

University of Arizona

PROCEEDINGS OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Meeting of Monday

October 11, 1965

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:40 o'clock on Monday afternoon, October 11, 1965 in Room 202 of the Home Economics Building. Forty-one members were present with President Harvill presiding. Dr. Kenneth Keating and Dr. Darrel Metcalfe were also present.

PRESENT: Beattie, Blitzer, Carlson, Coleman, Coulter, Damon, DuVal, E. Gaines, P. Gaines, Gegenheimer, Gries, Hall, Harris, Harshbarger, Harvill, Hillman, Hull, Johnson, Joyner, Little, Lyons, Marcoux, McCarthy, McCaughey, McDonald, McMillan, Paulsen, Picard, Quinn, Rappeport, Rhodes, Roy, Simonian, Sorensen, Stanislawski, Svob, Tucker, Voris, Wilson, Windsor, Yoshino.

ABSENT: Bartlett, Blecha, Brewer, Chadwick, Cockrum, Delaplane, Forrester, Kruttsch, Lynn, Martin, Myers, Patrick, Shields, Siegel.

NEW MEMBERS OF SENATE, WELCOME TO: President Harvill welcomed to the Senate those members who were newly elected and were attending their first meeting, or who were returning to the Senate after a period of having not been a member. These included the following: Dr. Paul E. Damon, Dr. Conrad F. Joyner, Mr. Heliodore A. Marcoux, Dr. Patrick J. McCarthy, Dr. William F. McCaughey, Dr. James E. McDonald, Dr. Currin V. Shields, Dr. Henry Tucker and Dr. I. Roger Yoshino.

The president also welcomed those Senators-at-large who had been re-elected for a second consecutive term. These included: Dr. Neil Bartlett, Dr. Arthur Beattie, Dr. E. L. Cockrum, Dr. George A. Gries, Dr. Robert M. Harris, Dr. Jimmie S. Hillman, Dr. Klonda Lynn, Dr. Paul S. Martin, Mr. Joseph L. Picard, Mr. Robert S. Svob, Dr. Andrew W. Wilson.

The President also announced that the new College Representative of the College of Medicine was Dr. Philip H. Kruttsch.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of May 3, 1965 were approved as published and distributed.

CATALOGUE MATERIAL: The following catalogue material was accepted: New courses: Mathematics 49a,b - Analytic Geometry and Calculus (5-5) Yr. Staff (Students in Engineering and Mines will take this course instead of Mathematics 79a,b); Mathematics 205a,b - Advanced Analysis for Engineers (3-3) Yr. Staff; Oriental Studies 269 - Islamic Thought (2) II Staff (Supported by National Defense Education Act funds); Oriental Studies 296a,b - Readings in Arabic (1-4, 1-4) Yr. Staff (Supported by National Defense Education Act funds); Economics 200i - National Science Foundation Institute in Economics (6) 1st Term 1966 Summer, Gifford-Marshall (Supported by National Science Foundation Institute funds); English 87 a,b - American Literature for Foreign Students (3-3) Yr. Robinson.

Changes: Engineering 171 - Introduction to Engineering Analysis II, change units from (4) to (3); English 5a,b - Writing and Speech for Foreign Students (5-5) Yr., change to English 5a,b - English Composition for Foreign Students (3-3) and

Speech 1, Speech for Foreign Students (2) I, II; Mathematics 201 - Boundary Value Problems (3) I, II change to Fourier Series and Orthogonal Functions (3) I; History and Oriental Studies 272 - History of the Middle East (3), change to History and Oriental Studies 272a,b (3-3).

Deletions: Mathematics 172 - Intermediate Calculus and Differential Equations (3) II; Mathematics 202 - Topics in Applied Mathematics (3) I, II.

SENATORS TO FILL VACANCIES OF SENATORS ON LEAVE OF ABSENCE, ELECTION OF:

The Senate elected Dr. Cornelius Steelink, Assistant Professor of Chemistry, to serve as a Senator-at-large during the year 1965-66 in the place of Dr. Paul S. Martin who will be on leave during the entire year of 1965-66. Dr. Millard Seeley, Professor of Chemistry, was elected to serve as a Senator-at-large during the first semester of 1965-66, during the semester's leave of absence of Dr. Neil R. Bartlett.

