

ADDENDUM TO THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF OCTOBER 5, 1964

A Report to the Faculty on the Work of
THE COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN
October 1963-May 1964

This summary presents briefly the composition of and major topics discussed and acted upon by the Committee of Eleven at the 14 meetings it held during the year 1963-64.

1. Membership and elected officers for 1963-64:

Dr. Albert Gegenheimer (ex officio), Chairman of the Faculty
 Dr. Leon Blitzer, Secretary January-June 1964.
 Dr. Emil S. Gavlak (elected to fill vacancy, Feb. 1964)
 Dr. Emil W. Haury
 Dr. A. Richard Kassander (resigned Oct. 1963)
 Dr. Arthur R. Kemmerer (resigned summer 1963)
 Dr. Edwin B. Kurtz
 Dr. A. Laurence Muir
 Miss Patricia Paylore, Chairman
 Prof. Joseph L. Picard (elected to fill vacancy Dec. 1963)
 Dr. William J. Pistor (resigned Feb. 1964)
 Dr. J. Melvin Rhodes, Secretary Oct.-Dec. 1963; resigned Dec. 1963)
 Dr. Renato Rosaldo (elected to fill vacancy Oct. 1963)
 Dr. Cornelius Steelink (elected to fill vacancy Oct. 1963)
 Dr. Mitchell G. Vavich

2. Recommendations on the following matters were submitted to the Faculty Senate:

- a) Establishment of a standing University Committee on Safety. Passed.
- b) Relaxation of the University's policy on nepotism to permit the employment of married graduate assistants and other temporary personnel in the same department. Debated, but no action taken.
- c) Establishment of a faculty committee to work with the President's office in the preparation of the revisions to "The Manual of Procedure and Policy for Faculty and Staff." Passed.
- d) Revision of the University's scheduling of final examinations. Debated. Of eight points offered, one was adopted, two were adopted provisionally, one was rendered unnecessary by previous Senate action, and three were passed over without action.

3. Recommendation on the creation of a University Committee on Advanced Placement. Sent to University Administration. Under consideration.

4. Discussion with the University Administration about the feasibility of computerized master faculty and staff file. Under consideration.

5. Discussion and investigation on the following topics will be continued during the sessions of the new Committee for 1964-65:

- a) Military Loyalty Oath
- b) Religion-in-Life Week

6. The Committee also reviewed the University's policy on Summer School contracts and pay scales, and made recommendations to the Summer School administration for improvements in timing and communication with the general Faculty.
7. The Committee discussed briefly the crowded conditions in the Faculty dining room, but agreed that no amelioration was possible without capital expansion.
8. The Committee discussed the possibility of advances for authorized field expenses, but found that except in unusual cases of prolonged absence, the policy will not permit such advances.
9. Campus traffic problems were reviewed, and recommendations were made to the Physical Plant for expediting traffic off campus at certain peak hours.

This report will give an indication of the range of problems handled by the Committee of Eleven. As the Faculty Manual states, "the main function of this committee is to act as a channelway in initiating action for the solution of problems of concern to the faculty and the University." Members of the faculty may address communications to the Chairman or the Secretary of the Committee.

The University of Arizona
Proceedings of the Faculty Senate

Meeting of Monday

October 5, 1964

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:40 P.M. on Monday, October 5, 1964, in Room 111 of the College of Business and Public Administration. Thirty-nine members were present with Vice President Delaplane presiding. Dr. Philip H. Krutzsch of the College of Medicine and Miss Patricia Pallister, Assistant Dean of Women were also present.

PRESENT: Bartlett, Beattie, Blecha, Blitzer, Brewer, Coleman, Coulter, Delaplane, Edwin Gaines, Gegenheimer, Gillmor, Hall, Harris, Harshbarger, Hull, Hillman, Hudson, Johnson, Kassander, Kemmerer, Little, Lyons, Muir, Myers, Paylore, Picard, Powell, Quinn, Rappeport, H.D. Rhodes, Siegel, Simonian, Stanislawski, Svob, Vavich, Voris, Wilson, Wallraff, Windsor.

