

The University of Arizona
Proceedings of the Faculty Senate

Meeting of Monday

April 19, 1971

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:40 p.m. on Monday, April 19, 1971, in the Modern Languages Building auditorium (Room 350). This was the regular April meeting, having been postponed from the first Monday of the month because of the spring recess. Fifty-two members were present with President Harvill presiding.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: J. R. Anthony, J. W. Anthony, Bartlett, Blitzler, Bretall, Brewer, Carlson, Christopherson, Cole, Delaplane, Dewhirst, Dixon, DuVal, Edwards, Fahey, Freeman, Gegenheimer, Giebner, Goodwin, Gould, Grant, Harvill, Herber, Krebs, Lane, Lytle, Mautner, McMillan, Mees, Murphy, H. Myers, Nigh, Paulsen, Paylore, Perkins, Putt, Reiblich, Rhodes, Richard, Schaefer, Selke, Siegel, Sorensen, Steelink, Svob, Tomizuka, Varney, M. Voris, W. Voris, Windsor, Younggren, and Zwolinski. Student representative attending was Cathy Cleven. Also attending were student guests Randy Tufts, newly elected ASUA President, and David Vance.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Ares, Bannister, Bingham, Blecha, Bok, Boyer, Frasier, Gaines, Houston, Hull, Johnson, Kassander, Kemmerer, Little, Lowe, L. Myers, Resnick, Robson, Wise, and Yoshino. Student representatives absent were Charles Eaton and Bruce Eggers.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes and proceedings of the meeting of March 1, 1971 were approved as distributed to members with two corrections: On page 41 (page 3 of the proceedings) in the fourth paragraph, in the next to the last sentence, reference is made to remarks by President Harvill stating "... so far as tolerating the behavior of students in the streets outside the campus was concerned." The reference in fact had been to "non-students." Further, the minutes and proceedings should be corrected to show that Dr. Steelink was present at the March 1 meeting.

CATALOG MATERIAL: The catalog material previously distributed to members of the Senate by means of the "Curriculum" Bulletin was approved.

HONORARY DEGREES, APPROVAL OF: The Senate considered and approved recommendations for two honorary degrees to be awarded by the University of Arizona at its 1971 Commencement. These were in addition to those approved at the March 1 meeting. These recommendations next will be considered by the General Faculty and by the Board of Regents.

In discussing the proposed honorary degrees, the question was asked what policy governs which honorary degrees should be recommended by which colleges. For instance, would it be in order for the College of Education to recommend that the degree Doctor of Laws be conferred on an individual. The secretary explained that there is no pattern at the University of Arizona as to which degree would be recommended by which college faculty. The designation of the degree rather refers to the accomplishment of the individual being honored or the type of activity in his career which is being particularly recognized.

REVISION OF THE PASS-FAIL OPTION, APPROVAL OF: President Harvill called on Dr. Albert Picchioni, chairman of the Faculty Pass-Fail Committee. Dr. Picchioni reminded the Senate that in 1969 a pass-fail option was established on an experimental basis for a two-year period. At the time of its inception it had been agreed that the Faculty Pass-Fail Committee should review and evaluate the progress of this grading system near the end of the trial period to determine if it merited continuation and suggest appropriate changes in the program, if any.

Dr. Picchioni explained that the members of the pass-fail committee included W. Kirby Lockard, G. D. Percy, Mitchell G. Vavich, and David L. Windsor, with himself serving as chairman.

The committee had received comments and suggestions from faculty and students, especially from those who had been involved with the pass-fail system. The committee had studied the results of faculty and student surveys conducted by the student pass-fail committee of April 1970 and in February 1971. The students who directed those surveys, namely Mr. Bruce Burke in 1970 and Miss Nanette Warner and Miss Catherine Thompson in 1971, were to be commended for their excellent work in conducting these surveys and analyzing the results, Dr. Picchioni emphasized. The surveys included questionnaires sent to faculty members and students involved in the pass-fail option. For example, in the most recent survey based on the pass-fail program last semester, 170 questionnaires were sent to faculty members; 49% were returned; 310 questionnaires were sent to students; 57% were returned. It was of special interest that the GPA of the student respondents was 1.9, Dr. Picchioni said. Time did not permit a discussion of the questions or the results of these questionnaires, Dr. Picchioni said, but he emphasized that they were very useful to the Faculty Pass-Fail Committee during its meetings in recent weeks.

