

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, March 3, 1975 Kiva, Room 211 College of Education

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session on Monday, March 3, 1975 in the Kiva, Room 211 of the College of Education. Sixty-six members were present with President Schaefer presiding.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Aamodt, Bleibtreu, Boghosian, Brewer, D. Butler, H. Butler, Carr, Chin, Christensen, Corrigan, Demer, Dinowitz, Dresher, Edwards, Elliott, S. Fahey, W. Fahey, Fazio, Gaines, Garcia, Graham, Halderman, Hull, Inman, Jensen, Kass, Kassander, Kearns, Knorr, LaBan, Livermore, Malik, Manes, Mathews, McConnell, McCoy, McCullough, McMillan, McWhorter, Muramoto, D. Myers, L. Myers, Nelson, Odishaw, Palsson, Paulsen, Paylore, Peterson, Ray, Reed, Roemer, Schaefer, Simpson, Skinner, Sorensen, Stairs, Steelink, Svob, Tomizuka, Trier, Vanselow, Weaver, Wiersma, Windsor, Woods, and Yoshino. Student representatives present were Scott Nation, Ken Sobel, and Jorge Reyes. Dr. Robert Sankey was present as parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Capponi, DuVal, Evans, Johnson, Joyner, Mason, Massengale, Miller, Noyes, Rhodes, Roby, Rosaldo, Rosenberg, Shields, Stubblefield, and Thompson.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of February 10, 1975 were approved as distributed to members.

APPROVAL OF DEGREES COMPLETED DECEMBER 31, 1974: The Faculty Senate, having been provided in advance of the meeting a list of the candidates for degrees who completed requirements on December 31, 1974, approved the awarding of those degrees. The list included 791 bachelor's degrees, 405 master's degrees, 21 Juris Doctor degrees, 1 Doctor of Medicine degree, 4 Specialist degrees, and 70 Doctor's degrees (A.Mus.D., Ed.D., Ph.D.), for a total of 1,292. A copy of this list is attached to the Secretary's official file copy of these minutes.

APPROVAL OF HONORARY DEGREES: The Senate considered and approved three honorary degrees to be conferred at the 1975 Commencement. These next will be acted upon by the General Faculty of the University.

COMMENTS BY THE FACULTY CHAIRMAN: President Schaefer recognized Dr. Steelink, Chairman of the Faculty, who reported that the Arizona Universities Faculty Council had met in Tempe the previous Saturday. The Council went on record as officially supporting a number of pieces of legislation now before the Arizona Legislature relating to the retirement of state employees including University personnel. Dr. Steelink urged members of the faculty each to act in his or her own way to muster support for the proposed legislation concerning retirement. He had available for interested Senate members information about the several pieces of legislation.

FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED NEW FACULTY CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS: The Senate turned next to continuing its review of the proposed new Faculty Constitution and Bylaws. The first item considered was a proposal from the Committee of Eleven recommending that the title of the chief elected officer of the faculty be "Speaker of the Faculty" instead of "Faculty Chairman". In a memorandum to the Senate the Committee of Eleven had pointed out that inasmuch as the Faculty Chairman does not preside over the Faculty Senate nor over faculty meetings (except meetings called by petition) nor over any standing committees, "Chairman" does not seem to describe the function correctly. In addition, "Chairman" is frequently interpreted to have a gender connotation. The title "Speaker of the Faculty" does describe one of the principal functions of the office, the Committee of Eleven communication said, namely, "Spokesperson". It implies uniqueness whereas "Representative" does not; and finally it is a title which has a precedent in Congress and state legislatures which seems appropriate. The memorandum from the Committee of Eleven had closed with the following proposed implementing motion: "It is moved that wherever the title 'Faculty Chairman' appears in the Faculty Constitution or Bylaws it be replaced by 'Speaker of the Faculty'." The President explained that this proposal now came before the Senate as a seconded motion.