ABSENT: Carlson, DuVal, Forrester, F.P. Gaines, Harvill, McMillan, Patrick, Paulsen, J.M. Rhodes, Roy.

NEW MEMBERS OF SENATE, WELCOME TO: Dr. Delaplane welcomed to the Senate the new Dean of the College of Fine Arts, Dr. Robert Hull, the new Dean of the College of Engineering, Dr. Howard Coleman, and the Dean of the recently created College of Nursing, Dean Pearl Coulter. He also announced that Dr. Robert Paulsen, the new Dean of the College of Education, who will be serving as a member of the Senate, was out of the city.

Dr. Delaplane also welcomed to the Senate those Senators elected as college representatives in the spring of 1964 who today were attending their first meeting of a two-year term as college Senators. These included: Dr. Leon Blitzer, Liberal Arts; Dr. John Harshbarger, Mines; Dr. Dan Stanislawski, Business and Public Administration; Dr. Robert Quinn, Fine Arts; Dr. Milo Blecha, Education (Reelected); Mr. David J. Hall, Engineering (Reelected); Mr. Jack Rappeport, Law (Reelected); Dr. Albert Siegel, Agriculture (Reelected); Dr. V. H. Simonian, Pharmacy (Reelected).

Dr. Delaplane also recognized Miss Patricia Pallister, new Assistant Dean of Women who was attending the Senate meeting representing Dean Carlson and Dr. Philip H. Krutzsch, who was representing Dean DuVal of the College of Medicine.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of May 4, 1964 were approved as published and distributed.

SENATORS TO FILL VACANCIES OF SENATORS ON LEAVE OF ABSENCE, ELECTION OF: The Senate elected Dr. Klonda Lynn, Professor of Speech, and Dr. Lendell Cockrum, Professor of Zoology, to serve as Senators-at-large during 1964-65, completing the terms of Dr. Cornelius Steelink and Dr. Roger Yoshino, both of whom will be on leave for the full academic year. The Senate elected Dr. Paul S. Martin, Associate Professor of Geochronology, to serve as a Senator-at-large for the balance of the first semester replacing Dr. Edwin Kurtz who is on leave for the fall semester.

It was announced that elections would be held soon to select College Senators representing the new College of Architecture and the new College of Nursing.

MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON CONCILIATION, ELECTION OF: The Senate elected Dr. Andrew Wilson of the Department of Geography to a two year term as a member of the two member Committee on Conciliation. Dr. Leon Blitzer 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 1964-65. Professor Arthur Kemmerer had been elected chairman and Professor Frances Gillmor had been elected Secretary. Professor C. F. Wallraff had been elected to fill the vacancy on the committee created by Dr. Yoshino's leave of absence for this year.

Dr. Gegenheimer pointed out that he had with him a report of the activities of the Committee of Eleven during the year 1963-64 and while he would not present the report to the Senate at this time, he was asking that the report be reproduced and attached to the minutes of this meeting of the Senate and distributed with the published Proceedings which will be distributed to the faculty at large. (The report of the Committee of Eleven is attached to these minutes.)

CATALOGUE MATERIAL: (New courses) - History 200, Representative Americans (3) I Carroll; Law 122s, Real Estate Transactions (2) Baker; Nuclear Engineering 345, Nuclear Safety (3) Hetrick-Seale; and Nursing 199, Independent Study (1-4) I, II Fee \$0 to \$15.

SUMMARY OF PETITIONS FOR 1963-64, DISCUSSION RE: Mr. Windsor had provided members of the Senate in advance of the meeting copies of the "Summary of Petitions Approved" for the academic year 1963-64. Mr. Windsor commented that he thought the format of the report should be modified before another year. He pointed out that what is of interest is the number of petitions approved and emphasized it is not meaningful to indicate the number of petitions in a certain category that have been denied, although such information in some instances is included in the report. The number of denials is rather meaningless since in many instances a petition is denied at "its source". That is, a student wishes to submit a petition but is told at the office of his dean or at the Registrar's office that the case is one which has no likelihood of being approved and there is therefore no point in the petition's being submitted. This in fact amounts to a denial but it is not then a matter of record.

