

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

May 16, 1986

MINUTES

The special meeting of the University Faculty Senate for the purpose of discussing the interim report prepared by the President's Commission on Undergraduate Education was called to order on Friday, May 16, 1986, at 4:00 p.m., with President Callahan presiding.

Senators Excused were: Lee Anderson, Joan Brown, Charles Ih, Mark Noll, Michael Pohlen, Nancy Schweda-Nicholson

Dean Frank Murray, co-chair of the President's Commission, opened the meeting with a brief statement, describing the interim report as a summary of the various subcommittees' of the Commission reports. He indicated that the goal of the Commission was to obtain reactions to the recommendations. In response to a question from Professor John Morgan, Dean Murray clarified a statement in the preface of the report regarding the use of the term "consensus" to describe the members of the Commission's degree of agreement with all of the recommendations. He noted that consensus meant that the recommendations had been discussed, that there had been no serious objection to them from the members, but that a formal vote on each the recommendation had not been taken.

Several questions focused on the "curriculum" section of the interim report.

Professor Kenneth Lomax expressed confusion regarding the specific number of credit hours to be required in each of the University's degree programs in the recommended areas of the humanities, the social sciences, and mathematics and the physical sciences and in writing, women's studies, Black American studies, public speaking and oral presentation, and health and wellness. He questioned whether or not the recommended 60 credit hours included all of the above identified areas or only the areas of the humanities, the social sciences, and mathematics and the physical sciences. Dean Murray's response indicated that the Commission is recommending that each degree program at the University should have at least 60 credit hours in a balanced distribution among the areas of the humanities, the social sciences, and mathematics and the physical sciences. In addition, the Commission is suggesting that there are some specific subject areas that should be included in each curriculum; these include: writing, women's studies, Black American studies, public speaking and oral presentation, and health and wellness. Each unit would determine whether or not these specific areas would be included within or in addition to the recommended 60 credit hours.

Professor David Ermann requested a rationale for the inclusion of women's studies, Black American studies, public speaking and oral presentation, and health and wellness. Dean Murray responded that (1) there are several people on the Commission who feel very strongly about each of these areas; (2) members of the Commission, including the student members, feel that "students are weak in their powers of expression, both written and oral" and, consequently, writing and public speaking and oral presentation experiences should be required of all students; and (3) members of the Commission feel that women's studies and Black

American studies are being neglected by a number of students, and if this neglect is to be rectified, then students must be required to investigate these areas. Dean Murray added that the Commission is not proposing that a women's studies course or a Black American course, as currently designated, must be taken to fulfill these requirements. He noted that there are many courses in the University which in their entirety or in their parts would fulfill the Commission's intentions.

President E. A. Trabant requested an explanation for the inclusion of the health and wellness area. Again Dean Murray indicated that some members of the Commission believe that an important part of the University's students development is being ignored if students are not provided with information on this topic.

Dean Helen Gouldner, speaking for the faculty of the College of Arts and Science, suggested the Commission was remiss in not considering the recent revisions of the College of Arts and Science general education requirements, revisions prepared after four years of study by a distinguished group of Arts and Science faculty. She suggested that these general education requirements should be evaluated to determine whether or not they are working before new courses are proposed.

Professor David Bellamy concurred with Dean Gouldner's comment and further noted that courses reflecting different groups' interests should not be put together with the result being a bachelor's degree. Dean Murray provided assurance that the courses were not a prescription for a degree, rather the Commission is suggesting that each degree have a balance of courses in the humanities, the social sciences, mathematics, and the physical sciences. A student should not leave the University without having studied these areas.

Dean Murray elaborated on the length of time needed to complete these requirements. He suggested that the Commission believes that these 60 hours could be completed within the typical four years. Programs in the College of Arts and Science would be least affected. Programs in the Colleges of Engineering, Physical Education, and Education the most affected.

