

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, March 6, 1972
Room 350 Modern Languages

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:40 p.m. on Monday, March 6, 1972, in the Modern Languages Building auditorium (Room 350). Fifty-five members were present with Vice President Delaplane presiding. Dr. Klonda Lynn was present as parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Anthony, Ares, Bannister, Bartlett, Bleibreu, Blitzer Bok, Boyer, Bretall, Brewer, Butler, Christopherson, Cole, Delaplane, Dewhirst, Dixon, Dresher, Eisner, Evans, S. Fahey, W. Fahey, Gegenheimer, Goodwin, Gould, Grant, Green, Herber, Hetrick, Hull, Keating, Lane, Layton, Lytle, Mason, Massengale, Mathews, Mautner, McConnell, Munsinger, Muramoto, H. Myers, L. Myers, Nigh, Putt, Reiblich, Richard, Siegel, Sorensen, Steelink, Thompson, Voris, Windsor, Wise, Younggren, and Zwolinski. Student representatives attending were Julie Lauber, Randy Tufts, and Nanette Warner.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Barnes, Edwards, Freeman, Gaines, Johnson, Joyner, Krebs, McMillan, Murphy, Paulsen, Rhodes, Robson, Schaefer, Shields, Skinner, Svob, Tomizuka, and Varney.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of February 7, 1972, were approved as distributed to members. During the discussion of the minutes Dr. Christopherson referred to the fifth paragraph on page 108 of those minutes where Dr. Bok was quoted as saying that if there are persons on the campus who are involved only in research and who are not, in fact, contributing to the teaching function, he thought they had no place in the University. Dr. Christopherson said that at a land-grant institution where the institution's responsibilities include instruction, research, and service, full-time people are committed to research only and to say explicitly or implicitly that these persons do not have a place in such an institution does a disservice to the University. Dr. Bok said that Dr. Christopherson's point was well taken. He said he felt, however, that he was correctly quoted in the minutes. His point had been that a university's basic function is teaching and the institution is something less than it should be if too many faculty members become so wrapped up in research that they become removed from the teaching activity with no contact with students.

CATALOG MATERIAL: The catalog material previously distributed to members of the Senate by means of the "Curriculum" bulletin was accepted without change. Mr. Windsor pointed out that on page 3 of the "Curriculum" issue of February 21, 1972, under the description of the revised admission requirements for enrollment in the College of Education the reference to "65 units of work" should have read 56 units.

LIMITATION ON PROPORTION OF UNITS IN WHICH A STUDENT CAN RECEIVE WITHDRAWAL GRADES OF 8 OR N, INTRODUCTION OF PROPOSAL RE: Senate members had been furnished the following statement as they arrived at the meeting:

"The Advisory Council recommends to the Faculty Senate that the period during which a passing withdrawal mark of 8 is automatically given students who officially withdraw from individual courses or from the University, now limited to the first six weeks of the semester, be extended through the semester, that is, to the last day of classes.

"The Council further recommends that the statement concerning Absences

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, March 6, 1972
Room 350 Modern Languages

