

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, April 25, 1955
Room 101, Law Building

The Faculty Senate convened in special session at 3:40 P.M. on Monday, April 25, 1955, in Room 101 of the Law Building. Twenty-nine members were present with Vice President Nugent presiding.

Minutes of meeting of April 4, 1955, correction in: Dr. Houghton requested that the statement "It was Dr. Houghton's opinion that the statement suggested for deletion could be retained and left for consideration of the faculty." be deleted from page 4, paragraph 4. With this change, the minutes were approved.

Honorary Degree, recommendation for: Upon motion by Dean Roy, with a second by Dr. Roberts, the Senate voted to approve the recommendation submitted by the College of Liberal Arts and to recommend to the general faculty that the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws be conferred upon Harold S. Colton. The statement of information supporting this recommendation read as follows:

"Harold Sellers Colton was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on August 29, 1881. All of his formal education was in that state. In 1908 he was awarded the Ph.D. degree in zoology by the University of Pennsylvania, and the following year studied at the Naples Zoological Station. In 1909 he was appointed to the teaching faculty of the University of Pennsylvania where he remained until 1926. In that year Dr. Colton moved to Flagstaff. During earlier visits to northern Arizona he had come to realize that this area offered an exceptional opportunity for integrating research in the natural and social sciences.

"Late in 1927 he founded the Northern Arizona Society of Science and Art to maintain a museum where the story of northern Arizona in all its phases could be told. In 1928 the doors of the Museum of Northern Arizona were opened with Dr. Colton as Director.

"The development of this institution in the past quarter century, both physically and scientifically, is attributable to his wise direction, broad vision, and keen sense of problem. The facilities of the Museum of Northern Arizona have grown to include a Museum Building with four main exhibit galleries, a Research Center Building, and a Geological Department Building. Accommodations are available during the summer months for temporary staff, visiting scientists, and students. An energetic research and publications program and outstanding exhibit techniques have brought international recognition to this institution.

"A basic philosophy held by Dr. Colton is that scientific effort is incomplete and meaningless without publication. His own written contributions in the fields of anthropology, history, geology, zoology, and marine biology total more than 180 titles. This high standard is reflected also in the achievements of the museum personnel and of those who have used the facilities of the institution. The twenty-five-year publication record (ending in 1953) lists 101 titles in geology and paleontology, 80 titles in biology, and 231 titles in anthropology. From 1928 to 1939 the Museum of Northern Arizona issued a monthly

"leaflet called "Musuem Notes," since replaced by a quarterly publication "The Plateau." A bulletin series, the last issue being No. 27, provides for the publication of lengthy reports.

"Dr. Colton has been responsible for many contributions to science ranging from the particular to the general. He has built up extensive comparative collections and a scientific library in the areas of archaeology, ethnology, geology, paleontology, and zoology. His writings on Hopi Kachinas and Southwestern ceramics are regarded as basic sources. He developed an orderly system for describing culture history in northern Arizona by the application of taxonomic principles drawn from natural science. His deep interest in the rise and fall of prehistoric populations led him to ingeniously combine the data from geology, tree-ring studies, and archaeology and show that the eruption of Sunset Crater, soon after the middle of the eleventh century A.D., profoundly influenced population shifts in northern Arizona.

"Throughout a long lifetime of unselfish service Dr. Colton has adhered to the highest scientific ideals and at the same time has successfully established rapport with the community in which he has worked by sharing his knowledge and making it live. He has set an enviable example of inter-institutional cooperation especially involving those in Arizona. The esteem in which he is held by his professional colleagues is reflected in the number of societies which have elected him to membership.

"In view of Dr. Harold S. Colton's outstanding contribution to science and to the cultural life of Arizona through the Museum of Northern Arizona, established so firmly that it will long survive him, the Department of Anthropology unanimously recommends to this faculty that he be awarded the honorary degree, Doctor of Laws, at the 1955 Commencement exercises."

Report of Grading Committee (Scholarship Requirements for Graduation): Dr. Merritt, Chairman of the committee, reviewed the pertinent points made by the committee report. He then moved the adoption of the committee's recommendation that the Senate retain the present grade average (3.2000) required for graduation and the present system for computing this (graduation average). The motion was seconded by Dr. Galbraith.

