

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
Monday, May 5, 1969 Room 350 Modern Languages

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:40 p.m. on Monday, May 5, 1969, in the Modern Languages Building auditorium (Room 350). Fifty-four members were present with President Harvill presiding.

PRESENT: Ares, Armstrong, Bartlett, Bingham, Bok, Burton, Carlson, Damon, Davis, Delaplane, Dewhirst, Dutt, <sup>Dr. V. L. C.</sup> Fahey, Gegenheimer, Goodwin, Gould, Harvill, Herber, Hetrick, Higley, Johnson, Kassander, Kemmerer, Krebs, Little, Lynn, Lytle, Marcoux, Martin, Massengale, McDonald, McMillan, Miller, Myers, Nigh, Paulsen, Resnick, Rhodes, Robson, Roy, Shields, Sigworth, Skinner, Sorensen, Spicer, Steelink, Svob, Thompson, Tomizuka, M. Voris, W. Voris, Wilson, Windsor, and Wise. Also attending the meeting were Dr. Ed McCullough, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee to Consider Placing Students on University Committees; Mr. Paul Erickson and Mr. Mitch Dorson, members of the Student Committee on Placing Students on Faculty Committees; and Mr. Lou Myers, Chairman, and Dr. Oswald, member, of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Grading System of the University.

ABSENT: Barnes, Blecha, Brewer, Cockrum, ~~DuVal~~, Forrester, Gaines, Green, Harris, Hull, Joyner, Krutzsch, Leonard, Mees, Murphy, Paylore, and Richard.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of April 14, 1969 were approved as distributed to members.

MEMBERSHIP OF AD HOC COMMITTEE TO ORGANIZE AND CONDUCT PROGRAM OF SOLICITATION OF SCHOLARSHIP FUNDS FOR MINORITY STUDENTS WITH FINANCIAL NEED, ANNOUNCEMENT RE: The secretary informed the Senate that the ad hoc committee this body had asked the President to appoint to organize and conduct a program of solicitation of scholarship funds for minority students with financial need had been appointed by President Harvill as follows: Dr. Walter H. Evans, Professor of Electrical Engineering and Meteorology; Dr. Clifford M. Lytle, Associate Professor of Government; Dr. Arthur R. Kemmerer, Head, Department of Agricultural Biochemistry; Dr. Michael A. Wells, Assistant Professor of Biochemistry; Dr. David L. Hetrick, Professor of Nuclear Engineering. Dr. Evans was asked to serve as chairman of the committee. Following the announcement of the members of the committee, Dr. Gegenheimer asked for the floor briefly in order to urge all members of the Senate to make contributions to the fund. He pointed out that in publicizing the fund campaign among the General Faculty, it would be helpful to be able to indicate that specific members of the Faculty Senate had already contributed to this effort.

RECOMMENDATION FOR HONORARY DEGREE TO BE CONFERRED AT THE 1969 COMMENCEMENT, APPROVAL OF: The Senate considered and approved a recommendation concerning an honorary degree to be conferred at the 1969 Commencement. (Two other recommendations had been approved at the April Senate meeting.) This recommendation next will be considered by the General Faculty of the University and by the Board of Regents.

*Barry M. Goldwater*

COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER PLACING STUDENTS ON UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES, FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF: The Senate continued its consideration of the report of the ad hoc Senate Committee to Study Student Participation on University Committees. This committee had been chaired by Dr. Ed McCullough who had at the April meeting

presented the committee's report and who was again present at this meeting.

At the time the last meeting had adjourned, the Senate had before it a motion by Dr. Gegenheimer, seconded by Dr. Damon, that the committee's full report be accepted and that recommendations 1, 2, and 4 be adopted (see full statement of report in minutes of meeting of April 14, 1969). The Senate also had before it a proposed amendment to Dr. Gegenheimer's motion, such motion to amend having been made by Dr. Sigworth and seconded by Dean Rhodes and reading: "It is further recommended that deans and department chairmen involve students as far as possible in consideration of departmental and college curricular matters."

