

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, February 5, 1973
Gallagher Theater

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:00 p.m. on Monday, February 5, 1973, in the Gallagher Theater of the Student Union. Fifty-four members were present with President Schaefer presiding.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Bannister, Bateman, Battan, Blitzer, Brewer, Bull, Butler, Carr, Christopherson, Cole, Davis, Dixon, DuVal, Edwards, Evans, S. Fahey, W. Fahey, Gegenheimer, A. Grant, Grossman, Harris, Hull, Keating, Krueger, Lane, Manes, Mason, Massengale, Mautner, McConnell, McCoy, McMillan, Muramoto, Myers, Odishaw, Olson, Paulsen, Rhodes, Roby, Rosenberg, Schaefer, Shields, Skinner, Steelink, Stubblefield, Svob, Thompson, Trafton, Vignery, Ware, Weaver, Windsor, Yoshino, and Zwolinski. Student representative attending was Gene Simko. Dr. Frank LaBan was present as parliamentarian. Mr. Steven Dowdle was present as Assistant Secretary.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Ares, Blecha, Bleibtreu, Boyer, Bretall, Dresher, Freeman, Gaines, R. Grant, Green, Johnson, Joyner, Kassander, Mathews, Mees, Rosaldo, Sorensen, Varney, and Younggren. Student representatives absent were Paula Brimmer and John McKinney.

MERLIN K. DUVAL, WELCOME TO SENATE OF: President Schaefer welcomed back to the Faculty Senate Dr. Merlin DuVal, Vice President for Health Sciences. Vice President DuVal was founding dean of the College of Medicine and for the present will serve as acting dean of that college while a search for a new dean continues. Dr. Jack Layton has relinquished the post of acting dean. For the past eighteen months Dr. DuVal has been serving in Washington in the post of Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of December 4, 1972 were approved as distributed to members with one correction. Dr. Merle S. Olson should have been recorded as present at that meeting, not absent.

ROLL TAKING AT SENATE MEETING, CHANGE IN PROCEDURE FOR: Mr. Windsor explained that it was difficult for the secretary accurately to take roll at Senate meetings along with his other duties. Therefore effective this meeting a new roll-taking procedure was being followed. Two rosters of the membership would circulate among the group and each Senate member was asked to mark himself present on one of the rosters.

CATALOG MATERIAL: Catalog material as previously distributed to members by means of "Curriculum" Bulletins Vol. 4, No. 5 and No. 6, was approved with one exception. It was noted that in the "Curriculum" issue of January 22, 1973 (Vol. 4, No. 6) on page 5, under the College of Fine Arts, in the section headed "Speech and Hearing Sciences", the proposal that the unit value of the course 420 was being changed from a variable 1 to 9 units to a variable 18 to 32 units had been withdrawn.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN ENGLISH DEPARTMENT AND COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION RE BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION 300A-300B: Mr. Windsor reminded the Senate that at its December meeting it had referred back to the Coordinator of Curricular Matters the proposed new course, Business Administration 300a-300b, Report Writing, at the request of representatives of the Department of English. He informed the Senate that the syllabus of the course had been revised and the course had been retitled "Business Case Analysis and Presentation". The new proposal had been found satisfactory to all concerned.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE ON EFFECTIVE TEACHING: It was announced to the Senate that President Schaefer had appointed a Committee on Effective Teaching which would include the following members:

Dr. Milo K. Blecha, Professor of Elementary Education
Dr. Edgar J. McCullough, Jr., Professor of Geosciences
Dr. Henry J. Perkins, Jr., Professor of Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering
Dr. Paul H. Skinner, Professor of Speech and Hearing Sciences
Dr. J. Warren Stull, Professor of Dairy and Food Sciences
Dr. Richard M. Edwards, Vice President for Student Relations, Chairman

Dr. Edwards told the Senate that his committee's charge has been as follows: "The committee is charged with the responsibility of gathering data on teaching evaluation techniques from other campuses, supporting efforts to improve teaching and reporting to the Faculty Senate after a three-year period with positive recommendations for further implementation of an effective teaching program." Dr. Edwards said that the committee is meeting weekly. He felt confident that at least a preliminary report from the committee would be ready to be submitted to the Senate in the early fall.

RECOMMENDATION FOR HONORARY DEGREE TO BE CONFERRED AT 1973 COMMENCEMENT, APPROVAL OF: The Senate considered and approved a recommendation from one college faculty that a certain individual be awarded an honorary degree by the University of Arizona at the 1973 Commencement. This recommendation next will be considered by the General Faculty and by the Board of Regents.

