



THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
T U C S O N

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

October 26, 1962

To the members of the Freshman Class:

At the assembly for new students on September eleventh I shared with you some of my concern on matters which I believe should be paramount in the thinking and attitudes of University of Arizona students. Some of these views should be repeated now.

You have the privilege of attending one of the great universities of the United States. This in turn imposes upon you the obligation and responsibility to take full advantage of the opportunities that are offered for your intellectual growth and maturity. The attainment of this purpose requires much of you. The task that you face is not easy and is not to be taken lightly.

The world today is marked by unprecedentedly rapid scientific, technological, social and political change. At this moment the United States faces perilous decisions and is taking drastic action in the protection of freedom.

Formal preparation of great breadth and depth is necessary if you are to meet successfully the challenges presented by the opportunities that you have and at the same time carry out the awesome responsibilities that are immediately before you and will continue for an indefinite future. The purposes and goals that you should keep in mind are clear:

Preparation for a personally rewarding and satisfying life based upon fundamental and tested values.

Gaining competence as citizens well versed in the duties and responsibilities of good citizenship and dedicated to the task of the understanding of social relationships and change in a seemingly chaotic world.

Gaining competence for professional and business endeavors in which you will be engaged during the next half century, the period of your productive life.

Despite all the efforts that have been made to acquaint you with your opportunities and responsibilities and to provide for you the best quality of instructional resources, I have heard disappointing reports to the effect that many of you are not applying yourselves well to the academic tasks at hand. Those who find themselves in this position can retrieve losses already sustained only by hard work, promptness and thoroughness in meeting your commitments, and by sacrificing many activities that apparently are more immediately appealing but in the long run are hazards to success in the University.

Again, I wish all of you success in achieving your scholastic purposes, which can be done only through hard work and dedicated effort.

Sincerely yours,

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

November 5, 1962

REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE AD HOC SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE
ACCEPTANCE OF TRANSFERRED SUBJECT-MATTER CREDIT

Appointment of Committee

Prior to the 1961-62 academic year, a student transferring to the University from another institution was granted a limited amount of unit-credit for transferred courses in which the lowest passing grade was received. The former rule was that the number of units in the barely-passing grade credited to a transferring student could not exceed 20% of the total number of units transferred from any one institution. Although the number of units in excess of 20% were deducted from the gross units presented, the student was allowed full subject-matter credit for all courses he had passed, including those in which he had received only the barely-passing grade.

Then, at its March 27, 1961, meeting the Senate approved a recommendation from the Advisory Council that effective with the 1961-62 academic year the University would not accept in transfer unit-credit in courses in which the lowest passing grade was received. In accordance with this action, the current Biennial Catalogue states on page 85, "Credit in courses in which the lowest passing grade was received is not transferrable."

This new University policy, however, did not specify whether subject-matter credit, as opposed to unit-credit, should or should not be granted for such courses. The question arose whether students who had completed required terminal courses or prerequisite courses with the lowest passing grade at other institutions should be exempt from repeating such courses at the University of Arizona or should be required to repeat them. The question was referred to the Advisory Council, and it was the consensus of this group that the matter properly should be left to the option of the various departments, but that a specific policy should be established by the Senate.

After considerable discussion of the question in various meetings of the Senate, a motion was passed at the April 2, 1962, meeting that a committee be appointed to consider the problem and to formulate for Senate consideration a specific recommendation on a policy to be followed. Pursuant to this action, President Harvill appointed this committee on April 24, 1962.

Current Practices of the Various Departments of the University

From the reports of the academic deans it is apparent that no uniform or consistent policy presently exists within the University governing the acceptance of subject-matter credit for transferred courses in which the lowest passing grade was received.¹

1. The reports of the academic deans have been furnished previously to Senate members.

Some departments, for example, are rigidly requiring that all transferred courses in which the lowest passing grade was received must be repeated if these courses are to be used to satisfy college group requirements or are needed as prerequisites to other courses. In some instances, a student who has received the lowest passing grade in the "a" part of an "a-b" course is required to repeat the "a" part of the course even though he has subsequently passed the "b" part with a grade of "C" ("3") or better and has had unit-credit in the "b" part accepted in transfer by the University.