Dr. Harvill asked Dr. McCullough if there were further comments he wished to make at this time. Dr. McCullough said he would like to report to the Senate three communications he had received since the April Senate meeting. He had received a letter from Dr. Robert Johnson, University Librarian, pointing out that the Library Committee is strictly an advisory one, and he saw no need for student membership on that committee. Further, if there was to be student representation, he felt two members would not be appropriate inasmuch as no one University department has two members on the committee and some have none at all. To have voting membership on a committee that is purely an advisory one would be meaningless, he emphasized.

Dr. McCullough said further that he had received a communication from the Committee on Dishonest Scholastic Work pointing out that that committee had already been considering recommending that student members be placed on it. Such action, however, had been deferred until the Senate had completed action on Dr. McCullough's committee's study. The Committee on Dishonest Scholastic Work felt, however, that they probably would be recommending that four regular student members and four alternate student members be appointed.

Dean Hull had informed Dr. McCullough that the Artist Series Committee had for some years been made up of six student members and six faculty members. Dean Hull is one of the six faculty members and since he chairs this group's meetings he does not have a vote except in case of a tie. Therefore in the normal course of affairs, the students can out-vote the faculty members.

Dr. Harvill reminded the Senate that at the Senate's invitation representatives of the student committee that had been studying the question of student membership on faculty committees had been invited to attend this meeting as they had been the April meeting, and Mr. Paul Erickson and Mr. Mitch Dorson were present. Dr. McCullough then asked Mr. Erickson if he wished to make a statement to the Senate. It was understood that the report given by Mr. Erickson represented the thinking of the three student members of the committee which included Mr. Dorson and Margaret Maxwell in addition to Mr. Erickson.

Mr. Erickson's remarks were as follows:

"Dr. Harvill and members of the Faculty Senate,

"I would like to take this opportunity to thank you on behalf of the Associated Students, for allowing us to come before you today. We realize that it is not customary procedure to allow students to address this body or to exchange in dialogue with you. We are indeed grateful for this opportunity to give you the student rationale supporting student representation on University committees.

"Before we tackled the problem of placing students on the University committees, we had to clearly define the role of the student in the University. This role has, for too long, been vague and has bred ambivalence and ambiguity. What, after all is the student's role in the University community? Is he a member of a slightly organized group that appeals to the authorities for beneficence and redress; or is he a full member of the University community, a necessary part of the whole with a recognized place in the affairs of the University? We have defined the student's role in the latter context, that is, as a full partner in a joint venture with shared responsibilities.

"Why then, should students be on University committees? We feel the existence of students on the committees in effect guarantees an institutionalized dialogue between the various members of the University as a means of arriving at policy recommendations. It affirms the position of the student as a partner in the University, a partner taking part in discussions and being consulted when the University's operations concern him. Such dialogue is real.

"It is our opinion that student participation would add perspective to these committees and would serve to initiate a meaningful dialogue in which the student would be assured a continuing voice on the decision-making level. The creation of positions for students on these committees would be another large step toward the realization of the student's responsible place in the University community. As the University of Arizona continues to grow, it is vital that it undergoes this growth in a spirit of cooperation and common interest shared by students, faculty, and administration.

"Once we answered these questions, we then turned our attention to the need for student participation.

"We feel that the democratic principle and educational policy justifies equal student participation within the University community. Student participation would increase the excellence of the University as well as the maturity of its students.

"Students are capable of recognizing University problems, such as the Pass-Fail System and Voluntary R.O.T.C. Student perspective would contribute to the creation of a more comprehensive and overall approach towards University policy making.

"An institution must offer an opportunity to those men and women who are willing to accept a responsible role in the governance of modern higher educational institutions whether they be students, faculty, or administration. The emphasis in the future must be a team or partnership concept within the University, characterized by shared functions and responsibilities.

"A university should be a center for creativity and innovation, criticism and challenge, debate and dissent. The vigorous assertion of dissatisfaction and efforts to influence both the internal policy of the University and its posture and role in the larger society are indicative of an intellectual vitality that should be fostered and welcomed.

