University Senate Archives

Volume XXI

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of April 29, 1985

Additional information: Digitized by University Libraries Technical Services and archived in SOAR: Shocker Open Access Repository at: http://soar.wichita.edu/handle/10057/15280

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY SENATE

AGENDA

Meeting Notice: April 29, 1985, 126 Clinton Hall, 3:30 p.m.

Order of Business:

I. Calling of the Meeting to Order

II. Informal Proposals and Statements

III. Approval of minutes for the meeting of April 22, 1985 (Vol. XXI, no. 13).

IV. Old Business:

Report of Traffic Policy Committee--
Paul Ackerman, Chair
(Attachment F to agenda 4-8-85)

Report of Faculty Handbook Committee--
Gerald Hoag, Chair
(Attachment A to this agenda)

Report of Academic Standards & Practices Committee--Richard Yeargan, Chair

V. New Business:

Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Grade Devaluation--Rosalind Scudder, Chair
(Attachment B to this agenda)

VI. Adjournment

ATTACHMENT A
To Agenda 4-29-85

Document 24

Report of the University Handbook Committee to the University Senate
April 1985

The following changes constitute an update, not an extensive revision of the University Handbook for Faculty. As the university and its various functions continue to evolve, the committee will attempt to update the Handbook accordingly. For example, changes will need to be made next year in Section 4 on faculty benefits, and the committee plans to develop an index to the Handbook, referencing major numbered sections as well as major headings and subheadings of the Appendixes. The committee is grateful for information and suggestions regarding any needed additions or changes.

The first group of changes and additions have been previously approved by the Senate:

1. Procedures of the Court of Student Academic Appeals, to replace the old statement as Appendix H.

2. The heading and third paragraph of Section 3.10, now to be titled "Interpretive Statements on Tenure at Wichita State University."

3. Statement on Sexual Harassment of Students, to replace the old Appendix J.

4. The new Grievance Procedures, to replace the old Appendix F.

5. The new administrative flow chart on page 8.

The following group of proposed additions and changes have not yet been approved by the Senate:

6. Addition to the membership of the Traffic Committee, Appendix G, as ex-officio member: Director of Handicap Services.

7. Addition of a statement on Guidelines for Copying, as Appendix N, as follows:

> The purpose of the following guidelines is to state the minimum and not the maximum standards of educational fair use under Section 107 of [the Copyright Act of 1976]. The parties agree that the conditions determining the extent of permissible copying for educational purposes may change in the future; that certain types of copying permitted under these guidelines may not be permissible in the future; and conversely that in the future other types of copying not permitted under these guidelines may be permissible under revised guidelines.
>
> Moreover, the following statement of guidelines is not intended to limit the types of copying permitted under the standards of fair use under judicial decision and which are stated in Section 107 of the [act]. There may be instances in which copying which does not fall within the guidelines stated below may nonetheless be permitted under the criteria of fair use.

GUIDELINES

I. Single Copying for Teachers

A single copy may be made of any of the following by or for a teacher at his or her individual request for his or scholarly research or use in teaching or preparation to teach a class:

A. A chapter from a book;
B. An article from a periodical or newspaper;
C. A short story, short essay or short poem, whether or not from a collective work;
D. A chart, graph, diagram, drawing, cartoon or picture from a book, periodical, or newspaper.

II. Multiple Copies for Classroom Use

Multiple copies (not to exceed in any event more than one copy per pupil in a course) may be made by or for the teacher giving the course for classroom use or discussion; provided that:

A. The copying meets the tests of brevity and spontaneity as defined below; and,
B. Meets the cumulative effect test as defined below; and,
C. Each copy includes a notice of copyright

Definitions

Brevity

(i) Poetry: (a) A complete poem if less than 250 words and if printed on not more than two pages or, (b) from a longer poem, an excerpt of not more than 250 words.

(ii) Prose: (a) Either a complete article, story, or essay of less than 2,500 words, or (b) an excerpt from any prose work of not more than 1,000 words or 10 per cent of the work, whichever is less, but in any event a minimum of 500 words.

[Each of the numerical limits stated in "i" and "ii" above may be expanded to permit the completion of an unfinished line of a poem or of an unfinished prose paragraph.]

(iii) Illustration: One chart, graph, diagram, drawing, cartoon, or picture per book or per periodical issue.

(iv) "Special" works: Certain works in poetry, prose, or in "poetic prose" which often combine language with illustrations and which are intended sometimes for children and, at other times, for a more general audience fall short of 2,500 words in their entirety. Paragraph "ii" above notwithstanding, such "special works" may not be reproduced in their entirety; however, an excerpt comprising not more than two of the published pages of such special work and containing not more than 10 per cent of the words found in the text thereof may be reproduced.

Spontaneity

(i) The copying is at the instance and inspiration of the individual teacher, and

(ii) The inspiration and decision to use the work and the moment of its use for maximum teaching effectiveness are so close in time that it would be unreasonable to expect a timely reply to a request for permission.

