

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, May 6, 1957
Room 101, Law Building

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:40 P.M. on Monday, May 6, 1957, in Room 101 of the Law Building. Thirty-four members were present with Vice President Nugent presiding. Dr. Buehrer was present for Dean Myers.

Approval of minutes: The minutes of the meeting of April 1, 1957 were approved as distributed to members.

Delinquent Scholarship Reports, report of Committee to Study: Dr. Merritt, Chairman of the special committee appointed to study Delinquent Scholarship Reports, submitted the committee report, as follows:

COMMITTEE REPORT

To: President Harvill
Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona

From: Committee on Delinquent Scholarship Report Procedures:
(Professors Bateman, Newlin, Roos, Vanvig, Merritt (Chm.))

Re: Committee Recommendations

On February 20, 1957 the above committee was appointed and charged with bringing back to the Senate recommendations on two matters which had been referred to the Senate by the Advisory Council. On March 20 an additional question was referred to the committee and on April 2 another question was referred to the committee. Below are the committee's re-formulation of these four questions. The committee's recommendations follow.

Questions:

- 1) Should students reported with failures at the time of the delinquent scholarship report be permitted to drop courses without penalty at that time?
- 2) Should the date of the delinquent scholarship report be moved to an earlier date in the semester?
- 3) Should students who have been resident students for two full semesters meet sophomore scholarship requirements even though they have less than the minimum number of credit hours required for sophomore standing?
- 4) Should standards based on cumulative grade averages be used as a basis for the disqualification of students instead of or in addition to the present requirement? (At present, freshmen must pass 50% of their work and sophomores must pass in 60% of their work.)

In attempting to formulate recommendations, the committee has considered the work of previous committees which dealt with similar questions, obtained the views of all deans by means of a checklist, and met a number of times to consider the merits and disadvantages of alternative proposals. While the committee believes its recommendations will strengthen and/or maintain standards, it recognizes that quality cannot be legislated and that it is in the classroom rather than the catalogue that quality will be maintained. The committee's recommendations appear below.

In connection with question one above, the committee recommends that

- A. Present policy be continued with respect to dropping courses in which a failing grade was received at the time of the delinquent scholarship report.

Justification: It was felt that the present meaning of a grade of "W" should be retained. A "W" given after the 2nd week of the semester now means an approved withdrawal indicating satisfactory work at the time the course is dropped.

The Committee felt that a change in this regulation might lead to additional pressure by students for special consideration in connection with staying in a dormitory, letters to draft boards, etc. For students taking laboratory work where space is at a premium, it might lead to unused space which might have been used by more interested students. It was also felt that to change the present regulation would offer a convenient "out" and might discourage sincere effort right at the beginning of a course.

At present, exceptional cases can be handled satisfactorily under the provisions of the section of the catalogue on page 80 entitled Transfer to Less Advanced Course.

*Page 90 of
1957-59
catalogue*

In connection with question two above, the committee recommends that

- A. The date of the midsemester scholarship report be changed by rewriting the catalogue material on page 80 to read as follows:

Pg. 90-1957-59 cat.

A report of grades covering scholarship deficiencies shall be furnished by instructors to the Registrar's office at the close of work on Tuesday of the seventh week of each semester. (And delete the remainder of the sentence.)

Justification: The committee gathered information from the several deans as to their practice in calling students for consultation and their views on the desirability of changing the date of the Delinquent scholarship report; all ten Deans believed that the Delinquent Scholarship Report did not come in time to be of maximum value to the students. One dean pointed out the difficulty of obtaining a fair estimate of student work much earlier than is now the case. Eight of the ten thought that the D-list date should be moved to an earlier date on the academic calendar. Three thought it should be set one

week earlier. Three thought it should be set two weeks earlier. The committee felt that an earlier D-list date would be of value to students.

In connection with question three above, the committee recommends that

- A. Freshman students who have been resident students for two full semesters be required to pass more than 60 per cent of their work to be continued in good standing. (This is the present requirement for sophomores.) To accomplish this, the catalogue should be changed to read as follows: (Page 81, line three),

Freshman students are returned to good standing upon passing more than 50 per cent of their work except that freshman students who have been resident students for two full semesters must pass in more than 60 per cent of their work. Students of sophomore, junior, and senior standing must. . . . etc.