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:40 p.m. on Monday, March 6, 1972, in the Modern Languages Building auditorium (Room 350). Fifty-five members were present with Vice President Delaplane presiding. Dr. Klonda Lynn was present as parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Anthony, Ares, Bannister, Bartlett, Bleibtreu, Blitzer, Bok, Boyer, Bretall, Brewer, Butler, Christopherson, Cole, Delaplane, Dewhirst, Dixon, Dresher, Eisner, Evans, S. Fahey, W. Fahey, Gegenheimer, Goodwin, Gould, Grant, Green, Herber, Hetrick, Hull, Keating, Lane, Layton, Lytle, Mason, Massengale, Mathews, Mautner, McConnell, Munsinger, Muramoto, H. Myers, L. Myers, Nigh, Putt, Reiblich, Richard, Siegel, Sorensen, Steelink, Thompson, Voris, Windsor, Wise, Younggren, and Zwolinski. Student representatives attending were Julie Lauber, Randy Tufts, and Nanette Warner.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Barnes, Edwards, Freeman, Gaines, Johnson, Joyner, Krebs, McMillan, Murphy, Paulsen, Rhodes, Robson, Schaefer, Shields, Skinner, Svob, Tomizuka, and Varney.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of February 7, 1972, were approved as distributed to members. During the discussion of the minutes Dr. Christopherson referred to the fifth paragraph on page 108 of those minutes where Dr. Bok was quoted as saying that if there are persons on the campus who are involved only in research and who are not, in fact, contributing to the teaching function, he thought they had no place in the University. Dr. Christopherson said that at a land-grant institution where the institution's responsibilities include instruction, research, and service, full-time people are committed to research only and to say explicitly or implicitly that these persons do not have a place in such an institution does a disservice to the University. Dr. Bok said that Dr. Christopherson's point was well taken. He said he felt, however, that he was correctly quoted in the minutes. His point had been that a university's basic function is teaching and the institution is something less than it should be if too many faculty members become so wrapped up in research that they become removed from the teaching activity with no contact with students.

CATALOG MATERIAL: The catalog material previously distributed to members of the Senate by means of the "Curriculum" bulletin was accepted without change. Mr. Windsor pointed out that on page 3 of the "Curriculum" issue of February 21, 1972, under the description of the revised admission requirements for enrollment in the College of Education the reference to "65 units of work" should have read 56 units.

LIMITATION ON PROPORTION OF UNITS IN WHICH A STUDENT CAN RECEIVE WITHDRAWAL GRADES OF 8 OR N, INTRODUCTION OF PROPOSAL RE: Senate members had been furnished the following statement as they arrived at the meeting:

The following item considered by the Senate January 3, 1972 was tabled at that meeting:

"The Advisory Council recommends to the Faculty Senate that the period during which a passing withdrawal mark of 8 is automatically given students who officially withdraw from individual courses or from the University, now limited to the first six weeks of the semester, be extended through the semester, that is, to the last day of classes.

"The Council further recommends that the statement concerning Absences appearing on page 184-185 of the current catalog be revised so that the sentence beginning at the bottom of page 184 and including the first three lines at the top of page 185 would read, 'If the Dean has no such information, he shall notify the student that his absences have been reported and that additional absences will authorize the instructor, at his discretion, to drop the student from the course with the grade N (non-official withdrawal).' In the third line of the following paragraph the word 'appropriate' would be deleted and 'N' would be inserted following the word 'grade'.

"In the Council discussion the view was emphasized that a failing grade should be awarded only in instances where a student has failed academically after carrying a course to its completion. The consensus was that a grade of 5 should not be used as a punitive measure (in cases of excessive absences, for example) or as a final mark when a student has not taken the final examination.

"This revised policy, if approved, would become effective the first semester of 1972-73.

At today's Senate meeting adoption of the following statement will be proposed as a corollary to the above proposal:

"Should a student receive withdrawal grades (8 or N) in more than 20% of the cumulative total credits for which he has enrolled in residence at the University of Arizona, he is subject to being declared ineligible for re-enrollment by the Advisory Council. Recommendation for ineligibility originates with the dean of the college in which the student has been enrolled. The first such ineligibility is for one semester only. However, following a second ineligibility for this reason a student may return to the University only with the approval of the dean of the college in which he was last enrolled."

This policy would become effective with enrollment for the first semester of 1972-73.

It is understood that ineligibility would never come about automatically but would always result only from a recommendation for such action by the dean of the college concerned.

Grades of 8 or N acquired before the first semester of 1972-73 would not be considered in implementing this policy.

Although the above statement proposes to set a limit on grades of 8 or N of 20% of a student's cumulative total credits, it is not intended that this policy would prevent a particular college from establishing a smaller allowed percentage.