Dr. Picchioni explained that the Registrar's Data Processing Center had provided the committee statistical data on the pass-fail program for the four semesters it has been in existence. He shared with the Senate certain statistics which he had found particularly interesting. These were as follows:

1. Number of students who have enrolled in pass-fail courses since the inception of the grading system (exclusive of students in courses in which the only grading system is pass-fail--e.g., College of Medicine and certain courses in the Colleges of Education and Law):

1969-70

I	463 students; represented about 6.4% of the total junior and senior students
II	323 students; represented about 4.3% of the total junior and senior students

1970-71

I	388 students; represented about 5% of the total junior and senior students
II	416 students; represented about 5% of present junior and senior enrollment

2. Number of courses offered on pass-fail option:

<u>1969-70</u>	<u>P/F Courses</u>	<u>Total Courses</u>
II	495	2,450
<u>1970-71</u>		
I	571	2,545
II	402	2,746

3. Departments or divisions with courses having largest numbers of pass-fail students during 1970-71, semesters I and II:

<u>Department or Division</u>	<u>Students Enrolled Pass-Fail Semesters I & II</u>
Psychology	96
Sociology	77
Mathematics	61
Government	54
English	50
Anthropology	47
Philosophy	40
Accounting	35
Classics	30
Speech	26
Chemistry	23
Music	20

Dr. Picchioni explained that after considerable discussion and deliberation, in light of the experiences with the pass-fail option that had been reported by faculty and students, the committee wished to make the following recommendations for consideration by the Faculty Senate:

The pass-fail option should be continued at the University of Arizona. It should be administered in the same manner as is currently being practiced (see 1969-71 biennial catalog, p. 138), with the following exceptions:

- (1) An undergraduate student may take elective courses under the pass-fail option after he has attained sophomore standing.
- (2) An undergraduate student may register under the pass-fail option for not more than two elective courses per semester up to a maximum of twelve courses.
- (3) Students may change from pass-fail enrollment to enrollment for a regular grade or vice versa only during the time period that a student is permitted to drop a course with the automatic passing withdrawal grade of 8 (last day of the sixth calendar week during which classes are held).

Dr. Lytle moved that the committee's report be accepted and the pass-fail option be continued as revised by the committee's recommendations. Several seconds to the motion were heard and it carried unanimously.

Dr. Harvill thanked Dr. Picchioni and his committee for their work on this matter. He said he hoped the committee would consider itself as not yet discharged but would be available to review the pass-fail option further as might come to be felt necessary in the future.

REMARKS BY DR. RAY THOMPSON REGARDING CERTAIN REVISIONS OF LETTERS OF APPOINTMENTS TO FACULTY MEMBERS: Dr. Harvill called on Dr. Ray Thompson who had played a key role on behalf of the University of Arizona faculty in working with representatives of the other two universities and with the Board of Regents in revisions made in the recently adopted Campus Code of Conduct.

Dr. Thompson explained that the Code of Conduct provided that an appropriate statement be made part of the letters of appointments all university employees on salary contracts sign each year. He, together with representatives of the other two universities (President Walkup of Northern Arizona University and Vice President Dannenfeldt of Arizona State University) had been asked to work with the Regents in developing an appropriate statement. Dr. Thompson explained that the result of the work of the institutional representatives with the Regents had been a compromise which he felt was a good one from the point of view of University faculty members. Where some Regents had thought certain language as it first appeared in the Code of Conduct and which later was deleted would be transferred to the letters of appointment themselves, such language being of a nature that some faculty members would find it rather offensive, what in fact had resulted was an agreement to make use of the statement on the professional conduct of faculty members as adopted by the Faculty Senate at the U of A, expanding it slightly to include some of the language of a similar document adopted by the faculty at ASU. It was understood the language was also acceptable to the Faculty Council at Northern Arizona University. This statement would appear on the back side of the letter of appointment form. On the foreside of the document the following statement would appear and each appointee would be asked to sign this statement in accepting his appointment:

"In accepting this appointment, I agree to comply with the rules and regulations of the University and the Arizona Board of Regents relating to my appointment and, when applicable to my appointment, I agree to abide by the University patent policy and the provisions of the standards of professional conduct for faculty members printed on the reverse side of this document."

Dr. Thompson emphasized that the Regents had accepted almost verbatim the proposal of the three institutional representatives in this regard. The Regents had made a few minor suggestions which Dr. Thompson felt in fact had strengthened the statement. "We in a sense now have the best of two worlds," Dr. Thompson said. The Regents feel they have a firmer relationship with the faculty by a more specific document. At the same time the individual faculty member can sign something that should not be considered offensive in any way. Dr. Thompson explained that Vice President Dannenfeldt had suggested the inclusion of the words, "when applicable to my appointment." Dr. Thompson said he felt that a very good compromise had been developed jointly by the institutional representatives and the Regents and that all concerned should feel comfortable with the result.

Dr. Harvill thanked Dr. Thompson for his splendid work as the representative of the University of Arizona both earlier at the time the Code of Conduct was being revised and more recently in developing this new statement for the letters of appointment.

REPORT RE INTER-UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE'S STUDY OF THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR: Dr. Harvill next called on Dr. Darrel Metcalfe, chairman of the faculty committee appointed to consider revisions in the academic calendar. Dr. Metcalfe is also one of the University's representatives to the inter-university committee that is studying academic calendar revision proposals at the request of the Board of Regents.

Dr. Metcalfe reminded the group that in the fall of 1969 the Student Senate had recommended to the Faculty Senate that consideration be given to revising the academic calendar to the end that the fall semester would start early

enough that it would end before the Christmas recess. At its meeting in January 1970, the Senate had voted to ask President Harvill to appoint a committee to study this question. The committee was then appointed, with Dr. Metcalfe serving as chairman. The committee had met through the spring of 1970 and had studied the calendars of a number of other institutions and had interviewed both faculty members and students widely. They had submitted their report to President Harvill and then to the Faculty Senate in October 1970. At the October Senate meeting the proposal that the calendar be revised so that the fall semester would end before Christmas had passed. At the November meeting the Senate had voted to delay implementation of its earlier action until more information could be gathered about faculty and student feeling on the matter. A questionnaire had then been sent to 1,662 faculty members, 75% of whom had returned it. 72% of those returning the questionnaire had voted in favor of a calendar which would terminate the fall semester before Christmas. Results of this poll were reported to the February meeting of the Senate. At that same meeting the Senate received a petition signed by 11,000 students requesting that the calendar be changed in the same way.

At this point it became known that similar consideration was taking place at the other two universities. The Regents then asked that an inter-university committee, with two representatives from each institution, be appointed to study the question. The Regents indicated they wanted any calendar change of this nature to be the same at all three institutions. This committee had met in Tempe on March 11. The University of Arizona representatives had been Dr. Metcalfe and Dr. Bart Bok. The committee had reached certain tentative conclusions which the committee members were asked to report to their respective campuses for reaction. The committee was to meet again in Tempe on April 22 to make further recommendations.

The inter-university committee's tentative conclusions had been as follows:

1. A modified academic calendar should be introduced in 1972-73 if at all possible.
2. The present system which provides for two semesters in an academic year should be retained.
3. Each semester (fall and spring) should be kept in balance and should provide for approximately 15 weeks of instruction and an additional week for final examinations. This would provide for a semester of 16 weeks in length.
4. The fall semester should be concluded before Christmas.
5. Each institution should maintain its own pattern of official holidays during the academic year.