Cumulative Effect

(i) The copying of the material is for only one course in the school in which the copies are made.

(ii) Not more than one short poem, article, story, essay, or two excerpts may be copied from the same author, nor more than three from the same collective work or periodical volume during one class term.

(iii) There shall not be more than nine instances of such multiple copying for one course during one class term.

[The limitations stated in"ii" and "iii" above shall not apply to current news periodicals and newspapers and current news sections of other periodicals.]

III. Prohibitions as to I and II Above

Notwithstanding any of the above, the following shall be prohibited:

(A) Copying shall not be used to create or to replace or substitute for anthologies, compilations, or collective works. Such replacement or substitution may occur whether copies of various works or excerpts therefrom are accumulated or produced and used separately.

(B) There shall be no copying of or from works intended to be "consumable" in the course of study or of teaching. These include workbooks, exercises, standardized tests and test booklets and answer sheets, and like consumable material.

(C) Copying shall not:

(a) substitute for the purchase of books, publishers' reprints, or periodicals;

(b) be directed by higher authority;

(c) be repeated with respect to the same item by the same teacher from term to term.

(D) No charge shall be made to the student beyond the actual cost of the photocopying.

8. Addition of a statement of Policy on Biohazards, as Section 6.15, as follows:

The University conducts surveillance over all instructional, research and service activities involving biological or physical agents which might cause disease, physical trauma, reproductive disability or death of plants or animals. The University Radiation Safety and Hazardous Chemical Materials Committee monitors uses of natural and synthetic toxic chemicals, explosives and ionizing or nonionizing radiations. The Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC) has equivalent responsibility for work with

recombinant DNA, infectious agents and the use and maintenance of potentially dangerous plants and animals.

All projects involving biological materials which may be hazardous for University personnel or the community at large must be approved by the Institutional Biosafety Committee prior to initiation of work. Each approval will be based on a statement from the project director, certified by the immediate administrative officer involved, attesting to compliance of protocols with applicable federal guidelines or federal, state and local laws. For continuing projects, the Committee requires annual statements documenting ongoing compliance. All research on recombinant DNA must adhere specifically to the national Institutes of Health's Guidelines for Research Involving Recombinant DNA Molecules. Similarly, all work with infectious agents must conform with the general containment recommendations outlined by the U.S. Public Health Service, Center for Disease Control, Office of Biosafety, in the publication "Classification of Etiological Agents on the Basis of Hazard". For efforts not covered by external directives or guidelines, the project director is to submit to the Committee for approval descriptions of controls to be exercised based on best professional judgment. All project facilities and operations falling under jurisdiction of the Institutional Biosafety Committee may be subject to direct inspection by representatives of the Committee as well as federal, state and local responsible officials.

Specific information concerning governmental and institutional regulations affecting uses of hazardous biological materials may be obtained from the Chairman of the Institutional Biosafety Committee, Vice-President for Research and Dean of Graduate School.

9. Restoration of statement on Faculty Personnel Records, as Section 4.22, as follows:

4.22/Faculty Personnel Records

Faculty members fill out the Faculty Personnel Record early in their first period of service in the University. The record deals with marital status, education and degrees, military service, occupational history, awards, memberships and offices in professional and learned organizations, etc. A complete transcript of college and university work is also required. Faculty personnel records are maintained in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

10. Revision of Sections 2.032 through 2.038, to reflect changes in the flow chart, as follows:

2.032 Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

The executive vice president for academic affairs has responsibility for the general supervision, budget, and coordination of the academic programs and activities of the six degree-granting colleges, the Division of Continuing Education Services, Admissions, Records and Financial Aids and the faculty records office. The executive vice president presides during the President's absence and serves in a coordinating capacity with the other vice presidents. University-

level review of all unclassified personnel actions is exercised through the Office of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.

2.033 Vice President for Administration and Finance

The vice president for administration and finance is the chief business officer of the University with responsibility for the areas of fiscal management, financial accounting and reporting, business management, and administrative management. In the area of fiscal management, the vice president for administration and finance has responsibility for the preparation of the University's budget and for expenditure control. The area of business management encompasses the operations of the Physical Plant and the WSU Police Department. The area of administrative management includes responsibility for the administration of personnel programs, including benefits and classified employee relations, and administrative responsibility for the Campus Activities Center (CAC), the University Post Office, and Central Service Bureau and telephones.

2.034 Vice President for Student Affairs

The vice president for student affairs has administrative responsibility for a wide range of programs and services for students. They include University College, Orientation, Counseling Center, Testing Center, Office of Student Life and Services, Placement and Career Services, Student Health Center, International Program, Heskett Center, and University Preschool. The vice president for student affairs also oversees University-owned residence halls, fraternities, sororities, and student publications and has responsibilities in matters of student discipline.

2.035 Vice President for Academic Resource Development

The vice president for academic resource development is involved with enrichment of the University's library and art collections through acquisition, principally by donation, of primary resource materials and original works of art. The Edwin A. Ulrich Museum of Art, its educational programs, and the collection of outdoor sculpture have resulted from the efforts of this vice president.

