

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
Monday, January 6, 1969 Room 350 Modern Languages

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:40 p.m. on Monday, January 6, 1969, in the Modern Languages Building auditorium (Room 350). Forty members were present with Vice President McMillan presiding.

**PRESENT:** Ares, Armstrong, Bingham, Blecha, Brewer, Burton, Cockrum, Damon, Davis, Delaplaine, Dewhirst, DuVal, Forrester, Gegenheimer, Gould, Green, Hall, Harris, Hetrick, Hull, Johnson, Kemmerer, Kruttsch, Leonard, McMillan, Myers, Paylore, Resnick, Rhodes, Roy, Shields, Skinner, Sorensen, Spicer, Steelink, Svob, Thompson, Voris, Wilson, and Windsor. Professor Louis Battan also attended the meeting.

**ABSENT:** Bok, Carlson, Gaines, Harvill, Joyner, Kassander, Krebs, Little, Lynn, Marcoux, Martin, McDonald, Mees, Murphy, Patrick, and Paulsen.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes of the meeting of December 2, 1968 were approved as distributed to members.

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION OF MEMBERS OF THE SENATE, COMMENT RE:** Chairman McMillan referred to two items which had recently been furnished each member of the Senate for their information. The first was an ACT Class Profile Report of College-Bound High School Seniors 1967-68 in comparison with ACT Percentiles for New Students at the University of Arizona 1968-69. This report, submitted to the President, had been prepared by Vice President Delaplaine. The second item was a copy of an address by Sidney Hook, Professor of Philosophy at New York University, entitled "The Trojan Horse in American Education", presented at a general session of the November, 1968 convention of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

**SUGGESTED SENATE ACTION CONFIRMING THAT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA DOES NOT RESTRICT HIRING ON ETHNIC, RELIGIOUS, OR RACIAL GROUNDS:** The Secretary read the following communication addressed to the Faculty Senate from Dr. Harvey Cohn, formerly Head of the Department of Mathematics:

"As a former department head, I feel qualified to state from my own experience that the administration of the University of Arizona has never restricted hiring in Mathematics on ethnic, religious, or racial grounds during the period of my tenure (1958-67). In fact such matters were never even mentioned.

"I am sure that other current and past department heads will be prepared to make similar statements. In Mathematics, the situation may be special. I do not recall a single black applicant for a faculty position and extremely few such applicants for graduate assistantships.

"It is obvious that such statements are normally embarrassing and superfluous, but the possibility exists that the absence of such support for President Harvill at the present time might be misinterpreted by the students and public.

"Might I suggest that such support could come also from the Faculty Senate?"

Dr. Steelink commented that he thought it would be appropriate for the Senate to request creation of a special committee to study the matter of developing a curriculum of Black Studies. Mr. McMillan said he felt that was a question not related to the point of Dr. Cohn's letter. Dean Brewer said that it could be stated that all divisions of the institution have been fair in not restricting hiring on racial grounds.

Dr. Damon commented that there are sins of omission as well as sins of commission. It is not enough, he said, just to say that certain restrictions have not prevailed. Rather, the University should take the initiative to act positively in seeking out qualified persons from minority groups. He said that no one can deny the fact that racial discrimination has been practiced on the University of Arizona campus. He said the discrimination practiced within fraternities and sororities at this institution is an example of this. There is no question that the Negro has been misused and mistreated in American society, he stated. He cited as another example the prejudice against blacks in the mining industry in Arizona. Because so many sins have been committed against blacks for so long, an institution like the University should deliberately try to find black intellectuals, actively seeking them out and inviting them to join our faculty, Dr. Damon concluded.

Dr. Gegenheimer said that the Senate is not in a position to take action as suggested by Dr. Cohn. The Senate is not involved in the hiring of faculty members. Administrative officers such as college deans could appropriately make statements if they wish to do so.

Mr. McMillan then asked Mr. Windsor to communicate the thanks of the Senate to Dr. Cohn for his communication and explain that it was felt that this was not a matter appropriate for Senate action.

Mr. McMillan informed the Senate that a statement by President Harvill, who is presently out of the state, would be issued on January 10 responding to a number of demands which had been presented him in mid-December shortly before the Christmas vacation by representatives of black students and other groups.

