



# THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

TUCSON, ARIZONA 85721

OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF  
ADMISSIONS AND RECORDS

October 18, 1973

TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY:

In the enclosed Proceedings of the meeting of the Faculty Senate of October 1, 1973 you will find recorded the discussion and subsequent approval of a recommendation from the Committee of Eleven "that Section A of Article III of the Faculty Constitution, dealing with the membership of the Faculty Senate, be amended to provide that a total of 12 students shall hold full membership in the Faculty Senate. These shall include the President and the Executive Vice President of the Associated Students of the University of Arizona, and 10 student senators elected by and from the Student Senate, no more than one of whom shall be enrolled in any one college."

Also enclosed are a statement in support of the proposed amendment and a statement against it. These statements were prepared by committees representing respectively the two points of view. The committees were appointed by the Chairman of the Faculty, Dr. Albert Gegenheimer.

President Schaefer has called a meeting of the General Faculty to discuss the proposed amendment to be held at 4:30 o'clock on Thursday afternoon, November 8, 1973, in Room 100 of the Liberal Arts Building (the Liberal Arts Auditorium). Following the faculty meeting where the proposed amendment will be discussed, a balloting of the faculty will be conducted by mail. If the proposed amendment is approved by the faculty it will be submitted to the Board of Regents. The proposed amendment would become operative when approved by the Board of Regents.

David L. Windsor, Secretary  
General Faculty

STATEMENT IN FAVOR OF ADMITTING STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES  
TO THE FACULTY SENATE WITH FULL VOTING RIGHTS

Of the various segments of the University, three seem to have a primary interest in the academic quality of the institution. These are the teaching faculty, the administrators, and the students. Only the students, at present, lack an effective voice in that body which considers various academic issues and makes recommendations as to the resolution of those issues. That body, the Faculty Senate, should expand its membership to include representatives of the student body so that the student perspective will be known to the Senate and so that student government will have more meaning to the student body as a whole than it has presently.

It has been argued that the Faculty Senate is, in fact, not a teaching faculty senate as the name implies, but is a body of teachers, administrators, and service personnel and that the addition of student senators would make the name "Faculty Senate" even more of a misnomer. This is true, but beside the point. Perhaps a name such as "University Senate" would be better and perhaps a body consisting only of teaching faculty should be formed in addition. But since the Senate does now include members representing at least two major segments of the University, shouldn't that large and critically important segment, the students, also be represented? Without a larger student voice, the Senate can scarcely speak with authority on issues of concern to students, faculty, and administrators.

October 1973

STATEMENT AGAINST ADMITTING STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES  
TO THE FACULTY SENATE WITH FULL VOTING RIGHTS

Good universities expect their faculties to teach, carry out scholarly activities and guide the affairs of the university. The Faculty Senate is the institutional mechanism by which the faculty normally performs the last of these functions. At this University, the Faculty Senate is chaired by the President and includes 25 nonelected administrators. This one-third of the Senate, by virtue of the prestige and position of its members, exerts a disproportionately large influence on the decisions of the Senate.

Certainly the students should have a voice in the affairs of the University. When any question dealing with University matters arises, the Student Senate can promulgate a position on the question. The three nonvoting student members of the Faculty Senate can present the position and supporting arguments to this Senate.

At present, it is not entirely accurate to regard the body composed of 25 administrators and 50 faculty as a Faculty Senate. If 12 student voting members were added, it would be even less accurate. It would be impossible to discriminate between the views of the administration, the students, and the faculty. In such a circumstance, the faculty's influence on University affairs will be even less than it is today.

The proposal is a step toward the creation of an All-University Senate, but it also moves in the direction of depriving the faculty of a representative body for taking stands on matters which concern the faculty in the fulfillment of its responsibilities. Consequently, it further downgrades the status of the faculty at this University.

October 1973

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
Proceedings of the Faculty Senate

