

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, February 7, 1977 Kiva, Room 211 College of Education

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3 p.m. on Monday, February 7, 1977, in the Kiva, Room 211 of the College of Education. Seventy-seven members were present with President Schaefer presiding.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Atwater, Bartlett, Blackwell, Boghosian, Briggs, Butler, Caldwell, Carr, Ceballos, Chin, Coxon, Davis, DeWalt, DuVal, Edwards, Federhar, Flores, Garcia, Gegenheimer, Gerhard, Graham, Hawkins, Hetrick, Hull, Hyland, Ingram, Inman, Kassander, Kneebone, LaBan, Laird, Lytle, Manes, Marchello, Matlock, McConnell, McCullough, Meredith, Mitchell, Munroe, Munsinger, Murphy, Myers, Nelson, Nigh, Odishaw, Paplanus, Peterson, Picchioni, Prosser, Rehm, Rhodes, Ridge, Rosenberg, Roubicek, Rush, Rusk, Schaefer, Seibert, Selke, Sigworth, Sivo, Smith, Stairs, Steelink, Sumner, Svob, Thompson, Townsend, Weaver, Webb, Wenders, Wiersma, Windsor, Witte, Woloshin, and Wrenn. Dr. Robert Sankey was present as parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Clark, Dresher, Fahey, Gaines, Heusinkveld, M. Johnson, R. Johnson, Lebowitz, Livermore, Manning, McMillan, Paulsen, Peacock, Rosenblatt, Sorensen, Tomizuka, and Vanselow.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of January 17, 1977 were approved as distributed.

REPORTS FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY, THE SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY, THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY, AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE ASSOCIATED STUDENTS: President Schaefer reviewed for the Senate his appearance before Arizona legislative committees on February 4 in Phoenix defending the University of Arizona's budget request for 1977-78. Dr. Schaefer said he felt the five hours of discussion had been very worthwhile, reports in the press concerning the "rough time" some legislators had given him notwithstanding. He had felt very little hostility on the part of the legislators, he said. Many of the questions were probing ones. Legislators are interested in how well prepared are the students the University is receiving. There is widespread concern about the quality of secondary education in Arizona. The President said he welcomed opportunities like legislative hearings which make it possible for him to interpret to key government leaders what the extensive contributions of the University are to the entire state of Arizona.

The President said he had been asked by some legislators to explain why the University was requesting an increase in its budget for 1977-78 when enrollment had dropped in 1976-77 below that of 1975-76. While a total budget increase of 10% is planned, the President explained, the University is asking for a 14% increase in state-appropriated funds. The University will have no contingency reserve left by the end of 1976-77, the President explained. The U of A's headcount in the fall of 1976 had dropped below the fall of 1975 by 57 students, the President said, while the full-time equivalent count had dropped 441. Thus according to the Regents' student-faculty ratio, the University is over staffed about 20 faculty positions, the President said.

The point he had made with the legislators, Dr. Schaefer continued, was that many activities not directly related to enrollment must be staffed in a large complex institution like the University. For example, when a large new enterprise like the new University Library is opened, additional personnel must be employed. The new library requires not only additional library staff but additional maintenance personnel as well.

The President said that questions had been raised about converting the former main library building to a College of Law building. He said that he had had an opportunity to explain the reasons why this would be a poor move.

The President said he continues to feel optimistic about the University of Arizona's chances for receiving good support from the Legislature this year. While it is obvious that no new faculty positions can be authorized, the state is in an excellent financial position with tax receipts coming in very well. He said that he is hopeful that the University will receive good legislative support for its capital outlay requests as well as for its operating budget.

Dean Windsor, the Secretary of the Senate, then informed the body that the Senate Executive Committee shortly would be appointing members of the Senate Committee on University Planning. Seven members will be chosen, five from the elected membership of the Senate and two from the ex-officio group. He said the Executive Committee would appreciate receiving suggestion for membership on the University Planning Committee from the Senate members themselves. He asked that names be turned in to him or Dr. Steelink today or be mailed to either of them within a one-week period. All names will be submitted to the Committee on Committees for approval and then the Executive Committee will make its final selection. The Senate Committee on University Planning will be asked to develop a list of long-range objectives, establish priorities after consulting with representatives of various elements of the University in studying previously developed material, and will then focus on particular goals and make specific recommendations.