To the other extreme, some departments are exempting students from repeating such transferred courses, both prerequisite and terminal courses, on the basis that they have passed the subject matter even though the University has not accepted the unit-credit.

Although it appears that current practices among departments vary from one extreme to the other, it is apparent also that most departments make a distinction between transferred "D" courses which are needed as prerequisites to other courses and transferred courses which are terminal or are to be used only to meet college group requirements.

Policies of Other Institutions

Under the direction of the Registrar, a survey was completed of the practices of other colleges and universities in allowing subject-matter satisfaction for transferred courses in which the lowest passing grade was received.²

At best, the information collected shows no consistent policy among the institutions surveyed. Of the sixteen institutions responding to the Registrar's questionnaire, two stated that subject-matter credit is granted very rarely and that ordinarily the course must be repeated; three replied that subject-matter credit normally is given regardless of the nature of the course; and eleven indicated that subject-matter credit is allowed under certain circumstances, in most instances only by permission of the major department or the academic dean.

Thus, of the sixteen institutions reporting, fourteen have adopted policies which to some extent allow subject-matter satisfaction for transferred "D" courses.

Committee Deliberations

In discussing the question of accepting subject-matter credit for transferred "D" courses, members of the Committee agreed that primary consideration should be given to the educational objective of the individual student. For example, the situation of a student who had received a grade of "D" in Fundamentals of Chemistry at another institution and who then transferred to the University of Arizona to major in chemistry was believed to be quite different from the case of the transfer student who came to the University to major in history and simply wished the chemistry course to apply toward the College of Liberal Arts group requirement in science. As a first step, therefore, the Committee decided that a distinction should be made between those transferred

2. A summary of the practices of other institutions was distributed previously to Senate Members.

"D" courses that are needed to satisfy prerequisites for advanced work in a given field and those that are terminal or are to be used only to satisfy college group requirements.

With regard to transferred "D" courses that are needed to satisfy prerequisites for further study in a given field, the Committee felt that decisions relating to the granting of subject-matter credit properly should be left to the option of the subject-matter departments. The question arose, however, as to which "subject-matter" department should have jurisdiction in a given case.

Of course, when one department teaches both the subject matter of the transferred "D" course and the course to which the transferred "D" course is prerequisite, the Committee felt that it is quite obvious that this department should make the decision on the acceptance of subject-matter credit for the course in question. For example, the question as to whether a course in fundamentals of chemistry, completed at another institution with a grade of "D", may be used to satisfy the prerequisite to General Organic Chemistry should be decided by the Department of Chemistry.

On the other hand, when more than one department is involved, the question arose as to which department should have the prerogative of making the decision. For example, a transfer student is admitted to the Engineering College of the University and wishes to register for C. E. 6. He has completed Math. 79b, a prerequisite to C. E. 6, at another institution with the lowest passing grade. The question then arises as to whether the Department of Mathematics or the Department of Civil Engineering should make the decision on the acceptance of subject-matter credit for Math. 69b. In other words, should the decision be made by the department which teaches the subject matter of the transferred "D" course or by the department which teaches the course to which the transferred "D" course is prerequisite?

Although there seem to be sound arguments in support of either of the two positions mentioned above, the Committee felt that in most instances a proper evaluation of the transferred "D" work, both quantitatively and qualitatively, would be of primary importance. Thus, it concluded that the department which teaches the subject matter of the transferred "D" course should assume primary responsibility for deciding whether subject-matter credit should be granted. Of course, cooperation between interested departments is to be encouraged.

With regard to transferred "D" courses which are terminal courses or are used to meet college group requirements at the University, the Committee felt that the granting of subject-matter credit should be decided by the student's major professor, academic dean, and college course adjustment committee. For example, the question of whether a two-semester course in general botany, completed at another institution with grades of "D", may be used to satisfy the science requirement for a transfer student entering the College of Business and Public Administration to major in finance, should be decided by the student's major professor, academic dean, and college course adjustment committee, rather than by the student's major professor only or by the subject-matter department concerned.