2.036 Vice President for Development, Alumni and University Relations

The vice president for development, alumni and university relations is the University's chief advancement officer. The vice president has executive responsibility for coordination of private and corporate fundraising activities and planning and execution of public information, development and alumni programming activities. The vice president oversees the operations of University Relations, the Alumni Association and development activities of the Board of Trustees.

2.037 Vice President for Research

The vice president for research has administrative responsibility for the development and coordination of research activity at the

University. Additionally, the vice president is responsible for development, review and evaluation of all graduate programs. Review and evaluation responsibilities also include: the Graduate School, Library/Media Resources Center, Digital Computing Center, Planning and Institutional Research, the Center for Urban Studies and the Gerontology Center.

2.038 Council of Deans

The Council of Deans serves as a forum for consideration of matters of academic policy. The council is chaired by the executive vice president for academic affairs and is composed of the academic deans; the deans of University College, Continuing Education Services, and Library and Media Resources.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerald Hoag, Chairperson
For the University Handbook Committee

ATTACHMENT B
To Agenda 4-29-85

Document 25

FINAL REPORT BY THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON GRADE DEVALUATION

I. INTRODUCTION

This report will present the findings and recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Grade Devaluation. We will begin with an introduction of the organization and committee charge, and then describe some of the findings. Recommendations will be presented in two parts: recommendations for change and recommendations for further study.

II. COMMITTEE COMPOSITION AND CHARGE

Members of the committee were appointed by Brooke Collison, Senate President. They were chosen to represent various types of teaching paradigms such as large classroom instruction, seminars, practicum courses, tutorials, etc. The final committee composition also represented all of the colleges at Wichita State University and the student group as well.

The initial meeting of the committee was held on November 5, 1984 when committee members met with Vice President John Breazeale and Brooke Collison. At that time the committee charge was given to members and a chairperson was chosen by the group.

The committee charge was as follows:

To review the evaluation of student performance at WSU with special focus on the following questions:

1. Is the range of options for grading at WSU appropriate, or is it too broad or narrow?

2. Are grades awarded at WSU consonant with actual student performance?

3. Are grades awarded at WSU consonant with the catalog definition of goals?

4. What short term and long term trends in grading are evident at WSU?

5. How are grading patterns at WSU affected by withdrawal and other academic policies?

6. What evidence is there about whether external agencies accept WSU grades at face value?

7. Where do WSU grading practices fit within the range of such practice in higher education?

To recommend appropriate actions in light of the information developed from the Committee review, the Committee is asked to make its final report to the University Senate, with a copy to the VPAA before the close of the academic year.

The committee began its work by investigating documents available which addressed the above charges. Of particular interest to us were previous studies exploring grade inflation at WSU and a national grading survey. We also studied academic policies at WSU and other regents' institutions. Interviews were conducted with various faculty, students and administrators.

We also reviewed the definition of grades as printed in the 1984-85 catalog and compared those descriptions with grade definitions at other regents' institutions.

III. FINDINGS

The most obvious finding is that grade inflation has occurred at WSU as well as across the nation. Several studies point to a steady rise in the aggregate grade point average of WSU undergraduates since the late 60's - early 70's. This average GPA rose from a 2.2 in 1967 to a high of 2.82 in 1978. In the five years since 1978 the average GPA has stayed relatively steady with a slight decline to a 2.69 in 1983. National averages have paralleled this trend. (For example, KU's 1983 average was 2.76.)

The committee observed a "tightening up" that has already occurred on this campus. Many faculty are aware of grading problems and have changed some practices in order to have grades reflect the students' actual performance. It was also noted that more students are advised to take special help courses in the Personal Development curriculum, English and Math courses at the 011 level, and that several colleges within the university have more strict admission requirements than in the past.

The committee also found Wichita State University's grade definitions to be acceptable and, in fact, superior to those found in the KU and K State catalogs. Concern was

expressed, however, that not all faculty and students know the published definitions, and that many do not perceive them to be as written. (The definitions are as follows: A - Distinguished achievement, B - Superior achievement, C- Average achievement, D - Below average achievement, F - Failing work).

Finally, the committee reviewed the administrative policies and procedures. Several of these policies and procedures need to be changed. These will be reviewed in the next section.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGE

The following policies are those which the committee believes need some modification in order to support faculty grading practices or to make such policies more in line with those at other regents' institutions.

Honor Roll. The present policy applies to students of all colleges and is a grade point average of 3.25 or higher for a semester with a minimum enrollment of 12 hours. Other universities have established the upper 10 per cent of a college or a minimum 3.5. We recommend the minimum 3.5 for a minimum of 12 hours.

