

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, December 5, 1960 Room 101, Old Law Building

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:40 P.M. on Monday, December 5, 1960, in Room 101 of the old Law Building. Thirty-one members were present with President Harvill presiding. Miss Jean Wilson was present in Dean Carlson's absence. Dr. David L. Patrick, Dr. Charles O. Hucker, and Dr. Arthur H. Beattie also attended the meeting.

PRESENT: Blitzer, Brewer, Danielson, Ewing, Gegenheimer, Gillmor, Gustavson, Harvill, Haury, Hausenbauer, Humphrey, Irwin, Little, Livermore, McDonald, McMillan, Marcoux, Merritt, Murphy, H. Myers, L. Myers, Nugent, Picard, Pistor, Rhodes, Rosaldo, Roy, Tucker, Wallraff, Windsor, Zapotocky.

ABSENT: Carlson, Casaday, Conley, Denton, Forrestey, Gaines, Howard, Hunt, Lyons, Martin, Mead, Moore, Slonaker.

WELCOME OF DR. PAUL DANIELSON TO THE SENATE: President Harvill welcomed Professor Paul Danielson to the Senate. At the last meeting, Dr. Danielson had been elected as a replacement during the present semester for Dr. Robert H. Hurlbutt, who is on leave from the University until the opening of the spring semester.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of November 7 were approved as distributed to members of the Senate.

GENERAL COMMENTS BY PRESIDENT-HARVILL: President Harvill reported briefly to the Senate on the recent meeting of the Board of Regents. He announced that the proposed catalogue changes for the next biennium had been approved by the Board as submitted.

The President remarked that he had informed the Board that the University hoped to obtain some \$200,000 from the Federal government under the provisions of the National Defense Education Act in the next year. A considerable amount of this sum will be for the development of new programs, including several new Ph.D. programs. Dr. Harvill stated that it was being less than realistic to fail to realize that the amount of financial support for higher education which will be forthcoming from the Federal government in the next few years will increase substantially. He reminded the Senate that Federal financial aid was not new for this University. This institution, along with a number of others, has long received financial support from the Federal government, some of the funds going for salaries.

The President indicated that the new capital outlay requests of the three institutions had been studied by the Board. While no final decisions were reached, the President felt that it was likely the Board would not approve the full amount requested by the University. Further action will be taken by the Board on the capital outlay requests at the next meeting, tentatively scheduled for December 30.

The President reported that the Board of Regents had formally approved the revised statement of policy concerning sabbatical leaves as jointly proposed by the faculties of the three state institutions of higher learning. (See later item in these minutes concerning Sabbatical Leave Policy.)

The President took occasion to comment on the success of the campaign for passage of Proposition 100 at the recent general election. This proposition when it becomes law will permit the University to employ selected aliens as members of the University faculty. The President noted that there had been no organized opposition to this proposal. He complimented the fine work done by the special University committee created to work in the interest of passage of Proposition 100. Chairman of this group was Dr. Klonda Lynn. Dr. Harvill indicated the University would move slowly in the employment of alien faculty members. Some interpretation of the new law would be needed, he pointed out. For example, just what positions are included under "faculty" in this instance? Dr. Harvill indicated he planned to confer with the Presidents of the other two institutions to the end that all three institutions would follow a uniform procedure in the employment of aliens.

Dr. Nugent stated that he felt particular praise for their hard work in support of Proposition 100 should go to the student committee representing the Associated Students who had worked enthusiastically in the interest of this matter. He mentioned also the support given the measure by the Tucson Chamber of Commerce. Dean Myers had spoken to that body in support of the measure.

REGISTRAR'S REPORT ON MIGRATION OF STUDENTS: Mr. Windsor distributed to members of the Senate copies of a report on Student Migration, showing the number of Arizona students who were graduated from Arizona High Schools in the spring of 1958 who had entered college the following fall in institutions in other states. The report showed the number of "out migrations" from Arizona, by men and women, to each state in the union. The report also showed the percentage of each state's freshman students who had left their home state to attend an out-of-state institution in the fall of 1958. Members of the Senate were pleased to note that the percentage of "out migration" for Arizona as compared with the percentages for other states was very low (12%). Only five states showed a lower percentage of "out-migration."

FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ENCOURAGEMENT OF SUPERIOR STUDENTS: The Senate next turned its attention to further consideration of the report of the committee on the Encouragement of Superior Students.

Dr. Tucker remarked that he felt the report really could be divided into two separate sections. One has to do with the attracting of superior students to this institution. The other concerns changing procedures in a variety of areas within the University.

Dr. Hucker responded that he was not sure that the committee's report could be so arbitrarily divided into two parts. He said that he hoped the early section of the report which deals with the development of an honors program would be given formal endorsement by the Senate.

Dr. Gegenheimer then moved that the Senate accept the committee report and that the Senate urge the creation of an honors program, details to be determined later; further, that the other portions of the report be forwarded to the various individuals, administrative and otherwise concerned, as an expression of the interest of the Senate in these areas and as suggestions which might be helpful to them as they develop their respective programs.

Dr. Gegenheimer explained that the only commitment his motion would make would be to the development of an honors program. No particular type of honors program was recommended, he emphasized. The development of a unique study program for superior students would be the responsibility of Dr. Beattie, as already established.

Dr. Gegenheimer's motion was seconded by Dean Rhodes.

Dr. Murphy said he thought the committee's report, in full, was a good one. He felt, however, that many of the general items included in the report should be carefully discussed in the Senate before they were routinely forwarded to the departments concerned as recommendations.

At this point Dr. Harvill invited Dr. Gustavson to comment on the committee's report. The President stated that he thought Dr. Gustavson's wide experience over a period of years as a professor and as an administrator in several types of institutions would be helpful.

Dr. Gustavson, admitting he was speaking completely extemporaneously, said he would warn the Senate to look clearly at all facts before drawing conclusions which might not be properly warranted. Moreover, he counseled that the University should be very careful in adopting a "philosophy of selection." We should not forget, he pointed out, that there is always a "middle curve" group, a "large number of intelligent followers." "We must not forget our responsibilities as a state University to the average youngster. The average youngster has the right to the best education that he is capable of accepting and we are capable of giving him, in order that he as an individual might best be prepared to stand up in our complex society," he said.

Dr. Gustavson reminded the Senate that we can all find instances where a mediocre student in high school has proved to be an excellent student in the University or where a mediocre student in the University has molded a distinguished professional career later in life.

Dr. Hucker remarked that it had at no time been his committee's intention to suggest that the University of Arizona should attempt to make itself a Harvard of the West or to limit its teaching to only the top 10% of Arizonans, etc. However, the committee had felt that it would be appropriate for the University to give more attention to the better students since it was assumed the proposed development of a junior college system in the state would mean that the University would be in a position to raise its admission standards without at the same time denying students an opportunity for further education in a public institution. Dr. Hucker said the committee had understood its mandate was to deal with the problems of superior students, not the problems of average students. The committee had been concerned about the numbers of superior students in the high schools who are not coming to the University of Arizona. How could such students be attracted to the University, and, once here, how could they be so stimulated that they would perform to a high capacity and be so satisfied with the institution that they would be pleased to remain? Dr. Hucker explained it was hoped all of this could be accomplished without fostering a reputation among the high schools that the University of Arizona is too difficult a school for any but the very best high school students.

President Harvill commented at this point that those responsible for developing a junior college system in the state should realize that junior college education is not cheap education if it is to be truly higher education. A junior college is not

simply an extension of high school, or at least it should not be. A good junior college system such as that developed in the state of California is very costly.

Dr. Gegenheimer commented on Dr. Murphy's remarks pointing out that he felt that if the Senate discussed in detail the various sections of the report, discussing recommendations concerning the various areas of University activity, the Senate would be unable to move on to other business for months to come, its time being fully occupied month after month with this report.

