

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Proceedings of the Faculty Senate

Meeting of Monday

November 4, 1974

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Aamodt, Bleibtreu, Boghosian, Brewer, D. Butler, H. Butler, Capponi, Carr, Chin, Corrigan, Demer, Edwards, Elliott, Evans, S. Fahey, W. Fahey, Garcia, Gavlak, Halderman, Hull, Inman, Jensen, Johnson, Kearns, Knorr, LaBan, Malik, Manes, Massengale, Mathews, McCoy, McCullough, McMillan, Miller, Muramoto, D. Myers, L. Myers, Noyes, Odishaw, Palsson, Paulsen, Paylore, Peterson, Ray, Reed, Rhodes, Roby, Roemer, Rosaldo, Rosenberg, Schaefer, Shields, Simpson, Sorensen, Stairs, Steelink, Stubblefield, Svob, Thompson, Tomizuka, Trier, Weaver, Wiersma, and Yoshino. Student representatives present were Scott Nation, Jorge Reyes, and Ken Sobel. Dr. Robert Sankey was present as parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Christensen, Dinowitz, Dresher, DuVal, Fazio, Gaines, Graham, Joyner, Kassander, Livermore, Mason, McConnell, McWhorter, Nelson, Skinner, Vanselow, Windsor, and Woods.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS: President Schaefer introduced the following new Liberal Arts representatives recently elected to the Senate: Dr. Guido Capponi, Dr. Jose Garcia, Dr. Billie Jo Inman, Dr. Henning Jensen, Dr. Joe Malik, Dr. Donald Myers, Dr. William Noyes, and Dr. Elizabeth Roemer. Newly reelected Liberal Arts representatives are Dr. Renato Rosaldo and Dr. Charles Rosenberg.

CATALOG MATERIAL: The catalog material as presented in "Curriculum" bulletins Vol. 5, No. 8 and Vol. 5, No. 9 (issue dates of October 3, 1974, and October 25, 1974, respectively) was approved.

APPROVAL OF DEGREES COMPLETED SEPTEMBER 1, 1974: The Faculty Senate, having been provided in advance of the meeting a list of the recipients of earned degrees completed on September 1, 1974, approved the awarding of those degrees. The September 1, 1974, list included 564 bachelor's degrees, 542 master's degrees, 2 Juris Doctor degrees, 2 Doctor of Medicine degrees, and 84 Doctor's (A.Mus.D., Ed.D., Ph.D.) degrees, for a total of 1,194 degrees. (A copy of this list is attached to the Secretary's official file copy of the minutes.)

ELECTION OF MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON CONCILIATION: The Senate voted by ballot to select the new member of the Committee on Conciliation. Two members serve on this committee, holding staggered two-year terms. The carry-over member this year is Dr. Edgar McCullough. The nominees of the Committee on Committees for the new member were Dr. James Anthony, Professor of Music, and Dr. Mary Wetzel, Assistant Professor of Psychology.

Dr. Mary Wetzel was elected.

APPROVAL FOR OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN PROGRAM TO SOLICIT FACULTY FOR FUNDS: Vice President Johnson reminded the Senate that one of its responsibilities was to approve on-campus solicitation of funds from faculty and staff. Previously the Senate had approve solicitation only for the United Way Campaign, for Camp Wildcat, and for the New Start program. The Advisory Committee to the Opportunities for Women Program had now asked him as chairman of the committee to request that the Senate approve a fund drive for the Opportunities for Women Program.

Vice President Johnson explained that this program which had begun in April was directed mainly toward women who for some reason had been forced to interrupt their educational program. These women include housewives, divorcees, and women who want to upgrade their skills. Most of them are part-time students. Federal and state governmental restrictions severely limit the amount of financial aid which can be awarded to part-time students. Because of these restrictions the Advisory Committee is looking for additional funds to assist this program. The committee is soliciting outside sources and has talked to various undergraduate organizations such as Mortar Board.

On behalf of the Advisory Committee Vice President Johnson moved that the Senate permit the Opportunities for Women Program the privilege of soliciting university faculty and staff members for funds to support this program. The motion was seconded by Dr. Muramoto.

