

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, October 2, 1972 Room 350 Modern Languages

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 4:00 p.m. on Monday, October 2, 1972, in the Modern Languages Building auditorium (Room 350). Fifty-seven members were present with President Schaefer presiding.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Ares, Bannister, Battan, Blecha, Bleibtreu, Blitzler, Bretall, Brewer, Bull, H. Butler, Carr, Christopherson, Dixon, Dresher, Edwards, Evans, S. Fahey, W. Fahey, Gegenheimer, A. Grant, R. Grant, Green, Grossman, Harris, Kassander, Keating, Krueger, Lane, Mason, Massengale, Mathews, Mautner, McConnell, McCoy, McMillan, Mees, Muramoto, Myers, Odishaw, Olson, Paulsen, Roby, Rosaldo, Rosenberg, Schaefer, Shields, Skinner, Sorensen, Stubblefield, Svob, Thompson, Trafton, Varney, Ware, Weaver, Windsor, and Yoshino. Student representative attending was Gene Simko. Dr. Klonda Lynn was present as parliamentarian. Mr. David Butler was present as Assistant Secretary.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Bateman, Boyer, Cole, Davis, Freeman, Gaines, Hull, Johnson, Joyner, Layton, Manes, Rhodes, Steelink, Vignery, and Younggren. Student representatives absent were John McKinney and Paula VanNess.

TIME AND PLACE OF SENATE MEETINGS, CHANGE IN: The Senate agreed that effective with the November meeting the monthly meetings of the body would begin at 3 p.m. with an automatic adjournment time of 5 o'clock. Since the Modern Languages auditorium would not be available for meetings at 3 o'clock on Mondays, it was agreed that the Senate would henceforth meet in the Gallagher Theater of the Student Union.

TIME OF FIRST SENATE MEETING EACH YEAR, AGREEMENT RE: The Senate agreed that although the University is under a revised calendar whereby the fall semester begins the last week of August, the Senate should continue to hold its first meeting each year on the first Monday of October.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meetings of May 1, 1972 and May 15, 1972 were approved as distributed to members.

NEW MEMBERS OF SENATE, WELCOME OF: The President called upon the secretary to introduce new and re-elected members of the Senate. Mr. Windsor introduced the new and re-elected college representatives, asking each of them to stand.

New college representatives elected in the spring of 1972 are:
Dr. Thomas M. Stubblefield and Dr. George W. Ware, College of Agriculture;
Dr. Leahmae McCoy, College of Business and Public Administration; Dr. William B. Bull, College of Earth Sciences; Dr. Milo K. Blecha and Dr. Robert T. Grant, College of Education; Mr. Quentin M. Mees, College of Engineering; Mr. Maurice K. Grossman, College of Fine Arts; Mr. Ray J. Davis, College of Law; Dr. Herman E. Bateman, Dr. Louis J. Battan, Dr. Charles I. Rosenberg, Dr. Renato I. Rosaldo, Dr. Clinton L. Trafton, Dr. Robert M. Harris, and Dr. John R. Vignery, College of Liberal Arts; Dr. Merle S. Olson, College of Medicine; Dr. Janelle C. Krueger, College of Nursing; Dr. Frederick B. Roby, Jr., Non-College Group.

Re-elected immediately upon completion of the 1970-72 term had been Mr. Barry N. Freeman and Mr. Albert M. Lane, College of Agriculture; Mr. Ellery C. Green, College of Architecture; Dr. Hollis A. Dixon, College of Business and Public Administration; Dr. Cornelius Steelink, College of Liberal Arts; Dr. John T. Boyer, College of Medicine; Dr. Kenneth L. Keating, College of Mines; Dr. Jack R. Cola, College of Pharmacy; Mr. William Varney and Mr. Arthur T. Grant, Non-College Group.

Mr. Windsor also introduced as a new student representative to the Faculty Senate Mr. Gene Simko, selected by and from the Student Senate.