Justification: The committee felt that such students have already had the benefit of the lower freshman requirement (50 per cent passing) and should thereafter be expected to pass in more than 60 per cent of their work.

In connection with question four above, the committee recommends that

- A. Present policy be continued with respect to standards for probation and disqualification. (Except that the change recommended just above be incorporated.)

Justification: The committee found evidence that our present system works reasonably well. Data from two of the largest colleges indicated that the poorer students do not now continue at the University. Students in the lowest deciles on the scholastic aptitude test seldom if ever continue to graduation. Most of them do not get as far as the junior year. Their grade averages are typically low and they do not continue at the University. Our system does have the advantage of giving students a chance to try. Their year or two at the University is not without some value to these students.

The proportion of students with low grade averages (below 3.5) changes drastically from the freshman to the senior year, becoming lower each year, especially at the upper division level. In one of the big colleges, thirty-six per cent of the freshmen had grade averages below 3.5 while only five per cent of the seniors had grade averages below this point.

The committee feels that academic standards at the University of Arizona now compare favorably with similar

standards at other good state universities. While there are some arguments opposing those given, the committee feels that there is no compelling reason for a change at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON DELINQUENT
SCHOLARSHIP REPORT PROCEDURES

H. E. Bateman
P. B. Newlin
N. R. Roos
A. Vanvig
C. C. Merritt, Chairman

Dr. Merritt moved the adoption of the recommendations of the committee. The motion was seconded by Dr. Bateman.

Dr. Merritt then reviewed briefly the several points made by the committee. In this connection Mr. Leshar suggested that unless attention was given to the time taken for the review of scholarship cases in the several colleges, no advantage would result from the change in schedule. Dr. Merritt explained, also, that it was the committee's thought that a resident student, as referred to, is one who enrolls for not less than twelve credits.

Dean Roy favored the recommendation of the committee and stated that the student who has had an opportunity to adjust himself during a period of two semesters should have to meet the requirement imposed for students with sophomore standing. The present requirement, he said, is not too demanding, and it is impractical in the Registrar's Office to make a detailed check of the number of credits completed during the year.

Dr. Merritt further explained that the committee had studied the present requirement at considerable length; and it was the feeling of the committee that the present system does work, that the lowest-ability students do not persist in the University.

Dr. Hudson commented that the proposal for a grade average requirement was aimed at the students who are found in their junior or senior years to have little hope of meeting the scholarship requirement for graduation. He felt that the grade average plan would have the advantage of weeding out these students somewhat earlier, but did not wish to press the point if it were not generally supported.

Mr. Bogart observed that it seemed a waste of money and time to carry poor students along on the present requirement if they have no chance of graduation. Mr. Leshar remarked that we are now graduating students with averages considerably below a 3.2 for their over-all records.

Dr. Martin took exception to the recommendation in Question 4 of the report, expressing a preference for a regulation based on the student's academic average.

Dr. Galbraith felt that at present there was no basis upon which to recommend disqualification of certain students since disqualification is based upon the number of credits failed rather than upon a general average.

Dr. Merritt explained that when the committee had studied this point it appeared that adoption of the proposal for grade average would result in disqualification of so many students that it was not within the province of the committee to submit any drastic change in University policy.

Dr. Gegenheimer moved that the Senate substitute for the original motion a motion that Question 4 be separated from the rest of the report and that the Senate accept the recommendations on the first three questions, with the provision that the recommendations on number 4 be further considered when additional statistics are available. This motion was seconded by Dean Patrick.

There was no further discussion of the report and when the question was called for on the substitute motion, it was passed without dissent. The report of the committee, therefore, was adopted with the deletion of point 4.

Dr. Rhodes moved that the President appoint a committee to consider point 4. The motion was seconded by Professor Marcoux and passed.

Mr. Leshner suggested that any committee which is appointed might have in mind the present policy of the University under which comparatively few students are disqualified, especially during the freshman year. There would appear to be no advantage in adopting any new requirement insofar as disqualifications are concerned unless the over-all policy of the University is altered.