Dr. Peterson spoke in objection. He said that none of the several definitions of "Speaker" in a dictionary seemed to him to be at all appropriate for the role and function of the elected chief officer of the faculty. He thought the word "Chairman" appropriately did describe the responsibility of the office. To change the name simply in a process of desexing the Constitution was foolish, he felt, and requests for desexing should not be dignified by the action proposed.

Dr. Tomizuka said that at the request of Dr. Leon Blitzer he would like to share with the Senate the sentiments of Dr. Blitzer, one of the drafters of the proposed new Constitution and Bylaws. Dr. Blitzer felt the same way as did Dr. Peterson. The function of a "speaker" is different from that of a "chairman". It is not possible to eliminate from general use all words in our vocabulary ending in -man. Dr. Blitzer could find no sexist connotation in the word "Chairman". Dr. Tomizuka explained he was pleased to relate this expression from Dr. Blitzer, pointing out that it was not necessarily his own view on the matter.

Mrs. McWhorter said she would like to speak in support of the same point of view expressed by Dr. Peterson and Dr. Blitzer.

Dr. Inman said she felt the Senate must consider the reality of the situation and not be governed just by what the dictionary says. There is a feeling held by many people, she emphasized, that the word "Chairman" has a strictly masculine implication.

A vote on the motion was called for. On a voice vote the Chair was unsure of the result. Voting by a show of hands then followed and the motion on the Committee of Eleven proposal lost by a vote of 23 "for" and 35 "against".

Dr. Inman reminded the Senate that this body was already on record as having voted to desex the proposed new Constitution. Thus if the title "Speaker"

for the office in question was not approved, what then was to be done? Dr. Kassander said that he felt many people had voted as he had, that is, not in support necessarily of the word "Chairman" but simply against the word "Speaker", feeling that term was inappropriate.

Dean Hull then moved that the term "Chairperson of the Faculty" be approved. This was seconded by Dr. Shirley Fahey.

Dr. Myers commented that after the Senate had referred to the Committee of Eleven the question of finding an appropriate title, Senate members had been asked to send recommended titles to the committee. Very few suggestions had been received.

Dean Livermore said he wondered where all this might be leading. He said he has received correspondence addressed to a "Deanperson" and has seen the term "Professorperson" used. He was troubled about the extent to which people are going to go trying to desex our language. He thought objections for the most part must be based in the mind of the beholder. If followed to its logical conclusion could not one object to the word "person", claiming that the -son ending has a sexist connotation. Do we then need a new word "perdaughter"?

A vote on the motion to approve the term "Chairperson" was called for and the motion lost.

Dr. Peterson stated that he thought the word "Chairman" was a completely appropriate one for the office in question regardless of whether the holder of the office was man or woman. He said he would like to emphasize again that the word "Chairman" carries no sexist connotation. He moved that the Constitution use the term "Chairman of the Faculty". Several seconds to the motion were heard.

Dr. Dinowitz said that he thought Dr. Inman's points had been well taken. Approximately 50% of our population is made up of women. A large proportion of these feel a "tyranny of language" from the use of words ending in -man. These people do feel oppressed by the use of such words. We have finally gotten rid of racist words in our newspapers and most of our journals, he said. An effort should be made also to get rid of words considered by many to be sexist in our publications, documents, etc. He said he felt a satisfactory alternative could be found and that action should be postponed until it was found. He therefore moved to table the matter under discussion. Several seconds to this motion were made. The question was called for and on a voice vote the Chair was unsure of the vote. By a show of hands the motion to table then lost. The vote was "for" - 21, and "against" - 30.

President Schaefer asked Parliamentarian Sankey if the Senate was proceeding properly. Dr. Sankey explained that inasmuch as the body had formally voted completely to desex the proposed Constitution and Bylaws, to void the obligation carried by that action and allow retaining the title "Chairman of the Faculty" the Senate would have to vote by a two-thirds majority to undo the original motion, or -- and this would accomplish the same thing -- by a two-thirds vote take action specifically to approve the term "Chairman of the Faculty".

