

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

Room 101, Law Building, Monday, December 4, 1950

The Faculty Senate met in regular session at 3:40 p.m. on Monday, December 4, 1950, in Room 101 of the Law Building. Thirty-four members and two guests were present, with President McCormick presiding.

MINUTES, APPROVAL OF: The minutes of the meeting of November 6 were approved as published. Mr. Leshar called attention to the fact that the item pertaining to the restriction of advanced degrees was incorrectly stated in the Proceedings as published last month. The statement should read: "...to members of the University faculty of the rank of instructor and below and to members of the administration not of higher rank..."

ELECTIONS COMMITTEE, REPORT OF: President McCormick referred to a report submitted by Dr. Kelso, Chairman of the Elections Committee, giving elections results in the last regularly scheduled faculty election for the year. A summary of the elections was also published as follows:

"Report of the Faculty Elections Committee on
Regularly Scheduled Elections, 1950-51 Academic Year

"Professor Melvin T. Solve was reelected Chairman of the Faculty in the election which closed at noon Monday, November 27, 1950. The contest was the last of the regularly scheduled faculty elections for the 1950-1951 academic year.

"The ten elective members of the Committee of Eleven chosen in the balloting which ended November 27 are as follows:

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Professor William S. Barnes | Associate Professor Philip G. Hudson |
| Associate Professor William H. Brown | Professor Joseph L. Picard |
| Associate Professor Bartley P. Cardon | Professor William J. Pistor |
| Mr. Frederick Cromwell | Professor Francis A. Roy |
| Professor Neal D. Houghton | Professor Matthew M. R. Schneck |

Only Professors Barnes and Pistor and Mr. Cromwell are not now serving on the Committee of Eleven. The Chairman of the Faculty is ex officio the eleventh member of the committee.

"The fifteen Members at Large of the Faculty Senate chosen by the general faculty in the election which closed November 2, 1950, are as follows:

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Professor Claude H. Brown | Associate Professor Klonda Lynn |
| *Associate Professor Bartley P. Cardon | *Professor Joseph L. Picard |
| Professor Russell C. Ewing | Professor William J. Pistor |
| *Associate Professor Frances Gillmor | Professor H. D. Rhodes |
| *Professor Laurence R. Gray | *Professor Matthew M. R. Schneck |
| Professor George F. Herrick | *Professor Harold C. Schwalen |
| Professor R. M. Howard | *Professor Earle H. Warner |
| Associate Professor Paul Kelso | |

Members-elect whose names are preceded by an asterisk (*) are currently serving as Members at Large of the Faculty Senate.

"Terms of office of the Chairman of the Faculty, Members at Large of the Faculty

Senate, and members of the Committee of Eleven will begin with resumption of class work after the Christmas vacation. Elective members of the Senate serve for a term of two years but may not serve more than two consecutive terms. The Chairman of the Faculty and members of the Committee of Eleven are chosen for a one-year term and are eligible for an indefinite number of terms.

"College representatives in the Faculty Senate, whose terms hold over for another year, are as follows:

Professor Andreas S. Andersen, Fine Arts
 Professor William S. Barnes, Law
 Professor Erasmus S. Borgquist, Engineering
 Associate Professor Willis R. Brewer, Pharmacy
 Professor John B. Cunningham, Mines
 Associate Professor Philip G. Hudson, BPA
 Professor Victor Kelley, Education
 Professor Melvin T. Solve, Liberal Arts
 Exten. Hort. Harvey F. Tate, Agriculture

"The President, Vice-President, Registrar, and all deans are permanent members of the Faculty Senate.

"Fewer than 50 per cent of the members of the general faculty participated in the elections held in the course of the present academic year. Participation was higher in the final elections than in the primaries. Voting reached a high point in the last regularly scheduled election, when faculty members returned a total of 202 ballots, or 44 percent of the 459 mailed to them. In each of the primary and final elections, 459 ballots were mailed to the general faculty. The number and percentage of ballots cast in each of the four elections were as follows:

| | Primary Election | | Final Election | |
|--|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| | No. of ballots returned | % of total distributed | No. of ballots returned | % of total distributed |
| Senate Members at Large | 127 | 28 | 198 | 43 |
| Faculty Chairman and Committee of Eleven | 118 | 26 | 202 | 44 |

"In the primary elections, members of the faculty proposed a total of 196 persons as nominees for the office of Senate Member at Large; twenty-three as nominees for the office of Faculty Chairman; and 115 as nominees for the Committee of Eleven. Official nominees for the aforementioned offices numbered thirty, five, and twenty persons, respectively.