RULING REGARDING EXEMPTION OF TAX-SHELTERED ANNUITIES FROM ARIZONA STATE INCOME TAX, DISCUSSION RE: Mr. McMillan reported that Dr. David Hetrick, a member of the Senate, had been asked to submit a resolution for consideration by the Senate at this meeting whereby the Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona would request the Board of Regents to seek from the Attorney General of the State of Arizona a ruling regarding the exemption of Tax-Sheltered Annuities from Arizona State Income Tax. Mr. McMillan explained that the Arizona Attorney General had already been requested to make such a ruling and had declined to do so inasmuch as he is the attorney for the Arizona State Tax Commission as well as the attorney for the Board of Regents and he therefore did not feel he could appropriately make a ruling. Therefore, Mr. McMillan explained, steps are being taken to bring suit against the Arizona State Tax Commission on the part of the employees of the three state universities concerned in this matter. Further information concerning the question should be forthcoming in the near future.

RECONSIDERATION OF SENATE ACTION ESTABLISHING INTERMEDIATE GRADES OF B+, C+, AND D+, APPROVAL OF: Mr. McMillan said he had been informed some members of the Senate wished reconsideration of the Senate action in November establishing intermediate grades of B+, C+, and D+.

Dean Roy explained that he had moved in favor of the motion establishing such grades at the November meeting. He then moved that this matter be reconsidered by the Senate. The motion was seconded by Dr. Blecha.

Mr. McMillan explained that Professor Louis Battan, a member of the faculty who had become concerned about this matter when he learned of the November Senate action, had prepared a statement of his position which had been furnished each member of the Senate. Dr. Battan was at the Senate meeting by invitation, and Mr. McMillan asked him to speak at this time.

Dr. Battan then summarized his position. His full statement was as follows:

"Summary

"At the November 18, 1968 meeting, the Faculty Senate adopted two motions dealing with the University grading system. The first motion calls for the 'Reversal of the present numerical equivalency with 4.0 being the high grade of A, etc.' The second action was the adoption of the following recommendation:

'Intermediate grades of B+, C+, and D+ be made available to those faculty members who care to use them.'

"For reasons given below, it appears that the action dealing with intermediate grades may have been taken without adequate consideration by the faculty at large and may not be in the best interests of the entire University.

"In view of the very important nature of this action, it is requested that the Faculty Senate reconsider it, and that the arguments for and against it be examined in greater depth.

"Background

"The proposed changes in the grading system were recommended by a committee of the Senate chaired by Professor Louis A. Myers. The justifications for adopting intermediate grades are given in the committee's report under a section entitled 'Provisions for More Flexibility in the Grading System.' It is noted that in the College of Law, the Graduate College, and the Music Department, there tends to be a 'bunching of students at various levels of performance.' The arguments for intermediate grades are the following:

1. They would be helpful to instructors who must now agonize over grades.
2. They would facilitate the operation of various colleges and departments by having a finer division of grades.

The committee report suggests a lack of enthusiasm for the idea among other faculty by noting, 'A number of persons with whom the committee consulted felt it would be difficult for instructors to make fine-enough evaluations in order to award such intermediate grades.' The report goes on to make the statement: 'However, it follows that should some instructors wish to do so, it would be appropriate to make such grades available to them.' It is not at all clear that this conclusion follows from the preceding discussion. The action adopted by the Senate affects not only the instructors who now wish to use intermediate grades, it affects the entire University, and should be viewed in that light.

"Discussion by the Senate

"The minutes of the meeting of the Senate on November 18 do not reflect an extensive evaluation of the consequences of the use of intermediate grades. Several senators indicated that they favored greater flexibility in grading. Another senator stated that the use of intermediate grades would not reduce his agonizing over the award of grades. Professor L. Myers stated that 'the use of intermediate grades is uncommon at other colleges and universities' but a minority of schools 'do use them'. Dean Ares said that he felt it was a substantial minority.

"Arguments for Postponing Adoption of Intermediate Grades

"If only a minority of other colleges and universities employ intermediate grades, why should the University of Arizona join the minority?