"The system cannot afford to be a closed one but one receptive to ideas and viewpoints from all areas within the University community.

"These then, were the basic underlying principles which guided our thought.

"In the past, the student viewpoints and attitudes have been represented by administrators or other persons who are not truly close to the pulse of student opinion. I should like to refer to the minutes from your last meeting to the summary remarks from Dr. McCullough's committee found on page 4, paragraph 2:

'In reaction to statements that students in a sense do participate in University affairs since Mr. Johnson, Miss Carlson, and Mr. Svob represent them on many committees, most interviewees opined that these people are not truly students nor can they be expected to respond to all proposals as students would. It seemed to be generally agreed that many faculty could not be expected to have an entirely valid view of the feelings of students on most issues.'

"In summary then, no one can speak better for students than students themselves.

"In addition, student participation has proven to be useful and constructive. In the course of our research, we found that here and at universities across the nation, the response was overwhelmingly favorable to the student participation. I would like once again to turn to page 4, paragraph 1, of the minutes from your last meeting:

'Faculty and staff who had served on committees with students said that the students had made significant contributions to the work of the committees and that the students had been as industrious and conscientious as any faculty member. These people also ventured the opinion that once the students had participated in committee action, they began to show greater appreciation of the complexity of University problems.'

"We realize that because this whole concept of involved student participation is new to the University of Arizona, the integration of students into the committee system will have to be gradual. Our long-range goal is to have an equal 1/3 voting student membership on those University committees whose decisions directly affect the lives and education of students. Yet, we would make this one additional request: that an increase in student voting memberships be considered by the Faculty Senate after one year rather than two as put forth in Dr. McCullough's committee report.

"At this time, I would like to turn to the selection procedure we outlined in our report to Dr. McCullough's committee. Let me quote from our report:

'The proposed process is as follows:

The entire project would be coordinated by an ASUA Presidential Aide. He would be responsible for notifying the student body that applications for the committee seats were available.

Interested persons would fill out an application and go before an interview board composed of the following persons: ASUA President, RHA President, an Administrative Aide, appointed by the ASUA President, and a student senator appointed by the Speaker of the Senate.'

"After much thought and discussion, we do not feel that the AWS and RHA Presidents will have a seat on this interview board. We feel that the members of this board must come from as broad a representational base as possible. It is our opinion that AWS and RHA are basically interest groups and not truly representative of the student body. Their seats would probably be filled by student senators or administrative assistants to the ASUA President. I would ask you also to please keep in mind that what we have proposed here in terms of a selection process are only guidelines and our ideas as to how the selection procedure will probably be organized.

"In conclusion, we would just like to say this request is an attempt on our part to help eliminate the age-old cause of student-administration friction: misunderstanding.

"It comes from a number of causes, most notably a lack of knowledge, a lack of consultation by the decision makers to those directly affected and a lack in effective and accurate communication between the students, faculty, and the administration. With the integration of students into the University's decision-making process, the faculty and administration will better know and understand the currents of student opinion.

"We feel strongly that affirmative action upon our proposal will increase and solidify the concept of an administration-faculty-student partnership within the University, and we have confidence that our added participation in the decision-making structure of the campus will prove to be beneficial to the entire University community. We therefore urge its most serious consideration by the University as a whole on the basis of its merits and its implications for the future of the University.

"Thank you once again for the privilege of coming before you. We sincerely feel that this is one significant way to open communication channels between the students, faculty, and administration. We hope that in the future, other students will have the opportunity and privilege, as we have had, to exchange in dialogue on matters concerning the University."

Following Mr. Erickson's remarks, Dean Carlson said that she thought one point should be clarified. Associated Women Students is not an interest group as had been indicated. Rather it is a governmental group and has been so on this campus for forty years, and it is a strong governmental group. In fact, in the last six years it has produced two national presidents.