Dr. Peterson asked who comprised the membership of the Advisory Committee. Vice President Johnson stated that the members of the committee are Dr. Mary Beavers, Mrs. Marialyce Conter, Dean Barbara Hesler, Mrs. Mary Kay Johnson, Dr. Janelle Krueger, Dr. Gary Munsinger, Mrs. Jo Ann Sudigala, Dean Robert Svob, Dr. Laurel Wilkening, Dean David Windsor, Dr. Robert Wrenn, and himself. He pointed out that the staff of the program consists of one person, Mrs. Jo Ann Sudigala, who is also a member of the Advisory Committee.

Dr. Shirley Fahey stated that she was bothered by the fact that this program was limited to women. There are many students who for one reason or another have been forced to interrupt their education or who wish to upgrade their skills. She suspected that most of these would be women; however, she thought the program should be expanded to provide opportunities for all returning students who are part-time students. She also asked if there were not some federal guidelines which might place this program in jeopardy if it were targeted only toward women. Vice President Johnson replied that we may eventually have to do just as Dr. Fahey has suggested. But until that time he thought we should go ahead with the program as it is now structured. He further said that perhaps the motion should be to solicit funds for all part-time students. However, he did not feel that he could speak for the Advisory Committee and he was under instructions from the committee to request that the solicitation be for the Opportunities for Women Program only.

After further brief discussion the motion passed unanimously.

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT: President Schaefer asked the deans to see to it that every department head and director under their supervision is urged to emphasize and discuss with their faculties the United Way Campaign. At the present time the University has achieved only 46% of its goal. This is far below what the University has done in this campaign in years past. President Schaefer pointed

out that we have a real social responsibility as part of the community of Tucson to contribute to the United Way Campaign. The Tucson community has supported the University well in the past and we should do our share to support this community effort.

RECOMMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON CONCILIATION RE CHANGE IN PRESENT BYLAW 12, a:
President Schaefer recognized Dr. Edgar McCullough, the carry-over member on the Committee on Conciliation, to present a recommendation from this committee concerning changes in the present Bylaw 12, a. Dr. Schaefer pointed out that final action on the recommendation would have to wait until the next meeting of the Senate and that it could only be presented for discussion at this meeting.

Dr. McCullough stated that because of the extremely heavy workload the Committee on Conciliation had experienced the past academic year and is currently experiencing, the committee found it necessary to request this proposed bylaw change which would place alternate members on the committee. He further pointed out that the proposal as presented would not be fully operative this year since the Senate had by its earlier action already elected the second member to the Committee on Conciliation. However, if the proposal is approved the alternate members could be elected later.

Dr. McCullough then presented the following proposed revision of Bylaw 12, a. concerning the Committee on Conciliation:

Bylaw 12.

a. COMMITTEE ON CONCILIATION

- i. Membership and organization. This Committee shall consist of two members and four alternates composed of Faculty other than deans, elected by the Senate by secret ballot upon nomination by the Committee on Committees, which shall furnish twice as many names as persons to be elected. In the event that additional committees are required or in the event of extended absence from campus by one of the committee members, the Chairman of the Faculty or Executive Vice President shall call upon the alternates as necessary. Not more than one member of any college faculty shall be on the Committee at the same time. The term of membership shall be two years, three persons to be elected annually, two of whom shall serve as alternates. For the first year of this procedure the Committee on Committees shall nominate ten persons. The person receiving the highest number of votes shall serve a two-year term as a regular member of the Conciliation Committee, and the four persons receiving the next highest number of votes shall serve as alternates. Of those four the two persons receiving the highest number of votes shall serve for two years, and the remaining two for one year. Thereafter, three persons shall be elected each year with the person receiving the highest number of votes becoming the regular committee member and the other two becoming alternates. Members may be reelected to this Committee.

- ii. Area of responsibility. The Committee, at the discretion of the President, or at the request of the faculty of any college, or of any individual faculty member affected, shall investigate promptly any important problem involving any faculty member in his relationship to the University. It shall be its duty after careful investigation to offer counsel to the President and/or to the person or persons concerned. If conciliation is successful, due notification shall be transmitted to the Executive Vice President. If conciliation seems unlikely, both parties shall be notified accordingly with the faculty member being advised of the available options. Unless unusual or extenuating circumstances prevail, participation by legal counsel shall not be deemed appropriate in Conciliation Committee meetings.