Upon the recommendation of the faculty of the College of Architecture, the Senate elected Mr. Ellery Green as College of Architecture Senator replacing Professor Lionel T. Chadwick who is on leave during the first semester. The Senate, upon the recommendation of the faculty of the College of Agriculture elected Dr. Francis Stromberg to serve as Senator from the College of Agriculture during the year 1965-66 replacing Dr. Albert Siegel who is on leave.

MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON CONCILIATION, ELECTION OF: The Senate elected Dr. Curtis Merritt of the College of Education to a two-year term as a member of the two member Committee on Conciliation. Dr. Andrew Wilson will continue to serve on the committee for the next year completing the second year of the two-year term.

COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN, REPORT RE: Dr. Gegenheimer reported that the Committee of Eleven had recently elected its officers for the year 1965-66. Dr. Renato Rosaldo of the Department of Romance Languages had been elected chairman and Professor Francis Gillmor had been reelected secretary.

PARTICIPATION IN ADVANCED PLACEMENT PROGRAM, REPORT RE: President Harvill called on Mr. Windsor to report to the Senate on participation in the Advanced Placement program of students entering the University as new freshmen in the fall of 1965.

Mr. Windsor reported as follows:

126 students had their Advanced Placement scores and examination papers sent to the University of Arizona this fall. This involved 155 tests since some students took more than one examination. The 126 students compares with 85 students in 1964, 61 in 1963, 53 in 1962 and 22 in 1960.

40 of these students came from Tucson High School, 25 from Rincon High School, 24 from Palo Verde High School, 12 from Catalina High School and 3 from Pueblo High School. Two students are from Safford High School in Safford, Arizona. Twenty students came from out-of-state high schools.

31 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in Chemistry. 15 received 8 units of credit, 7 received 4 units of credit, 9 received no advanced placement or credit.

9 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in Biology. 4 students were granted 8 units of degree credit, 3 students received 4 units of credit, 2 students received no placement or credit.

42 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in Mathematics. 13 students received 5 units of degree credit. 29 were granted no advanced placement or credit.

5 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in American History. 2 students received 6 units of credit, 1 student was awarded 3 units of credit and 2 received no advanced placement or credit.

2 students who took the Advanced Placement Examination in European History were awarded no advanced placement or credit.

1 student took the Advanced Placement Examination in Physics and was granted 8 units of degree credit.

3 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in French. None received advanced placement or credit.

7 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in Spanish. 3 students received 8 units of degree credit, 1 student received 10 units, and 1 received 12 units of degree credit. 2 received no placement or credit.

55 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in English. 21 students were permitted to register for English 4 and if they perform well in the advanced level course, will later be given three hours of degree credit for the course English 2, which they were permitted to skip. 31 students were permitted to register for English 2 (advanced placement only), and 3 received no advanced placement or credit.

There were no questions from the Senate about Mr. Windsor's report.

FINAL EXAMINATION SCHEDULE, DISCUSSION OF: Mr. Windsor reminded the members of the Senate that this body in the spring of 1964 had directed him, following receipt of a recommendation from the Committee of Eleven, to attempt to revise the University's final examination schedule to provide that the examination period still be limited to eight days, that all evening classes have their final examinations given during the regular examination schedule, that an examination time be scheduled for each class meeting time, and that adequate periods be scheduled for the giving of common examinations in all sectioned courses where the departments concerned wished to schedule common examinations.

In order to accommodate all these considerations, the Senate had voted to reduce the time of each examination period from three hours to two hours. The Registrar's office had presented such a revised schedule to the Senate in the fall of 1964, and it had been adopted by that group for the first and second semesters of 1964-65.

Mr. Windsor pointed out that provisions had been made whereby any student finding he or she had more than three examinations in one day could through the Registrar's office arrange to have the examination or examinations in excess of three rescheduled at another time (the student's class or classes having the smallest enrollment would be rescheduled). At the end of the first semester last

year only one student had asked for this adjustment. At the end of the spring semester, no student had requested an adjustment.

