

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
Monday, February 5, 1968 Room 103 Architecture

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:40 P.M. on Monday, February 5, 1968, in Room 103 of the College of Architecture. Forty-six members were present with President Harvill presiding.

**PRESENT:** Anthony, Ares, Armstrong, Bingham, Blecha, Blitzer, Brewer, Carlson, Cole, Davis, Dees, Delaplane, Forrester, Gegenheimer, Hall, Harvill, Johnson, Kassander, Kemmerer, Krutzsch, Little, Lynn, Marcoux, Martin, Massengale, McDonald, McMillan, Mees, Murphy, Myers, Patrick, Paulsen, Paylore, Quinn, Resnick, Rhodes, Robinson, Roy, Shields, Sorensen, Steelink, Svob, Thompson, Voris, Wilson, and Windsor.

**ABSENT:** Allen, Chadwick, Cockrum, Coleman, Damon, DuVal, Gaines, Hull, Joyner, Livermore, and Spicer.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes of the meeting of January 8, 1968 were approved as published and distributed, with the secretary making a correction to show that Professor John W. Anthony was present at that meeting rather than absent.

**CATALOGUE MATERIAL:** The following catalogue material was accepted: New Courses Health, Physical Education, and Recreation 154s, Workshop in Gymnastics (Men and Women) (3) \$2.00 Summer Wilson; History 217s, Nineteenth Century Issues in American History (3) Summer Jackson; History 224s, Intellectual History of Latin America Since 1810 (3) Summer Brubaker; Law 259, Modern Real Estate Transactions (3) II Baker; Law 271, Legal Process (3) II Woods; Law 276, Legislation (3) II Wexler; Law 277, Bankruptcy (2) II Leshner; Physical Education for Women 6212s, Workshop: Folk Dance for Elementary Teachers (3) \$2.00 Summer Garner; and the following changes: Education 264s, Comparative Education: Study Tour of Mexico change to Comparative Education: Study Tour of Mexico and Guatemala; Health Physical Education, and Recreation 399s, Seminar, change from 2 units to 1-3 units.

**REMARKS BY PRESIDENT HARVILL:** President Harvill referred to the report by Dr. Vernon Odom, Regional Director of the American College Testing Program, at the January meeting of the Senate. Dr. Odom had discussed the results of certain research conducted by the ACT Research Office concerning those students entering the University of Arizona as freshmen in the fall of 1966 who had taken the American College Tests as seniors in high school. Dr. Harvill said he felt there was much in the material discussed by Dr. Odom which would be of real value to the University once it were properly understood by such people as members of the Senate. He said he would ask Mr. Arthur Grant, University Educational Research Analyst, to make a further report on this material to the Senate in an appropriate way, in written form if not by a personal presentation.

The President then turned to the University's request for appropriations before the current session of the Arizona Legislature. He said that he and other University officials had made a presentation before the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate several weeks ago. University officials were treated well, he felt, despite press reports to the contrary. Some legislators showed a narrow view toward support of higher education, but the President did not feel that the attitude of these persons was characteristic of the majority of the members of either Appropriations Committee. Many legislators apparently had been surprised at Governor Williams' message to the Legislature recommending large cuts in the amounts requested of the Legislature by the Board of Regents. The Regents themselves, of

course, were completely astonished, the President commented.

Dr. Harvill predicted that there would be efforts to make significant changes in the request budget. However, he said that he knew that the Regents and the administrations of the three universities would not deviate one iota from the amount requested of the Legislature for the operating budget. Important as is the capital funds appropriation, the operating budget is more vital, and nothing can be spared from it, the President emphasized. On the other hand, it might be necessary to delay planning for some phases of the building program.

Dr. Harvill said that there is great concern in the state about support of higher education in Arizona. Many business leaders, for instance, are concerned, and they are seeking and finding avenues to express their opinions to both the Governor and the Legislature.

Dr. Harvill referred to certain attempts to discredit the operation of the universities, for instance, the use made of overhead funds received in connection with research grants. The charges made were totally irresponsible and actually very absurd, the President pointed out, since all funds from research grants are committed for the expenses which are involved in the conduct of grant programs (cost to the Physical Plant and salaries of persons to administer the grants, for example). These expenses are supported totally by the overhead funds and this money is never placed in the regular budget of the University in the first place.