"A major reason for adopting the A = 4.0, B = 3.0, etc., system is that 80 percent or more of the universities throughout the country use that system. By adopting it, we have taken the reasonable step of bringing our procedures into conformity with those in common use. Having done so, it is inconsistent to take the second step of adopting intermediate grades, and hence putting us out of step with the great majority of universities.

"The arguments for intermediate grades will not be persuasive until satisfactory answers to the following questions have been obtained:

1. If the faculty at most other universities can function satisfactorily without intermediate grades, why cannot our faculty do the same?
2. How does the faculty at large feel about intermediate grades?
3. How will other universities and faculties view the University of Arizona's adoption of intermediate grades? Will our reputation be enhanced?
4. Why is the 'bunching' of grades such a serious problem? If it is, are there other means for reducing the bunching of students at various grade levels?
5. As noted by one senator, in light of attempts to reduce emphasis on grades, is it wise to make the grading system more detailed?
6. Will intermediate grades be beneficial to the students? The arguments for adopting them have dealt mostly with possible benefits to instructors and administrators. What will be the consequences on student performance and education?
7. Should the view of student leaders be sought before making such important changes in the grading system?
8. Should not the Senate have more hard facts before committing the University to a course of action with which it will have to live for a long time?"

The question was then called for, and the motion to reconsider the Senate action in connection with intermediate grades carried.

Dr. Gegenheimer said that in his judgment this matter was not being handled correctly. The Faculty Constitution provides a procedure whereby a member of the faculty who objects to action taken by the Senate can, by obtaining the signatures of a specified number of members of the faculty, petition the Chairman of the Faculty to call a special meeting of the General Faculty to consider the matter concerned. Dean Roy said that it had been his suggestion that the matter might be reconsidered by the Senate. The subject had arisen in a recent meeting of the faculty of the College of Liberal Arts. Dean Roy said he saw no harm in the Senate's agreeing to reconsider a matter that it had previously acted on, if it wished to do so. Dean Roy then moved that the question of establishing new intermediate grades of B+, C+, and D+ be referred back to the special Senate committee which had studied the grading system for further review, and that that group be requested to poll the General Faculty to obtain faculty opinion on this question. Dr. Gegenheimer seconded that motion.

Dean Ares said it seemed to him that certain points made by Dr. Battan, if completely followed, would solidify the status quo. He also questioned the logic of some of Dr. Battan's conclusions. He said that certainly from the point of view of law education the bunching of grades in the C range presents serious problems and it is important to be able to distinguish between a C and a C+.

Dr. Battan commented that he wondered if the special committee, in coming to its conclusions, had a sufficiently complete picture of the opinion of the faculty at large in this matter. Professor Davis pointed out that he had been a member of the study committee, and the committee had indeed talked with a representative group of faculty members and had felt that they had obtained a balance of different opinions concerning this proposal. He said he personally would dislike for the committee to have to work further on this question since the members had already worked hard and long. He thought it would be an onerous chore for the committee to have to poll the faculty. In any event, he said he hoped the Law College would be permitted to use the intermediate grades.

Mr. Windsor asked Dean Ares if it were not true that a number of law schools used a grading system different from or with variations from that used by the rest of the institution of which they were a part. Dean Ares said he did not know if this were true or not. Dr. Burton asked if it were feasible mechanically to begin using such intermediate grades. Mr. Windsor explained that it was feasible given enough lead time and adequate staffing and financing. It would require a major reprogramming procedure as well as the redesign of many office forms. The Registrar's Office is already involved in a number of other conversion projects, some of which will still take some months or even years to complete. It has been estimated that it would cost a minimum of \$30,000 to convert from the present grading system of 1, 2, 3, 4 to A, B+, B, C+, C, D+, D. Mr. Windsor had reviewed the financial aspects of this particular conversion with the President and it appears that the earliest time the new grading system adopted by the Senate in November could be activated would be September, 1971. The Senate action had provided, however, that the new system was to take effect only when staff and finances made it possible to implement the change.

Mr. Windsor remarked that changes of this sort, assuming they are feasible, should be considered on the basis of whether or not they are educationally desirable and sound and not on the basis of the amount of extra work they would create.

