

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, May 1, 1967 Room 103 Architecture

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:40 P.M. on Monday, May 1, 1967, in Room 103 of the College of Architecture. Forty-three members were present with President Harvill presiding. Dr. Richard K. Frevert, Dr. Jean Smith, Miss Donna Knapp, and Mr. Michael B. Stern also were present.

PRESENT: Ares, Bartlett, Blitzer, Bretall, Brewer, Clark, Cole, Coleman, Coulter, Dees, Delaplane, DuVal, Forrester, Gries, Hall, Harris, Harvill, Hull, Johnson, Joyner, Kemmerer, Krutzsch, Little, Livermore, Lynn, Marcoux, Massengale, McCaughey, McMillan, Mees, Patrick, Paulsen, Picard, Quinn, Rhodes, Robinson, Roy, Steelink, Svob, Voris, Wilson, Windsor, Yoshino.

ABSENT: Allen, Carlson, Chadwick, Cockrum, Damon, Gaines, Harshbarger, Martin, McDonald, Myers, Shields, Silberman, Sorensen.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of April 3, 1967 were approved as published and distributed, with the following correction:

Page 12, paragraph 2, first sentence, referring to a remark by Dr. Blitzer, should be corrected to read:

"Dr. Blitzer said that the Faculty Constitution as originally drafted did not provide for any ex-officio members of the Faculty Senate and it was only after President Atkinson said he would not carry the constitution to the Board of Regents as first drafted that certain ex-officio members were included."

LENGTHENING OF SPRING RECESS, APPROVAL OF: President Harvill informed the Senate that a representative of the Associated Students, Mr. Michael Stern, wished to present for Faculty Senate consideration a recommendation from the Student Senate. Mr. Stern was waiting near the Senate chamber in the event the Senate should vote to invite him to address the body.

On motion by Dr. Blitzer, seconded by Dr. Livermore, the Senate voted to ask Mr. Stern to speak to the Faculty Senate. Mr. Stern was sent for and upon arrival was introduced to the Senate by President Harvill. President Harvill pointed out that Mr. Stern had served this year as President of the Residence Hall Association as well as a member of the Student Senate.

Mr. Stern referred to Student Senate Bill 146 which had unanimously passed that body and which recommended that the University lengthen the spring recess from the present short holiday which includes only Good Friday through the Monday after Easter. The student bill did not specify how long the recess should be, but Mr. Stern said the students would like to have a full week of holiday, that is, from Saturday noon to a week from the following Monday morning. Mr. Stern said he would not repeat all of the arguments in consideration of the proposal that were included in the bill but said he would emphasize three of them: (1) The spring semester with only a short break at Easter-time, contributes to building pressures which encourage student demonstrations; (2) The graduating

students seeking employment upon leaving the University need a longer period of time than is now available to travel to various parts of the country for job interviews; and (3) Graduate students need additional time for work on theses, research papers, etc.

In answer to a question whether or not the students proposed that the academic year extend further into June than at present, Mr. Stern said this was not proposed by the students. Any class days lost because of a longer recess would just be "absorbed" by the balance of the teaching schedule.

In answer to a question, Mr. Stern said that a survey of other colleges and universities had revealed that a number of institutions, including a number of state universities, had as long a spring recess as was being proposed for this institution and yet they had considerably fewer class days than the University of Arizona would have even if the spring recess were lengthened to one week.

The President thanked Mr. Stern for appearing before the Senate and Mr. Stern then left the chamber.

Several members of the Senate asked if the calendar for 1967-69 had already been established. Mr. Windsor pointed out that the Senate had approved the next biennial calendar some months earlier. The spring recess approved at that time had included only a "Friday through Monday" vacation.

Mr. Windsor was asked to review the relative lengths of the two semesters of the 1967-68 academic year as presently scheduled with reference to class days, vacation periods, etc. Mr. Windsor first commented that the University of Arizona compares very favorably with other universities as to the number of teaching days in the two regular semesters. He then explained that the calendar for 1967-68 as now scheduled provided for 86 teaching days the first semester and 88 teaching days the second semester. Thus several teaching days could be given up in the spring without causing imbalance between the number of teaching days in the fall and spring semesters.