Mr. Windsor also indicated that another year the category of "excess registration" be dropped from the report since permission to carry a unit load in excess of the usual maximum is no longer handled by the process of petition but is handled in individual cases by each academic dean's office at the time of registration.

Dr. Bartlett asked what was meant by the category in the section devoted to Graduate College petitions headed "adjust Ph.D. language requirement". Dean Rhodes explained that this referred to a substitution of some other language in meeting the French-German requirement.

Dean Brewer asked why the report showed that one student in the College of Pharmacy had been given permission to establish credit for work done during a period of disqualification or suspension. He said he could not recall such an instance. Mr. Windsor explained he did not have information in hand about this case but would check on the matter before the next meeting of the Senate. Dr. Blitzer asked what was meant by the category in the section devoted to undergraduate petitions indicating the number of petitions approved by the Advisory Council adjusting the scholarship requirement for the degree. Mr. Windsor said he would have to obtain more information about this and report to the Senate at its next meeting. He said he knew it was not a matter of the overall graduation grade average requirement's being adjusted. It was his opinion that this referred to an adjustment of the grade average requirement in the major. He said further information would be provided the Senate in November.

Subject to the additional information to be brought to the Senate at its next meeting, Dr. Delaplane said that the report should be considered accepted.

REVISED FINAL EXAMINATION SCHEDULE, APPROVAL OF: Dr. Delaplane asked Mr. Windsor to report to the Senate on the revised final examination schedule which he had developed over the summer months following the directions given him by the Senate at its May meeting. Mr. Windsor distributed to members of the Senate a tentative final examination schedule for the first semester of 1964-65. He explained that the proposed schedule was the result of work carried on in his office since last May when the Senate adopted certain recommendations submitted by the Committee of Eleven. These recommendations had provided that the examination schedule be so revised that it would schedule in the regular examination period examinations for late afternoon and evening courses, that it would eliminate holding examinations over the noon hour, that it would retain the present arrangement of scheduling a final examination period for each class meeting time, that it would provide times for common examinations for all sectioned courses in which the department wished to give common examinations, and that the examination period be held to the present eight day period.

Mr. Windsor remarked that this had proved to be a jumbo-sized assignment. There are over 200 sectioned courses in the University. A survey of departments had revealed that common examinations were desired for over 70 of these. Mr. Windsor said he had written a number of colleges and universities in the country and then had visited several of them including UCLA, Stanford, Oregon, Michigan and Northwestern to find out how final examinations were scheduled in those institutions. He said that, as a matter of fact, he had found that common examinations in sectioned courses were not nearly so common as had been believed. A more common type of final examination schedule is one similar to one that has been followed at Arizona for many years. At a number of institutions where common examinations in sectioned courses are desired, they are scheduled during the evening hours. However, this would not be possible at Arizona because this would interfere with the scheduling of final examinations in the regular examination schedule for late afternoon and evening courses. Many institutions comparable to the University of Arizona in size use a "compromise combination" somewhat similar to what Mr. Windsor had devised.

Mr. Windsor reminded the Senate that they had voted in the spring to reduce the length of final examinations from three hours to two. The proposed schedule which he had distributed was about as "conflict free" as could be developed, he said. However, he pointed out that it is impossible to avoid some conflicts for some students. Mr. Windsor pointed out that the proposed plan provided that when a conflict does occur, that is, when the student has two or more examinations scheduled for the same examination period, he is to take the examination in his first course listed for that period in the examination table. He must arrange with his instructor in the other course(s) in the conflict to schedule a makeup examination at the earliest possible date during the period of final examinations.

"Having to give some makeup examinations is the price we must pay for scheduling common examinations", Mr. Windsor emphasized.