Three new vice presidents were introduced as ex-officio members of the Senate: Dr. Albert Weaver, Executive Vice President; Mr. Sherwood Carr, Vice President for Business Affairs and Treasurer; and Dr. A. Richard Kassander, Vice President for Research.

Also introduced as a new ex-officio member of the Senate was Dean Hugh Odishaw of the College of Earth Sciences.

President Schaefer extended his welcome to the new members and said he looked forward to their contributions to the Senate deliberations.

REPLACEMENT TO FILL VACANCY IN SENATE, ELECTION OF: The secretary reported that one senator-at-large is at present on sabbatical leave. Dr. Sigmund Eisner will be on leave the entire year of 1972-73.

Following the practice of referring to the report of the Elections Committee for the election in question, Dr. Gegenheimer moved that the runner-up in the election for at-large members conducted in the spring of 1971, Dr. Malcolm Zwolinski, be elected as the replacement for Dr. Eisner for 1972-73. The motion was seconded and Dr. Zwolinski was unanimously elected to replace Dr. Eisner for the year 1972-73.

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

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON CONCILIATION: Dr. Gegenheimer explained that the Committee on Conciliation is a two-man faculty committee, each member serving two-year terms in a staggered arrangement. Dr. Mitchell Vavich's term has expired and he has left the committee. Dr. Paul Danielson is the carry-over member. It is the Senate's responsibility each fall to elect a new member to the Committee. Nominations are submitted by the Committee on Committees. The nominees must come from different colleges and must be from a college other than the one from which the continuing member of the committee comes.

In line with this procedure Dr. Gegenheimer presented two nominations, one to be elected: Dr. Shirley Fahey of the College of Medicine and Dr. Victor Christopherson of the School of Home Economics. Voting by ballot proceeded with Mr. Windsor and Mr. David Butler serving as tellers. Dr. Christopherson was elected the new member of the Committee on Conciliation.

ELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVES TO ARIZONA COLLEGE ASSOCIATION: Dr. Gegenheimer explained it was the time of year when the University of Arizona should select its representatives to the Arizona College Association, and he placed in nomination the names of Dr. Loyal Gryting of the Department of Romance Languages and Professor Dorothy Fuller of the Department of English.

By unanimous vote the Senate then elected Dr. Gryting and Professor Fuller as the University of Arizona's representatives to the Arizona College Association for 1972-73.

ACADEMIC CALENDARS FOR 1973-74 AND 1974-75, APPROVAL OF: The Senate approved the Academic Calendars for 1973-74 and 1974-75 as submitted by the Secretary of the Faculty, with one change. On motion by Dr. Blitzer, with several seconds, the Senate voted to discontinue the practice of observing an academic holiday in February on the Thursday of La Fiesta de los Vaqueros, the day of the Tucson Rodeo Parade. Instead Washington's Birthday will be observed as an academic holiday. These holidays fall on Monday, February 18, 1974, and Monday, February 17, 1975.

Note: The Registrar pointed out that while the calendars provide only two days for registration the fall semester of 1973 and the fall semester of 1974, it may be necessary to involve at least part of a third day. This would be Wednesday, August 22, in 1973, and Wednesday, August 21, in 1974. Whether or not a mail registration has been implemented will determine how many days must be scheduled for registration activities at those times, it was explained.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PRIVILEGE AND TENURE: Dr. Gegenheimer announced that the new member to the Committee on Academic Privilege and Tenure was Dr. David L. Hetrick of the College of Engineering. He had been selected by the Committee on Committees. (This is the year that the Committee on Committees selects the member.) The continuing member, Dr. John Lyons, and Dr. Hetrick will together select a replacement for Professor John Bloom who has now left the committee. Professor Bloom could not leave the committee last year at the time his term normally would have expired because the committee was in the middle of handling a case.

