

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

March 1961

To Members of the Senate

Data bearing on the proposal before the Senate to provide a revised method of determining disqualification are given below:

1. In February 1961, in the College of Business and Public Administration, there were 189 individuals, who had either Junior (class 3) or Senior (class 4) standing, on the original "automatic" probation list. This was 23.5% of the combined upper-division enrollment in the College.

However, 40% of these 189 were immediately removed from probation for the simple reason that their records for the semester were so good that probation was a wholly illogical penalty. The present method of determining probation allows no weight for performance in the current semester. See Exhibit A for examples.

Another 5 had such incomplete records that probation was theoretical only.

Another 4 had withdrawn (mostly with '8' grades) during the semester. One was disqualified because of a previously hopeless record.

Another 17 were transfers in their first semester at this University.

This left 122 cases, or about 15%, where probation status seemed relevant to the proposal before the Senate.

To these a combination of judgment and statistical projection (of the probability of "success" in attaining a degree) can be applied. A rough division in this way shows 77 whose records are good enough to indicate better than a 50-50 chance of ultimate "success." This of course varies by units achieved, number of semesters left in the student's planned attendance, required courses remaining to be taken, etc. About half of this group are barely over the "break-line" for probation status. It would be safe to say that all 77 would be reinstated, if disqualified.

The remainder, 45, had "poor" records in the foregoing sense, in varying degrees. This is 5.6% of the upper division enrollment. Of these, about 10 have been warned that they will be disqualified in June 1961 unless sharp improvement occurs in Semester II. Almost all of this group (and some fraction of the foregoing 77) will presumably appear again on the June "automatic probation" list because their cumulative averages will still fall below the Catalogus level required (3.15 for Seniors, 3.40 for Juniors).

Thus, it is our best judgment that about 75 students in the upper division would thus be "disqualified" under the proposed rule, in June 1961.

2. In the Freshman-Sophomore classes, the problem is greatly complicated by the heavy voluntary drop-out rate in the Summers following the first and second years. The College is now analyzing the drop-out situation over the Summer of 1960. This raises the question: "Should such voluntary withdrawals with two-semester probation records, be officially recorded as "disqualified"? Only a few would avail themselves of a petition for re-instatement, once they had reached the decision to withdraw.

March 1961

EXHIBIT A

Case 1.

Disqualified in 1958
Probation June 1960; appeared consecutively on
probation February 1961. With Cum. Av. 3.36
Grade average in Semester I 1960-61, 2.00 incl.
4 units of 1.
Senior standing. Removed from probation list.

Case 2.

Probation June 1959
Disqualified, Engineering, January 1960
Appeared on probation February 1961. Cum. Av. 3.58,
Junior standing, but grade record in Sem. I, 60-61 was
2.53, including 3 units (Econ) of 1. Foreign student.
Removed from probation list.

Case 3.

Disqualified 1957
Probation June 1960
Appeared consecutively on probation list in February 1960.
Cum. Av. 3.41, but semester average of 2.66, incl. 9 units
of 2 in upper division courses. Removed from probation list.
Junior standing.

Case 4.

Senior standing. Appeared on probation list Febr. 61.,
Cum. Av. 3.168, but semester average of 2.23 incl. 9
units of 2 and 2 units of 1. Removed from probation
list.

Case 5.

Probation June 1960.
Appeared consecutively on probation list February 1961,
Cum. Av. 3.2677, but semester average 1.75, including
6 units of 1, and 3 of 2. Removed from probation.
Foreign Student.

Case 6.

Probation 1953 (twice)
Disqualified 1955
Probation 1956
Probation Summer 1960
Appeared consecutively on probation list in February 1960,
Cum. Aver., 3.71 but semester aver. of 1.45, incl. 6 units
of 1 and 6 of 2 in Upper Division course in P.A. Removed
from probation.
Junior Standing

Case 7.

Probation 1957
Disqualified February 1958
Probation June 1960 and August 1960
February 1961 consecutively on probation list.
Cum. Av., 3.43 but Semester average 2.00, including 6 units
of 1 and 3 of 2 in Upper Division courses. Senior standing.
Removed from probation list.

