

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
Monday, April 21, 1958 Room 101, Law Building

The Faculty Senate convened in special session at 3:40 P.M. on Monday, April 21, 1958, in Room 101 of the Law Building. Thirty-five members were present with President Harvill presiding. Dr. Shutt was present for Dean Slonaker.

Present: Bateman, Bogart, Buchhauser, Casaday, Crowell, Enke, Forrester, Gegenheimer, Hall, Harvill, Hudson, Humphrey, Irwin, Kemmerer, Leshner, Livermore, Lynn, Lyons, Marcoux, Martin, Mead, Merritt, Murphy, Myers, Park, Patrick, Paylore, Picard, Pistor, Powell, Rhodes, Shutt (for Slonaker), Tucker, Vavich, Wallraff, Zapotocky.

Absent: Brewer, Carlson, Conley, Garretson, Howard, Hull, Nugent, Roy.

Approval of minutes: The minutes of the meeting of April 14, 1958 were approved as distributed to members.

Delinquent Scholarship Report Procedures, further consideration of report on: Dr. Merritt referred to the report of the committee on Delinquent Scholarship Report Procedures and reminded the Senate that at its last meeting it had denied approval of Point 1, which was to continue the restriction on transfer of credits during a period of disqualification. By its action the Senate had removed this restriction.

Dr. Merritt then moved for the adoption of Point 2, the recommendation that the University discontinue the policy of "forgiving" a failing grade of 5 received in the freshman and sophomore year if the course is repeated for credit. The motion was seconded by Dr. Gegenheimer.

Dr. Patrick argued in favor of retaining the present policy but raising the scholarship average from a 3.2 to 3.0. Dr. Gegenheimer pointed out that the question of raising the grade point average was not involved in the committee's motion and suggested a substitute motion to cover this point. Dr. Patrick thereupon made the substitute motion that the present policy of forgiving 5's be retained but the graduation average be raised from 3.2 to 3.0. The motion was seconded by Dr. Wallraff.

Dr. Rhodes reported the tendency of the student to ask for a grade of 5 rather than a grade of 4 in order to improve his general average by an opportunity to repeat the course. He felt that this should be discouraged. Dr. Wallraff suggested that the policy be extended by allowing the student to raise any grade from 2 to 5 by repetition of the course. It was his feeling that the attainment of the student as indicated by the second grade was the important thing rather than the initial failure. President Harvill also emphasized the importance of final attainment on the part of the student rather than initial failures. This position was also supported by Dr. Tucker. Dr. Martin, however, took the opposite position and pointed out that comparative attainment is not valid when based upon repetition of the course.

Mr. Leshner suggested that the proposal would set a new standard for all students whereas the Senate was considering primarily the student who obtains failing grades. It was his thought that the present average of 3.2 was a sufficiently high standard for graduation. Dr. Patrick agreed that the change would raise the standard for all students but he did not feel it would affect many students who customarily make better than a 3 average. Mr. Leshner stated that we actually have two standards for graduation under the present policy. The student who has no failures meets a 3.2 average as the minimum but a student who has a number of failures can have an over-all average considerably below 3.2 and yet graduate because his original failures are forgiven. In the last senior class one student was forgiven no less than thirty-one units of failing grades. He suggested that the problem might be resolved by canceling the present policy but lowering the average required for graduation for all work completed to a 3.4 or 3.5, as it actually is in some cases.

Dean Livermore indicated he would vote "no" on both questions since the University is studying the matter of higher admission standards effective in the fall of 1959. He suggested that the Senate would have time to consider Dr. Patrick's motion before that time.

Dr. Bateman pointed out the problem occasioned by the student's misunderstanding when he finds that "forgiven" 5's remain on his record, in connection with application to professional schools such as those of Medicine and Dentistry. These institutions are interested in the over-all record of the student. He felt it was important that the grade average given in connection with graduation reflect the student's actual attainment and stated that the University has been complimented on the quality of grades given here. Some other institutions, on the other hand, have not enjoyed the confidence of professional schools because grade averages reported have not reflected the actual work done by the student.

