

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
Proceedings of the Faculty Senate

Meeting of Monday

April 2, 1973

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:00 p.m. on Monday, April 2, 1973, in Room 331 of the Education Building. Fifty members were present with Executive Vice President Weaver presiding.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Bannister, Bateman, Battan, Blecha, Blitzler, Boyer, Bretall, Brewer, Bull, D. Butler, H. Butler, Carr, Cole, Davis, Dixon, Dresher, Evans, Gegenheimer, R. Grant, Harris, Hull, Johnson, Kassander, Keating, Krueger, Lane, Mason, Massengale, Mathews, McConnell, McCoy, Mees, Muramoto, Myers, Olson, Paulsen, Paylore, Rhodes, Rosaldo, Rosenberg, Skinner, Sorensen, Steelink, Stubblefield, Svob, Tomizuka, Trafton, Vignery, Weaver, and Windsor. Dr. Robert Sankey was present as parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Ares, Bleibtreu, Christopherson, DuVal, Edwards, S. Fahey, W. Fahey, Freeman, Gaines, A. Grant, Green, Grossman, Joyner, Manes, Mautner, McMillan, Odishaw, Roby, Schaefer, Shields, Thompson, Varney, Ware, Yoshino, Younggren, and Zwolinski. Student representatives absent were Paula VanNess, John McKinney, and Gene Simko.

WELCOME TO RETURNING SENATORS PAYLORE AND TOMIZUKA: Dr. Weaver welcomed to the Senate Miss Patricia Paylore and Dr. Carl Tomizuka. Since in the member-at-large election recently completed these two persons had received the greatest number of votes of those elected who were not presently members of the Senate, they had been declared members for the balance of the 1972-73 academic year and authorized to take seats beginning at this meeting in conformance with special action of the Senate taken on March 5. This action had been taken to maintain the appropriate balance between ex-officio members and elected members of the Senate. The Senate had taken this action inasmuch as on March 1 the former Registrar had been named Dean of Admissions and Records and a new Registrar had been appointed with the result that the Senate now had an additional ex-officio member.

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

CHANGE IN DATES OF SPRING RECESS IN 1973-74 AND 1974-75: The Secretary explained that at the University of Arizona the spring recess traditionally has moved about the semester with Easter. Various faculty members and groups had urged that the time of the spring recess be stabilized. The Advisory Council had therefore recently voted to recommend to the Senate that the one week spring vacation, beginning in 1973-74, be held during the ninth full week of classes. Dean Windsor moved that

beginning with the 1973-74 academic year the spring recess be scheduled for the ninth full week of classes of the second semester, and an academic holiday be held on Good Friday preceding Easter. Several seconds were heard.

Dean Rhodes said it was his recollection that the Advisory Council action had specified that the spring vacation fall in or about the ninth full week of classes and he felt that the Senate action should provide similar flexibility. Mr. Butler, who had served as Secretary of the Advisory Council meeting when that body had acted on this matter, confirmed Dean Rhodes' understanding of the Council action. Dean Rhodes moved to amend the motion on the floor to indicate the recess be on or about the ninth full week of classes. Several seconds were heard to Dean Rhodes' motion. Dr. Stubblefield then moved to amend Dean Rhodes' amendment to provide that the spring recess fall during the ninth full week of classes except when Easter falls in the eighth or tenth week, in which case the vacation would be taken during Easter week. Several seconds were heard to Dr. Stubblefield's motion. Dean Rhodes said that the point had been made in the Advisory Council meeting that it would be desirable to provide flexibility for reasons in addition to relating the recess to the date of Easter. Voting on Dr. Stubblefield's amendment to Dean Rhodes' amendment was called for and Dr. Stubblefield's motion failed. The motion on Dean Rhodes' amendment was called for. The amendment carried. The question on the original motion was then called for and it carried.

Mr. Davis said he assumed that the College of Law like the College of Medicine would continue to have the privilege of adjusting its calendar as deemed appropriate by the faculty of that college. The Secretary said he assumed that the Law College would continue to have such flexibility.

