

The University of Arizona  
Proceedings of the Faculty Senate

Meeting of Monday

October 2, 1961

PRESENT: Bateman, Blitzer, Carlson, Conley, Ewing, Gegenheimer, Gillmor, Harvill, Haury, Hausenbauer, Hunt, Hudson, Irwin, Kassander, Kemmerer, Little, Livermore, Lyons, McMillan, Martin, Muir, Murphy, Myers H., Myers L., Nugent, Patrick, Paylore, Powell, Rhodes, Rosaldo, Roy, Slonaker, Vavich, Wallraff, Windsor, Zapotocky. Dr. Arthur H. Beattie was present also.

ABSENT: Brewer, Forrester, Gaines, Gustavson, McDonald, Moore.

WELCOME OF NEW MEMBERS: Vice President McMillan welcomed to the Senate the following newly-elected members: Serving for the first time - Dr. A. R. Kassander and Mr. Donald M. Powell; Returning to service after an interval - Dr. Herman E. Bateman, Dr. Philip G. Hudson, Dr. Arthur R. Kemmerer, Dr. A. Laurence Muir, Miss Patricia Paylore, and Dr. M. G. Vavich; and Serving for a second consecutive term - Dr. Leon Blitzer, Dr. Russell C. Ewing, Dr. Frances Gillmor, Dr. Emil W. Haury, Dr. James E. McDonald, Dr. R. I. Rosaldo, and Dr. Chas. F. Wallraff.

Mr. McMillan also welcomed back to the Senate Dr. David L. Patrick, who is now automatically a member of the Senate because of his position as Coordinator of Research. A recently approved amendment to the Faculty Constitution makes the Coordinator of Research a member of the Senate. Dr. Patrick formerly served in the Senate when he was Academic Vice President of the University.

ELECTION OF NEW MEMBERS TO THE SENATE: The Senate filled six vacancies in its membership by electing the following new members: Replacing Dr. E. F. Carpenter, Senator-at-large, resigned - Dr. Robert H. Hurlbutt; New members-at-large (in accordance with the recently approved amendment to the Faculty Constitution increasing the number of Senators-at-large from seventeen to twenty) - Robert N. Quinn, Klonda Lynn, J. Melvin Rhodes; Replacing Dr. Henry Tucker, Senator from the College of Agriculture, resigned - Jimmie S. Hillman; Replacing Dr. Edwin B. Kurtz, Senator-at-large, during the period of his Sabbatical leave - that is, until February 1, 1962 - Robert S. Svob.

Senators Hurlbutt, Quinn, Lynn, and Rhodes will serve as Senators-at-large until June 30, 1963; Senator Hillman will serve as College Representative until June 30, 1962, when Dr. Tucker's term would have expired; and Senator Svob will serve until February 1, 1962.

CATALOGUE MATERIAL: The catalogue material distributed to members was accepted without change. The courses included those approved through the Advisory Council subsequent to the May meeting of the Senate. These were as follow:

New Courses: Regular Session - Agr.Chem.& Soils 205, Structure and Physical Properties of Soils (3); Anthropology 208, Introduction to Applied Anthropology (3); Anthropology 265, Primitive Technology (3); Astronomy 265, The Classification of Stellar Spectra (3); Astronomy 399, Seminar; Education 284, Techniques of Rehabilitation Counseling (3); Education 380, Diagnosis in Vocational Counseling (3); Education 381a-381b, Medical Aspects of Disability (3); Education 382, Psychological Aspects of Disability (3); Education 383, Rehabilitation Aspects of Gerontology (3); English 109, Poetry Writing (3); Geology 4, Introduction to Hydrology (1); Geology 52,