Meeting of Monday

October 1, 1973

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Bateman, Battan, Blecha, Bleibtreu, Brewer, D. Butler, Carr, Davis, Dewhirst, Dresher, DuVal, Edwards, S. Fahey, Frank, Gegenheimer, Graham, A. Grant, Green, Grossman, Harris, Hull, Joyner, Kassander, Knorr, Krueger, Lane, Manes, Mason, Massengale, McCoy, McMillan, Miller, Muramoto, Odishaw, Olson, Paulsen, Paylore, Rhodes, Roby, Rosenberg, Schaefer, Skinner, Sorensen, Stairs, Steelink, Stubblefield, Thompson, Tomizuka, Trafton, Vignery, Weaver, Windsor, and Yoshino. Student representatives present were Bryna Vertlieb, Stephanie Denkowicz, and Chris Reece. Dr. Frank LaBan and Dr. Robert Sankey were present as parliamentarians.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Boyer, Bull, H. Butler, Cole, Dixon, Evans, W. Fahey, Fazio, Freeman, Gaines, R. Grant, Johnson, Keating, Livermore, Mathews, McConnell, McCullough, Mees, Rosaldo, Shields, Svob, Varney, and Ware.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS: President Schaefer asked the secretary to introduce new members-at-large who were beginning two-year terms of Senate membership. New members-at-large serving their first term in the Senate, or returning after an absence, included: Dr. Leonard Dewhirst, Veterinary Science; Mr. Steve Fazio, Horticulture & Landscape Architecture; Mr. Gordon J. Graham, Agricultural Experiment Station; Dr. Amy Jean Knorr, Home Economics; Dr. Donna M. Miller, Physical Education for Women; Dr. Edgar McCullough Jr., Geosciences.

Members-at-large elected to continue in service immediately following terms as members-at-large included: Dr. Henry E. Butler, Educational Administration; Dr. Daniel D. Evans, Hydrology & Water Resources; Dr. Shirley N. Fahey, Psychiatry; Dr. Conrad F. Joyner, Government; Dr. Charles T. Mason Jr., Biological Sciences; Dr. Christopher K. Mathews, Biochemistry-Medical; Dr. Martin Massengale, Agronomy & Plant Genetics; Dr. Hiroshi Muramoto, Agronomy & Plant Genetics; Dr. Currin V. Shields, Community Services; Dr. Paul H. Skinner, Speech and Hearing Sciences; Dr. Raymond H. Thompson, Anthropology; Dr. I. Roger Yoshino, Sociology.

Dean Windsor pointed out that Miss Patricia Paylore and Dr. Carl Tomizuka had also been elected as members-at-large. They, however, had been seated in the spring of 1973 and served in the Senate in April and May to maintain balance in the Senate between ex-officio and elected members. Miss Paylore and Dr. Tomizuka had been the two nominees receiving the highest number of votes in the 1973 members-at-large election.

Dean Windsor further stated that this year's student representatives were Bryna Vertlieb, President of the Associated Students of the University of Arizona; Chris Reece, Executive Vice President; and Stephanie Denkowicz, the third student representative. All three students had been introduced at the May meeting.

President Schaefer also introduced Dr. Gerald Stairs, new Dean of the College of Agriculture and new ex-officio member of the Faculty Senate. Dean Joseph Livermore, new Dean of the College of Law and new ex-officio member of the Senate, could not be present at this meeting.

President Schaefer welcomed all new members of the Senate to the body.

ELECTION OF REPLACEMENTS TO FILL VACANCIES IN SENATE: The secretary explained that Dr. Christopher K. Mathews, elected in the spring to a two-year term as a member-at-large, was on sabbatical leave for the 1973-74 year and that the Senate should elect a replacement for this position for the period of Dr. Mathews' absence from the campus. It was explained that in the election for senators-at-large in March the next runner-up eligible now to serve was Dr. Ray Reed of the Department of Veterinary Science. On motion by Dr. Gegenheimer with several seconds heard the Senate unanimously elected Dr. Reed to serve as senator-at-large during the year 1973-74 in place of Dr. Mathews. Dr. Mathews will resume his position in the fall of 1974 and serve the second year of his two-year term.

The secretary pointed out that Dr. Hollis A. Dixon, a senator from the College of Business and Public Administration, was on leave during the first semester of 1973-74 and a replacement for Dr. Dixon should be chosen. Dean Manes then nominated Dr. Helmut J. Frank to serve during the first semester replacing Dr. Dixon. Dr. Frank was the next runner-up in the election of senators from the College of Business and Public Administration in the spring of 1972. Several seconds were heard to Dean Manes' motion that Dr. Frank be unanimously elected and the motion carried. Dr. Frank was in the room and then took his place as a member of the Faculty Senate.

CATALOG MATERIAL: The catalog material as previously distributed to members of the Senate by means of the "Curriculum" bulletins was approved with one exception. Mr. Windsor pointed out that communication from Dr. William Noyes, Coordinator of Curricular Matters, had explained that the last entry under "Catalog Changes" in the August 10, 1973 issue of the "Curriculum," referring to Secondary Education 397d, e, f, and g and the crosslisting of these as English 397d, e, f, and g, was published in error and the proposed change had been withdrawn.