The President pointed out that the Director of the Budget in the Office of the Commissioner of Finance had attempted, by selecting 22 universities in the West with which the institutions in Arizona were then compared, to show that the institutions in this state were in a favorable comparable position. This was not a proper comparative study at all. Many of the institutions were very small ones, many not offering graduate work, and most of them conducting no research effort. The President said he believed that the University administration had been able to show what a false comparison the study made. The University in turn had presented evidence comparing the University with truly comparable institutions. This study showed that in salaries, for instance, the University was well below the group average in every teaching rank.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO STUDY QUESTION OF CHANGING ROTC PROGRAM FROM COMPULSORY TO VOLUNTARY: Mr. Windsor informed the Senate that following action by this body at its January meeting authorizing the President of the University to appoint an ad hoc committee to study and report back at the March meeting of the Senate regarding the institution's policy with respect to ROTC training during a student's first two years, specifically studying the question whether or not the present requirement of compulsory ROTC should be continued, the President had appointed such a committee. The members were Dr. Paul Allen, Dr. Paul Damon, Dean Robert Hull, Professor Heliodore Marcoux, Dean Robert Svob, and Dr. Raymond Thompson. Professor Marcoux had been asked to serve as chairman of the committee.

CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN REGARDING A REVIEW OF THE FACULTY CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS: The Senate next considered a recommendation from the Committee of Eleven which had been first introduced to the Senate at its meeting in December. The proposal read as follows:

"The Committee of Eleven recommends that the Senate create an ad hoc committee of the Faculty to undertake a comprehensive review of the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws; that such committee be constituted as follows:

a) ex-officio members shall be the Secretary of the Faculty, the Chairman of the Faculty, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, the Chairman of the Committee on Committees, and the Dean of the College of Law or his representative, and b) five additional members from the general Faculty to be appointed by the Committee on Committees in consultation with the Chairman of the Faculty; and, finally, that such committee present its proposals for revision to the Faculty Senate for action.

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

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

Dr. Gegenheimer said that the Committee of Eleven had felt for some time that the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws should be studied to see if they should be revised. He then moved that the recommendation as submitted by the Committee of Eleven be approved by the Senate. The motion was seconded by Dr. Blitzer.

Mr. Windsor stated that he would be on the committee as an ex-officio member by virtue of his administrative position with the University. He said that he served as an administrative official of the University responsible to the President of the University. He pointed out that the President of the University is the person who would eventually have the responsibility of gaining the approval by the Board of Regents of any changes in the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws. Yet the President of the University is completely disregarded in this proposal and would have nothing to say about the composition of the ad hoc committee. He said he, therefore, would be unwilling to serve on the committee.

Dr. Gegenheimer said that Dr. Livermore, Chairman of the Committee of Eleven at the time the recommendation was drafted by that body, had pointed out that the Registrar as Secretary of the Faculty should be a member of the committee. Mr. Windsor asked why there would be objection to having the President of the University appoint the members of the committee. Dr. Gegenheimer said that the Committee of Eleven has felt that this was an instance where the Committee on Committees might well make the selection.

Dr. Harvill remarked that the work of the proposed ad hoc committee would be simply an intramural study if the recommendations stand as made by the Committee of Eleven. If some members of this committee were not chosen by the Administration, Dr. Harvill emphasized, he was certain the Board or Regents would not be receptive

to whatever it might recommend. He pointed out that at the time the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws were originally approved by the Board of Regents, Dr. Alfred Atkinson, then President of the University, had great difficulty in obtaining the Regents' approval. Dr. Atkinson finally convinced the Regents that participation by faculty in certain legislative matters would be desirable. His wishes finally prevailed. However, Dr. Harvill said, he is aware that the Board's attitude in some respects toward matters of this sort is no different today from what it was at the time that the Constitution was originally adopted.

Dr. Martin asked the President if he was saying that if the Committee of Eleven by its action had in fact selected the administrative faculty members of the committee, this would prejudice the Board of Regents against any proposal that might come from the committee even after the committee's recommendations had been approved by the full Faculty Senate. Dr. Harvill said this was precisely what he was saying.

Dr. Kassander then moved that the Committee of Eleven's recommendation be amended to provide that the Senate authorize an ad hoc committee of the Faculty to undertake a comprehensive review of the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws, such committee to be appointed by the President of the University. Dr. Kassander's motion was seconded by Dr. Massengale.