Professor Henry Shipman questioned how completion of the 60 hours would be possible within four years. He suggested that 49 credits currently are required in the general education area in the College of Arts and Science. If this is expanded to 60 credits -- or more -- either the students lose electives or remain at the University for four to six years. Dean Murray responded that each credit taken as a part of each program would be examined for evidence of presentation of information in each of the identified general domains of knowledge. Additional courses or credits may not be required.

Professor Joan Del Fattore -- drawing from a memo prepared by Professor Mark Amsler, Chair of the Committee on General Education Evaluation, College of Arts and Science Senate, to support her contentions -- suggested that there was confusion in two areas. She questioned whether or not the subcommittee of the Commission that originated the general education recommendations prepared a report which was different from the interim report and whether or not this subcommittee would have interacted with Professor Amsler's committee. Dean Murray suggested that the interim report was not the subcommittee's report; the

interim report was an attempt to summarize a number of subcommittee reports. The subcommittee reports have not been distributed, however copies of these reports are available.

Professor John Burmeister reiterated a point made earlier by Dean Murray. He noted that the number of credits in the three areas viewed by the Commission as critical currently is greater than 60 in all College of Arts and Science degree programs. The problem is in such disciplines as engineering. For example, in one engineering discipline the number of credits, 71, in the arts and sciences is not a problem. Rather the problem is that 51 of these credits are in the math and science area. Senator Robert Dalrymple agreed noting that the implication of an additional 18 credit hours for engineering would be "catastrophic since the students only have 24 hours outside the college to choose in the general education area." He proposed that the Commission examine other ways of raising students' consciousness. Professor Dalrymple's specific concern is with the women's studies, Black American studies, public speaking and health and wellness areas.

Professor Anna De Armond, chair of the curriculum subcommittee supported Professor Burmeister's and Dean Murray's statements; "nothing [in her subcommittee's report] will significantly affect in any way the College of Arts and Science."

Professor Peter Rees disagreed. His totaling of credits in the required areas would increase the number of credits to more than 60.

Professor Ivar Stakgold reminded the Senate that the interim report was issued for discussion. His comments suggested that the Commission is continuing to discuss the 60 credits and the specific courses defined as appropriate within these credits. He noted that, to date, the Commission has agreed on three "general principles." These principles include: the University needs better students; there is a need for a more vigorous learning environment at the University; and certain social questions, having to do with American and world culture and society, were not handled properly at the University.

Professor Bertram Levin noted that to improve undergraduate instruction will cost. He indicated that "what that cost is, how is it to be allocated, what will be given up, and how that giving up process will be done, is generally unspecified." He expressed concern that should the University devote more of its resources to promoting high quality undergraduate education something will happen to "graduate education, or research efforts, or whatever." He proposed that the Commission must tell the faculty how the improvements are to be achieved and who or what will bear the consequences. Dean Murray referred Professor Levin to pages 7 and 8 of the interim report for the Commission's best estimate of the "practical impact of some of its recommendations." Professor Levin restressed his point that to make decisions the Senate or President or Board of Trustees will need to know the costs of the various new options in terms of what will have to be sacrificed. He expressed concern that while the cost of reducing class size is noted in the report what will receive less money is undefined. Dean Murray accepted Professor Levin's claim that "you don't do these things without costs."

Dean Eric Brucker's comments focused on the evaluation section of the report. He noted that the interim report discusses the importance of having some assessment of the entire undergraduate curriculum and experience. He asked, "Would you say that the Commission has undertaken such an assessment in the process of planning and looking forward to what our undergraduate program needs?" Dean Murray responded that such an assessment had occurred and the findings were in the various subcommittee reports. Dean Brucker suggested that the recommendations could be greatly helped if a summary of this information was included in the final report.

Professor John Morgan turned to the recommendation to increase faculty teaching loads to reduce class size as one means of enhancing the quality of education. He suggested adding more faculty and slightly reducing the number of students would be beneficial. Quality teaching and quality research must be maintained. Dean Murray indicated that the Commission agreed.