ELECTION OF DR. EDGAR MCCULLOUGH TO COMMITTEE ON CONCILIATION: Dr. Gegenheimer reminded the Senate that the Committee on Conciliation is a two-member committee with each member serving a two-year term. Terms are staggered. Dr. Victor Christopherson has a second year to serve of his term. Dr. Gegenheimer reported that the Committee on Committees had nominated Dr. Cecil Robinson and Dr. Edgar McCullough Jr. for the new two-year term of membership on the Committee on Conciliation. Voting by ballot was then conducted with Registrar Butler and Dr. LaBan serving as tellers. Dr. McCullough was elected.

Dr. Gegenheimer said that Dr. Christopherson had suggested that there would be advantage to enlarging the Committee on Conciliation to some size larger than two members. This larger membership would make it easier to handle difficulties which arise when a conciliation case involves a faculty member from the same college as that of one of the Committee members or when a member of the Committee is on leave or otherwise unable to participate in the consideration of a conciliation case.

LENGTH OF UNIVERSITY TEACHING CONTRACTS, REFERENCE TO: Dr. Thompson asked President Schaefer if he could explain indications in the press recently, in connection with the statements of a disgruntled member of the faculty who felt he was not being fairly treated, that some persons had been offered three-year teaching contracts. Dr. Thompson asked if contracts of greater length than one year were now available at the University. Following general laughter President Schaefer stated that, as most people are aware, under Arizona law no University employe can be given a contract for a period of longer than one year. Department chairmen and deans frequently inform individuals that if all goes well and an individual's performance is satisfactory, he can expect to be continued in employment for longer than one year. The institution, however, cannot make a binding legal contract for longer than a twelve-month period.

OFFICERS OF COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND NEW MEMBER OF COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN, ANNOUNCEMENTS RE: Dr. Gegenheimer informed the Senate that Dr. George Sparks would serve as chairman of the Committee on Committees during 1973-74 and Dr. Joseph Zapotocky would serve as secretary.

A vacancy had occurred in the membership of the Committee of Eleven, Dr. Gegenheimer reported, and Professor Charles Ares of the College of Law had been selected as the replacement in that post.

ELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVES TO ARIZONA COLLEGE ASSOCIATION: Dr. Gegenheimer nominated Professor Dorothy Fuller of the Department of English and Dr. Loyal Gryting of the Department of Romance Languages as the representatives of the University of Arizona to the Arizona College Association for 1973-74. He said that both Miss Fuller and Dr. Gryting had served as Arizona College Association representatives previously including the year 1972-73 and he urged their re-election. Miss Fuller and Dr. Gryting were then unanimously elected as representatives of the University of Arizona to the Arizona College Association for the ensuing year.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PRIVILEGE AND TENURE: Dean Windsor reminded the Senate that the Committee on Academic Privilege and Tenure includes three members, each serving a three-year staggered term. One year the new member is selected by the Committee on Committees, the next year by the President of the University, and the next year by the two continuing members of the Committee. 1973 is the year when the President of the University appoints the new member. The Secretary announced that President Schaefer had appointed Dr. Willard H. VanSlyck Jr. of the College of Law to the Committee on Academic Privilege and Tenure. Dr. VanSlyck will be on leave the first semester of 1973-74 and President Schaefer has prevailed upon Dr. John Lyons, the retiring member of the committee, to continue to serve until January 1974 when Dr. VanSlyck will return to the campus.

COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN REPORT: President Schaefer referred to the annual report of the Committee of Eleven which had been received from the Secretary of the 1972-73 Committee, Miss Patricia Paylore. A copy of this report had been furnished each member of the Senate with the call of this meeting. Dr. Gegenheimer moved that the 1972-73 report of the Committee of Eleven be accepted, and that it be made a part of the permanent minutes of this meeting. The report would then be included in the Proceedings of the Senate meeting furnished all members of the faculty.

Several seconds were heard to Dr. Gegenheimer's motion and it carried unanimously.

ADVANCED PLACEMENT REPORT: The President referred to the annual report on students entering the University of Arizona who have taken the national Advanced Placement Examinations in their high schools. This report is prepared once a year by the Department of Admissions and Records. A copy had been sent each member of the Senate with the call of this meeting. On motion the Senate voted to accept the report which will become a part of the permanent minutes of the meeting. A copy of the Advanced Placement report will be furnished all members of the faculty as part of the Proceedings of this meeting.

FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN'S RECOMMENDATION THAT TWELVE STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES BE MADE VOTING MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY SENATE: President Schaefer referred to the recommendation received from the Committee of Eleven at the May meeting of the Senate whereby twelve student representatives would be made voting members of the Faculty Senate.