Hermann K. Bleibtreu
Walter J. Fahey
Robert S. Svob
David L. Windsor

Dr. Delaplane recognized Dean Fahey who said that the ad hoc committee who had prepared the original proposal which would permit a student to withdraw from a course with an automatic grade of 8 throughout the semester now wished to introduce a proposed safeguard to prevent abuse of the proposed new privilege. It was not his intention today to take the original proposal from the table where

it was placed at the January meeting. He intended to make a motion to that effect at the April meeting. The committee wished today to introduce a proposed limitation to the "automatic 8" privilege. Members of the ad hoc committee were not convinced that a need for the safeguard would really exist, but because concern in this area had been expressed by some members of the Senate, the committee had developed this proposal which would provide a mechanism whereby the dilettante and the student who abused the automatic 8 privilege could be excluded from the University.

Dean Fahey said that the committee had looked at the actual experience of students at the University of Arizona and found that the average student drops 13% of the units for which he enrolls with grades of 8. Some have a larger proportion, of course, and some smaller. The committee had concluded that a 20% limitation would be reasonable. He noted that the proposal provided that a case would be individually reviewed by the dean of the college concerned before a recommendation was made to the Advisory Council that the student be found ineligible to continue in the University. Dean Fahey asked members of the Senate to study the proposal and be prepared to discuss it and take action at the April Senate meeting.

Dean Hull asked why the last paragraph of the ad hoc committee's statement, referring to a particular college's establishing a smaller allowed percentage, was included. Dean Fahey said that some deans had indicated that their colleges might want to impose a smaller percentage than that adopted as University-wide policy. The committee felt this would be appropriate since this would be consistent with the fact that some colleges have stricter minimum academic requirements than others.

Mr. Tufts asked what appeal would be open to a student who felt he had been unfairly dealt with by this procedure. Dean Fahey said that he believed adequate appeal procedures did exist on this campus to take care of such a situation.

Dr. Bretall asked if the new policy would prevent a faculty person's awarding a final grade of 5 to a student who had stopped coming to class. It was explained that the proposed policy would apply only to a student who formally dropped a course. Nothing was being proposed which would prevent a professor's awarding a grade of 5 at the end of a semester for whatever reason he thought appropriate.

CHANGE IN CREDIT FOR CERTAIN SUBJECT EXAMINATIONS OF THE COLLEGE LEVEL EXAMINATION PROGRAM (CLEP): Mr. Windsor pointed out that in February 1970 the Faculty Senate had approved the granting of 3 semester hours of credit for each College Level Examination Program (CLEP) subject examination passed with a standard score of 50 (a median figure) or better. In September 1971, the University had learned from the College Entrance Examination Board, sponsors of CLEP, that a number of these subject examinations had been designed to cover course work two semesters in length. At the request of the Admissions Committee, Mr. Windsor had then submitted sample questions from each of the examinations in question to the head of each department concerned or his representative and all had agreed that the examinations in the following subjects should properly carry the amount of credit indicated below:

<u>Subject Examination</u>	<u>University of Arizona Evaluation</u>
American History	History 10a-10b (3-3)
Western Civilization	History 4a-4b (3-3)
Biology	Biological Sciences 1a-1b (4-4)

<u>Subject Examination (Cont'd)</u>	<u>University of Arizona Evaluation (Cont'd)</u>
General Chemistry	Chemistry 2aR-2bR, 2aL (3-3, 1)
Geology	Geosciences 1a-1b, 2a-2b (3-3, 1-1)
Introductory Accounting	Accounting 1, 3 (3, 3)
Introductory Calculus	Mathematics 49a+ (6)
Introductory Economics	Economics 2a-2b (3-3)
Introductory Sociology	Sociology 1, 83 (3, 3)

The Department of English had wished to inspect the complete examinations in four subjects that fall within its area of study, American Literature, Analysis and Interpretation of Literature, English Composition, and English Literature and had requested the loan of copies of these examinations from the College Entrance Examination Board headquarters in order to make a judgment to its satisfaction. This review is now underway.