Dr. Steelink next presented his report as Chairman of the Faculty. Dr. Steelink's report was as follows:

"The 1977 faculty elections are now underway. One of the offices to be filled this year is that of the Chairman of the Faculty. I will not stand for re-election for this office.

"As Chairman of the UA Faculty, I have had three rewarding years and have received the generous support of the faculty. However two considerations have prompted me to step down.

"1. There should be a periodic turnover of office holders. No elected office should become a sinecure. The constant demands on the Chairman of the Faculty eventually cool his ardor as an advocate for the faculty and dull his sensitivity to individual problems. In time, he becomes reasonable and charitable.

"2. There is no released time for the Chairman of the Faculty from his departmental duties. As a result he may neglect his teaching

and research, or his duties as Chairman. The most persistent demand on his time is listening to the problems and complaints of his constituents. This role of ombudsman is vital, but it takes its toll in time and emotional energy.

"The Faculty Senate should seriously consider recommending released time for future Faculty Chairmen. One mechanism to achieve this goal would be to provide financial assistance to the department. In this way the department could find a replacement without burdening other faculty members.

"I would also like to report a balance sheet of the achievements and disappointments of my office during the past three years. Of course these can only be measured by comparison to my original self-imposed goals announced in June 1974. The office of Chairman of the Faculty has no job descriptions; its scope is defined by the office holder. I have chosen to make it a very visible and aggressive advocate for faculty governance and initiative and for increasing economic benefits.

"A. Disappointments and Unfinished Business

1. College of Medicine Controversy. In June 1975 I appointed a committee to try to resolve this controversy. The committee was unable to find a solution after considerable time and effort. Now, two years later, the controversy has been narrowed and focused on a dismissal proceeding against a tenured faculty member. Dismissal of a tenured faculty member can only create grave concern in the academic community. These proceedings will only be destructive to all parties involved.
2. Faculty Constitution. Three years ago I promised to do my best to obtain passage and ratification of the Faculty Constitution. A good constitution passed the Senate, the General Faculty, and a preliminary review by the Regents Policy Committee. But no agreement has yet been reached in my negotiations with the Regents on the final draft. In my remaining months I will try to push this matter again.

"B. Achievements

1. Secretarial Support. A half-time secretary was provided for the Faculty Chairman and Committee of Eleven for the past year. I assume this position will continue. We are indebted to President Schaefer for this support.
2. Reorganization of the Faculty Senate. The Senate has adopted a number of my suggestions to make its deliberations more organized and rational. I am particularly pleased to have the Senate officially involved in University planning.

3. Legislative Activity. The Faculty Chairman and a number of faculty have participated in meetings with legislators. The focus of most of these contacts has been on legislation to improve fringe benefits, particularly retirement benefits. The general faculty has responded very well to my appeals for funds and help for this activity.
4. Arizona Universities Faculty Council. This group, comprised of representatives of the three Arizona University faculties, has become a viable force for representing faculty views to the public and for mutual exchange of ideas and problems. It sponsored a very successful luncheon meeting and workshop with Arizona legislators last January 21, 1977 in Phoenix.
5. CAPT. The Committee on Academic Privilege and Tenure has been changed from an appointed body to an elected body.
6. Committee on Committees. At my suggestion, this committee has instituted an annual survey of the general faculty to solicit faculty preferences for one or more of the 100 committees on campus. This has broadened the base of faculty participation.
7. Kitchen Cabinet. My original intent was to provide the President with a faculty sounding board, analogous to his Advisory Council of top administrators. The cabinet of 20 faculty has met irregularly and is still seeking to define its role and scope.
8. Ombudsman. Although the office of the Chairman of the Faculty is mainly a listening and counseling post, it has been able to guide some people to successful solution to their problems.

"I will continue to work on important legislative matters during the spring of 1977 with a reasonable hope for success for fringe benefit improvements."

Dr. Steelink concluded his remarks by announcing that legislation would shortly be introduced in the Arizona House which would improve retirement benefits for Arizona public employes. He said particular thanks for their work in support of this particular legislation were due Dr. Nestor Roos and Dr. Donald Myers.