Dr. Steelink pointed out that by other action all other "sexist" references in the Constitution had been deleted. The language had been revised to eliminate "he", "she", "his", "her", etc. The term "presiding officer" had been used in several places. All references to "Chairman" had been eliminated except the position Chairman of the Faculty.

The vote on Dr. Peterson's motion to approve the title "Chairman of the Faculty" was then called for and the motion carried by more than a two-thirds vote.

Dr. Schaefer pointed out that if opponents of this action were so inclined they could request reconsideration of the action at a later time.

The Senate next considered a recommendation from the Committee of Eleven, which it was explained was in concurrence with a resolution by the Appropriations Board of the Associated Students of the University of Arizona, proposing that Section III, A, 3 of the proposed Constitution be revised to provide that "Nine students shall be voting members of the Faculty Senate..." rather than three students as presently indicated in the proposal. It was explained that this matter came before the Senate as a seconded motion. No objection to the proposal was voiced and the motion carried with no dissenting vote heard.

Next the Senate turned its attention to a proposal that the proposed Constitution be modified to make the University Librarian an ex-officio member of the Faculty Senate. Mrs. McWhorter moved that this change be approved and Dr. Muramoto seconded the motion. Dr. Peterson asked just what was meant by ex-officio member. The President replied that such an individual was a member of the Senate by virtue of the University position he or she held. Dr. Peterson asked if such a member was a voting member. The answer was in the affirmative. Dean Gaines said that the library is the "heart and soul" of a university and the University Librarian is one of the institution's chief scholars. He felt the motion should be approved. Dr. Schaefer pointed out that the University Librarian is considered one of the chief academic officers of the institution. He sits on the President's Advisory Council, for example.

The question was called for and the motion carried with one dissenting vote heard.

FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF REPORT FROM AD HOC COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROVISIONS OF THE FACULTY MANUAL RE DISMISSAL OF FACULTY MEMBERS: President Schaefer said he would like to share with the Senate a communication he had received from Dean Manes concerning certain sections of the report from the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Provisions of the Faculty Manual Regarding the Dismissal of Faculty Members. The committee's report had been discussed at the February meeting following which comments and proposed changes in the report had been requested. Dr. Shirley Fahey said that Dean Manes' communication had also been sent to the ad hoc committee and in its deliberations following the February Senate meeting the committee had taken Dr. Manes' comments into account. She therefore thought that consideration of Dean Manes' letter should be held until the full report of the ad hoc committee again comes before the Senate. The secretary informed the President that he had been in touch with Dr. Gegenheimer, chairman

of the ad hoc committee, and that it was planned that further consideration of the report from the committee be on the agenda of the April Senate meeting.

Dr. Schaefer agreed that consideration of Dr. Manes' suggestion should be held until the next meeting.

DISCUSSION OF CENSURE OF DEPARTMENT OF SURGERY FACULTY MEMBERS BY 13 DEPARTMENT HEADS AND 99 FACULTY MEMBERS OF THE COLLEGE OF MEDICINE IN AUGUST 1974:

President Schaefer referred to the next item on the meeting agenda listed as a discussion of the censure of the Department of Surgery faculty members by 13 department heads and 99 faculty members of the College of Medicine in August 1974. Senate members had been provided copies of certain documents by Dr. William Trier, as well as a statement from the Committee of Eleven which read as follows:

"To assist the Faculty Senate in responding expeditiously to the request from the Department of Surgery concerning the action of the College of Medicine August 2, 1974, the Committee of Eleven requests consideration of the following:

1. The Committee on Committees be instructed to select an ad hoc committee of five persons within ten days. This committee would choose its own presiding officer and none of the members should have been previously involved in matters relating to the Department of Surgery.
2. The responsibilities of the ad hoc committee are as follows:
 - (a) to consider the circumstances surrounding the July 30, 1974 document signed by thirteen department heads and the August 2, 1974 vote of ninety-nine members of the faculty of the College of Medicine.
 - (b) to determine what procedural safeguards are appropriate when actions such as those referred to in (a) are contemplated and whether they were provided to the members of the Department of Surgery.
 - (c) To review any consequences which might have evolved from the above actions.
 - (d) To make appropriate recommendations concerning the propriety and proper subsequent use of such actions.