The committee had then developed two proposals, Plan A and Plan B, using the 1972-73 academic year as a model. Plan A would be built on fifty-minute class periods. For the fall semester advisement and registration would begin on August 21, instruction would begin on August 28, and final examinations would end on December 22.

If the traditional two-week Christmas break were maintained, advisement and registration for the spring semester would begin on January 8, instruction would begin on January 15, and final examinations would end on May 12. If a three-week Christmas break were established, advisement and registration would begin on January 15, instruction would begin on January 22, and semester examinations would end on May 19.

Under Plan B sixty-minute class periods would be utilized in the fall semester. Advisement and registration would begin on August 28, instruction would begin on September 5, and final examinations would end December 22. The second semester would revert to fifty-minute periods and would be the same as under Plan A.

Dr. Metcalfe said that the University of Arizona faculty committee endorsed all of the tentative conclusions reached by the inter-university committee and recommended their approval by the Senate. Further the University of Arizona calendar committee recommended that Plan A, with only a two-week Christmas break, be approved by the Senate. Under this schedule in 1972 first semester advisement and registration would begin on August 21, instruction would begin on August 28, and final examinations would end on December 22. Second semester advisement and registration would begin on January 8, instruction would begin on January 15, and second semester examinations would end on May 12. Dr. Metcalfe explained that the faculties of NAU and ASU were on record favoring a calendar which would have the fall semester start early enough to be completed before the Christmas break. The community colleges of Arizona have most of them already changed to this calendar.

Dr. Siegel asked if under the proposal of the faculty committee as much instruction time would be available as under the present calendar. The answer was yes. He asked if consideration had been given to the quarter system. It was pointed out that the current committee had not studied this matter. However, other committees in recent years have considered this calendar for the University of Arizona and the conclusion had been reached that the disadvantages of the quarter system outweighed the advantages.

Dr. Bartlett asked what the objection would be to the sixty-minute class period calendar. Mr. Windsor pointed out that under this calendar two class periods a day would be lost and it would become more difficult to accommodate the class schedule in the number of class meetings available for scheduling.

Mr. Varney asked if the summer calendar would change if Plan A were adopted. Mr. Windsor explained that initially the committee had felt it did not want to recommend any change in the U of A summer session calendar inasmuch as so many of the summer students are public school teachers and summer session, therefore, should not begin before public school teachers are out of school. Very recently, however, he had received word from the two largest school districts in the state pointing out that if the universities changed, the public schools would be interested in changing their calendars similarly for the same reasons that the University faculty were considering making a change. Thus, it seemed to Mr. Windsor that in time the summer session might change its calendar to begin earlier and consequently end earlier. The fall semester beginning in late August then would not fall so closely on the heels of the close of the summer session.

Dr. Harvill said that any recommendation to the Board of Regents would have to be supported by strong facts. He said he hoped information could be collected which would satisfy the Regents who would not make so major a calendar change without well-documented supporting evidence.

Dr. Bretall said he had heard the comment that it might be difficult for faculty members to retool their teaching procedures to alter a course presented in fifty-minute class periods to sixty-minute presentations. He said perhaps faculty members are more adaptable than we give them credit for and he said he wondered

what was wrong with Plan B. Mr. Windsor said that changing to sixty-minute periods throughout the day thus eliminating two class meeting options would present serious scheduling problems. The institution is making very effective use of its space now, and would have real difficulty if two class periods a day were lost.

Dr. Dewhirst then moved that the Senate accept the recommendation of the faculty calendar committee and several seconds were heard. Dr. Gegenheimer commented that he believed the calendar did not provide enough time for final examinations. He hoped that additional days could be scheduled for final examinations either beginning the exam period earlier or running further into May by an additional day or two. Dr. Metcalfe said such an adjustment could be made if it was felt to be desirable.