"Three women were nominated for Memberships at Large in the Faculty Senate and two of them were elected. Nominees for the Committee of Eleven included two women, neither of whom was elected. Two women are currently serving as Members at Large of the Faculty Senate and a like number on the Committee of Eleven. No person (of academic rank) below the level of associate professor was elected to faculty office, although one assistant professor was among the nominees for the Faculty Senate. Of the twenty-six persons elected this fall to faculty office, eighteen hold the rank of professor. The University Librarian is included among the members-elect of the Committee of Eleven.

"The Faculty Elections Committee wishes to thank Mr. Louis A. Myers Jr., chairman of the elections committee last year, for his work in organizing the committee at the beginning of the present school year and for the advice he gave from time to time; Mrs. Catharine Robbins, and Miss Marian Rees of the President's Office for the dispatch with which they prepared a roster of the general faculty for the committee use; Mr. C. Zaner Leshner, Secretary, Faculty Senate, for supplying a goodly portion of the information which accompanied the ballots; Mrs. Margaret I. Good, manager of the Mailing and Mimeographing Bureau, for the promptness with which she and her staff prepared the ballots and mailed them to faculty voters; and to Mr. and Mrs. Albert L. Brown, Dr. R. A. Gomez, Mr. Herman E. Bateman, Mr. James A. Beatson, Mr. Robert Hartman, and Mr. Keith B. Aubrey for their help with the tally for one or more of the several elections.

Faculty Elections Committee
Paul Kelso, Chairman
Glenn H. Nelson
Robert M. Quinn
N. J. Tremblay
Charles F. Wallraff"

COMMITTEE TO STUDY CLASSIFICATION OF STAFF MEMBERS, MEMBERSHIP OF: The President reported the names of the persons appointed to the Committee on Classification of certain categories of staff members as follows: Dean R. A. Harvill, Chairman; H. R. Baker; G. H. Munding; Lila Sands; R. M. Quinn; with Dean Harvill and Mr. Baker representing the Administration.

He mentioned that there is a problem not only with respect to classification under the Faculty Constitution but also as far as classification in the Catalog is concerned. He pointed out that that has always been a problem for Mrs. Robbins, who makes up the list of faculty for the Catalog. He mentioned the classification of "Administrative Assistants" which contains persons of such various ranks as stenographers and the Purchasing Agent and asked Dean Harvill, as chairman of the committee, if that problem could be considered also and a report made at the next meeting of the Senate on January 8, in order that the Catalog deadline could be met.

In response to a question by Dr. Roberts as to whether or not this report would have any bearing on protocol, such as the place in the academic procession, Dr. McCormick suggested that the committee also take this matter under consideration.

In connection with the preparation of the Catalog, the Registrar asked if the listings in the Catalog could be confined to voting members of the Faculty. He pointed out that very few colleges list as extensively as we do the staff members, and that the question would be whether or not we could use the Catalog listing as evidence that a certain person has faculty standing in the sense that he is entitled to vote and to enjoy the privileges of the faculty.

Dean Harvill stated that the committee probably would be meeting this week or next and that any suggestions from the faculty would be welcomed.

The Secretary reported that Mr. Vosskuhler has submitted a request that the members of his staff be given a listing similar to that of the Agricultural Extension Service. That would, in his opinion, raise the question again of whether the Comptroller's Office and the Registrar's Office and the Library staff should all be listed in the same way. Dr. McCormick said that Mr. Vosskuhler's request would be forwarded to the committee.

Dr. McCormick listed the three items the committee should consider, as brought

out above:

- (1) Voting privilege under the Constitution
- (2) Catalog listing
- (3) Academic procession

REPORT OF CATALOG MATERIAL TO SENATE, QUESTION RE: Mr. Leshner brought up the question of whether or not it is necessary for the Deans of the several colleges to prepare for the Senate 75 copies of the catalog material which they are submitting to the Coordinating Committee, if, as required, the Secretary sends a report of all action taken by the Advisory Council to all Senate members. In his opinion it was a needless duplication of effort. He pointed out that all action of the Advisory Council, both affirmative and negative, was reported to Senate members and that this was done in advance of Senate meetings.