Dr. Roberts moved to amend the motion to read: "The report of the committee is received." This motion was seconded by Dr. Solve.

Dr. Roberts explained that it was desirable to leave this matter open for further consideration prior to publication of the next catalogue, and that the adoption of his motion would indicate the Senate's preference for reviewing the question rather than having the matter regarded as closed at this time. He felt there was a good case for the report of the original committee on scholarship requirements and that it would be well to review the question of adjusting the scholarship requirement by disregarding failing grades when courses have been repeated.

Dr. Houghton also suggested that in view of the limited period of time which the committee had to consider the matter, it would be well to leave the question open for further review.

There was a question as to whether Dr. Roberts' amended motion was a substitute for the original motion rather than an amendment, but the chair ruled that

the change was an appropriate amendment. The Senate then voted to pass the amendment to the motion. The motion as amended was "The report of the Grading Committee is received." When the question was called for, the amended motion was carried. The report read as follows:

Report of the 1955 Grading Committee
March 31, 1955

"I. Establishment of the Committee

"In a meeting of the University Senate on February 7, 1955 a motion was approved in favor of the appointment of a special committee to study the grading system. This motion followed discussion by the senate of a suggestion that students be permitted to repeat any course and receive for the purpose of the grade average only the grade received on the second effort.

"On February 24 the present committee was appointed and charged with carrying out the intent of the senate motion by studying "the grading system at the University of Arizona, with special reference to the problem of determining the procedure to follow when students repeat courses, insofar as the grade averages are concerned."

"At this point, the present committee wishes to acknowledge its indebtedness to Dean Roy and his committee for their report on the grading system which was presented to the senate on Jan. 3, 1949. It may be recalled that this report was accepted but with one change. The change involved the committee's recommendation that the grade average required for graduation be set at 3.3000. In accepting the report, the senate changed this figure to 3.2000. The senate may also recall that the whole matter was reopened on Dec. 1, 1952 when a motion passed to set the graduation requirement at 3.2 (anything less than 3.3). At the senate meeting of Jan. 5, 1953, objections were raised to the action of Dec. 1 and a motion passed to reactivate the Roy committee, have it review the whole matter and submit another recommendation on Feb. 2. A new recommendation, which is now the present practice as described below, was submitted to the senate Feb. 2 and was approved.

"The present committee wishes to thank Dean Roy for attending one of our meetings and for the use of extensive information compiled by his committee. We are also grateful to Mr. Leshner and Miss Husted for their cooperation in consulting with us and in making available the information requested by this committee.

"II. Present Grading System

"On p. 63 of the 1953-55 catalog, the present grading system is described as follows.

"FINAL GRADES. Final grades awarded in the courses of study are given on a basis of relative position in a series. These grades are: 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. . . . No final grade may be raised except by repetition of the course in residence when this has been

"approved by the student's dean, the head of the department, and the instructor concerned. When a course is so repeated, the original grade remains on the student's record and is included in his general scholarship average, except that a failing grade received in the freshman or sophomore year is not included in the average when the course is repeated and established for credit."

Also on p. 63

"MINIMUM SCHOLARSHIP REQUIREMENT. A general scholarship average of 3.2000 for all work undertaken at the University of Arizona is required for the bachelor's degree (except in the College of Law, where an average of 3.000 is required for all courses of study undertaken in the College of Law. It is provided, however, that the grade of 5 for a course failed in the freshman or sophomore year is not included in the average when the course is repeated and established for credit." (Note: This last provision does not extend to courses in the student's MAJOR)

"III. Grading systems and graduation requirements at other institutions

There is no single grading system that is used by a majority of universities. The present committee concurs with the Roy committee in the belief that our present grading system and graduation requirements are well within the limits of equivalent requirements used at other good institutions. The present committee believes that the alternatives given the most serious consideration here are also well within those same limits.

"It also seems evident that the mere statement of a requirement is no specific indication of what the actual standards of an institution are. Various studies of the percentage distribution of the five possible grades indicate that a 3 average in an institution where there is a very low percentage of 4's and 5's will not usually represent the same standard of work as does a 3 average from an institution with a much larger proportion of 4's and 5's. Also, institutions vary in the grades which are considered in computing the graduation average. Some disregard failing grades completely. Others, when courses have been repeated, count only passing grades which have replaced earlier failing grades. A few assign minus honor point values to failing grades. All of these practices affect the meaning of a stated graduation requirement.

