

MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
Wednesday, November 26, 1958 Room 101, Law Building

The Faculty Senate convened in special session at 3:40 P.M. on Wednesday, November 26, 1958, in Room 101 of the Law Building. Thirty-eight members were present with President Harvill presiding.

Present: Andersen, Bateman, Bogart, Brewer, Carlson, Casaday, Crowell, Forrester, Gegenheimer, Harvill, Hausenbauer, Hudson, Hull, Humphrey, Irwin, Kemmerer, Little, Livermore, Lyons, Marcoux, Martin, Mead, Mees, Merritt, Murphy, Nugent, Patrick, Paylore, Picard, Powell, Rhodes, Roy, Slonaker, Tucker, Vavich, Wallraff, Windsor, Zapotocky.

Absent: Enke, Garretson, Howard, Lynn, Myers, Pistor.

ADMISSION PLAN PROPOSED BY REGENTS' COMMITTEE ON ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS, APPROVAL OF:  
President Harvill explained to the Senate that this special meeting had been called so that the Senate could give consideration to the new admission plan proposed by the Regents' Committee on Entrance Requirements. This was the only matter to be considered at this special meeting.

The President then asked Vice President Patrick, the representative of the University of Arizona on the Regents' Special Committee on Entrance Requirements, to present the proposed plan to the Senate.

Dr. Patrick reminded the group that the special committee included Vice President Richardson of Arizona State College at Tempe, Dean Meister of Arizona State College at Flagstaff, and himself, as Chairman. The committee, after a series of meetings held during the past year and after consultation with Arizona high school administrators, was presenting a proposed draft of the new admission plan to the faculties of the two state colleges and the University. Each of the three representatives was, if possible, to obtain approval of the plan from his institution and the committee was to meet again on November 28. It was expected that the plan, as finally drafted, would then be presented to the Board of Regents at its December 27 meeting.

The proposed admission plan which had been distributed to members of the Senate in advance of the meeting was as follows:

ADMISSION TO FRESHMAN STANDING

The first phase of admission is admission to the institution - college or university. The second phase is admission to freshman standing in a curriculum of a particular college, school, division, or department within the institution.

All applicants for admission to the institution must have graduated with satisfactory scholarship from an accredited secondary school and must have completed the equivalent of a 4-year secondary-school course with a minimum of sixteen units in acceptable subjects. The definition of a unit is that used by the North Central Association, that is a Carnegie unit of credit.

### Scholarship Requirement

Regular Admission - Students must offer an acceptable program of secondary school subjects and must have ranked in the upper three-quarters of their graduating class.

Probationary Admission - Students offering an acceptable program of subjects but ranking in the lower one-fourth of their high school graduating class may apply for probationary admission. Such applicants will be granted probationary admission at the discretion of the institution to which they apply only after pre-admission counseling and testing in which they give evidence of ability to carry college work successfully.

Advanced Placement - Students who have taken advanced college level courses in secondary schools and have taken the Advanced Placement Examination will be considered for the award of college credit counting towards degree requirements.

### Recommended Secondary-School Subject Units

English	4		(from Group I)
or English 3 and Foreign language 2 (in one language)		5	(from Groups I and II)
Mathematics	2	2	(from Group III)
American History	1	1	(from Group IV)
Social Studies	1	1	(from Group IV)
Laboratory Science	2	2	(from Group V)
Electives	6		(from Group I through VI)
or depending upon English option		5	
	<u>16</u>	<u>16</u>	

### Classification of Acceptable Secondary-School Subjects

- Group I. English: only courses with major emphasis upon grammar, composition, and literary analysis.
- Group II. Foreign Language: A classical or modern foreign language. Less than one unit is not accepted. Two units or more are strongly recommended.
- Group III. Mathematics: One unit of algebra and one other unit of mathematics exclusive of general and vocational mathematics.
- Group IV. Social studies: history, civics, economics, sociology, geography, and government (including United States and Arizona constitution.)
- Group V. Laboratory Science: only courses in biology, chemistry, or physics, in which at least one regular laboratory period is scheduled each week.

Group VI. Art, bookkeeping, general science, arithmetic, business arithmetic, general mathematics, journalism, manual training, music, public speaking, stenography, typewriting, and other subjects commonly offered for credit by secondary schools.

Comments:

The recommended pattern of subjects is that which on the basis of experience can reasonably be expected to provide satisfactory preparation for college when these subjects have been completed with better than average grades. Academically talented students are strongly urged to take additional courses from Groups I through V beyond those recommended above.