Professor Demer moved that the words "within thirty days" be added before the words "shall investigate promptly" and after the words "any important problems" in the first sentence of the proposed Bylaw 12, a, ii. The sentence then would read, "The Committee, at the discretion of the President, or at the request of the faculty of any college, or of any individual faculty member affected, shall investigate promptly within thirty days any important problem involving any faculty member in his relationship to the University." Dr. Demer said that through painful personal knowledge he was aware that some complaints brought before the committee had taken up to four months to be resolved. He said he felt the specificity of thirty days was necessary. This motion was seconded by Dr. Shirley Fahey and passed.

Dr. Steelink stated that he believed it was important that the committee consist only of tenured faculty members because of the nature of the committee's work. He therefore moved that in the first sentence of the proposed Bylaw 12, a., i. the words "tenured members of the" be inserted before the word "Faculty." The sentence would then read, "This Committee shall consist of two members and four alternates composed of tenured members of the Faculty other than deans, elected by the Senate by secret ballot upon nomination by the Committee on Committees, which shall furnish twice as many names as persons to be elected."

The motion was seconded and passed.

RECOMMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN RE CHANGING BYLAW 12, b. CONCERNING THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PRIVILEGE AND TENURE: President Schaefer recognized Dr. Donald Myers, President of the University of Arizona Chapter of the American Association of University Professors, a member of the Committee of Eleven, and a member of the Senate, who presented a recommendation from the Committee of Eleven regarding the changing of Bylaw 12, b. concerning the Committee on Academic Privilege and Tenure.

The recommendation follows:

"Believing that the provisions of Faculty Bylaw 12.b., 'Committee on Academic Privilege and Tenure,' are in several respects outdated and in need of revision, the members of the Committee of Eleven with the advice and assistance of the Committee on Academic Privilege and Tenure, submit the following proposal:

1. That the language of present Faculty Bylaw 12.b., appearing on pages 70-71 of the current Faculty Manual (13th ed., 1973), be repealed and that the following language be substituted therefor:

Bylaw 12.b. COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PRIVILEGE AND TENURE.

i. Membership and Organization.

The regular membership of the Committee shall consist of nine members elected by the faculty. These shall be in three classes with three members in each class, each serving a three-year term. A new class of three will be elected each year concurrent with the election of Senate members.

The Committee on Committees shall provide a slate of not less than twice the number of persons to be elected each year. The Committee on Committees shall give due consideration to representation from the various colleges.

The Committee shall elect its chairman from those of its regular members who have served at least one year.

Temporary members of the Committee shall be appointed to hear specific cases when the number of cases pending before the Committee is such that, in the Committee's opinion, undue delay will be experienced in the hearing and disposition of all such cases by its regular members.

Temporary members shall be selected by the chairman of the Committee on Academic Privilege and Tenure by random selection from a pool of names provided by the Committee on Committees. Such a pool shall contain not less than twice the number of names as there are temporary members to be selected.

The Committee shall select one of its regular members to serve as panel chairman for each case. In all cases, the tenure of temporary members on the Committee shall be limited to the hearing and disposition of the particular case which occasioned their appointment.

ii. Duties. The Committee shall consider as a principal obligation to the faculty the protection of academic freedom and tenure. In particular the Committee shall review on behalf of the affected faculty member any recommendation for dismissal or any suspension of a faculty member as described in 12.b.(iii).

IN ADDITION, the Committee shall concern itself with complaints and grievances by members of the faculty (and, to the extent provided in 9.03 of Chapter IX of the Faculty Manual, by any other affected member of the University community) in ways designed helpfully to supplement the regular administrative processes of adjusting such matters. The Committee shall receive complaints in writing from individual members of the faculty or from groups of faculty members. The Committee shall also make investigations with respect to grievances of faculty members upon request of the President of the University or of the Board of Regents and, pursuant to 9.03 of Chapter IX of the Faculty Manual, with respect to complaints of any affected member of the University community made thereunder upon referral thereof to the Committee.

The Committee shall take no action on a complaint brought to its attention until it becomes apparent that the complainant has been unable to obtain satisfactory solutions or adjustments through the customary administrative channels and the Committee on Conciliation.

iii. Procedures. Except in cases involving the recommended dismissal OR THE SUSPENSION of a faculty member, the complainant shall submit in writing to the Committee before any hearing is held on their complaint: (a) an accurate and complete statement of the charges and the essential facts out of which they have arisen; and (b) a list of witnesses whom the Committee should question. Copies of such material shall thereupon be furnished by the Committee to the parties complained against, who may submit to the Committee similar written materials, responsive to the complaint, copies thereof being furnished to the complainant.

