine
1966 Resident Enrollment 12,000
1964 Graduate Enrollment 318
1964 Degrees Conferred: Bachelors 986, Professional 10,
Masters 196, Doctors 3.
- c. Oklahoma State University
1966 Resident Enrollment 17,000
1964 Graduate Enrollment 1,742
1964 Degrees Conferred: Bachelors 1,740, Professional 78,
Masters 526, Doctors 94.
- d. University of Delaware
1966 Resident Enrollment 11,000
1964 Graduate Enrollment 1,489
1964 Degrees Conferred: Bachelors 667, Professional - 0,
Masters 220, Doctors 45.
- e. University of New Hampshire
1966 Resident Enrollment 8,000
1964 Graduate Enrollment 570
1964 Degrees Conferred: Bachelors 752, Professional - 0,
Masters 138, Doctors 16.

The comparable figures for the University of Arizona were as follows:

1966 Resident Enrollment 21,000
1964 Graduate Enrollment 2,600
1964 Degrees Conferred: Bachelors 1,704, Professional 126,
Masters 531, Doctors 63.

Mr. Grant next gave a comparison of dollars of state appropriation per full-time on-campus student in public institutions of higher education of all levels (junior colleges, senior institutions, universities with graduate programs) in

1966-67. He pointed out that the University of Arizona ranked seventh from the bottom among the 48 states ranked (data from Pennsylvania and Mississippi were unavailable). He called the Senate's attention to the six states ranking below Arizona: Utah, Alabama, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, and Oklahoma. He emphasized that all but one of these states had received from their legislatures substantial increases for 1967-68. Ohio received a 61% increase, Nebraska 52%, North Dakota 42%, Alabama 41%, and Utah 35%. In 1967-68 Arizona, along with Oklahoma, stayed at the bottom of the group, Arizona with a 14% increase and Oklahoma with a 12% increase.

Mr. Grant then presented some salary information that he had presented to the State Finance Director at a Budget Hearing a few months ago. On that occasion President Harvill had pointed out that the University of Arizona is now in an extremely unfavorable position in terms of salary scales. This unfavorable position is evident when salaries at this University are compared with State Universities in the West, State Universities throughout the nation, public four-year colleges, and public junior colleges.

A 1967-68 salary survey conducted among fourteen large public universities in the West comparable to the University of Arizona showed the average annual (10 month) salary of the University of Arizona full professors to be \$2,500 below the average annual (10 month) salary for professors at these fourteen comparable institutions. Average salaries of associate professors at Arizona are \$1,000 below the average at these institutions. Assistant professors at Arizona are about \$700 below the average and instructors \$400 below. In terms of 12-month salaries, full professors are again \$2,500 below the average at these fourteen institutions, associate professors are \$1,700 below, assistant professors \$1,400 below, and instructors \$300 below. These facts illustrate very clearly the unfavorable position the University of Arizona now finds itself among western public universities. The same situation prevails in comparing Arizona salaries with those of public universities nationally. Average University of Arizona salaries for full professors are \$1,100 below the average of the national group, for associate professors \$800 below, assistant professors \$500, and instructors \$375. We are, in every case, substantially below the national average for seventy large public universities in a survey published this year by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. According to this same report, we are also below the averages of 194 public liberal arts colleges at all ranks except the rank of full professor.

What is even more distressing, Mr. Grant emphasized, is that this survey showed that the University of Arizona average salaries for associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors are now below these same ranks at 107 public junior colleges!

Mr. Grant pointed out that it is obvious what must happen to the programs of the University of Arizona if the institution cannot quickly raise its salary scales into a more competitive position. We are already losing faculty at an alarming rate, he said. This will continue at an even faster pace unless we can improve our position among comparable institutions in the West and the nation.

RECOMMENDATION FROM COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN RE REVIEW OF FACULTY CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS, INTRODUCTION OF: Dr. Livermore, Chairman of the Committee of Eleven entered into the record the following recommendation:

The Committee of Eleven recommends that the Senate create an ad hoc committee of the Faculty to undertake a comprehensive review of the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws; that such committee be constituted as follows: a) ex officio members shall be the Secretary of the Faculty, the Chairman of the Faculty, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, the Chairman of the Committee on Committees, and the Dean of the College of Law or his representative, and b) five additional members from the general Faculty to be appointed by the Committee on Committees in consultation with the Chairman of the Faculty; and, finally, that such committee present its proposals for revision to the Faculty Senate for action.

It is further recommended that this ad hoc committee be instructed to include in its objectives substantive changes in the Constitution on such points as the following:

- a. In Article I, Section A, a detailed statement of the qualifications for "membership" of the Faculty, or an exact definition of voting members of the Faculty as distinguished from persons on appointment;
- b. In Article I, Section C, subsection 1 d, a revision in the procedure for holding faculty meetings upon petition, and the prerogatives of the Faculty when so meeting;
- c. Appropriate revisions in the requirements for signees of petitions, and in the requirements for a quorum;
- d. A possible new section in the Constitution establishing Annexes, consisting of major policy legislation which has been approved by the Senate and/or approved by Faculty ballot on subjects included in Article III, Section e ("Functions of the Faculty Senate").

The Senate voted that this matter be placed on the Agenda of the Senate for further consideration at the earliest possible time.

PLACING ON AGENDA OF QUESTION OF COMPULSORY ROTC, APPROVAL OF: The Senate voted that the question of compulsory ROTC be placed on the Agenda of the Faculty Senate for its January meeting and that Mr. Rafael Arvizu, President of the Associate Students be invited to address the Senate on this subject at that time.

David L. Windsor, Secretary