Dean Ares commented that a matter which concerned him was that of students generally being aware of what is going on in University committees. Even with students serving on committees, how is information about the decision-making process to make its way back to the student constituency generally, that is, the full student body? How can this be assured? Mr. Dorson said that the students would like a procedure whereby student members of faculty committees would report back to the Associated Students by some appropriate means, either directly to the ASUA president or to the Student Senate. It was assumed that a scheme would be developed whereby the best qualified students possible would be placed on faculty committees.

Vice President Johnson referred to the Student Life Committee listed under k. under the first recommendation of Dr. McCullough's report, and pointed out that the Student Life Committee no longer exists. It has been absorbed by the Student Personnel Committee.

Dr. Damon asked why the Faculty Athletic Committee was not included in the proposed list of committees on which students would sit. Dr. McCullough explained that members of his committee had conferred with members of the Faculty Athletic Committee and with Athletic Director Clausen. It had been pointed out that among the concerns of this group are personnel matters including the hiring and firing of coaches, and at least at the present time it was not felt appropriate that students should sit on such a group. A number of matters which now come before the Faculty Athletic Committee could not properly be handled if there were student members participating in the deliberations. The conclusion had been reached, therefore, that until the end of a trial period of two years, the Faculty Athletic Committee should not include student members. If at the end of that time students have demonstrated that they can serve affectively on other faculty committees and exercise discretion when necessary, then perhaps students could be placed on the Faculty Athletic Committee.

Several calls were now heard for voting on the amendment to the motion, that is, the proposal by Dr. Sigworth that deans and department chairmen involve students as far as possible in consideration of departmental and college curricular matters. Dr. Sigworth said that at the last Senate meeting Dean Roy had implied that he did not think it necessary that the Senate call for placement of student members on University-wide committees dealing with curricular matters since these concerns were primarily handled at the departmental or college level, and he thought many departments and colleges were already involving students. Dr. Sigworth said that only the Faculty Senate can speak in its unique way for the whole institution, and even though it can only recommend, he saw real value in the Faculty Senate's going on record as aligning itself with the strong expression of student opinion that student voices should be heard in curricular matters. The Senate would only be affirming what most people seem to agree ought to be the case anyway, and he urged passage of the amendment. The vote on the amendment was then taken by voice vote, and it carried with only a few dissenting votes heard.

The Senate then turned itself to the original motion of Dr. Gegenheimer. By consent item k. under Recommendation 1 was deleted (the reference to the Student Life Committee) and items l. and m. then became k. and l.

Dean Myers commented that as he reread Dr. McCullough's report, he thought Recommendation 3 seemed satisfactory in itself. He then moved that Dr. Gegenheimer's motion be amended to include Recommendation 3. Mr. McMillan seconded the motion. Dr. Gegenheimer said he felt that paragraph 3 as drafted by the faculty committee was not satisfactory because it was too unspecific. It did not outline a plan of procedure. Also, since there was a difference of opinion about point 3 between the recommendation of the faculty committee and the wishes of the student committee, he felt he did not wish to jeopardize the other recommendations. For that reason he had made his motion as he had.

Dr. McCullough said that the faculty committee had opposed the students' proposal in this regard for not assuring a representative enough system. Further the ad hoc committee members did not feel that they wanted first to give the students a responsibility and then tell them how to carry it out.

Vice President Johnson said he could not agree with Dr. McCullough. He said he thought the original recommendation of the students was a satisfactory one. It provided breadth. It provided the appropriate student leaders adequate voice. It provided a means whereby there could be good communication from committee action back to the student body, better communication than if only the Student Senate were involved. He then moved to amend Dean Myers' motion by substituting the original recommendation of the students concerning selection

of student members of committees. At this point some confusion developed as to just how Mr. Johnson's motion related to Dean Myers'. To help rectify this situation, Dean Myers then withdrew his motion with the consent of Mr. McMillan who had seconded it.

Dr. Gegenheimer then moved consideration of the previous question (that is, his motion as originally made at the previous meeting). There were many seconds to this motion and it carried.

