

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
Proceedings of the Faculty Senate

Meeting of Monday

February 7, 1972

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:40 p.m. on Monday, February 7, 1972, in the Modern Languages Building auditorium (Room 350). Forty-eight members were present with Vice President McMillan presiding.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Ares, Bannister, Bartlett, Bleibtreu, Blitzer, Bok, Bretall, Brewer, Christopherson, Cole, Delaplane, Dixon, Dresher, Eisner, Evans, S. Fahey, Gould, Grant, Herber, Hetrick, Joyner, Keating, Krebs, Lytle, Mason, Massengale, Mathews, Mautner, McMillan, Muramoto, Murphy, L. Myers, Paulsen, Putt, Reiblich, Rhodes, Richard, Robson, Skinner, Steelink, Svob, Thompson, Tomizuka, Varney, Voris, Windsor, Wise, and Zwolinski. Student representative attending was Julie Lauber.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Anthony, Barnes, Boyer, Butler, Dewhirst, Edwards, W. Fahey, Freeman, Gaines, Gegenheimer, Goodwin, Green, Hull, Johnson, Lane, Layton, McConnell, Munsinger, H. Myers, Nigh, Schaefer, Shields, Siegel, Sorensen, and Younggren. Student representatives absent were Randy Tufts and Nanette Warner.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of January 3, 1972 were approved as distributed to members.

CATALOG MATERIAL: The catalog material previously distributed to members of the Senate by means of the "Curriculum" bulletin was accepted without change.

ELECTION OF REPLACEMENT IN SENATE MEMBERSHIP: Vice President McMillan referred to the fact that Dr. Bryant Bannister was now a member of the Senate by virtue of his position as Acting Dean of the College of Earth Sciences. Previously he had been a member at large. Mr. McMillan welcomed back to the Senate Dr. Leon Blitzer who had rejoined the faculty after a one-semester sabbatical leave.

At this point Mr. Windsor pointed out that Dr. Bannister's becoming an ex-officio member of the Senate left vacant his position as a senator at large. Mr. Windsor said that Professor Lou Myers had been elected by the Senate to fill the vacancy created by Dr. Blitzer's absence during the first semester. It seemed to him it would be appropriate now to elect Professor Myers to fill the vacancy created by Dr. Bannister's becoming an ex-officio member. He so moved. Several seconds were heard and Professor Myers was then unanimously elected as senator at large.

PROPOSAL TO CHANGE BYLAWS: The chairman referred to the memorandum sent out under date of January 10, 1972 which informed members of the Senate that they would be asked to consider at the February meeting the following change in the University of Arizona General Faculty Bylaws:

Delete the words "the Senate, or" from the first line of Bylaw 6, page 92, Faculty and Staff Manual of Procedure and Policy. Add the following paragraphs to the bylaw:

All meetings of the Faculty Senate are open to the public. The only exceptions are when a majority of those present and voting call for an executive session or when the presiding officer calls an executive session.

Non-members may participate in discussions or debates upon invitation of the presiding officer.

Before the close of each Senate meeting, the presiding officer "calls the audience." Under this item only those who are not members of the Senate may address the body on any matters which are germane to the Senate's responsibilities. Comments under "call to the audience" may not exceed five minutes unless the presiding officer rules otherwise.

Dr. LaBan, Senate parliamentarian, stated it should be clearly understood that the proposal, which had been submitted at an earlier meeting by Dr. Conrad Joyner, referred only to meetings of the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Joyner said he would not again speak extensively in support of his proposal but would ask instead that the minutes refer to his statements on this subject at the December 1971 and January 1972 meetings of the Faculty Senate.

He further asked that these minutes include certain statements he had made in a memorandum he had sent to all members of the Faculty Senate prior to the December meeting in which he discussed open meetings and participation by the public. These remarks had stated that Dr. Joyner believed that all members of the University community as well as the public should be permitted to attend virtually all meetings of the Senate and even say a few words if they desire. The memorandum continued, "Both the logic and practice of an open society recommend these policies.