Mr. Windsor reported that at the end of last year only two department heads had communicated with him commenting on the new system. The head of the Department of Economics had written him that that department was extremely pleased with the new schedule and hoped it would be continued. The head of the History Department had written saying he hoped the schedule could be changed so as again to provide three hour examination periods, explaining that in a subject like history a two hour examination period is felt to be inadequate.

Mr. Windsor said that his office did not wish to plan the final examination schedule for this semester until the Senate had decided whether or not the schedule used in 1964-65 should be continued. He said that the general reaction he had had from both students and faculty members toward the revised schedule had been favorable.

Dr. Gegenheimer then moved that the revised examination schedule plan used for both semesters of 1964-65 be continued for 1965-66 and be the plan followed for final examinations in the future until and unless a different plan is approved by the Senate.

A number of seconds to Dr. Gegenheimer's motion were heard and the motion carried without a dissenting vote.

MEMORIAL FROM STUDENT SENATE REGARDING SENIOR EXAMINATIONS, CONSIDERATION OF: The Senate considered a memorial resolution from the Student Senate passed by that body in the spring of 1965. The proposal had been received by the Advisory Council which had referred it to the Faculty Senate.

The full statement of the memorial was as follows:

PASSED: March 10, 1965

SENATE BILL #103
Third Legislature
Second Session

Introduced by: Ray Oglethorpe

A Memorial

To recommend to the Faculty Senate and Administration of the University of Arizona that they delete the requirement that graduating seniors must attend classes during their final examinations.

WHEREAS, a major portion of a student's grade is based upon his final examination, a graduating senior having to attend classes will not have a chance to adequately prepare for them compared to a student taking them at the regular time; and

WHEREAS, a graduating senior willfully missing a class to study for an examination may be penalized by the instructor of that class; and

THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Student Senate that upon passage of this bill, the Faculty Senate and Administration shall be recommended to delete the requirement that graduating seniors shall attend classes during their final examinations.

Signed,

Warren Rustand
ASUA President

Dean Roy moved that the President appoint a committee of Senate members to confer with a student committee about this matter. The motion was seconded by Dr. McCarthy.

Dr. Wilson commented that he felt the objections raised by the students were legitimate ones. The present system of final examinations followed in the spring, whereby senior examinations are given early, presents many problems. He said he felt the entire question of senior examinations should be reviewed. Many abuses have developed, he said. Some students are not given examinations at all. Non-seniors are often permitted to take the shortened senior examinations.

Dr. Gegenheimer pointed out that the subject of senior examinations had been given careful study by faculty committees in 1948, again in 1950, again in 1956, and again in 1962, and that no better system had been found acceptable.

Dr. McCarthy explained that if the student memorial were adopted, inasmuch as senior examinations often extend over a period of two weeks, some students would not be attending classes for a period of two weeks, thus missing a considerable portion of the semester's work in all subjects.

Dr. Tucker pointed out that some seniors are excused by their departments from taking any final examination. Under this memorial could they be excused from all classwork during the period of senior examinations?

Dr. Stanislawski asked why other procedures had not been found acceptable when the question had been studied earlier. Dr. Gegenheimer explained that such matters were involved as who of the faculty or students would attend Commencement, if it were held at the late date that would be required if seniors took regular examinations and then time were allowed for the grades to be determined, reported, and processed. How would you hold an appropriate Commencement convocation without the services of the musical groups, who could not be expected to wait to a later date to participate?

Dean Roy's motion passed unanimously and Dr. Harvill appointed Dr. Beattie, Mrs. Sorensen, Dr. Wilson and Mr. Windsor to serve as a faculty committee to consult with a student committee, to be selected by the President of the Associated Students. Dr. Beattie was asked to serve as chairman of the Senate committee.