Dr. Delaplane said he was surprised to see courses such as Economics 248 or Economics 291 or Systems Engineering 277 listed among the common examinations. Mr. Windsor said that these courses did have several sections and that the departments concerned wished to have a common examination scheduled for them.

Dr. Bartlett asked if any provision was made for a student who might find he had several examinations scheduled for the same day. Mr. Windsor said that no provision had yet been made for such situations. He pointed out that one of the recommendations submitted by the Committee of Eleven to the Senate in May and adopted at that time was that the University discontinue the former practice of permitting a student who had several examinations in one day (more than two

examinations in one day under the former schedule which made it possible for a student to have three examinations a day in some instances) to postpone his middle examination until later in the week. It had been found that few students asked to postpone an examination to a later time. Dr. Delaplane pointed out that the maximum number of examinations under the old plan which a student might have on one day was three. Theoretically under the new plan a student might have five examinations scheduled in one day. Mr. Windsor said that while theoretically it was possible, he doubted if a student would ever have more than four, since most people taking examinations during the 4:30 to 6:30 and 7:30 to 9:30 periods would be Continuing Education students.

Dean Rhodes said that while he could understand that a student would not be taking simultaneously more than one course of English X, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5a, or 24a, he wondered if a student might not be taking concurrently Russian 1a and Aeronautical and Mechanical Engineering 235, for example. Mr. Windsor said that it was possible for some conflicts such as that described by Dean Rhodes to occur. The schedule was planned however, to have a minimum of such conflicts. Mr. Windsor said he had consulted with a number of department heads to determine whether or not it was likely that students would have such conflicts. Such conflicts as might result are, at least as far as can be pre-determined now, highly unlikely.

Dr. Gegenheimer asked if this is a matter which eventually could be predicted, checked, and determined by a machine. Mr. Windsor said that this probably was a programming job which could be handled on the computer later.

Dr. Delaplane asked when the final examination schedule would be printed for distribution. Mr. Windsor said no set date was determined. He would like to publish it as soon as possible since inquiries are being received every week about the examination schedule.

Dr. Gegenheimer then moved adoption of the proposed schedule and the motion was seconded.

Vice President Johnson asked what was the main objective lying behind the recommendation of the Committee of Eleven. He asked was the real purpose of the proposed change to reduce the work involved in preparing final examinations so that only one examination in a course had to be prepared. He said he was concerned about adopting an examination schedule which might make it possible for a student to have four examinations, for example, in one day. How would the institution be a better one by adopting this proposed examination schedule, he asked.

Dr. Gegenheimer replied that one of the main points in the mind of the Committee of Eleven was the fact that many persons who have taught sectioned courses feel that when a number of different examinations are given in the same subject, there is no assurance that students are being fairly tested, that is, all being given tests of equal difficulty. He pointed out that several instructors last year, including Dr. Gustavson who teaches the large Chemistry 2a course via television (and later the Department of Geology had a similar problem in connection with its course taught by television) had asked that the matter be studied, and this had led to the action by the Committee of Eleven.

Dr. Beattie commented that in multiple-sectioned courses such as elementary Spanish and French it is not a matter of reducing the time necessary in preparing the examinations as much as it is one of maintaining effective testing procedures. He pointed out that now many of the more elementary courses are taught by graduate assistants. If each of these inexperienced persons is allowed to make

up his own final examination, the University is losing control of its examination procedure. Common examinations will provide a much fairer system of examining and grading and this should improve University standards, he felt.

Dr. Gegenheimer commented that this was simply an extension into other courses, a practice that has prevailed for many years in Freshman English and in the Humanities course.

Several Senators commented that they felt that some provision should be made to permit students having an excessive number of examinations in one day to postpone one of these and take a makeup at another time. Mr. Windsor pointed out that examinations were not considered on the first or last Saturday nights of the examinations period or on the final Monday night. However, it was felt it would not be desirable to schedule examinations on a Saturday night. Dean Hull asked if Saturday night could be scheduled as a makeup period. Mr. Windsor pointed out that this would obligate certain faculty members to be available on Saturday night to give an examination.