In its investigation of a complaint, other than one involving the proposed dismissal OR THE SUSPENSION of a faculty member, the Committee may proceed informally, receiving testimony and other evidence from the parties and their witnesses in such manner as the Committee may deem appropriate. In such informal investigations, a verbatim record of the proceedings shall not be required, and the various hearings shall be closed unless one of the parties requests that a particular hearing be open to the University community. Any party may designate an observer or a legal adviser, or both, who need not be members of the University community and who shall be privileged to be present at the hearing held on the complaint.

Any faculty member requested by the Committee to appear as a witness in its investigation of a complaint shall consider it an obligation as a faculty member to appear, give testimony and submit to cross-examination.

The Committee shall select from among its membership three-member panels to conduct informal hearings and five-member panels to conduct hearings in the case of a faculty member whose dismissal has been recommended or who has been suspended. Any panel may request a legally trained member of the faculty to act as legal consultant to the panel.

A faculty member whose dismissal is recommended OR WHO HAS BEEN SUSPENDED has the right to the more formal 'fair hearing' procedures hereinafter described affording the faculty member the following rights:

(a) The burden of proof of the existence of adequate cause for the faculty member's dismissal or suspension shall be on the appointing authorities.

(b) Service of notice of hearing containing a statement of the grounds for dismissal or suspension in writing at least twenty days prior to the hearing.

(c) The right to be advised, in advance of the hearing, of the names of witnesses and to have access to documentary evidence upon the basis of which dismissal is sought or the faculty member has been suspended. Adjournments of the hearing shall be granted to enable either party to investigate evidence as to which a persuasive claim of surprise is made. The hearing shall be open to the public unless the faculty member requests that it be closed.

(d) The right to be heard in his or her own defense, and to offer the testimony of witnesses and other evidence.

(e) The right to legal counsel or other representative.

(f) The right to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses.

(g) A stenographic record to be made of the hearing, and the right to a copy of the transcript thereof without charge.

(h) Findings of fact and recommendations to the President of the University based on the hearing record.

Whether formal or informal, a hearing by the Committee shall be conducted according to accepted rules of an administrative fact-finding commission. The panel chairman, assisted by the other members, shall conduct the hearing and shall be responsible for a full and complete hearing of the issues. The admissibility of evidence shall not be restricted by the rules of Arizona law applicable in judicial proceedings.

If the Committee's hearing on a complaint submitted by a nontenured faculty member is not concluded before his or her appointment expires, the complainant may elect that the proceedings on the complaint be carried to a conclusion. Unless such a written election is served upon the Committee, the proceedings shall be discontinued upon the expiration of the appointment.

In a case involving proposed nonretention of a faculty member wherein he or she claims a tenured status which is not recognized by the University, the Committee shall first make an informal preliminary investigation and report its conclusions regarding the tenure issue. If the Committee concludes that the claim of tenured status is justified, the faculty member has the right to the formal, 'fair hearing' procedures described above for dismissal and suspension cases.

iv. Report and recommendations. As soon as practicable after the conclusion of its hearing on a matter, the Committee shall forward to the President of the University and to all individual parties copies of the hearing transcript (if one was made) and of its report, findings and recommendations. The President shall as soon as practicable after receipt of this material, make his or her determination and forward copies of his or her written recommendation to the faculty member concerned and to the Committee. In a dismissal case, whether or not the Committee recommends dismissal, should the President determine to recommend dismissal, he or she shall submit his or her recommendation to the Board of Regents with his or her reasons for recommending dismissal and shall, at the same time, so inform the Committee and the faculty member concerned.

2. In order to implement this proposed change in an orderly manner, the present Committee on Academic Privilege and Tenure shall serve until June 30, 1976, with an additional six members to be elected in the spring of 1975. The three receiving the most votes shall serve from July 1, 1975, to June 30, 1978, the remaining three elected shall serve from July 1, 1975, to June 30, 1977. Beginning in the spring of 1976 and each year thereafter a class of three shall be elected for a three year-term."

Dr. Myers explained that the salient points of the Committee of Eleven's proposal on Bylaw 12, b. were as follows:

1. Committee size increased to nine.
2. Members to be elected by the faculty, three each year, from slate submitted by Committee on Committees.