Memo from K. U. Edwards

ANNOUNCEMENT RE ELECTION OF NOMINEES FOR THE UNIVERSITY TRIAL BOARD, THE UNIVERSITY REVIEW AND ADVISORY BOARD, AND THE UNIVERSITY CONDUCT BOARD: Dr. Gegenheimer reminded members of the Senate that under the provisions of the Code of Conduct it is the responsibility of the Faculty Senate each spring to submit to the President nominees for appointment to the University Trial Board, the University Review and Advisory Board, and the University Conduct Board, such nominees to be selected by the Faculty Senate. He explained that the Committee on Committees has the responsibility of preparing the lists of names from which the Senate is to select stated numbers of nominees. It is from the Senate selectees that the President makes his appointments. He said the Committee on Committees has prepared the required lists of names.

Dr. Gegenheimer moved that the secretary be instructed to conduct a mail ballot among the Senate membership on these selections. Several seconds were heard and the motion carried.

REVISED REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY, CONSIDERATION OF: Dr. Schaefer recognized Mrs. Evelyn J. Kirmse, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Political Activity. Mrs. Kirmse reminded the Senate that at the November meeting of this body an earlier report submitted by the committee had been referred back to the committee for further development. The committee had taken into account both comments of Senate members at the November meeting and written comments members had received directly from faculty colleagues. The committee was now submitting to the Senate its revised report as follows:

REVISED REPORT

COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY

February 1973

SUGGESTED REVISIONS OF 2.29 OF THE FACULTY AND STAFF MANUAL

2.29 OUTSIDE WORK BY MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY AND STAFF

A. General Policy: Outside work in the professional field of the faculty or staff member or in the field of public service is permitted and, in general, encouraged--provided of course that such work does not interfere with the performance of the University duties of the faculty or staff member. It is recognized that the extent to which outside work may interfere with the performance of University duties will vary from college to college as well as with the nature of the outside work (for example, there is good reason for allowing more time for outside work in the form of public service than in the form of work solely for private gain); and it is understood that each department and/or college will formulate its general policies and procedures related to approval of outside work in accord with the policies set forth herein, and keep its members informed thereof.

1. This general policy applies to professional work secured by the faculty or staff member himself, or proffered by outside groups, and also to the pursuit of work under University contracts, to extra teaching, and to other University-generated projects such as are described in Sec. 2.31, "Supplemental Work for the University."
 - (a) It is important that such work be conducted in accordance with the "Conflict of Interest Policy" set forth in Sec. 2.30.
 - (b) When University facilities are used, a special financial arrangement will be made with the University through the office of the department head and dean.
 - (c) The writing of books or other creative work is encouraged so long as there is no interference with assigned duties.
2. The above general policy also applies to political activity, as to which the following guidelines will be followed:

- (a) The college or university member is a citizen, and, like other citizens, should be free to engage in political activities as far as he is able to do so consistently with his obligations as a teacher and scholar.
 - (b) Many kinds of political activity (Examples: holding part-time office in a political party, seeking election to any office under circumstances that do not require extensive campaigning, or serving by appointment or election in a part-time political office) are consistent with effective service as a member of the faculty. Other kinds of political activity (Examples: intensive campaigning for elective office, or serving in a full-time position--even for a limited period of time) will often require that the professor seek a leave of absence from the University.
 - (c) In recognition of the legitimacy and social importance of political activity by professors, the University should provide institutional arrangements to permit this, similar to those applicable to other public or private extra-mural service.
 - (d) A faculty member seeking leave should recognize that he has a primary obligation to his institution and to his growth as an educator and scholar; he should be mindful of the problem which a leave can create for his administration, his colleagues, and his students; and he should not abuse the privilege of too frequent or too late or too extended a leave. If adjustments in his favor are made, such as a reduction of work load, he should expect them to be limited to a reasonable period.
3. Outside work other than that of a professional nature or that which is done in public service is discouraged only when such work is inappropriate and would result in bringing discredit to the University or in diminished effectiveness of the faculty member.
 4. While employed in outside work, or in the field of public service, the faculty or staff member will not represent or speak for the University, and he should see that his name and that of the University of Arizona will not be used for a commercial advantage by the employer of his services.* It must be understood by the employer that the faculty member is acting as an individual and that his findings are not to be interpreted as those of the University.
- B. Procedures: Whenever a faculty or staff member proposes to engage in outside work (whether in his professional field, public service, political activity, or otherwise) which may raise questions as to the full performance of his academic duties, the following procedures shall be observed:
1. The faculty or staff member who proposes to engage in such outside work should report his proposed activity to his department head, dean, or director as soon as possible and have appropriate approval, which shall be given or withheld in compliance with the above statements of general policy. In many cases (hopefully, most cases), where the outside work or activity is of such limited

