REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

April 6, 1970

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 4:13 p.m., President Olson presiding. Senators not in attendance were:

James B. Heck	John P. McLaughlin	Robert W. Stegner
Joseph W. Hunt, Jr.	Peter W. Rees	Edward A. Trabant
Raanan Liebermann	Edward E. Schweizer	Peter M. Weil
	John W. Shirley	

I. REPORTS

A. Organization and Rules Committee

The President reported that the Executive Committee had met with Dr. Willard Baxter to go through the constitution and bylaws to make sure the intent of the framers of the document. As a result of this meeting, several points of clarification should be made, one of which is covered by the resolution submitted by Mr. Tingey.

Section IV, Article 9, states how the meeting of the Senate is to be constructed. First, let us consider the item of New Business. A part of each regular meeting must be set aside for New Business. Further, no motion introduced under New Business shall be acted upon until the next meeting of the Senate. This section is included to check the power of the Vice-President in the control of the agenda. The check is activated by senators inserting items on the agenda from the floor for consideration at the next meeting under Old Business. The Vice-President cannot delete the items from the next agenda. The chair will, at the beginning of the meeting, call for items of New Business to be inserted on the current agenda.

Another matter for consideration is the item of prior notification. The purpose of this item is to ensure that the deliberation of the Senate is known to the entire University Community in advance of the time they take place. Any item submitted to the Vice-President in advance of the publishing of the call for the meeting may appear as an item on the agenda which may be acted upon in that meeting. An example of this is the resolution to be presented today by Mr. Worthen.

The chair pointed out that minor modifications or amendments on submitted resolutions are in order, but extreme care should be exercised in offering

significant alterations which may change the intent of a resolution. This would destroy the intent of prior notification. If such a circumstance arises, the chair may suggest that the resolution or amendment be deferred to a later meeting.

Mr. Rees introduced a motion in the last meeting for a roll call voting procedure. After discussion with the Executive Committee, Mr. Rees agreed to the procedure that if an item is of sufficient import for a roll call vote, then one will be called for. This matter is to be settled at the time of the vote. The roll call vote should be used with discretion as it is very time consuming.

B. Committee on Committees

Mr. Kerner was called upon to report on the activities of this committee. He indicated that his committee had already met once. They call upon the faculty to submit comments to him on the committee structure for the University. He recommends that as a formal matter, all existing University committees report to the Senate at the regular May meeting. The committee is working on three matters, critically examining present committees, thoughts on new committees, and, finally, the preparation of a rough report to allow the faculty a reaction prior to the end of the semester.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Executive Committee has invited Mr. Rosenberry, Mr. Catts, Mr. Moody, and Mr. Pemberton to present their view on the Honors Program resolution now on the floor of the Senate.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The chair suggested dispensing with the reading of the minutes. There were no additions or corrections to the minutes of the meeting of March 16 and March 19. The minutes were approved as mailed.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Denn introduced an item to discuss the arrangements for the special meeting on April 7.

Mr. Moszynski introduced an item to discuss the new examination schedule, which makes it impossible to administer three-hour exams.

V. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted by motion by Mr. Salsbury, seconded by Mr. Brown.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (from meeting of General Faculty)

A. Student Honors

Motion by Mr. Williams, second Mr. Salsbury: RESOLVED, That the degree with high honors be determined by index alone, the specific level to be established by the Committee on Student Honors.

This item arose from the report of the Committee on Student Honors. It had been debated on the floor of the last faculty meeting and was near a vote when a call for the quorum was made.

Dr. Rosenberry presented his thoughts and various letters he has written on this question. His view is that the index should be the sole criterion for the award of the degree with high honors.

Mr. Williams discussed his resolution and then made a motion, second Mr. Salsbury. RESOLVED, That the Williams resolution be transmitted to the next General Faculty meeting for adoption.

Discussion:

Mr. Krum disagrees with the Williams resolution which also reflects the feelings of the Honors Committee. The current program has been conducted for many years, high Honors should be given not only on the basis of grades or index. This is not a new proposition, but has been under study for several years. A survey of eligible students (index 3.25 or higher) was made. Of 120 students contacted, 94 replied with 65 percent in favor of the present system and 34 percent preferring high honors based on index alone. Mr. Krum reviewed the procedure for nomination and examination of the candidates. He emphasized that index alone was not the sole criteria in that it does not measure the total educational experience at the University. The program in no way denies the student his index. Rather, it boosts the student on aspects outside of academic rank.