3. Temporary members may be appointed.
4. Five-member panels will hear suspension or dismissal cases.
5. Three-member panels will handle other matters.
6. Any panel may ask for a legally trained faculty member to assist.
7. The committee will conduct a hearing on any dismissal or suspension unless the faculty member requests otherwise.
8. Dismissal or suspension hearings are open to the public unless the faculty member requests otherwise.

Dr. Myers pointed out that the changes reflected to a considerable degree the experience of the committee during the past year in particular, and perhaps in previous years. Dr. Myers further stated that the changes would enable the committee to cope more readily with its responsibilities. Some of the changes will make legitimate the ad hoc changes which the committee has made this past year.

Dean Stairs asked if in the light of the earlier Senate action, it would not be wise to state that the membership of the Committee on Academic Privilege and Tenure should also consist of "tenured faculty members?" It was agreed that this should be done.

Dr. Weaver said that he questioned the proposed method of selection of the committee members especially when the present committee has experienced no difficulty at all with the present method of selection. He said that the present committee has made decisions which he felt the faculty could endorse and he did not understand why the Committee of Eleven wished to change the method of selection of members for this committee. Dr. Schaefer replied that he had the same reservation. He has always accepted the recommendations of this committee. Therefore he did not understand why a change was necessary at this time. He said that if the Senate does vote to accept this change he hoped that it would at least give some thought to methods of providing administrative input into the selection of the committee.

Dr. Myers replied that he did not believe that any reflection on anyone was intended because of this recommended change in the method of selection of committee members. He said that he thought that this past year has indicated that sometimes appearance is every bit as important as substance. The new method of selection of members could have some advantage to President Schaefer in relieving him of any unwarranted accusations of having undue influence on the committee.

Professor Myers further said that the implementing provision at the end of the proposal would incorporate into the new committee the three present members. Thus the new committee would begin with experienced members and would retain those three members for another year and a half. President Schaefer said that he agreed with the comments that were just made. He felt that the decisions of this committee were decisions that should be made by the faculty and he very much respects the work of this committee. He said that he wanted to make sure that this proposed change would not work to the disadvantage of the faculty. Were the administration no longer to have input into the makeup of the committee, there would be removed a very real constraint on him when he considers the recommendations of the committee. He said that he did not anticipate this happening in the future, but it was a point worth considering.

Dr. LaBan said that he understood the reluctance to have the appearance of administrative representatives on this committee, but was there any valid reason for total exclusion? Professor Myers stated that on the other hand one could question whether the faculty member involved had the opportunity to select a member of the committee. The complaint has been leveled in the past that one party to a dispute has been able to select a member of the committee which makes recommendations concerning the resolution of the dispute. Professor LaBan replied that since we are dealing with the affairs of men wouldn't there be just as much danger that a committee comprised entirely of faculty members might be slanted to always view the dispute toward the faculty members' points of view. President Schaefer stated that of the dozen or so cases which are "grinding through the hopper" at present about 90% involve faculty members lodging complaints against other faculty members or against their departments, rather than against the university administration.

Dr. Tomizuka stated that without administrative input to the selection of the members of the committee the administration could feel more at ease in vetoing the recommendations of the committee because it had had no early input. However, if there is an administrative appointee on the committee it more or less morally binds the administration to accept the recommendation of the committee. He stated that he felt there was an advantage in maintaining the present system because we have seen in recent months that the administration has been willing to go along with the recommendations of the committee.

Dr. Trier said that since by the President's earlier statement most of the problems coming before the committee involve only faculty, would not the faculty be the better qualified group to resolve the problems. Dr. Trier said that he believed that we were all working toward responsible conduct on the part of both faculty and administration. Therefore he felt that it was very important to have a committee composed not only of faculty but also of persons elected by faculty. He further said that it would be advantageous to increase the size of the Committee on Academic Privilege and Tenure to enable the members of that committee to serve on less frequent occasions than they now do and thus make it easier for them to carry out their responsibilities.

Dr. Butler said that he questioned whether it was proper for the faculty member to have the right to legal counsel or the right to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses in this hearing if this is to be a hearing conducted entirely by faculty members. He thought this right might better attach itself to appeals from the decision of the President rather than on the committee level. Dr. Schaefer replied that the elements of due process do provide for the right to cross-examine and the right to legal counsel and that the University had made counsel available when requested. He said the local ground rules specify that the committee does the interrogation rather than having an attorney do this.