Dean Myers stated that he felt that the committee's report, with which he was in sympathy, should be accepted. However, he questioned whether or not the report should be distributed at this time. He felt it certainly should not be issued until after each recommendation concerning a particular area of University activity had been approved section by section. He then moved an amendment to Dr. Gegenheimer's motion which would eliminate the second part of the motion. That is, the original motion then would be simply to accept the report, with the understanding that the recommendation to establish some sort of honors program would be implemented as promptly as possible. Dean Myers's motion to amend Dr. Gegenheimer's original motion was seconded by Dr. Zapotocky. This motion then carried.

Dr. Gegenheimer's original motion as amended (with the latter part of the motion deleted) was then passed.

Dr. McDonald then stated that he fully agreed with Dr. Murphy's earlier remarks. He felt that the Senate had appropriately taken a positive action in setting up an honors program. He was disappointed, however, that a number of other recommendations by Dr. Hucker's committee were simply being more or less passed over. The entire nation is at the present time seeking ways and means of bettering education, he pointed out. The high schools have taken some definite steps to raise standards. He said he felt the University must do something about further raising its admission requirements. He said he agreed with Dr. Gustavson that we must not take steps to block entry into the channels of education those who have potentials but have not performed. On the other hand, he felt our entrance requirements are such that some very weak students gain admission into the institution. As an example he cited the number of students who are unable to meet the very low standards of performance required for admission to English 1. Dr. McDonald said he felt the University should give attention to setting up entrance examinations in both Mathematics and English.

Dean Livermore said that he agreed the Senate should adopt many of the proposals but he had counted forty-seven separate recommendations covering the whole wide range of University activities. The Senate simply could not properly consider so many different proposals in less than a year's time, he felt.

Dr. Hucker said at this point he wished to apologize to the Senate for taking up so much of its time, and he appreciated the expression of support of the principles that the committee had concerned itself with in preparing the report. He stated that the committee had not expected the Senate to take up the various matters point by point and adopt them or reach conclusions about each of them. He wondered if the Senate would care to take some action simply indicating general support of the recommendations and call upon the responsible persons, officers, or agencies of the University to use these as guidance in the future development of their programs.

Dr. Tucker stated he felt the best approach to the matter would be to ask the Senatemenbers to select any items discussed in the report in which they are particularly interested and submit specific recommendations concerning them to

the Senate. For instance, he said he himself might later bring in a specific recommendation concerning the University's policy on disqualification for poor scholarship.

This procedure met with general approval of the Senate membership.

Dr. Hucker stated he would be glad to attend Senate meetings in the future if his presence was desired to assist in any way in discussion which might be forthcoming concerning any of the specific proposals made in the latter part of the committee report.

SABBATICAL LEAVE POLICY: Dr. Patrick pointed out that the Sabbatical Leave Policy recently approved by the Board of Regents was virtually that approved last year by the Faculty Senate of the University. Certain refinements had been made in the statement, however, following consultation with representatives of the faculties of Arizona State University and Arizona State College. The Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona had not subsequently formally approved the final revised statement as submitted to the Board of Regents. A draft of the final version had been furnished all members of the Senate some weeks earlier.

Dean Livermore then moved that the final version of the Sabbatical Leave Policy as drafted in conference by representatives of the faculties of the three state institutions of higher learning, be approved by the Senate. Dean Myers seconded the motion and it carried.

OTHER MATTERS: Dean Livermore said that he hoped the Senate would give consideration at its next meeting to two matters. One was a proposal that the privilege of including in the graduation grade average (normally based on work in residence only) the grade in one elective course taken at another institution, be adjusted to make it possible to include in the major grade average the grade in one course in the major field taken at another institution.

The other item was a proposal to abolish the present requirement that a detailed record be kept of all petitions handled by the various college course adjustment groups each year and an annual report of all course adjustment actions made to the Senate. Dean Livermore said that this procedure requires a great amount of work in a number of University offices and felt it serves no worthwhile purpose.

It was agreed that both these matters would be on the agenda of the next meeting of the Senate.

Meeting adjourned at 5:35 P.M.



David L. Windsor, Secretary