Dr. Blitzer commented that he was surprised at some of the reactions expressed to the Committee of Eleven's proposal. He said he was sure that nothing untoward was intended by the recommendation as to the manner in which the committee was to be selected.

Dr. Harvill said he did not mean to imply by his remark that he was questioning the motives of anyone. It is a fact, however, that the Board of Regents does feel strongly about the relationship of responsibility and authority in the operation of the University. This question has come up a number of times, he said, and he has always been able to explain to the Regents that although there may be differences in views on various issues, there is a strong spirit of harmony in the conduct of the affairs of the University.

Dr. Harvill stressed that he knows the Board of Regents has a high respect for the Faculty of this institution, and will always listen to anything the Faculty recommends in the areas of academic concern. Further, the Administration should not involve itself unduly in such questions as how to teach, for instance. On the other hand, administrative policy must be kept in the hands of the administrators responsible to the Board of Regents and assigned the authority for this responsibility by the Regents.

Dr. Kassander said that he understood the situation as explained by the President, and that was precisely why he had submitted his proposed amendment.

Dr. Harvill said that he personally would favor a study of the Constitution and Bylaws to see if revisions are desirable, but the Administration should have something to say about the makeup of the study committee.

Dr. Steelink asked if Dr. Kassander's motion referred to the ex-officio members of the committee as outlined in the Committee of Eleven's recommendation only, or also to the members to come from the general Faculty. Dr. Kassander said his amendment was intended to provide that the full membership of the committee should be selected by the President.

The question on the amendment was then called for and Dr. Kassander's motion carried without dissenting vote being heard. The vote on the original motion as amended was then called for and this motion carried without dissenting vote being heard.

Dr. Harvill told the Senate that he would consult with the Committee on Committees to obtain suggestions as to persons who might be appointed to the committee.

AUTHORIZATION OF COMMITTEE TO STUDY UNIVERSITY GRADING SYSTEM: Dean Ares of the College of Law pointed out to the Senate that there was a consensus in the Law Faculty that the present grading system of the University is insufficiently flexible and does not provide a broad enough range of grades at the C level so far as grading of Law courses is concerned. He said he had inquired whether pluses and minuses might be added to the system resulting in number equivalences with partial decimal values (2.5 for example). He had been informed by Mr. Thomas Rowe, the Assistant Registrar for Data Processing, that through proper systems and programming procedures such an adjustment could be accomplished, although at least eighteen months to two years would no doubt be required for the redesigning of forms and reprogramming of the University's system of grading.

Dean Ares pointed out that the Law Faculty felt that the University of Arizona's grading system was difficult to understand by persons in other parts of the United States.

Inquiries among colleagues in other colleges on the campus had indicated that perhaps it is time for a review of the entire University grading system. Dean Ares had reported the attitude of the Law Faculty to the University Advisory Council, and that body had suggested that the matter was one which might well be presented to the Senate.

Dean Ares emphasized that this proposal in no way related to other studies being conducted at the present time of a possible pass-fail grading system. The University would always have a standard grading system of some sort regardless of any pass-fail options that might be available in certain courses or for certain students.

Dr. Ares then moved that the Senate ask the President to appoint a committee to study the University grading system, with special attention to the problems of the College of Law, and that the committee be asked to report back to the Senate by the end of the spring semester of 1968, if possible.

This motion was seconded by Dr. Blitzer.

Dean Roy commented that while he felt it would be appropriate at this time to study the institution's grading system, he wondered if a report could be prepared by the end of this semester. It seemed to him a more reasonable deadline might be a date that would permit the new system to be announced in the next biennial catalogue.

Dean Ares said that the Faculty of the Law College wanted relief at the earliest possible date.

Vice President Johnson asked if the Regents had given attention to this matter in recent years. Dr. Harvill explained that not too many years ago one regent raised the question of whether or not all three state universities should not be required to use the same grading system. The decision of the Regents at that time

had been that each institution should adopt and follow whatever grading system that institution felt appropriate for its particular needs.

In answer to a question, Mr. Windsor pointed out that at the present time the grading system used by the University of Arizona is the same as that used by Northern Arizona University, all of the junior colleges of the state, Grand Canyon College, The American Institute for Foreign Trade, and all of the public schools of Arizona. The only collegiate institutions using another grading system are Arizona State University and Prescott College.