On January 20, 1972, the Admissions Committee had voted to recommend to the Advisory Council and the Faculty Senate that for satisfactory performance on the subject examinations listed above credit be allowed in the amounts indicated rather than credit for one semester only, and that the University accept credit in the four English courses in conformance with whatever is the final recommendation of the English Department.

In addition, the Admissions Committee had voted to continue using a cutting score of 50 as a basis for granting credit in all CLEP subject matter examinations, even though the CEEB had recommended slight variations in the cutting scores for various individual examinations, based on new national norms.

The Advisory Council had recently approved the recommendation of the Admissions Committee regarding the amount of credit in the indicated examinations and the question now came to the Faculty Senate for action.

On motion by Dean Hull, with many seconds heard, the Senate voted its approval of granting two semesters of credit for certain CLEP subject matter examinations as described earlier.

POLICY FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA RESOURCES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, CONSIDERATION OF: The Chairman introduced Dr. Edgar J. McCullough who represented the committee which had recently developed a "Policy for the Implementation of Instructional Media Resources at the University of Arizona", a copy of which had been sent all Senate members with the agenda for today's meeting. Dr. McCullough referred to the action of the Faculty Senate on March 2, 1970, which had updated policies and procedures governing instruction by television on the U of A campus including the development of television courses by faculty members. He explained that as a result of the expansion of the University Radio-Television Bureau and the expansion of the services of the University's Audio-Visual Services with a certain amount of overlapping between the two divisions, it had been felt necessary to expand the former statement of policy on television courses to something more broad and the phrase "Instructional Media Resources" had been agreed upon. The policy which today was being presented to the Senate had been developed

as a broad policy to cover all radio and television instructional activity as well as procedures which involve the University's Audio-Visual Services. He said that the lengthy document which had been sent to Senate members (a copy of which is attached to the secretary's file copy of the minutes of this meeting) did, in fact, contain one section devoted entirely to administrative procedure and he suggested that so far as action by the Senate was concerned all paragraphs numbered 7.00-7.03 should not come before the Senate for action.

Dr. Gegenheimer then moved that all paragraphs of the policy statement, except those numbered 7.00-7.03, be accepted. Dr. Gould seconded the motion.

Dr. Hetrick said his first objection to the document had to do with its title. The document was labeled "policy", but it was more like a handbook of detailed administrative procedures. He said he did not think that the Senate could or should consider such a document. There were a hundred little items to be challenged, and the Senate should not concern itself with such fine points of administrative procedure. Meanwhile, the important features of the document were concealed among the trivia, and the real matters of policy, which were legitimate business of the Senate, could be stated on one page.

He said he had a second and more important objection. "What we have here is a grand scheme for super-centralization of audio-visual and television services," he said. "But there is nothing sacred about a television camera, and any department should have the right to own one in the sense that any department may own, or have jurisdiction over, a typewriter, a milling machine, or a special set of reference books."

A number of departments have their own machine shops, he continued. "There has been talk about centralizing. Fortunately, local control has prevailed. Some of you have had experience with this and similar questions, and you understand how essential it is to have immediate local control of such services."

Similar questions have arisen about central computing facilities, Dr. Hetrick said. Fortunately, he can still use his slide rule without first consulting a central committee.

Of direct relevance to the document before the Senate was the following, Dr. Hetrick stated: "I teach a course in a laboratory which contains a darkroom and some pieces of photographic equipment. What I do with that equipment is the business of me and my department, and nobody else. The proposed new 'policy' makes my course a matter of concern for a university committee, and if a piece of film should be made to move through my equipment I must have a producer-director at my elbow."

There is, of course, some value in centralization, Dr. Hetrick concluded. But there is a boundary line which reasonable people can identify, and this document encroaches far beyond it. He urged rejection of the motion.

Dr. McCullough responded that the committee had no intention to centralize equipment. It was intended that departments would obtain approval of a central authority before buying a certain type of material. It is important that proliferation of equipment be avoided. There should be some coordination whereby equipment in various parts of the campus is compatible with other equipment. A major problem, he said, is maintenance. If a central office is to be responsible for the maintenance of equipment, that office should be consulted before material is purchased.