DISCUSSION OF REVISED STATEMENT OF FACULTY AND STAFF MANUAL SECTION 2.31, "SUPPLEMENTAL WORK FOR THE UNIVERSITY": Dr. Weaver called on Dr. Kassander who explained that early in the year President Schaefer had asked Vice President Weaver and Vice President Kassander to study the present statement in the Faculty and Staff Manual titled "Supplemental Work for the University," Section 2.31. Much input had been received from deans and directors, Dr. Kassander said. All concerned had agreed it would be desirable to revise the present statement not only because a periodic re-examination of any policy is desirable but because the manner in which the present statement of Section 2.31 is worded, referring to a limitation of supplemental work within the University to a specified number of hours, had caused some persons to feel they automatically therefore were expected to spend only a certain minimum number of hours on their regular University duties. The limitation on supplemental work for the University as carried in the present Manual statement has been as follows (2.31 (a)): "The limitation of such extra work as mentioned above is, in brief, 712 hours per fiscal year for academic year appointees (this includes an allowance of ten weeks full time during June, July and August), and 384 hours for 12-month appointees."

Dr. Kassander called attention to a comparative statement he had prepared and which had been distributed to members of the Senate carrying the present Manual statement and a revised statement developed by him and Dr. Weaver. He explained that the revised statement had been officially adopted by the Advisory Council on February 28, 1973. The revised statement read as follows:

## 2.31 SUPPLEMENTAL WORK FOR THE UNIVERSITY

As a matter of policy, it is expected that the teaching, research, and service activities of the University's faculty and staff should have the benefit of their full attention. There is no automatic provision for persons on either academic or fiscal appointment for relief of time for outside consulting or for work on University-generated contracts or projects.

In certain special circumstances, outside consulting or service activities could be expected sufficiently to enhance a person's regular teaching, research or service responsibility that it would be considered in the institution's best interest that the faculty or staff member be permitted the use of time and facilities otherwise committed to the University. Every such activity should be discussed with the appropriate department head and dean or director and a record of time and resources used should be kept.

No general regulations are proposed for extra compensation from outside sources for such services. These are considered very special situations and final determination of acceptability shall be by the dean or director involved according to the professional ethics of the particular field.

Extra compensation from grants and contracts held by the University is discouraged, except during periods of academic holiday and summer session by people on academic appointment. Certain exceptions to this policy will necessarily exist, especially where there is no reasonable alternative to the faculty or staff member spending considerable time and effort beyond that generally expected. Every such exception must be approved by the appropriate dean or director and careful records kept. The rate for such compensation will be the faculty or staff member's regular rate.

In summary, University administration expects the full effort from the members of the faculty and staff and will make its best effort that they be properly compensated. Supplemental compensation from other University-administered funds is discouraged except where there is a clear advantage to the institution and the practice is encouraged by the ethics and customs of the profession involved.

Dr. Kassander emphasized that this matter referred only to supplemental work for the University of Arizona. Outside work is provided for in other policy statements.

Dr. Kassander commented that he felt the strength of the proposed statement was that the responsibility would now reside where observation of what an individual faculty member is doing can best be carried on, that is, with the director or dean concerned. He explained that the Advisory Council had approved the new statement after it had been earlier considered and approved by the Committee of Eleven. He said that while Faculty Senate approval was not necessary he had thought it would be appropriate to bring the statement to the Senate for comment.

Dr. Battan asked if it were not true that there has been a tradition on this campus that faculty members could consult up to eight hours a week. This would account for the development of the statement earlier referred to in terms of specific hours limiting supplemental work. He asked if this proposal would change this tradition. Dr. Kassander said that while it is true that if 712 hours per fiscal year were divided by the number of work weeks concerned the result would be a figure of eight hours a week, there was no other document he had been able to find which referred to the privilege of eight hours a week of outside consulting or of supplemental work. He emphasized again that the statement under discussion referred to supplemental work for the University. He said that a dean or department head could still approve a person's working a considerable amount of time in supplemental activity if it was in the institution's best interest. That determination should be made by the dean or director. However, the re-statement of policy would remove any implication that faculty members are expected to spend only 32 hours a week on their regular University duties (40 hours minus 8). He referred to the statement "..... it is expected that the teaching, research and service activities of the University's faculty and staff should have the benefit of their full attention."