Professor Shipman calculated the increase in the total amount of teaching required to reduce the class sizes to the recommended levels. He suggested that approximately "256 sections of 100 and 200 level courses would need to be added. [This] would represent a 17% increase in the total amount of teaching" being done. This means that if teaching loads are to be kept constant, then 100 new faculty members would need to be hired. For physics, this would mean 15 new faculty. Provost L. Leon Campbell elaborated on this point using data prepared by Mr. Joseph DiMartile. He reported that "to get the class size between 31 and 60, would require 237 additional sections." If faculty were to continue to teach "at roughly the two courses per semester load -- 119 new faculty" would need to be hired. At the new hire assistant professor level, these new faculty would cost approximately four million dollars. These new faculty would need to be housed in a new office building. Provost Campbell continued "To get the additional sections required to reduce the class size to less than 30, would require 393 additional sections. Again assuming the same teaching load, that would require 196 new faculty," costing "6.9 million, assuming the average salary of an assistant professor."

Dean Murray suggested that it would be helpful for the Commission to receive reactions of a different kind to its proposals. The Commission's goal was to ascertain whether or not their general analysis was accurate and whether or not their ideas are good. If the ideas are good, then they should be pursued.

Professor Robert Brown suggested that perhaps the reduction in class size could be treated somewhat differently. He proposed that during the freshman year, a freshman student might be obliged to take one or two additional courses beyond the English and foreign language courses -- which have controlled class sizes -- which would be open to freshman only and would have writing and speaking components. This would permit every freshman to have some experiences in classes with small enrollments and not incur nearly the costs.

Dean Gouldner, speaking not only for herself but also for the College of Arts and Science Senate, strongly supported the Commission's recommendation to increase admission requirements.

Professor Louise Little registered her support that individual departments be permitted to determine how the specific area recommendations are incorporated into degrees and that the areas not be translated to mean "everybody taking a

course." Dean Murray indicated that with one exception no specific courses are being proposed. The one exception is the nine credits in western civilization. Professor Shipman suggested a potential problem in determining who would develop the course and would decide its content. He suggested that all students be required to take a survey of "something," e.g. English literature, American literature, course.

Professor Little questioned what the equivalency of three credits means. Dean Murray suggested that each degree program examine the content of the curriculum and determine whether or not the areas are represented in the curriculum. A three credit course devoted to writing or public speaking will not be required. Student Justin McNeill supported Dean Murray's explanation that the areas may be represented within courses already existing in various degree curriculum with an example of public speaking in an engineering class. Professor David Bellamy supported Mr. McNeill's comments suggesting that since "in order to learn to speak in public it helps to have something to say," the practice is best placed, though not required, in upper division courses.

Professor Levin questioned whether or not the "Commission considered possible ways by which the process of educating students might be [accelerated] without sacrificing quality of knowledge?" Dean Murray suggested the Commission had not considered this option.

Professor Levin questioned whether or not the Commission had considered ways to improve the extent of engineering knowledge by non-engineers. Dean Murray indicated that the Commission had mostly addressed the notion of having students study in the physical science and mathematics. He did suggest that a minor in engineering had been passed by the Senate for this purpose. Professor Lomax clarified that the minor was in civil engineering.

Dean Gouldner offered a comment of support for the emphasis on the intellectual life on campus.

Professor Lomax recommended that college representation outside of the student's major be required, e.g. a College of Arts and Science major would take an education course, as a way of "forcing" a breadth of education.

Professor George Frick questioned how the success of the Commission's recommendations would be evaluated. Dean Murray suggested a standardized exam, an annual essay, and a senior thesis have been discussed. Professor Frick questioned whether or not we should have these first before the University institutes the numerous remedial reforms. Dean Murray responded that we often must proceed before having all the information needed.

Professor Robert Hampel requested information on the barriers to change that Dean Murray perceived at the University. Dean Murray responded that class size seems to be a barrier. He further reiterated that the intent of the report has been to identify mechanisms that address the problems, as perceived by the Commission.