He said he would like to clear up one point of misunderstanding if it existed. It was not intended that the proposed policy would control the activity of an instructor who was developing his own course with no assistance from the Radio-TV Bureau. Reference was only to courses developed with the assistance of Radio-Television Bureau personnel.

Dean Fahey said the document seemed to him to be a conglomeration of items, a minor proportion of which should be of concern to the Faculty Senate, for instance, matters relating to the bilateral responsibilities of the faculty and of the University. These, however, were put out of focus by other sections which were concerned only with purely administrative procedures. He wondered if the document should not be referred back to the committee with the request that strictly administrative procedures be excised and only actual policy matters be brought back then to the Senate.

Dr. Steelink referred to Paragraph 10.01 of the document which read as follows:

"The Instructor of a Radio, Television or Film Production presentation will be selected on the basis of academic acceptability, knowledge of the particular content to be presented and ability to function well in the medium to be employed. Final approval of the Instructor will be done by a Committee made up of the Head of the Academic Department, a representative from the University Committee on Instructional Media Resources and the Radio-TV Bureau's Manager for Instructional Services. The above procedure will apply to all courses making use of radio, television or film production within the classroom presentation when 10% or more of a particular course is offered via one or more of these Media."

Dr. McCullough said that this statement was intended to refer only to courses produced by the Radio-TV Bureau. If this was not clear from the wording, however, then obviously clarification was needed, he said. Professor Green said that he found a major fault with the document to be the fact that it was loaded with "killer" clauses. If taken literally, for example, he would be discouraged from making his own slides for use in his classes and showing them then in a University carrousel.

Dr. Keating referred to Paragraph 4.03 which states:

"All content materials are the property of the Instructor."

Dr. McCullough said that this statement applied only to courses in the development of which, services of the Radio-TV Bureau had been requested.

Dr. McCullough explained that the document had ended up with as much detail as it did because the University lawyers, when the document was referred to them, had insisted that many additional provisions be incorporated.

Professor Reiblich moved to table the question and Dr. Boyer seconded the motion. Professor Reiblich commented that it was difficult to redraft a document of this sort in a large assembly. Dr. McCullough said that there was some urgency involved because some specific problem cases had developed in recent months. Professor Reiblich then withdrew his motion.

Dr. Lytle then moved to table the matter. He said no matter how serious the problems were which may now exist, a matter of this importance should not be hastily considered. Many seconds to his motion to table were heard and the motion carried.

Dr. Steelink commented that he felt some action was desirable at this time. He said he knew of a particular problem that existed on the campus at present and he moved to call a special meeting of the Senate before the April meeting to consider the matter of instructional media resources. Dr. Gegenheimer seconded the motion. Dean Bleibtreu pointed out that any case currently at hand was already being handled and that this document would not have direct bearing on such a case. Professor Reiblich spoke against the motion saying he felt that action taken as soon as a meeting between now and the April meeting would still result in too hasty action. Dr. McCullough wondered if new policy must be established before new personnel could be engaged to come to the University to develop new television courses. Dean Bleibtreu said that he thought whether or not new personnel being considered for next fall would come to the U of A would not hinge on the adopting of this policy at this time.

The question on the motion for the special meeting was then called for and the motion failed.

STATEMENT BY PROVOST RE CLASSIFIED RESEARCH, INCLUSION IN MINUTES OF: Dr. Steelink said that two years ago the Committee of Eleven had conducted rather extensive study on whether the University of Arizona should have a policy on classified research, and had then developed a proposed policy. The policy had been sent to the President but had not been accepted at that time. A few months ago a similar proposal had been sent to the new President of the University and an answer had been received from the Provost. Dr. Steelink said that the Committee of Eleven had then instructed him to read into the minutes of today's Senate meeting the final paragraph of the letter which the Provost had sent to the Committee of Eleven. This was as follows:

"Let me stress to you again, that the University is not carrying on any classified research and that to the best of my knowledge there is no pressure or inclination to undertake any. The reasons for not adopting a more restrictive policy under these circumstances are those which I outlined to the Committee on an earlier occasion."

