

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, October 20, 1969 Room 350 Modern Languages

The Faculty Senate convened in special session at 3:40 p.m. on Monday, October 20, 1969, in the Modern Languages Building auditorium (Room 350). Fifty-three members were present with Vice President McMillan presiding.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Anthony, Armstrong, Bannister, Bartlett, Blitzer, Burton, Carlson, Davis, Delaplane, Dewhirst, Dutt, Fahey, Forrester, Gegenheimer, Goodwin, Gould, Green, Herber, Hetrick, Higley, Houston, Kassander, Kemmerer, Krebs, Lytle, Massengale, McMillan, Mees, Miller, Murphy, H. Myers, L. Myers, Nigh, Paulsen, Paylore, Rhodes, Richard, Robson, Saarinen, Selke, Siegel, Sigworth, Skinner, Sorensen, Spicer, Svob, Tomizuka, W. Voris, Windsor, Wise, Yoshino, Younggren, and Zwolinski.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Ares, Barnes, Bingham, Blecha, Bok, Brewer, Christopherson, DuVal, Gaines, Harvill, Hull, Johnson, Krutzsch, Little, Lowe, Mautner, Resnick, Roy, and M. Voris.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of October 6, 1969 were approved as distributed to members.

COMMENT RE CANCELLING OF CLASSES ON OCTOBER 31: Faculty Chairman Gegenheimer stated to the Senate that he had been asked whether or not the Senate had been the body taking action to cancel classes on October 31 so that the convention of the Arizona Education Association could be held on the University campus. He pointed out that the convention on October 31 would be the sixth such convention held on this campus in the past twelve years. The convention alternately is held on the campuses of Arizona State University and the University of Arizona. The first three times the convention was held at the University of Arizona the Senate approved the cancelling of classes. It had then been felt the precedent was well established, and approval of the cancelling of classes on the three most recent occasions had been by the Advisory Council.

ELECTION OF SENATOR REPRESENTING THE COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: Vice President McMillan explained that a vacancy existed in the Senate because of the resignation from the University last summer of Dr. Jack Leonard, Senator representing the College of Business and Public Administration. Dean Voris reported that the faculty of the College of Business and Public Administration wished to nominate as a replacement for Dr. Leonard, Dr. Tom Saarinen.

On motion by Dr. Gegenheimer with many seconds heard, Dr. Saarinen was unanimously elected to the Senate representing the College of Business and Public Administration.

CONSIDERATION OF A PROPOSED RESOLUTION FROM THE FACULTY RETIREMENT AND INSURANCE COMMITTEE RE ASKING THE REGENTS TO MOVE THE UNIVERSITY RETIREMENT PROGRAM FROM THE ARIZONA STATE RETIREMENT SYSTEM TO TIAA-CREF: Dr. Gegenheimer explained that the Faculty Retirement and Insurance Committee had reviewed the University's retirement program and had recommended that certain adjustments be made. In

line with these recommendations he then moved that the Senate recommend to the President of the University that he request the Board of Regents to approve the moving of the University retirement program from the present State Retirement System to TIAA-CREF (Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association-College Retirement Equities Fund). This would be an optional move for current employees but would be mandatory for all employees hired after July 1, 1970 or whatever date was established as the effective date. The motion was seconded by Dr. Blitzer.

Dr. Blitzer said he had been recommending such a change for some years and wondered if the prospects were any better now that such a proposal would receive consideration at a higher level. Dr. Gegenheimer said there was reason to think that the Regents would at least consider the matter. Dr. Bartlett asked what were the advantages to the proposed different plan. Dr. Gegenheimer explained that the major advantage would be the aid this procedure would give departments in their recruiting efforts. Not only are certain benefits under TIAA more generous than those of the Arizona State Retirement System, but the TIAA plan is a more attractive program to persons at other institutions being offered positions at the University of Arizona. Young people being recruited to this campus want to be assured that they will be participating in a program here that they can take with them should they later leave the University of Arizona. Older persons want to be assured that they can bring with them their previous participation in TIAA and continue under the same program at the University of Arizona. The TIAA program has very low overhead costs, Dr. Gegenheimer said. It is the program for virtually all the private colleges and universities in the country and approximately 60% of the public ones. It provides a very mobile retirement program for its members.