The Senate was then left uncertain as to how to proceed so far as Recommendation 3 was concerned, that is, a recommendation relating to the selection process of student members. Mr. Windsor moved that the first sentence, with a slight change, of the faculty committee's recommendation be combined with three paragraphs on this subject recommended at the last meeting by the student committee, so that paragraph 3 would read as follows: "The selection of students to serve on the committees should be the responsibility of student government utilizing a method that would insure representation of all segments of the student body. The entire project would be coordinated by an ASUA Presidential Aide. He would be responsible for notifying the student body that applications for the committee seats were available. Interested persons would fill out an application and go before an interview board composed of the following persons: ASUA President, AWS President, RHA President, an Administrative Aide, appointed by the ASUA President, and a student senator appointed by the Speaker of the Senate. The Presidential Aide who coordinates the effort will announce the board's final selections and the Speaker of the Senate will submit the board's recommendations to the Student Senate for confirmation." Several seconds to Mr. Windsor's motion were heard.

Dr. McCullough said he felt Mr. Windsor's motion incorporated two different ideas. First it said that the selection of the students should be left up to student government to devise a method. Then a specific plan is spelled out.

Dean Ares asked if no plan were devised and provision were simply made that the students should make their own committee assignments, who would actually make the selection? No one seemed to know.

Dr. Wilson said he agreed with Dr. McCullough's point that there was an internal inconsistency in Mr. Windsor's motion. "First we say we'll leave this to the students and then we specify how the students are to proceed." Mr. Johnson said that since the recommended procedure had come from the students, he saw no inconsistency here. Dr. Damon said he would like to know what the students felt about this point, and Mr. Erickson said that he thought the students would devise some sort of plan similar to the one that had been proposed. At the moment he said he did not know exactly what the majority of the students did want. Dr. McCullough asked Mr. Erickson if he thought the students would resent the Faculty Senate's outlining as specific a plan as was now being discussed. Mr. Erickson said that he thought that most students would prefer that the matter be left as wide open as possible. Dr. Sigworth asked Mr. Erickson if he objected to this proposal. Mr. Erickson said he did not personally, but some other students might. Mr. Windsor commented that he thought that his motion simply provided the students with exactly what they had been wanting. Mr. Erickson said that the student committee's recommendation on this point resulted from some action taken some months ago when there was a different leadership in the Associated Students government. Now a new group of leaders have assumed office. However, he felt all

concerned would want the selection process to be as broad as possible. Dr. Steelink asked if whatever procedure the students devise would have to come back to the Faculty Senate for approval. Dr. Harvill said he did not see why necessarily this should be so.

Dr. Wilson said he thought the students should be commended for their study and good work in developing a procedure and we should have confidence in them, and he therefore thought that the motion should not be approved. Dr. Damon and others spoke against the motion, and when the vote was called, the motion failed. Dr. Shields then moved that Recommendation 3 read simply: "The selection of students to serve on the committees should be the responsibility of student government utilizing a method that would insure representation of all segments of the student body." There were several seconds to this motion.

Mr. Johnson said that this point troubled him. Who then is to approve the students' method of selection? No one. We must look at the vote in the recent student body election, he said, to realize what a small proportion of the student body student government does represent. We should not forget, Mr. Johnson pointed out, that these are University committees we're talking about here, faculty committees with very basic University responsibilities. These are not student committees although they would now have student members. We should have some assurance that a proper method is devised whereby student committee members would be selected. We should see to it that there is opportunity for a wide range of student participation. He wondered if the procedure should not have to be approved by the Faculty Senate.

Dean Carlson said that since as wide a representation as possible was desired, as large segments of the student body as possible should be involved. Therefore Associated Women Students, which represents 40% of the student body, should be assured appropriate representation. Several members of the Senate commented that women students in the University are members of ASUA as well as AWS. A proposal whereby AWS would have representation equal to that of ASUA would mean that women students would have double representation. Dr. Damon said he thought that the Associated Students government could well be given authority to handle the matter of selecting student members of faculty committees. He thought that such a step might stimulate greater participation by students in student government and would strengthen it. As far as student apathy is concerned, Dr. Damon pointed out that the faculty are apathetic about many matters also.