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT HARVILL: President Harvill reported to the Senate that the Board of Regents had approved a request operating budget for presentation to the State Legislature in January totaling \$26,336,141. This represents an increase of \$2,870,955 over the budget under which the University is operating for the academic year 1965-66, an increase of 12.23 per cent. The salary item - for both merit increases and new positions - in the new request budget is approximately \$2,000,000 higher than the salary item in the present budget, an increase of over 11 per cent. The operations item has been increased by \$576,000, rising from \$2.563 million to \$3.140 million, an increase of 22 1/2 per cent.

The President explained that the travel item would be increased 4.97 per cent, an increase of approximately \$19,000. Small capital items would remain at about the same figure as at present, the President explained. He pointed out that small capital items for new buildings are included in the total capital appropriation for new facilities. The President explained that the wages item would be increased \$212,000, an increase of 9.96 per cent.

Dr. Harvill said that of the total request budget of \$26,336,141, 17.1 million dollars would be requested by legislative appropriation. This compares with a figure of 15.3 million dollars in appropriated funds in the current budget. Student fees will support approximately \$7,000,000 of the budget, a marked increase from the present \$6,000,000. Student fees will provide 26.87 per cent of the total budget, compared with 25.64 per cent in the present budget.

Other items of the budget will remain at about the same figure as in the 1965-66 budget, the President said.

Dr. Harvill explained that while the headcount of students this fall had not run very far ahead of the figure used in the planning budget (it was only 69 ahead of the planned-for figure at the time a report was made to the Board of Regents on October 2), the full-time equivalent figure was more than 200 ahead of the planned-for-number. It appears that the University will be able to accommodate in 1966-67 only 760 more full-time equivalent students than are enrolled in 1965-66. This raises the question of how the number shall be controlled, the President explained. Should admissions be closed at an earlier date, should there be a general tightening of requirements, or just what should be the appropriate action? These are matters which will be given careful study in the near future, the President said.

Dr. Quinn said he hoped that the matter would not be solved by drastically reducing the number of out-of-state students which could be accommodated. Dr. Harvill explained that the curtailing of out-of-state enrollment was not necessarily the solution which would be developed. He pointed out that he believes there no longer is very strong feeling in the state that out-of-state students do not pay their own way, since it has been demonstrated that they do so.

Dean Hull asked if the construction program now under way would not ease the crowded conditions on campus. Dr. Harvill said that two of the new buildings would be devoted almost entirely to classroom space and office space, and these would greatly relieve the crowded situation so far as adequate classroom and laboratory space is concerned. However, these buildings would not be ready for some time, he pointed out. One building probably would not be ready until 1967 and the other one not until 1968. The President said he felt that even when additional facilities are completed, the University would not continue to increase its enrollment at the rate it has in recent years. There are reasons why it is not desirable to have facilities utilized at the very high rate the University has had to use its classroom and laboratory space in recent years, he said.

The President was asked if there would be any good purpose served by the Senate's going on record in favor of higher entrance requirements. The President said the Senate could certainly take any such action it wished. He wondered if this was desirable, however. Action should not be taken precipitately which might later be misunderstood and have an undesirable result, creating antagonism in the Legislature, for instance. Such a matter would need thorough study, the President pointed out. Of course, it could be placed on the Senate agenda for future consideration.

Dr. Tucker asked if the opening of a junior college in Tucson would relieve pressure on the University. Dr. Harvill said undoubtedly a local junior college will be opening in Tucson sooner or later. He said he had no idea just how soon. The community, of course, must study its needs. Up to the present time there has not been really meaningful interest in a junior college in Tucson on the part of community leaders. Further, some persons are interested in developing a

Pima County junior college that would for the most part offer only work of a technical or vocational nature. This would not particularly relieve the pressure on the University, it was pointed out. The President said he is not aware of any serious move for a real study of the question of a need for a junior college in Pima County.

The President commented that the proposal regarding bonding for state agencies that is to be voted on by the people of Arizona on October 19 had stimulated considerable debate throughout the state. The question had been referred to the people by the Legislature and would, if approved by the voters, amend the state constitution so as to raise the limit on the state's indebtedness from \$350,000 to \$100 million. The Legislature then would have to approve issuance of bonds for each agency as needed. All registered voters are eligible to vote on this matter, it was pointed out, at the special election called for October 19.