RESOLUTION ASKING CREATION OF AD HOC COMMITTEE TO STUDY PARKING GARAGE AND STADIUM ADDITION, PROPOSAL, ADOPTION OF: The chair recognized Mr. Tufts who yielded to Dr. Nigh who is the Faculty Senate's representative to the Student Senate. Dr. Nigh then read a resolution which had been drafted by Dr. Steelink, Dr. Joyner, Miss Lauber, Miss Warner, and Mr. Tufts. The resolution read as follows:

Whereas: The needs of the University can best be met by processes of community decision making which include faculty and students; and

Whereas: Faculty, staff, and students are to pay an additional forty dollars per year for the proposed stadium addition and parking garage, yet there has been almost no input from these important segments of the campus community into the planning of the proposal; and

Whereas: Since such proposal was approved by the Board of Regents on February 19, 1972, research has revealed serious doubts about the wisdom and need of such a plan, and there have been significant questions raised by faculty, students, staff, experts in urban planning, as well as state legislators about the desirability of such structures and about the methods of funding them; and

Whereas: It is proper that before the campus community is to pay an additional \$870,000 per year, there should be further investigation and analysis which would answer these important questions and doubts and consider possible alternative solutions.

Therefore: Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate hereby requests Dr. Schaefer to withdraw House Bill 2361, concerning an eleven million dollar bond request to fund a stadium addition and parking garage, from the State House of Representatives pending an all university analysis of the proposals and possible alternatives. This analysis would take the form of an Ad Hoc Committee on the Stadium Addition and Parking Garage Proposal which would consist of faculty, students, and administrators. This ad hoc committee shall contain two faculty, two students, and two administrators to be appointed by Dr. Albert Gegenheimer, Chairman of the Faculty, Randy Tufts, President of ASUA, and Dr. John Schaefer, President of the University, respectively. Said committee will report its findings to the university community by May 1, 1972, and is authorized to recommend a specific proposal to Dr. Schaefer.

Therefore: Be it further resolved that after a report is made by this ad hoc committee to the university community, a yes - no vote be taken on the current proposal by faculty and students, and that Dr. Schaefer take the vote into serious consideration before resubmitting any proposals to the Board of Regents or the State Legislature.

Dr. Nigh moved that the proposed resolution be adopted and Dr. Steelink seconded the motion.

Mr. Tufts then presented to the Senate the results of a poll the Associated Students had recently conducted among faculty members on the proposed student registration fee increase and the increased faculty-staff parking levy to be used to retire bonds issued for the construction of a parking garage and stadium addition. The questions asked in the poll, the number of responses received to each question, and the percentage of Yes and No responses were as follows:

1. Do you agree with the emphasis given the construction of the stadium addition and multi-level garage?

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
679	22.8%	70.6%

2. Do you approve of the method proposed to finance the stadium expansion and multi-level garage?

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
693	21.9%	73.3%

3. Do you feel that the multi-level parking garage is the best alternative to the U of A's present traffic problems?

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
707	38.3%	50.1%

4. Since the students and faculty have been asked to pay for the parking garage and stadium addition, should their vote decide whether the stadium addition and multi-level parking garage are to be built?

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
697	63.2%	29.7%

Mr. Tufts said that the Associated Students government planned to place on the ballot at the student elections later this month a Yes/No question whereby students could indicate their approval or disapproval of the proposed fee increase.

Mr. Grant pointed out that the President could not withdraw House Bill 2361 since it was already in the legislative process, having been sponsored by the Appropriations Committee. He commented further that the basic question is how the construction bonds, if their issue is authorized, are to be amortized. One way would be by student fees. However the bill before the Legislature does not specify how the amortization of the bonds is to be funded.