Dr. Skinner said he thought it would be appropriate to put the students on their mettle and let them assume responsibility for the handling of this matter. The question was then called for and carried with a few dissenting votes heard.

Dr. Nigh asked if the vote on the report disregarded the student recommendation that the trial period be only one year, or was the trial period to be two years as originally recommended by Dr. McCullough's committee? The answer was that the recommendation of Dr. McCullough's committee of a two years' trial period prevailed.

Dr. Harvill then thanked Dr. McCullough and his committee for their work on this report. He also thanked Mr. Erickson and Mr. Dorson for their contribution to the discussion. Mr. Erickson in turn expressed the thanks of the student committee to Dr. McCullough and the faculty committee and to the Faculty

Senate for the opportunity to participate in the discussion. Mr. Erickson said he felt that opportunities of this sort for dialogue between students and faculty members were very worthwhile for all concerned.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY PRESIDENT: At this point Dr. Harvill announced that appointment letters for 1969-70 would be mailed by the end of the week. Work would begin within the next two weeks on the Request Budget for 1970-71.

The President also referred to certain statements in the Arizona Wildcat that proportionately the largest salary increases for 1969-70 were going to the higher faculty ranks. This was not true, the President emphasized, although the Committee of Eleven has recommended that consideration be given to such an adjustment in 1970-71. However, experience has shown that in recent years the greatest number of losses of faculty personnel has been from the medium ranks, and for that reason for 1969-70 proportionately the largest salary increases had been made to persons in the medium ranks.

At this point Dr. Harvill had to leave the meeting and Vice President McMillan assumed the chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE GRADING SYSTEM OF THE UNIVERSITY: Mr. McMillan introduced Professor Lou Myers, chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Grading System of the University. Mr. Myers presented the committee's report as follows:

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE  
OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE TO STUDY  
THE GRADING SYSTEM OF THE UNIVERSITY

Reconsideration of Action Taken on Use of Intermediate Grades

At its January 6, 1969 meeting, the Faculty Senate entertained a motion to reconsider the action taken at its November 18, 1968 meeting approving a recommendation of this committee to adopt the intermediate grades of B+, C+, and D+. After considerable discussion, a motion was passed to refer the matter back to this committee for further study, with a specific request that the general faculty be polled to obtain faculty opinion on the question.

Faculty Poll

The committee conducted its poll during the first two weeks of March, sending out some two thousand questionnaires. Of this number, sixty-two percent were returned, constituting, we believe, an excellent sample of faculty opinion.

Briefly, sixty-one percent of the faculty members responding to the questionnaire would not find intermediate grades useful in their own courses and, on balance, would not be in favor of establishing them at the University of Arizona. In addition, it is important to note that of these faculty members who would not find such grades useful in their own courses, about one-half would object to their use by other members of the faculty. For your information and guidance, a summary of responses to the questionnaire is attached.

In reviewing the comments and suggestions of the faculty members polled, the committee discovered no basic arguments for or against the use of intermediate grades other than those that were set forth in the memorandum accompanying the questionnaire.

#### Student Views

At the suggestion of some members of the Faculty Senate, the committee sought the views of student leaders on this issue. Mr. Steve Malkin, president of Associated Students, was anxious to cooperate, and he promptly appointed Mr. Bruce Eggers as his special representative. Mr. Eggers, in turn, requested the ASUA Academic Committee to study the problem and to submit its recommendations to him.

As reported to us by Mr. Eggers, the consensus of the student committee is that the establishment of intermediate grades in general is not a sound idea. They believe that the grading system should not become more complex at the very time efforts are being made here and at other institutions to de-emphasize the importance of grades. It is interesting to note that while some faculty members feel that the use of intermediate grades would tend to raise grade averages, the student committee believes that their use would have just the opposite effect.