NEW STATEMENT OF UNIVERSITY POLICY RE CREDIT BY EXAMINATION AND PROFICIENCY AND EXEMPTION EXAMINATIONS, APPROVAL OF: The Senate considered a report from the Undergraduate Council recommending changes in the procedures governing various practices in the University with regard to Credit by Examination, Advanced Placement, and Proficiency and Exemption Examinations. The report previously had been approved by the Advisory Council after that group made a few changes in the recommendations from the Undergraduate Council. Dr. Bruce Crowell who had worked closely with the Undergraduate Council as Coordinator of Curricular Matters, the University position he then held, explained to the Senate the rationale behind the committee's recommendations. The recommended statement not only would coordinate a number of varying policies, but for the first time would provide for payment of the faculty members who prepare special examinations and then grade them.

On motion by Dean Myers, seconded by Dr. Shields, the recommendations were approved.

The report as adopted by the Senate follows.

PROFICIENCY AND EXEMPTION EXAMINATIONS, AND CREDIT BY EXAMINATION

Students may establish credit or proficiency in various disciplines at the University under any of several modes. They are:

1. The Advanced Placement program administered by the College Entrance Examination Board;
2. The College Level Examination Program (also administered by the College Entrance Examination Board);
3. Departmental exemption or proficiency examinations;
4. Departmental examinations for credit.

All credits earned under the above are computed as non-residence credit. In no case may the sum of credits earned through the above examinations exceed sixty units toward an undergraduate degree. No graduate credit can be established in this manner.

I: Advanced Placement from High School

The Advanced Placement program recognizes that certain students are often able to complete college level courses while attending high school. The College Entrance Examination Board provides course descriptions and professional consultants to help schools establish college level courses. The program administers and grades the examinations, and send the examinations to the students' prospective colleges.

Successful completion of these examinations which are administered in the student's high school, entitles the student to be considered for advanced placement, or to be granted college credit, or both, depending upon the area and the examination scores. Advanced placement without credit never reduces the total units remaining to be earned for the bachelor's degree, but allows the student to commence his studies in the particular field at a higher level than otherwise possible. Advanced placement with credit reduces the units remaining to be completed for a degree. Final decision regarding credit or placement is in all cases the prerogative of the department concerned. The three top scores on Advanced Placement examinations are 3, 4, and 5; in a majority of cases, a Placement score of at least 3 will suffice for advanced placement and credit.

The following is a list of the Advanced Placement examinations offered and their course equivalents at the University:

<u>Name of Advanced Placement Exam</u>	<u>Univ. of Arizona Course Equivalent</u>
AMERICAN HISTORY	--History 10a-b
BIOLOGY	--Bio. Sci. 1a-b, 5a-b
CHEMISTRY	--Chem. 2aR-2bR, 2aL-2bL
ENGLISH	--a) Credit for English 2, placement in 4 b) Credit for English 4, placement in 2 c) placement in English 2

<u>Name of Advanced Placement Exam (Cont'd)</u>	<u>Univ. of Arizona Course Equivalent (Cont'd)</u>
EUROPEAN HISTORY	--History 4a-b
FRENCH LANGUAGE	--French 2a-b, 75a-b
FRENCH LITERATURE	--Undetermined
GERMAN	--Placement above 16 unit level
LATIN VERGIL, LATIN LYRIC, LATIN PROSE	--Undetermined
MATH-CALCULUS AB*	--Math 49a, or 50a, or 66
MATH-CALCULUS BC*	--Math 49a-b, or 50a-b-c
PHYSICS B	--Physics 2a-b
PHYSICS C	--Physics 10
SPANISH	--Spanish 2a-b, 75a-b

* If advanced placement puts the student in Mathematics 49b, he will be allowed five added units of degree credit in mathematics. If placement puts him past the 49b level he will be allowed ten units of degree credit.

Credit is not necessarily stated in terms of a particular course equivalent, but only indicated on the student's record as degree credit in the particular field.

No grades are recorded for courses credited through the Advanced Placement Program.

University policy encourages prospective students to avail themselves of any Advanced Placement programs suitable to their college goals, since successful achievement in them will increase substantially students' freedom in designing their university program of study.

II: College Level Examination Program (C.L.E.P.)