Dr. Dutt said he did not see how he could vote on the motion. He didn't know what he would be voting on. He said he personally knew nothing about TIAA and had been furnished no information about it.

Dr. Siegel asked if the committee had given consideration to what the effect would be on the retirement accounts of persons continuing under the State Plan, if a number of individuals left the State Plan to join TIAA. No one had an answer to this question.

Dr. Gegenheimer said the Faculty Retirement and Insurance Committee had compared both plans carefully and had found that for most individuals TIAA would be a better plan. Some persons who have been at the University of Arizona a long time might be better off remaining under the State Plan.

Dean Forrester pointed out that an Interim Joint Legislative Committee was studying the State Retirement System. He thought it might be ill advised for the Faculty Senate to act until the Legislative Committee's recommendations were known. Dr. Gegenheimer said that the Legislative Committee was aware that this proposal to switch to TIAA was under consideration. Dr. Kassander said that if this motion were approved, the Senate was only recommending to the President that he make a recommendation to the Board of Regents. The Regents could decide if this proposal would be desirable in the light of what might develop within the Legislative Committee, and if it became evident that the Senate's proposal was an unwise one, the Regents could simply disregard it.

Vice President Murphy said the Interim Joint Legislative Committee had actuaries presently at work studying the state system. If certain

recommendations that had been recommended were approved by the Legislature, he said, the state system would become not only much better than what it is at present, but much better than what TIAA could offer. He thought the Regents would be able to make a judgment and compare the two programs, and if it were felt not to be to the advantage of the faculty, then disregard this request.

The motion then passed with a few dissenting votes heard.

CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION FROM STUDENT SENATE TO FACULTY SENATE RE EXTENDING SPRING RECESS TO INCLUDE THE FIRST MONDAY FOLLOWING EASTER SUNDAY: The Senate considered a proposal proposed by the Student Senate in May, 1969 (Student Senate Act #266) requesting the Faculty Senate to extend the spring recess to include the first Monday following Easter Sunday as follows:

- "WHEREAS, The last day of Spring Recess is on Easter Sunday, and
- "WHEREAS, On the first Monday following Easter Sunday, classes resume; and
- "WHEREAS, Many students and faculty members must leave their families on Easter Sunday in order to return to classes the following day; and
- "WHEREAS, Holiday traveling conditions are congested, causing inconvenience and potential dangers to students and faculty members who must travel on Easter Sunday; and
- "WHEREAS, The Registrar has indicated that there is enough flexibility in the University class day schedule to absorb another day into Spring Recess;
- "WHEREFORE: The Faculty Senate is respectfully requested to extend Spring Recess to include the first Monday following Easter Sunday."

Dr. Blitzer moved that the memorial be adopted by the Senate, effective with the spring of 1970. His motion was seconded by Dr. Massengale and passed unanimously.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION OF FACULTY SUPPORT OF UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION IN DEALING WITH DISORDER, UNLAWFULNESS, AND PHYSICAL VIOLENCE: The Senate considered a resolution submitted to that body in late spring by Mr. Louis Gasper, Assistant Professor of Economics. The resolution read as follows:

- "WHEREAS, Disorder, unlawfulness, and physical violence are destructive of the ends of the University; and
- "WHEREAS, The University, in the person of its administration, has the duty to protect itself, and its guests, from the aforesaid destructive actions; and
- "WHEREAS, The efficacy of actions by the University so to protect itself requires the active and proclaimed support of the faculty; now, therefore, be it

"RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA,

"That the faculty of the University of Arizona support and endorse actions of the administration necessary to maintain peace, order, and freedom from physical violence and threats thereof on this campus."