#### Recommendations

When the ad hoc committee made its initial recommendations last November, the consensus of its members was that the intermediate grades of B+, C+, and D+ should be made available to those faculty members who cared to use them. It seemed then that a real need for such grades had been clearly demonstrated by some divisions of the University, and that little or no harm would result to others since their use would be made optional. The faculty opinion questionnaire supported the committee's belief that a considerable number of faculty members (about thirty-five percent) would favor the use of such grades. On the other hand, the committee did not anticipate that such a relatively large proportion of those faculty members not favoring the use of intermediate grades for their own courses would object to their use by others. It is mainly for this reason that the majority of the committee now wishes to recommend to the Faculty Senate that it rescind its previous action relating to the establishment of the intermediate grades of B+, C+, and D+, and that it establish point values for letter grades as follows:

A = 4  
B = 3  
C = 2  
D = 1  
F = 0

Because the majority of the committee believes that the formal system of grading should apply to the University as a whole, it further recommends that those divisions of the University which have indicated a need for intermediate grades maintain separate, but unofficial, records that will provide the desired information. In this regard, your attention is invited to the dissenting opinion reported elsewhere.

The Ad Hoc Committee:

Professor Manfred Bottaccini  
Professor Edgar J. McCullough  
Professor Ray Jay Davis  
Professor Louis A. Myers, Chairman

Dean Roy moved acceptance of the report and Dean Voris seconded the motion. Dean Rhodes asked if it were known how many of the portion of persons who had voted that they would not object to other departments or colleges using intermediate grades were members of the faculty of the College of Law. Mr. Myers said he did not know this, but in the total number of questionnaires returned the number of law votes in any case could not be considered significant.

At this point Professor Myers referred to the summary of responses to the faculty questionnaire as follows:

Summary of Responses to the Faculty  
Questionnaire on the Use of Intermediate Grades

<u>Question</u>	<u>Percent Answering</u>		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
1. What is the subject-matter area in which you teach?			
2. Would you find the intermediate grades of B+, C+, and D+ useful in awarding final grades to your students?			
a. In courses offered for undergraduate credit?	33%	61%	6%
b. In courses offered for graduate credit?	26%	61%	13%
3. Would you object to other instructors in your department using intermediate grades even though you elect not to use them?	36%	58%	6%*
4. Would you object to other departments or colleges of the University using intermediate grades even though your department or college elects not to use them?	34%	60%	6%**
5. On balance, are you in favor of establishing the intermediate grades of B+, C+, and D+ at the University of Arizona?	35%	61%	4%

\* Of those answering "No" to either part or both parts of question 2, 48% answered "Yes" to this question, 47% answered "No", and 5% had no opinion.

\*\* Of those answering "No" to either part or both parts of question 2, 45% answered "Yes" to this question, 49% answered "No", and 6% had no opinion.

---

Number of Questionnaires Sent Out - 2,021  
Number of Questionnaires Returned - 1,248  
Percent Returned - 62%

Mr. Myers also referred to the dissenting opinion of a member of the committee, Professor Ray Jay Davis as follows:

DISSENTING OPINION OF PROFESSOR RAY JAY DAVIS

I disagree with the recommendations of the other members of the committee. There is a demonstrated need for intermediate grades in the College of Law. The University has no valid reason for denying the Law College the right to follow such a system. The formal grading system of the remainder of the University will in no way be affected by use of intermediate grades in the Law School. For the most part law students do not take classes in other divisions of the University; other University students do not take classes at the Law School.

The final committee recommendation that the Law School continue its present system of unofficial intermediate grades is impractical. This involves the cost and confusion of keeping two separate sets of records. It is unfair to students not to count in their averages the intermediate higher grades that the unofficial records indicate they have earned. It is unfair to other students to treat them the same as persons shown by the unofficial records to have earned a half grade lower.

I would recommend that the Faculty Senate establish in the College of Law the official intermediate grades of B+, C+, and D+ and that the point values be established in that college for letter grades as follows:

A = 4  
B+ = 3.5  
B = 3  
C+ = 2.5  
C = 2  
D+ = 1.5  
D = 1  
F = 0

I would further recommend that those other divisions of the University where intermediate grades apparently are not now desired be permitted to have a formal system of grading as is suggested by the other members of the committee.