The President said he would next like to discuss the policy governing the listing of off-campus housing available for University students in the files of the Housing Office. He said it should be noted that decisions it has been necessary for him to make on behalf of the institution should be considered quite separate from personal viewpoints of his own. He said he has heard it said that his decisions in certain matters had been as they were because "he is from Mississippi". Dr. Harvill pointed out that it has been some decades since he left the state of Mississippi. Further, his attitude about race relations and civil rights was well known when he was a resident of Mississippi and later when he lived in North Carolina. He said he would dare say that no two individuals in Tucson have had more people of different nationalities, colors, creeds, etc. as guests in their home than have he and Mrs. Harvill. This has been so, he said, not because entertaining such guests was the obligation of the university president, but because he and Mrs. Harvill genuinely enjoyed having such persons as guests in their home, many of them as overnight guests. The Harvills, in turn, have been guests in the homes of other persons of various colors and nationalities, the President said.

Dr. Harvill related an experience he had in 1953 when a member of the state Senate said to the President that he had noticed that the University admission application blank asked a student to indicate his religion. Dr. Harvill said his response was that he doubted this was so but he would check into the matter. He then found that the application blank of the University indeed did ask a student to indicate his religious preference. Although the application blank had just been reprinted and was in stock in the Registrar's office in good supply, the President then directed that the supply on hand be destroyed and the form be reprinted omitting the question asking a student to indicate his religious preference, and this was done. He pointed out to the Senator that the question had been added to the form in the beginning, when the University was small, only because the representatives of the various religious denominations in Tucson had asked that the form carry this question, so that the various ministers could write to students at their homes after they had been admitted to the University, before they came to Tucson, inviting them to participate in the programs of the various religious groups in Tucson.

Dr. Harvill pointed out that a number of other similar matters had come to his attention from time to time during his years in the Presidency and as he learned about these, they were corrected.

Dr. Harvill said that no request had come to the University this year from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People asking the

University to adjust its policy in the listing of off-campus housing accommodations available to students. He said that in late August a delegation representing the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations had called on Vice President Johnson claiming to be acting on behalf of the N.A.A.C.P. This group spent one and one-half hours with Mr. Johnson. It had been explained to these visitors that this question did not seem to be an appropriate matter for them to be concerned with. Further, it was later learned that the N.A.A.C.P. had not formally asked the Commission to make any inquiry or investigation of the housing situation prior to their approaching Mr. Johnson. Dr. Harvill said he had later checked the city ordinance creating the Commission on Human Relations and found that this group had no authority to intervene as it did in matters of this sort at the University.

Mr. Johnson had explained to the representatives of the Commission the University policy governing the listing of off-campus housing accommodations. Dr. Harvill said that no one at the University knows just how many facilities listed in the off-campus housing file would take any prospective renters regardless of color, creed, etc. For homeowners whose premises do not fall under the provisions of the federal civil rights laws, the University does not inquire whether they would rent to anyone. The University does make a special point of obtaining listings in ample quantity of good housing that is available to all students who might possibly have trouble based on their race, creed, color or national origins if they went out on their own to try to find accommodations.

He explained that the N.A.A.C.P. had reported the cases of two individuals who presumably had had difficulty in obtaining housing during the summer of 1965. One of these individuals, it had been pointed out later, was not a student, but was a member of the faculty, and no one had asked the Student Housing Office to find housing for him.

A second individual had had difficulty finding housing, but he had not asked the Housing Office to assist him. When this matter was brought to the attention of President Harvill, he asked the Housing Office to find housing for the man and his family, following its usual procedure, and such housing was obtained in a matter of a few hours. The man later expressed great satisfaction with his accommodation.

Dr. Harvill explained that certain individuals and groups have demanded that the University not list in the Student Housing Office any accommodations without first requiring the owner or operator to sign a statement that he will rent to anyone regardless of race, creed, color, etc. The University, on the other hand, has taken the position that this requirement should not be imposed on individuals whose housing does not fall under the federal civil rights laws. The University will not list housing which is subject to the civil rights laws if there is any evidence of discrimination.