Extension Work, Committee report on Integration of: Dr. Gegenheimer read as a matter of information and discussion by the Senate the following report which was submitted to the President by a Subcommittee of the Committee of Eleven, appointed to study the integration of extension class work with that of the regular University session:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN
ON INTEGRATION OF EXTENSION WORK

- I. The Committee wishes to emphasize the fact that it has not concerned itself with problems of the internal administration of Extension Work, but only with questions of policy.
- II. The Committee agrees that the present system of handling Extension Work is unsatisfactory in these respects:
 1. The compensation for participating faculty members is inadequate.
 2. The facilities of the University are not being used to their fullest extent.
 3. The University is not offering the residents of the State as full and adequate a program as will be required in the near future.

III. The Committee recommends:

1. That correspondence and non-credit courses be retained in the Extension Division and handled as at present and that strenuous efforts be made to increase the number of non-credit offerings.
2. That locally-given courses for college credit be integrated with the regular program of the University on these bases:
 1. Class taught at any hour shall be considered part of the instructor's teaching load.
 2. The instructor shall receive extra compensation (at a rate at least equal to the present Extension compensation) for teaching at off hours.

IV. The Committee realizes that it may be necessary to introduce its recommendations in Section III gradually (for budgetary reasons) but feels that it is desirable to make a beginning as soon as possible.

V. The Committee further recommends that work given out of Tucson should also count as part of an instructor's teaching load and that the compensation for this teaching should reflect the time spent not only in teaching but also in traveling and the consequent drain upon the amount of time available to the instructor for his other work and research.

Dr. Gegenheimer explained that the Senate need not take any formal action, but it would be in order to discuss the report.

Professor Marcoux suggested that an addition be made as Part B of number V. of the statement to the effect that "substantial term life insurance and personal liability insurance be provided to adequately cover the hazards inherent in commuting to and from teaching or administrative assignments."

Dean Garretson explained that the University is covered under the Industrial Commission at the present time and it is a satisfactory coverage. He referred to the case of one member of the faculty who died as result of an automobile accident while on University work. The widow draws 35% of the member's annual salary as long as she remains single and receives 15% of the salary for each child until the child is eighteen. In this particular case the widow has available 65% of the salary.

Dr. Gegenheimer reported that it is difficult under present laws to provide liability insurance. In one instance in the public schools, bus drivers were required to carry insurance but their salaries were raised to meet this requirement.

In reply to question by Mr. Leshner, Dr. Gegenheimer explained that classes presently given in the Extension Division except correspondence and

no-credit classes would be incorporated in the general University session and that students would enroll in the University rather than the Extension Division.

Mr. Leshner raised a question as to whether this would cause any difficulty by imposing requirements on admission to certain courses without prerequisites or to upper-division courses when students have had no previous college work. It was Dr. Gegenheimer's thought that the students would meet the same requirements as imposed for those taking courses in the regular daytime session. It was Mr. Leshner's feeling that under these circumstances Extension Class enrollment might be reduced.

Dr. Nugent suggested that the Senate might indicate its generally favorable action to the report of the committee, but Professor Marcoux stated that there is a difference of opinion in other institutions as to how to administer Extension or evening courses as related to courses in the regular session. He referred particularly to the arrangement for salaries and whether appointments ought to cover a total teaching load including both daytime and evening classes or whether additional compensation should be allowed for evening classes with the full-time teaching load limited to day sessions.

Dr. Nugent indicated that if a special meeting of the Senate were necessary to review this matter after the return of President Harvill one would be called.

Vice President appointments: Miss Paylore expressed an interest in administrative procedure resulting from the appointment of two new vice presidents, one for financial matters and one for academic matters; and suggested it would be helpful if the Senate could be advised as to procedures that may be established to handle administrative details.

Dr. Nugent expressed the feeling that the President would be happy to inform the Senate concerning these matters and that it doubtless would be a matter of discussion if a special meeting of the Senate were called.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 P.M.


C. Zaner Leshner, Secretary