Ms. Cheryl Cavanaugh commended the Commission on their recommendation that grading on the curve should be eliminated.

May 30, 1986

Professor Elaine Safer questioned what the procedures for implementing the principles outlined in the report would be. Dean Murray suggested that the usual procedure for changing curriculum would be used. She further challenged the statement in the report on page 11 which suggested "the equivalent of six credits in the first two years be devoted to writing." She suggested that individual colleges should determine when the second course would be taken.

Professor James Lantolf suggested that as well as ensuring that the University has better students, the Commission also should consider ways to develop better teachers at the University.

Provost Campbell suggested that "The figures [he] gave the Senate were just for information. There are a lot of different ways that one can approach the financial aspect of this problem. If the faculty and the people believe that, as Dean Murray has said, these are good goals to aim for, then you have to start talking about over what time frame." He noted that the recommendations made in The Decade Ahead also were expensive to implement at the University, but if one checks, most of those were implemented in that time frame. He suggested that he views the Commission's report as a blueprint for the next 10 or 15 years.

Having provided the Commission with reaction to its recommendations, the meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Dutifully Submitted,

*Carol Vukelich*

Carol Vukelich  
Secretary  
University Faculty Senate

rg

Attachment: President's Commission on Undergraduate  
Education, Interim Report for Open  
Hearing Responses

President's Commission on Undergraduate Education  
Interim Report for Open Hearing Responses<sup>1</sup>

The Commission was charged to make recommendations about things which must be done to strengthen the total learning environment of our undergraduates so that our graduates can take their place as leaders in the multi-cultural world of the 21st Century. The whole of the undergraduate experience--academic, extra-curricular, cultural and residential--was studied by the Commission.

The Commission gave particular attention to the following items:

1. The implementation of changes that will improve the likelihood, without compromising our standards, that the students we recruit and enroll will fulfill their intellectual potential.

---

<sup>1</sup>This report contains a summary of the principal recommendations of the several subcommittees of the Commission. These recommendations have been adopted individually and tentatively by consensus of the Commission, and have not been approved in total by a formal vote. Additional recommendations are anticipated as are modifications of the recommendations in this report.

The report is issued only as a basis for wider University discussion of the proposals the Commission is actively considering. A final report will be issued after that discussion is completed.

2. The implementation of changes that will enhance the interactions between faculty and students.
3. The examination of the undergraduate experience for educational and cultural enhancement, particularly for blacks and females.
4. The contribution of all University programs--academic, residential and commuter life--to the academic goals of the University.

In addition, the Commission reviewed the recommendations on undergraduate education made in 1971 by the Community Design Planning Commission to see which of those worth implementing have not been accomplished.

The Commission believes the University of Delaware should be distinguished by the following attributes: (1) the teaching atmosphere of the small high quality liberal arts college, (2) the faculty quality of the major research university, (3) the preparation of students to be multi-culturally literate citizens, and (4) two fundamental missions of the land grant university--the dissemination of academic information throughout the state and region and the education of experts who give professional service in important social areas and who create the knowledge needed for the solution to many of the region's pressing problems. We seek to create a symbiotic relationship between these attributes in which each enhances the others. Above all, we want to insure that policy decisions about how we do our research and provide consulting services to the region and the professions enhance, and at least not diminish, our overriding



obligation to provide the highest quality instructional program for our students.

We seek to extend the best instructional features of the graduate school as far downward into the undergraduate programs as possible. We wish to see our undergraduate students, wherever possible, working independently and actively under the same kind of close supervision and guidance as our graduate students receive. In other words, our aspirations for the kind of academic environment our undergraduate students experience is not inherently different from our aspirations for the kind our graduate students typically experience.