Several persons asked why Plan B would involve sixty-minute periods the first semester, but fifty-minute periods the second. The answer was that it was felt that the Legislature if not the Regents would object to faculty members' completing their duties as early in the spring as would be the result if sixty-minute periods were used during the second semester.

Dean Schaefer said he was not fully in agreement with all that was recommended by the committee but it was apparent that there was strong support and desire for the proposal both by a large proportion of the student body and by a large proportion of the faculty. He therefore suggested that the proposal be approved on a trial basis for a two-year period. President Harvill said he wondered if action should be delayed until more information had been collected.

Dr. Blitzer said he wondered if the period before Labor Day would not be a wasted interval since the heat at that time of year is great and since he believed some students would not arrive until after Labor Day. Dr. Metcalfe and Mr. Windsor explained that at institutions that have shifted to the early calendar a situation such as Dr. Blitzer described had been anticipated. This, in fact, had not turned out to be the case however.

Dr. Bartlett asked why a mid-year break of longer than two weeks was not being considered. The answer was that it was felt that Regents and Legislators would object to the faculty's being on the payroll having such a long "paid vacation" at mid-year.

Dr. Blitzer said he thought the appropriate action at this time would be to table the proposal. He said that if this action were approved, he then would suggest that a straw vote be taken to give Dr. Metcalfe the information he needed for his next inter-university meeting. Dr. Blitzer then moved to table the motion. Several seconds were heard. The motion to table lost.

Dr. Harvill asked how the change in calendar would affect the College of Medicine and the College of Law. Dean DuVal explained that the College of Medicine was on a different calendar anyway, operating on a twelve-month calendar. Professor Reiblich said he assumed that the College of Law would be free to operate under a calendar independent of the University's general calendar. Dr. Metcalfe stated this was the understanding of the committee.

Dean Schaefer asked how the proposed change would affect the salaries of regular faculty members working for the University during the summer period under outside funds, for example, research grant funds. Dr. Metcalfe answered that

Vice President Murphy had indicated that this would present no problem. The procedure would be the same as it is at present.

The question was called for and Dr. Dewhirst's motion that the recommendation of the faculty calendar committee be approved carried. It was understood that Dr. Metcalfe would report to the inter-university committee this action of the Faculty Senate. The inter-university committee will now either submit recommendations directly to the Board of Regents or separately through the respective presidents, it was understood.

PROPOSAL FROM STUDENT SENATE REQUESTING THE FACULTY SENATE TO DROP THE REQUIREMENT OF ATTENDANCE AND PENALTIES FOR NONATTENDANCE FROM UNIVERSITY POLICY: The Senate had received the following resolution from the Student Senate:

SENATE BILL #398

Introduced by: David B. Vance

A RESOLUTION

To the Faculty Senate and all Committees or Administrative
Organs dealing with the Biennial Catalog Revision

WHEREAS: Courses are designed to provide tools and background for the specific amount of knowledge that the course encompasses,

WHEREAS: Some students enter courses with varying levels of competence or experience in the field, and others study or research better in outside readings or other assignments, and all students learn at different speeds with different methods,

WHEREAS: Students' knowledge is the goal of the course and is sufficiently measured for academic purposes by tests, projects, papers, and finals,

WHEREAS: The classroom attendance has little bearing on academic achievement. That students should be responsible for any risk they take academically in not attending classes. That students choose and pay for courses and should have the option of how to use or not use this service they have paid for. That professors can stress the importance of their classes and encourage attendance by quizzes, non-textbook testable material, and stimulating lectures and discussions.

BE IT RESOLVED: That the requirement of attendance and penalties for nonattendance be dropped from the catalog and University policy.

Senate Action Third Reading: 19 Ayes, 1 Nay and 1 Abstain
21 voting members present

Speaker of the Senate Action /s/ CHARLES E. EATON Date 3/24/71

ASUA President Action /s/ BRUCE J. EGGERS Date 3/29/71

President Harvill recognized Miss Cleven who commented that the provisions of the bill written by David Vance were self-explanatory. It was felt that some students find themselves in classes with students of varying levels of competence and in some instances regular class attendance is not required for a student to perform well in the course. The question of attendance should be left up to the individual student, she emphasized. She explained that this bill had passed the Student Senate by a vote of 19 to 1. She pointed out that the author of the bill, Mr. David Vance, was present at this meeting.