Repeats. At present, any previously completed course may be repeated, and the grades received in the repeated courses will replace previous grades up to a maximum total of five. Any one course may not be repeated more than twice. There is no restriction of what grade the student is repeating (B, C, D, F or W, etc.). Many of the schools surveyed allowed repeats only for students with grades of D or below. None of them, except for KU, allow as many repeat options as does WSU. We recommend that students at WSU be allowed to repeat up to five courses, all of which will replace the previously earned grade, that each course may be repeated twice, but that students may repeat only courses in which they have been graded D, F, U, NCr or W. (Note: this eliminates averaged grades.) Also, there will no longer be the allowance of repeat for any course which has already been counted toward an earned Bachelor's Degree.

Range of Grading Options. The range of grading options at WSU include A, B, C, D, P, F, W, Au, Cr, NCr, S, U,, I, R and CrE. In reviewing other Kansas schools the committee found that Kansas State University offers similar options with the exception of the S, U option that is provided at WSU. In addition, K-State faculty, employees and full-time students are not charged for auditing courses (all others

are charged $1.00 per semesster hour) and the Audit option is not recorded in the permanent record. Kansas University grading options are also similar to those of WSU but KU adds a "+" option which is one method of designating passing work at KU. Other grading options at KU are provided in the individual schools and colleges within the university. For example,, one school used plus (+) and minus (-) grades for all its courses. We recommend that since the S and U grading option seems redundant with the Cr and Ncr option, that Cr and NCr be eliminated.

Audits. The current policy for auditing is appropriate. Students, faculty and staff should pay the regular fees, with the Au noted on the transcript. Students should not audit courses that they plan to enroll in for credit. We recommend that courses previously audited cannot be repeated for credit. An exception to this might be allowed if a student changes major fields and needs credit in the previously audited course.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This study of grade devaluation has raised many interesting side issues. We recommend that this not be considered a finished issue, but that there be a standing committee (perhaps a sub-committee of Academic Standards and Practices) appointed to review grading practices and policies at Wichita State University. Issues for further study should include, but not be limited to, the following:

Withdrawal Policy. We found no clear evidence that shorter periods of withdrawal reduce grade devaluation. Withdrawal periods, no matter how short they are, will always give the student a significant step ahead of his/her class the next semester resulting in higher grades. We recommend a college by college examination of the withdrawal policy to study if restricting subsequent enrollment would be an effective policy. For example, the policy applied in the engineering college has been sucessful in maintaining the value of the grades. According to that policy, students can always enroll in a class, from which they withdrew earlier, provided that the class is open.

Plus and Minus Grading. Although the option of plus and minus grading was proposed a few years ago and defeated by a vote of the general faculty, we would still recommend that this topic be studied further in the future. We would suggest that this option be submitted to individual colleges for review and vote.

Student Evaluations. If there is concern that some faculty give higher grades in order to get favorable student evaluations for promotion and tenure documents, then the

role of student evaluations should be studied. Perhaps alternate forms of evaluation of faculty teachings should be explored. Further, SGA and other student organizations should conduct campaigns among students to explain the significance of LASTIC and other evaluations and that such evaluations should be independent of the grade they expect to get in the course.

Support for Faculty. Workshops, seminars and the like should be given, particularly for new faculty, to present the grading options available to faculty and to review and discuss the definitions of grades at WSU and practices of grading. All encouragement and help possible should be given in order to ensure as uniform as possible adherence to the published definitions.

Curriculum. A review of curriculum offerings and degree programs which might be contributing to grade inflation should be carried out. Further study is warranted.

VI. SUMMARY

It seems imperative to us that the issue of grading not be a forgotten one, only to surface every few years as a crisis situation. We recommend regular studies of the grading practices within each department, conducted by the chairpersons. Faculty members of the department should be encouraged to discuss regularly their grading policies. Grade statistics of each college should be available to all faculty who should be encouraged to conduct their own analyses over the semesters.

We recommend that the faculty, staff, students and administrators at Wichita State stop apologizing for what we do at this school. We found no evidence that our graduates fare differently in the job interview or the graduate school application than others. We are doing much at this university to be proud of and we need to let others know about it.

Submitted by:

Dorothy Crum
Eric Dey
Gerald Hoag
Alicia Huckstadt
Robert Ross
Mahmoud Sawan
Mel Zandler
Rosalind Scudder, Chairperson
William Wynne, Ex Officio

UNIVERSITY SENATE

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes of the meeting of April 29, 1985, (Vol. XXI, no. 14).

Members Present: Ballenger, Blakeslee, Blazicek, Breazeale, Brewer, Campbell, Clark, Collison, Crum, Davis, Dey, Downes, Dreifort, Duell, Feleppa, Ginns, Gosman, Graham, Greenberg, Harmon, Huckstadt, Masud, Mathis, Meisch, E. Myers, M. Myers, Pangburn, Perel, Rishell, Safizadeh, Sawan, Stone, Terrell, Throckmorton, Wentworth, Wineke, Yeager.
Members Absent: Allen, Armstrong, Beachey, Carmody, Chaffee, Childs, Daley, Drew, Gardenhire, Hansan, Kahn, Kahrs, Kasten, Loomis, Mays, Rhatigan, Scriven, Talaty, Tilford.
Guests: R. Scudder, S. DesMarteau, B. Wynne, B. Mawhiney, P. Ackerman, T. Elliott, R. Hartsook, G. Hoag, R. Ross.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Issued at 3:35 p.m.