The examinations offered under the C.L.E.P. were designed primarily to allow people who may not have been formal students for many years to achieve college-level credit for knowledge acquired through self-education and experience. By successful performance on C.L.E.P. examinations, many have been encouraged to pursue further a college or university education.

Additionally, these examinations are seen increasingly as of value to students formally engaged in degree programs, as a means of satisfying certain course or area requirements, or for earning extra course credits, without having to enroll formally in the courses.

The fees for the examinations are \$15 each for the Subject examinations and \$15 for one to five General examinations. Testing centers for Arizona are located in Tempe and Tucson. Resident students at the University of Arizona should contact the Director of the Student Counseling Service for information regarding these examinations.

The University of Arizona accepts for college credit both the general and the subject matter examinations of the C.L.E.P., providing satisfactory scores are attained. Scores of 500 or better will entitle the student, upon registration at the University, to six units of credit in each of the five General Examinations: 1) English Composition; 2) Humanities; 3) Mathematics; 4) Natural Sciences; 5) Social Sciences-History.

Three to eight units of credit, depending upon the examination, may be earned by scores of 50 or better on any of the twenty-seven Subject Matter Examinations:

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| American Government | History of American Education |
| American History | Human Growth & Devpt. |
| * American Literature (with essay) | Introduction to Business Management |
| Analysis and Interpretation of Literature (with essay) | * Introductory Accounting |
| ** Biology | * Introductory Calculus |
| ** Chemistry | * Introductory Economics |
| College Algebra-Trigonometry | Introductory Marketing |
| Computers and Data Processing | * Introductory Sociology |
| Educational Psychology | Money and Banking |
| * English Composition (with essay) | Statistics |
| * English Literature (with essay) | Tests and Measurements |
| General Chemistry | Trigonometry |
| General Psychology | * Western Civilization |
| ** Geology | |

* Available by examination for six units.

** Available by examination for eight units, except for Chemistry which is seven units.

Other examinations will be added as they become available.

For both prospective and currently enrolled students utilizing C.L.E.P. examinations, duplicate credit will not be awarded in subjects at the same level. In addition, resident students will not be awarded credit through C.L.E.P. for courses equivalent to, or at a lower level than, other courses they have already established in formal course work.

Passing scores for subjects credited through the C.L.E.P. are recorded simply as CR (credit), and may not necessarily be stated in terms of a specific course equivalent. No record is made of failing scores.

NOTE: No general restriction is to apply which would prevent a student from taking a C.L.E.P. examination if he had already taken and failed a regular University course in the comparable subject matter, or if he had audited such a course.

III: Exemption or Proficiency Examinations

A number of colleges and departments regularly offer exemption or proficiency examinations covering introductory or basic areas of their disciplines. These examinations are designed and graded by the individual departments. No credit is awarded on the basis of successful performance on these, but they allow a student two privileges: a) The opportunity of enrolling in advanced level courses in the area of his proficiency; or b) the opportunity of satisfying various college or departmental "area" or proficiency requirements without taking prescribed courses.

Proficiency or exemption examinations for many courses are available to any student currently enrolled in a degree program at the University. Capable students wishing to increase their elective freedom are encouraged by University policy to examine the opportunities provided through the various proficiency examinations.

At the discretion of the department, the proficiency examination may include laboratory projects or other evidence of satisfactory skills in addition to or instead of the written examination. A fee is normally charged for these examinations.

The following departments presently offer proficiency examinations at one level or another in their programs:

Astronomy	Mathematics
English	Music
German	Oriental Studies
Health, Physical Education, and Recreation	Philosophy
Home Economics	Physical Education for Women
Hydrology & Water Resources	Romance Languages
Journalism	Russian

Foreign language proficiency examination: It is possible for students to take advantage of unusual circumstances of family background, foreign residence, or individual effort to meet the language requirements by taking a proficiency examination in one language at the 16-unit level.

Foreign students will be allowed credit by transfer in their native language only for those courses taken during the years equivalent to the United States college years. They may be allowed proficiency to meet the lower-division foreign language requirement, but without credit toward graduation.