- "1. With but few exceptions, the University's resources come from public funds. The Senate, by virtue of delegation of authority, is empowered in some cases to recommend actions to the Board of Regents and the President of the University and in other instances make binding decisions as regards the policies of the University. These recommendations and decisions affect both those within and outside the University community. It follows except that in the most sensitive cases, e.g., the awarding of honorary degrees, those who might have a stake in our proceedings have a right to be present and to be heard. We are not a closed corporation.
- "2. As a matter of practice, if the public is welcome at our meetings and they are regularly reported by the media, this

might contribute to a better understanding of what the University is doing. Certainly, those of us in higher education need to inform the citizens of our various and vital functions.

- "3. In both closing meetings and permitting non-members to speak considerable discretion is granted to the presiding officer. This presents little or no problem. A majority of senators present and voting may reverse his rulings."

The chairman stated that the proposal came before the Senate as a seconded motion. Dr. Thompson then asked that there be a division in the consideration of the proposal, the first two paragraphs referring to open meetings being treated as one question and the third paragraph referring to "calling the audience" being treated separately. The chair ruled that the matter would be considered as a divided question.

Dr. Lytle said that he viewed the proposal with mixed emotions although he intended to vote in favor of at least the first two paragraphs. He said that Senate members should be aware of the fact, however, that in many legislative bodies there are ways of proceeding when a sensitive issue is to come before the group that are not so easily available in the Faculty Senate. If a group is small, word can easily be disseminated as to the desirability of action being taken in a certain direction. In a large legislative group there is a whip who can get the word around about what lies behind a certain sensitive issue. The Faculty Senate is made up of professional people with full time duties as teachers, administrators, and research personnel who have assumed legislative responsibilities simply as an additional responsibility. No mechanism exists whereby members can always be made sufficiently aware of the background of a particular sensitive issue prior to a meeting. Dr. Lytle said he was simply warning the group that it may be necessary to develop a more sophisticated communication system to get word out as to how votes on certain issues might best go--to avoid embarrassment to the University, for instance.

Dr. Joyner said he agreed completely with Dr. Lytle's comments.

Dr. Bok said he had experiences with legislative groups of this sort. If the proposal is adopted, he said, he felt the President should call for the Senate to go into executive session almost every meeting. This would become almost an automatic step of routine procedure. Otherwise when an issue of a particularly sensitive nature arises which makes it imperative to go into executive session, the novelty of the procedure causes persons to become excited and unduly concerned about the action.

Dr. Tomizuka said he felt the proposed opening up of the Senate meetings would gradually change the role of the Senate, possibly to the point where the real decisions on major issues would have been made behind the scenes before matters actually came up on the Senate floor. He said he was aware of the fact that in many bodies--some city councils, for instance--the actual deliberation and decision-making process takes place behind the scenes, and the so-called democratic procedures of the opening meeting become only a formality, a facade. Dr. Joyner said that as a veteran of service on a city council he could attest that very heated arguments and very real decisions are often hammered out in open meetings. He said he did not see

how open meetings could be considered to be less democratic. He felt the proposed change in procedure would develop greater confidence in the Faculty Senate.

The question was called for. Twenty-five members voted in favor of the proposal and eighteen voted against it. Since two-thirds of those present and voting had not voted in favor of the proposed change in the bylaws, it failed.

Dr. Joyner than asked that the second part of the question, that relating to "calling the audience," be withdrawn. Mr. Mautner who had seconded Dr. Joyner's original proposal concurred in this request.

(See further discussion concerning this item at a later point in these minutes.)

REPORT ON PERMISSIBLE DATES FOR SUPPLEMENTAL WORK DURING 1972 SUMMER SESSION:

Mr. McMillan reported to the Senate that Vice President Murphy, in response to a request from the Senate, had prepared a schedule in regard to permissible dates during the summer of 1972 for supplemental work on sponsored research projects by faculty members on ten-month (academic year) appointments. The schedule was as follows:

- (a) Summer 1972  
June 1 (Thursday) through August 19 (Saturday),  
maximum 11 weeks, 2 1/2 days;
- (b) Academic appointments to start August 16;
- (c) Summer 1973  
May 21 (Monday) through August 18 (Saturday),  
maximum 13 weeks.

COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN PROPOSAL THAT THE PRESIDENT BE ASKED TO APPOINT A COMMITTEE

ON EFFECTIVE TEACHING: Dr. Steelink explained to the Senate that last year a campus AAUP committee on faculty responsibility, chaired by Dr. Leslie Forster of the Department of Chemistry, had developed a set of recommendations regarding the development of effective teaching, including a proposal that a Committee on Effective Teaching be created. These recommendations had been based on studies at five conferences held in various parts of the nation sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation. Dr. Steelink had attended one of these. These studies had all been published.

The recommendation of the AAUP committee had been presented to an open faculty meeting last year, Dr. Steelink said. President Schaefer had been in attendance. Later the recommendation had been submitted to the Committee of Eleven. Dr. Steelink said that the Committee of Eleven feels that there is a need on this campus for the faculty and administration to make a commitment to developing more effective undergraduate teaching. The Committee of Eleven is responding not only to developing pressures from outside the University for teaching accountability and productivity, but is now submitting recommendations with the conviction that there is professional talent on this campus which can be developed, resulting in a more creative and productive teaching environment, an environment which will benefit faculty and students alike.

Dr. Steelink said that there is a wealth of published material now available on improving teaching. There are a number of departments on the Arizona campus which have developed innovative teaching programs. If a Committee on Effective Teaching were created, some of the areas which it could investigate would be: general teaching developments in higher education; a comprehensive program to assist personal and professional development of faculty members and graduate students; a mechanism for faculty members to obtain useful feedback from students concerning teaching activities; creation of alternate teaching environments; creation and evaluation of course objectives.

To collect, assimilate and pattern this information for the University of Arizona campus would take time, Dr. Steelink said, but the Committee of Eleven feels that such activity would only benefit the University, both internally and externally.

The report of the Committee of Eleven was as follows:

"The Committee of Eleven recommends that the President be asked to appoint a Committee on Effective Teaching, whose mandate would be as follows:

1. Gather data on teaching evaluation techniques from this campus and other institutions, act as a clearing house for such data, and support efforts to improve such techniques.
2. Support efforts to improve teaching concepts and techniques that faculty or administrative units might wish to undertake.
3. Receive appropriate funding.
4. Report annually to the Faculty Senate, and in no more than three years time, make positive recommendations for implementation.

(A background statement supporting this recommendation is attached to these minutes.)

Cornelius Steelink, Chairman  
Committee of Eleven"

Dr. Steelink moved that the Committee of Eleven proposal be accepted. Dr. Joyner seconded the motion.

Dr. Robson said he questioned the wording of Paragraph 1 describing the mandate for the Committee on Effective Teaching. It was explained, however, that the language had been found acceptable by certain members of the English faculty who sit on the Committee of Eleven.

Dr. Bartlett wondered if a similar committee had not been at work several years ago. Dr. Evans said he believed Dr. Bartlett was remembering a Science Education Committee which had studied effective teaching on this campus several years ago.

Dr. Mathews asked what sort of recommendations regarding good teaching should be sought. Dr. Steelink said that he felt the committee should determine these. Dr. Bannister said he wondered just what was meant in Paragraph 2 of the "mandate" where there is reference to efforts to improve teaching concepts. Dr. Steelink responded that the wording of the mandate was deliberately vague.

Professor Dixon asked just what was good teaching. Does it mean bringing about a student's learning a certain body of material which will be obsolete two years from now? Does it mean stimulating a student to develop certain attitudes so that he would be motivated fifteen years hence to learn still more about particular matter? Dr. Steelink said much material has been published to date on how to measure a good teacher. Dr. Tomizuka said he felt each person in the room no doubt had his own idea of what was good teaching, but he would not want to see a single definition of this developed. He said he thought a very important point was that the committee must be of the right composition. Dr. Dixon said he didn't see how something could be evaluated until there was agreement on what good teaching in fact is. This, however, must first be defined, he repeated. Dr. Bok commented that though we may not know what good teaching is at least we know what bad teaching is. He said he thought this was as good a point as any to comment that a university should marshal all the teaching potential it could. If there are persons on the campus who are involved only in research and who are not in fact contributing to the teaching function, he thought they had no place within the University.