II. INFORMAL PROPOSALS AND STATEMENTS

President Collison made the following announcements:
1. The Agenda Committee meets 1:30 Tuesday, April 30, in CAC 220.
2. An open hearing on commercial advertising on campus has been called by a subcommittee of the Land Use Planning and Design Committee, Thursday, May 2, 2:30-3:30 in CAC 314. The subcommittee is exploring whether or not advertising should be regulated, and if so, how.

Robert Hartsook, Vice President for Development, Alumnae, and University Relations spoke briefly to the Senate. He remarked that while many see his main task as fund-raising, he sees his responsibility as to promote the University, particularly the activities of the Faculty. This will facilitate the task of fund-raising.

Senator Stone announced that the SGA is circulating a petition against the student fee hike for athletics. It is also distributing postcards already addressed to the Board of Regents, on which faculty can make comments.

Senator Throckmorton encouraged Senators to circulate the petition among faculty members. Completed petitions should be returned to Campus Box 56.

Senator Dreifort made the following suggestions for improving Faculty benefits: (1) $200,000 of Mill Levy money that currently goes to certain programs on campus could be put into new endowed chairs that would keep or attract high quality faculty. These programs should be held accountable in terms of credit hours just as all other programs are. (2) A centrally located Faculty Club should be established. This would enhance faculty communication. (3) The faculty discount at the bookstore should be reinstated. Senator Greenberg added that faculty are, indeed, charged an additional $.50 for ordering books not in stock.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of April 22, 1985 (Vol. XXI, no. 13) were approved as submitted.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

MOTION
Traffic Policy Committee Report

Paul Ackerman, Chair of the Traffic Policy Committee, moved acceptance of the committee's report (Attachment F to agenda 4-8-85).

In response to a query by Senator Dreifort, Dr. Ackerman cited earlier Senate disapproval as pivotal in ending consideration of the hang-cards.

Senator Dreifort asked that elimination of faculty parking fees be considered, noting that not many places charge their own employees for parking. Dr. Ackerman indicated that he would mention this at the next meeting of the committee.

In response to queries by Senators Huckstadt, Terrell, and Gosman, Dr. Ackerman replied (1) that the number of parking stickers made available each year have been decreased, and this seems to be the direction in which things will continue to move; (2) reserve parking allotments are currently under review, and will be on the agenda of next year's committee, which will make an effort to eliminate discrepancies; (3) the general policy is to provide spaces for people at the Dean's level and above; beyond that, such parking should be provided only under special circumstances.

Ombudsperson DesMarteau noted a problem concerning the tendency of motorcycle sticker ink to wear off, resulting in undeserved tickets. Dr. Ackerman indicated he is aware of the problem and it is being looked at.

VOTE

The motion passed.

Faculty Handbook Committee Report

President Collison noted that the committee's report (Attachment A to this agenda) is an informational item intended to keep faculty abreast of changes in the handbook.

Gerald Hoag, Chair of the Faculty Handbook Committee, addressed the Senate. He made the following comments: There is an error in item 6 of the report: it should refer to Appendix C, not G. Item 10, which concerns the new vice presidential positions, has not yet been approved by President Armstrong, and may be changed. The members of the committee (not mentioned in the report) are Curtis Terflinger, Nancy Scriven, and Barbara Mawhiney (ex officio). He moved acceptance of the report.

MOTION

In response to queries by President Collison, Dr. Hoag remarked that item 7 (concerning permissible copying for educational purposes) is a clarification of existing policies and guidelines, and not a significant change; and that item 8 (addition of a statement of Policy on Biohazards) is intended to meet federal regulations, since there is someone at the university doing research to which this is relevant. A committee on biohazards has also been formed. Senator Clark remarked that the source of the guidelines for copying ought to be included (an agreement on guidelines for classroom copying in not-for-profit educational institutions with respect to books and periodicals, adopted by 38 educational institutions and the publishing industry).

In response to a query by Senator Greenberg, Vice President Breazeale replied that item 10 ought to reflect the second titles of each of the vice presidents mentioned in it.

In response to a query by Senator Greenberg, Dr. Hoag indicated that he

did not think there would be any more changes this year.

In response to a question by Senator Dreifort concerning the legal status of the Handbook, Vice President Breazeale noted that it is almost invariably called in as a piece of evidence in court. He remarked that he believed there is a statement of intent, near the beginning of the Handbook, to compress into two of the chapters those things which are viewed as clearly part of the conditions of employment--i.e., the chapters having to do with tenure and promotion procedures, the nature of appointment notices, and related items. The other sections of the Handbook are regarded as informational in nature, and not part of the contract.

In response to a question by Senator Gosman, Dr. Hoag indicated that if future changes in appointment notices warrant it, the committee would discuss corresponding changes in the Handbook. It has not as yet done so.