The completion of the course-levels set in this paragraph will represent the satisfaction of the requirement: Oriental Studies 260b (Arabic); Oriental Studies 200b (Chinese); Classics (Greek) 110b; Classics (Hebrew) 120b; Classics (Latin) 2b; French 2b; German 2b or 3c; Oriental Studies 230b (Hindi); Italian 2b; Oriental Studies 220b (Japanese); Oriental Studies 295b (Persian); Portuguese 102b; Russian 2b or 2c; Spanish 2b or 101b.

Passing the proficiency examination at the 16-unit level in a foreign language fulfills the language requirement in colleges requiring a foreign language. Passing a course for which the 16-unit level is prerequisite also establishes proficiency in that language. Credit may not be earned by merely passing the proficiency examination.

The results of each proficiency or exemption examination, if successful, become part of the student's permanent record, and are reported in writing by the department directly to the Office of the Registrar, with a copy of the report sent to the student. The results, if not successful, do not appear on the student's record.

General regulations:

1. Proficiency or exemption exams are available only to students enrolled in a degree program.
2. In no case does passing an exemption or proficiency examination lower the total number of units required for the bachelor's degree.
3. In normal circumstances, a student may not take a proficiency examination for the same course more than twice.
4. Arrangements for taking proficiency or exemption examinations are to be made by the student directly with the department concerned.

IV: Special Examination for Credit

Any student currently enrolled in good standing at the University of Arizona may establish up to sixty units of non-residence credit toward an undergraduate degree, through the use of special examination for credit.

Undergraduate courses currently offered by the University may be taken for credit by special examination except for those courses excluded by individual departments or schools. This examination privilege is based on the principle that the student is responsible for preparing himself to be so examined; faculty are not responsible for providing the student with individual assistance in preparation for the examination.

Capable students are encouraged to make maximum use of the special examination privilege, as it allows much greater freedom in developing their study programs. The privilege, although not automatic, is valuable. Many degree requirements as specified by the University in general, by the student's particular college, or by the department of his major, can be met through such examinations rather than through regular course enrollment.

Grades on special examinations for credit in which the student receives a passing mark are recorded as CR (credit). They become a permanent part of the student's record but are not utilized in computing the cumulative grade average. However in exceptional instances a department might petition to allow a student both a grade and residence credit on the basis of special examination.

NOTE: No general restriction is to apply which would prevent a student from taking a special examination for credit in a course he has taken previously and failed, as long as the department head approves him taking the special examination.

Limitations:

1. The credit so earned may not duplicate units already presented for admission to the University, either collegiate or subcollegiate.

2. The credit may not be in a course which is equivalent to, or more elementary than, another course in which the student is enrolled or has already received credit in that department. Whether one course is necessarily more or less elementary or advanced than another is not necessarily indicated by the course numbers. The department head concerned has the responsibility of determining the applicability of this limitation in each student's case.
3. No credit may be established in this manner for beginning or intermediate language courses in the native language of the applicant. The student may, of course, take the proficiency examination in such a language (see above).
4. The head of the examining department is in all cases the final judge as to whether the student's circumstances will be best served by such an examination.

Special examinations for credit as a rule differ substantially from proficiency or exemption examinations in their manner of administration, grading policies, duration and intent.

The examinations are constructed by the department concerned. They are designed to reflect and explore the scholastic equivalent of the course, and are more comprehensive than the usual "final exam." The examinations may be wholly, or in substantial part, written, unless the nature of the course makes an oral or "performance" examination more appropriate. Examinations in laboratory courses may be written but must give assurance that the laboratory techniques have been mastered. Departments may require course or laboratory projects, written reports, or evidence of skills of performance in addition to the written examination; they may also require satisfaction of certain prerequisites, either by coursework or examination.

Disposition of prerequisites to courses taken by special examination varies with the departments. In many cases, the prerequisites will still be required. In some cases, credit for certain prerequisites may be allowed within the department; in others, the student's elective freedom may be simply increased by the number of units represented in prerequisites to the course in question. However, in no case will the total units required for the bachelor's degree be reduced.