Mr. Windsor pointed out that the proposal to lengthen the spring recess had been referred to a ballot vote of the general student body, after the proposal had unanimously passed the Student Senate. The ballot vote had been 3,710 votes in favor and only 149 against. He pointed out further that the Faculty Committee on Student Personnel had unanimously recommended that the spring recess be lengthened. He explained that this committee includes the deans of Women, the deans of Men, the Director of the Student Health Service, the Director of the Student Counseling Bureau, and a number of other individuals -- all those persons who are responsible for student personnel services at this institution.

Dr. Livermore asked if the North Central Association recommended a certain number of teaching days. Mr. Windsor replied in the negative. Dr. Steelink then moved that the Faculty Senate accept the recommendation of the Student Senate and this motion was seconded by Dean Svob. The question was asked whether Dr. Steelink's motion would in fact provide for the specific length of the spring recess. It was pointed out that it would not since the students themselves were not recommending the specific length.

Dean Ares asked if the spring recess should be related to the date of Easter. Further, he pointed out the College of Law might prefer to have a recess at a time somewhat later in the semester than arbitrarily at Easter-time or at mid-semester.

It was pointed out that if the vacation is held at some time other than Easter, students might take an additional unauthorized holiday on Good Friday and the Saturday before Easter.

Several Senate members thought it might be well for the Senate simply to vote on Dr. Steelink's motion to indicate this body's attitude toward the principle of a longer vacation. A report could be brought back to the Senate later as to specific length. Several members of the Senate, however, said they felt the students should be given a definite answer, including specific length of recess, as soon as possible.

In response to an earlier comment by Dean Ares, Mr. Windsor pointed out the College of Law could observe a different calendar from that of the rest of the University if the Law College faculty wished so to recommend.

The question was then called for and by voice vote carried with no negative votes being heard.

Dr. Steelink then moved that the vacation be for six teaching days, and upon a request for clarification, specified that the vacation should extend from a Saturday noon until a week from the following Monday morning. This motion was seconded by Dr. Joyner and Dr. Livermore.

Dr. Harris asked if students in dormitories would be permitted to occupy their quarters during a week-long spring recess if they did not leave the campus and Dean Svob responded that they would.

Dr. Blitzer asked if he was correct in his understanding that the Senate would reduce the number of teaching days in the spring semester by this action. A number of Senate members replied that a reduction of teaching days was involved but if it was felt that this was appropriate.

At this point someone asked what had been the length of the spring recess before it was reduced to Good Friday through Easter Monday some years ago. Mr. Windsor replied that the vacation had begun on the Thursday evening before Good Friday and had extended through the week following Easter.

The question was asked if there had been a net increase in teaching days when the length of the vacation had been reduced. It was pointed out that the days gained had been assigned to an additional day of registration, an additional day of final examinations, one free day between the last day of classes and the first day of examinations, and the scheduling of two other free days between the last day of fall semester examinations and spring registration at mid-year.

Mr. Windsor then moved that Dr. Steelink's motion be amended to specify that the period of recess be the week preceding Easter. This motion was seconded by Dean Roy and carried with no opposing votes being heard.

Mr. Windsor then moved that the motion be further amended to specify that the lengthened recess become effective in the spring of 1968. This motion was seconded by Dr. Bartlett and several others.

Dean Hull spoke against this amendment. He explained that he was in favor of a longer spring vacation, that he felt what was being proposed was very much in order. However, he urged that the new schedule not take effect until the spring of 1969 because the calendar of events for the spring of 1968 has already been developed with the understanding that the spring vacation would be the short recess of Good Friday through the Monday after Easter. He said certain productions by the School of Music, the Department of Drama, as well as Artist Series attractions would be affected. Several members of the Senate said they realized the adjustment being proposed would cause some inconvenience to certain divisions of the University because of plans already made, particularly the College of Fine Arts. However, they felt these disadvantages were outweighed by the good to be gained by lengthening the vacation as soon as possible, that is, in the spring of 1968.

The vote on this amendment was called for and carried with several dissenting votes being heard.

The vote on the original motion, as amended, was then called for and carried unanimously.

The President pointed out that the Senate action was in fact a recommendation to the Board of Regents. He said he felt confident the Board would approve the recommendation.