Dr. Roberts felt it was more practical for the Colleges (in the case of Liberal Arts, especially) to send Senate members the mimeographed copies which are distributed among the college faculty members. However, Dr. Schneck pointed out that these copies do not even show action taken by the Liberal Arts College and that a Senate member is not interested in every detail of what happens all along the way, but in the action the Advisory Council takes.

On Dr. Schneck's motion, seconded by several members of the Senate, the Senate voted to delete the requirement that 75 copies of catalog material be prepared by the college offices for the Senate and to require only the report of action taken by the Advisory Council.

COMMITTEE ON DEFICIENCIES IN WRITTEN ENGLISH, REPORT OF: Dean Brown reported to the Senate on the problem of deficiencies in written English as follows:

"REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON DEFICIENCY IN WRITTEN ENGLISH

"Your special Committee on Deficiency in Written English urges that the Senate recommend the creation of a Bureau staffed by the Department of English but under advisory authority of a University committee appointed by the President.

"Such a Bureau, in connection with the testing services of the Department of Philosophy and Psychology, would provide diagnostic tests in reading comprehension, composition, and related learning skills. When a student's difficulties have been determined, he may be assigned individually or as a member of a small group for corrective work with a staff member of the Bureau. Remedial work may be carried concurrently with the student's regular course work, but in some cases the student may be advised to drop a course to lighten his load.

"The proposed Bureau would provide corrective training for three classes of students:

- (1) Those students who under present procedure are now enrolled in English X.
- (2) Students in all classes of the University whose reading comprehension is inadequate or whose written English is unacceptable may be sent by any instructor for diagnosis of the difficulty and for remedial instruction to the Bureau. It is suggested that in order to require students to correct these defects, an instructor be given the authority to add the letters "E.D." (English deficiency) following any recorded grade (1,2,3,4,Inc.,D). A student may in this way pass the course requirement but

be asked to do corrective work in the Bureau. Such students would be compelled to correct the deficiency and secure a clearance from the Bureau as a condition of graduation.

- (3) Finally, this would afford an opportunity for students in all years of University work voluntarily to seek such a diagnosis of their deficiencies in written English, reading comprehension, vocabulary, or related learning skills and to receive assistance in correcting their deficiencies.

"Your Committee believes that much of the success of the suggested plan depends upon the employment by the University of a well-trained person to carry on the corrective work started by Miss Wolhaupter in testing and guidance in the Department of Philosophy and Psychology.

Committee Members:

Emil Larson
Martin Thornburg
E. J. Brown"

Dean Brown explained that this was the second report of the Committee and it was the preference of the Committee members, ~~including Vice Dean Hawkins, who is at home because of illness, and Dr. Muir, who is on leave, that the present Committee be discharged.~~ He then read the full report of the Committee (above), explaining that the first paragraph of the report only is the sole recommendation of the Committee to the Senate. The balance of the statement is an explanation in a brief way of how the Bureau might operate and constitutes a suggestion which the Committee felt would be helpful in administering the work of the Bureau.

Dean Brown moved that the report of the Committee be approved. The motion was seconded by Dr. Solve.

President McCormick asked if it was intended that a specialist should be added to the faculty or if someone in Dr. Solve's department would handle the work. Dr. Solve explained that they could only estimate the number of students who would require remedial work, but that it would probably take about three people to manage the Bureau. His department, he felt, could undertake the teaching load but nothing more. Although they do not have as large an enrollment as last year, he believed there should be an expert somewhere who has skills and training beyond that of the English staff to aid in reading skills and some of the peculiarities connected with spelling.

President McCormick asked if he could find someone for the English Department faculty. Dr. Solve replied that in his opinion the specialist need not be a member of the English Department. He could be a member of the Department of Philosophy and Psychology, or perhaps someone in the College of Education. It was assumed that a number of students equivalent to those enrolled in English X, but who would be enrolled in English Ia, would need remedial work. There are at present nine sections of English X, requiring three members of the teaching staff. It was thought that the Bureau would be open perhaps eight hours a day and that students would be sent there whenever convenient for them. There would, perhaps, be two or three regular conferences a week. This would involve a considerable amount of time. He explained that other institutions which have similar organizations have several full-time staff members for the work. He felt, however, that for the time being the Department could staff the Bureau with the present faculty. He further explained that the three teachers who formerly taught English X would be assigned to English Ia and that if enrollment next year was equal to the present enrollment, an additional staff would

be needed. But, Dr. Solve stated, he rather expected that because of a loss in enrollment some people could be spared for remedial work. He added that various members of the department had volunteered in case of necessity to put in extra time at the Bureau in addition to their teaching load.