Procedures for Special Examination for Credit

1. The student obtains an application for special examination for credit from General Extension Services, Rm. 18, Alumni Building.
2. His qualifications for taking the desired examination are reviewed by the department concerned. The signatures of both the faculty member who will design the examination and the department head responsible must appear upon the application.
3. The application is returned to General Extension Services, and the appropriate fee is paid at that office: \$18 for an examination covering up to five units in value, \$24 for an examination covering six or more units, and \$32 for an examination covering 10 or more units. No department may schedule a special examination for a student until notified by General Extension Services that the appropriate fee has been paid.

4. The instructor responsible forwards to General Extension Services the examination to be given; General Extension Services then schedules the time and place for the examination, notifies the student, and proctors the examination. (In certain areas, the nature of the examination may dictate a different set of procedures.)
5. Under normal circumstances, the student must take the examination within thirty days of its receipt by General Extension Services.
6. General Extension Services returns the completed examination to the instructor responsible for grading.
7. The examination given by the department, together with the student's corrected examination paper, is then filed with General Extension Services for at least one year, and the grade is reported to the Registrar.
8. Upon receipt of the completed grade form, General Extension Services is authorized to reimburse the instructor at the rate of \$10 for an examination covering one through five units, \$16 for an examination covering six through nine units, and \$24 for an examination covering 10 or more units.

Note: It is the prerogative of each department to elect to offer such special examinations either "on demand," or at stated intervals only, during the school year. General Extension Services sets its schedules according to the departmental options.

ANNUAL REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN, RECEIPT OF: The annual report of the Committee of Eleven was received. Each member of the Senate had been mailed a copy of this report in advance of the meeting.

As a matter of record, Dr. Gegenheimer asked Senate members to report to their faculty colleagues that the minutes of all meetings of the Committee of Eleven are filed each year in the Special Collections Section of the University Library. They are made available there to any interested faculty member who has obtained permission to see them from the Chairman of the Faculty (Dr. Gegenheimer).

The annual report of the Committee of Eleven for 1971-72 will be incorporated in the proceedings of this meeting which will then be distributed to every member of the faculty.

ADVANCED PLACEMENT REPORT: Mr. Windsor reported that the fall 1972 report on the Advanced Placement Examination program had been prepared by his office and mailed to each senator. The report will be included as an attachment to the proceedings of the meeting sent every faculty member.

PROPOSED FACULTY CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS, CONSIDERATION OF: The Senate turned next to consideration of the proposed Faculty Constitution and Bylaws. Senate members had been mailed in advance of the meeting a statement comparing the proposed document and the existing one point by point.

President Schaefer recognized Dr. Currin Shields, chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Constitution and Bylaws. Dr. Shields pointed out that the committee consisted of the following members: Dr. Leon Blitzler, Dr. Donald J. Hanahan, Dr. David L. Hetrick, Mr. Samuel C. McMillan, Dr. Darrel S. Metcalfe (who had replaced the late Dean Francis Roy), Dr. G. Kenneth Reiblich, and

Mr. David L. Windsor. The committee had been created in 1968 as a result of action by the Faculty Senate and had met at least twice a month over a period of more than three years. The committee had obtained by various means recommendations for changes in the Constitution and Bylaws from members of the faculty. About eight months were spent developing an agenda. The committee then moved through this agenda as fast as it could, developing proposed revisions in both the Constitution and the Bylaws. The committee worked long and hard. There had been considerable disagreement along the way, of course, Dr. Shields said, but what was now before the Senate represented the committee's conclusions.

Dr. Shields then suggested an appropriate way to proceed would be for the Senate to move into a committee of the whole to consider the proposed Constitution and Bylaws. Formal action could be taken later. Parliamentarian Lynn said this indeed would be a good way to proceed. On motion by Dr. Gegenheimer, with many seconds heard, the Senate then moved into a committee of the whole.