The recommended program meets admission requirements in Agriculture, Business Administration, Education, Liberal Arts and Fine Arts. Note - Engineering requires applicants to have 3 units of mathematics, 1 unit of chemistry and 1 unit of physics.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR ADMISSION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL GRADUATES WHO HAVE NOT FOLLOWED THE RECOMMENDED STUDIES:

1. To provide for a period of transition to the new admission requirements, students applying for admission for the academic years 1959-60 or 1960-61, may be admitted provided they offer 10 units chosen from Groups I through V and 5 elective units chosen from Groups I through VI. Other exceptions may be made only with the approval of the Admissions Committee.
2. Applicants who lack no more than two units of the recommended program may be admitted with deficiencies. Credit for college courses applied to deficiencies is not applicable to degree requirements.

Dr. Patrick reported that when a proposal to increase the subject-matter requirements for admission to the University and state colleges was first discussed with Arizona high school principals, general reaction had been favorable. Early this fall, however, considerable objection to the proposal had been voiced, particularly by the superintendent of the Phoenix Union High School District. More recently, following a meeting of the superintendents of the Tucson School District No. 1 and the Phoenix Union High School District with the Regents' Special Committee, support of the proposal had been obtained from the administrations of both the Phoenix and Tucson high school districts, in which are located institutions educating a large proportion of the high school students of Arizona.

At this point, Dr. Patrick made brief reference to the report made to the Board of Regents by Dr. Richard Pearson, Vice President of the College Entrance Examination Board, concerning the results of the Scholastic Aptitude Tests given entering freshman students at the two state colleges and the University in September, 1958. Results of the test had shown that University of Arizona students had tested at a

level on a par with students entering other state universities. As a group, University of Arizona freshmen had performed better on the tests than freshmen entering Arizona State College at Tempe, and students entering Arizona State College at Tempe had made better scores than students entering Arizona State College at Flagstaff. The Regents had indicated great interest in Dr. Pearson's report and expressed the wish that the test be administered again to a future entering group and that follow-up studies be made on the college level performance of the students entering the three institutions in the fall of 1958.

Dr. Patrick next reviewed the proposed admission plan in detail. Following this, Dr. Gegenheimer rose to say that he had received considerable favorable comment from members of the faculty concerning the proposed plan and he moved that the Senate vote institutional approval of the plan and express its appreciation to Dr. Patrick and the other members of the Regents' Committee for their good work during the past year. The motion was seconded by Dr. Wallraff.

Dr. Tucker explained that members of the faculty of the College of Agriculture wished to object to the provision whereby students admitted with deficiencies who then complete college level courses to remove these deficiencies must forfeit degree credit in such courses. Dr. Patrick explained that he was aware that some faculty members felt that if a student completes a college course offered for college credit he should be allowed degree credit for the course. He pointed out, however, that if students are admitted with deficiencies and then are not required to turn back credit for college level study to remove these deficiencies or to make up the deficiencies in some other fashion (such as actually completing additional high school course work), in effect the entrance requirement has been reduced.

Dr. Humphrey stated he felt that the provision concerning deficiencies in effect reduced the entrance requirement from 16 units to 14. Mr. Windsor pointed out that this provision did not refer to the total number of units required, that is, 16, but referred only to the specified pattern of high school subject-matter.

Mr. Bogart asked if the sentence under SPECIAL PROVISION 1. "Other exceptions may be made...." referred to the transition period of two years only or was it to be a permanent feature of the plan. Dr. Patrick explained that this would apply to the transition period only. Mr. Bogart asked if the new plan would be applied to students who had been out of school four or five years, having not completed in high school the pattern of subject-matter prescribed by this proposal. Dr. Patrick explained that it was assumed the University would continue its present practice of adjusting admission requirements for students over 21 years of age to the end that they could be admitted in special status if lacking the high school subject-matter credits normally required for entrance.

Mr. Windsor questioned the statement under SPECIAL PROVISIONS 1. which indicated that during the years 1959-60, 1960-61 students could be admitted if they offered ten units chosen from Groups I through V. This indicated a student could be accepted without presenting credit in high school algebra, which is now specifically required for entrance to the University. However, Mr. Windsor stated he felt his comment was out of order since the objective of the proposal was to establish minimum requirements for all three institutions and it was apparent the University still could impose any additional specific requirement it chose, such as algebra, even during the two-year transition period.

Dr. Patrick pointed out that the plan was not what he and other representatives of the University had originally proposed as a ideal one, but rather was a compromise plan developed in the hope that a plan of entrance requirements could be devised which would be acceptable to all three institutions and would be truly a strengthening of entrance requirements.