The proposal from the Committee of Eleven had been that a new bylaw, Bylaw 16, be adopted as follows: "A total of twelve students shall hold full membership in the Faculty Senate. These shall include the President and Vice President of the Associated Students of the University of Arizona and ten student senators selected by and from the Student Senate." The proposal had been debated at length at the May meeting of the Senate but action on the proposal had been carried over to the October meeting.

The President pointed out that legal advice had made it clear that the proposed change in the Senate membership could not be provided for simply by adoption of an additional bylaw. Since the makeup of the membership of the Senate is provided for by the Constitution itself, this could be changed only by an amendment to the Constitution. Dr. Schaefer said that the Senate of course could propose amendments to the Constitution. He emphasized he was not speaking against the proposal but was merely explaining that the proposed change could not legally be brought about simply by the adoption of an additional bylaw. Rather the Constitution itself must be amended.

The question before the House then, he continued, should be considered as a proposed amendment to the Constitution.

Dean Brewer asked if the proposal would involve representation on the part of students according to the colleges in which they are enrolled. Several persons answered in the negative. Mr. Reece pointed out that since the student representatives would be elected by and from the Student Senate and since the Senate membership itself includes representatives from all colleges of the University, to that extent college representation would be involved.

Dr. Muramoto then moved that the proposal being considered be amended to provide that the student representatives include one student from each college. Mr. McMillan seconded this motion.

Dr. Trafton said he thought the faculty should not tell the students to such an extent how they should elect their representatives to the Faculty Senate.

At this point Dr. LaBan pointed out that the initiating body of a proposal of this sort--in this case the Committee of Eleven--had the right to reject proposed changes in recommendation of the nature proposed by Dr. Muramoto.

Several senators pointed out that since there are fourteen colleges Dr. Muramoto's proposal if adopted would provide for a larger number of student representatives than twelve. Dean Hull urged that no more than one student representative come from any one college. Dr. Gegenheimer asked if Dean Hull intended that no student senator elected to the Faculty Senate should come from the same college in which the ASUA President or Vice President was enrolled. Further, what if the President and the Vice President of ASUA both were enrolled in the same college?

At this juncture it was pointed out that the proposal from the Committee of Eleven referred to "the Vice President of the Associated Students." However this year ASUA has two Vice Presidents. It was suggested that the proposal specify "the Executive Vice President" and Miss Vertlieb and Mr. Reece indicated that this change would be acceptable.

Dr. Muramoto then stated that he would change his motion to specify that the original proposal should be amended to insert the word "Executive" before the reference to the ASUA Vice President and following the reference to the election of ten student representatives from and by the Student Senate to insert the phrase, "no more than one of whom shall be enrolled in any one college."

Dean Rhodes said he thought it should be clearly indicated that a graduate student in a liberal arts department (chemistry, for example) should be considered enrolled in the Graduate College rather than in the College of Liberal Arts. Dr. Gegenheimer said that the same situation should prevail here as prevails in the election of student senators in the first place. Graduate senators are elected as representatives of the Graduate College without reference to the department or discipline in which their graduate studies fall.

Dean Manes asked if all colleges are represented in the Student Senate and the answer was in the affirmative.

Dr. Rosenberg said he thought it was inappropriate to propose bringing student representatives into the faculty's representative body, that is, the Faculty Senate, but then to decline to recognize the students' right to select their representatives in their own way.

Dean Brewer said he felt providing for widespread college representation would be as important in electing student representatives as it was in electing faculty representatives. He said he felt if specific provision were not made, a small college such as Pharmacy could easily find itself unrepresented.

Dr. Trafton said that the Faculty Senate should not force a particular format of representation upon the students.

Dr. Gegenheimer referred to Dr. LaBan's statement that the initiating body of a proposal (in this case the Committee of Eleven) could reject a proposed change in its recommendation. "Does not the proposal once received by the Senate become the property of the Senate?", he asked.

Dr. Sankey explained that if an amendment to a proposal runs contrary to the essence of the proposal itself the sponsoring group has the right to reject the proposal. He pointed out that of course if the Committee of Eleven declined to accept the proposed change, the Senate could vote down the original recommendation

and then develop and adopt a proposal that would include the features of the amendment as a new proposition before the House.

President Schaefer said that in conversations with student leaders he had become aware that there has been some dissatisfaction among students with the Student Senate, some persons even feeling that that body should be phased out. If this should happen, how could a Student Senate that no longer existed select representatives to the Faculty Senate? Dr. Schaefer directed his question to Bryna Vertlieb. Miss Vertlieb referred the question to Mr. Reece who said he sensed there was really no widespread desire or intent among students to abolish the Student Senate. It was acknowledged that the Student Senate needed strengthening. Vice President Edwards said he was sure Mr. Reece and Miss Vertlieb would agree with him that if this proposal were adopted it would in fact strengthen the Student Senate, giving it increased stature.