The Commission's examination of the major higher education reports led it to see that the lessons in the Nation at Risk for the high schools hold as well for the University. Whatever evidence there is for a crisis in public education (K-12) can be brought forward with equal force for the upper levels of public education (12-16). There is a continuity in the indicators of educational quality that extend from the high schools into the University. Like SAT scores, the Graduate Record Examination scores have declined (in both the basic aptitude tests and in academic subject examinations); like public school teachers, faculty award higher grades than students earn; faculty positions--like all teaching positions--are becoming less attractive; as in the high school there has been a proliferation of elective and major subject areas. In general, the pressures inherent in the laudable goals of universal schooling have forced

the higher education institutions to compromise their standards in much the same fashion as the high schools have had to compromise theirs.

The report, All One System (Demographics of Education, Kindergarten Through Graduate School), issued by the Institute for Educational Leadership, makes it plain that the next generation of undergraduates will be quite different from those currently enrolled in higher education. One indicator of the change in the undergraduate population are the dramatic increases over the last ten years in the percentages of women (60%), minorities (85%), over 24-year-old students (70%), part-time students (65%) at a time when percentage increases in males (15%) and full-time students (18%) were much smaller. In addition, for the next twenty years the nation will have to work with such a limited number of young people, whether in higher education, the military or business, that it will not be possible to replace the failures with others of the same age as we have in the past. As well, the University of Delaware will need to confront the issue of why higher education isn't more attractive to minority high school graduates, whose high school completion rates have been increasing, and why it loses its appeal for the approximately 30% of our students who do not complete their programs.

The recommendations in the national reports specifically about higher education are in line generally with the Commission's analysis of the undergraduate programs at Delaware. We found a similar lack of coherence in the curriculum, an

avoidance of a core of enduring and fundamental ideas of the sort, but by no means limited to or identical with that cited by the National Endowment for the Humanities in To Reclaim a Legacy. We see the same failure of the faculty to assume a corporate responsibility for the entire undergraduate program that the American Association of Colleges found in Integrity in the College Curriculum. The discipline or departmental organization of the University, the source of so much strength in the modern university, is at the same time a symptom of the limited faculty attention and leadership to issues that extend beyond the narrow boundaries of the academic major. The Commission was in agreement with the National Institute of Education's Involvement in Learning in which it was argued that the test of sound academic policy was whether it increased the students active involvement in genuine problem solving, especially during the critical first two years of the curriculum where it is so noticeably absent.

We said above that at a minimum we seek to resolve the conflicts--sometimes inevitable conflicts--between the teaching, research, and service missions in ways that do not detract from the teaching mission. We urge a vigilant scrutiny of the innumerable small decisions by faculty and administrators that so clearly compromise and weaken the instruction program while they attempt to strengthen our service and research competence. The employment of faculty and teaching assistants who do not speak English well is for us a prototypical example of where the

pursuit of excellence in research is conducted at the expense of teaching. The ubiquitous faculty request for a reduced teaching load, rather than reduced research or service obligations, is another symptom of our concern.

The Commission notes that the undergraduate program is not a four-year program for most students. At the University of Delaware, and nationally, less than half (about .46) of the undergraduates complete their programs in four years. Nationally only about seventy percent of those who start actually receive a baccalaureate from some institution by their seventh year of academic study. Unlike the high school dropout, the college dropout has as good grades as those who stay to complete the program. At Delaware, about 30% of our freshmen will not complete their programs--even after six years. Several of the Commission's recommendations are designed to improve these disturbing percentages at Delaware.

Finally, the Commission believes that none of our goals for excellence can be achieved without an equitable campus climate that supports each student's personal, academic, and social development. There can be no excellence without equity. The final barriers of gender, color, language, culture, and attitude that work against our students' academic accomplishments and personal development must be removed. Specific recommendations to assist the University in achieving and maintaining excellence with equity are being formulated by subcommittees of the Commission.

The Commission is prepared to recommend the following policies for the University of Delaware and to present analyses to show how these are feasible, consistent, and will ultimately lead us to be a better university.

Conditions for Change

Our recommendation for a reduction in the size of lower division classes is a critical precondition of many Commission recommendations. At least half the enrollments in 100 and 200 level courses should be in sections small enough for there to be significant amounts of writing and speaking.