Dr. Bartlett then moved that any student who finds that, because of the examination schedule, he is scheduled to take more than three final examinations in one day, may upon prior notice to the instructor concerned, postpone his examination in the course in which he is enrolled which has the lowest enrollment. Dr. Gegenheimer suggested that if this proposal is adopted, a procedure be developed whereby the student would file an application for permission to adjust the time of certain final examinations with the Office of the Registrar. Provision should also be made to specify a time in which the makeup examination should be taken. Dr. Bartlett said he agreed with Dr. Gegenheimer's suggestion. Dr. Gegenheimer commented that he felt very few students would elect to change the time of an examination anyway.

Several Senators asked if a specific makeup period should be designated but agreement could not be reached on when this should be. Dr. Gegenheimer then suggested that it simply be provided that any student finding that he has more than three examinations scheduled for one day, would arrange with his instructor in the course(s) he is taking that has the smallest enrollment to take a makeup examination at the earliest possible date within the final examination period. Dr. Bartlett said this was completely acceptable to him.

Mr. Windsor pointed out that a student who might find that he had more than three examinations on the last day of examinations could arrange to take a makeup examination in the course whose time of examination is being adjusted to a period earlier in the week.

Dr. Delaplane asked if he was correct in his assumption that Dr. Bartlett's motion was in effect an amendment to Dr. Gegenheimer's original motion. Dr. Bartlett and Dr. Gegenheimer said that they concurred in this understanding. The amendment to the motion then carried with no opposing voice heard.

The original motion was then called for. Dr. Quinn asked when final grades would be due under the proposed schedule. Mr. Windsor said that he assumed that the examination schedule would not change the practice of asking that final grades be turned in within 48 hours after an examination has been given, wherever possible.

Dr. Quinn and Dr. Bartlett then pointed out that under the proposed schedule certain courses with heavy enrollments would fall on the last day of final examinations. This would make it difficult for the instructor concerned to

get his grades to the Registrar's office on time. Mr. Windsor explained that the examination schedule is rotated under a certain system so that instructors over a period of several years have equal experience of having their examinations fall early in the week or late in the week. Dr. Bartlett asked if it were possible to shift the 8:40 TThS sequence to some period earlier in the week because one course in psychology, for example, meeting at that hour has an enrollment of over 800.

Dr. Delaplane then asked members of the Senate to bring to the attention of Mr. Windsor promptly any shifts in the proposed schedule which they thought should be made. Mr. Windsor said he would consult with members of his staff on the feasibility of adjusting the traditional rotating pattern of examination periods.

The question was asked whether or not the final examination schedule could be known prior to registration each semester. Mr. Windsor said this could be arranged. However, it has been the practice at the University of Arizona, partly because of the wishes of the Faculty Senate, that the final examination schedule not be announced prior to the time of registration in order to discourage students selecting their course program according to when final examinations in particular courses would be held.

The question was then called for and carried with several members of the Senate abstaining and Vice President Johnson voting against the motion.

CAMPUS SAFETY COMMITTEE, REPORT FROM: Dr. Gustavson, Chairman of the Campus Safety Committee, presented the following report from the Campus Safety Committee:

1. Following a request from the Campus Safety Committee, a representative from each department, as far as possible, has been appointed to a general committee to which the Campus Safety Committee can communicate.
2. In response to a request from the Campus Safety Committee, these departments have, at this time, submitted over fifty reports bearing on safety conditions in their respective departments.
3. Mr. Robert L. Houston and Mr. William Lersch, both of the Department of Physical Plant, are now members of the Safety Committee. Mr. Houston has indicated a very positive interest in the work of the committee and its recommendations.
4. The Committee has visited a few places on the campus to inform itself first-hand on certain safety problems.
5. One cannot help but be impressed with the wide spectrum of potential hazards that have been reported. It is good to know that the faculty have gone to a great deal of trouble to make the safety reports to the Committee exceedingly valuable.
6. The Committee held only one meeting during the summer. Meetings will be under way at regular intervals from now on.
7. The Committee will make general reports to the Senate from time to time. Specific reports will of course be made to Mr. Houston's office as rapidly as the Campus Safety Committee can evaluate reports coming to it from the departmental representatives.