The question on Dr. Muramoto's proposed amendment, specifying that the ASUA Vice President concerned be the Executive Vice President and providing that of the ten elected student senators not more than one could be enrolled in any one college, carried by a vote of 26 to 19.

Mr. Davis then moved that the original proposal before the House be amended whereby the reference to students holding full membership would be changed to non-voting membership. In other words the word "full" preceding the word "membership" would be replaced by the hyphenated word "non-voting." This motion was seconded by Dr. Tomizuka.

Dr. Trafton commented that Mr. Davis' motion reflected an attitude that did not have much regard for student opinion. Dr. Kassander said he wondered what the Committee of Eleven would think of this amendment.

Mr. Davis said that as a member of the Faculty Senate he feels the presence of students is appropriate and helpful and provides valuable input reflecting the student point of view on a variety of issues. As a member of the faculty, however, he feels it important that the faculty hold on to whatever power, small though it may be, it has now. To bring student votes into the Senate would dilute faculty power, he felt.

Dean Hull said that faculty senators could outvote 12 student votes. Dr. Joyner said that some years ago he served in a body where the student votes actually outnumbered the faculty votes and yet the legislative process functioned well.

Dr. Tomizuka said he felt students were wasting their time if they thought they would gain any power through gaining votes in the Faculty Senate. Most of the issues that come before the Faculty Senate are not properly the business of students anyway, he said.

Dr. Battan commented that one-third of the members of the Faculty Senate are administrators. Many people think already that the faculty have too little voice in University affairs. He felt faculty voice in the Senate would be diluted even more by adding 12 student votes. If we are going to have a Senate that includes the prestige of administrative members and the enthusiasm of student members, he wondered if the body should even continue to be called the Faculty Senate. He thought it would be more appropriate to give membership to only two students, namely, the President and the Executive Vice President of the student body but let them each have a vote.

Dr. Gegenheimer agreed that this Senate has never truly been a Faculty Senate. "We really have a Faculty-Administration Senate," he said. Why not move ahead and bring in another constituent group, that is, the students, and have a Senate that is, in fact, a University Senate? The question was asked, "Why the figure 12?" Dr. Gegenheimer said that twelve is a good round figure. Groups of twelve members have a certain respectable historical significance. He said he felt students should not be invited into the Senate as members at all if they would not have a vote. Why let them "participate" if they can't vote? "We should have them as voting members or not have them at all," he said. He felt to authorize 12 non-voting members would simply bring a feeling of "super futility" to the students.

Dr. Trafton said he could not see where adding students to the Senate as voting members would dilute the faculty's interests in any way. Faculty interests and student interests are commonly conjunctive. He felt that administrative and faculty interests commonly have been conjunctive, also.

Dr. Battan, commenting on an All-University Senate, asked where in such a body would the membership limits extend. Would groundskeepers, janitors, and typists be represented? There is a real need, he said, for the faculty to be able to determine and specify the best course of action in faculty affairs. This course of action should reflect the opinion of faculty members. We hear repeatedly that the strength of the University is in its faculty. This strength then should be able to express itself through the vehicle of a faculty body without the dilution of the influence of other groups.

Dr. Trafton said he agreed that a faculty group was needed to deal particularly with faculty concerns. That was why he had been active in the University of Arizona Chapter of the American Association of University Professors. However he felt much was to be gained by developing a legislative body that included representation of various campus constituent groups and he believed the proposal to add voting students to the Faculty Senate would be a move toward a University Senate. If the Faculty Senate as presently constituted was truly a body only of teaching and research personnel, he might feel differently. But we do not have that sort of body anyway because of the presence of a large number of administrators. Therefore, he believed students should be brought into this Senate as full voting members.

The question was called for on Mr. Davis' proposed amendment which would give twelve student members non-voting membership rather than full membership. The proposed amendment lost.

Dr. Battan then moved to amend the proposal to limit the student membership to 2 persons, the President and the Executive Vice President of the student body, each of whom would have full voting membership. Mr. Davis seconded this motion. Dr. Battan said he felt it would be appropriate to have the students represented in this body by 2 voting members but that 12 was too large a number. Dr. Thompson commented that this would provide less representation than that provided for in the proposed new Constitution and Bylaws still under study. The new Constitution would provide for three student representatives all holding full voting rights. There had been no objection expressed in the Senate when that provision of the new Constitution was discussed.