Dr. Harvill emphasized that the University of Arizona does have an obligation to assist students in finding housing off the campus. This is because the University is unable to house so large a number of its students in organized housing on the campus. Further, the University has an obligation to do all it can to prevent any student's being embarrassed when he goes into the community to seek housing. Thus, a very real effort is made to have ample housing of a satisfactory quality available for those students who might otherwise have difficulty in obtaining satisfactory accommodations. The President further emphasized that the off-campus housing office is not maintained as a convenience or service for landlords. Rather it is maintained as a service for University students, for whom the Univer-

sity does have an obligation. The President pointed out that the University does have listed considerably more housing that is open to all students regardless of color, creed, etc. than is needed to house those students who might normally have difficulty finding accommodations. This list is kept of ample size to assure that these students can be referred to listings where they will not be subjected to embarrassment by being rebuffed because of color or other reason. The President said therefore he does not see how in any sense the University can be accused of demonstrating a philosophy or point of view indicating that discrimination is being promoted.

Dr. Harvill stated that the University is not a social action organization. It is an educational institution. He said he would admit that sometimes it is difficult to draw the line between the two, but it is necessary to try to do so. In this instance, he is convinced, if the University assumed the position of trying to serve as a social action organization, this would not benefit the cause of eliminating discrimination. Moreover, the University might well be hurt in a number of other respects.

Dr. Harvill said that another point should be made. If the University should adopt a policy whereby it would list housing accommodations only of those owners who would sign an agreement not to discriminate in any way, those individuals who under the law are not required to have an "open door policy" undoubtedly would feel that as a state institution, the University should be forced to accept their listings. In fact, Dr. Harvill stated, he had received phone calls from individuals who had said that if the University changed its policy, they would picket and demonstrate against the institution because, as a state agency, it does not have the right to refuse to list housing accommodations offered to rent by persons who, under the law, are not required to sign an anti-discriminatory statement. These persons have further explained that they would take legal action against the University if its present policy were changed. In fact, Dr. Harvill explained, one man in the state who is known as one of Arizona's leaders in the cause of civil rights, has said that he would take the leadership in filing such legal action against the University if the institution changed its present policy.

Dr. Harvill said that the only procedure he felt properly could be followed is for the matter to be adjudicated through legal channels, and this is now being done. The Superior Court of Pima County has issued an injunction prohibiting the N.A.A.C.P. from demonstrating further on the University campus. It is assumed that this decision will be appealed. Meanwhile, the matter of the University's policy governing the listing of off-campus housing has been referred by the N.A.A.C.P. to the proper commission in Washington, D.C. Dr. Harvill said he feels there is not the remotest chance that the University will be found to be in violation of any law or government regulation in this regard, but he said he is no lawyer.

Dr. Tucker pointed out that since the newspapers have made much of the point that landlords should have the right to select their tenants, he wondered just what the University does ask landlords to state in indicating any preferences. Dr. Harvill said the matter is approached from the point of view of determining who will take anyone regardless of race, nationality, etc. "Those are the persons whose listings we want in quantity," he explained. Persons of dark skin or certain religion or nationality may, if they seek housing on their own, be rebuffed. "We do not want any of our students to have this embarrassing experience," he said. "Therefore, we maintain an adequate listing of suitable accommodations."

Dr. Harris asked Dr. Harvill if he knew what the situation was at other institutions in other states. Dr. Harvill said that in some states there are state civil rights laws which require that state institutions require any landlord to declare that he will rent to anyone, otherwise, his listing cannot be carried in the housing office file. Some institutions have such a policy even though state law does not require it.

Dr. Joyner asked whether or not landlords' preferences of tenants are noted, as for instance, "white males". It was pointed out that various preferences are noted. Dr. Joyner asked if the University, in fact, does maintain two lists. The answer was, "Yes. We must have one list, of considerable size of individuals who will rent to anyone so that students of various races, nationalities, etc. will under no circumstances experience embarrassment."

In answer to a question, Dr. Harvill explained that between six and seven thousand of the University's students are from out-of-town and are housed in the community. About the same number of students live on the campus in organized housing and about the same number are Tucson residents living in their own homes.