Dr. Steelink asked if it were feasible for different colleges within the University to use different grading procedures.

Professor Green said that he was opposed to the intermediate grades because they seemed to him to go against the current trend in American universities to use fewer grades. He referred to this institution's recent adaptation of a pass-fail option and said it seemed absurd to him to turn around and make available more grades. He said he also would resist one college's--the College of Law, for instance--having a grading system that was more complex than that used by the institution generally.

Dr. Delaplane asked if the committee had considered reserving the availability of intermediate grades to the graduate divisions, that is, the Graduate College, the College of Law, and the College of Medicine. Professor Davis said the committee had considered this but had felt it would be preferable to have the entire University on one common system. Dr. Gegenheimer said that while perhaps the graduate divisions might use a different system, he would hate to see varying systems in use among the several undergraduate colleges. Dr. Gegenheimer said he would like to point out again that the new grades are available if a department wishes to use them but it does not have to. He said that to him the use of intermediate grades would put less emphasis on any particular grade rather than more, as had been suggested.

Dr. Damon said he felt confusion would result if the graduate schools had a procedure different from that of the rest of the University. He said he personally would like to see a wider use of pass-fail grading in courses taken before students have selected their field of concentration. Once they have selected their field, then rigorous grading should be imposed in courses in the field of concentration.

Dean Ares said that if intermediate grades were available in the College of Law but not generally, students from other divisions enrolling for law course work could be so designated and would be given grades of A, B, C, or D, for instance, but not intermediate grades.

Dr. Blecha pointed out that people with extensive experience in evaluation and measurement realize that faculty members are on thin ice in assigning grades. He said the faculty experience difficulty in determining what grades should be given under the present system and the task will become even more difficult if intermediate grades are available. He said he doubted that anyone could truly defend a grade of C+ against a C.

Dr. Thompson said that faculty members are in the business of making judgments. He thought the Senate should be open-minded about this matter. Intermediate grades should be available to those who wish to use them.

Dean Rhodes pointed out that a number of senior students are permitted to enroll in 300 level courses. Hundreds of graduate students take 200 level courses in which other hundreds of juniors and seniors are registered. There are, in fact, hundreds of courses in the University open both to upper division undergraduate students and graduate students. Thus, there could be only great confusion if a grading system were to be used for graduate students separate from that used in grading undergraduates. He said he saw no objection, however, to the Law College's using a different system from the rest of the University.

The question on the original motion was then called for and carried by a vote of 21 to 13.

CATALOG MATERIAL: The following catalog material was accepted:

New Courses

Health, Physical Education, and Recreation 6275s, Arizona Symposium on Alcohol Studies  
(1) Summer Nasser  
Journalism 240s, News and Mass Media (2) Summer Carson  
Music 225s, The Use of Instruments in the Teaching of General Music (3) Summer  
Webb and Carl  
Physical Education for Women 6216s, Workshop in Creative Dance (2) Fee \$2.00  
Summer Goodman  
Secondary Education 251as-251bs, Teaching German Literature in the Secondary School  
(3-3) Summer Tinsley  
Secondary Education 333s, School Activities (3) Summer Gubser

Changes

Entomology 208, Insect Toxicology, reduce units from 4 to 3, effective 2nd Sem. 1968-69.  
Entomology 222s, Entomology for Science Teachers, reduce units from 4 to 3.  
Military Aerospace Studies 1a-1b, First Year. World Military Systems. Credit  
value to be increased from 1-1 to 2-2.  
Military Aerospace Studies 2a-2b, Second Year. World Military Systems. Credit  
value to be increased from 1-1 to 2-2.  
Military Science 1a-1b, First Year GMS. Credit value to be increased from 1-1 to 2-2.  
Military Science 2a-2b, Second Year GMS. Credit value to be increased from 1-1 to 2-2.  
Speech 1, Speech for Foreign Students (2), change to Speech 1a-1b (2-2), both 1a and  
1b to be offered second semester 1968-69.