Dr. Bretall said he was for the most part sympathetic with this request from the students. He wondered, however, how binding such policy could be on a faculty member who might in fact want to require students' attendance. He felt most Faculty Senate members would resist anything that might imply coercion of individual faculty members. Miss Cleven explained that the students did not wish to take away faculty prerogative in this matter. Rather they wanted to give faculty members the option. Attendance by all freshman students, for example, is mandatory now under university policy and a faculty member has no option in theory but to report excessive absences. The same procedure applies to students in certain other courses covered by the catalog policy.

Dr. Zwolinski said that if students' attendance is not required, how does a professor ever determine precisely who is and who is not in his classes so that class rolls can be properly maintained. It is only when there is opportunity for checking roll that a professor can know when to report to the Registrar's Office that certain persons are not in his class but are on his class lists.

Professor Voris pointed out that in many group courses an ensemble effort is the major feature of the course. The ensemble activity is what makes these courses meaningful and if attendance is not required he did not see how such courses could accomplish their goals. Dean Brewer commented that under no circumstances could the College of Pharmacy submit to such a procedure as this bill proposed. Miss Cleven said again it was the students' intent that the matter of attendance be left up to each individual instructor. The University mandatory rule would be dropped, however. Professor Mees asked if the students were aware that the present policy refers only to freshman students and to students in laboratory, discussion, and drill classes. Miss Cleven said the students were aware of the distinction.

President Harvill pointed out that only a year ago the Senate received and adopted a report from a faculty committee appointed at the request of the Senate to study class attendance policy. At that time the policy was revised and the new policy is carried in the current supplement to the 1969-71 biennial catalog. He wondered if the student proposal should not be considered in the light of the report of that committee's study.

Dr. Thompson said that although he was not currently a member of the Senate, he could not help but observe that the Code of Conduct requires members

of the faculty to be present on the campus and meet their classes. He agreed that students should be responsible for their own attendance in classes, but he wondered if we should take action which might remove all evidence that there is any expectation of students to attend classes. He thought to go so far would be unwise.

Dr. Lytle said that it seemed apparent to him that the discussion was pointing toward this proposal's being defeated. He therefore moved that the matter be tabled and several seconds were heard. It was pointed out however that there was no motion before the assembly. It was then agreed that discussion of the matter should not continue at this meeting.

COMMITTEE TO DEVELOP WAYS TO AVOID CAMPUS DISORDERS, ANNOUNCEMENT RE MEMBERSHIP OF:

The secretary reminded the Senate that at its meeting on March 1 it had taken action to implement a memorial from the Student Senate which would create an ad hoc committee to study finding ways to avoid future campus disorders. The committee was to be made up of nine members, including three members of the teaching and research faculty selected by the Committee on Committees, three student members selected by the President of the Associated Students, and three members representing the administration of the University including the security department appointed by the President of the University. He announced that the committee of nine members would include the following persons:

Three members of the teaching and research faculty, selected by the Committee on Committees:

Dr. Raymond Thompson
Dr. Clifton Wilson
Dr. Gerald Peterson

Three student members appointed by the President of the Associated Students:

Mr. Lorenzo Cotton
Mr. John Hutton
Miss Marlene Lerner

Three members representing the University administration including the security department appointed by President Harvill:

Mr. Marvin Johnson
Mr. Douglas Paxton
Dean John Schaefer

Mr. Windsor pointed out that the action of the Senate had provided that the committee should select its chairman at its first meeting. Dr. Gegenheimer, Chairman of the Faculty, was therefore being asked to convene the first meeting of the group. He would chair the meeting until the members had selected their chairman.

The Senate meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

David L. Windsor, Secretary