Professor Ray Jay Davis

Dean Ares commented that it was obvious that if a substantial portion of the faculty did not want the University to adopt intermediate grades as part of its general grading system, the law faculty would not force these on them. On the other hand, he said he did not see why the faculty of a particular college should be deprived of the opportunity to use these grades if they wanted to. So far as the reference in the report to keeping intermediate grades internally by means of unofficial records was concerned, he thought this would not be satisfactory. If a practice is bad if followed officially, why should it be permitted unofficially? Further he did not want to face the job of keeping two sets of books in his office, he said. Dean Ares then moved that any college of the University should be authorized to use intermediate grades of B+, C+, or D+ if the majority of the faculty of that college wished to do so. His motion was seconded.

Mr. Windsor referred to the comment in Dr. Davis' dissenting opinion that indicated other University students do not take classes at the Law School. Mr. Windsor pointed out that law courses are now open to qualified students in other divisions of the University, particularly in the Graduate College. Law courses can carry graduate credit and under certain circumstances, law courses may be applied toward an advanced degree. Dr. Davis said that he had intended that the word "generally" be included before the statement cited. Dean Ares said that Mr. Windsor's point was well taken. However, he pointed out that law students likewise are now permitted to carry work on the graduate or undergraduate level in other divisions of the University outside the Law School and apply up to six credits toward a law degree.

Mr. Windsor was then asked by Dr. Burton to comment on Dean Ares' proposal. Mr. Windsor said he had several points to make. When the report of the committee with the accompanying dissenting opinion had been received, members of his staff had investigated the feasibility of keeping separate records manually by hand for law students. It had been concluded, however, that this was not feasible. The matter had then been investigated of how complicated it would be to program a separate grading system for the College of Law using intermediate grades. It was concluded that it would be just as difficult, take just as long a time to program, and cost just as much as to develop a system involving intermediate grades for the entire University. He pointed out that his office had been asked to check to see how common intermediate grades are currently being used by other institutions. Many catalogs had been reviewed and many transcripts inspected, and while Mr. Windsor was not acquainted with the practice of other law schools, so far as general grading systems in undergraduate colleges are concerned, the only school now using an intermediate grading system that could be identified was St. Olaf College. Mr. Windsor pointed out that it would probably be at least two years before the University could convert to the A, B, C, D, F grading system generally because of problems in computer programming, etc. The cost would be approximately \$30,000 and funding for this has not yet been obtained. To add the variation of intermediate grades into the development of the new program--and it would not be feasible to develop the two programs separately--would require not only further time, but additional expense. In conclusion Mr. Windsor said that he was not a professor of law, but although he had discussed this matter at some length with Dean Ares, he still failed to see how law was so different a teaching discipline that a different grading system from that satisfactory for the rest of the University is needed. If we start authorizing different grading systems for different divisions, where might this end? Might not the College of Medicine want its own method, and then perhaps Pharmacy, and then Architecture, and then Nursing? A common grading system for the entire University seems much more desirable, he felt.

Professor Tomizuka commented that he thought the questionnaire that had been circulated among the faculty contained certain biases because of the way certain questions were worded and this might have affected the results. Mr. Myers said that the format of the questionnaire, the determination of what questions would be included and the wording of them had been agreed to by the full committee.

Dr. Skinner said he felt that the University should operate by majority action and that the Senate should be governed by the action of the majority of the ad hoc committee.

The question was called for and the vote on the amendment, to permit individual colleges where the faculties wished to do so, to adopt a grading system involving intermediate grades, was defeated. The vote was then called for on the motion to accept the majority report of Mr. Myers' committee which would rescind the earlier Senate action of establishing intermediate grades, and provide grades of A to F with point values as follows:

A = 4  
B = 3  
C = 2  
D = 1  
F = 0

This motion then carried with a few dissenting votes heard.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David L. Windsor, Secretary