(NOTE: Dr. Hetrick questioned increasing the credit value of the basic ROTC course work from 1 hour of credit each semester to 2. He asked if this was appropriate. Mr. Windsor said that it was the judgment of the Coordinating Committee and the Advisory Council that not enough credit had been given for these courses in the past, and this was simply an adjustment of something that had been inappropriate previously. Dr. Thompson pointed out that the Senate committee which had studied the ROTC question had recommended earlier to the Senate that the credit for the lower division ROTC courses be increased and the Senate had adopted this recommendation.)

Mr. Windsor explained that each Senate member upon adjournment of this meeting would receive a summary of the catalog proposals for 1969-70, 1970-71 for the various divisions of the University. Senate members were asked to review this material and be prepared to discuss it at the next meeting of the Senate-- either an especially called meeting later in January or at the February meeting.

AD HOC FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE ADJUDICATION OF DISPUTES RELATED TO NON-ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES OF STUDENTS, REPORT OF: Vice President Johnson announced that the Report of the ad hoc Committee on the Adjudication of Disputes Related to Nonacademic Activities of Students had been completed. This would be distributed to the Senate membership by the secretary, and Mr. Johnson asked each Senator to study the report and be prepared to discuss it at the February meeting.

Mr. Johnson said it would be helpful if all members of the ad hoc committee, including the student members, could be present at the Senate meeting where the report is discussed. On motion by Dean Rhodes, seconded by Dean Myers, the Senate voted to invite the student members of the committee as well as the faculty members who are not members of the Senate to be present at the Senate meeting when the report is discussed. The motion carried unanimously.

INDIVIDUAL PRINTED SUMMARY FOR EACH EMPLOYEE ITEMIZING DEDUCTIONS MADE DURING PREVIOUS CALENDAR YEAR FOR VARIOUS WITHHOLDING PURPOSES, REQUEST FOR: Dr. Steelink asked if the University Business Office could not provide each employee at the end of each calendar year a printed summary itemizing the deductions from his pay made during the previous calendar year for various withholding purposes. This would assist employees in preparing their income tax returns, he said, and he stated that such a report formerly was furnished each employee.

Mr. McMillan said this matter would be referred to Vice President Murphy and a report brought to the Senate at its next meeting.

PROPER USES OF DISSENT AND POWER, COMMENTS RE: Dr. Damon said he would like to refer to the address by Sidney Hook mentioned earlier. He said he interpreted distribution of this address as an indication that the President was warning the faculty to be prepared for strong administrative action against dissenting groups.

He said that a growing misuse of power in America can only encourage a reaction of violence, with the result that society is going to be brutalized in our country. As an example of misuse of power, he cited the action by the University administration in abolishing an off-campus housing office rather than reforming it.

A distinction must be made, he said, between using forms of dissent as means of communication--for example, orderly picketing as a dramatic means of conveying a message--on the one hand, and violence on the other. They are not the same thing. Of course rebellion and revolution must be repressed. But to suppress orderly dissent by an improper use of the power that an agency like the University can call to its command will drive dissent underground. If proper dissent is not permitted it becomes forbidden fruit, he emphasized. Universities should take a chance on complete freedom of speech and completely democratic procedures. We should not use the excesses of extreme groups as a justification to repress all dissent, he said. We should keep in mind that recognition of an organization should not require approval of its stated aims or its rhetoric. To claim otherwise would mean that only an orthodox point of view could be expressed, Dr. Damon said. This would constitute a serious restriction of free speech.

Dean Roy remarked that he had seen no indication that this University was planning to suppress orderly dissent. Dr. Damon replied that that was precisely what the University had done three years ago when highway patrolmen were called to the campus to remove persons who were picketing the Administration Building in protest against the institution's policies on the listing of off-campus housing facilities. The refusal of the University to permit the holding of the "Viet Nam Convocation" at the time of Commencement in the spring of 1968 was an act of suppression brought about by the University's evoking its power. When the University proceeds in this way, it is teaching its students that power can be so used and should be so used, and Dr. Damon said he felt this was wrong.

Dean Hull said he felt the Senate was not in a position to be helpful in the matter under discussion. He then moved that the meeting adjourn.

Mr. McMillan declared the meeting adjourned at 4:55 o'clock.



David L. Windsor, Secretary