Historical Geology for Engineers (3); Geology 251, Geomorphology of Glaciers, Beaches, and Dunes (3); Geology 350, Quantitative Geomorphology (3); Hydrology (Committee) 280, Hydrologic Systems (3); Hydrology (Committee) 340a-340b, Dynamics of Flow Systems of the Earth (2-2); Hydrology (Committee) 341a-341b, Continental Hydrology (3-3); Hydrology (Comm.) 342, Analog Model Analysis of Hydrologic Systems (4); Hydrology (Committee) 345a-345b, Mathematical Statistics in Hydrology (2-2); Hydrology (Committee) 399 - Seminar (1-3); Hydrology (Committee) 400, Research (1-4); Hydrology (Committee) 410, Thesis (2-4); Hydrology (Committee) 420, Dissertation (1-9); Mathematics 59a,b - Introductory Analytic Geometry and Calculus (3-3); Mathematics 253, Theoretical Aerodynamics (3); Mathematics 398B, Special Topics in Analysis (3); Mechanical Engineering 143, Applied Thermodynamics (3); Nuclear Engineering 270, Separation Processes for Nuclear Materials (3); Nuclear Engineering 399, Seminar (1-3); Physics 260a-260b, Introduction to Solid State Physics (3-3); Physics 272, Introduction to Quantum Mechanics (3); Systems Engineering 1, Orientation for Foreign Students (1)(Credit not applicable toward degree); Summer Session - Education 296s, Workshop on the Teaching of the English Language to Bi-lingual Students (6); Hydrology (Committee) 214s, Field Hydrology (Summer Camp) (3); Mechanical Engineering 298, Engineering Study Tour (6); Nuclear Engineering 330i, Atomic and Nuclear Physics (3); Nuclear Engineering 331i, Special Topics in Nuclear Science (3); Nuclear Engineering 332i, Nuclear Science Laboratory (1); Continuing Education - Botany 8206b, Experimental Biology (3); Mathematics 8179, Basic Concepts of Calculus (2); Mathematics 820Ca, Structure of Algebra (3); Mathematics 8200b, Modern Euclidean Geometry (3); Zoology 8206a, Experimental Biology (3).

REPORT ON PETITIONS, ACCEPTANCE OF: Mr. Windsor described briefly the annual report on petitions which is prepared by the Office of the Registrar and which had been mailed to members of the Senate prior to the meeting. He explained that his office had been directed to provide such a report to the Senate each year. The report summarizes, by a variety of categories, and by colleges, petitions approved and denied during the previous academic year. President Harvill asked for comments concerning the report. Dean Roy suggested that hereafter the category summarizing Change of Major petitions be eliminated since petitions for this adjustment are for record-keeping purposes only, and it is not conceivable that these petitions would ever be denied. Mr. Windsor agreed that this change would be incorporated in preparing the report in the future. There were no other comments about the report and it was, therefore, considered accepted by consent.

REPORTS PERTAINING TO THE WORK OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE TO STUDY SCHOLASTIC DISQUALIFICATION, DISCUSSION RE: Mr. Windsor reminded the Senate that in the spring of 1961 the Senate Committee on Scholastic Disqualification, made up of Dr. Tucker, Dr. Merritt, and Dean Livermore, had presented certain recommendations to the Senate. The committee's report had been accepted by the Senate and had included recommendations for certain actions to be taken immediately, some to be taken in the future, and some to be given further study. One recommendation had been that the Registrar's Delinquent Scholarship Report each semester be supplemented with a computation of the grade average required during the next academic year to raise a student's cumulative average to the minimum required to be removed from probation status; that is, the number of credit hours of 1, 2, 3, etc., needed to remove a student from the Delinquent Scholarship list. Mr. Windsor pointed out that this information had been programmed onto the computer in time for this information to be included in the Delinquent Scholarship report published at the end of the 1961 summer session and so was, therefore, now a part of the regular procedure in preparing that report.

The committee had further asked that the Registrar provide the Senate with information showing the number of students receiving bachelor's degrees, both in 1960 and 1961, who would not have qualified for graduation had the University not had

its policy of forgiving the grades of "5" received in the freshman and sophomore years when the courses failed have been repeated in residence and passed. Members of the Senate had now been furnished with detailed information concerning this matter. The report showed that thirty-two students in 1961 and thirty-six in 1960 would not have been graduated had the freshman and sophomore failures later repeated not been forgiven. The report to the Senate also included a distribution of the number of units that had been forgiven in the cases of the students concerned, as well as a distribution of the "true averages" of these students with the "5's" included. Mr. Windsor pointed out that this information was furnished for information only at this time since the Committee on Scholastic Disqualification was not yet ready to make any recommendations concerning University policy in the forgiving of "5's."