Dr. Gegenheimer asked what the status was of the proposed Constitution and Bylaws. Dean Windsor explained that certain proposals, suggestions, recommendations, and questions that had resulted from the Senate's consideration of the proposed Constitution and Bylaws in the spring of 1973 had been referred to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Shields. He understood that the committee would be giving attention to those matters referred to it for study at an early date. The vote on Dr. Battan's motion was called for and the motion was defeated.

At this juncture it was pointed out that a majority of the Committee of Eleven were members of the Faculty Senate and were present at this meeting. It was suggested that the meeting go into recess for a short time so the Committee of Eleven could consider Dr. Muramoto's amendment to their original recommendation which the Senate had just adopted. A recess was called and after a short meeting in the corridor by the members of the Committee of Eleven the chair was informed that the majority of the Committee of Eleven members present accepted the amendment.

Voting by written ballot followed on the motion before the Senate which was as follows: "That Section A of Article III of the Faculty Constitution, dealing with the membership of the Faculty Senate, be amended to provide that a total of 12 students shall hold full membership in the Faculty Senate. These shall include the President and the Executive Vice President of the Associated Students of the University of Arizona, and 10 student senators elected by and from the Student Senate, no more than one of whom shall be enrolled in any one college." While ballots were being distributed, Dr. Tomizuka asked members of the Senate to look at the agenda for today's meeting. He said that most items on the agenda of any Senate meeting are matters of faculty concern rather than student concern. Referring to the agenda for today's meeting, he called attention to only three items, those devoted to curriculum development, election of representatives to the Arizona College Association, and election of a member to the Committee on Conciliation. These are not student concerns, he said.

Mr. Davis said that the idea of an All-University Senate appealed to him. He would like to urge that the Committee on Constitution and Bylaws consider the concept of developing a University Senate. We could have a genuine Faculty Senate, he said, as well as an All-University Senate. Dr. Shirley Fahey said that the question of whether or not an All-University Senate should be developed could be looked at separately. However she felt it would be a step forward meanwhile to bring student voting members into the Faculty Senate.

Balloting then proceeded. Dr. LaBan and Mr. Butler served as tellers. It was announced that the proposed amendment to the Constitution had passed the Faculty Senate by a vote of 29 to 21. Dr. Schaefer explained that a copy of the proposal shortly would be sent to all members of the faculty. He felt that the information distributed to the faculty should include a position paper supporting the proposal as well as a position paper opposing it. He asked Dr. Gegenheimer as Chairman of the Faculty to appoint a three-member committee to develop the position paper in favor of the proposed amendment and to appoint a three-member committee to prepare a position paper against it. He said he knew Dr. Gegenheimer would appreciate hearing from any member of the Senate who wished to volunteer to serve on either of the committees. Following distribution of information about the proposal but no sooner than 20 days after such distribution in accordance with the procedure called for in the Constitution for consideration of a proposed amendment,

a meeting of the General Faculty will be held for discussion of the proposal. The amendment will then be submitted to a vote of the faculty by mail ballot and a majority of those voting will be necessary for approval. The amendment could become operative then only after approval by the Board of Regents.

Mr. Davis said he did feel that Dr. Shields and the Constitution and Bylaws Committee should be asked to examine the feasibility of developing a truly Faculty Senate made up exclusively of teaching and research faculty personnel. He moved that the Senate approve asking the Constitution and Bylaws Committee to investigate this concept. His motion was seconded by Dr. Trafton. Dr. Gegenheimer asked, "If such a Teaching and Research Faculty Senate were developed, would this preclude the need for an All-University Senate?" Several senators answered in the negative. Dr. DuVal asked Mr. Davis, "If the General Faculty should turn down the proposed amendment to the Constitution, would you still feel the need for a separate Teaching and Research Faculty Senate?" Mr. Davis answered yes. Dr. Steelink asked Mr. Davis if he envisioned possibly three senates on the campus, a Student Senate, a strictly Faculty Senate, and an All-University Senate. Mr. Davis answered yes.

Dr. Dewhirst said he saw no need for a senate limited just to teaching and research personnel as proposed by Mr. Davis and urged voting against the motion. The question was called for and the motion was defeated.