In support of this approach, the Committee felt that a particular college faculty, as designated in the above proposal, is in a more favorable position to determine, in light of a student's announced educational objective, whether a group requirement of that college has been met satisfactorily. It was noted also that this approach provides a framework for consistent action within each college.

Of course, one objection to the proposed policy is that a transfer student who enters one college of the University and later transfers to another college of the University may find his transferred subject-matter credit open to re-appraisal if college policies should differ substantially.

Summary of Recommendations

The Committee recommends that University policy governing the acceptance of subject-matter credit for transferred "D" courses be stated essentially as follows:

(1) A transferred course in which the lowest passing grade was received and which is prerequisite to another course to be taken at the University of Arizona shall or shall not be granted subject-matter credit at the discretion of the department which teaches the subject matter of the transferred course in question.

(2) In the case of all other transferred courses in which the lowest passing grade was received, the granting of subject-matter credit shall be decided by the student's major professor, academic dean, and college course adjustment committee, which may obtain a recommendation from the department which teaches the subject-matter of the transferred course in question. (See page 776 of minutes).

The Committee recommends also that the Office of the Registrar design an appropriate form on which approvals and denials of subject-matter credit by appropriate departments and colleges may be made a matter of record.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas L. Martin
Curtis B. Merritt
Francis A. Roy
David L. Windsor
Joseph A. Zapotocky
Louis A. Myers, Chairman

The University of Arizona

Proceedings of the Faculty Senate

Meeting of Monday

November 5, 1962

PRESENT: Bartlett, Blitzer, Brewer, Conley, Delaplane, Ewing, Forrester, Gegenheimer, Gillmor, Gustavson, Harvill, Haury, Hillman, Hudson, Kassander, Kemmerer, Kurtz, Lacy, Livermore, Lyons, McDonald, Moore, Muir, H. E. Myers, L. A. Myers, Patrick, Paylore, Rappeport, H. D. Rhodes, J. M. Rhodes, Rosaldo, Roy, Russell, Siegel, Simonian, Slonaker, Svob, Vavich.

ABSENT: Blecha, Carlson, F. P. Gaines, Little, Lynn, McMillan, Martin, Nugent, Powell, Wallraff, Windsor.

APPROVAL OF CATALOGUE MATERIAL: The following catalogue change was accepted: Mathematics 8179, reactivated for Continuing Education (formerly National Science Foundation course), raise unit value from 2 to 3, change number to 7179a.

EDUCATION 201a,b - The Teaching of Language to the Deaf, and EDUCATION 207 a,b - Methods of Teaching Speech to the Deaf, FURTHER INFORMATION RE: The President asked the secretary to present to the Senate further information concerning the proposed new courses Education 201 a,b - The Teaching of Language to the Deaf, and Education 207 a,b - Methods of Teaching Speech to the Deaf. This information had been requested by Dr. Siegel at the October meeting of the Senate. Dr. Siegel had asked what were the differences between these two courses. It was explained that Education 201 a,b - The Teaching of Language to the Deaf, was concerned with various methods of communication among deaf people, while Education 207 a,b - Methods of Teaching Speech to the Deaf, dealt with the teaching of speech to the deaf.

COMMITTEE ON CONCILIATION, ELECTION OF: The Senate next gave its attention to the election of the new University Committee on Conciliation, as provided by amended By-Law 12, which was adopted by the University Faculty in the spring of 1962. Under this provision the Committee on Committees was to submit a slate of four names to the Faculty Senate, two of them to be elected to membership on the two-man Committee on Conciliation. The nominee receiving the highest number of votes would be elected to a two-year term and the nominee with the next highest number of votes to a one-year term. Hereafter, the Committee on Committees each fall is to nominate two persons to the Senate who will elect one member of the Committee on Conciliation for a two-year term. Committee members may succeed themselves.