Dr. Gegenheimer remarked that the present policy of forgiving 5's, if carried to an extreme, could lead to a ridiculous situation since a student might actually graduate with honors on the basis of repeated grades.

In response to a question by the President, Mr. Leshner stated that we now graduate twenty-five or thirty students who would not have graduated if the failures had not been forgiven. It was the Registrar's feeling that with respect to the graduating standard we have returned to the same position we were in under the old requirement that the student must have 80% of his credits above 4 for graduation.

Dr. Martin thought the problem was one of retention of poorly qualified students since many who fail the first time will fail the second time as well, and this group should be eliminated rather than encouraged to go on for a degree.

When the question was called for on Dr. Patrick's motion, the motion lost.

The question was then called for on the original motion which would abandon the present practice of forgiving failing grades, but the motion lost.

Professor Marcoux then moved that the present policy be changed to allow the forgiving of the grade of 4 upon repetition of the course. Dr. Wallraff seconded the motion. Dr. Rhodes raised the question as to whether this action would not actually lower standards of graduation. When the question was called for, the motion failed.

Dr. Gegenheimer explained that he had voted against the substitute motion made by Dr. Patrick and moved that the Senate reconsider its action on Dr. Patrick's motion. The President ruled that it was not in order to consider such a motion at this time but that it could be made at the next meeting of the Senate.

Dr. Merritt moved adoption of Point 3 of the report which would allow a student to take one elective course in residence at an accredited institution if not more than three semester hours were involved and the elective course is approved by the Dean of the college concerned (the grade to apply on graduation average). The motion was seconded by Dr. Crowell.

It was then suggested by Mr. Bogart that the phrase "not more than one semester course" be substituted for the reference to the number of credits involved. Mr. Leshar then moved to amend the motion to include provision for the transfer of "not more than one semester course" rather than "3 units of credit." This motion was seconded by Mr. Bogart, and was passed. The Senate then passed the motion adopting Point 3 as amended. X

Dr. Merritt then moved adoption of Point 4 as stated. This permits the student to reach the average required for graduation by taking one elective course in correspondence with the University if not more than 3 semester hours of credit are involved and the elective is approved by the Dean of the college concerned. The motion was seconded by Dean Livermore.

Mr. Leshar then moved to amend the motion by deleting reference to the number of credits involved and permitting the student to offer one semester elective course by correspondence study with the University. Dr. Merritt accepted the amendment and when the question was called for the Senate passed the motion as amended. X

Dr. Merritt moved the adoption of Point 5 which provides that when summer session work results in probation status for the student the Dean of the college concerned may remove such probation status if he deems it to be the best interest of the student and the University. The motion was seconded by Dr. Bateman.

Dean Rhodes objected to the phrase "the best interests of the student and the University" and moved to amend the motion by deleting this statement and substituting "The Dean of the college concerned may remove probation status at his discretion." His motion was seconded by Dr. Patrick. The President explained that the vote would be taken without reference to the practice now obtaining in the College of Law regarding the determination of probation status.

Dr. Patrick indicated he would prefer that the College of Law plan apply throughout the University, but this proposal was discouraged.

\* After some further discussion, and when the question was called for, the Senate passed the motion with the amendment as agreed upon.

Dr. Merritt called attention to Points 6 and 7 referring to credit received during a period of disqualification for disciplinary reasons and credit by examination for courses audited or in which a grade of 5 has been received, and explained that there was no recommendation on these points covering present practice. It was agreed that these policies would stand.

Dr. Merritt then proceeded to discussion of Point 8, the question of whether or not standards based upon grade averages should be used as a basis for determining probation status instead of the present percentage requirement. He explained that the committee had worked longest and hardest on this question, realizing that it would be a major change. He explained that the committee presented its plan for information of the Senate without making any definite recommendation. He added that it was the opinion of the committee that the proposed plan would work. (For statement of the plan, see minutes of March 10, 1958 meeting of Faculty Senate.)