Dr. Skinner moved that this matter be tabled and referred to the Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Committee to Develop Statement re Freedom of Expression under the chairmanship of Dr. Massengale. Many seconds to the motion were heard and the motion carried with some dissenting votes heard.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSAL THAT PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF ASSOCIATED STUDENTS AND ONE SENATOR SELECTED BY AND FROM STUDENT SENATE BE EXTENDED EX-OFFICIO NON-VOTING MEMBERSHIP IN FACULTY SENATE: Dr. Lytle said he had felt for some time that student voice should be heard in the Faculty Senate and he then moved that the President and the Vice President of the Associated Students of the University of Arizona and one student senator selected by and from the Student Senate be made ex-officio non-voting members of the Faculty Senate. Dr. Robson seconded the motion.

It was pointed out that the question of student membership in the Faculty Senate was on the agenda of points to be considered soon by the ad hoc Committee on the Faculty Constitution.

Dr. Gegenheimer said that this was indeed a constitutional matter and Dr. Lytle's proposal, if adopted by the Senate, would simply set in motion the machinery to propose an amendment to the Constitution. Dr. Lytle said that he saw no need to wait for the Constitution and Bylaws Committee to make a recommendation on this question. The University, as it should be, is moving in the direction of providing more student voice in affairs of the institution. Dr. Lytle said he would like to expand his motion to provide that, pending formal amendment of the Constitution, the three persons indicated should be invited to attend all Senate meetings as guests of the Senate. This adjustment was acceptable to the second.

Dr. Skinner said he felt great value would be received from having student representatives participate in Senate deliberations in an advisory capacity.

The motion carried with only two or three dissenting votes.

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION FROM STUDENT SENATE RE UNIVERSITY'S COURSE ATTENDANCE POLICY: The Senate considered a memorial from the Student Senate concerning the institution's course attendance policy (Student Senate Act #231) as follows:

"WHEREAS, By administrative action any student may be dropped from a course due to excessive absences; and

"WHEREAS, A student's grade may be lowered due to his attendance record; and

"WHEREAS, The student has the sole responsibility to attend to his academic duties at the University; and

"WHEREAS, Better teaching may occur when students may not be dropped from a course due to absences;

"WHEREFORE, Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona be requested to delete all paragraphs dealing with academic class absences in all University publications as follows:

1. Delete the requirement concerning holidays ('No instructor shall have the authority to grant excuses for absences on the days immediately preceding or immediately following regularly scheduled holidays unless the absence is due to reasons which would justify excuse at other times.')
2. Delete the provision for reporting absences of students in both upper and lower division courses to the Dean of Men or Dean of Women.
3. Delete the authorization to penalize a student for absences through the grade given in the course.
4. Delete all other paragraphs allowing the formal dropping of a student's course or penalization of a student's grade by an instructor or by administrative action.

"Replace these attendance rules with a statement that attendance is the student's responsibility."

Dr. Robson moved that the memorial be approved and several seconds were heard.

The question was asked if the present policy governing absences had been established by the Faculty Senate and the consensus was that it had been.

Dean Rhodes said he knew at one time the feeling of the University was that we should know about students' whereabouts, and if roll was never taken in classes a student could be away from the campus weeks on end and no one know about it. He said perhaps attitudes are different now. Dr. Dutt pointed out that at one time under the provisions of the G. I. Bill institutions were obligated to certify to the government that a veteran's class attendance had been regular the preceding month, before a student could receive his subsistence check. Such reporting could not be done, of course, if roll were never taken. (Comment: The Veterans Administration still requires such certification.)

Dr. Burton said that the College of Pharmacy took strong exception to this proposal. Participation in pharmacy courses requires regular attendance in laboratories to acquire the necessary skills for the pharmacy profession.

He commented further that not too long ago a woman Pharmacy student was found in her living quarters after she had been dead for three days. She probably would not have been found even then if investigation had not resulted from a report on her class absences.