- Case 8. Probation August 1957, Mid-term Fall 1957
Probation June 1960, August 1960
Appeared consecutively on probation list February 1961,
Cum. Aver., 3.34 but semester aver. 2.67, incl. 9 units
of 2 in Upper Division courses. Removed from probation.
Senior standing
- Case 9. Probation February 1960
Probation June 1960 and August 1960
Appeared consecutively on probation list February 1961,
Cum. Aver., 3.53 but sem. Aver. 2.687 including 4 units of 1.
Junior Standing
- Case 10. Appeared on probation list in February 1960, June 1960,
August 1960 but removed each of 3 times by Dean.
Appeared again February 1961 with semester aver., of 2.31
(Cum. Aver. 3.34) with 2 units of 1 and 5 units of 2
- Case 11. Probation June 1959
Probation February 1960
Probation June 1960 (all consecutive)
Appeared on probation list again February 1961 with
Cum. Aver., 3.795 but semester aver. of 2.75 with
7 units of 2. Removed; Sophomore standing.
- Case 12. Probation 1957
Probation June 1960
Appeared consecutively February 1961 with Cum. Aver., 3.34
but semester aver. of 2.25, including 5 units of 1, and
2. of 2. Removed.
Senior Standing.
- Case 13. Probation June 1960
Probation August 1960
Appeared consecutively in February 1961 with Cum. Aver.
3.22 but semester average of 1.94, including 7 units
of 1 and 3 units of 2. Removed.
Senior standing.
- Case 14. Probation August 1955
Probation January 1956
Probation March 1957
Probation November 1957
Appeared on probation in February 1961 with 116 units, cum.
Aver., 3.55 but sem. aver., 2.20, incl. 6 units of 1.
Senior Standing, removed.
- Case 15. Probation fall 1958, March 1959, February 1960,
Removed from probation list June 1960.
Appeared consecutively Febr. 1961 with cum. aver., 3.22 and
semester aver. 2.33 incl. 12 units of 2.
Senior standing; removed.
- Case 16. Probation March 1957
Disqualified June 1957 (Lib. Arts)
After return, appeared February 1960 and consecutively
June 1960, removed both times. Appeared third consecutive
time February 1961 with Cum. aver. 3.32 but semester
aver. 2.43 incl. 8 units of 2. Removed.
Senior Standing (137 units)

The University of Arizona
Proceedings of the Faculty Senate

Meeting of Monday

March 27, 1961

PRESENT: Blitzer, Brewer, Casady, Forrester, Gegenheimer, Gillmor, Gustavson, Harvill, Haury, Irwin, Little, Livermore, Lyons, McDonald, McMillan, Marcoux, Martin, Merritt, Moore, Murphy, L. Myers, Nugent, Picard, Rhodes, Rosaldo, Tucker, Wallraff, Windsor, Zapotocky.

ABSENT: Carlson, Conley, Denton, Ewing, Gaines, Hausenbauer, Howard, Hunt, Humphrey, Hurlbutt, Mead, H. Myers, Pistor, Roy, Slonaker.

CATALOGUE MATERIAL: The catalogue material distributed to members under date of March 20, 1961 was accepted without change. These new courses were as follows: Regular Session: (To be offered in 1962-63) Architecture 214, The History of American Architecture; Summer Session: Natural Science 201s, Trends in Natural Science and in Engineering; Continuing Education (Off-Campus): Mathematics 7118, SMSG Modern Algebra and Geometry; Mathematics 7137, Probability and Statistics-TV.

HONORARY DEGREE, RECOMMENDATION RE: The Senate voted to recommend the awarding of another honorary degree at the Commencement exercises in May, 1961. The recommendation, in addition to two recommendations approved at the March 6 Senate meeting, next are to be considered by the General Faculty. Announcement of these degrees will be made upon approval by the Board of Regents.

RESIGNATION OF JOHN H. DENTON FROM FACULTY SENATE, ANNOUNCEMENT OF: Dr. Harvill informed the Senate he had received a letter of resignation from the Faculty Senate from John H. Denton. Professor Denton had explained that other duties made it impossible for him to attend Senate meetings. Professor Denton was serving as a Senator-at-large.

Since there would be only one more Senate meeting this year and since election of Senators-at-large is now being conducted on the campus to select new Senators whose terms will begin in July 1961, the Senate agreed not to fill Professor Denton's vacancy at this time.

DELEGATES TO ARIZONA COLLEGE ASSOCIATION COUNCIL, ELECTION OF: On motion by Dean Rhodes, seconded by Dr. Gillmor, the Senate unanimously elected as delegates of The University of Arizona to the Arizona College Association Council Dr. William Pistor and Professor Joseph Picard. Both men are presently this institution's delegates to the Council.