AMENDMENT TO THE FACULTY CONSTITUTION PROPOSED BY THE COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN RE THE NUMBER OF ELECTED MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY SENATE, FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF: The Senate voted to take from the table a motion by Dr. Kemmerer, seconded by Dr. Joyner, at the April meeting that the Senate approve a proposed amendment to the Constitution, originally recommended by the Committee of Eleven, which had to do with enlarging the size of the Faculty Senate (see minutes of Senate meeting of April 3, 1967.)

Dr. Joyner moved that the last sentence of paragraph "d" of the proposal be revised so as to read: "Such apportionment is to be established by an ad hoc committee of three Senate members, no two of whom may be from the same college, appointed by the Chairman of the Faculty in the appropriate Fall Semester." (Underlined words are new.) Dr. Blitzer seconded Dr. Joyner's motion.

The question was asked why the Committee of Eleven had proposed that the ad hoc committee be made up of three members. Would five, or more than five, be more appropriate? Dr. Bartlett and several other members of the Senate explained it was felt that a committee of three was the most practical size for a committee of this sort.

The secretary was asked if information was available on the comparative representation of the various faculties of the University in the Senate at the present time. Mr. Windsor said that he did have some information about this and presented it as summarized in the following table:

<u>College or Unit</u>	<u>Number of Voting Faculty</u>	<u>No. of College Representatives</u>	<u>No. of at-large Representatives</u>	<u>Total Representatives</u>	<u>Representation Ratio</u>
Agriculture	267	1	1	2	1 for 133
Architecture	12	1	0	1	1 for 12
Bus. & Pub. Admin.	92	1	1	2	1 for 46
Education	73	1	0	1	1 for 73
Engineering	87	1	2	3	1 for 29
Fine Arts	77	1	1	2	1 for 38
Law	18	1	0	1	1 for 18
Liberal Arts	394	1	12	13	1 for 33
Medicine	8	1	0	1	1 for 8
Mines	52	1	1	2	1 for 26
Nursing	28	1	0	1	1 for 28
Pharmacy	10	1	0	1	1 for 10
Other Academic Units *	166	0	2	2	1 for 83
Miscellaneous **	82	0	0	0	0 for 82
Total ---	1366	12	20	32	1 for 43

* Includes Geochronology, Tree Ring Laboratory, Steward Observatory, Lunar Laboratory, Arid Lands, Arizona State Museum, Institute of Atmospheric Physics, Library, Physical Education for Women, Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Air and Military Science.

** Administrative units including Dean of Men, Dean of Women, Student Health Service, Student Union, Bookstore, etc.

Dr. Patrick asked, "If so much emphasis is going to be put on proportionate representation according to size of the various college faculties, why continue to have members-at-large at all?" He said he would be very much pleased to see the Faculty Senate enlarged. He said he felt this would contribute to a greater feeling of faculty participation in the management of academic affairs. However, he

did not see the point of greater emphasis on proportionate representation while still having some senators elected at-large. Dr. Blitzer replied that memberships at-large would simply be in line with the original intent of the Constitution. Dr. Patrick said that the proposal is to change the basis for election of senators from the original intent of the Constitution. Dr. Blitzer said this simply would reflect the growth of the University since members of one college faculty may now not be acquainted with members of another college faculty. Dr. Kemmerer said this thought was one of the factors which lay behind the Committee of Eleven's recommendation.

Mr. Windsor said this discussion confirmed something he had wondered about for some time. The Faculty Constitution is now twenty years old and he asked if the entire Constitution should not be subjected to a complete review to see if perhaps it should be updated. Mr. Clark said he agreed that this should be done.

Dr. Harvill said that the question has been asked of him several times whether or not faculty members with the rank of instructor should continue to be voting members of the faculty. At the time the Constitution was drafted, almost every college on campus had a substantial number of instructors on its faculty. This is not the case today. Further, very few instructors remain with the institution more than a few years as instructors. They are either promoted or they leave the institution. It was also pointed out that the constitutions of the faculties of most other colleges and universities do not give a vote to personnel of instructor rank.

Mr. Windsor stated that some faculty constitutions do not give a vote to assistant professors. Dr. Harvill said he was aware that this was so but he did not feel this would be appropriate at the University of Arizona.