8. The Committee wishes to express its appreciation and satisfaction to the departments who have made reports through their representatives and to Mr. Houston and Mr. Lersch for their fine cooperation.

Members:	Dr. Leon Blitzer	R. G. Gustavson
	Dr. Myron L. Corrin	Campus Safety Committee
	Mr. Jack B. Flesher	
	Professor Lez Haas	
	Dr. Mitchell G. Vavich	Mr. Robert L. Houston
	Dr. Albert Picchioni	Mr. William Lersch

Dr. Gustavson said he wished particularly to express thanks to Mr. Houston and Mr. Lersch for their cooperation. He said that the matter of campus safety is a big problem and the more one studies it the more one is impressed with the fact that the University is a little universe in itself and safety hazards on the campus are widespread.

Dr. Gustavson said that one interesting development that has come from the series of reports that have been received so far is that Mr. Houston has been provided with much helpful information which he will use in dealing with architects for future buildings to be constructed on the University campus. Certain hazards can be avoided in the construction of buildings which are hard to correct once a building has been constructed.

Dr. Siegel asked if he was correct in his understanding that the committee has been transmitting reports to Mr. Houston's office. Dr. Gustavson said this was correct. He pointed out again however that both Mr. Houston and Mr. Lersch sit regularly with the committee. Dr. Siegel asked if the committee will see to it that anything is done about the reports once they have been submitted. Dr. Gustavson said Mr. Houston has indicated he will report back to the committee on the various reports after they have been considered by his department.

Dr. Delaplane thanked Dr. Gustavson for his report.

PARTICIPATION IN ADVANCED PLACEMENT PROGRAM, REPORT RE: Dr. Delaplane called on Mr. Windsor to report to the Senate on participation in the Advanced Placement Program of students entering the University as new freshman this fall. Mr. Windsor explained for the benefit of the new members of the Senate that the Advanced Placement Program is sponsored by the College Entrance Examination Board. It is a program whereby selected superior high school seniors are given an opportunity (in schools participating in the program) to carry freshman college level course work during their high school senior year. These students then take common examinations given throughout the country on the same day in the spring. Their examination papers are forwarded to Princeton, New Jersey where they are read and graded by readers. The examinations and grade reports along with the actual examination papers are then submitted to the colleges and universities where the students concerned will be enrolling and where the tests are further read and graded by the teaching departments concerned. The departments are not bound to recognize the marks of the graders in Princeton. The departments then inform the Office of the Registrar as to whether advanced placement, advanced placement and credit, or neither advanced placement nor credit is to be awarded each student concerned. The student is informed of the decision as is the high school where he took the advanced placement courses.

Mr. Windsor remarked that University departments have now developed considerable confidence in the Princeton grades but are not obligated to accept these in any way.

Mr. Windsor commented that for the first time this year, this program which has become well established in Tucson School District No. 1 but nowhere else in the state, has for the first time received some slight attention in the Phoenix area. He then gave the following detailed information concerning the participation in the Advanced Placement Program of students entering the University of Arizona in the fall of 1964:

Eighty-five students had their Advanced Placement scores and examination papers sent to the University of Arizona this fall. This involved 104 tests since some students took more than one examination. The 85 students compares with 61 students in 1963, 53 in 1962 and 22 in 1960.

36 of these students came from Rincon High School, 9 from Tucson High School, 4 from Palo Verde, 3 from Catalina High School, 2 from Camelback in Phoenix, 1 from West High School in Phoenix, 1 from Central High School in Phoenix. The other 29 students came from 28 out-of-state high schools.

19 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in Chemistry. 11 of these students were given some degree credit in Chemistry (3 received 4 credits and 8 received 8 credits).