"Grading systems fall largely into two general classes. 1) Those giving letter marks and assigning grade or honor points to each letter, and 2) Those using number systems similar to ours which yield a direct index of the standing of the student.

"IV. General Considerations

"In deciding what to recommend to the University Senate, the present committee has had the following in mind.

- 1) That a change would not be recommended merely for the sake of a change.
- 2) That we did not wish to lower academic standards at the UA.
- 3) That a method of grading and/or a graduation requirement should be as simple and uncomplicated as possible.
- 4) That the mere statement of a required average does not guarantee anything concerning the actual standard of work required for graduation.
- 5) That there is no perfect method of grading or of setting graduation requirements. Any method is subject to criticism or debate from some standpoint.

"V. Alternatives Considered

- 1) Retain the present grade average (3.2000) required for graduation and the present system for computing this "graduation average".
- 2) Change the grade average required for graduation to 3.2999 but have this average computed on the basis of all grades earned. (including 5's that are made up).
- 3) Retain the present grade average (3.2000) required for graduation and limit the provision for removing 5's, by establishing courses for credit, to the freshman year. Extend the provision for removing 5's to grades of 4 as well (freshman year only).
- 4) Retain the present grade average (3.2000) required for graduation and compute the average on the basis of all grades earned (including 5's that are made up).
- 5) Change from our present number system (grades of 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5) to a letter system (A, B, C, D, and E) which sets an academic standard equivalent to that which we have now. Assign appropriate honor point values to each letter grade.
- 6) Let any student repeat any course in an attempt to improve his grade and count only the last effort in computing the grade average.

"Modifications of each alternative above are possible. In the interest of brevity, possible variations have not been spelled out in detail.

"VI. Data Considered

"A wealth of data describing grading systems at other universities and much correspondence about the problems involved was gathered by Dean Roy's committee. All of this material was reviewed.

"The committee took note of Mr. Leshner's data to the effect that, in 1954, 22 students received degrees although these students' actual grade averages were lower than 3.2000. Mr. Leshner also provided data to show that, had the graduation requirement been an actual or true grade average of 3.2999, only 4 of the students in this group would have failed to graduate.

"The list of potential graduates for 1954 was examined by Miss Husted for the names of any students who failed to graduate because of low grades. Twelve such names were found and the pertinent data are presented in Table 1. This list was examined to see how many students, who could not graduate under our present requirements, might have graduated if the grade average required had been 3.2999.

"Table 1
AVERAGES OF STUDENTS WHO MIGHT HAVE GRADUATED IN 1954 WHO FAILED DUE TO GRADES

Student	Graduation average	Real average	5's removed
* A	3.2440	3.2440	0
B	3.2021	3.4056	12
* C	3.2679	3.3333	6
* D	3.2941	3.2941	0
* E	3.3129	3.4100	8
F	3.2033	3.2033	0
G	3.2426	3.2832	4
H	3.3656	3.4791	10
* I	3.2907	3.3716	7
* J	3.2035	3.2035	0
* K	3.2101	3.2965	7
* L	3.2236	3.4198	20

* Since completed graduation requirements

"An examination of Table 1 shows that there were six students (A,D,F,G,J,K) who failed to meet the "graduation average" of 3.2000 but who would have graduated had graduation been based on a real average of 3.2999.

"The committee was also interested in whether or not there was any 'bunching up' just above the grade average (3.2000) required for graduation. The data below throw some light on this question.

<u>Grade range</u>	<u>Number</u>
3.2000 up to 3.1000	80
3.1000 up to 3.0000	39
3.0000 up to 2.9000	55

"The data indicate that there is some 'bunching up' in the grade point range just above the minimum graduation requirement.

"Since a change from our present requirement to a real average of 3.2999 required for graduation amounts to a lowering of standards for those who transfer in as juniors, the committee wished information as to the number of students who would be affected. Partial data from the

"registrar's report on Comparative Scholarship by Classes for the first semester of 1953-54 are reproduced below.