Several persons commented that this proposal seemed to be one that one really could not oppose since it was in a class with apple pie and motherhood.

The question was called for and the proposal was adopted by voice vote with a few dissenting votes heard.

OPEN MEETINGS, FURTHER DISCUSSION RE: Dr. Joyner said that he wanted his colleagues to know how he would answer questions, if he were asked them, about the Senate's action by which it declined to open its meetings to the public. He said he felt his response should include the following points:

1. The Senate action demonstrates insensitivity to the function of the modern university. Citizens ask and expect answers to questions concerning what universities are doing. They have a right to know. One way for the public to achieve greater knowledge would be through open Faculty Senate meetings.
2. Arizona State University as well as other institutions have open Faculty Senate meetings. To his knowledge, there have been no adverse effects as a result of these open meetings.
3. Citizens would have greater appreciation for the functions of our University. Public appreciation and understanding should make our tasks more meaningful for the citizens of Arizona.

4. As a result of this vote, the major deliberative body of the University of Arizona faculty will remain a closed corporation. On this issue we are still operating with the principles of the 19th century.

Dr. Skinner said that men of good will can always have honest differences of opinion. He said he hoped, however, that Dr. Joyner would not assume the role of spokesman for the Senate in statements he might make to others about what happened at this meeting. Dr. Joyner asked if Dr. Skinner wished the Senate to instruct him not to discuss the matter outside the Senate chamber. Mr. Mautner commented that some persons voted against the "open meetings" proposal honestly motivated by a desire to have the Senate's deliberations conducted in as democratic a fashion as possible, just as those voting in favor of the motion were. Dr. Joyner said any comments he made would be with the understanding that he was speaking only as one member of the Senate. He said he would indeed not solicit a forum but if newspaper reporters, for instance, asked him what had happened, he had let his colleagues know what he felt he must say.

The question was asked how reports about Senate business usually are released to news media. Mr. Windsor said that from time to time he has been called by a reporter after a Senate meeting. Similarly, the President is called. There is no reason why individual faculty members might not similarly be asked questions about meetings.

Dean Ares said he hoped there was no feeling that any "gag rule" should be in effect whereby any Senate member could not discuss what had happened if he wished to do so. He said he wondered whether too much wasn't being made of the whole matter.

Mr. McMillan said he was sure no one intended that any "gag rule" prevail. Dr. Skinner said he would withdraw his comments since he was satisfied that Dr. Joyner in fact was not going to seek a forum before which to comment on the Senate action. Dean Rhodes said he did not feel that an issue should be re-argued publicly once it had been disposed of within the Senate, but he felt any member should be able to say what he pleased to others about Senate actions, exercising his own good judgment as a responsible member of the faculty and of the Senate.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:55 o'clock.

---

David L. Windsor, Secretary

August 5, 1971

MEMORANDUM TO: Committee of Eleven

REGARDING: Improvement of Teaching

At a time when the universities are under attack for alleged neglect of undergraduate teaching, it is desirable that we examine our teaching effectiveness. A number of studies pertinent to the evaluation and improvement of teaching have been published in recent years and we urge the Committee of Eleven to consider at this time procedures for the evaluation and improvement of the quality of instruction at the University of Arizona.

Any plan to improve teaching at the University of Arizona should include creation of:

- 1) A formal University-wide procedure for evaluating teaching, including colleague and student input.
- 2) An office to provide information, equipment and funds for upgrading instruction.
- 3) A climate in which good teaching is recognized and rewarded through merit increases and promotion.

Although this report will emphasize the evaluation procedure, we do not minimize the importance of the other two elements.