Currently, class sizes for only about 20 percent of registrants in 100 and 200 level courses meet a standard of enrollments between 1 and 30, and nearly 50 percent of all students in 100 and 200 level courses were in classes of over 100 students. This recommended reduction in the size of sections in which freshmen and sophomores typically enroll should not be made through increases in the size of other university classes. The implementation of the policy will require several of the following:

1. significant addition and reallocation of resources to the undergraduate programs.
2. increases in the average faculty teaching load (currently at 5.2 credit hours per week).
3. the use of video-disk and cassette formats in large lecture courses in which dialectic and class discussion are not necessary or desirable.

4. reductions in the number of students enrolled in the University, but without a reduction in the enrollment of black students and with increased efforts to retain those who are already enrolled.
5. conversion of non-faculty lines to teaching faculty positions.
6. reductions in the numbers of seniors and juniors who take lower division courses (e.g. in the College of Arts and Science between 55% and 72% of the courses in degree programs are at the 100 and 200 levels).
7. significant changes in the way we evaluate and reward effective teaching.
8. the addition of up to 256 additional sections each semester.

Finally, let us make clear two things we are not advocating. First we are not advocating an across-the-board increase in every faculty member's teaching load. Faculty talents and interests are not all alike and each should be permitted and, indeed, encouraged to specialize more heavily in that area best suiting his or her abilities. Second, we are not arguing that an increase in the overall average faculty load is a costless panacea. We recognize that more time spent with students means less time available for research and service. We simply submit that if the University is sincere in its desire to improve undergraduate education, it must pay that cost.

Another critical precondition for the changes we seek centers on the type of high school curriculum our applicants have taken.

### Admission Standards

The Commission endorses the logic of the predicted grade index (PGI) means of admitting students and urges the constant evaluation of the utility and validity of the factors used to compute the PGI. As well, it urges the constant exploration for new predictive indicators of academic success at the University of Delaware.

The admission standards and procedures of the University should be published and widely disseminated.

We believe that applicants for admission to the University should have followed the following college preparatory curriculum in high school (grades 9-12).

1. Four years of English with extensive writing components.
2. Three years of mathematics (including algebra I and II and geometry).
3. Three years of science (including 2 years of laboratory science in physics, chemistry and/or biology).
4. Three years of social studies (including at least two years of history).
5. Two years of study of a foreign language.

In addition, we recommend that four years of study in mathematics, science, social studies and foreign language be undertaken as the most desirable preparation for the University of Delaware. These standards should take effect three years after their adoption and initial dissemination.

We believe the admission decision and the accuracy of the PGI would be improved by the inclusion of achievement test scores in mathematics, English, and a third area related to the student's intended major. As well, we believe that placement tests in mathematics and the sciences would aid students in curriculum planning.

We wish to see many fewer students admitted with PGI less than 2.0 and then only when their admission furthers some other important University goal.

The utility of the SAT (or ACT) scores requires re-examination, and serious attention should be given to deleting them for applicants whose PGI is not affected by the inclusion of the SAT in PGI computation, e.g., those in the top 10 percent of their high school classes.

It should be noted that only 73 percent of the entering class in the Fall 1985 would have met the recommended high school curriculum standard, and only 8% would have met the criterion of four years of study in each area.

#### The Central Recommendations

##### Curriculum

The Commission's intention is to have each undergraduate study some important subjects that may not be covered in the current programs of study. In some cases, we wish to require new courses and in other cases we wish to require that certain subject matters be covered by existing courses or parts of several existing courses.



The Commission recommends that each degree program in the University have an appropriate and balanced distribution of at least 60 credit hours from the humanities, the social sciences, and mathematics and the physical sciences.

Drawing upon the faculty resources of the entire University, a new nine credit core course sequence will be developed and required in each degree program. The course sequence will cover a common set of significant ideas and developments in Western and non-Western civilization and may require up to 100 additional course sections each semester.