DISCONTINUANCE OF ACCEPTANCE OF TRANSFER CREDIT IN COURSES IN WHICH BARELY PASSING GRADE WAS RECEIVED, APPROVAL OF: On motion by Dr. Tucker, seconded by Dean Livermore, the Senate approved a recommendation from the Advisory Council that effective with the 1961-62 academic year the University will not accept in transfer, credit in courses in which the barely passing grade was received. The present catalogue provision governing the transfer of credit in courses in which the barely passing grade is received reads as follows:

The number of units in the barely-passing grade credited to students admitted to advanced standing may not exceed 20 per cent of the total number of units completed. This regulation applies to records in separate institutions when the student has attended more than one.

Hereafter the catalogue provision will read:

Credit in courses in which the lowest passing grade was received is not transferable.

PROPOSAL FOR AUTOMATIC DISQUALIFICATION OF ALL STUDENTS WHO FOR THE TWO CONSECUTIVE SEMESTERS OF THE ACADEMIC YEAR FAIL TO MEET SPECIFIED GRADE AVERAGES, FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF: The Senate continued discussion of a proposal made at the March 6 meeting by Dr. Henry Tucker that all students who, for the two consecutive semesters of the regular academic year, fail to earn the specified cumulative grade averages for their respective classes, be automatically disqualified from the University. The proposal provided that students automatically disqualified would then have the opportunity of formally petitioning for reinstatement.

The point was again made by supporters of the proposal that automatic disqualification would raise the academic standards of the institution. Opponents of the proposal stated that if unworthy students are being retained too long, the University should do something about that but this can be done under the present disqualification procedure without such drastic action as automatic disqualification.

Several members of the Senate stated that they felt it was better to review each individual case before action is taken so that all factors can be taken into account prior to the action of disqualification. To disqualify first and then permit students to petition for reinstatement will mean that some less aggressive students who should not be disqualified after all facts in their case could be known simply will leave the University without petitioning for a review of their cases.

Dr. Merritt pointed out that when the Senate committee, of which he was Chairman, devised the present bases for probation and/or disqualification, establishing the progressive grade averages by classes that students must earn to remain in good standing, the averages set had a sound statistical basis in that students having earned to date such averages in their respective classes could under statistical possibility still earn the necessary grade average for graduation within the normal period of time. He pointed out that students, of course, may improve their grade averages at a faster rate than the "progression" necessary under the present scale of required grade averages by classes. To disqualify automatically all students who fall below the set averages, Dr. Merritt emphasized, was putting a very important matter in the hands of a machine and leaving out the important element of human judgment.

Several Senate members then said they thought this matter was important enough that special study by committee should be authorized. The point was made that perhaps particular attention should be given to cases such as one where a student has serious scholarship difficulty in one college of the University, then transfers to another college within the institution, and "finding himself" there proceeds to do good work. However, he must carry with him the "albatross" of low marks earned in the college where he first enrolled but where he lacked aptitude for success. Several Senators hoped a means could be found whereby disqualification from a particular college of the University with eligibility to re-register in another division would be distinct from disqualification from the University as a whole.

The Senate then voted to table Dr. Tucker's original motion until such time as the result of a study by a special committee could be considered. The Senate action also provided for the creation of the special study committee.

Dr. Harvill then named Dean Livermore, Dr. Merritt, and Dr. Tucker to this committee, with Dr. Tucker named Chairman.

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT HARVILL: Dr. Harvill reported to the Senate briefly on the recent legislative session, pointing out that the legislature had appropriated for the University all that the Board of Regents had requested be appropriated, including both funds for the operating budget for 1961-62 and funds for capital outlay and land acquisition during the next year. The legislature had also authorized the issuance of revenue bonds by the University for the construction of a new women's dormitory.

The president pointed out that most members of the University faculty and staff were gratified that the legislature had seen fit not to pass the disclaimer loyalty oath as originally proposed but in its place had passed a positive loyalty oath which most individuals found much less objectionable. The President said that he planned to have a summary of the full legislative action establishing the requirement of the new oath prepared at an early date so that it would be available to interested individuals.

The President announced that he hoped that the operating budget for 1961 would be finally approved by the Board of Regents at its next meeting, tentatively scheduled for mid-April, and he hoped that appointment letters could be mailed to all members of the faculty and staff by the end of April.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 o'clock.

David L. Windsor, Secretary