Dr. Steelink received a heavy round of applause following his remarks.

The President next introduced Patrick Mitchell, President of the Associated Students. Mr. Mitchell reported that the Arizona Students Association, the lobbying arm of the student governments at the three Arizona universities, had recently met with the Board of Regents Policy Committee. He was hopeful

that this meeting would result in the Regents considering modifying the practices followed in late years at the three Arizona universities concerning students' control of the expenditure of student fees and other student-generated income. He was hopeful that the students would be granted more voice in how student-generated income is expended. He said the Associated Students of the University of Arizona had endorsed Senate ratification of the Governor's appointment of Mr. John Molloy of Tucson as a member of the Arizona Board of Regents. He said that a bill would soon be introduced by Senator Sue Dye in the Arizona Legislature which would place a student member on the Arizona Board of Regents. He said that student government would continue to work for the authorization of a street overpass over Speedway Blvd. at Olive Road adjacent to the University campus. He said the leadership of ASUA would be glad to assist in any way possible in the faculty's efforts to spur final action by the Arizona Board of Regents approving the new U of A Faculty Constitution. He announced that ASUA elections would be held during the first two weeks of March.

APPROVAL OF CATALOG MATERIAL AS REPORTED IN CURRICULUM BULLETIN: The Senate approved catalog material as furnished Senate members in "Curriculum" bulletin Vol. 6, No. 8 (issue date of February 9, 1977). In response to a question from Dean Hull, upon consultation with Dr. William Noyes, Coordinator of Curricular Matters, who was in the gallery, the President said it was understood that the description of the proposed new course Physics 8, Introductory Acoustics, which includes in the course description the words "speech and hearing", would be subject to agreement between Dr. Carl Tomizuka, Head of the Department of Physics and Dr. Paul Skinner, Head of the Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences. In answer to a question from Dean Rhodes, Dr. Noyes acknowledged that the proposed new American-Indian Studies course 203a-203b, Elementary Navajo Language, would carry a course number of 103a-103b rather than 203a-203b.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE ELECTION OF NOMINEES FOR UNIVERSITY TRIAL BOARD, UNIVERSITY REVIEW AND ADVISORY BOARD, AND UNIVERSITY CONDUCT BOARD: Dr. Steelink announced that the election of nominees for the University Trial Board, the University Review and Advisory Board, and the University Conduct Board would be conducted by mail ballot shortly. The Committee on Committees had recently completed its review of faculty personnel and submitted to the secretary the necessary list of names for the several ballots.

PROPOSED REVISIONS IN THE GRADING SYSTEM: The President recognized Dr. Gerald Peterson, Chairman of the Undergraduate Council's subcommittee on the grading system. Dr. Peterson said that since the Senate's recent review of the proposed new grading system (see December 6 Senate minutes) a number of suggestions about the proposals had been received from members of the faculty. The committee was now proposing a few slight changes from its original proposal. The committee had developed a revised report indicating precisely how the new grading system would be described in the catalog. The report included a description of the grading system itself, a section on changes of schedule, a section on the averaging of grades, a section on incomplete grades, a section on withdrawal grades, and a section on absences, and a proposed change in the Faculty Manual statement on withdrawals from courses. Senate members in advance of the meeting had been provided the report giving comparative statements of the present catalog wording and the proposed wording on all these items.

Dr. Peterson explained that the committee now was recommending that a

grade of R be introduced, to be awarded in 400 level courses, to indicate that the work was still in progress at the termination of a term. He noted that in fact some other symbol would be used by the Registrar for this purpose since an R is already used for another purpose, namely to designate an off-campus residence offering. The committee was also recommending that the final date for withdrawal from class with a grade of W, with the permission of the instructor and the dean, be changed from the final day of class, as proposed in December for undergraduate students, to the last day of the tenth week in which classes are offered. This modification returns the W to its present limitation. Students could still receive a W after the last day of the tenth week, but only for an extraordinary reason. The subcommittee was further recommending that instead of an I being literally changed to an E after one year, if it had not been removed, the I be counted as an E in the grade average from that point on but that the posted I remain showing on the record.