At this point Dr. Bannister asked if the University of Arizona faculty might get into some real trouble if a proposed new constitution were submitted to the Board of Regents. He understood that another institution in the state had not fared well when its constitution was submitted to the Regents. Dr. Schaefer called on Arthur Grant who explained that he had attended a Regents meeting where a proposed constitution submitted by the faculty of Northern Arizona University was indeed extensively rewritten by members of the Board. A particular point the Regents had emphasized had been that the president of the university should chair the meetings of the Faculty Senate. Many senators said that they felt the Senate should consider the proposed draft of the Constitution and Bylaws and the body then began a line by line review of the proposed document.

Senate members agreed to the deletion of certain faculty titles which no longer exist, such as Provost and Coordinator of Research, and to substituting other titles if appropriate. Similarly, certain effective dates had to be updated since dates in the document referred to 1971.

In connection with the proposed definition of membership of the faculty Dean Ares asked what would be the status of associate or assistant deans who in addition to their administrative duties were part-time members of the teaching faculty. It was pointed out that the Committee on Faculty Membership would determine the status of such persons.

Dr. Stubblefield asked what would be the status of members of the Agricultural Extension Service. Dr. Shields explained that here also the Committee on Faculty Membership would determine the status of such persons. Dean Myers said that members of the Agricultural Extension Service were covered by the provision that faculty membership shall include personnel who hold full-time research *or service* appointments. Further, following the academic rank listing there are the words "or equivalent", Dean Myers pointed out.

Mr. Mautner wondered if the faculty status of librarians was not more limited under the new Constitution than the old. Dr. Shields explained that at the present time the determination of who shall and shall not have faculty status falls on the Office of the President. This is often a difficult determination to make. As a matter of fact, former President Harvill had expressed the hope that the committee would indeed be able to develop guidelines in this area. Dr. Shields

said that here again the Committee on Faculty Membership would have to make the determinations.

Mr. Grant asked what would be the status of a tenured person who goes from full-time to part-time status, for instance, when he grows older. He might not necessarily yet have been given emeritus status. Dr. Shields explained that this point had been given careful study, but that finally it was agreed that here again determination would have to be made by the Committee on Faculty Membership. Dr. Shields pointed out that under the "grandfather clause" of I, A, 3 of the proposed Constitution, no one presently holding faculty status would be removed from it.

Dean Ares asked who appropriately should make the determination of what is equivalent to the professorial ranks. Dr. Shields said the Constitution Committee had assumed the deans of the colleges would be helpful in this area. In any event, the Committee on Faculty Membership would have to resolve a certain number of questions.

Dr. Mathews said he thought the Committee on Faculty Membership might have difficulty making some of its determinations and he wondered if under the definition of faculty membership, reference to academic personnel who hold full-time teaching, research or service appointments might be improved if the words "teaching, research or service appointments" were simply eliminated, the committee then having to focus only on the phrase "or equivalent" which comes later. Several members of the Senate said they wondered what Dr. Mathews' proposal would accomplish. The consensus seemed to be that the definition of the three areas in which academic personnel serve would be helpful and in fact rather necessary.

Dean Drescher asked what the status would be of members of the staff of the Bureau of Mines and it was explained that these would be considered academic personnel holding research service appointments.

Dean Bleibtreu asked if a distinction was being made between General Faculty membership and voting membership. Dr. Shields said that while under the present Constitution there may be faculty membership that is not voting membership, it was the intent in the new document to provide that faculty membership be in fact voting membership. Dr. Weaver asked if under the proposed document some academic personnel might have certain faculty privileges but not have the right to vote. Dr. Shields answered in the affirmative.

Several members of the Senate asked why the statement concerning graduate appointees came as it did under I, B. A number of senators commented that they had concluded that the statement on graduate appointees falling where it did was intended to imply some sort of membership in the faculty. Dr. Shields said as a matter of fact since these persons were part-time employees and candidates for degrees they could in no way qualify under the definition of faculty membership as stated. The intent was to exempt them from faculty status. On the other hand, there had been an effort to give them a level of status higher than that carried by custodial personnel, clerk-typists, etc. Several members again said that they thought that the statement concerning graduate appointees falling where it did was confusing.