The slate of four nominees presented by the Committee on Committees included the following: Vincent F. Boland, R. A. Gomez, C. B. Merritt, and Albert Siegel. Secret balloting followed, with the result that Dr. Merritt was elected to a two-year term on the Committee on Conciliation and Dr. Gomez to a one-year term.

FRATERNITY PROGRAM, REMARKS RE: The President called on Dr. Edwin Gaines, Assistant Dean of Men, to speak to the Senate. At the October meeting of this body, there had been discussion about the scholarship performance of University students, particularly those who are members of fraternities. It had been suggested at that time that Dean Gaines, who has as one of his primary responsibilities the supervision of the fraternity program on this campus, be invited to appear before the Senate to explain what was being done to bring about an improvement of scholarship in the fraternities.

Dean Gaines explained that it was accepted that one of the long-range goals of the fraternity program should be the development of a genuine atmosphere of intellectual curiosity. This, obviously, could not be done overnight, he said, and so during the past year some intermediate methods have been used to point the students' interests in this direction. For example, Dean Gaines explained, if a fraternity's scholarship record is not satisfactory at the end of a given semester that group is declared ineligible for participation in certain University events the following term. If satisfactory improvement does not come about during the next semester, the group is placed on social probation. If the group has not improved its situation within four semesters, the group loses its charter on this campus.

The Dean described certain other actions which had been taken, such as the elimination of the hazing of pledges. Of a positive nature, Dean Gaines described a scholarship retreat for fraternity leaders. Fraternities have been encouraged to develop libraries in their houses. Academic Deans and other University officials have visited the houses and spoken to fraternity members on the importance of scholarship. He pointed out that the alumni members of the various groups have agreed to accept more responsibility in seeing to it that the undergraduates give proper attention to their studies. An effort here has been made to copy the program of Panhellenic, which directs the sorority program, he explained. "We have been putting on the pressure to get these students genuinely interested in scholarship," Dean Gaines explained, "not alone to earn good marks but to develop a real curiosity to know the nature of knowledge."

The fraternity system on this campus does have very real problems, he pointed out. He explained that in one semester the capacity of the fraternity houses, because of the new fraternity-house building program, had jumped from 700 to 1100. Groups then had the problem of filling all their beds or losing their house, with the result that screening of pledges was not nearly as selective as it might otherwise have been. At the present time, Dean Gaines said, one-third of the members of the fraternity system on this campus are pledges. Another problem now under discussion, he explained, is whether or not the size of a fraternity appropriately should be limited by the University. One fraternity on this campus has 130 members, he said. It is very difficult to control the members of such a large organization. Perhaps a limit should be established as to the maximum number of members any fraternity might have, possibly 100. The sororities have a maximum limit now and this has proved to be satisfactory.

Dean Gaines said that he would welcome suggestions from members of the Faculty as to how to improve the scholastic performance of fraternity members.

President Harvill then asked if Senate members wished to direct questions to Dean Gaines. Dr. Gegenheimer asked how many University students are fraternity members and Dean Gaines replied that 18% of the undergraduate males are. In answer to another question Dean Gaines said that 1070 men students live in fraternity houses and about 700 women in sorority houses.

Dr. Siegel commented that while he thought it was an excellent idea to work with fraternities in an effort to raise their academic standards, he was interested in what efforts were being made to raise the scholarship level of men not in fraternities. Dean Gaines said that the staff of the Office of the Dean of Men was concerned about the entire male student body and did not feel that attention in any area should be directed exclusively to the fraternity members.

However, better group control is possible in fraternity houses and residence halls, he explained. It is more difficult to reach the student who is not a member of a fraternity or who does not live in a residence hall.