Dr. Gegenheimer moved that this matter be referred to an ad hoc study committee which would report back to the Senate, hopefully in time for any changes approved to be announced in the supplement to the biennial catalog. There were several seconds to Dr. Gegenheimer's motion and it carried unanimously.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSAL BY ENGINEERING COLLEGE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE THAT SENATE LIBERALIZE UNIVERSITY POLICY REGARDING GRADES AWARDED UPON WITHDRAWAL FROM COURSES:
The secretary read the following communication to the Faculty Senate from L. B. Scott, Jr., Secretary of the College of Engineering Curriculum Committee:

"The Engineering College Curriculum Committee respectfully requests that the Senate consider liberalizing the existing University rule (p. 147 of the 1969-71 catalog) regarding grades awarded upon withdrawal from courses. In a recent formal opinion poll conducted by this committee, a large majority of the faculty of the College of Engineering felt that all withdrawals properly filed with the University cashier prior to the end of the tenth week of classes should be recorded as a grade of 8. A minority of the faculty felt that a ten week 'free drop' period was too liberal, but were in favor of lengthening the existing two-week deadline to coincide with the midterm scholarship report. An equal minority of the faculty were opposed to any change in the existing rule.

"The basic argument for the proposed liberalization is as follows: Under the present rules a student cannot drop a course after the second week without a 5 unless he is passing. However, if a man is passing, why should he drop (unless for illness, etc.)? What is needed is a mechanism to provide for the man who starts a course with all good intentions and then finds, after some reasonable time, that he is not ready for the course, and wants to try again at a later date, perhaps after more preparation. Two weeks, which is the cut-off date now, is not enough time to find out how he is going to do in the course.

"The main argument against this is essentially as follows: If there is no penalty for dropping, a student can keep on trying a course until he makes it, possibly by sheer luck, and yet, according to the records, he will look just as good as the man who passed it the first time.

"The counter to this argument is that the time lost in dropping and repeating is penalty enough, and the fact that a course was dropped does show on the transcript."

Professor Mees moved that the policy governing withdrawal grades announced in the University catalog be revised to the end that all withdrawals properly filed prior to the end of the tenth week of classes would be recorded as 8, regardless of a student's scholastic performance up to the time of dropping. There were several seconds to this motion.

Dr. Blitzer said he wished to express vigorous opposition to the proposal. He said to encourage such laxity of standards would "open Pandora's Box." The University's admissions standards are not so high that we have such a select body of students that we should permit any student up through the tenth week of a semester the privilege of then dropping a course with an automatic passing withdrawal mark of 8.

Dr. Skinner stated that he thought if this motion were approved the University might as well eliminate the grade of 5 from its grading system.

Dr. Hetrick said that while the proposed ten weeks might be too long a period, the present two weeks, he felt is too short. Dr. Dutt commented that many students do not have time to determine whether or not they are truly prepared for a course during a period as limited as the first two weeks. Prerequisites are not always the appropriate measure of whether or not a student is ready for a course. He thought a period of time longer than two weeks is needed.

Dean Rhodes then moved an amendment to the proposed motion, changing the period of ten weeks to six weeks. There were several seconds to this motion and the amendment carried. The vote on the original motion was then called for and carried with a few dissenting votes heard.

REPORT ON 1969 ADVANCED PLACEMENT EXAMINATIONS: Mr. Windsor indicated that 143 students had had their advanced placement scores and examination papers sent to the University of Arizona this fall. This had involved 179 tests since some students took more than one examination. The 143 students compare with 137 students in the fall of 1968. Mr. Windsor said that rather than read the full report, he would include it in the minutes and proceedings of this meeting so that it would be circulated to all members of the faculty.

The full Report on Advanced Placement Examinations for 1969 is as follows:

"143 students had their Advanced Placement scores and examination papers sent to the University of Arizona this fall. This involved 179 tests since some students took more than one examination. The 143 students compared with 137 students in 1968, 127 students in 1967, 96 students in 1966, 126 students in 1965, 85 students in 1964, 61 in 1963, 53 in 1962, and 22 in 1960.

"7 of these students are graduates of Catalina High School; 1 of Canyon del Oro High School; 17 of Palo Verde High School; 1 of Pueblo High School; 25 of Rincon High School; 1 of Sahuaro High School; 19 of Sunnyside High School; 14 of Tucson High School. 1 of these students was a graduate of Agua Fria Union High School; 5 of Alhambra High School; 3 of Camelback High School; 4 of Central High School; 8 of Coolidge High School; 1 of Cortez High School; 1 of Maryvale High School; 1 of Washington High School. 34 students came from out-of-state high schools.