Dr. Joyner commented that so far as electing senators-at-large is concerned, he felt there was value in having some representatives directly responsible to the faculty at large. These senators might very well feel more responsible to the entire University faculty rather than only to their own college faculty.

Mr. Johnson pointed out that in discussing the number of ex-officio members and the number of elected members, some persons had been including the Chairman of the Faculty as an ex-officio member. He asked if he, in fact, should not be counted as an elected member. There was general agreement that in any such analysis of the membership of the Senate, the Chairman of the Faculty should be considered an elected member for he is indeed the most "at-large" member of all.

Several members of the Senate asked why the ratio of two elected members to every ex-officio member was so important. Why would this ratio in itself give any more effective representation to the faculty?

Dr. Joyner said that certainly nobody in the Committee of Eleven would deny that there should be a generous base of administrators in the Senate, but the fundamental philosophy behind the recommendation was that the make-up of the Senate should be so constituted that the elected members could carry the day if they needed to carry the day. The ratio between faculty members and ex-officio

members has been gradually going down, Dr. Joyner said. As the number of ex-officio members increases the Senate becomes more of an administrative Senate than a Faculty Senate.

Dr. Livermore commented that a particular advantage he saw to the proposal was that an automatic provision would be provided for keeping an appropriate balance as, if, and when additional ex-officio members join the Senate. Heretofore, if the Senate acquired additional ex-officio members because of the University's acquiring additional deans or vice presidents, for example, special action had to be taken each time to amend the Constitution to increase the number of elected members.

Dr. Blitzer said he felt it was unfortunate to base the discussion on a ratio between administrative members of the Faculty Senate and elected members. He said that he thought of administrative members as members of the faculty. However, the faculty itself has grown so much that faculty members do not have much opportunity to see administrative officers. The more elected members of the Senate there are the more opportunity there is for communication between the administration and the faculty, he said. Dean Roy said he would agree with Dr. Blitzer's comments but he said, "Let's be honest as we face the facts involved. The real issue is the desire of the faculty to have a Senate that is dominated by the faculty membership. This is the issue that will be voted on when a vote is taken on the proposed amendment and it should be faced squarely." Dr. Joyner said he agreed with Dean Roy.

Dr. Harvill said that from time to time the question has come up within the Board of Regents whether or not the faculty is taking over the making of administrative decisions. Dr. Harvill said he has been able up to now to assure the Board that this is nothing to worry about, that matters are being handled with a proper balance.

Mr. Clark said he formerly was associated with a University where a faculty smaller than that of the University of Arizona plays a large role in determining policies for the institution. He said he felt the Committee of Eleven's proposal was not only a sound one but provided for a ratio between administrative members and elected members that should not frighten anyone. It is actually a very modest proposal, he said.

At this point several members of the Senate said that while this discussion was fruitful they felt there should be further study and discussion before the Senate voted on the proposal. Other Senate members said they thought there was adequate information to proceed with the vote. It was pointed out at this juncture that the discussion had gotten rather far away from the question of Dr. Joyner's proposed amendment to the original proposal.

Several senators felt that Dr. Joyner's proposed amendment to the motion could be more simply worded but after further discussion it was agreed that the wording proposed by Dr. Joyner was appropriate.

The question on the amendment was then called for and passed with no negative votes heard.

A vote on the main proposal itself was then called for by several persons. Mr. Johnson called for a written ballot and Dr. Wilson and Dr. Gries were asked to serve as tellers.

While the votes were being counted, Dr. Blitzer said he would like to take occasion to compliment Dr. Harvill on his efforts to have the Arizona State Public Employees' Retirement plan improved through changes made by the recent session of the legislature. Dr. Harvill said that while he certainly was in favor of the action taken, credit for the action should go to the Arizona State Retirement Board. Of course the efforts of the Board of Regents had been helpful also.

It was then announced that the proposal from the Committee of Eleven had been approved by the Senate by a vote of twenty-one to seventeen. It was understood that the matter in due time would be referred to the General Faculty as provided for in the Faculty Constitution.

RETIRING SENATE MEMBERS, APPRECIATION OF SERVICE OF: Dr. Harvill expressed appreciation to those members of the Senate who were completing terms of office and would not be serving in the Senate in 1967-68.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 P.M.



David L. Windsor, Secretary