* See later action changing the wording of the preceding sentence.

nature as to result in no substantial intrusion on the faculty or staff member's performance of his University duties, informal approval of the department head and/or dean, or director, will suffice. When, however, the outside work or activity is of such a character as to cause the department head, dean, or director to suggest some adjustment in the faculty or staff member's University duties, the proposal shall be submitted by the faculty or staff member in writing as promptly as he can do so to his department head, dean, or director (according to which is his immediate supervisor). The department head, dean, or director (as the case may be) shall promptly formulate his recommendation as to the conditions of the outside work or activity and forward copies to the appropriate Vice-President, the President of the University, and the faculty or staff member concerned. This recommendation shall be specific as to salary, academic (or other) load, full or part-time leave, the length of time any leave is permitted to run, and all other factors that should be considered.

2. Should a disagreement arise between a faculty or staff member and any of the above administrative officers regarding the conditions of a faculty or staff member's engaging in public service or political activities, he shall be entitled to appeal to the Committee on Conciliation, which, after hearing shall make its recommendations to the President.
3. Complete case files pertaining to recommendations and decisions covering the participation of faculty members in outside work (whether in professional work, political activity, or otherwise) shall be maintained in the President's office, and be available to any faculty or staff considering such activities, as well as to department heads, deans, or others involved in the procedure for approving such activities.
4. Sabbatical leave may be requested for public service or political activities when the purpose of said leave is within the sabbatical leave policy of the University. (See 2.24 SABBATICAL LEAVE.)

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY

Milo K. Blecha
Walter H. Evans
Donald R. Hall *
G. Kenneth Reiblich
Evelyn J. Kirmse, Chairman

* Dr. Hall, who is on leave, did not attend the last meeting of the committee and did not vote on this report.

Mrs. Kirmse made several comments about the report. She explained that a statement in the latter part of Paragraph A, "General Policy", was intended to assure that the autonomy of the individual departments would be maintained.

She said that effort had been made to avoid discriminating against outside political activity as compared with other types of outside activity. Language in the report had been somewhat changed to take care of this point. It had been felt necessary to make reference to political campaigning activity. While there is no onus on campaigning, it must be realized, Mrs. Kirmse pointed out, that campaigning can take a considerable amount of a person's time away from his University duties in order to gain nomination and election, even before service in a political office can begin.

Mrs. Kirmse said questions had been raised why mention was made of the fact that University faculty members are citizens and like other citizens should be free to engage in political activity. Would not a faculty member assume that he of course had the rights of other citizens without this being stated? The point is, Mrs. Kirmse emphasized, that people within the University community certainly understand this but people outside the University community sometimes do not, and if the matter is stated and is officially on record, a certain protection is thereby provided. The particular wording of this statement, she said, was borrowed from a national policy statement of the American Association of University Professors.

Referring to Item 1 of Section B, "Procedures", which discusses outside work or activity of a limited nature, Mrs. Kirmse said that the committee felt that reporting such activities even when they are ones that one normally might be doing fully on his own time would assist the administration when it is called upon to report on contributions faculty members make to the community, for instance. This can be of considerable value in the institution's public relations and it is to the University's credit to have such activity on record in a department head's office or in a dean's office, for example.

Mrs. Kirmse emphasized an effort had been made to spell out certain details to a greater degree in the revised report than had been done in the original one.

Referring to Item 3 of Section B, Mrs. Kirmse said it was suggested that case files be maintained not so that the administration would know at all times what every member of the faculty was doing when he was away from the campus. Rather it was felt that accurate and complete information was needed in one central place to answer questions about decisions that have been made on the division of work, teaching loads, and other concerns which sometimes have to be dealt with as a result of the outside activity of faculty members. Maintaining such a file is in no way intended to be a means of checking up on any faculty member, Mrs. Kirmse emphasized.

Dr. Gegenheimer moved that the report be accepted and several seconds were heard.

Dr. Weaver pointed out that a committee appointed by the President is at work as a result of action by the Advisory Council studying the general

matter of consulting activity by members of the faculty. Much input for this committee had been received from the college deans. Dr. Weaver said he believed the work of that committee had not been coordinated with the work of the committee of which Mrs. Kirmse was chairman. He said he thought care should be taken to see that there is not conflict between the recommendations of the two committees. Mrs. Kirmse said she was aware of the activity of the other group and it was her understanding that there would not be conflict between the recommendations of the two groups. Other members of the Senate said they thought perhaps there might be, however.