Dean Livermore asked if the reaction of the officials of Phoenix College concerning the proposed plan had been obtained. Dr. Patrick said he understood that even though the proposed plan were adopted by the two state colleges and the University, Phoenix College would continue to admit any high school graduate regardless of pattern of subject-matter preparation.

Dr. Harvill commented that he felt the provision to admit on probation students graduating from high school in the bottom quarter of their classes would in effect discourage most such students from attempting to enroll in the University since it would be assumed that such students had little likelihood of succeeding in the University. He reported that a practice similar to that being proposed had been adopted at the University of Florida with the result that the lower-ability students even though they could be admitted to the University on probation, soon realized it would be unwise to attempt University work.

Dr. Tucker asked if a student's being admitted on probation would carry any stigma. Dr. Patrick replied that such students would not be particularly identified in any way, although of course their University performance record would be carefully watched. Dr. Harvill asked whether or not the permanent record of a student admitted on probation would indicate his status. Mr. Windsor at first replied that normal practice would be to state on the permanent record the fact that a student was accepted on probation. Upon considering the matter a bit further, however, he stated he saw no reason why a student admitted on probation because of high school rank in his class need have any notation of this fact entered on his Arizona permanent record.

Dr. Crowell asked if students graduating from small schools with small graduating classes would be admitted on probation because they ranked in the bottom quartile of their graduating group, as, for example, 7 in a class of 8, or 4 in a class of 4. Dr. Patrick explained this was a matter which could be determined in the counseling procedure and if, as a result of counseling and/or testing a student in the bottom quartile of a small class was believed to be capable of succeeding in college, he need not automatically enter the University on probation. He said that literal application of the rule probably should be limited to schools graduating a statistically sufficient number of seniors each year to make a distinction valid.

Dr. Harvill reminded the Senate, however, that the probation provision should be specific. It would be unwise for any one of the three institutions to be able administratively to interpret policy in such a way as to avoid the intent of admitting low-ranking students only on probation.

(At this point, Dr. Gegenheimer left the meeting to attend another appointment.)

Dean Forrester then suggested that the term "provisional" admission be substituted for "probation." He explained that the word "provisional" carries no stigma and could be applied in a very specific way to all students graduating in the bottom quarter of their class, even those graduating from small high schools.

Dr. Patrick then reminded the Senate that at the next meeting of the Regents' Special Committee on November 28, doubtless the committee members would bring minor revisions from their respective faculties concerning the plan. He inquired if the motion to approve the proposal could be reworded to provide him some latitude in his next meeting with the representatives of the other two institutions. In other words, he said, he would appreciate having the Senate approve the spirit of the proposal without spelling out specific detailed wording of each point.

Since Dr. Gegenheimer, who had made the motion to approve the proposed plan, had now left the meeting, Dr. Wallraff, who had seconded the motion, was asked if he would object to the Senate's approval's being of a general nature. Dean Rhodes stated he felt Dr. Patrick should be given "operating latitude" at the meeting. He felt certain that inasmuch as the second part of Dr. Gegenheimer's motion had recommended an expression of confidence in Dr. Patrick and the special committee, as well as appreciation for their efforts to date, Dr. Gegenheimer would not object to the motion's being interpreted in general terms. Dr. Wallraff voiced no objection to this interpretation and President Harvill then ruled that it was the consensus of the Senate that Dr. Patrick and his committee could make whatever minor adjustments in the proposed plan seemed appropriate at the time of their next meeting.


At this point Dr. Humphrey stated that he felt the paragraph on Probationary Admission might be interpreted differently at the other two institutions than at the University. He felt that the proposal gave the other institutions authority to set standards of college work not as high as those of the University. Dr. Patrick replied that it was not the intent of the committee to make the standards of the three institutions the same; rather an attempt was being made to make the minimum admission standards of the three institutions the same.

Dr. Harvill remarked he felt it was possible that at some future date the Board of Regents might direct the institutions to establish some rather high minimum requirements for admission of out-of-state applicants. This was a question for future consideration, however, he explained.

Dean Roy asked if students graduating in the lower quartile of their class could, on the basis of testing administered by the University Guidance Bureau, be regularly accepted rather than provisionally accepted. Dr. Nugent explained that the danger of allowing this procedure would be that other institutions could then be more liberal in eliminating provisional admission status than the University would be. The only safeguard would be to impose provisional admission status on all students graduating in the bottom quarter of their high school classes.

The question being called for, the motion passed by unanimous vote.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 P.M.

  
David L. Windsor, Secretary