Dean Roy responded to Dr. Siegel's comment by pointing out that the various colleges give much attention to the matter of student scholarship. In the College of Liberal Arts, as an example, he pointed out that all entering freshmen are cautioned both by letter and by Orientation Week lecture about the importance of scholarship. At the time of the mid-semester delinquent scholarship report, students who are having scholastic difficulty are contacted and, where it seems appropriate, referred to the Student Counseling Bureau. A recent development has been the establishment of the reading improvement program which is for average and good readers as well as poor ones, Dean Roy pointed out.

Dr. Kassander said he wondered why the University had established a maximum number of members for sororities but had not done this for fraternities. Dean Gaines said that traditionally in this country sororities are better organized and better controlled both through their national administrations and on local campuses than are fraternities. Moreover, national Panhellenic is more sympathetic to the idea of limiting the size of groups than is the national Interfraternity Council.

Dean Livermore asked if the proportion of students at Arizona who are members of fraternities is low in comparison with other institutions. Dean Gaines said it was his opinion that this was true. He pointed out that a national survey of this very point is currently being made. He explained that 30% of the men students at the University of Virginia are affiliated with fraternities.

Dr. Kemmerer asked if fraternities are required to have housemothers. Dean Gaines explained that all fraternity houses must have housemothers living in the house. At the present time two fraternities at Arizona do not have houses.

Dean Moore asked if some houses had good scholarship records. Dean Gaines replied in the affirmative, pointing out that one fraternity had been in the top group regularly for the past ten years, with an over-all grade average of 2.52. He explained that four meetings a year are scheduled for the scholarship chairman of the fraternities. It was felt that at these meetings the study procedures of the houses with good records can be studied by the chairman of the houses with poorer records. An effort is being made to assure that the Scholarship Chairman himself in all instances has a good grade record.

Dr. Blitzer asked if the grades of pledges are included in a fraternity's grade average. Dean Gaines said "Yes," that the University of Arizona is strict in this matter. Some institutions, he pointed out, do not include in the organization's grade average the grade of pledges if the grades are not good enough for the man to be initiated into the fraternity. Such a student's grades are computed in the group of non-fraternity men.

Dr. Kurtz pointed out that some students have complained that the number of outside activities in which fraternities expect their members to participate interfere with their scholarship. Dean Gaines said this claim might have some validity, however, he felt that too often this statement is made by students seeking an excuse for not having done as well as they should have in their studies. As a matter of fact, it was his observation that the busiest student is usually the most capable student and the students involved in the most activities are often the ones making honor grades as well.

Dr. Harvill asked if each fraternity has an alumnus adviser and a faculty adviser. Dean Gaines replied that each group had both an alumnus and a faculty adviser.

Dr. Vavich asked what the cost differential is for a student joining a fraternity. Dean Gaines said he thought the cost of organized social events would run \$2 to \$5 a month more for a fraternity member. He said, however, that considering the entire financial "buy" that a fraternity member receives, including lodging, meals, etc., he thought a fraternity member receives more than the student does who eats his meals in campus area cafes and lives off the campus.

Dr. Kurtz asked if it is not rather costly to "keep up" in the social whirl of the fraternities. Dean Gaines said this depends on how extensive a social program an individual wants to maintain.

Dr. Bartlett asked if the fraternities should not pay more attention to the selection of their members. Perhaps the students should be helped to develop suitable yardsticks for measuring the scholarship potential of rushees as related to the scholastic objective of the group. Dean Gaines said undoubtedly this is a matter which should be given more study.

Dr. Blitzer said that he has long been concerned with the problem of the entering freshman who, along with all the other adjustments incident to entering college, is expected to survive the fraternity rush and even pre-rush program. He questioned whether a student in the short time allowed could make the best decision as to which fraternity he should join. Dr. Blitzer then asked Dean Gaines if deferring rush for a year might give a student a chance to adjust better to college before selecting his fraternity affiliation. Dean Gaines said that he feels the present system as it exists at Arizona to be the preferable one. Surely no system will be perfect, he emphasized. He said that he had formerly been affiliated with a University that tried a program where rushing continued for one year. Rushing throughout the year proved to be highly unsatisfactory so the rush period was reduced to one semester. That also proved unsatisfactory and so the institution has now returned to the system being followed six years ago - the same system followed at the University of Arizona. Under the "long rush" system rushing becomes a year-long or semester-long affair where fraternities are spending all their efforts on the rush program rather than involving their members in other University endeavors, including encouraging scholarship. Lengthening the rush period is not the answer, Dean Gaines said. Maybe some day we will come to having no rush at all, he said. Some Universities have done this although this too has not proved to be a workable procedure. He said he could not conceive of such a practice for the University of Arizona since the financial obligations presently faced by the various fraternity groups make it necessary that they conduct successful rush programs.