The ad hoc committee should submit a report to the Senate, for consideration at the April meeting, including recommendations for such action by the Senate as may be appropriate."

Dr. Weaver said that he had no comments to make on the merit or lack of merit of the August action by the faculty of the College of Medicine. He said he did however ask the President to question the propriety of action by a college faculty's being reviewed, or being subject to review by some other body. College faculties traditionally have had the right to operate their own affairs and should be free to do so without review by some other group. Such a review would be a rank violation of the academic freedom of the college faculty, he said. Further, while the general faculty can review actions of the Senate, he

questioned whether the Senate can appropriately question actions of the faculty. He again strongly suggested that the President rule this matter's coming before the Senate out of order.

Dr. LaBan pointed out that quite apart from whether or not it was appropriate for such a matter to come before the Senate, he as a senator wondered what he was supposed to do if it was presented. What is there for the Senate to consider here anyway? What would he as a senator be expected to vote on?

President Schaefer said he was inclined to rule as Dr. Weaver had suggested. It seemed to him that the internal affairs of college faculties should not be subject to review by the Faculty Senate. Perhaps a case could be made for taking them before the general faculty.

Dr. Myers stated that one of the functions of the Senate was, upon the request of a faculty member, to investigate and conduct hearings on grievances. Dr. Schaefer said this was correct but he could not see how this matter was a real grievance. Rather, some members of the surgery faculty were reporting that they were unhappy with an action by the full faculty of the College of Medicine.

Dr. Kassander said he could find no indication of a grievance here.

Dr. Myers commented that the Committee of Eleven had prepared and submitted its proposed procedure only after Dr. Trier had placed the matter of the censure of the Department of Surgery by the College of Medicine on the Senate agenda.

Dr. Steelink said that several months ago when Dr. Trier had submitted the censure matter for placing on the Senate agenda, President Schaefer, Dr. Steelink, and Dr. Myers had conferred and agreed that the matter should be placed on the agenda but that then a special committee should be authorized to give the matter special study, set up a review of jurisdictional procedures, etc. He said he was aware of another case now on campus involving another college where there seems to be no machinery to provide further review. He has urged the group of persons concerned in that case also to go to the Senate.

Dean Vanselow said there was a fundamental question here relating to what can a college faculty do. Where does the jurisdiction of a college faculty begin and end? If the Faculty Senate is to review anything and everything a college faculty does, then what actions can any college faculty really take? He said that no one from the Committee of Eleven had discussed the matter with him; was it the intent that the procedure proposed by the Committee of Eleven subsequently would call for asking the Senate to place a value judgment on the action of the Medicine faculty last August? Is the Senate to second-guess a college faculty?


Dr. Tomizuka asked where a department that has been censured by its college faculty can go if it wishes further review of the action. If the Physics faculty was censured by the College of Liberal Arts, where could its members appeal?

Dr. Schaefer said he still felt it would be appropriate for him to rule the matter before the house out of order. He pointed out that if the

Senate then was unhappy with his ruling, his action could be overruled. He then ruled the matter of the Senate's considering the censure of the Department of Surgery by the faculty of the College of Medicine out of order. Several motions that the chair be overruled were then made and there were several seconds. The vote was called for and the motion to overturn the President's ruling lost. That is, the President's ruling was sustained.

President Schaefer informed the Senate he would ask the Committee of Eleven to study the matter of what recourse should be made available to a department wishing to appeal an action by college faculty, for example, a vote of censure. The Committee of Eleven would be asked to submit recommendations about this matter to the Faculty Senate.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 o'clock.



David L. Windsor, Secretary



David Butler, Assistant Secretary