"35 students took the Advanced Placement in Mathematics. 28 students received 5 semester hours of degree credit and 7 received no advanced placement or degree credit.

"63 students took the Advanced Placement in English. 32 received placement in English 4 with credit for English 2 with the same grade they earn in English 4.

1 student received placement in English 4 with credit for English 2 with the same grade earned in English 4. 19 students received placement in English 2. 11 students received no advanced placement or degree credit.

"17 students took the Advanced Placement in American History. 3 students received 6 semester hours of degree credit and 14 students received no advanced placement or credit.

"3 students took the Advanced Placement in European History. 2 students received 6 semester hours of degree credit and 1 student received no advanced placement or credit.

"17 students took the Advanced Placement in Spanish. 9 students received 8 semester hours of degree credit; 3 students received 11 semester hours of degree credit; 1 student received 14 semester hours of degree credit; 4 students received no advanced placement or credit.

"18 students took the Advanced Placement in Biology. 3 students received 8 semester hours of degree credit; 4 students received 4 semester hours of degree credit; 11 received no advanced placement or credit.

"19 students took the Advanced Placement in Chemistry. 7 students received 8 semester hours of degree credit; 4 students received 4 semester hours of degree credit; 8 students received no advanced placement or credit.

"1 student took the Advanced Placement Examination in French and received no advanced placement or credit.

"1 student took the Advanced Placement Examination in German and received placement above the 3b level.

"3 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in Physics. 1 student received 6 semester hours of degree credit; 1 student received 3 semester hours of degree credit; 1 student received no advanced placement or degree credit.

"2 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in Latin and received no advanced placement or credit."

PROPOSAL FROM COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING FACULTY THAT SENATE OPEN THE PASS-FAIL GRADING OPTION TO ENGINEERING STUDENTS IN THE GROUP REQUIREMENT OF COURSE WORK IN THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES: The secretary read the following communication from the faculty of the College of Engineering:

"The Engineering College faculty by a vote of 64 in favor to 13 opposed respectfully recommends that the University Faculty Senate be requested to open the pass-fail grading option, under rules adopted by the Senate on December 2, 1968, to engineering students in elective courses in the humanities and social sciences (under the current pass-fail rules, group requirements are not eligible).

"The faculty believes that engineering students should be encouraged, through the pass-fail system, to work more in depth in the humanities and social sciences.

"Support for this argument is found in the American Society for Engineering Education report on Humanistic-Social Studies in December 1968 where it was stated:

'An examination of transcripts on a number of campuses indicates that engineering students frequently make up their humanistic-social science program almost entirely from introductory courses. It has long been observed that such courses seldom spark student interest, and that the student who takes them in his upper years almost inevitably gets a bad impression of the fields they represent. An elementary social science course may look very elementary indeed to a student who is in his fourth year in engineering. The solution to this problem may be a requirement of at least one two-course or three-course sequence. This answer seems to be too obvious to be highlighted as a recommendation, but it may be worthwhile to point out a less complicated way of encouraging work in depth.'

18. 'Students should be encouraged to attempt more advanced courses in the humanities and social sciences on a pass-fail basis.'

David J. Hall
Associate Dean"

Professor Mees moved that the pass-fail option be opened to engineering students as far as meeting their group requirements were concerned.

Dr. Hetrick moved as a substitute motion that the pass-fail option be opened to College of Engineering students in the courses they elect to take in satisfying their group requirement in humanities and social studies. Several seconds to Dr. Hetrick's substitute motion were heard. Professor Mees and Dr. Hetrick said that College of Engineering students should be encouraged to explore in the humanities and social studies without the possibility of incurring a low grade.

Dr. Sigworth said he dealt in the main with students majoring in the humanities. Why then should not these students be permitted to explore among science courses in meeting their graduation requirement in science without risking the penalty of a specific grade?

Dr. Skinner moved that the matter be tabled and referred to the committee which originally developed the pass-fail plan. Several seconds to the motion were heard and it carried.

Mr. Windsor pointed out that the pass-fail plan was not permanently established but was operating on a two-year experimental basis. Professor Mees said it was unfair to engineering students to deprive them for two years of the option of taking pass-fail work.

