

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, May 2, 1977 Kiva, Room 211 College of Education

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3 p.m. on Monday, May 2, 1977, in the Kiva, Room 211 of the College of Education. Fifty-eight members were present with Vice President Weaver presiding.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Bartlett, Blackwell, Boghosian, Briggs, Butler, Chin, Cole, Coxon, DeWalt, DuVal, Edwards, Fahey, Federhar, Flores, Garcia, Gegenheimer, Gerhard, Hetrick, Hull, Ingram, Inman, R. Johnson, Kassander, Kneebone, LaBan, Laird, Lebowitz, Livermore, Lytle, Manes, McConnell, McCullough, Meredith, Munroe, Munsinger, Myers, Nelson, Matlock, Nigh, Odishaw, Paulsen, Peterson, Prosser, Rehm, Rosenberg, Rosenblatt, Selke, Sigworth, Sivo, Sorensen, Stairs, Steelink, Summer, Svob, Thompson, Tomizuka, Vanselow, Weaver, and Woloshin. Dr. Frank LaBan served as parliamentarian, in Dr. Robert Sankey's absence due to illness.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Atwater, Caldwell, Carr, Ceballos, Clark, Davis, Drescher, Gaines, Graham, Hawkins, Heusinkveld, Hyland, Manning, Marchello, McMillan, Mitchell, Murphy, Paplanus, Peacock, Rhodes, Ridge, Roubicek, Rush, Rusk, Schaefer, Seibert, Smith, Townsend, Webb, Wenders, Wiersma, Windsor, Witte, and Wrenn.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of April 4, 1977 were approved as distributed with one correction. Dr. Myers pointed out that the second paragraph on page 168 should be corrected to read: "Dr. Myers then moved that the Faculty Senate reaffirm its approval of Chapter VIII as approved in April 1976. The motion was seconded by Dr. Gegenheimer."

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Dr. Steelink, Chairman of the Faculty, gave the following report: 1) Professor Joseph Livermore has been appointed by the Committee on Committees to be a member of the Committee on Faculty Membership during the sabbatical leave of Professor Ray Thompson. 2) Dr. Steelink has withdrawn his request to President Schaefer and the Board of Regents to have the Faculty Constitution considered immediately. 3) The retirement bill is in difficulty in the State Legislature because so many amendments have been attached to it that if it passed at this point it would do no one any good. Bill 1230 providing group health insurance for retired persons seems to be going well.

The package for cost-of-living increases for state employes will be \$12,000,000 this year. This includes \$60 per month for health insurance and a sliding cost-of-living salary increase. 4) Dr. Steelink reminded the Senate that solicitation for funds for the Arizona Universities Faculty Council is under way. He has not been receiving responses at the same rate as last year.

Dr. Thompson moved that the Senate thank Dr. Steelink for his outstanding service to the University, the faculty, and the Senate during his tenure as Chairman of the Faculty and extend to him our best wishes upon his

return to the idyllic life of a normal faculty member. Many seconds were heard and a hearty round of applause followed.

Dr. Weaver then asked Senate permission to combine agenda items 4 and 7 since they both were contained in the "Curriculum" Bulletin. There was no objection to this.

CATALOG MATERIAL: Approval of the catalog material as furnished Senate members in Curriculum bulletin Vol. 6, No. 10 (issue date of April 28, 1977) Item I, Changes in Existing Program, pertaining to the Reorganization of the School of Home Economics and the proposed change in the Title of the School of Home Economics to the School of Social and Human Resources was deferred for several reasons.

Dean McConnell moved that Item I,A,2, particularly the proposal that a reorganized division be named Human Environment and Design, be referred back to the Undergraduate Council for further consideration when an architecture representative could be present. The motion was seconded and passed.

Dean Rosenblatt said that he objected to Item I,B, referring to the proposed name change of the School of Home Economics. He moved that this item be referred back to the Undergraduate Council for discussion with a representative from the Psychology Department. This motion was seconded and passed.

GUIDELINES FOR THE UNIVERSITY CALENDAR: Dr. Gerald Peterson presented the recommendation for guidelines for the University calendar as submitted by the calendar subcommittee of the Undergraduate Council as follows:

GUIDELINES FOR THE UNIVERSITY CALENDAR

The Undergraduate Council proposes the following guidelines for the creation of the University Calendar:

General

1. The nominal length of the semester is 15 weeks of classes plus one week of final examinations.
2. There shall be not less than 44 days nor more than 46 days in the M/W/F sequence.
3. There shall be not less than 29 days nor more than 31 days in the T/Th sequence.
4. The last teaching day in each semester shall be a Wednesday. Finals will start on Friday and extend through the following Friday, including the Saturday following the first Friday.