Dr. Peterson reminded the Senate again that courses dropped during the first four weeks of the course would not appear on the student's record at all. He said the power controlling what may be done after the tenth week will, as now, lie in the dean's office. Of course some instructors may tell a student that they are willing to award a W after the tenth week but ~~the~~ the dean won't approve it. The student then may go to the dean's office and be told that the dean's signature would be available but instructors are not willing to give a W so late in the term. Dr. Peterson said he understood that the associate deans group have said that they would give this matter particular attention in an effort to develop a reasonable, consistent, campus-wide policy. There probably will be some "tightening up". Perhaps the Undergraduate Council, working with the associate deans, can develop some campus-wide guidelines, he said.

Dr. Peterson pointed out that the same prohibition against dropping a course, after the tenth week, except for extraordinary reasons would apply to changes in registration from credit to no credit (audit).

Dr. Peterson said he was aware that some persons would say that it was punitive use of the grade of E to change an I to an E after one year. Dr. Peterson said it would be punitive only if the I had not been appropriately given in the first place. An I should be awarded only at the end of a semester when all but a minor portion of the course work has been satisfactorily completed. Under those circumstances a student should be expected to complete the remaining course requirements within a year. In an unusual situation, Dr. Peterson noted, the student would have recourse to appropriate administrative procedures, for instance, a petition.

Dr. Peterson referred to the proposed new catalog statement discussing the withdrawal grade of W. He said it was deliberately worded as it was. The present catalog statement is somewhat hazy. He said the question had been asked whether or not a student could still be dropped administratively for excessive absences and the answer was yes, with a grade of E.

Dean Svob said that in the proposed paragraph headed Change of Schedule which includes the wording "Changes in an original registration by additions or withdrawals must be initiated by the student...." the meaning would be clearer if some word other than "withdrawals" were used. The term "withdrawal" is more commonly thought of as referring to complete withdrawal from the institution. What is referred to here is only dropping from a single course. Dr. Peterson said he

wondered what better word could be used than "withdrawal". An effort would be made to improve this statement.

Dr. Hetrick asked if it would be possible for a student to process a complete withdrawal after the tenth week and the answer was yes, this would be allowed.

Then Mr. Webb, saying he did so in order to get the matter before the Senate for formal consideration, moved adoption of the proposed new grading system. Several seconds were heard.

Referring to the proposed new Faculty Manual statement concerning withdrawals from courses, Dr. Hawkins asked why it was provided that "it is imperative that instructors inform their classes, in writing, of their withdrawal policies at the earliest possible time". Dr. Peterson said this was proposed for one reason to help protect the faculty member in case of legal action. Certain cases are well known on this campus at present, he said, where suit has been filed because, it is alleged, faculty members failed adequately to inform their students of requirements in their courses. Mr. Mitchell said it is best that students be informed in writing of their professors' various policies, particularly if the new procedure allows great discretion among faculty members as to their policy on the awarding of W's. A student should be informed of what his or her respective faculty member's practice on this matter will be.

Dean Hull said that the relevant dates on this matter would be published in the University calendar, the University catalog, and in the Schedule of Hours booklet. Shouldn't these suffice? He also asked why the tenth week had been selected as the delimiting period, after which courses could be dropped only for extraordinary reasons. Dr. Peterson explained that it had been felt that a certain amount of time should be allowed for a student to make adjustments in his or her program after the midsemester delinquent scholarship report had been published.

Dr. Gegenheimer said he was distressed to note that a student even though doing passing work could be refused the right to drop a course with a W, after the fourth week. This could result in discrimination, he felt. In a multi-sectioned course some instructors might have policies different from those of other instructors teaching the same course. If the student is passing he should be entitled to a W if he drops the course, he said. Some faculty members see their job as being to teach. Others seem to see their job as being to flunk as many students as possible. Dr. Peterson said that the committee was aware there were strong differences of opinion on this matter. It is true that some faculty members feel, "Once you're in my course I'm not going to let you out, no matter what."

Dr. Schaefer asked that anybody wishing to offer amendments to any of the provisions before the house submit them in writing.