Mr. Rosenberry: The problem as I see it is fundamentally one of confusion between two desirable features of our academic program. Instruction on the one hand and certification on the other. Academic degree which University awards as an aspect of certification rather than instruction. This is a matter of record of what the student has achieved during four years in this school. Actually, fairness to the student is to be considered. The student who gets a 3.9 index has it, but the operation of the honors program is to deny the 3.9 high honors if that committee does not adjudge him a suitable recipient. Arbitrarily, a few people act as a committee judging a student for high degree of honor. 3.35 is more deserving of highest degree, yet a student with a considerably higher arithmetical index is denied such honor.

I have been sufficiently agitated about this question since the inception of our present honors program; horrified to find I have no less than six memoranda passed out over a period of two years on this subject. My feelings are strongly moved to read all six of these memorandum and unload on you completely.

He then read a paragraph from one of his earliest memorandum: "This certification has one function and one function only--to describe fairly and accurately the student's academic achievement. It is that simple. I am in favor of an index criteria. In the awarding of earned academic distinctions based upon index is a virtue rather than a defect. It is impersonal and therefore fair; it is standard and therefore universally understood."

Mr. Catts: I am at an advantage over all of you that have spoken to you so far. I have been privileged to sit in on the interviews of between 75 and 100 students who you as a faculty considered to be outstanding and qualified for the degree with high honors. In essence, although there have been great changes in the last five years in logistics, the selection is made essentially as Mr. Kerner described it and it was that way five years ago. I still have the privilege to act as a helper with the present honors committee although I am not a member and, as a footnote, think that Mr. Krum could use someone else's help.

Extra curricular, academic test scores, and index achieved by the student lead one to conclude that is is undesirable to give academic honors purely upon basis of grade. The present system is not without faults. By using grade index itself, this is what students have been fighting. I doubt if we have made many mistakes. People who had no connection with the University without exception have been complimentary to our system. You are really taking a big task in trying to evaluate students this way. Keep on doing it.

Mr. Crawford asked, "What sort of questions were asked in the interviews?" In reply it was stated that they write a statement of 600 words telling about their interests, what they want to do. We couch our questions from this statement. Rather, to try to put the student at ease and explore any area they want to.

A. J. DeArmond commented there is an implication that the IBM machine determined the grades. This is not the case in that the grades are assigned by 40 different instructors, not an IBM machine.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Catts said with regard to the statement from the fine report of Dr. Pemberton which he also took a look at. The points at the bottom of the page regarding discrepancy between grade index and performance on tests,

national tests, is in the context of variations between disciplines and between colleges. It is made clear in Figure 1 (Pemberton report). I think the statement of the motion is such that a resourceful committee on student honors, which we already have, can overcome this specific matter. Figure 1 shows that in the sciences and engineering we grade too hard compared to the test scores shown; in the humanities our grading is higher than the scores on national tests. However, the ingenious committee could handle this matter. The idea of fixing the exact level different for colleges or even disciplines could be handled still maintaining the index as the criteria for measuring ability.

The index, as has also been pointed out, is used widely. Hence, a degree with high honors is widely recognized as measuring performance on academic work of student, not on the final test. In the interests of currency, having an honor which is recognizable easily at other institutions on the basis of reflecting total interaction of the student with faculty, not an IBM number but a number reflecting total reaction of faculty--index is best.

Mr. Pemberton: This activity has nothing to do with my position in student counseling service. I have looked at this matter for some time. It runs contrary, against the main stream of education. Movement is toward educational deform rather than reform. Grades <u>are</u> <u>suspect</u> as a basis of evaluating students. They are suspect as an adequate basis. It appears that a university has systematically been discriminating against men who are self-directed rather than outer directed. If possible, don't conclude your debate today until I have had an opportunity to distribute the whole report to you.

I maintain that the grade point average does not describe fairly and accurately the student's academic competence. It does measure his achievement. The grademaking students should be related to each other but they are not the same thing. Hoey undertook a review of some 50 studies attempting to correlate grade-point index with after-college achievement. I have found no single study that showed any significant relationship with college achievement and outside achievement.