Fall Semester

1. Classes shall start on a Monday. The last Friday of finals shall be the last Friday in December falling on or before December 21.
2. Holidays will be Labor Day, Veterans' Day, and Thanksgiving Recess (four days, starting on Thanksgiving day).

Spring Semester

1. Classes shall start on a Thursday. Commencement shall be on the first Saturday in May falling on or after May 11. The last Friday of finals shall be the day before Commencement.
2. Holidays shall be Tucson Rodeo (the 4th Thursday in February) and Spring Recess (9 days, Saturday to Sunday, inclusive, the ninth full week of classes).

It is recommended that the Honors Convocations be held on a Wednesday in October, unless Veterans' Day falls on a M, W, or F, in which case the Convocations should be scheduled for a Tuesday. Scheduling the Convocations during the M/W/F sequence will result in the minimum percentage time taken away from a course. Monday and Friday are less desirable than Wednesday, since Labor Day and the Thanksgiving Recess take away one Monday and one Friday meeting. When Veterans' Day falls on a M, W, or F, scheduling the Convocations on Tuesday will provide a better balance of teaching days.

He stated there were three points to which this subcommittee had directed its attention. 1) They tried to get the calendar back to fifteen weeks. 2) They tried to get a better balance of teaching days. 3) They considered the timing of the end of the fall semester in relationship to the Christmas holidays.

Senator Flores asked if there had been any consultation regarding student charter flights. Dr. Peterson stated there had not.

Professor Thompson then moved that the Senate accept the recommendation for the guidelines for the University calendar as a substitute motion for the following motion which was currently on the table:

"The Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona hereby recommends that the academic calendar for the 1978-79 year be moved back one full week. The recommended calendar would move the last day of all finals from December 22 to December 15."

This motion was seconded.

Dr. Garcia then moved to amend the substitute motion to have the holiday in February be Washington's Birthday rather than the Tucson Rodeo Day. This motion was seconded. Dr. Sigworth stated that this has become a meeting time for some professional organizations and it would be beneficial to have a Monday holiday in February.

Dr. Thompson said that he was against the amendment because the

University does have an obligation to cooperate with the community of Tucson. Professor Coxon also expressed opposition to the motion and stated that he represented several colleagues in this opposition because there were frequent absences during the Rodeo holiday. Thus it should become an official holiday.

Ms. Blackwell spoke in favor of the amendment because she said the students wanted a three-day weekend. Mr. Gerhard said that a Thursday holiday would result in absences on Friday also.

Dr. Johnson stated that the Senate had recently changed this holiday back from Washington's Birthday to Rodeo Day and he has heard no good reason for another change. At this point the question was called for and the amendment to the substitute motion failed by a vote of 22 to 34.

Professor Thompson's substitute motion was then carried by a large margin.

APPROVAL OF CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES: The Senate approved the official list prepared by the University Registrar of candidates for degrees to be completed at the end of the current spring semester. Also included in the approval action was the awarding of three professional degrees recommended by the faculty of the College of Mines, as follows:

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Jose Ramirez Rubalcaba | Geological Engineer |
| William A. McKinney | Metallurgical Engineer |
| Albert A. Wallach | Mining Engineer |

The Registrar's report of May 1977 candidates included 2,168 bachelor's degrees, 770 master's degrees, 108 Juris Doctor's degrees, 85 Doctor of Medicine degrees, 13 Specialist degrees, and 74 doctoral degrees including Ph.D.'s, Ed.D.'s, and Doctors of Mus. Arts. The University of Arizona's estimated total earned degrees for 1976-77 would be 5,899.

Dr. Gegenheimer stated that at one time the General Faculty wanted to approve all degrees. Several people have recently spoken to him, however, about the approval of honorary degrees by the General Faculty. It was his understanding that the attendance at the General Faculty meetings to approve honorary degrees has been dismal and he suggested that the Committee on Bylaws study this problem and bring a recommendation to the Senate in the fall regarding the approval of honorary degrees by the General Faculty. Dr. Garcia asked if it could not be possible for the Faculty Senate to get information about honorary degrees prior to the meeting. He felt that more than five minutes was needed to intelligently vote on the awarding of such a degree. Dr. Weaver said that he would suggest that this matter be discussed at the next meeting of the Deans' Council.

FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF CHAPTER VIII OF THE FACULTY MANUAL: Dr. Weaver stated that upon advice of counsel, President Schaefer is not in a position to accept the Senate version of Paragraphs 8.17 and 8.24 of Chapter VIII. Dr. Schaefer is willing to bring these paragraphs to the Regents to see if they agree with

counsel or not. Dr. Weaver injected one other point. As a matter of operating procedure, in his opinion, it would be better if we could operate with Chapter VIII as approved by the Senate with the exception of those two paragraphs. For those two paragraphs we would need to revert to the 13th Edition of the Faculty Manual for current operating procedure. (Paragraph 8.24 of Chapter VIII distributed with the April Senate minutes is Paragraph 8.23 in the 13th Edition of the Faculty Manual.)

Dr. Steelink said that he found it somewhat difficult to talk about a document which has been changed from the version which the Senate has approved. He thought this matter should be discussed in the Senate. He stated that we should operate on a unified basis; thus, he moved that the Senate reaffirm its position on Chapter VIII, that is, the authentic version of Chapter VIII is that which is contained in cumulative minutes of the Senate up through April 1976. This motion was seconded.

Dr. Gegenheimer pointed out that the Chapter VIII version which members of the Senate had received with the April minutes indicated in Paragraph 8.17 that "Grounds for dismissal include but are not limited to the following...". He urged the Senate to urge the President to discuss with counsel the fact that this phrase undercuts the entire matter of the grounds for dismissal. He felt the minutes should show that the sense of the Senate is that this is a matter of great concern. Dr. Myers stated that the comments from the Committee of Eleven which had been distributed to each senator at this meeting, a copy of which is attached to these minutes, were guided by the principle that if a document has been approved by the Senate, the Senate should be the body to make changes if changes are to be made. Since it is now the end of the year, he has not had time to study the changes which had been made in Chapter VIII and felt we should delay action until the fall and simply reaffirm the document on which the Senate has spent considerable time.

Dr. LaBan asked what document should we be operating under then. Professor Myers said that Dr. Steelink's motion is that we should operate under the current document as approved by the Senate through April 1976.

Vice President Weaver stated that the President, however, must operate under the 13th Edition of the Faculty Manual for Paragraphs 8.17 and 8.24 (8.23 in the 13th Edition) until he is instructed by the Regents to do differently.

Dr. Sigworth asked about Paragraph 8.11. At the end of the paragraph it refers to Sections 8.02 and 8.04, but he can find no logical reason for reference to 8.04.

Dr. Hetrick pointed out that there was obviously some difficulty in renumbering paragraphs and the reference should be Paragraph 8.05 rather than 8.04. Dr. Sigworth further pointed out that Paragraph 8.15 has a negative connotation and instead of reading "An associate professor who is not covered by 8.13.5 ..." should read "An associate professor who is covered by 8.14.5...".

Some further discussion ensued, the question was called for, and the motion was carried. Dr. Weaver stated that the minutes must show that the President cannot be bound by Paragraphs 8.17 or 8.24 as passed.

Dr. Garcia asked if the Senate could have the President's counsel present their arguments as to what is objectionable to those two paragraphs so the Senate could understand the reasoning of the counsel. Dr. Weaver stated that he could not make a commitment for the President's attorneys, but would either bring written documents to the Senate regarding these items or have the President discuss them.

Dr. Rosenberg asked what Faculty Manual we will be using. Dr. Weaver replied that aside from Chapter VIII the Faculty Manual is ready to be printed. Dr. Rosenberg asked what new faculty members will receive in the way of a Faculty Manual. Vice President Weaver stated that there is a possibility that there may not be a Faculty Manual since this matter is not resolved.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO REVIEW UNIVERSITY PROCEDURES CONCERNING DISHONEST SCHOLASTIC WORK: The Senate next considered the report from the Committee to Review the University's Procedures Concerning Dishonest Scholastic Work, which had been distributed to Senate members prior to this meeting. A copy of the report is attached to these minutes.

Dr. Clifford Lytle, Chairman of the ad hoc committee, introduced committee member, Dr. Malcolm Zwolinski, and Professor Franklin Flint, current chairman of the University Committee on Dishonest Scholastic Work. Dr. Lytle indicated the committee had done three things. First of all, they surveyed a number of large state institutions asking for their policies regarding the above matter. The response was almost unanimous that the other institutions had no policy. One exception to this was Cornell University which shared its policy with the committee. Secondly, the committee surveyed faculty and students to get their opinions regarding a dishonest scholastic work policy. And thirdly, the proposed policy has been circulated through the Kitchen Cabinet, the assistant and associate deans' groups, directors, Dean of Students, and legal counsel.