Professor Demer stated that he believed there was an inequity in this procedure in that the administration had its own counsel and had access to counsel. However, the aggrieved party must provide counsel at his own expense. He stated that he would like to assure that any complainant may ask for a legally trained faculty member to assist him in presenting his case. Dr. Schaefer replied that the procedures under the Code of Conduct involved two attorneys, one to represent the administration and one to represent the aggrieved party. The University does pay the salaries of these two attorneys.

It was agreed that the proposed revision of Bylaw 12, b., having been presented at this meeting of the Senate, would be considered further at the December meeting.

FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED NEW FACULTY CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS: President Schaefer recognized Dr. Currin Shields, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Faculty Constitution and Bylaws Committee, and asked him to present the final changes in the proposed document which the committee had been asked to make.

Dr. Shields pointed out that the report of the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws Committee was received last year and then the committee was asked to make certain technical changes resulting from adjustments in the academic calendar or as result of actions of the Faculty Senate, and they were also asked to "desex" the language of the Constitution and Bylaws. The committee had met on October 24 and had prepared a report on these changes.

The first item concerned a change in the proposed Constitution itself. In section I, D., 5. the committee recommended that as a result of the action taken by the Faculty Senate last year regarding open meetings the language of that action be incorporated into the Constitution. Section I, D., 5. should now read "Meetings of the Senate and of the General Faculty shall be open to the public except when those bodies decide to meet in executive session. Meetings of all other faculty bodies shall be closed to the public except when those bodies decide to hold open meetings." Dr. Shields moved that this change be approved. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Dr. Shields said that the next item to be considered also related to action taken by the Senate earlier. In Bylaw 5., d., iii., the words "issue or" preceding the word "accept" should be deleted as was done earlier in 5., d., ii. Dr. Shields moved that this amendment be accepted. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

Dr. Shields stated that the third item was a result of a change in the academic calendar. Dr. Shields said that the committee recommended that under Bylaw 5., e., v., the date April 15 be changed to April 1, under Bylaw 5., e., vi., the date May 1 be changed to April 15, and under Bylaw 5., e., vii., the date May 20 be changed to May 1. Dr. Shields moved that these changes be approved. His motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

The committee's next recommendation concerned the removing of all references to sex in the Constitution as directed by the Faculty Senate previously. Dr. Shields moved that the first page of the Constitution carry a footnote stating that "all uses of words ending in -man (chairman, spokesman, etc.) and all uses of he, his, or him refer to the generic use of the words with no implication of male or female." This motion was seconded.

Dr. Shirley Fahey stated that she found this to be a very sad attempt to desex the Constitution and Bylaws and frankly she would prefer not to have it done at all if this is the best that can be done. Dr. Inman stated that she felt it was not adequate because on page 4 of the Bylaws under Bylaw 5., d., ii. it refers to "his or her" which indicates that women were meant to be included in the Faculty. President Schaefer then asked why the committee had not made the changes as instructed by the Senate.

Dr. Shields replied that the committee believed that the footnote was adequate to accomplish the intended purpose of the Faculty Senate. They believed that there would be some rather awkward language situations encountered in trying to revise the entire document. Dr. Shirley Fahey stated that it would not take too much effort to go through and revise the Constitution and Bylaws. After further discussion the motion was defeated. President Schaefer then appointed a committee composed of Drs. Inman, S. Fahey, Bleibtreu, and Capponi to work with Dean Windsor to carry out the required changes which need to be made as a result of this defeated motion.

Dr. Roemer then pointed out that there was a technical matter on page 6 of the Bylaws that needed attention. Under Bylaw 5, paragraph f., ii. and iii. it is not made clear which office is involved. Every other statement in that paragraph refers to a particular office. However statements ii. and iii. state only the candidate. She moved that the words "for Faculty Chairman" be inserted after the word "candidate" in the two sections mentioned. The motion was seconded and carried.

President Schaefer then asked if the Senate was ready to vote on the proposed Constitution and Bylaws. Dr. Donald Myers asked, since the Senate had before it proposals from two committees concerning changes in Bylaws 12., a. and 12., b. if those sections should not be eliminated from consideration of the new Constitution and Bylaws. The parliamentarian replied that the proposed Constitution and Bylaws should be passed as it is drafted. If Bylaws 12., a. and 12., b. were left out of the action, and the proposed changes were then defeated, there would be a void concerning the membership of these two committees.