Mr. Windsor told the Senate that the third report his office had been directed to prepare by the Committee on Scholastic Disqualification had been one showing the current status of students placed on scholarship probation the previous year; that is, of the students placed on probation, how many subsequently were disqualified, how many were retained on probation, how many voluntarily dropped out of the University, and how many returned to good standing. The report was also to show the number of previous times these students had been placed on probation and how many times in the past they had been disqualified from the University. Mr. Windsor indicated that this report was not quite ready but would be submitted at an early date. He referred also to a report prepared by Dean Livermore reviewing the subsequent "history" of probation cases in the College of Business and Public Administration.

Dean Livermore pointed out that the report of the Committee on Student Disqualification last spring had provided that the individual deans should bring to the Senate information concerning the experience in their respective colleges of students placed on probation.

He explained that his report was simply a part of a very much larger study which would include, for instance, information as to drop-outs. Why do students drop out voluntarily, particularly students with medium or good records?

Dean Livermore emphasized that another point, perhaps the critical one to be considered eventually by the Senate, was whether or not the University should adopt some sort of modified disqualification procedure whereby a student would be disqualified from one division of the University but would be eligible to enroll in another division.

President Harvill remarked that he was pleased to see that special study was to be given to withdrawals from the University. He pointed out that the forms a student completes when he withdraws from the University in the course of the semester ask him to give his reasons for withdrawal. It is agreed, however, that students often do not indicate the true reason for leaving. Moreover, many students do not formally withdraw during the semester but simply fail to report for re-registration at the start of the next semester.

The President remarked that it might later be felt worthwhile to ask Arthur Grant, Associate Registrar, to make a study of student drop-outs in his institutional research.

MEETING ON UNIVERSITY CAMPUS OF ARIZONA EDUCATION ASSOCIATION: Vice President Nugent announced to the Senate that the annual meeting of the Arizona Education Association would be held November 3 and 4 on the University of Arizona campus. The Association alternates its annual meetings between the campus of Arizona State

University and The University of Arizona. Because some six thousand public school teachers and administrators are expected to attend the meeting it will be necessary to cancel classes on Friday, November 3, Dr. Nugent pointed out. The University is unable to provide meeting rooms, feeding facilities, or parking space for six thousand visitors when University classes are in session. He pointed out that although association meetings will continue on Saturday, November 4, these will be smaller sectional conferences and classes will be held on Saturday, November 4.

Dr. Nugent said that many members of the University faculty are assisting in the convention program in various ways.

A PROPOSAL FOR A UNIVERSITY-WIDE HONORS PROGRAM, PRESENTATION OF: President Harvill reminded the Senate that one of the recommendations included in the report of the Committee on the Encouragement of Superior Students, submitted to the Senate last year, had been the recommendation that the University give attention to developing a University-wide honors program. The President had, therefore, asked Dr. Arthur H. Beattie to study this matter and submit a report to the Senate, including specific recommendations to the Senate. This had recently been distributed to the Senate membership by mail and the President had asked Dr. Beattie to be present at the Senate meeting today to present his recommendations to this body. The President then called on Dr. Beattie.

Dr. Beattie stated that the philosophy behind his recommendations could best be summarized by the opening paragraph of the section in the report headed "Preliminary Considerations," which he read:

"Inscribed above the doorway of the library of Converse College at Spartanburg, South Carolina, is this text drawn from the fourth chapter of the Book of Proverbs: 'Wisdom is the principal thing; therefore get wisdom: and with all the getting get understanding.' The admonition is highly appropriate placed at the entrance to a storehouse of the accumulated knowledge of mankind; it seems to me appropriate also as a guide to those who would formulate a program of Honors studies or to those who would enter into such a program as participating students. It is not enough for an Honors program to permit the specialist to penetrate a little more deeply into the narrow province within his major of which he seeks to attain professional mastery; it is not enough for it to encourage a little superficial breadth through a brief seminar on 'The Nature of Man,' or 'The Concept of Evolution'; it is not enough for it to permit acceleration of the studies of the superior student, though some speeding up of his progress toward graduation may on occasion be a by-product of the plan. A program of Honors studies for the superior student ought not to 'let him out of' anything; it should rather demand more of him in quantity and in quality, and by providing him with a true challenge oblige him to develop to the fullest the gifts of mind and spirit with which he has been endowed. By demanding more of the student of superior intelligence and creative imagination, a good Honors program encourages both depth and breadth in his studies, it invites him to go beyond the mere gathering of factual knowledge to the examination of principles and the consideration of relationships, and it thus creates a climate in which the acquisition of true understanding becomes possible."