Senator Terrell asked if there was any reason why this committee could not be abolished. Dr. Hoag replied that he thought the committee was useful, since Handbook changes would continue to be necessary, and faculty are better suited to make changes that are closely relevant to faculty interests. Items of contractual significance should be examined by faculty. This year's business was fairly routine, but an index to the Handbook is being planned, and faculty input is needed here since they have a better idea of what needs to go into it. Senator Terrell asked if the committee could act in an oversight capacity, reviewing galleys prepared by administrative staff. Dr. Hoag replied that he believed that it would be more efficient, in some cases, if it were prepared by faculty, who ought to have a hand in early as well as late stages of preparation.

VOTE The motion passed.

Richard Yeargan, Chair of the Academic Standards and Practices Committee was not present. President Collison indicated that the committee had failed to report for two meetings in a row, and no report has been submitted.

MOTION Senator Terrell moved that the committee be recalled and reappointed by June 1, 1985. Seconded by Senator Perel.

There was some disagreement as to whether this committee had, indeed, met this year. Senator Stone indicated that he and another student member of the committee and have received no notification of a meeting during that time, even though he has sent a written inqury in this regard. Also, as far as he knows, the committee did not elect Mr. Yeargan chair for this year. Senator Campbell noted that she also had evidence that it had not met. Senator Wentworth indicated that he thought it had, and that it would be unfair to recall it.

In response to queries by Senators Wentworth and Graham concerning efforts to contact the chair, President Collison replied that Senator Greenberg has requested reports in writing, secretary Lucille Brodie has made numerous calls, and he himself has had a conversation with the chair in the Commons.

Senator Duell remarked that it seemed too drastic to recall the whole committee, since efforts had evidently been made by some of its members to call meetings. Senator Terrell replied that to some extent committees have to be responsible for having chairs and arranging meetings and otherwise being active. He invited referral of the motion to committee.

MOTION Senator Stone moved that this motion be referred to the Committee on Committees. Seconded by Senator Duell.

Senator Perel indicated that the Committee on Committees might also consider whether this committee needs to exist. President Collison indicated that this is under consideration by the Rules Committee.

Senator Dreifort noted that the failure of such an important committee to meet reflects a general malaise about academic standards and practices. He added that the fact that the Ad Hoc Committee on Grade Devaluation was also scheduled to report today bears out a general tendency at the University to appoint ad hoc committees to deal with special problems that standard Senate committees ought to be addressing. Perhaps the Academic Standards and Practices Committee hasn't met because of this.

Senator Perel reminded the Senate that this committee began as an ad hoc committee, of which he was chair, whose charge included formation of a standing committee. It is one of the standard composition committees, and thus has members, indeed has had chairs, who are not regular faculty. He remarked that they are not as concerned with these matters as regular faculty members, and that this constitutes one of the main problems of the committee.

VOTE The motion to refer passed.

V. NEW BUSINESS
Grade Devaluation Committee Report

President Collison reminded the Senate of the background to the formation of the Ad Hoc Committee on Grade Devaluation, which was formed in response to a request by President Armstrong made in his address to the faculty last Fall. He indicated that specific recommendations at the end of the committee's report (Attachment B to today's agenda), would be moved individually for acceptance after the report itself has been accepted.

MOTION Rosalind Scudder, chair of the committee, moved acceptance of the report. She remarked that the committee members worked extensively and cooperatively, and that the report reflects general consensus without much disagreement. It had initial concerns about encroaching on other committees' areas of responsibility, but decided to act and make its recommendations without concern for this. She emphasized remarks in the report's concluding summary (p. 5) that grade inflation not be raised in the future as a matter of crisis, since this calls undue negative attention to the University. Grading practices should be studied regularly and as a matter of course. The University must stop apologizing for the problem, since while it has had grade inflation over the past decade, it is not unique in this regard. Also, grade-point averages have stabilized, and the committee found no evidence that WSU graduates fare less well in the market place or in admission to graduate schools than graduates of other institutions.

Senator Clark asked why peer pressure was not recommended as a remedy and why statistics were given at the college, but not the departmental level.

William Wynne, Registrar and ex officio committee member replied that these statistics are available. Dr. Scudder replied that the committee felt it difficult to legislate peer pressure.

Senator Dreifort concurred, while emphasizing the importance of peer pressure. He commended the committee for not trying to achieve more than is feasible at this time. The problem must be attacked incrementally and faculty must be made aware of what letter grades mean. The average grade should be C, while it has tended here to be B.

Senator Greenberg noted that it would be possible to circulate statistics to each chair for circulation among the faculty, and this would enable peer pressure. He indicated that this is not done in his department. Dr. Scudder and Senator Masud pointed out that it is done in other departments. Vice President Breazeale noted that for the past decade at least departmental statistics, in their entirety, are distributed to all Deans with the recommendation that they be shared with each department and that there be department discussion of them. Practice varies across campus.