Dr. Thompson then suggested that the statement on graduate appointees have the following words added following the words "part-time graduate students":
-----"but are not members of the General Faculty". It was felt this addition

would remove the confusion which some members felt existed.

The question was raised why it was now provided that the Chairman of the Faculty should serve a term of two years. Dr. Shields pointed out that it was the belief of the committee, as would become more evident later, that the election procedure for the faculty organization needed to be simplified. One feature of this simplification would be to elect certain officers to two-year rather than one-year terms, thus making it necessary to conduct elections only every other year.

President Schaefer questioned the provision that written petitions to call a special meeting of the faculty should require 5% or 100 members of the General Faculty, whichever is larger. He wondered if this requirement was too demanding. Dr. Shields said that effort had been made to hit upon a figure which would not be so small that a few dissident members of the faculty could harass the rest of the faculty or the administration by constantly causing meetings to be called. On the other hand a number so large as to be cumbersome, it was felt, should not be established either. It was felt that the resulting figures were reasonable.

Several persons questioned whether under provision I, D, 6, Order of Business, it was necessary to state that the faculty may order its members polled by mail. The consensus was that this was an appropriate provision and could have real usefulness under certain circumstances.

It was pointed out that the document being studied included one typographical error under I, E, 1. The reference in parentheses should be to III, F, 9, not to III, E, 9.

The Senate continued its discussion suggesting minor editorial changes. Under I, E, 1, the words "as a faculty action" should be inserted after the word "effective" in the second line. The full sentence would then read, "Faculty Senate actions not appealed to the General Faculty shall become effective as a faculty action fourteen (14) days (see b., above) after the date copies of the Senate action were distributed." Dean Ares suggested in Section II, The College Faculty, the word "the" be inserted in front of the words "immediate charge" so that the first sentence would read, "Each college shall be in the immediate charge of its particular faculty." Some members of the Senate questioned this section's being included at all but it was pointed out that a similar provision has existed for 20 years in the present Constitution. The ensuing discussion showed it was the consensus that there should be provision for a college faculty structure to have voice and power in certain concerns.

Dr. Weaver said he appreciated the great amount of labor that had gone into preparing this Constitution but he felt another point should be considered. He asked if the faculty indeed wanted to proceed to consider the proposed Constitution. "Is it possible", he asked, "that we could end up with a document which would be taken to the Regents who would then take it upon themselves to rewrite it? Wouldn't it be better to revise our present Constitution modestly, if need be, but avoid the risk of having the Regents write a new constitution for us?"

Dr. Gegenheimer responded by saying that though not a member of the Faculty Constitution Committee, by invitation he had attended virtually every

meeting and participated in the committee's deliberations. He said he wished to state as Chairman of the Faculty that he thought it was desirable to proceed as the body was doing to obtain Senate approval of the proposed new document, and next proceed to obtain faculty approval. The document should then be submitted to the Board of Regents and if that body declines to approve it, that then will be their decision. The faculty will have done its part and met its obligation as a faculty to prepare the best document it feels it can. From that point on, let the chips fall where they may, he said. He wondered if the Senate would wish to consider a special meeting to continue its consideration of the proposed Constitution.

Dr. Skinner said he appreciated that much work had gone into this Constitution and more would go into it before the Senate and then the General Faculty approved it. He said, "Let's get the document into the best shape we can. Perhaps we then can try it out unofficially if it is at that time felt inappropriate to take it to the Board of Regents."

There were obviously mixed feelings among the Senate members whether a special meeting should be called to continue consideration of the Constitution. The secretary commented that at this time he knew of no major items to be on the agenda of the November meeting so that probably almost the full time could be devoted to continuing consideration of the Constitution.

The President then announced that no special meeting would be called at this time. It would be planned to have most of the time at the November meeting devoted to continuing consideration of the proposed Constitution.

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.


David L. Windsor, Secretary