

The University of Arizona
Proceedings of the Faculty Senate

Meeting of Monday

April 11, 1960

PRESENT: Bateman, Bogart, Brewer, Carlson, Carpenter, Crowell, Forrester, Gegenheimer, Harvill, Haury, Hausenbauer, Irwin, Little, Livermore, McDonald, Martin, Mead, Mees, Murphy, Myers, Patrick, Picard, Pistor, Rhodes, Slonaker, Tucker, Wallraff, Windsor, Zapotocky.

ABSENT: Andersen, Blitzer, Casaday, Denton, Ewing, Gaines, Howard, Hurlbutt, Lyons, Marcoux, Merritt, Nugent, Rosaldo, Roy.

CATALOGUE MATERIAL: The Senate accepted proposed catalogue material as follows:

SUMMER SESSION 1960 - P.E. 252, Health Programs, Problems and Applied Physiology (3), changed to P.E. 252s, Health Programs, Problems and Applied Physiology (2); P.E. 264, Supervision of Play and Playgrounds (3), changed to P.E. 264s, Supervision of Play and Playgrounds (2).

NEW COURSES - (In-service Institute for Teachers courses): Bacteriology 8201, Microbiology for High School Teachers; Mathematics 8115, Foundations in Arithmetic; Mathematics 8141, Modern Elementary Mathematics; Mathematics 8241, Topics in Modern Mathematics; Botany 8100a, Principles and Experiments in Biology for the Junior High School Teacher; Zoology 8100b, Principles and Experiments in Biology for the Junior High School Teacher; Botany 8102, Integrated Elementary Biology; Botany 8205, Genetics and Cytogenetics for High School Teachers; Zoology 8102 (Identical with Botany 8102); Zoology 8205 (Identical with Botany 8205).

The Senate also accepted a new In-service Institute course, Physics 8094a, b, Physical Science for the Elementary and Junior High School Teacher, with the understanding that the title of the course would be further studied by the Science Education Committee. Dr. Carpenter objected to the present title. It was his feeling that the term Physical Sciences implied that Astronomy, Chemistry, and Geology would be included in the course, where as a matter of fact, only topics in Physics are to be presented.

Dr. Patrick pointed out that the National Science Foundation had approved this title when making the grant to support it.

There was some division of opinion among members of the Senate as to whether or not the term "Physical Science" as used in the title did imply that the course would include all areas of physical science.

Dr. Murphy suggested that "Topics in Physical Science" be substituted for "Physical Science". Dr. Crowell pointed out that this course is for elementary and junior high school teachers and such teachers will not register for a course bearing a title referring to Physics only.

Dr. Gegenheimer stated that a title other than the one suggested probably would give the impression that this is an ordinary course in Physics. He stated that to him "Physical Science" meant something somewhat different from "Physical Sciences." If the course were called "Physical Sciences for the Elementary and Junior High School Teacher," he could agree with Dr. Carpenter, but this is not the case.

Mr. Windsor then read the syllabus of the course. Dr. Carpenter stated he felt the syllabus sustained his point.

Dr. Gegenheimer stated that if the National Science Foundation had raised no objection to the title as submitted and if to change the title might risk failing to attract the teachers the course is designed to attract, it seemed to him unwise to change the title of the course.

Dr. Tucker commented he thought some high school teachers would be disillusioned if they registered for a course entitled Physical Science and found it was limited to topics in Physics.

Dr. Carpenter stated that a good course in Physics is desperately needed in the high school curriculum and this proposed course could be a step in preparing teachers for such a high school course. It was then pointed out to him, however, that this course is not designed for high school teachers but for elementary and junior high school teachers.

Dr. Gegenheimer then moved that the Senate approve this course, but that the Science Education Committee be asked to consider whether or not the title should be changed in the light of the discussion in the Senate. It was understood that the final decision as to the title of the course should lie with the Science Education Committee. This motion was seconded by Dr. Carpenter and passed without a dissenting vote.

HONORARY DEGREES, RECOMMENDATIONS RE: The Senate voted to recommend the award of four honorary degrees at the Commencement exercises in June 1960. The recommendations next are to be considered by the General Faculty. Announcement of the degrees will be made upon approval by the Board of Regents.

COMMITTEE ON SABBATICAL LEAVE POLICY, REPORT OF: Dr. Patrick, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Sabbatical Leaves submitted the following report from his committee:

REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON SABBATICAL LEAVES
Submitted April 11, 1960

The Senate Committee on Sabbatical Leaves has reviewed the present sabbatical leave practices at The University of Arizona and has examined a survey, "A Sabbatical Leave Survey Among Forty Selected Colleges and Universities," made by Charles H. Dailey, Oregon State College, 1955-56. Dailey found that among the 37 colleges answering his questionnaire, 24 had sabbatical leave policies with various minor differences.

The Committee hoped, at first, to be able to define rather exactly the purposes appropriate to sabbatical leaves and perhaps provide a scale of merit for projects of various types. It was found on further study that the appropriateness of projects is related closely to special circumstances in the many departments comprising the University, and that acceptable criteria could not be reduced to a simple pattern common to all divisions.

In the plan proposed, there is latitude for department heads and deans to take special circumstances into account in estimating the merits of a particular application.