Dr. Beattie explained that this philosophy had furnished him the guiding principles with which to consider the various honors plans from around the nation that he has studied. He emphasized he had sought to keep his proposed plan simple. He realized some persons would consider it too timid a program. He said, however, he felt it was important not to oblige any department or any division of the

University to participate in this program against its will. He had sought to provide a framework University-wide which would permit those departments not yet ready to enter such a program to remain outside. He then read the following paragraph from his report:

"The proposal which follows reflects my own best judgment about how we might in a simple, economic, yet effective way initiate an Honors program in this university. I have talked with a number of my colleagues on these matters, but by no means as generally or as fully as I might. I cannot present this proposal as a cooperative undertaking. I might defend myself by quoting Descartes to the effect that 'frequently there is less perfection in a work produced by several persons than in one produced by a single hand,' but I am not that presumptuous. I believe, however, that whatever blame I may merit for having worked too much alone may be mitigated somewhat when it is recognized that I recommended a simple beginning, with numerous decisions to be made, as the program develops by the proposed Director of Honors and the Honors Council, in consultation with the administration and with the general faculty. Consultation will be a continuing matter, for there is offered in this proposal no rigid plan to be imposed for all time as here set forth, but rather the basic framework upon which to construct an evolving structure many details of which are to be decided in the future."

Dr. Beattie next referred to the summary of the program's salient features:

"The present proposal calls for a modest beginning in the second semester of 1961-62 with selected students from the freshman class. The program for freshmen in this first year of operation would be twofold -- it would provide, in the first place, for interviews under what might be called the University Scholars' Advising Program, and, in the second place, for a series of non-credit lecture-discussions under the general title of 'Frontiers of Knowledge.' Neither element of this initial stage in the development of a freshman Honors program would seem to require legislation of any sort by the faculty, nor would it involve the immediate creation of new courses. The Advising Program, to be discussed more fully in a subsequent section, would continue for every year a student remained in the Honors or the University Scholars' groups. An effort would doubtless be made before a second year of operation to transform the non-credit 'Frontiers of Knowledge' series, open on invitation to selected freshmen, into a credit-bearing inter-departmental Honors course. By that time, an Honors Colloquium would doubtless be established also for the sophomore year, to be followed by at least one inter-departmental colloquium each semester for upper-division Honors students. At the freshman and sophomore levels, the creation of Honors sections in multi-sectioned courses would be recommended. This would, however, be a matter for each department to consider, and presumably again no legislation would be required. For the junior and senior years, the primary responsibility for conducting Honors work would fall upon the individual departments. Provisions now in effect in the College of Liberal Arts, the College of Business and Public Administration, and the College of Education provide the necessary framework for departmental Honors studies. Other divisions of the University would be invited to consider the feasibility of establishing comparable programs. The proposal would make general examinations, written and oral, mandatory for the bachelor's degree with Honors, and would provide for representation of the Honors Program Committee at the oral examination. One addition to the present provisions for independent Honors work in the junior and senior years is recommended in the proposal -- the creation of independent reading programs to be accomplished in the summer vacation preceding the junior and senior years."

Dr. Beattie explained that he had made a special effort to give the proposed program a simple beginning, involving at first no courses for credit, involving almost nothing in the way of enabling legislation. Of course a Director of Honors, an Honors Council (to determine policy), and an Honors Study Committee (to conduct the counseling work that is an essential element in a program of this sort) should be appointed at the earliest possible date.

The main feature of the freshman year would be a "Frontiers of Knowledge" series of lectures. Dr. Beattie said he personally felt that at present little is done to challenge a freshman student's intellectual curiosity about matters that are changing the traditional concept of the universe and changing our society. Skillful faculty lecturers should be able to present some of these new concepts, new discoveries, in a challenging and interesting way which would make new knowledge acceptable to freshmen who have had little experience in these fields but who do have certain gifts of mind which should be stimulated. Of course the freshman superior students in this program would have to be provided special counseling.

The sophomore program would include an honors colloquium. Dr. Beattie said he would hope that special honors sections in multi-sectioned courses on the freshmen and sophomore level could be arranged so that students of superior capabilities could be grouped homogeneously.