President Harvill expressed his appreciation to Dr. Merritt and members of his committee for their efforts in preparing the report.

It was then moved by Dr. Patrick, with a second by Dean Livermore, that Point 8 be placed on the agenda for the fall meeting of the Senate. The motion was carried without dissent.

Mr. Leshar suggested that in view of the Senate action removing the restriction on the transfer of credit made during period of disqualification it would be helpful if he could have indication as to when this change of policy would be effective. The President confirmed the effect of the Senate action but no comment was heard regarding the effective date of the change. It was the Registrar's assumption that the change in policy would be effective with the beginning of the next biennium.

Councilman for Arizona College Association, election of: The President explained that it was necessary to elect a Councilman to fill the vacancy occasioned by the election of Dr. Phillips to the office of Vice President of the Association.

Professor Marcoux nominated Dr. Martin, but the nomination was declined.

Mr. Leshar nominated Dr. Pistor, who demurred, but whose nomination was seconded by Dr. Crowell. Dr. Gegenheimer moved that the nominations be closed and a unanimous ballot be cast for Dr. Pistor. This motion was seconded and was passed.

Report by the President: President Harvill reported that the Board of Regents at its meeting of Friday, April 18, approved his recommendation that students of the University who are sons or daughters of faculty members be permitted to register for an incidental fee of \$5.00 plus special fees such as laboratory course, library, Union, and activity fees. It was explained that this adjustment in fees applies also in the other two institutions of the state. In response to a question by Mr. Leshar, the President explained that the action of the Board of Regents was limited to sons and daughters of members of the faculty and did not include members of the families of staff members.

The President added that there was an item on the agenda of the next meeting of the National Association of State Universities in New York proposing a reciprocal relationship which would provide the privilege of special fees to sons and daughters of faculty members in member institutions of the association. It was doubtful, the President said, that such a proposal would be approved by the Board of Regents.

President Harvill reported that the Board of Regents took no further action regarding scholarships and that his proposal to provide additional awards for outstanding students was not discussed at the Board meeting because of lack of time.

The names selected for the two new men's dormitories are Huachuca Hall and Kaibab Hall.

The President explained that the total budget as approved is in excess of \$9,700,000, with the receipt of federal funds in the amount of some \$54,000 added to the original figure.

The President mentioned the announcement of the Rockefeller grant of \$201,800 to support various types of research. He commended Dr. Patrick and the members of his University committee for the organization and planning of the research projects which have received the support of the Rockefeller Foundation Board of Directors. The President mentioned also a gift from the IBM Corporation of \$200,000 worth of equipment to facilitate the expansion of an experimental project known as "SPACE" - Special Purpose Arizona Computer, Experimental - for research work in the department of Electrical Engineering. Dr. Harvill added that an anonymous gift for research was received in the amount of \$60,000, and will be allocated to the Geochronology Program. He further explained that much of the Rak estate, which amounted to \$114,000 will accrue to the University to support scholarships. This will be the largest amount the University has received for this purpose.

Another substantial fund of some \$25,000 will be available from the Jackling estate to create a loan fund for students in the College of Mines and related fields. It may possibly be used also for scholarships.

The President announced that the Board of Regents had approved the award of degrees for the class of 1958, subject to certification by the Registrar and the approval by the University faculty. It also approved the renewal of five scholarships for Hungarian Refugee students.

The President explained that the Board of Regents will meet again on the 11th or 12th of May and that shortly thereafter requests will be sent to the heads of departments and deans for budget material to be presented to the legislature in 1959. Much thought will be given, the President added, to increases in salaries and it appears it will be necessary to make some differentiation on the basis of ranks. In seeking teaching talent opposition is stronger in some ranks than in others.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 P.M.

---

C. Zaner Leshner, Secretary