It was the President's understanding that the only addition to the faculty occasioned by the establishment of the Bureau would be the employment of the specialist to direct the Bureau, but Dr. Solve explained that the specialist would not necessarily direct the Bureau but would serve to diagnose and correct special cases. Dr. Schneck added that the English Department could handle cases due to inadequate training but that the specialist would serve particularly in connection with those cases which are troublesome because of psychological difficulties.

In reply to a question by Dr. Roberts, Dr. Solve explained that no fee would be charged in connection with the Bureau's services. He further explained that it was the hope that the new plan would cover more corrective work than is available through English X.

Dr. Roberts asked if there would be some compulsion behind the plan in connection with the sending of students for remedial work. Dr. Solve responded that the suggested plan would make it possible for instructors to report in connection with the grade for a particular course the deficiencies in English and that unless this deficiency was removed through the Bureau and the grade cleared, the student could not graduate.

In answer to another question by Dr. Roberts, Dr. Solve explained that students who fail in the English Placement Test would nevertheless be enrolled in English 1a and that such students would not be compelled to take remedial work in the Bureau if their work in English 1a proved satisfactory.

Dr. Barnes asked if the work of the Bureau would be confined mostly to students with psychological blocks or to those with poor preparation in English, to which Dr. Solve replied that most of the cases would be those of students with inadequate preparation. He felt that there would be few psychological cases.

President McCormick asked if, as indicated by the Committee's recommendation, it would be necessary that he appoint a committee for the administration of the Bureau, since some individual member of the department might be in charge. Dr. Solve explained that it was felt that the Bureau was a University organization and that the faculty would have more confidence in it if it was not set up in a particular department.

Dean Harvill pointed out some difficulties in connection with the suggested plan arising particularly from the administration of student schedules, especially in connection with adjustments suggested by the remedial requirement. He expressed doubt that the student would be able to carry English 1a, if he has any real deficiency in English. He pointed out particularly that while the Committee's report recommends only the creation of a Bureau, the suggested plan was in effect a part of the recommendation. He felt that the changes involved should be considered as are other catalog changes and should follow the usual steps taken in the preparation of the Catalog. He explained that the matter is now being considered in the College of Liberal Arts. He moved an amendment to Dean Brown's motion to the effect that the Senate not take action at this time but that the matter be deferred until the Curriculum Committee of the College of Liberal Arts has considered it further and

it has been reviewed by the faculty of that college, the Coordinating Committee of the University, and the Advisory Council. The motion was seconded by Dr. Nugent.

There was some difference of opinion expressed as to whether or not the matter should be considered directly by the Senate, but Dr. Solve suggested that it would be well if the Senate voted merely to receive the report, rather than to take definite action on the recommendation.

In consideration of this suggestion, Dean Harvill, with the approval of Dr. Nugent, withdrew his motion.

Dean Brown then moved that the report of his committee be accepted by the Senate and that the Committee be discharged. This motion was seconded by Dr. Solve.

Dean Brown again explained that the recommendation of the Committee was limited to the establishment of a Bureau and did not include the informal suggestions made in connection with the administration of the Bureau.

The question being called for, the motion was passed.

SENIOR EXAMINATIONS, REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON: Dr. Desmond Powell, Chairman of the Committee on Senior Examinations, presented the report of the committee as follows:

"REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON SENIOR EXAMINATIONS

"In the course of its deliberations the committee took cognizance of the following facts:

- 1) The policy of giving early examinations to seniors seems to be limited to schools in Arizona. a)
- 2) This policy has resulted in considerable variation in the type of final examination given to seniors in the University.
- 3) In the past the question of changing this policy has been debated in the Council, in the senate, and in administrative meetings. The weight of opinion in these bodies has been consistently against changing the policy.
- 4) On February 7, 1949 a proposal to change the present policy was presented to the faculty senate. This proposal cut the final examination period down by having three examinations a day, thus allowing commencement to follow the end of finals at a distance of 7 days, with only two days added to the present school year. The proposal was voted down.
- 5) The arguments advanced against the above proposal were: 1) More than two examinations a day would be undesirable; 2) The present system works very well; if one-hour senior examinations are given on the last day of classes; 3) Commencement attendance would be cut down if commencement were to follow the examination period.

- a) This is based on an examination of catalogues of state universities and colleges. It may be that some schools have such a policy but do not state it in their bulletins.