13 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in Biology. Five students were awarded degree credit, eight received no credit.

21 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in Mathematics. Nine students were awarded degree credit, 11 students were awarded no credit, one did not apply for admission to the University.

6 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in American History. Four students received degree credit, 2 students received no credit or placement.

5 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in European History. Two students received degree credit, 3 students received no credit or placement.

1 student took the Advanced Placement Examination in Physics and received 8 credits.

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

1 student took the Advanced Placement Examination in German and received no degree credit or placement.

6 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in Spanish and none received degree credit or placement.

31 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in English. 10 students were granted Advanced Placement, 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) they were permitted to skip; 14 students received Advanced Placement only, were permitted to register for English 2; and 7 students received no advanced placement or degree credit.

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

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:50 P.M.

David L. Windsor, Secretary

ADDENDUM TO THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF OCTOBER 5, 1964

A Report to the Faculty on the Work of
THE COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN
October 1963-May 1964

This summary presents briefly the composition of and major topics discussed and acted upon by the Committee of Eleven at the 14 meetings it held during the year 1963-64.

1. Membership and elected officers for 1963-64:

Dr. Albert Gegenheimer (ex officio), Chairman of the Faculty
Dr. Leon Blitzer, Secretary January-June 1964
Dr. Emil S. Gavlak (elected to fill vacancy, Feb. 1964)
Dr. Emil W. Haury
Dr. A. Richard Kassander (resigned Oct. 1963)
Dr. Arthur R. Kemmerer (resigned summer 1963)
Dr. Edwin B. Kurtz
Dr. A. Laurence Muir
Miss Patricia Paylore, Chairman
Prof. Joseph L. Picard (elected to fill vacancy Dec. 1963)
Dr. William J. Pistor (resigned Feb. 1964)
Dr. J. Melvin Rhodes, Secretary Oct.-Dec. 1963;(resigned Dec. 1963)
Dr. Renato Rosaldo (elected to fill vacancy Oct. 1963)
Dr. Cornelius Steelink (elected to fill vacancy Oct. 1963)
Dr. Mitchell G. Vavich

2. Recommendations on the following matters were submitted to the Faculty Senate:

- a) Establishment of a standing University Committee on Safety. Passed.
- b) Relaxation of the University's policy on nepotism to permit the employment of married graduate assistants and other temporary personnel in the same department. Debated, but no action taken.
- c) Establishment of a faculty committee to work with the President's office in the preparation of the revisions to "The Manual of Procedure and Policy for Faculty and Staff." Passed.
- d) Revision of the University's scheduling of final examinations. Debated. Of eight points offered, one was adopted, two were adopted provisionally, one was rendered unnecessary by previous Senate action, and three were passed over without action.

3. Recommendation on the creation of a University Committee on Advanced Placement. Sent to University Administration. Under consideration.

4. Discussion with the University Administration about the feasibility of computerized master faculty and staff file. Under consideration.

5. Discussion and investigation on the following topics will be continued during the sessions of the new Committee for 1964-65:

- a) Military Loyalty Oath
- b) Religion-in-Life Week

6. The Committee also reviewed the University's policy on Summer School contracts and pay scales, and made recommendations to the Summer School administration for improvements in timing and communication with the general Faculty.
7. The Committee discussed briefly the crowded condition in the Faculty dining room, but agreed that no amelioration was possible without capital expansion.
8. The Committee discussed the possibility of advances for authorized field expenses, but found that except in unusual cases of prolonged absence, the policy will not permit such advances.
9. Campus traffic problems were reviewed, and recommendations were made to the Physical Plant for expediting traffic off campus at certain peak hours.

- - - - -

This report will give an indication of the range of problems handled by the Committee of Eleven. As the Faculty Manual states, "the main function of this committee is to act as a channelway in initiating action for the solution of problems of concern to the faculty and the University." Members of the faculty may address communications to the Chairman or the Secretary of the Committee.