Dr. Lytle continued to say that the thrust of the document is to place much of the responsibility on the shoulders of the faculty. The committee felt that if an affirmative document is developed, then prevention is the keynote and will have a trend to minimize abuses in the area of scholastic dishonesty. Thus the document was formulated in positive terms. Dr. Lytle said that he hoped to have the document printed like the Code of Conduct so that it can be given to each student.

Dr. Lytle said that basically they have tried to create two options which a faculty member can take. The first option is a faculty hearing which is more informal than a committee hearing. The second option the faculty member has is that of moving straight to the Committee on Academic Integrity resulting in a formal committee hearing. Dr. Lytle then asked for any questions which members of the Senate may have.

Dean Livermore asked if he understood that each college could submit to the committee an alternative method of handling cases of this sort and secondly, assuming that the idea of this document is accepted, can amendments be made later on or is this a final document? Dr. Lytle answered affirmative to both points. He pointed out that the document is not rigid and, in fact, the committee wished to receive comments and have the ability to make changes without having to refer this matter back to the Senate.

Dr. Myers stated that one of the penalties assessed is to have the notation "Declared guilty of violation of the Code of Academic Integrity" placed on the academic record. He wondered if through the appeal process this notation could be removed from the record. Dr. Lytle answered that it would.

Dean Vanselow stated that the College of Medicine has some concern with paragraph 4, on page 3, regarding jurisdiction. Within the College of Medicine they already have a very elaborate arrangement regarding the handling of disputes of this sort. In fact, it is handled entirely by the college since medical students are under the honor system. Under this proposed procedure it would be possible for students to appeal through five committees which may take several years. He asked if the sentence "The decisions of a college committee may be appealed by the student to the Committee on Academic Integrity" could be deleted. Dean Vanselow suggested that it would be out of order to make a motion to delete that sentence since there was no motion on the floor. Dr. Lytle stated that the committee did not want to develop a bureaucratic monster and would be happy to be flexible in this regard. He then moved that the document including the supplemental page which has been incorporated in the attached report be adopted by the Faculty Senate. This motion was seconded.

Dr. Gegenheimer stated that he was delighted to see two tracks available to the faculty. In times past, in his opinion, many faculty members had not taken cases of cheating to the committee because a faculty member had been the one that ended up on trial rather than the student. He commended the committee for their excellent work.

Dean Vanselow moved that Dr. Lytle's motion be amended to delete the fifth sentence of paragraph 4, on page 3. This motion was seconded. Dr. Garcia said that if Dr. Lytle is agreeable, and he said he was agreeable, why couldn't this be deleted from the original document without having to take a vote. Dr. Lytle stated that he would be happy to do that if there was no dissent. Hearing no dissent he moved on.

Dean Livermore said that he was troubled by the process of getting a document and then trying to make sense of it on the floor of the Senate. He would prefer to remand the whole matter back to the committee to discuss some of the concerns expressed. He stated that individual colleges need to look over this document and unless there is an urgency to get this enacted before the summer it should be deferred. Dr. Lytle said that the committee believed that there is an urgency. We should adopt this because we have guidelines whatsoever now. Interpretations could be made by the newly established Committee on Academic Integrity after we have a working document.

Dr. LaBan said he supported Dean Livermore's thought. Working these things out on the floor of the Senate is difficult at best. He reminded the body that this is one of the reasons we were having difficulty with Chapter VIII. Dr. Lytle asked where these voices were two or three weeks ago. The faculty had access to this document but none of these concerns had been communicated to the committee. He believed that it is incumbent upon the Senate and upon the faculty to read documents and submit objections beforehand.

At this point Dr. Hawkins moved to table the motion before the Senate.

The motion to table was defeated.

Dr. Hetrick stated that he was concerned about Dean Vanselow's motion which would indicate that there was no appeal to a University body. He felt that this may be a violation of due process. At this point Dr. Woloshin raised a point of order indicating that there was no motion before the floor because Dean Vanselow's motion had been incorporated into the document without action. Dr. Lytle stated that that was correct and that he had stipulated that he would incorporate this into the document if there was no objection. Dr. Hetrick said that at the time Dr. Lytle asked if there was an objection he had raised his hand, but was not recognized. (Since an objection was heard, then Dean Vanselow's seconded motion to amend was now back before the Senate.)