Mr. Federhar said it seemed to him the basic tenor of the report was to make it more difficult to withdraw from courses at the University of Arizona than anywhere else in the United States. Because there has been grade inflation at this University and because the grades of N and W have been misused, it apparently is felt now that extreme corrective action must be taken. He said he feared the result would be that University of Arizona students would be put

at a disadvantage when compared with students attending other colleges and universities that are not developing such strict policies. Our students then will be penalized when they are compared with students who are able to drop courses more easily at other institutions. From the point of view of the students, he said, he thought the proposed procedures were extremely arbitrary.

Dr. Rosenberg said he would like to speak briefly to the Senate on behalf of Dean Rosenblatt who could not be present. He reported that a survey had been conducted of the faculty of the College of Liberal Arts. The response has been gratifying. 90% of the Liberal Arts faculty responding favored a ten-week limitation on the period during which a student could routinely drop a course, without extraordinary reason. For the most part the Liberal Arts faculty were in favor of all the proposed changes, Dr. Rosenberg said. He said he personally felt that to change an I to an E after a year would be a punitive measure. In 1977 the student's performance was of a passing nature entitling him or her to an I. In 1978, nothing having changed, the work would no longer be considered to be of passing level but of failing level. He thought it would be better after a year to change the I that had not been removed to an O. There could be a number of valid reasons, he said, why a student might not have removed a grade of incomplete during the one-year interval.

Dr. Gegenheimer then moved that the words "the awarding of a W grade is entirely at the discretion of the course instructor" be deleted from the proposal. Dr. Bartlett seconded the motion. Dr. Peterson said that with those words deleted we are left only with the present wording and this has proved to be completely unsatisfactory. It is at the instructor's discretion now but it isn't properly expressed in the catalog. "Please don't leave the present wording," he said. Dr. Ingram spoke in favor of leaving the matter up to the faculty member. It is reasonable to leave it in the hands of the instructor, she said, so long as the student is made aware of the policy. She gave as an example the situation in a political science course where students are assigned particular roles. Perhaps a student is assigned the role of a United States senator. If he or she later is permitted to drop from the course the entire course project can be destroyed.

Dr. Rosenberg noted that the faculty would soon find itself grouped in two categories, those who give W's readily and those who are very tough and rarely assign W's. Students pretty soon will be picking their courses according to which sort of faculty member teaches them, he felt. This can be a particular problem in multisectioned courses.

Dr. Gegenheimer said he would like to modify his original motion, hoping to accomplish the same thing. In the paragraph titled "Withdrawal Grade" he proposed to change the word "may" in the first sentence to "will". The sentence then would read, "The grade of W will be awarded between the end of the fourth week and the end of the tenth week of classes, to students who are doing passing work at the time of withdrawal." The second sentence of the paragraph would then be deleted, he said. Dr. Gegenheimer's seconder, Dr. Bartlett, approved this change. Dr. Gegenheimer was asked if it was his intent that the student's college dean's signature would still be required and Dr. Gegenheimer said yes. Dr. Hawkins pointed out that if this amendment passed he assumed that the final sentence of the proposed revision of Section 3.19 of the Faculty Manual concerning withdrawal from courses, requiring faculty members to inform their classes in writing of their withdrawal policies, would be deleted also. He was informed that this would be so.

Mr. Ceballos said there were many reasons why students withdraw from a course. Frequently they find that they are simply in the wrong course. He felt the student should be guaranteed an automatic W any time up to the end of the tenth week of classes.

The question was called for on Dr. Gegenheimer's amendment and it carried.

Dr. Garcia said he would like to object to the definition of a C as "Fair". "Average" is a much better definition of a C grade, he said. The word "fair" has connotations which make it an inappropriate definition of the C grade, he said.

Dr. Garcia then moved that the proposed new definition for the grade of C or "Fair" be changed to "Average", the definition of that grade at present. He said he had no objection to changing the definition of A from "Superior" to "Excellent" or of B from "Above Average" to "Good" or of D from "Below Average" to "Poor", but he did think "Fair" was a poor definition of a C. Dean Rhodes said he thought the use of the word "average" would be misleading. There has been considerable dissatisfaction with that definition in the past. "Average" implies a quantitative specificity; yet it is not the average grade in the class. Dr. Bartlett spoke in support of Dean Rhodes' comment. Dr. Hetrick asked Dr. Garcia what he meant by "average"---the average grade of all students in a given course, the average level for the entire University, or what? Dr. Garcia said a C is a respectable grade. The word "fair" implies to some people something that is not so respectable.