In response to queries by Senator Harmon, Dr. Scudder replied that the committee's judgment that WSU graduates were holding their own in the market place was based on limited evidence. One committee member contacted local employers and asked for job rating and performance reports. The committee also drew upon one of the deans. Graduates were explicitly compared with those from other institutions. Mr. Wynne pointed out that part-time student grades were not analyzed separately in the report, because the last time he checked this, the part-time people in the semester he examined did not do as well as full-time students.

MOTION Dr. Scudder moved that the minimum grade point average for honor roll be raised to 3.5 for a minimum of 12 hours.

In response to a question by Senator Blakeslee, Dr. Scudder replied that the committee chose not to make having a gpa in the upper 10 percent of a college a criterion of membership since this could lead to there being an excessively large number of students on the honor roll, and since establishing a clear minimum gives students something concrete to aim at and lessens competition among them. Senators Masud, Wineke, and Huckstadt spoke in favor of the 3.5 minimum. Senator Huckstadt added that using the 10 percent criterion would induce students to see themselves as competing against one another.

In response to a question by Senator Gosman, Mr. Wynne replied that this change would significantly shrink the honor roll in some colleges.

Senator Terrell asked for further elaboration of the connection between the findings in section III of the report and the recommendations in section IV, since he could see none. Dr. Scudder replied that the committee felt pressured to report and make recommendations, and made some of its recommendations on the basis of past complaints. Recommendations were not made from the specific points discussed in section III since this

would have entailed legislating faculty behaviors that the committee felt should not be legislated. Committee member Ross replied that there are some connections: the findings indicate that certain policies need to be tightened, and that is being recommended.

Senator Terrell asked if there was a finding that too many people have been qualifying for the honor roll. Dr. Scudder replied that an overwhelming majority of the institutions surveyed have abandoned the 3.25 figure; also reports and criticisms of WSU indicated that "everyone makes honor roll." She added that the committee dealt with data far in excess of what could be included in the report.

Senator Terrell noted a seeming incongruity between the mention in the first paragraph of section III of a stabilization in gpa's over the past five years and the recommendations in IV.

Dr. Ross replied that it has been far more than five years since the honor roll policy was changed.

MOTION Senator Gosman moved the previous question. Seconded by Senator Stone.

VOTE The motion to move the previous question passed.

VOTE The motion to raise the honor roll minimum passed.

MOTION Dr. Scudder moved that students at WSU be allowed to repeat up to five courses, all of which will replace the previously earned grade, that each course may be repeated twice, but that students may repeat only courses in which they have been graded D, F, U, NCr or W. (Note: this eliminates averaged grades.) Also, there will no longer be the allowance of repeat for any course which has already been counted toward an earned Bachelor's Degree.

Senator Gosman noted that limiting repeatable grades to these was the policy until it was changed six or seven years ago by the Academic Standards and Practices Committee, of which he was then a member. He opposed the change then and thus supports the current motion.

In response to questions by Senator Gosman, Mr. Wynne replied that grades were averaged for those repeated courses after the first five. Now that the limit is five, averaging is thus eliminated. After a student has repeated five courses, grades for additional repeated courses will not be counted at all. If a student gets a D or F in a required course after exceeding the limit, they will be unable to fulfill that requirement.

Dr. Scudder noted that the committee discussed possible problems stemming from students taking complete withdrawals, and decided that this could be handled by existing appeals processes. Mr. Wynne concurred, noting that the committee felt that it would be better to rely on the appeals process than to make policy for the lowest common denominator, which is not compatible with efforts to stop grade devaluation. The exceptions committee should deal with genuine exceptions such as will arise under this policy, rather than the routine ones that now typically bog it down.

Senator Dreifort agreed that levels of expectation should not be reduced.

Students should live up to what we feel a college student ought to be able to do, rather than be allowed to repeat courses indefinitely.

In response to a question by Senator Campbell, Dr. Scudder replied that data indicate a low percentage of students repeating courses five times. Among 1454 B.A. graduates in 1983-4, 95.3 percent had four or less; 60 percent had no repeats at all.

Senator Stone spoke in favor of the policy, but warned that advising and counseling would have to be improved. Part of the blame for excessive repeats lies in the poor quality of advising and insufficient number of advisors. President Collison remarked that the Board of Regents is looking into this problem.

Senator Duell raised concerns about early withdrawals. Mr. Wynne replied that withdrawals in the first two weeks do not appear on students' records and thus do not count.

In response to a question by Senator Masud, Dr. Scudder replied that transfer students' repeats involving courses from other schools would be counted. Senator Masud expressed concern that these students would be switching from one set of criteria to another.

Senator Gosman expressed waxing favor with the motion.

Senator Perel spoke against the motion, arguing that the limitation to five is excessively restrictive and impractical, and will drastically reduce enrollments. He noted that Dr. Scudder's statistics mention only graduating students and suggested that the repeat rate might well be higher for students who continue to take courses here for extended periods of time without graduating. He also opposed the entailed increase in the Admissions and Exceptions Committee's workload. He asked whether a student who needed to repeat a course over the limit to meet a degree requirement could do so, even though the earlier low grade remained on the record. (The student might have a high enough grade point average to graduate, even with that grade included.)