In the junior and senior years the responsibility for the honors program would be left pretty much with the individual departments. Dr. Beattie emphasized that in his judgment honors work at the junior and senior level should be administered in the major departments and not by an inter-departmental committee. He felt that honors work should be tied to the area of specialization, with provision for greater breadth than the ordinary major receives. This program would be available only in those departments who wished to be involved in it, he reiterated.

Dr. Beattie pointed out that the honors program would be culminated with requirements of written and oral examinations at the end of the senior year, for students to qualify for a degree with honors. These probably would be conducted by the major departments but with representatives of the Honors Study Committee participating.

At this point Dr. Gegenheimer asked Dr. Beattie how the superior students were to be identified in the freshman year. Moreover, he asked, if much of the honors work is to be conducted by the departments, why was identification in the freshman year necessary? Dr. Beattie explained that before students are ready for honors work in the junior and senior years, it is necessary, while they are still lower division students, to widen their horizons and permit them to do some independent work in attempting to gain a broad academic background. Dr. Beattie said we must admit that the freshman year normally offers students the dullest and most ineffective teaching they probably will receive. Freshman teaching is assigned to assistants and inexperienced junior instructors and there is little done to challenge the minds of students in the freshman year. Superior students entering into the dull routine of freshman college work may very well experience a real feeling of let-down and disappointment and absence of challenge, particularly if they came out of honors classes in high school. He said he felt it was essential that the honors program should start as early as possible. He explained that he did have reservations about distinguishing the superior students at the time of registration, although some universities undertake this identification on the basis of achievement tests, psychological tests, advanced placement attainment, success in honors programs in high school, etc. He said he would prefer to delay selection of the honor students

until after they had been in the University one semester. He would depend upon the recommendations of the instructors who had had these students in classes during the first semester. The faculty would be looking for freshmen who were not only capable of obtaining good grades but who displayed ingenuity, who went beyond the limit of officially prescribed work and attempted to do something on their own. This will not be a completely reliable procedure, he realized. Some glib students with a smooth manner will fool us, he said. Other truly superior students will be slower to reveal themselves. However, many students of superior quality make themselves known in the first semester of the freshman year. Dr. Beattie said he felt it would be unwise to postpone the identification of the students until the junior year.

Dr. Gegenheimer asked if a student were not selected at the beginning of the second semester of his freshman year, was he then automatically excluded? Dr. Beattie replied certainly not. He pointed out that his report indicated that a student to participate in the program should enter into it by no later than the second semester of the junior year.

Dr. Beattie went ahead to say that he would not want to be understood as ruling out developing a procedure in the future whereby honor students could be identified prior to their initial enrollment in the University, possibly while they were still in high school.

Dr. Patrick asked Dr. Beattie to describe in more detail how he envisioned the program of the second semester of the freshman year's operating; that is, just what would its impact be on a specific superior freshman. Dr. Beattie explained that in the first place the student would be interviewed by a committee of two or three members - at least two, representing the Honors Study Committee. Their purpose would be to question the student about his general background, his interests, seeking to identify his potential capacity for scholarly work. They would seek to discover where his interests might lie, what his possible fields of specialization might be. Of course the student might have his mind already made up in that regard, or he might not have, but he presumably would be open to suggestions based on what the committee would learn about his inclinations and ambitions. Dr. Beattie said he would hope that in this initial interview suggestions would be made about courses the student might well consider taking in order to broaden his background and prepare himself as fully as possible for his prospective major. Dr. Beattie hoped this interview would be a challenging one, would make the student concerned turn his eyes inward upon himself, help him to understand himself, to analyze his hopes and aspirations and then be stimulated to do better than average work, to apply himself to move toward the scholarly goal his potentialities seem to make possible for him. Dr. Beattie said he might be naive in thinking this experience could be useful to a freshman, but he felt that quite a few students would respond. The interviewing faculty members would each be called upon to submit a report upon the student, analyzing the student's capability for honors work, his interests, etc. These reports as they accumulate should furnish a magnificent design to gauge the student's real capabilities. Dr. Beattie said they could even provide helpful information for the future writing of letters of recommendation because it certainly would be hoped that some of these students would become strong candidates for outstanding awards at the time of graduation.