Dr. Battan referred to Item 4, Section A, particularly the wording "... should see that his name and that of the University of Arizona will not be used for a commercial advantage by the employer of his services." In certain instances, he pointed out, an employer might very well in his effort to promote his enterprise refer to the fact that a consultant used by him was a member of the faculty of the University of Arizona. Such action is of course not inappropriate, Dr. Battan said, and he suggested that in the fourth line of Item 4 following the words "will not be used" the words "in an inappropriate way" be inserted. He moved that this item be ~~amended~~ so to read. Dean Hull seconded the motion. Dr. Battan and Dean Hull then accepted Dr. Gegenheimer's suggestion that the language of the inserted wording proposed by the amendment be "in an inappropriate manner". President Schaefer commented that this would result in someone's having to interpret what indeed was appropriate but Dr. Battan said that in any event an absolute prohibition which no one seemed to want would be avoided.

The proposed amendment was then accepted by unanimous vote.

Dr. Weaver then moved to table the report as amended, pending a study comparing recommendations of this report with those of the ad hoc committee studying outside consulting on the part of faculty members. Many seconds were heard and the motion to table carried.

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT: President Schaefer said there were several comments he would like to make to the Senate. He said that preparation on the new biennial catalog was proceeding well, under the direction of Dr. William Noyes, Coordinator of Curricular Matters. The catalog will be published later in the spring.

He informed the Senate that with the approval of the Regents a bill has been introduced into the current session of the Arizona Legislature which would exempt the employees of the Arizona University System from the state health and accident insurance plan, while still providing covered employees with the \$15 a month premium payment from the state to apply toward coverage under the University's existing insurance plan. Another bill introduced in the Legislature would permit faculty members of the three state universities to participate in Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association (TIAA) and College Retirement Equities Fund (CREF) as alternatives to the Arizona Public Employees Retirement Program. Many persons feel that this would be advantageous to the universities and would facilitate the recruiting of new faculty members.

The President said that the University of Arizona would have a hearing before the Joint Budget Committee of the two houses of the legislature at 1 o'clock Friday afternoon, February 9, in Phoenix. It is hoped that support

of the University so far as appropriation by the Arizona Legislature this session will be rather generous, the President said. It is hoped that enough capital support will be furnished to proceed with development of the new University Library. Support for the operating budget looks rather promising, he said. On the other hand, the President pointed out, the prospect for federal support of higher education in the nation looks grim. The present administration in Washington has announced that it plans to work toward quite drastic cuts in federal support of higher education. Certainly it is obvious that funds for research will be much more difficult to obtain and University faculty members and department chairmen will have to work harder and harder to compete effectively to obtain the University's fair share of federal support money.

The President said that the Committee on Promotion and Tenure was providing yeoman service to the institution, meeting frequently and long. He said that there was need for concern in the area of tenure. At the present time 60% to 65% of University of Arizona faculty members hold tenure. If promotion and tenure continue to be granted in the next few years as has been the experience of recent years, in five or six years 90% to 95% of this institution's faculty would be tenured. This of course would be a very undesirable situation, he said, depriving the institution of opportunities for growth and development. It should be expected that only those individuals who indeed give every indication of great promise for the future will gain promotion and tenure in the foreseeable future.

Dr. Schaefer asked what the feeling of Senate members was to holding Commencement in the new McKale Center. Dr. Gegenheimer said he hoped the public address system would function well. Dr. Battan said he hoped the air conditioning would be adequate. Dr. Thompson said that he knew some people felt that being able to hold the commencement convocation out-of-doors at night had a certain uniqueness that should be given consideration.

PLACE OF SENATE MEETINGS, DISCUSSION RE: Dr. Gegenheimer asked the secretary to see if he could arrange for a more desirable meeting place for the Faculty Senate. He said several members of the Senate had complained to him about the cavernous size of Gallagher Theater as a legislative chamber, as well as the dim lighting. The nature of the room discourages debate, he said. President Schaefer asked Mr. Windsor to see if a smaller room satisfactory for the needs of the Senate could be found.

PROPOSED FACULTY CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS, FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF: The Senate continued its consideration of the proposed Faculty Constitution and Bylaws. The President declared that the Senate should become a committee of the whole. The Senate then resumed its line-by-line consideration of the proposed Bylaws beginning at the point where it had interrupted its review at the December meeting. Dr. Shields, chairman of the Ad Hoc Faculty Constitution and Bylaws Committee, took his place at the podium for this line-by-line reading.

The Senate resumed its consideration with Section F of Bylaw 5. There was no discussion other than an occasional question's being raised until Bylaw 8, titled "Departmental Government", was read. Dr. Schaefer said he could not accept this bylaw as an appropriate one. He felt that selection of department chairmen must be left to the judgment of the dean and he said he would urge defeat of adoption of that bylaw. Dr. Weaver said he concurred with President Schaefer.