Dr. Hillman said he had a question concerning chaperoning. What forms are chaperons expected to sign and when should they be signed? Dean Gaines explained that chaperons sign a form in advance saying that they will serve as chaperons at a given event and that they will see to it that the organization adheres to regulations of the University. A follow-up report must be signed and returned to the personnel deans after the event has been held. The chaperon is not required to report misconduct except in the event that after he has observed misconduct and reported it to the President or the Social Chairman of the organization those officers have not corrected the situation. Should a problem situation not be properly handled by the group officers this should be reported.

Dr. McDonald said that perhaps the problem of the scholarship record of the fraternities was not so much one where the fraternities failed to select better students but one where students failed to measure up to their potential after they were in a fraternity. Dean Gaines agreed this might well be the case. He said that perhaps in the future a study could be made of aptitude test scores and high school grade records of fraternity members as related to their University grade performance. This could be compared with the University grade record of students with the same entering test scores and high school grade backgrounds who did not join fraternities. Dean Gaines said the staff was not available for such a study at present but he would be glad to discuss this with the Registrar.

Dr. Bartlett pointed out that certain data for the class entering in the fall of 1958 had recently been given a careful analysis. This was involved in a study Mr. Grant had been making, based on data the Office of the Registrar had furnished him. Dean Gaines indicated that perhaps certain information in Mr. Grant's study could be used in a study of the sort described by Dr. McDonald.

Dean Rhodes said he was impressed with the program of Mortar Board in its attempts to interest members of the student body in cultural events and University activities definitely related to intellectual endeavors. He wondered if anything was being done of this sort among the fraternities. Dean Gaines replied that the Interfraternity Council is indeed interested in this sort of activity. He pointed out that many members of this group have been active in sponsoring the University's International Forum. Dean Rhodes said that it was his feeling that if student attitudes are to change, the change must come from the students themselves, that is, student organizations will have to generate new interests. Dean Gaines said he agreed completely with Dean Rhodes.

President Harvill thanked Dean Gaines for his appearance before the Senate.

ACCEPTANCE OF TRANSFERRED SUBJECT-MATTER CREDIT IN COURSES IN WHICH BARELY PASSING GRADE WAS RECEIVED, REPORT RE: The Senate considered the report of the ad hoc Committee on the Acceptance of Transferred Subject-Matter Credit in Courses in which the Barely Passing Grade had been Received. This committee, under the chairmanship of Louis A. Myers, had included the following members: Thomas L. Martin, Curtis B. Merritt, Francis A. Roy, David L. Windsor, and Joseph A. Zapotocky.

The Senate made only minor adjustments in the recommendations of the committee. The Senate then adopted the following University policy governing the acceptance of subject-matter credit for transferred "D" courses:

(1) A transferred course in which the lowest passing grade was received and which is prerequisite to another course to be taken at the University of Arizona shall or shall not be granted subject-matter credit at the discretion of the department which teaches the subject matter of the transferred course in question.

(2) In the case of all other transferred courses in which the lowest passing grade was received, the granting of subject-matter credit shall be decided by the student's major professor, academic dean, and college course adjustment committee, which may obtain a recommendation from the department which teaches the subject-matter of the transferred course in question.

- 776k -

- 6 -

The Office of the Registrar was asked to design an appropriate form on which approvals and denials of subject-matter credit by appropriate departments and colleges may be made a matter of record.

Warren W. Shirey, Secretary pro tem