"In addition to arguments listed in 5 above, there are the following objections to a change in policy:

- 1) The present system insures the full attendance of the band at commencement.
- 2) It allows the use of the band without additional expense. b)
- 3) Because many faculty members must reach summer sessions in distant institutions, either for teaching or study, there is considerable opposition to any change that will extend the school year.

"In view of the foregoing this committee recommends that no change be made in the present policy on senior examinations. The committee wishes to point out, however, that a schedule can be devised that will not extend the school year and will not entail the giving of more than two examinations a day. Such a schedule would necessitate cutting down the Easter Vacation. Such a proposal, however, would leave untouched the questions of band finance and the effect on attendance of a change in policy.

Desmond S. Powell
William S. Barnes
E. S. Borgquist
Samuel S. Fain
Richard A. Harvill
Edwin D. McKee
Ethel M. Thompson

- b) Many of the schools investigated pay their bands in cash, the cost varying from \$6 to \$20 per member for one or two events. The suggestion that the band members might not stay even if they were paid may be answered by the fact that some schools (Tempe, for example) pay them by band scholarships which require attendance at school events."

Dr. Barr asked if the committee would report on the number of upper-division classes in which only senior examinations are given as the final examinations, and Dr. Powell replied that the committee had not made a study of this question. They were aware that practice varies among the members of the faculty as to the method of conducting senior examinations and that some instructors apparently do not hold to the requirement that the examination should be given in a regular class or laboratory period.

President McCormick explained, in answer to a question by Dr. Barr, that in so far as penalties where violations of regulations are concerned, matters of this sort should be administered by Heads of the Departments concerned.

It was Dr. Roberts' opinion that it is almost impossible to conform fully to the regulations because of the necessity of conducting the classes for students other than seniors while at the same time arranging for final examinations for prospective graduates. It was his understanding that the instructor is required to give three hours, either in one or more periods, of final examinations.

Registrar Leshar explained that as far as he knew, there was no regulation which required that the instructor must give three hours of examination to any student but that it was required that the schedule of examinations provide

three-hour periods and that students are required to take final examinations. The length of the examination, however, is determined at the discretion of the instructor concerned. He expressed the opinion that the majority of the members of the faculty could determine, even without final examinations, the proper grade for the student because of the number of quizzes that are given during the semester, and that this perhaps explained why some instructors did not require examinations which would necessitate a three-hour period.

In reference to the band scholarships which the report mentioned, President McCormick reported that a number of band scholarships have already been awarded and that he did not feel the award of such scholarships would solve any problem in connection with attendance at the commencement program.

Dr. Barr again asked if he was correct in the assumption that instructors who include all students in the examination given to seniors and then fail to hold students other than seniors for the regularly scheduled final examination are open to censure.

President McCormick replied that only those students are permitted to take early final examinations ahead of the regular examination period who are candidates for degrees. One should look to the heads of the departments concerned for the enforcement of this policy.

Dean Harvill moved that the recommendation of the committee be approved. This motion was seconded by Dr. Barnes.

Dr. Carpenter, interpreting the statement of the Registrar as meaning that most of the faculty are of the opinion that the three-hour final examination periods are unnecessary, moved that the final examination period no longer be scheduled and that the final examinations be confined to the last hour of the regular class period.

There was no second to this motion, however, and the original motion was called for. Dean Harvill's motion adopting the recommendations of the committee was passed.

Dr. Carpenter moved that the three-hour final examination period no longer be scheduled and that the final examinations be given the last regularly-scheduled hour of the class. This motion was lost for want of a second.

STANDARDS OF PROBATION, REPORT OF GRADING COMMITTEE RE: Dr. Roy presented the report of the Senate grading committee as follows:

"SENATE GRADING COMMITTEE REPORT

"When the original report of the Grading Committee was presented to the Faculty Senate on January 3rd, 1949, it was hoped that at some time in the future it would be possible to revise the standards for probation and dismissal in line with the requirement of 3.2 for graduation. It was felt at that time, and this is borne out by the minutes of the January 3, 1949, meeting, that the present plan of disqualifying students should be reconsidered in the light of the results checked after the general requirement for graduation had been in effect for some time.

"On November 7, 1949, the Senate Grading Committee was reactivated and authorized to solicit recommendations from the various college faculties for standards

of probation and exclusion. The Senate Committee was to consider these recommendations and report to the Senate. Information was received from some of the colleges. The Committee also reviewed the provisions for probation and dismissal in effect at some forty colleges and universities, most of them members of the American Association of Universities. Almost all of these schools use an honor point system. It was found that very few of the schools set up standards at the freshman, sophomore, and junior levels on a grade point basis. Almost all of them have a system similar to the one which we are now using, e.g.

