

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, December 4, 1972
Gallagher Theater

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:00 p.m. on Monday, December 4, 1972, in the Gallagher Theater of the Student Union. Fifty members were present with Vice President McMillan presiding.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Blecha, Blitzer, Boyer, Bretall, Brewer, Bull, Carr, Christopherson, Cole, Davis, Dixon, Freeman, Gegenheimer, A. Grant, R. Grant, Green, Grossman, Harris, Hull, Johnson, Keating, Lane, Layton, Manes, Mason, Mathews, Mautner, McConnell, McCoy, McMillan, Mees, Myers, Odishaw, ^{DLBSON} Rhodes, Roby, Rosaldo, Rosenberg, Shields, Skinner, Sorensen, Steelink, Stubblefield, Svob, Thompson, Varney, Ware, Windsor, Yoshino, Younggren, and Zwolinski. Student representatives attending were John McKinney and Paula VanNess. Dr. Frank LaBan was present as Parliamentarian. Mr. David Butler was present as Assistant Secretary.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Ares, Bannister, Bateman, Battan, Bleibtreu, H. Butler, Dresher, Edwards, Evans, S. Fahey, W. Fahey, Gaines, Joyner, Kassander, Krueger, Massengale, Muramoto, ~~Olson~~, Paulsen, Schaefer, Trafton, Vignery, and Weaver. Student representative absent was Gene Simko.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of November 6, 1972 were approved as distributed to members.

CATALOG MATERIAL: Catalog material as previously distributed to members by means of "Curriculum" bulletin Volume 4, No. 4 (11/9/72) was approved with two exceptions. It was pointed out by Dean Manes that the proposed new course Optical Sciences 234, Management of Optics Research and Development, was not under consideration, the proposal for the course having been withdrawn and the Senate voted to table that proposed offering. Dr. Gegenheimer on behalf of the faculty of the Department of English moved that the proposed new course Business Administration 300a-300b, Report Writing, be referred back to the Coordinator of Curricular Matters. Dr. Gegenheimer explained that the description of this course indicated it was one that more properly fell under the purview of the Department of English. Dr. Dixon pointed out that in the past the Department of English had been requested by the College of Business and Public Administration to offer a course in writing for business students. English 119, Expository Writing, had been created but then the English Department had not staffed the course with the result that it consistently was not offered. A very real need is now felt for a writing course for students in the MBA program. The College of Business feels that the course must be offered and while it would be preferable for the Department of English to teach the course, since experience has shown that the English Department cannot be depended upon to provide staffing for such a course, it was felt necessary that the new course for graduate students be taught by the Department of Business Administration. It was remarked by several senators that the problems relating to this situation should be handled by Dr. William Noyes, Coordinator of Curricular Matters, working with the two departments concerned.

Many seconds to Dr. Gegenheimer's motion were then heard and the motion carried.

PROPOSED FACULTY CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS, FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF: The Senate continued its consideration of the proposed Faculty Constitution and Bylaws.

Dr. Shields, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Constitution and Bylaws, moved that the Senate move into a committee of the whole. Several seconds were heard and the motion carried. The Senate resumed its line-by-line consideration of the proposed Constitution beginning at the point where it had interrupted its consideration at the October meeting. The first provision to be considered was proposed Article III, Section B which provides that the presiding officer of the Faculty Senate should be elected by the Senate from its membership. Mr. Arthur Grant said he was sure many members of the Senate had heard him make the point before but he explained once again that a sister institution had submitted a proposed constitution to the Board of Regents only to have it considerably modified by that body. One feature of that proposed Constitution had been that the Senate was to elect its own presiding officer. The Regents felt at that time, and there seemed no doubt that they feel at the present time, that the person to preside over a faculty legislative group should be the President of the University. Dr. Shields reported that the Constitution Committee had considered three alternatives: the presiding officer of the Senate could be the President of the University, or the Chairman of the Faculty, or elected by the membership. The committee, not unanimously, concluded that the presiding officer should be elected by the Senate from its membership. Dr. Gegenheimer said that he had felt that the Chairman of the Faculty should not be the Senate's presiding officer. The Faculty Chairman should be able to act as a free agent in Senate meetings. The chairman of the body cannot be partisan. He said that as Chairman of the Faculty he frequently has felt he should be partisan. It would be awkward at such moments to have to relinquish the chair to a temporary chairman just to be able to speak out on an issue, he said. He said he thought that the President of the University should have the same freedom to speak from a partisan point of view from the floor in such a body as the Faculty Senate.

It was pointed out that some administrators appearing before the Constitution Committee, including former Provost Bowen Dees, had made the same point Dr. Gegenheimer had just made.

Mr. McMillan said that the Regents feel that there should be a direct conduit between the faculty and the Board of Regents and that this person should be the President of the University and that he should be the presiding officer of the faculty's legislative body. It is the President of the University that the Regents hold responsible for all that takes place within the institution. This person therefore should be the presiding officer of the faculty's legislative group.

Dr. Blitzer acknowledged that there seemed to be reason to believe that the Board of Regents might not like the proposed Constitution when it was presented to that body. He said he did not feel that the Senate could worry whether or not any particular point is going to meet favor with the Regents. He thought the faculty should develop the best document that it can, and then when it is finally ratified by all concerned and submitted to the Board of Regents, we can see what happens. At that time it may be necessary to negotiate on certain points. The members of the Senate are reasonable men and know where the power lies, he said.

Vice President Johnson asked what the rationale of the Constitution Committee had been in proposing that the Senate select its own presiding officer.