Evaluation of teaching should be framed positively, as a method for improving teaching, in order to reduce the threatening aspects as much as possible. Of course, any evaluation does carry some threat to the professor's ego and status within the University. It may, in extreme cases, adversely affect his salary or job security. It is, therefore, essential that considerable care be exercised in designing the evaluation procedure, not only to insure justice to the professor, but also to command wide acceptance and the cooperation needed to make teaching evaluation a success.

In accord with the above, we recommend the formulation and promulgation of procedures by which all teaching faculty, tenured and non-tenured alike, will be evaluated in their teaching performance as well as other facets of professional performance, viz., scholarship and community service. The procedure must in all cases include a written record.

Although the evaluation instrument may well vary throughout the University community, certain common features should be included in all. Data should include student and colleague judgements. If possible these opinions should be based upon the extent to which the evaluatee achieved his stated objectives. Thus, prior to the evaluation, an outline of the course objectives and the manner in which the desired goals were to be reached should be solicited from the evaluatee. Only in this way can a reasonable judgement of teaching effectiveness be reached. For example, it would be unfortunate if an instructor were

judged on the amount of information transferred in his lectures, when he did not intend the lectures to serve this function. Under no circumstances should the evaluation procedure inhibit the exercise of creative skills. The appropriateness of objectives is, of course, subject to discussion.

Student evaluations can take the form of questionnaires, but should not be limited to this device. Consideration might be given to the exit interview, in which graduating students register opinions about courses taken in earlier years. The perspective of time may well change a student's opinion.

A more controversial aspect of student judgement involves student-initiated complaints. At present such complaints are registered with department heads or deans in a haphazard manner. A better procedure, which is not threatening to the student, should be devised and communicated to the students. Perhaps some type of ombudsman could be appointed to receive and evaluate these complaints.

Colleague and peer evaluations pose a more difficult problem. This evaluation, which would vary in nature with the size and character of the department involved, might include classroom visitation or viewing of videotapes. It might be sufficient to examine the course syllabus and examinations. Alternatively, an interview with the evaluatee might be appropriate. In any event, a written summary of the peer evaluation should be prepared.

The T.A.'s are a group with both student and colleague attributes, but with a viewpoint somewhat different from either of these groups. Systematic solicitation of T.A. judgements could be very useful.

After the evaluation, what then? At the very least, the faculty member should have the opportunity to examine the record and to add comments as he chooses. For younger members of the faculty, assistance in improving teaching should be provided either through the department or a University office established for this purpose. Even experienced teachers may be unaware of lost effectiveness or distracting mannerisms and counseling may be appropriate in these cases.

Prior to receiving tenure, faculty should be evaluated yearly. Tenured faculty can be evaluated less frequently. Three or four year intervals seem reasonable unless a shorter interval is requested by the faculty member. However, yearly student questionnaires would seem appropriate.

Implicit in our recommendations is the complete openness of the evaluation procedure. Every faculty member should know the extent of his teaching responsibilities, the criteria upon which teaching will be evaluated, the results of the evaluation, and the weight that the evaluation will have in decisions on salary increases and promotion. The faculty should also recognize that the adoption of a formal procedure protects them from unwarranted attack by disgruntled students, colleagues, or individuals outside the University community.

Finally, the University administration must understand that improvement of teaching requires more than lip service. Not only must good teaching be recognized and rewarded, but financial support must be provided for released time to develop new courses and instructional materials and to establish a center for educational development.

In conclusion, we wish to point out that a considerable body of information, pertinent to the evaluation of instruction, is now available. These include:

- 1) "The Recognition and Evaluation of Teaching," Kenneth Eble.
- 2) "Course and Teacher Evaluation," Phillip Werdele.
- 3) "Effective University Teaching and its Evaluation," Report from Univ. of California at Davis.

The U of A Committee on Faculty  
Responsibility

/s/L.S. Forster, Chairman  
C. Mathews  
H.C. Perkins  
P. Skinner  
R. Thompson