Dr. Steelink pointed out that under the new Constitution the President would no longer chair the Faculty Senate. He asked President Schaefer his feelings about that. President Schaefer replied that he was opposed to that provision as well as several others in the Constitution, but he felt faculty members should vote their feelings on this matter. However when the Constitution and Bylaws later were presented to the Board of Regents he would have to speak against those parts with which he disagreed. He further stated that the faculty of another Arizona university had submitted to the Regents a new Constitution with such a feature in the past and the Regents had completely changed the proposed Constitution. He predicted that the same thing would happen to this document.

Dr. Steelink stated that the President's objections should be brought out now before the document is approved, rather than after, and when the document goes forward it should be an agreement of the Senate and the entire faculty. Dr. Schaefer said that he could definitely state that the Board of Regents would not allow someone other than the President of the University to be the chairman of the Faculty Senate. The Board has held that position steadfastly on several previous occasions. Furthermore, Dr. Schaefer himself felt that he ought to be the one to chair the Senate. Dr. Weaver stated that it might be a better procedure to have the Constitution and Bylaws Committee consider changes that would be desirable from the administration's point of view before submitting the document for final vote. Dr. Steelink said he certainly would like to have all objections to the proposed document brought out on the floor of the Senate before it is approved.

Dr. Stubblefield asked if the faculty would have opportunity to vote on this document. Dr. Schaefer replied it would be voted on by the General

Faculty following approval by the Senate. He proposed that the Faculty Senate send the document forward. If the General Faculty approved the document and it then was submitted to the Board of Regents, the Regents would probably ask for a committee of two or three members from the Faculty Senate to meet with a committee from the Board of Regents to go over the proposed Constitution and Bylaws item by item, line by line. The altered document probably would then be referred back to the Senate, and if the Senate members wished to accept the changes they could, or if they wished to dispute the changes the Regents and the faculty representatives had agreed upon, they could do that also.

Dr. LaBan stated that he recalled that a year and a half ago the Faculty Senate had voted to receive this document with the understanding that members of the Senate would have an opportunity later on to speak to the recommended changes. He felt that the Senate had not been afforded that opportunity. Dr. LaBan said that he was sure that the Senate was weary of discussing this document. However he felt that just a simple yes or no vote could not adequately reflect his feelings or those of many members of the Senate. He was afraid that a yes or no vote now would be made just to get the document out of the way and would not give it the thought that it needed. Dr. Shields pointed out that the Senate has already spent considerable time discussing the proposed changes.

Dr. Stubblefield asked if it were correct that we were still operating under the present Constitution and Bylaws until the new Constitution and Bylaws were approved by the Faculty and the Board of Regents. Dr. Schaefer replied that that was correct with one exception. The election procedure contained in the new Bylaws had been adopted and placed in effect by the Faculty Senate last spring.

Vice President Johnson moved that we table the matter before the Senate until next month. The motion was seconded and passed.

Dr. Schaefer stated that we should be prepared to devote most of the next Senate meeting to the examination and discussion of the proposed Constitution and Bylaws. The President further suggested that in order to have a more orderly meeting any objections members of the Senate may have be sent in writing to the Secretary of the Faculty. These objections then would be furnished members of the Senate in written form prior to the December meeting so they would have an opportunity to study them before the meeting.

Dr. Trier asked if there had been any attempt to determine the feelings of the entire faculty about the proposed Constitution and Bylaws. He asked if the committee could not prepare a brief outline of the new Constitution and Bylaws and furnish it to all members of the faculty so that they might have an opportunity to examine it at this point. President Schaefer replied that as senators each member present should adequately represent the feelings of his or her constituency. He did not believe it would be necessary or advisable to distribute an outline of the proposed changes to the entire faculty prior to Senate action on the proposals. Dr. Myers suggested that through announcements to the faculty by means of the "Blue Sheet" it be made known that the proposed Constitution would be discussed at the December Senate meeting.

Dr. Schaefer then asked that the Committee on Committees give some thought to naming three members of the Senate to serve as a committee to work with the Board of Regents in reviewing the new Constitution and Bylaws, once it has been approved by the Senate and then by the General Faculty.

The meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

David Butler, Secretary pro tem

Herman D. Carrillo, Assistant Secretary pro tem