Mr. Federhar said he thought in the minds of many people a C did mean average. Dr. Gegenheimer commented that at one time in Ivy League schools a C was considered a gentleman's grade. He supposed now this would have to be defined as a lady's and gentleman's grade.

Mr. Webb said he didn't think of a C in terms of fair or average. Rather, the C gave him two points in his grade index. He called for the question. The motion lost. The definition of C as "Fair" was retained, as recommended by the committee.

Dr. Thompson moved that at the end of the fourth paragraph of the section headed Change of Schedule the following words be added, "...or the Dean of Students (in the case of students completely withdrawing from the University)." Several seconds to Dr. Thompson's motion were heard. The motion carried.

Mr. Ceballos then moved that any student dropping a course before the end of the tenth week of classes automatically be granted a grade of W. Several seconds were heard. Mr. Sivo said that sometimes students are given their first test in a course in the sixth week and after they know the results of that test perhaps a week or so later, they may decide that they want out of that course. He thought an automatic W should be available through the tenth week of classes. He said he was speaking in support of Mr. Ceballos' motion. The question on the motion was called for and it failed by one vote.

Mr. Webb moved that the first sentence under the paragraph headed Withdrawal Grade be replaced by the following: "The grade of W may be awarded

until the final day of classes to students who are doing passing work at the time of withdrawal." Several seconds were heard. Dean Rhodes asked Mr. Webb if he meant that a passing student could receive a grade of W, with the approval of the student's college dean in the case of undergraduates or of the Graduate Council in the case of a graduate student. Mr. Webb responded that such approval would no longer be required. Dean Rhodes then said he wished vigorously to oppose the motion.

Mr. Ceballos asked, "Does the faculty believe it is better to force the student, who finds late in the semester that he is not doing well in a course, to take a C or a D rather than to be able to get out of the course? What if the student really feels he or she wants better attainment than a C or a D?" Several senators replied that student can take a course over. Both grades then go in the average. Dean Rhodes reminded the Senate that a very large proportion of the faculty had indicated that they wanted a ten-week limit on the privilege of dropping a course.

Dr. Atwater pointed out that if this amendment were approved we would be right back where we are with the grade of N. Dr. Peterson supported Dr. Atwater's remarks. This would lead to a no-fail grading system, he said. This would be moving against the trend in the country. Most institutions who a few years ago moved in the direction of a no-fail grading system are now moving away from such practice.

Mr. Webb pointed out that under his motion only a student who was doing passing work would be entitled to receive a W up to the last day of class. "Is the purpose of a university to provide education, or to fail students?", he asked. Frequently very special circumstances come up late in the semester and a student should be able to drop a course to save his grade average. Dean Rhodes said that special circumstances that are truly mitigating ones are taken into account now and are provided for under the provision that for extraordinary reason a student can be allowed to drop a course after the ten-week limit.

Dean Hull said that we owe the student the opportunity to fail. We should respect our students enough to give them rules to live by, he said.

Mr. Federhar said he wondered if the regulations were being developed in the interest of "responsibility to students" and on the basis of sound educational policy, or rather to develop some administrative rules to make life easier for the faculty, that is, make it unnecessary for them to avoid making hard decisions. It had been said that some faculty just don't want to be mean, and therefore if the opportunity is open to them they will let a student out of a course in order to avoid the necessity of awarding a low mark. Is that why the new policy was being recommended?

Dr. Thompson said that everybody has a responsibility to systems as they exist. Students should have a responsibility to the University and its prevailing systems. If students can drop a course right up to the end of a semester, then they have been given no responsibility for maintaining their course program. Maybe he was advocating a puritan ethic, he said, but at times he thinks this is in order within a university.

The question was called for on Mr. Webb's motion and it lost.