Mr. Grant said he would like to call attention to the fact that there is a factual error in the second "Whereas" paragraph of the resolution, since faculty and staff members would not be expected to pay an additional \$40 per year, but only an additional \$20 per year since they are already paying \$20 a year now.

Dr. Bartlett commented that if the President were to ask that the bill be withdrawn, it would probably just be allowed to die. Dr. Lytle pointed out, however, that if one arranges for a bill to die, after having arranged for it to be sponsored, it makes it much more difficult for one to arrange to have any bill sponsored in the future.

Dr. Lytle said he would like to point out that approval of this resolution would be moving into the politics of confrontation. This resolution would force the President into a corner, a most unfortunate development. In a confrontation situation, Dr. Lytle said, everybody loses. He said what would be more appropriate here would be to make it possible to move into an area where compromise can be worked out, where the President can maintain his position to a certain point and faculty and students can gain consideration of proposals they have.

Dr. Steelink said that if the bill before the legislature passed, from what sources would the bonds be paid off? Mr. Grant explained again that that is not indicated in the bill.

Professor Reiblich said he felt adoption of this resolution would be wrong. He said he didn't think the Senate should conclude necessarily that a majority of the faculty held the position that the majority of those who returned their questionnaires held. He said that although he sent in his questionnaire many of his colleagues had disregarded it. He said he felt the resolution should be voted down.

Miss Lauber said that the intent was not to force matters to an inappropriate head, but rather by means of the proposed ad hoc committee to bring about valid input from faculty, students, and administrators which the students feel has not yet been made to an adequate degree. Miss Lauber said that ASUA officers felt that since 35.5% of the faculty members sent questionnaires had responded, this indicated considerable interest in the matter. Further, since an impressive majority of those responding indicated they disapproved of the garage proposal, particularly the way the retirement of the bonds would be funded, it seemed important to the sponsors of the bill that it be brought to the Senate floor. A six-man review committee, she felt, could provide a better way of studying the issues than letters to editors, television debates, editorials, etc. Much of the dialogue to date had been rather hostile. The sponsors of the resolution thought that this resolution would bring about a more rational study of the situation and would provide a means to investigate alternate ways to fund the proposed structure.

Dean Myers said for years there has been discussion on this campus about the need for parking facilities. Much study has gone into the present proposal. The Regents have approved it. A bill to support it is now before the Legislature. For the Senate to take action as proposed at this time would be highly inappropriate.

Dr. Gegenheimer reiterated that the bill before the Legislature does not contain language specifying how funds are to be raised to retire the bonds. He said he agreed with Miss Lauber that there should be dialogue about alternate ways to provide funds to retire the bonds. He said he could see advantage in a committee's being created to study the issues. However, he did not think the Senate should ask the President to attempt to withdraw the bill now before the Legislature.

Dr. Gegenheimer then moved to amend the fifth paragraph of the resolution (the first paragraph beginning with the word "Therefore") to read:

Therefore: Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate hereby requests the appointment of an ad hoc committee on the stadium addition and parking garage proposal which would consist of faculty members, students, and administrators. This ad hoc committee would contain two faculty members, two students, and two administrators to be appointed by Dr. Albert Gegenheimer, Chairman of the Faculty, Randy Tufts, President of ASUA, and Dr. John Schaefer, President of the University, respectively. This committee shall report its findings to the Faculty Senate at its May meeting and shall also report its findings and its recommendations to the President of the University.

Dr. Blitzer seconded Dr. Gegenheimer's motion.

Mr. Tufts said he felt it was appropriate for the Senate to deal with this issue by consideration of the adoption of the original resolution. Everyone in the room is a citizen of the state of Arizona, he said. He said he thought basic questions on the validity of the need for the structure at all should be raised. A fundamental ecological issue is involved, for one thing. There has been much reference to student input on this issue over the years, but, he said, the situation several years ago was somewhat different from what it is today. Much student housing has been built adjacent to the campus and many students now walk to the campus. Many more students are now riding bicycles, particularly since the interior roads of the campus have been closed to automobile traffic.