Dr. Skinner said Bylaw 8 simply called for a review of the status of a department chairman and of the government of that department. Dr. Shields said there had been many requests that there be reference in the Bylaws to departmental government. Dr. Skinner said he was sure many members of the faculty would be disappointed if this provision were stricken. He said he was sure that selection of a chairman by the members of a department would not be appropriate in many instances but he thought a review of the status of the chairman and the government of every department would be healthy. Dr. Schaefer said that review is a healthy process if it does not degenerate into a popularity contest.

Dr. Blitzer said that sometimes conflicts must be resolved at an administrative level. He remembered that the late Dean Roy when he served as a member of the committee that drafted the Constitution and Bylaws had urged some such provision as Bylaw 8 would give. He said such reviews if regularly called for would help the administration resolve difficult situations. Dr. Skinner pointed out that conducting a review would not necessarily result in specific recommendations on the part of a department faculty to a college dean, for example.

He said that the lack of review was considerably worse in his judgment than providing for review. He felt the most wholesome approach to the situation would be to provide for a periodic review and he hoped that the administration would welcome such review. He said perhaps in the Faculty Bylaws would not be the proper place to provide for this, but it should be provided for somewhere. He said he thought a periodic review of deans would be healthy and he said again that he thought the entire procedure of review would be wholesome.

Dean Hull said that deans are constantly reviewing the performance of their department heads.

Dr. Shields said that the proposed Bylaw 8, in fact, really was a compromise. Some persons had supported the position that no review of department chairmen should be called for while others had held the view that automatic rotating chairmanships should be established.

Dr. Skinner said he believed that informal review of the sort that had been referred to earlier leads to input but leads also to decision making based on hearsay and only partial information.

Dr. Schaefer asked if anyone in the Senate believed that tenured members of the faculty should be reviewed periodically. No one responded that he thought review of faculty members should be provided for.

Dr. Gegenheimer said that this proposal had received careful attention from the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. He said the most cogent reason for specifically providing for periodic review of departmental government was that under the present system, although as Dean Hull indicated informal review does go on all the time, ever so often specific reviews must be made and when this happens it is so special a situation people feel a threat is being made and great turmoil results. If routine periodic review were provided for, it would be accepted as part of the University's normal ongoing operation.

Dean Fahey said he agreed with Dr. Gegenheimer. True, there is sustained review and occasionally there has to be special review. But regular periodic review would provide a more comfortable way and a more satisfactory way to operate. It is understood in the College of Engineering, for example, that in addition to continuing review regularly every five years there is a deliberate, special review of a department. Everyone expects it. When such review is known and expected, it is not nearly so traumatic, he said. He also thought a periodic review of deans would be in order.

Dr. Battan said he thought that provision for periodic review of a department's government in the Bylaws was inappropriate and should be deleted. Such review should be provided for, however, somewhere, he said, and it should include a review of the performance of deans also.

At this point Dr. Schaefer requested Dr. Shields to ask for a showing of hands by the members of the Senate, first on the propriety of providing for a review of departments in the Faculty Bylaws, and second, if such a review is not called for in the Bylaws, on the propriety of its being called for in University procedure some other way. By a heavy preponderance of voting by hand Senate members indicated they felt that provision for periodic review of departmental government should not be in the Bylaws. However, a heavy preponderance of the senators indicated they felt that the University should provide in some manner for a periodic review of departmental government although this was not called for in the Bylaws. President Schaefer thanked the Senate for this indication of the members' sentiments.

By consent the Senate then moved from a committee of the whole into a legislative body.

Dr. Shields then moved that the Senate accept the report of the committee. Dr. Gegenheimer seconded it. After some general discussion as to how the Senate next should proceed, Dr. Shields and Dr. Gegenheimer withdrew their motion.

The Senate then agreed that it would begin formal consideration of the proposed Constitution and Bylaws at its next meeting and the secretary was asked by Dr. Gegenheimer to provide all members of the Senate with an updated version of the proposed Constitution and Bylaws reflecting certain technical changes made during the initial reading of the proposal.

Turning again to the matter of a review of departmental government, Dr. Blitzer asked President Schaefer if it was his intent to appoint a committee to study this matter and recommend an appropriate way whereby a periodic review procedure would be established. Dr. Schaefer replied that it was his intent to appoint such a committee.

Dr. Cole referred to the practice at the University of Utah where each department is reviewed every three years. Not only the chairman but every member of the faculty of a department is reviewed by a University-wide committee of faculty members.

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 o'clock.


David L. Windsor, Secretary