Dr. Kassander said that the Committee of Eleven and/or the Constitution and Bylaws Committee might look into the feasibility of developing an All-University Senate. Dr. Gegenheimer said that these bodies would be aware of the discussion in the Senate and might very well investigate the matter further.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE ADDITIONAL PARAGRAPH IN CHAPTER VIII IN FACULTY MANUAL: Vice President Weaver referred to the Statement of Policies and Procedures regarding Appointment, Reappointment, Non-retention, Tenure, Promotion, Resignation, and Dismissal of Academic Personnel adopted by the Faculty Senate on November 6, 1972. This statement appears in the new edition of the Faculty Manual, that is, the 13th Edition, dated 1973, where it appears as Chapter VIII, entitled "Academic Personnel Policies." Dr. Weaver explained that when the manual was being prepared legal counsel had pointed out that an additional statement was necessary to avoid misunderstanding. The additional language appears as a third paragraph in Section 8.05 of Chapter VIII, and explains that although a definition of tenure is made under the statutes of the state of Arizona certain commitments cannot be legally binding beyond a certain point. The paragraph simply provides necessary clarification, Dr. Weaver pointed out, and in no sense alters or detracts from the sense of the complete Chapter VIII.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:15 o'clock.

---

David L. Windsor, Secretary

---

David Butler, Assistant Secretary

## COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN

### Report to the Faculty Senate for Year 1972/73

#### Membership:

Elected to the 1972/73 term: Leon Blitzler, Leonard W. Dewhirst, Shirley N. Fahey, Laurence M. Gould, A. Richard Kassander, Hiroshi Muramoto, Patricia Paylore, Currin Shields, Cornelius Steelink, and Bill Varney. Because of Dr. Kassander's resignation upon assuming an administration position, the Committee elected Paul Skinner to fill this vacancy. ASUA representative was Nanette Warner. Ex-officio as Chairman of the Faculty was A. F. Gegenheimer.

Officers: The Committee chose Shields to serve as its Chairman, Paylore as Secretary.

Meetings: The Committee met 14 times from September - May, on a regular schedule of twice monthly, plus an additional meeting held at Arizona State University, Tempe, where the Committee was the guest of ASU Faculty Assembly's Executive Council. Of a possible attendance of 180, including the ASUA representative, 30 absences were recorded, approximately 16% for the year, or exactly the same as reported for the year 1971/72.

Guests: The following persons appeared before the Committee during the year: Mr. James C. Martin, Manager, Campus Bookstore; Messrs. George Rosenberg and Gary Buck, Pima Health Systems; Messrs. Ralph Deal and Dale Lundeen, Director and Manager respectively, University Purchasing and Stores; Vice-President for Research A. R. Kassander, Drs. Carleton B. Moore and Phil A. Cooke, Chairman and Chairman-Elect respectively, Arizona State University Faculty Assembly; and Messrs. James C. Killeen and Jesse Walker, representing the Custodian Grievance Committee, Division of Physical Resources, and Mr. Alfred C. Strachan, Personnel Department.

#### Business:

On October 3, 1972, Mr. Martin, Manager of the Campus Bookstore, appeared before the Committee to discuss faculty-student problems, particularly those relating to book stock. As a result of this exchange of views and information, a sub-Committee was appointed to work with Mr. Martin (Fahey, Chairman, and members Dewhirst, Varney, and ASUA representative Warner), in an effort to understand better the operating procedures of the Bookstore, and to make recommendations for improved communication between faculty and manager.

On November 21, the report of this sub-Committee was presented to the full Committee for action. Recommendations adopted included: 1) administrative instructions to department heads for placing responsibility for bookstore orders from all departmental faculty through a single person, 2) circularizing instructions from the Bookstore relating to textbook orders to the entire faculty, rather than to department heads only, and 3) appointment by the President of a Committee to work with the Bookstore management, in somewhat the same way that a policy committee now works with Varney on the management of the Student Union's affairs. These recommendations have gone forward to the President.

---

On November 7, Messrs. Rosenberg and Buck, representing Pima Health Systems, were guests of the Committee. Addressing themselves to expressed faculty concern for the type of health care delivery under which we were operating in a kind of reprieve period [since extended for another year], the guests briefed the Committee on contemporary developments in health care, reminding us that University faculty was in an attractive negotiating position, and that it should be prepared to present details of coverage desired before asking for cost estimates from agents. It appears there are several avenues Faculty might explore as appropriate to its best long-term interests in this matter, including the use of the Faculty Club, as an incorporated body, as the mechanism by which a contract such as Group Health of Arizona might be entered into on behalf of faculty and staff. It was our belief, later, that wider representation than the Committee of Eleven should be enlisted to work with official University Committees, to insure that faculty has ample opportunity to express its views.

---

On December 12, Messrs. Deal and Lundeen came before the Committee to discuss continuing complaints relating to the handling of University mail. Deal defended the present procedures, pointing out that some complaints are based on policies no longer in effect. He did accept our suggestion that training sessions for secretaries and office managers would be useful, whereby better information at the point of origin might avoid delays and the necessity for occasionally opening mail (though, we were assured, never first-class letters).