College graduates are selected for ability. Comparing institutions across the board, there are enormously varying standards. Grade-point average should not be correlated with competence. It should be obvious to all of you there is no critical difference between an A - B and an A and C. What are the ultimate human values? Educational Testing Service at Princeton believes

predictor of achieving Ph.D. is not the index but a test, examination. We reward one type of student only.

Mr. Glenn: I would like to suggest a compromise which would be that the students who receive certain very high index averages would automatically receive high honors; other students receiving somewhat lower indexes, grades, and having qualities that the committee has described, also be given a chance at those high honors. This is because I like to feel a hard working student who learns well what he is taught to learn deserves a certain amount of award. We know there are creative types.

Mr. Austin: We suggest Mr. Williams defer his motion until such time as the members of the Senate and other faculty have had an opportunity to study Dr. Pemberton's report.

Mr. Williams did not wish this type of action to be taken. The chair indicated there was an amendment to the Williams resolution. Motion to amend by Mr. Halio, second Mr. Moszynski. The amendment:

"That in exceptional circumstances, upon recommendation by the student's Department Chairman or by two (teaching) faculty members, a student with an index below the required minimum may be considered by the Committee for the degree with high honors. Under no circumstances, however, shall the number of exceptions exceed by 10 percent the number of students receiving the degree with high honors by index alone."

The amendment would immediately follow the resolution by Dr. Williams instead of. . ."After honors. . ."but that in exceptional, etc.

Mr. Denn called for the question. The call was apparently disregarded by the chair.

A question was asked from the floor,"Are there many who have high indexes who have not received the degree?" Mr. Krum responded, "Thirty-five students were nominated for high honors and 28 of those students received high honors." He further remarked that "we have operated under a number of different systems, Department Chairmen, or Deans, to nominate students for the degree. We are now using this procedure. We changed the procedure because we were aware of the fact that Chairmen were not acting on the same basis. We asked the students to nominate themselves. Out of 130 having 3.25, 80 have nominated themselves. The colleges have screened these and interviews will be conducted for about 55 students in May.

Motion by Mr. Brown, second unknown: RESOLVED, That this particular resolution be postponed until the next Regular Faculty meeting. Passed.

Mr. Moszynski called upon the Senate to hesitate in postponing proposals which are on the agenda.

Motion by Mr. Tingey, second Mr. Glenn: RESOLVED, That the proposed Tingey amendment to the constitution be transmitted by the Senate to the next General Faculty meeting. Passed. No negative votes. This amendment and the rationale are included as attachments to the agenda for this meeting.

Motion by Mr. Osborne, second Mr. Nielsen: RESOLVED: That the Senate refer his proposal for amending the constitution to the next General Faculty meeting.

Discussion followed in which Mr. Kerner proposed an amendment, second by chorus: RESOLVED, That Section IV, Paragraph 11, read "Meetings of the Senate, excepting those designated in advance as "limited" meetings, shall be open to all members of the University Community as observers. Others may be invited to observe or to be heard in accordance with rules to be established by the Senate." Motion carried. Ayes 29 - Nays 13.

Motion by Mr. Wriston, second unknown: RESOLVED, That the Osborne amendment as amended be sent to the next General Faculty meeting. Passed Ayes 23, Nays 21, 2 Abstentions.

Motion by Mr. Halio, second unknown: RESOLVED, That the Senate requires a two-thirds majority vote as a temporary rule governing the vote for approval of resolutions. Motion defeated. Ayes 12, Nays 30.

Motion by Mr. Harlan, second Mr. Bonner to adjourn this meeting. Defeated. Yea 20, Nay 22.

Motion by Mr. Worthen, second by Mr. Granda: RESOLVED, That the University Faculty Senate approve the Revised Visitation Program Policy as recommended by the Faculty Residence Hall Committee March 27, 1970, a copy of which is attached to the April 6, 1970, agenda of the University Faculty Senate." Passed unanimously.

Mr. Moszynski voiced his opinion regarding the new examination schedule. In particular, it does not allow a faculty member to schedule a three-hour exam. Mr. Worthen suggested that we ask Dr. Mayer to explain the situation to the Senate or ask Dr. Mayer to poll the faculty with respect to three-hour examinations. The chair then suggested that we meet with Dr. Mayer in an unofficial meeting for those Senate members who are interested in this issue.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:46 p.m. on motion of Mr. Crawford, second Mr. Sasser.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry B. Tingey

Henry B. Tingey, Secretary