Dr. Woloshin moved that the fifth sentence of the section headed Incomplete Grades be revised to read, "If the incomplete is not removed by the instructor within one year, the "I" grade will remain permanently on the student's record and will not be counted in the grade point average." References in the sentence to pass/fail courses would be deleted. Several seconds to his motion were heard. Dr. Peterson pointed out that we then would have exactly what we have now. Dr. Woloshin said he wanted to take the punitive tone away from the recommended procedure. "To make the institution supposedly look good and to deflate grading, we are taking these measures", he said. "We should be spending our time in studying how to teach better. We should not punish the student for not finishing a course in which he has been given a grade of I," he said.

Dr. LaBan then moved the following as a substitute to Dr. Woloshin's motion: "An I for incomplete shall be awarded to those students who do not complete all requirements for the course. Students receiving an I who were failing at the time are required to make up the incomplete, by doing passing work, in one year. If the incomplete is not erased within that time the grade becomes an E. Those students receiving an I who were passing at the time have the same year to make up the I. If this is not done the I then becomes a W." Several seconds to Dr. LaBan's motion were heard.

Dr. LaBan explained that until a few years ago the University had an incomplete/failing grade of 6 which if not removed within a year became a failure (5), and a passing/incomplete grade of 7 which if not removed within a year became an 8 (passing/withdrawal). Dean Rhodes said it sounded to him that Dr. LaBan was proposing grades like I/P which at the end of a year if not removed would become a W and I/E which if not removed within a year would become an E. Dr. Woloshin said he would accept Dr. LaBan's substitute motion, as did his seconders.

Dr. Gegenheimer asked who under the proposal recommended by the Undergraduate Council was going to jog the instructor at the end of the year's time to remind him or her that if an incomplete is going to be removed now is the time to do it; otherwise the grade will revert to an E. Dr. Peterson said he thought perhaps the Registrar's Office could build such a reminding procedure into an automatic system.

Mr. Mitchell supported Dr. LaBan's proposal. The overall tone of the Undergraduate Council's recommendation, Mr. Mitchell said, was anti-student. He thought Dr. LaBan's proposal was at least one improvement.

Dr. Rosenberg asked if the language in the first sentence of the proposed statement on Incomplete Grades reading, ".....when all but a minor portion of the course work has been satisfactorily completed" meant passing work. Dr. Peterson and others said that "satisfactorily completed" indeed did mean passing work.

Registrar Butler spoke against the proposal. He said that the faculty had deleted the former grade of 6 as distinct from the former grade of 7 years ago because use of an incomplete/failing grade as distinct from an incomplete/passing mark had been so widely misunderstood. Also, he said, two kinds of incomplete might lead to a double standard. Further, as long as any I is available which can revert to a passing permanent mark of any sort it will result in our having the identical problems we have at present with the grade of N. Dr. Thompson said he would like to support the proposal concerning incomplete grades as developed and presented by the

Undergraduate Council. He said the remark had been made that this would be a punitive procedure. It would be punitive only in those cases where someone had improperly awarded an I in the first place.

Dr. Inman said she would like to answer the charge that the tenor of the overall report was anti-student. "It is not anti-student", she said. "It is an entirely respectable proposal and means that grades on transcripts can be meaningful and significant for students seeking entry into professional schools and for those seeking employment." She said the comment had been made today that students had abused the present system. For example, an excessive number of grades of N had been awarded. "These grades are not awarded by students", she pointed out. "They have been awarded by faculty and approved by deans."

The vote on Dr. LaBan's motion was called for and the motion lost.

The President next presented a motion by Dr. Inman that if a student who is failing wishes to withdraw from a course between the fifth and tenth week the instructor may have the option of awarding the W. Dr. Inman explained that she had sent the motion forward some time earlier in the meeting and she now wished to withdraw it.

Dr. Bartlett moved that the grades of E and F be interchanged, F becoming a failing grade that is calculated in the cumulative grade average and E becoming the failing grade that is not. E would be used for the grade in pass/fail situations, for example. Dr. Peterson suggested that this matter not be raised at this time. The whole question of pass/fail is another big issue that probably does merit faculty consideration but as a separate matter. He advised against changing the grades involved in the pass/fail system so long as there is a chance that in a year or two the pass/fail system might be dropped. If it should be retained then attention could be given to changing the grades, he said. Dr. Bartlett withdrew his motion.