Dean Forrester said he hoped the record would clearly show that the motion referred only to students in the College of Engineering and not to students in the College of Mines.

Dr. Hetrick said there seemed to be a difference of opinion as to what is a group requirement. Mr. Windsor said that "group requirements" are understood rather commonly as meaning general requirements which students satisfy by selecting work from among a group of courses. This category of studies is distinct from completely free electives.

Professor Green suggested that no change be made in the pass-fail plan during the two-year experimental period. He said if the College of Engineering was allowed to have a special provision governing its students, then the College of Architecture would wish to submit a request for a special adjustment, and soon we would have a variety of practices resulting in a number of problems which would be difficult to handle.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISHONEST SCHOLASTIC WORK FOR THE PERIOD OCTOBER 1, 1968-SEPTEMBER 30, 1969: For the information of the Senate, the secretary provided the following report of the activity of the Committee on Dishonest Scholastic Work during the period October 1, 1968 through September 30, 1969:

"Committee Meetings	3
Cases Reviewed	4
Individuals Involved	5

Nature of Cases Reviewed:

Copying another student's term report	1
Copying during an examination	2
Copying during an examination from notes written on the student's hand	$\frac{1}{4}$

Findings of Committee:

Guilty	5
Not Guilty	$\frac{0}{5}$

Recommendations of Committee:

Grade of 5 in course, reprimand by Dean of Men, and temporary suspension from intercollegiate athletics	1
Grade of 0 for examination, transfer of student to another lab section, and reprimand from the Dean of Men	1
Grade of 5 in course and reprimand by Dean of Men	1
Grade of 5 in course and suspension for remainder of semester	1
Grade of 5 in course and immediate suspension until February, 1970	$\frac{1}{5}$

ANNOUNCEMENT RE SPECIAL ACADEMIC CONVOCATION AT HOMECOMING: Mr. Windsor announced to the Senate that a special feature of the 1969 Homecoming would be an academic convocation to be held in the main auditorium at 11:30 o'clock. The Alumni Association will present several special awards. The featured speaker will be Astronaut Frank Borman. On this occasion Colonel Borman will receive the honorary Doctor of Science degree which was approved by the faculty in the spring of 1969.

CONSIDERATION OF A MEMORIAL FROM THE STUDENT SENATE REQUESTING SUSPENSION OF PENALTIES FOR ABSENCE FROM CLASSES ON WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1969, IN OBSERVANCE OF NATIONAL MORATORIUM DAY: The Senate considered a memorial from the Student Senate (Student Senate Act #307) as follows:

- "WHEREAS, The process of education includes discussion of current social issues; and
- "WHEREAS, One of the most volatile societal questions has been discussion of the war in Vietnam; and
- "WHEREAS, A nationwide student Moratorium Day from regular classes has been planned for October 15, 1969, seeking nationwide student debate over the war in keeping with the principles of academic freedom; and
- "WHEREAS, Students should have the option of attending classes or taking part in Moratorium Day without penalty for absence from classes; and
- "WHEREAS, Students must assume the responsibility of completing missed work; and
- "WHEREAS, The Biennial Catalog, 1969-70, 1970-71, page 145, reads in part; 'Instructors are authorized to penalize a student for absences through a grade given in a course.';
- "WHEREFORE: The Faculty, Faculty Senate, Advisory Council, and President of the University of Arizona are requested to suspend the penalty for missing classes on Wednesday, October 15, 1969 in observance of National Moratorium Day."

Dr. Skinner explained that if this memorial were approved the Senate would in fact be dictating to faculty members how they should administer their own classes. He moved that the proposal be denied. There were several seconds to the motion and it carried with only a few dissenting votes heard.

REMINDER RE ALL-UNIVERSITY CONFERENCES: Dr. Gegenheimer reminded members of the Senate of the All-University Conference planned for Sunday, October 26, 1969, from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. This occasion is being arranged by officers of the Associated Students. Dr. Gegenheimer urged all members of the Faculty Senate to attend this conference and take an active part in its deliberations.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.



David L. Windsor, Secretary