So far as the "Frontiers of Knowledge" lecture-discussion series was concerned, Dr. Beattie explained that this would be at first a non-credit program. Dr. Beattie said he was confident that superior students would accept with eagerness the opportunity to participate in such a program without being concerned about credit. He was convinced that the type of student who would be selected to participate

in such a program would be anxious to have a glimpse into the workings of various fields of learning and to be confronted with a range of ideas that take place in the higher levels of academic attainment. However, he felt that in time the lecture series might be developed into a regular credit-bearing course. He felt that the "Frontiers of Knowledge" lectures might total ten for the semester, and would include general areas of science, humanities and the arts. All fields of University work could not be represented, obviously. This series of lecture-discussions, Dr. Beattie emphasized, certainly would challenge a number of superior students and as their eyes are opened to what the true scholarly attitude is, they would be genuinely inspired.

Dr. Blitzer asked if in developing his proposal Dr. Beattie had given attention to the possibility of awarding scholarships to the students selected as honor students. Dr. Beattie said he had not. He would hope, of course, that students of the type to be selected as participants in an honors program would, in the normal course of events, receive strong consideration in the awarding of scholarships by the University Committee on Scholarships and Awards.

Dr. Kemmerer mentioned that the National Science Foundation might be interested in providing funds for scholarships for students selected to participate in such a program. This would apply of course only to students interested in science.

Dean Livermore emphasized that more and more superior students are coming from high schools where they have participated in honors programs. If these individuals are not challenged by a strong honors program as freshmen in the University, there is a good chance they will not remain in this institution, he pointed out. He said he thought this point should be kept clearly in mind when considering Dr. Gegenheimer's question of whether or not the honors program should be delayed until the beginning of the junior year. Any drop-out of superior students, because of lack of challenge, is truly tragic.

Dr. Hudson asked how many students Dr. Beattie anticipated would be participating in the proposed program after it had been in operation two or three years as opposed to the number now enrolling in departmental offerings under the course numbers 196 - Independent Study, and 198a,b - Honors? Dr. Beattie said the enrollment in 196 and 198a,b in most departments now is very small. Thus he thought the new honors program should in a few years result in a large increase of enrollments. Of course, he pointed out, the number of students that can be accommodated will have to be carefully considered. The number of faculty members available for counselling, interviewing, examination work, and the direction of independent study in the senior year would place definite limits on the number of students that could be accepted.

Dr. Muir asked what alternatives might be considered in the freshman year to the proposed lecture-discussion series? Dr. Beattie said that some institutions held honors colloquia in the freshman year. This requires a greater number of faculty members and Dr. Beattie felt it was considerably more cumbersome than what he was proposing.

Dean Roy asked why the reading program, which he felt to be a particularly desirable feature of the proposal, was limited to the upper-division, that is, the summers preceding the junior and senior years.

Dr. Beattie replied that he felt the reading program could be administered better on the departmental level rather than by an inter-departmental committee.



Dr. Blitzer asked for more information about the proposed sophomore colloquia. He asked if it was planned that these would be held in professors' homes where students were free to "let their hair down," or would they be held in classrooms? Dr. Beattie explained that these must be small and restrictive in membership. He then read from the report the following:

"Just as there appears in discussions of Honors plans general agreement on the importance of homogeneous grouping, there is general agreement also that the colloquium is the instructional tool par excellence in work with superior students. The colloquium, as usually defined, differs from the seminar. The seminar groups persons already relatively expert in a field for the presentation of learned studies on restricted aspects of a problem or related series of problems. The colloquium is less advanced, less formal, less erudite. Its point of departure will normally be a text read in advance by the entire group, usually a complete text of a literary, philosophic, or scientific nature. During the colloquium, the leaders will stir up discussion, stimulating the participants to relate the ideas involved to their own experience, and exploring various avenues opened up by the contributions of the students themselves. The leaders must also, however, cut short profitless or idle chatter, and direct the discussion back to basic intellectual and moral issues. Minds are sharpened (and sometimes tempers ruffled) in the contact of temperament against temperament which this sort of situation engenders. Basic assumptions are questioned, and breadth of experience and a rethinking of values fostered."

Dr. Beattie explained that for these colloquia there would be two teachers from different disciplines so that there would be a contrast of backgrounds and ideas on the part of the instructors in charge of the program. He felt the number of students should be fifteen. The home of a professor could be an ideal place to meet but this would depend on where the home is located (that is, how far from the campus), how many children are listening to television in the next room, etc. A professor's living room might be ideal but a seminar room could be quite satisfactory. Colloquia would not be held in regular classrooms.