As well, each degree program should cover the following subject areas:

1. the equivalent of 6 credits in the first two years devoted to writing.
2. the equivalent of 3 credits of women's studies.
3. the equivalent of 3 credits of black American studies.
4. the equivalent of 3 credits of public speaking and oral presentation.
5. the equivalent of 3 credits (recommended) in health or wellness.

The entire Commission has not agreed that all of these areas should be required of each student, but is agreed that, if they were, many courses and parts of courses would satisfy this requirement.

Finally, there should be a 3 credit senior seminar in each degree program which places the major field of study in a broad context and demonstrates how it fits with and is related to other significant areas of study.

#### Honors Program and Student Research

The Honors Program and the undergraduate student research program should be enhanced and expanded to include all degree programs. The opportunities for honors courses, advisement, and research should be extended, without compromising the program's integrity, to as many students as possible. Undergraduate research attracts bright and well-motivated students to the University, improves the quality and enjoyability of students' undergraduate education, and strengthens the research productivity of faculty and graduate students. Active Departmental participation in undergraduate research should be encouraged by the appointment of faculty undergraduate research coordinators who would work with the Undergraduate Research Office. Faculty development and recognition should be fostered by the following steps: workshops for increasing the effectiveness of undergraduate research supervision, a prize for excellence in faculty direction of undergraduate research, consideration of supervision of undergraduate research in annual faculty performance reviews and in promotion and merit-increase decisions. All of this will require increases in the financial support and program staff of the Undergraduate Research Program.

### Quality of Instruction

The quality of undergraduate education at the University of Delaware depends heavily on the quality of instruction given. The Student Subcommittee of the Commission notes that the problem of a classroom "language barrier" has been a longstanding concern of students in the cases of teaching assistants and professors. The Commission strongly recommends that all incoming professors be evaluated on their ability to speak English fluently and communicate subject matter well in a classroom environment. All professors about whom significant complaints have been filed should receive rigorous instruction in communication skills.

### Evaluation

The Commission endorses the straightforward proposition that grades are a measure of student mastery of the course material and only that. Thus, the practice of "grading on the curve" or any practice based upon a priori or a posteriori fixed percentages or quotas for the A to F grades and quotas should not be permitted. The Commission, in support of this proposition, also supports policies that will reduce grade inflation (e.g., the plus/minus addition to the letter grade metric, no P/F option for required courses).

The impact of the overall Delaware curriculum on our students must be assessed. Whether this is done best through a uniform exit examination or by the evaluation of a senior thesis or project is an issue the Commission has not resolved. However, we do believe some assessment of the entire undergraduate

experience is needed, if only as a basis for sound academic and institutional planning. We hope this overall assessment would give us much more; we see it as a means for preserving our standards of excellence and for increasing the level of coherence and integrity in the undergraduate course of study.

#### Quality of Student Life

The test of the soundness of residence and student life policies is the degree to which they contribute to the overall goals especially the academic goals of the University but these academic goals cannot be separated from our goals for our student's social and emotional human development. We seek an undergraduate program that promotes the unity of intellectual, social, and emotional development.

The Commission sees a need for greater faculty involvement in the residence and student life programs and recommends that student groups and dormitories invite faculty to become affiliated with them. Faculty participation would become a part of their workload and promotion and tenure evaluation.

The Commission anticipates having more concrete recommendations about the expansion of the Student Center to include a multi-purpose auditorium area that would accommodate 3,000 persons. As well, the Commission is considering the establishment of a Commuter Student Office to address the unique problem of our commuting students.

In sum, these are the major recommendations the Commission is prepared to make. They are tentative pending the response of our colleagues. We seek these responses through a series of open hearings and forums.

Costs

The final report will include our assessment of the implications of our recommendations for the allocation of university resources. To date, the Commission and its subcommittees have relied upon such institutional research studies as were relevant and have in a few instances commissioned studies. The costs of implementing our current proposals are substantial and will require significant redirections in how most faculty spend their time.

FBM:pah

4/24/86