Dr. Scudder replied that she would expect that the student would not be allowed to repeat.

In response to questions by Senators Terrell and Greenberg, Dr. Scudder replied that any particular course cannot be taken more than three times.

MOTION Senator Greenberg moved the previous motion. Seconded by Senator Dreifort.

VOTE The motion to move the previous question failed.

Senator E. Myers spoke in favor of the recommendation, noting that students are responsible for knowing requirements and that advising problems often result from students not coming to see advisors. The recommendation is integral to combatting grade inflation.

Amendment Senators Terrell and Stone raised concerns about the wording of the motion. Senator Stone moved that the phrase 'repeat up to five courses'

in the first sentence of the motion be changed to 'repeat up to and no more than five courses'. Seconded by Senator Terrell.

VOTE The amendment passed.

Senator Terrell asked if inclusion of W as a grade counted in tabulation of repeats might inconvenience students who withdraw because of job transfers or business trips. Senator Gosman replied that most of the time W's are used to avoid bad grades. Transfers would seem clearly to qualify as valid exceptions. Also, such cases would typically entail complete withdrawals, and these cases could be given special handling.

Senator Perel argued that the restriction would have no impact on grade inflation. People who repeat courses usually do poorly.

Senator Harmon questioned whether it is advisable to put the Admissions and Exceptions Committee in the position of having to evaluate student excuses. Dr. Scudder replied that this was the nature of their task. Senator Perel concurred.

Senator Wentworth inquired as to whether students would be unfairly disadvantaged due to illness.

Senator Dreifort replied that this could be handled by the appeals system. He spoke in favor of the motion, arguing that the system is worth a try and can be modified if it does not work out. We are legislating here for academic excellence, not credit-hour production. President Armstrong's primary concern is with the quality of graduating students.

Senator Stone raised concerns about prohibiting repeats of courses already counted toward an earned Bachelor's Degree. Returning graduates might well need the information in the course. Mr. Wynne replied that the intention of this restriction is to prevent retroactive raising of a student's gpa for the earned degree. Senator Clark suggested that such students could audit. Senator Gosman asked whether students ever tried to do this. Mr. Wynne replied that it has happened by default, and although the Registrar corrects such cases, nothing in the catalog prohibits this.

MOTION Senator Clark moved adjournment. Seconded by Senator Perel.

VOTE The motion failed.

MOTION Senator Dreifort moved the previous question. Seconded by Senator E. Myers.

VOTE The motion to move the previous question passed.

VOTE The amended Scudder motion passed.

MOTION Dr. Scudder moved that since the S and U grading option seems redundant with the Cr and NCr option, that Cr and NCr be eliminated.

Senator Dreifort inquired as to why the P grade not be dropped as well. These grades do not cast a favorable light on WSU transcripts, when they are compared with those of graduate schools.

Senator Gosman remarked that the Graduate School added the S and U grades, and asked whether S and U mean the same thing as Cr and NCr. Dr. Scudder and Mr. Wynne replied that they are equivalent, but that S and U are used by the graduate school because they are more clearly evaluative terms. Vice President Breazeale remarked that earlier Veterans Administration regulations prohibited crediting courses for which an NCr grade was received. Senator Stone noted that this policy has been changed.

Senator Terrell suggested eliminating P, S, U, Cr, and NCr.

Senator Perel asked why there is any problem with using Cr and NCr for courses that don't carry college credit. Dr. Scudder replied that S and U would do as well and the committee was simply trying to reduce the number of grading options.

Senator Gosman questioned the need for the motion, since S and U are used for graduate courses. Dr. Scudder and Mr. Wynne replied that it would be needed for courses which are taken by both graduates and undergraduates.

VOTE The motion passed.

Senator Graham remarked that while he supported the report, it is wrong for the Senate to be forced to do the business of a currently inoperative Academic Standards and Practices Committee. He indicated that he shared Senator Perel's concerns about impact on enrollment, and that this is the sort of thing that committee should be investigating. The Committee on Committees or somebody should make clear that this is no way to structure a university and its standards of evaluation.

MOTION Dr. Scudder moved that courses previously audited cannot be repeated for credit. An exception to this might be allowed if a student changes major fields and needs credit in the previously audited course.

Senators Gosman and Duell asked for the rationale for this recommendation, since it reflects past and current policy. Dr. Scudder replied that as she recalled it had to do with payment of fees. Senator Gosman requested deferral of the motion.

Senator Perel remarked the Admissions and Exceptions Committee is empowered to grant exceptions for any unforeseen problems. He also pointed out that sometimes the audit option is exercised by students in the late stages of a course in which they are not doing well.

President Collison adjourned the meeting at 5:15 for lack of a quorum.

Robert Feleppa, Senate Secretary
Lucille Brodie, Recording Secretary