Dr. Schaefer next read a motion by Dr. Rosenberg to revise the fifth sentence of the section headed Incomplete Grades to read as follows: "If the incomplete is not removed by the instructor within one year, an I grade will remain permanently on the student's record and will be counted as an O in the grade point average." Dr. Rosenberg said he had sent the motion forward earlier and now wished to withdraw it.

Mr. Webb said he would like to amend the proposed catalog statement on Absences. He moved that the first sentence of the paragraph now beginning with the words "Excessive absences" be revised to two sentences reading, "The instructor's absence policy will be stated during the first day of classes and included in the written syllabus given to the student. Excessive absences will be reported by the instructor to the Dean of Students." Several seconds to Mr. Webb's motion were heard. Dr. Sigworth pointed out that many classes do not have a syllabus. Mr. Webb said he felt students should be informed what an instructor's absence policy is in some written form.

Dr. Murphy said he thought the point raised by Dr. Sigworth was a "red herring". All that ~~was~~ being recommended, he said, was that every instructor provide all of his or her students a written statement of his or her class requirements, including the particular absence policy.

Dr. Bartlett said he lamented the endless cranking of mimeograph machines on the University campus.

Mr. Webb said that the point was that course rules and procedures--for instance, information about the absence policy--might be announced on the first day of classes. Students registering in the course late may never know what the rules are if they are not later provided in writing. Dr. Woloshin said that remarks had been made today about the responsibility of students. Students coming into a class late have the responsibility on their own to find out what information has been passed out prior to their joining the class.

Mr. Mitchell urged that every instructor provide his or her students with his or her requirements in writing.

Dr. Sigworth then proposed a substitute motion to Mr. Webb's motion. The sentence proposed by Dr. Sigworth would read, "The instructor will provide his or her students a written statement of his or her policy in respect to absences." This would be added at the end of the first paragraph under the catalog statement on Absences. Mr. Webb accepted Dr. Sigworth's substitute motion, as did his seconders.

Dr. Rosenberg commented that instructors who have a very lenient absence policy will be hesitant to publish this in writing.

A vote on Dr. Sigworth's substitute motion was called for and it carried 28 to 27.

Dr. Gegenheimer then moved to close debate and proceed to the question. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Federhar challenged Dr. Gegenheimer's motion, arguing that debate should be allowed to continue. He said he sensed that with the approach of five o'clock there was an eagerness to cease debate and get the matter disposed of. He felt there was much more still to be said about the proposed new grading system. Dr. Steelink asked if the publication deadline was so close that additional time could not be spent on this matter if the Senate wished. Dr. Noyes, who was still in the gallery, was asked to respond to Dr. Steelink's remark and said that the catalog deadline could still be satisfied so long as the proposed grading changes were disposed of at the March meeting of the Senate. Dr. Steelink pointed out that another alternative would be to call a special meeting of the Senate.

Mr. Federhar then moved that debate not be closed. Dr. Sankey, the parliamentarian, pointed out that a two-thirds vote would be necessary to carry Mr. Federhar's motion. The question on Mr. Federhar's motion was called for and the motion lost. The vote to close debate was then called for and that motion carried. The question on the original motion to approve the recommendations on the grading system as proposed by the Undergraduate Council, as amended at today's meeting, was then called for and the motion carried.

Dr. Schaefer asked the secretary to prepare a final, "cleaned-up" version of the new catalog statements concerning grading procedures and other matters included in the actions of today's meeting and to distribute this with the minutes of this meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5 p.m.

David L. Windsor

David L. Windsor, Secretary

David Butler

David Butler, Assistant Secretary

MOTIONS PASSED AT MEETING OF FEBRUARY 7, 1977:

1. Approval of Minutes of January 17, 1977.
2. Approval of "Curriculum" bulletin Vol. 6, No. 8.
3. Approval of revisions in the University grading system.

ACTION ITEMS PENDING:

1. Review of University policy which restricts higher administrative officers and certain faculty members from working for advanced degrees at this University (referred back to committee).
2. Review of University procedures concerning dishonest scholastic work.
3. Study of question of developing means of review of institution's administrators at the college and university level.
4. Development of Faculty Manual statement concerning the status of tenured personnel being released because of the lack of financial support, because of the curtailment or termination of a program, or because of a redirection of the goals of department.
5. Review of Television Station KUAT Policies.