Dr. Shields said that the majority of the members of the committee had felt, as already had been stated, that the presiding officer should be free to express partisan views from the floor of the Senate. As chairman of the body he appropriately could not express such views.

At this point Dr. Mathews asked when it was in order to propose amendments to the Constitution. It was explained that there would be opportunity for this at a later time when the Senate was formally voting on the Constitution item by item. Dr. LaBan, the parliamentarian, emphasized that when a body is acting as a committee of the whole this permits greater freedom and flexibility for discussion of matters before it.

It was apparent that there was considerable division among the members of the Senate over the proposal of Article III, Section B.

Referring to proposed Section III, D which discusses Senate meetings, Dr. Keating asked what assurance Senate members had that an item which they wished placed on the agenda of the Senate would indeed be so placed. It was pointed out that under regular parliamentary procedure, if a Senate member had not been able to have a matter placed on the agenda by having requested the President, the Chairman of the Faculty, or the Secretary to do so, he could simply raise the matter on the floor of one Senate meeting and ask that it be placed on the agenda of the next meeting.

Dean Rhodes referred to the provision that the Senate shall meet regularly the first Monday in each month during the academic year and wondered if specific provision should be made for times when the first Monday might be a holiday or for times when the first Monday might not be the appropriate time to hold a meeting. Dr. Shields pointed out that the language here provides only for meeting regularly and that meeting times could be changed and other meetings could be called without difficulty.

The Senate then continued with a line-by-line reading of the proposed draft. There were no further questions until the discussion of the Committee of Eleven was reached under V, A. Dean Rhodes asked if it was intentional under V, A that no limit on the number of terms of the Committee of Eleven was indicated. Dr. Shields said that this was intentional on the part of the committee. The committee had felt that no limit on terms should be set by the Constitution for any faculty elective office. Dr. Skinner said that he thought that the Constitution should place a limit on the number of times a faculty officer could succeed himself. He said he felt such a provision would discourage an individual's being routinely re-elected to a post term after term simply because he was already in it. Dr. Shields said that he understands that in American colleges and universities today as well as in other institutions the trend is not to limit the number of terms one may hold office. Dr. Gegenheimer commented that ex-officio members, Vice Presidents and Deans, for example, are members of the Senate "in perpetuity" so long as they hold their University positions. He said he believed the faculty should have the opportunity to have their elected representatives in office as continuously as the faculty are willing to continue to elect them.

Mr. Johnson asked why the two student delegates to the Committee of Eleven were designated as non-voting members of that group. Dr. Shields said that at the time this section of the Constitution was being written student representatives appearing before the committee had said they felt that was the appropriate status.

They had also indicated that they felt that the student members of the Faculty Senate should not have a vote since they did not feel that the Faculty Senate and Committee of Eleven representatives to the Student Senate should have a vote in that body. It was pointed out, however, that the faculty representatives to the Student Senate have been given a vote in that body by action of the student senators, and it is proposed in the new Constitution that the student representatives in the Faculty Senate should have a vote. (See Faculty Constitution III, A, 3.) Mr. McKinney said that he felt the student members of the Committee of Eleven should have a vote. Dr. Shields explained that the Constitution Committee had dealt with three different student administrations in three different years and that the several different student groups who had met with the committee had not been consistent in their views.

The Senate moved ahead and completed its "committee of the whole" discussion of the proposed Constitution itself. It then turned to a line-by-line consideration of the proposed Bylaws of the Constitution. Dr. Thompson commented on what seemed to him an inconsistency in that under proposed Bylaw 5 certain procedures for faculty elections are spelled out. Yet in the case of the election of the Committee of Eleven in Article V, Section A of the Constitution itself there is reference to the election procedure for that group. Dr. Shields said that the reference in the Constitution itself seemed to be appropriate properly to describe the Committee of Eleven.

The proposal under Bylaw 5., d., i., ii., iii., iv., etc. stimulated considerable discussion. Questions were asked why it was felt that persons should be nominated only if they have given their written consent, and why nominating petitions should be used, for example. Dr. Shields said that the committee had felt that a general overhaul of the faculty election procedure was very much needed. It was felt that the requirement of nominating petitions would considerably stimulate interest in faculty elections. It was also pointed out that in the past persons not members of the faculty have been nominated, faculty wives have been nominated, etc. Further, some persons without any real interest in the faculty affairs have been elected and then not served in their posts. Some persons elected to the Faculty Senate have failed to attend a single Faculty Senate meeting, it was reported. The faculty had thereby been deprived of proper representation.

Mr. Grant who has served for several years as secretary of the Faculty Election Committee outlined some of the problems the election system in the past has permitted. He said sometimes a person has been nominated by simply receiving one nomination ballot. Dr. Shields said that the committee felt that the proposed procedure would considerably improve the efficiency of the faculty election process. It would stimulate greater interest in faculty elections and would more greatly assure that persons nominated would be not only willing to serve and qualified to serve, but would have a modest amount of support before having their names placed on the ballot. Mr. Johnson commented that he feared the University might find itself overly involved in a fourth area of activity, in addition to teaching, research, and public service, namely a periodic "getting elected" activity.

It was noted that in the language of a number of the sub-paragraphs under Bylaw 5 the dates indicated would have to be updated (for example, the reference to 1971-74, under 5., b., ii., and the reference to 1971-73, under 5., c., iii.).

At this time it was noted so many senators had one by one left the meeting that a quorum had been lost. The parliamentarian confirmed that the Senate, operating as a committee of the whole but having lost its quorum, could no longer legally function. There being no additional matters on the Senate agenda, the meeting adjourned at four thirty-five o'clock.



David L. Windsor, Secretary