Dean McConnell stated that if the sentence regarding appeal to a University committee was deleted, in those colleges where there is only a single department the student may receive only one hearing. Professor Flint said that only those colleges who have their own complete hearing procedure for handling these matters would be affected by this. Dean Vanselow pointed out that the elimination of a sentence does not eliminate the appeal. It simply means that colleges may set their own policy and even then they may wish to allow an appeal to a University committee. In his opinion an appeal to this University committee should not be mandated by the document. Mr. Federhar said that a statement should be in there to indicate that students do have the right to appeal.

Dr. Thompson said that there were two other places in the document where appeals are specified. These other instances can take care of the objections named. At this point the question was called for and the amendment was carried.

Dr. Inman raised a question on Penalty No. 4, page 1. She wanted to make sure that any penalty notation could be removed from the student's permanent record in the future. Professor Flint said that the committee's intent was that such a notation, if it was to be removed, would be completely erased.

Dr. Inman further stated that in her opinion the wording under "Guidelines" is too general and she would like to suggest more specific wording. She stated that she would give this to the committee. Further, she said we also need a definition of plagiarism.

Professor Flint said this was a very critical issue and in the opinion of the committee the faculty member must make the definition. Dr. Inman stated that she disagreed with this opinion and that if it were left to each faculty member there would be too much opportunity for differences of interpretation.

Dr. Peterson said that paragraph 2, under "Guidelines", on page 1, should be amended to delete the phrase "but shall not be limited to". Since this body had encountered difficulty with this phrase in the Faculty Constitution, he felt that it should be eliminated here. Dr. Lytle said the committee believed that it could not foresee all of the problems; thus, it needed this phrase. Dr. Gegenheimer stated that he believed that Guideline No. 5 was the "escape hatch" for the committee and Dr. Lytle agreed that it was.

Dr. Myers then moved that the motion be amended to delete "but shall not be limited to". Several seconds were heard.

Dr. Thompson spoke in opposition to this amendment. He said the document already had a built-in protection against "craziness" in this area and the document now places the burden on the faculty member to provide a rational case. Dr. Hetrick spoke in favor of the amendment because, in his opinion, removal of the offensive phrase does not change the meaning. At that point the question was called for and the amendment carried.

Dr. Munroe pointed out what seemed to be an inconsistency. On page 5, Paragraph 6, "Penalties", stipulates that a failing grade in the course would be the minimum penalty imposed for a violation of the code, while on page 4, Paragraph 1, "Limitations", under "Faculty Hearing" indicates that the maximum penalty which may be imposed is a failing grade. Dr. Lytle explained that under a Faculty Hearing Committee the maximum penalty which is to be imposed is a failing grade. The paragraph on page 5 refers to penalties assessed by the Committee on Academic Integrity. Dr. Livermore pointed out that the Paragraph 6 in question then was certainly placed in the wrong position in this document.

At that point a point of order was called indicating that the Senate had lost its quorum and the meeting adjourned at 4:45 o'clock.



David Butler, Secretary pro tem



Herman Carrillo, Assistant Secretary pro tem

MOTIONS PASSED AT MEETING OF MAY 2, 1977:

1. Approval of Minutes of April 4, 1977.
2. Approval of motion thanking Dr. Cornelius Steelink for his service as Chairman of the Faculty.
3. Approval of motion to refer back to Undergraduate Council the proposal that a reorganized division of the School of Home Economics be named Human Environment and Design.
4. Approval of motion to refer back to the Undergraduate Council proposed name change for the School of Home Economics.
5. Approval of candidates for degrees to be conferred at 1977 Commencement.
6. Approval of guidelines from Undergraduate Council regarding the academic calendar.
7. Approval of motion to reaffirm Senate position on Chapter VIII, that is, approval of Chapter VIII as contained in cumulative minutes of the Senate through April 1976.

ACTION ITEMS PENDING:

1. Proposal to discontinue policy prohibiting transferring to the University work completed at another institution during period of University disqualification.
2. Review of University procedures concerning dishonest scholastic work.
3. Study of question of developing means of review of institution's administrators at the college and university level.
4. Development of Faculty Manual statement concerning the status of tenured personnel being released because of the lack of financial support, because of the curtailment or termination of a program, or because of a redirection of the goals of department.
5. Review of curricular matterial ("Curriculum" bulletin, Vol. 6, No. 10, issue date of April 28, 1977) pertaining to the Reorganization of the School of Home Economics and the proposed change in the Title of the School of Home Economics.