Dean Hull referred to the reference in the second paragraph of the statement to "outside consulting." Dr. Kassander said that the word "outside" here referred to outside one's own normal sphere of activity within the institution, but still within the University. He gave as an example a professor of engineering who was asked to do consulting in the College of Medicine. Professor Mees and Dr. Gegenheimer emphasized that this entire statement falls under the rubric of supplemental work for the University. It was then suggested by several persons that the phrase "supplemental consulting" replace the phrase "outside consulting" in the first sentence of the second paragraph of the new statement. Dr. Bannister pointed out that some supplemental activities might involve two or more departments in interdisciplinary effort. What should be done if the dean in which one discipline falls had a policy permitting such supplemental activity and the dean of the other discipline had a policy prohibiting such activity? The case then would have to be referred to a higher authority, Dr. Kassander said. He added that it was true that at least two colleges on the campus have policies prohibiting faculty members of those colleges from participating in supplemental activity, and he felt that it was appropriate that deans have the prerogative to establish college policy. He said he would not suggest that there be a provision whereby a dean who had such policy could be overruled. If an impasse developed because of two differing policies in two different colleges, the result would have to be that a particular project could not go forward. Dr. Bannister commented that he thought it was unlikely that such impasses would develop often.

Dr. Battan asked if the wording of the old statement setting a limitation of a specific number of hours, had been established to provide an inducement to attract faculty members to the University of Arizona. Dr. Kassander said yes, that the policy had been established at the urging of a former dean of one

of the colleges as a recruiting aid. Salaries were much lower then and it was felt that such an arrangement should be specified in order to show prospective faculty members that there might be opportunities to supplement one's income. Salaries are much better now, he said, and it is felt that such a statement is no longer appropriate or necessary.

Dr. Battan said that the old statement did have the advantage of indicating a specific number of hours that a faculty member might be permitted to engage in supplemental work within the institution. Might the new policy be interpreted as taking away that long-standing right? Dr. Kassander said he saw the matter in a different light. The old system stated a specific limitation. Now no limitation would be stated and a faculty member could engage in as much supplemental work as he wished so long as his dean or director thought it could and should appropriately be done. This would be a more liberal policy, he said. Such matters should be controlled by professional ethics, not arbitrarily specified hour limits.

Professor Mees commented that sometimes such supplemental work carried with it the benefit of enriching the background of the faculty member concerned with the end that he became a better teacher.

Dr. Gegenheimer commented that the Committee of Eleven had felt that the new statement was a more liberal and a superior statement to the old one. He moved that the Senate endorse the revised statement as approved by the Advisory Council. Dr. Tomizuka and Dr. Vignery said that they were confused by the use of the word "outside" in several points in this statement. Dr. Kassander said that the words "outside consulting" in the first paragraph were necessary and appropriate. He agreed that "outside consulting" could better be stated as "supplemental consulting" in the second paragraph. In the third paragraph in the reference to "outside sources," he felt the reference was simply to sources of funding but the activity concerned was still activity within the institution.

Dr. Skinner then moved that Dr. Gegenheimer's motion be tabled. He said he felt that Dr. Kassander had received considerable comment from the Senate which should be helpful to him in determining just how the policy on supplemental work for the University should now be stated in the Faculty and Staff Manual. Several seconds to this motion were heard and it carried.

PROPOSED FACULTY CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS, FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF: The Senate continued consideration line-by-line of the proposed new Faculty Constitution and proposed new Faculty Bylaws. Such consideration will continue at the next meeting of the Senate.

---

David L. Windsor, Secretary

---

David Butler, Assistant Secretary