Group	Units Carried	Per cent of total	Percentage of units in each grade				
			1	2	3	4	5
Juniors	14702	100	15.11	26.55	31.51	10.77	6.00
U. of A.	11746	80	15.67	26.64	32.10	10.44	5.90
Transfer	2956	20	12.89	26.19	29.13	12.11	6.39

"The data above indicate that transfer students make up a sizeable proportion of our upper division students. The figure is undoubtedly over 20% since others come as second semester juniors and as seniors.

"VII. Recommendation

"The committee recommends that the senate retain the present grade average (3.2000) required for graduation and the present system for computing this "graduation average". The grading system would thus remain as described on p. 63 of the current catalog.

"Before making this final choice, the committee narrowed the alternatives to the first two presented in Section V of this report. In support of the choice, the committee believes that:

- 1) The present requirements set a reasonably high academic standard at the University of Arizona, one which compares favorably with other institutions
- 2) A change in the direction of lowering standards is undesirable
- 3) The provision for removing 5's, while cumbersome in the registrar's office, does give an occasional worthy student the chance to get on his feet academically and eventually meet graduation requirements.

1955 Grading Committee

A. W. Buchhauser
B. C. Hennessy
P. G. Hudson
J. D. Lyons
C. B. Merritt, Chairman."

Dean Roy called attention to the fact that the present scholarship requirement for a degree made no reference to the requirement of the major, and there is a question as to whether it would not be advisable to apply the waiver of 5's for repeated courses to the requirement of 3.000 for the major subject. It was explained in this connection that failures in the major subject, when repeated for credit, are not computed in the general average required for graduation; but are computed in the average of 3.000 required in the major.

Committee to study "Broad and liberal educational background" for degree programs:
Dr. Nugent called attention to a third item on the agenda of the meeting having to do with a proposal submitted on January 10, 1955, to have a committee appointed to study the need for retaining in degree programs an academic core that would insure a broad

and liberal educational background. Mr. Leshner explained that it was the Senate's thought to have this matter studied sometime within the next two-year period, and Dr. Nugent asked that it be placed on the agenda of the first meeting in the fall.

May meeting, plan for: Dr. Nugent explained that in view of the fact that the Senate will have completed consideration of all items on the agenda at this meeting, it doubtless would not be necessary to have a meeting in May. It was agreed in this connection that notice of such a meeting would be sent, but that the Senate would not convene. The President and Secretary would check the meeting and report no quorum.

Scholarship requirement for graduation, re major subject: Dean Roy again referred to the scholarship requirement for graduation and indicated that no provision is made to waive failing grades of 5 in connection with the computation of average for the major. He moved that the statement with reference to the waiving of failing grades apply to the computation of the average required in the major subject as well as to the general average required for graduation. Dr. Wallraff seconded the motion.

Mr. Leshner stated that this was a matter of particular concern to the heads of departments and suggested that it should be considered through the usual channels for catalogue material. In the new catalogue the statement regarding the graduation requirement will indicate that the waiving of 5's applies only to the general scholarship average and not to the major subject.

Dr. Caldwell supported Mr. Leshner's view and said that the matter should be presented to the departments before coming to the Senate. It was understood that the change in the requirement, if made, would apply in either or both the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Business and Public Administration.

There was further discussion regarding the present policy, after which Dr. Caldwell moved to substitute for the original motion a motion that the question should be referred for discussion with heads of departments and action by the faculties of the particular colleges concerned before being referred to the Senate. This motion was seconded by Dean Patrick.

When the question was called for the motion to consider the substitution was passed.

The chair then presented for consideration the substitute motion, which was to refer the question to the faculties of the particular colleges concerned.

Dean Roy explained that he had no objection whatever to the question being referred to the faculties concerned. He was interested primarily in having the matter clarified so that everyone would understand that in the present requirement the waiving of 5's applies only to the computation of the general average and not to the average required in the major subject.

When the question was called for the motion passed.

Dr. Nugent then reminded the members of the Senate of the lecture to be given by Dr. Walter T. Stace, Stuart Professor of Philosophy at Princeton University, on "Mysticism and Human Reason," in the Liberal Arts auditorium this evening at 8:00 P.M. This is the first one of a program of lectures made possible by the Annie W. Riecker Memorial Lecture-ship fund of \$10,000.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 P.M.

*see minutes of 4/23/55 and 5/1/55
in 1455 60*


C. Vaner Leshner, Secretary