The question was then called for and carried unanimously with no opposing voice being heard.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN MEMBERSHIP OF FACULTY SENATE, REPORT RE: President Harvill informed the Senate that following the vote by the Faculty earlier in the year concerning the proposed amendment to the Faculty Constitution which would expand the size of the Senate, he had forwarded the action to the Board of Regents for consideration by that body. Because of the press of other matters, the Regents had not yet had time to consider this question.

DISCUSSION OF ACADEMIC ADVISING: President Harvill referred to the discussion in the Senate at its October 2, November 6, and December 4 meetings concerning academic advising on this campus, and the recommendations made by the special committee appointed to study this matter under the chairmanship of Dr. Richard Edwards.

Dr. Harvill said he would soon have to take action to do something about the situation, if the Senate did not. It is imperative that this institution improve the academic advising of its students, he said. His office receives many complaints about this matter continually, he said, from both off-campus and on-campus sources. This is not merely a state of mind, the President emphasized. He stated he does not feel that it is directly the result of the fact that the University has become such a large institution in size.

The President said as one major adjustment he would hope that a program of advising of entering freshman students in the late summer prior to September registration might be developed. Arizona State University has had some success with this operation. If the cost would not be too burdensome, the President said he would like to try this procedure.

Dr. Gegenheimer commented that what may have appeared to be foot-dragging on the part of members in the Senate in discussion of this question was not due to the fact that Senate members did not feel an upgrading of advising would be desirable. Rather, the Senate was aware that the problem was basically a fiscal one. A special advising program in the summer would cost money. Similarly, additional funds would be needed if faculty members' teaching loads were lightened so they could give more time to advising during the regular semesters. <sup>President Harvill pointed out that</sup> In some instances, manpower is available, he said, but it simply is not being used because the colleges are not emphasizing enough the importance of a strong academic advising system. For example, all faculty appointment contracts require that the individuals be on the campus by September 1. He said he could see no reason why all faculty members could not be required to be on duty September 1 and thereafter to do advising in early September during the several weeks before the regular orientation program starts. This would be better than August, for example, he said. Further, during the course of the year, faculty members should keep regular office hours exclusively for the purpose of advising students. Some departments for some reason seem to have trouble getting their faculty members to do this. Many students report that they have a very difficult time in

finding faculty members to obtain the counseling from them they need.

Dr. Harvill said that the first point is that there must be agreement as to how important this matter is. Secondly, what steps should be taken to improve matters? Third, how can these adjustments be paid for? He said this was one area where he was sure he would never have any trouble justifying the cost before the Legislature.

Dr. Harvill pointed out that in some colleges, freshmen seem not to have a definite advisor at all. Sophomores often have a similar problem. Every member of the faculty, however, should realize the importance of advising, if for no other reason, because every one of us should be interested in the students. The President pointed out that some departments do a superior job in their advising program. Other departments have the reputation of providing poor advising.

Dr. Wilson pointed out that in the College of Business and Public Administration, it was his impression that the juniors and seniors do receive good advising. However, the freshmen and sophomores do not. We should be worrying about the two lower division classes, he said. Dr. Harvill pointed out that the more students who are advised during a late summer advisement period, the lighter would be the load that would have to be accommodated during the regular Orientation Week.

Dr. Kassander then moved that the Senate accept the report of the Committee on Academic Advising, that the Committee be commended for its excellent study and report, and that the Senate go on record as requesting that every effort be made to implement the recommendations of the Committee as soon as possible, particularly the question of summer advising.

The President pointed out that he assumed various University groups would continue to give attention to this matter, particularly the Advisory Council.

PLACE OF MEETING: Dr. Thompson asked if Senate members would agree that there would be an advantage in the Senate meetings being held in a more central campus location than the College of Architecture, for example, in the auditorium of the Modern Languages Building. It was understood that the auditorium would have to be available, of course, at the hour of the Senate meeting.

Several Senate members pointed out that it would be much more difficult to find parking in the area of the Modern Languages Building than it is in the area of the Architecture Building. Several Senators commented on the comfortable appointments and the good acoustics of the Architecture Lecture Hall which provides a small intimate chamber which has proved to be far superior to other places where the Senate has met in the past. Often those quarters have been unattractive and cold, and it has been difficult to hear.

Dr. Gegenheimer then moved that the Senate hold its March meeting in the auditorium of the Modern Languages Building, if it is available, on a trial basis. The Senate then can determine whether or not that meeting place is satisfactory. The motion was seconded by Dr. Thompson and then carried.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

  
David L. Windsor, Secretary