1. Indiana University. Any student in the College of Arts and Sciences who fails to make a passing grade in at least two-thirds of his work or fails to secure at least 10 credit points, will be placed on probation.
2. Kansas University. Students who fail in 40% of their work are not eligible for enrollment the succeeding semester.
3. Louisiana State University. The student who fails to earn at least 8 semester hours and 8 quality credits during his first semester will be placed on probation.
4. Oklahoma University. A student who in any semester of work at the University fails in as much as 40% of his total enrollment shall be suspended, but on petition may re-enroll on probation for one semester.
5. Texas University. Students taking 9 or more semester hours, if first-year students, must pass in at least 9 hours and make a score of 3 points.

"Some of the schools do have some degree of correlation between the honor point requirement and the number of units taken by a student. In most cases these are schools that have rather strict entrance requirements or have a general division which is a prerequisite to entrance to one of the different colleges. The general impression that one gets is that other schools have found it very difficult to set a specific grade point requirement for the various years of a student's college career.

"Among objections that can be raised to establishing specific grade requirements at the end of the freshman, sophomore, and junior years are the following:

1. We do not feel that we can realistically appraise what such a level should be until we have had more experience with the 3.2 average for graduation.
2. The adoption of a grade-point requirement at the end of each year would entail considerably more work in the Registrar's Office and might even require additional staff.
3. Even if such additional staff were provided it would take some time for the reports to be prepared by the Registrar's Office. Action by the Scholarship Committees of the various colleges would be delayed far beyond what it is now.
4. The Committee could not help but consider also what effect such requirements might have on the enrollment.

"For all of these reasons the Committee makes the following recommendations:

1. Freshman students shall be required to pass in 50% of the units for which they are registered.
2. Students at the sophomore, junior, and senior levels shall be required to pass 60% of the units for which they are registered.
- * 3. Failure to meet these requirements in two successive semesters shall call for dismissal from the University.

"We realize that these recommendations are not too satisfactory. They do, however, take some cognizance of the new grade average requirement for graduation; they recognize that the student who barely manages to stay in school by passing 51% of his work semester after semester is very soon in a hopeless situation with regard to graduation. In order to avoid too many last-minute disappointments, the Committee also recommends that 'at the beginning of the junior year those students who are falling behind the required average for graduation shall be advised by the dean of the college as to their situation.'

T.G. Chapman
O.K. Garretson
R.M. Howard
J.D. Lyons
F.A. Roy, Chairman"

Dr. Roy moved the adoption of the above report. This motion was seconded by Dr. Barr.

Dr. Roberts asked if it was clearly the intention to recommend dismissal only after a failure to meet grade requirements for two successive semesters, rather than as at the present time to dismiss a student at the end of one semester.

President McCormick asked what would happen if the student failed to meet the scholarship requirement at the end of the second semester of his freshman year and again at the end of the second semester of the sophomore year. Would such a student be disqualified, even though the two semesters were not successive?

Dr. Roy's reply to these questions was that the Deans still have the power of dropping the student at any time when the student's failures indicate a hopeless situation.

The President further remarked that the Committee is recommending that the student be disqualified without any review of his case. This practice would mean that scholarship committees are done away with except for the purpose of aiding those students who are on the midsemester "D" list. It would mean that the scholarship committee does not have to recommend disqualification in order that the student be dropped.

Dean Lyons stated that it was his understanding that the Committee had no intention of saying that a student could be disqualified only on failure to meet the requirement for two successive semesters. The student could be disqualified in the usual way for failure to meet requirements after one semester. This, however, would require specific action by the scholarship committee.

It was Dean Brown's opinion that the Senate should have more time to consider the Committee's recommendations, and he moved that the matter be tabled until a later meeting and that in the meantime copies be sent to each member of the Senate. Dr. Barnes seconded this motion, and it was carried.

MEMBERS TERMINATING SERVICE, EXPRESSION OF GRATITUDE TO: Dr. Nugent explained that a number of members of the Senate were terminating their service with this meeting and he suggested that the members who will continue after the first of the year extend an expression of gratitude and best wishes to their colleagues who are leaving the Senate. The Senate's approval of this suggestion was indicated by generous applause.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.


C. Laner Leshner
Secretary

mle