---

On February 6, Vice-President Kassander was invited to discuss the University's policy on supplemental work. Committee suggestions, voiced at this meeting, for inclusion in the Weaver/Kassander draft of the revised statement being prepared by them to replace the present statement in the Manual of Procedure and Policy, were taken into consideration in this subsequent presentation by Dr. Kassander before the Senate on April 2.

---

Meetings with ASU faculty representatives, both in Tucson and in Tempe, brought forward for consideration a great many matters of mutual interest, and ways are being sought by which integrated action might serve both groups.

---

As an outgrowth of discussion with various student senate leaders relating to an all-University government, or some other modified version of greater student participation, the Committee recommended to the Senate a revision of the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws to permit a total of 12 students to hold full membership in the Senate. Vote on this recommendation, presented at the Senate meeting of May 7, was deferred to the next meeting of the Senate, and is, therefore, still pending. Recommended for consideration by the Constitution and Bylaws Committee was 1) an amendment to provide penalties for repeated absences, whereby the seat of an elected member of the Faculty Senate would be declared vacant after three consecutive absences by the incumbent, such seat then to be filled by the Senate in a manner appropriate to its policies; and 2) a change in the election procedures whereby only the names of those ineligible to serve be carried on information distributed with nominating and election ballots.

---

Final business of the year related to the presence before the Committee of Messrs. Killeen and Walker, representing the Custodian Grievance Committee, Division of Physical Resources, and Mr. Strachan representing Personnel. This meeting resulted not only in agreement on the need for better orientation on working conditions but on greater emphasis on communication, recognizing mutual fault by administrators, faculty, and staff, in failing to inform themselves on procedures, and making sure that those with grievances understand all the avenues by which such grievances may be redressed. In conveying the sense of this meeting to Personnel, later, we added that that Department might wish to consider appointing an ombudsman-type person to help foster better interrelations on all levels. It is hoped that adoption of the proposed new classification plan, outlined by Strachan to the Committee, will mitigate many of the dissatisfactions now felt by those represented by the two present at this meeting.

---

The Committee is aware of faculty criticism directed toward its inaction in some matters the faculty feel to be critical. Yet the Committee has never disregarded without consideration any issue brought to it. Given the limitations of time available for Committee service of this nature, we believe our record will show a high degree of sensitivity to faculty concerns, and a modest amount of courage in tackling problems addressed to us. Within the constraints of time, then, and our composition, over which we have no control, being brought together each year without benefit of collusion, we place this record before you for your judgment. If you believe we have not been responsive, you have only to take recourse in your ballot.

Patricia Paylore  
Secretary

The University of Arizona

REPORT ON ADVANCED PLACEMENT EXAMINATIONS - 1973

100 students had their Advanced Placement scores and examination papers sent to the University of Arizona this fall. This involved 116 tests since some students took more than one examination.

1 student is a graduate of Catalina High School; 2 of Green Fields School; 8 of Palo Verde High School; 13 of Rincon High School; and 10 of Sahuaro High School. 1 of these students is a graduate of Brophy Prep School; 6 students are graduates of Camelback High School; 3 of Central High School; 2 of Coconino High School; 1 of Cortez High School; 2 of Paradise Valley High School; 4 of Prescott High School; and 3 of West Phoenix High School. 44 students came from out-of-state high schools.

11 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in American History. 4 students received 6 semester hours of degree credit. 7 students received no advanced placement or degree credit.

4 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in Biology. 1 student received 4 semester hours of degree credit. 3 students received no advanced placement or degree credit.

3 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in Chemistry. None of these 3 received advanced placement or degree credit.

2 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in Classics-Vergil. Neither of these 2 received advanced placement or degree credit.

39 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in English. 23 students received 3 semester hours of degree credit and placement in English 4h. 16 students received no advanced placement or credit.

4 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in European History. 1 student received 6 semester hours of degree credit and 3 students received no advanced placement or degree credit.

4 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in French. 1 student received 3 semester hours of credit. 3 students received advanced placement in French.

2 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in German. 1 student received 18 semester hours of degree credit and 1 student received 8 semester hours of degree credit.

31 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in Mathematics. 7 students received 10 semester hours of degree credit. 3 students received 6 semester hours of degree credit. 4 students received 5 semester hours of degree credit. 10 students received 3 semester hours of degree credit and 7 students received no advanced placement or degree credit.

1 student took the Advanced Placement Examination in Physics. This student received no advanced placement or degree credit.

15 students took the Advanced Placement Examination in Spanish. 1 student received 14 semester hours of degree credit. 3 students received 11 semester hours of degree credit. 7 students received 8 semester hours of degree credit and 4 students received no advanced placement or credit.