Dr. Muir asked why colloquia could not be satisfactory for freshmen if they could be for sophomores? He said he felt that colloquia in the freshman year would be more satisfactory than the proposed ten lectures. Dr. Beattie replied that it is quite possible colloquia could be very satisfactory in the freshman year. He said, however, he still had the feeling the colloquia should involve active participation by the students to a degree that freshmen, even superior ones might not yet be ready for. Freshmen, even though they are superior students coming from honor high school classes, do not have too firm an idea as to just what the different academic disciplines are and to what sort of discoveries the various fields of study lead. He, therefore, felt that a more general sort of lecture-discussion would be more fruitful for freshmen in order to give the student more background before placing him in colloquia. If honors sections in freshman courses are established, the freshmen will get something in the nature of colloquia there since all of his fellow students will be ones of high intellectual capacity and they will have opportunity to participate in discussion with their peers as well as with their instructors on intellectual matters. On the other hand, Dr. Beattie felt the "Frontiers of Knowledge" would be designed to broaden horizons in a way that colloquia could not.

Dean Roy asked Dr. Beattie to describe some other types of typical honors programs. Dr. Beattie said the common elements were homogeneous sections in freshman classes, the use of honors seminars, and in a few instances - particularly at Washington State University - a program comparable to what he was proposing for

Arizona. Dean Roy pointed out that homogeneous sectioning is being practiced at present in the University's freshman English program. Dr. Beattie acknowledged this but pointed out there are a number of other areas where this might also well be established. Dr. Muir commented that he felt the advanced sections of freshman English could hardly be compared to honors sections. Students in these sections, although superior in their English ability, could not on the basis of that alone be identified as honors students.

Mr. Windsor asked Dr. Beattie for more information concerning the University of Pittsburgh plan for the special counseling of superior students. Dr. Beattie explained that that University has a large panel of faculty members available for this special counseling. Every student in the superior student group has an interview every semester with a team of three faculty members representing various disciplines. The purpose of the interviews is "to challenge and direct," and it is hoped to inspire the student to do his best work. This program, Dr. Beattie pointed out, is not directly connected with an honors program as such. Such a program would work in the direction of guiding students, however, to selecting the most appropriate course program for his individual situation, one where he would adequately be challenged. It is simply a program of special advising for superior students. Dr. Beattie explained that he had tried to adapt certain features of the Pitt program because he thought that certain divisions of the University might be interested in providing such counseling for superior students even though they were not participating in the total honors program, as such. Dr. Beattie would make the Director of Honors responsible not only for the conduct of the honors program but also for the conduct of the special counseling program for all superior students in the University.

Dr. Gegenheimer asked why the "Frontiers of Knowledge" lecture series should be confined to a small group of selected honor students. He wondered if the large entering group of freshman students would not benefit from such an "exposure." Dr. Beattie said this was something that had not occurred to him. He had felt because the "Frontiers of Knowledge" would include discussion as well as lectures that the group should not be very large.

Dean Roy at this point asked what action might be appropriate by the Senate at this time - if indeed the group was yet ready for action.

Dr. Harvill said he should think that at some point the Senate might feel that definite action was appropriate. He said that such action might in the light of the Senate discussion involve the definition more specifically of the elements of the several years of the proposed program, at least of the first two years. It was apparent that a tremendous amount of effort, time, labor, and thought had gone into Dr. Beattie's report. He emphasized that members of the Senate should recognize that there is a tremendous need in the University to stimulate students to more nearly attain the capacity of scholarly work of which they are capable. He was certain that there would be keen interest on the part of the students in such a program. He said he did not feel that students needed to be stimulated by competing for some sort of a prize; rather students are anxious to compete in the expression of ideas and understanding for the sheer joy of learning. He said that if the Senate could do something to inspire students to read more, that in itself would be a major accomplishment because students today do not read enough books. Even if what the Senate agrees upon as a first step is only a modest program, involving only a limited number of students, the President said he was convinced the program would grow, providing the program is conducted with real enthusiasm. He said that the proposal was not one involving a large amount of money although the expenditure of some funds would be involved. He said he would do everything in his power to

implement any kind of a program which is formulated by the Senate. He said, as a matter of fact, the climate is right just now to win support for this sort of program. The President said he personally was pleased to see that Dr. Beattie's proposal included a program for the freshmen and sophomore years because it is during these first two years that students' habits usually are formed, habits which stay with individuals a long time.