At this point Dr. Lynn pointed out that Mr. Tufts' remarks seemed not to relate to the proposed amendment. Dr. Dixon and several other senators said that they felt Mr. Tufts' remarks indeed were relevant to the discussion of the amendment. At this point Dr. Delaplane asked if the assembly was ready to vote on the proposed amendment. Dean Ares said he hoped that discussion of the amendment was not being cut off. Dr. Delaplane said that it was not his intention to cut off discussion and it continued.

Dr. Bartlett asked if it was Dr. Gegenheimer's intent that if his amendment were adopted, the study committee could properly consider the entire question of the proposed garage with all ramifications of the matter. Dr. Gegenheimer said that would be the case.

Miss Lauber said that many persons, both faculty and students, have been dissatisfied with the way this matter has developed without adequate input of student and faculty opinion.

Dean Ares said that the original proposed resolution, it seemed to him, was unnecessarily inflammatory and judgmental. He thought that the amendment would result in a far more acceptable resolution. He said that in considering Dr. Gegenheimer's proposed amendment he could not see how this would limit future discussion of all ramifications of the matter in any way. All that was being eliminated was the request that Dr. Schaefer withdraw the bill now before the Arizona Legislature. Dr. Christopherson said he wondered if the amendment were adopted if the committee would then feel the responsibility to give attention to some of the other concerns mentioned by Mr. Tufts, for instance the ecological issue.

Mr. Tufts asked if it were the intent of Dr. Gegenheimer that the committee when organized should be permitted to address itself to all issues relating to the garage structure, for example, ecological questions. Mr. Tufts said that he questioned whether the University should be taking action which would encourage people to drive automobiles to the campus. Dr. Gegenheimer said again that it certainly was his intention that the committee should consider all questions relating to the proposed parking structure.

Dr. Bok wondered if the question has to be considered as one involving a single structure. He said he was in favor of a parking garage but not in favor of a stadium addition.

Professor Mathews said he had mixed feelings about the motion before the Senate. He did feel that some strongly worded message should go forward by some means from the Senate to the President. On the other hand he felt attention should be given to the realities of practical procedure as urged by Dean Ares. Dr. Gegenheimer said he felt that his amendment would indeed be a strong statement. The vote on the amendment was then called for and carried. It was explained that the amendment resulted in the original language of the paragraph in question being stricken and the revised wording proposed by Dr. Gegenheimer taking its place.

Dean Ares then moved to strike the final paragraph of the resolution, that is, the second paragraph beginning with the word "Therefore". There were many seconds to this motion and it carried.

Professor Reiblich then suggested that the wording of the second paragraph be revised to correct the erroneous reference to an additional \$40 to be paid by faculty and staff. Before he could make a motion to correct this issue, however, he yielded to Dr. Thompson who said that he thought the first "Whereas" paragraph was a good preamble to the resolution. He thought the revised "Therefore" paragraph as developed by Dr. Gegenheimer was a good statement. Paragraphs 2, 3, and 4, however, he felt, took positions which many members of the Senate would have difficulty agreeing with. They were in fact pejorative statements, he felt, and should be dropped. He then moved that paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 of the resolution be deleted. Dr. Bok seconded the motion. Dr. Bretall said he felt that the deleting of these three paragraphs would weaken the resolution. Dr. Bok said that he in fact felt that deleting them would strengthen the document and that is why he had seconded Dr. Thompson's motion.

Miss Lauber said that she thought paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 simply stated certain obvious facts.

Dean McConnell said that there was no one in the room who had all the facts about this issue and he thought that a simple statement which would make it possible for a committee to be created and study the situation was desirable. He called for the question, that is, to vote on Dr. Thompson's proposal to delete paragraphs 2, 3, and 4. This motion carried.

The question on the main motion was then called for and the motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.



David L. Windsor, Secretary