Dr. McDonald stated that among those institutions which do require landlords to sign an agreement not to discriminate before their accommodations can be listed in the institution's housing office are Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Cornell, Kansas, Wisconsin, M.I.T., Boston, and the institutions of the entire California state system. He said he had recently checked by telephone with the housing office at Arizona State University and was informed that that institution requires landlords to sign an anti-discriminatory agreement in order to be listed, except persons renting rooms within their own dwellings. Dr. Harvill commented that various reports had been made about what the policy was at A.S.U. but he did not know specifically what it was.

Mr. Johnson pointed out that 80% of the student body at Arizona State University live at home, that institution's student body being predominantly a commuting one. This is not the situation at Arizona, of course.

Dr. Gegenheimer asked just how the information is listed in the University of Arizona Housing Office. It was explained that rentals are listed on dittoed sheets. When anyone comes to the office who might be embarrassed if he sought housing "on his own", he is referred only to those listings where it is known he will not be embarrassed. Of course, if someone obtains listings for him and doesn't point out that the listings are for someone of a particular race, nationality, etc., then it is possible that listings might be obtained of accommodations where, when the prospective renter called on the landlord, he would be rebuffed.

Dr. Damon said he was aware of the cases of two African students who several years ago had been unable to find satisfactory housing through the University Housing Office.

Dr. Harvill said he was not aware of an instance where anyone seeking accommodations through the Housing Office had been embarrassed in recent years. If such cases should occur, the President pointed out, he certainly wishes to be informed about them. Of course, mistakes are made, he said, and he is not claiming that the Housing Office or any University office operates perfectly.

Dr. Damon asked if a landlord wished legally to discriminate, could he not simply advertise in the usual way. Dr. Harvill said of course he could. On the other hand, the University has an obligation to assist its students in finding satisfactory quarters and to maintain a housing listing to provide this service. The President said he wished again to ask, is the University to be a social action organization or an institution of higher learning? The President again said he believed that to change the University's policy on listing housing would not help the cause of integration. Further, it might do considerable harm to the institution in other ways.

Dr. McCarthy said that regardless of how this situation had developed, it has now become an issue throughout the state. He said it is his fear that if matters continue as they have, the institution's true image is going to be misrepresented and therefore will be damaged. He said he personally knows that President Harvill is a tolerant person, but because of the present situation, both the President and the institution are being misrepresented in the minds of many people in Arizona. Would it not be in the best interests of the University to remove this issue from the scene?

The President responded by saying he was always glad to receive suggestions from members of the faculty about any subject. He said that in this particular question, he thinks it is now necessary that limitation be put on further public statements by him. The matter is in the courts and while the legal deliberations are being conducted, he feels he should not say anything. "Let the courts decide the matter on its merits," he said.

The President said, in reference to the image of the University, that this would depend on whom one was talking to. "We have to consider whose image," he explained. He said that during the summer he had traveled throughout the state of Arizona discussing the University with groups in a number of cities. He said he found himself defending the University all over the state against a number of persons who thought the University was a hotbed of extreme liberal radicalism. Our image is not uniform, he pointed out.

Dr. McDonald said that the hour had grown quite late and he felt that this subject merited further discussion by the Senate. He asked if it could be an item on the agenda of the November meeting of the Senate, and it was understood by consent that such would be the case.

At this point Dr. Hillman rose to urge all members of the Senate to work diligently for passage of Propositions 100 and 101 at the special election of October 19. Dr. Harvill commented that he is convinced that if the capital needs of the University in the next few years are to be met, and the funds for these needs must come from regular tax sources, then the institution's operating budget will be seriously pinched.

Dr. Hillman mentioned that certain legislators were reported to have said, referring to University personnel working for the passage of Propositions 100 and 101, "Do not bite the hand that feeds you." The President said that any matter which had been referred by the Legislature to the people was one in which University personnel had a right to concern themselves. This was all the more true in matters directly bearing on the welfare of the institution. He said he felt he would rather suffer the consequences of speaking out than remain silent.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 o'clock.

David L. Windsor, Secretary