Dr. Patrick remarked that some years ago he was the director of the University honors program. It thrived for a time but it does not thrive now. Too often, he said, honors programs are developed and then fade away. He stated that he thought Dr. Beattie's effort was a truly distinguished one, providing a simple, workable scheme. He said that he thought Dr. Beattie had carefully engineered out of his proposal the obstacles on which many other honors plans have foundered. He said he felt the Senate should be grateful indeed to Dr. Beattie for the plan he had submitted. He said he personally was prepared to vote approval of the proposal today, but possibly some members of the Senate thought more discussion was desirable before taking action. He pointed out that all that was required here is for the Senate to vote that the University should establish an honors program and appoint an Honors Director. The report then provides the framework on which the director would develop the program.

Dr. Gegenheimer said that he felt the Senate needed more concrete and specific suggestions and he asked if at the next meeting of the Senate Dr. Beattie could submit a specific proposal for the "Frontiers of Knowledge" lecture series for the second semester of the freshman year, listing what professors would give what lectures on what subjects, how many students would be involved, how they would be selected, etc.

Dr. Beattie said he of course could bring back a more specific proposal. However, he said he personally felt the Senate should not hamstring in advance the Honors Director. The sort of things Dr. Gegenheimer was talking about were the very things Dr. Beattie felt the Honors Director should decide. He said he felt that the Senate should not go beyond formulating certain guide lines to be later utilized by the Director. For that reason, he said, he was somewhat disinclined to consider such details as requested by Dr. Gegenheimer as appropriately being included in a general preliminary proposal.

Dr. Gegenheimer said he thought that the Senate, if it took affirmative action, without more specific data would be taking a resounding stand in favor of adventure. Dr. Gegenheimer then moved that a set of specific proposals outlining the details of the proposed honors program for the freshman year, be prepared by Dr. Beattie and submitted to the Senate at its next meeting. This motion was seconded by Dr. Muir.

Dr. Blitzer said he questioned whether the Senate should be considering details as specific as those asked for by Dr. Gegenheimer. He said he did not see why the proposal could not be voted on just as prepared by Dr. Beattie. Dean Rhodes said he agreed with Dr. Blitzer's remarks.

Dr. Muir said that he did not think that specific details were necessarily required. He said, however, he wished to know whether the concept being considered was one involving two hundred students or twenty. He pointed out that the University of Oregon has an Honors College, a very different thing from an honors program involving only twenty-five or fifty students. How many students selected from the freshman class does Dr. Beattie have in mind, he asked.

Dr. Beattie explained again that he hoped that admission to the honors program, since it was to take place at the beginning of the second semester, would be based on recommendations by faculty members who have had students in their classes during the first semester. A request would be sent to faculty members asking them to nominate students for participation in the program. These would then be carefully selected by the Director and the Honors Council by a method to be determined by them. Dr. Beattie said he felt that the program probably should be restricted to not more than fifty freshmen.

Dean Rhodes said the more he thought about the matter, the more he hoped that Dr. Gegenheimer's motion would be defeated. He said that more detailed information can be obtained about the proposal as Dr. Beattie envisioned it without the Senate setting a specific detailed procedure which could limit the Honors Director too seriously.

Dr. Harvill said that perhaps more information about the honors program of other institutions could be presented to the Senate at its next meeting. Dr. Gegenheimer said that the only purpose of his motion was to facilitate action by the Senate; if members of the Senate felt that adoption of his motion would delay development of an honors program, he hoped his motion would be defeated.

The Question was called for and only two aye votes were heard; many negative votes were heard. The motion failed.

It was then agreed that discussion of the proposed honors program would be continued at the next meeting of the Senate. It was agreed that Senate members would continue to study Dr. Beattie's proposal meanwhile, and it was hoped that definite action could be taken at the November meeting. Dr. Beattie indicated he would again be present to assist in the discussion of the proposal.

COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN, ANNOUNCEMENT RE: Dr. Gegenheimer announced that the Committee of Eleven had held its organizational meeting for the year. Dr. M. G. Vavich had been elected Chairman and Miss Patricia Paylore had been elected Secretary, Professors J. L. Picard and Dr. C. B. Merritt had been elected to membership on the committee to fill vacancies.

David L. Windsor, Secretary