The following provisions for a sabbatical leave policy are those judged by the committee to be generally applicable.

1) The sabbatical leave is understood to be an award made in meritorious cases to members of the faculty who have served continuously at the University on either a ten- or twelve-months' basis for a period of at least six years and who submit a sabbatical project beneficial to the faculty member receiving the award and to The University of Arizona.

2) A primary consideration in the granting of sabbatical leaves will be the scholarly value of the proposed project. Applications will be reviewed by the head of the department, the dean of the college, and by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Final approval is the prerogative of the President of the University. The head of the department will obtain evaluations of the project by persons of recognized competence in the applicant's field of study. The best interests of The University of Arizona will be an important factor in the consideration of applications.

3) Service counted towards requirements for sabbatical leave begins with appointment to an instructorship or an equivalent rank on the faculty, but sabbatical leaves will be granted preferably to members of the faculty who have attained the level of assistant professor or a higher level, or the equivalent of such ranks. Department heads and directors are eligible for sabbatical leave, although it is recognized that arrangements for sabbatical leaves for persons in these positions might be difficult.

4) Service applicable to sabbatical leave is not accumulated by those on part-time appointments.

5) The award shall be either for one or two semesters. If the sabbatical leave is for two semesters, the amount of the award will be three-fifths of the recipient's salary; if the award is for one semester, it will be full pay for that period.

6) It is appropriate that members of the faculty receiving salary grants for two consecutive semesters of sabbatical leave supplement this income through fellowship or scholarship awards or grants-in-aid. They may not accept employment during the period of sabbatical leave if such employment would be detrimental to the purposes for which the sabbatical leave is granted. Additional compensation expected is to be fully explained, and approved before the leave is granted, on the application form; opportunities developing later must be cleared.

7) Applications for either or both semesters of the following year must be filed not later than February 1 on forms provided. Applications may be withdrawn without prejudice to further applications provided reasonable notice is given.

8) The privilege of sabbatical leave is not forfeited because of the failure to apply for or to take sabbatical leave when the required period of service has been completed, but following a sabbatical leave, six years of further service are required before the faculty member can become eligible for a second sabbatical.

9) A member of the faculty granted sabbatical leave is expected to recognize an obligation to return to The University of Arizona for not less than one year of further service; but if he does not return, he is expected to return the amount of the grant.

10) On completion of the sabbatical leave, and not later than the end of the first semester thereafter, a concise final report shall be filed covering the attainment of the purposes stated in the application.

11) These policies shall be effective beginning with the academic year of 1961-62.

David L. Patrick, Chairman
Professor H. D. Christensen
Dr. Henry Freiser
Dean Shaw Livermore
Dr. C. F. Wallraff.

The Senate members discussed the report at length, suggesting several revisions. The Senate then voted to receive the report and to hold it for further consideration.

Meanwhile, members of the faculty were urged to submit to Vice President Patrick their comments or suggestions about the committee's report. Faculty reaction to the proposal is desired before it formally is adopted as official University policy.

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Harvill reported to the Senate that the recent legislative session had appropriated most of the operating budget for the University for 1960-61 requested by the Board of Regents. There had been slight cuts in the requested increase in the travel and capital categories and the legislature had not appropriated money to finance the state's absorbing part of the cost of premiums for the University's life insurance program. As a matter of fact, a special provision was written into the appropriations bill prohibiting the Regents' expending state funds for this.

The President stated he was not optimistic about gaining legislative support for the state's financing part of the cost of the life insurance programs at the institutions of higher learning.

Dr. Harvill mentioned that the capital outlay appropriation had been approved in full as requested. However, the House had failed to sustain the Senate's approval of the funds requested for land acquisition (\$500,000).

The President mentioned that beginning with the new fiscal year the per diem maximum for in-state travel would be increased from \$9 to \$10 and the maximum for out-of-state travel would be increased from \$12 to \$15.

The President stated that he intends to request the Board of Regents for an increase in salaries for 1961-62, especially in the ranks of professor and associate professor and the two corresponding ranks for those engaged in research and other services. In those two levels the University compares very poorly with other institutions with which we wish to be compared. We are in a more favorable position in the assistant professor and instructor ranks. Of course, assistant professors and instructors should be concerned with the floors for the higher ranks as they look ahead to advancement, Dr. Harvill pointed out. He said he is considering a recommendation that the floor for full professors on ten-month appointment be raised from \$7850, the floor for 1960-61, to \$9000 for 1961-62. Of course attention would be given to some increases for persons of all ranks on the basis of merit. The President stated he felt thinking in terms of blanket percentage increases should be avoided. The idea of automatic percentage increases often encourages unfavorable public opinion, he explained.

Dr. Harvill stated there was no question but that full justification could be made for raising the floors of the top two ranks. He said he was convinced the University must look ahead to substantial salary increases in the next few years, particularly at the upper two levels, that he has told the Board of Regents that unless plans are made to raise the floor for professors to \$14,000 to \$15,000 within the next few years, the University of Arizona is going to be outbid by other institutions because certainly a number of other universities are planning to raise their levels for professors to such amounts in the next five or six years.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

David L. Windsor, Secretary