

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, APRIL 10, 1995

The University Senate met in regular session at 3:00 p.m., Monday, April 10, 1995, in Room 115 of the Nursing Health Sciences Building.

Professor Raymond Cox, Chairperson of the Senate Council, presided.

Members absent were: Kevin Adams, Dan Altman, Drew Alvarez, Gary Anglin, James Applegate, Michael Bardo*, Paige Bendel, Mark Berger, Vasant Bhapkar, Suketu Bhavsar*, Thomas Blues, Maria Boosalis*, Jana Bowling, Douglas Boyd, Dean

Brothers, Joseph Burch, Allan Butterfield, Laretta Byars, Ben Carr, Edward Carter,

Jorden L. Cohen, Delwood Collins, Jean Cooper*, Virginia Davis-Nordin*, Lance DeLong, Lee A. Edgerton, David Elliott*, Robert Farquhar*, Thomas Ford, Donald Frazier*, Michael Freeman*, Richard Furst, Lorraine Garkovich, Lori Gonzalez, Anne

Haas, Lynne Hall*, Kirby Hancock, Issam Harik, J. John Harris, S. Zafar Hasan*, John

Haughton, Christine Havice*, Robert Hemenway, James Hertog, Floyd Holler, James Holsinger, James Houglan, Robert Ireland, Jeff Jones, Raleigh Jones, Craig Koontz,

Thomas Lester, Jonathan Liar, Thomas Lillich*, C. Oran Little, Brent Logan, Jan McCulloch, Martin McMahan, A. Lee Meyer*, Douglas Michael*, Donald Mullineaux, David Nash*, Phyllis Nash, Anthony Newberry, Scott Noble, Judith Page, Clayton Paul,

Ronald Pen, Barbara Phillips, Rhoda-Gale Pollack, Daniel Reedy, Thomas Robinson,

Ellen Rosenman, Edgar Sagan, W. Craig Shellhart, David Shipley, Timothy Sineath,

Deborah Slaton, William Stober*, David Stockham, Phillip Tibbs, Chris Vance, Charles

Wethington*, Carolyn Williams, Eugene Williams, Paul Willis, Emery Wilson, H. David

Wilson, Mary Witt.

Chairman Cox made the announcement that the minutes from the March 20, 1995 meeting had not yet been circulated. Any corrections need to be sent to Cindy Todd.

Formal approval will be done at the first senate meeting in the Fall.

The Chair made the following announcements:

The Chancellor's Search Committee has had it's second meeting and they have gotten the group down to seventeen candidates. The group will be reduced to five to

ten candidates at the next meeting. When that list is set, the names will be published and they will be brought to campus.

There is a correction from an article in the Kernel. It said the executive search corporation representative would be doing the cutting of the list. This is not the case.

Their representative will be interviewing the candidates to see if they are still serious candidates, and do background checks. The representative will then report to the

Committee. The Committee will be doing any cutting of the list.

The Senate Council has arranged to have a memorial bench in memory of Bill Lyons placed out in the green area that is between Patterson Office tower and the parking lot . There will be a dedication of the bench and a presentation of the first annual Lyons award. The first recipient is Gilbert Friedell of the Kentucky Cancer Program. The dedication and the award presentation will be on Thursday, April 27 , 1995 at 2:00 PM, weather permitting, outside at the bench. If weather is not permitting, it will be held in the student center. Notices will be sent.

* Absence Excused

Letters for new senators will be sent out this week.

The Chair recognized Dean David Mohny for a memorial resolution.

Memorial Resolution
Leonardo Ricci

Leonardo Ricci was born in Rome, Italy, on June 8th, 1918. Of himself, he would say, "I am just a man," but he was so much more: he wrote, taught, designed, painted, and theorized about a new architecture every day of his adult life. He lived with the belief in the brilliance of the human imagination and a profound existential positioning of the self in the world.

Ricci received a diploma from the University of Florence in 1942, and a doctorate of architecture from the University of Rome in 1950. Following the Second World War, in which he served as a member of the Engineering Corps, he began his academic career as an Assistant Professor of architecture at Florence, and remained on its faculty until 1963, serving for a period as Dean.

He taught a variety of courses which extended well beyond the conventional architectural curriculum, including industrial design, interior design, composition and drawing.

In 1960, Ricci came to the United States as a Visiting Professor of Architecture at MIT, and over the next two decades, he held similar positions at the University of Florida, Pratt Institute, and Pennsylvania State University. Interspersed with these American appointments was a return to the University of Florence. He became affiliated with the University of Kentucky in the early 1970s, and in 1977 Ricci was appointed as a distinguished Visiting Professor here. He remained in that capacity, both in Lexington and at the College of Architecture's Atelier Veneziano, in Venice, Italy, until his death.

Professor Ricci balanced his academic and artistic careers with a substantial architectural practice. After training with the Italian Modernist architect Giovanni Michelucci, Ricci established a studio in 1944 with friend and colleague Leonardo Savioli, which remained active for three decades. They undertook projects as wide-ranging as an apartment house for 1500 people in Sorgone, and the design for the Italian pavilion at the Expo '67, the World's Fair in Montreal. In the 1980's he took into a new partnership Professor Maria

Dallerba, herself a faculty member of the University of Kentucky, who also, in time, became his wife. They undertook major works together throughout the rest of his life, such as new gate for the city of Florence, the Palace of Justice in Savona, Italy (which has recently been completed), a Cultural Center in Pistoia, and a design for the Palace of Justice in Florence, which should start construction in the near future.

Yet the work which may best represent Ricci's life is the house which he built for himself in 1951, at the age of 33, on the hill of Monterinaldi overlooking Florence. In addition to designing the house, Ricci directed the construction and worked on it himself. Initially there was no road to the site, only a trail; access was difficult. The small construction crew quarried stone from the site (which had served as a stone quarry during the Renaissance). and hauled water to mix concrete from a distant well on a pack mule and by wheelbarrow. Florentine officials and other architects questioned Ricci's judgment in choosing to build on such a site. But Ricci stood firm, completed Casa Ricci, and it is now recognized as one of the great examples of postwar Italian architecture. In the ten years which followed completion of his house, 17 additional houses were designed and built, and the village of Monterinaldi was created. Thus out of such difficult circumstances, Ricci made a place not just for himself, but a place where others could join in the communion of social interaction.

Leonardo Ricci's students have experienced Ricci's heightened sense of the world in which we live, and the opportunities that world offers for the creative endeavor. Leo Ricci distilled in his students a belief that one can and will make significant architecture. As he said, "If I could be remembered for one thing, I hope it would not be as an architect, a painter, a writer, a philosopher, an existentialist, or a professor. It would be as a man who found something novel in our society, new in our culture, and that I was able to communicate that to the world."

Leonardo Ricci passed from this world on the night of September 30, 1994.

Dean Mohney asked that the resolution be made a part of the minutes and a copy sent to Professor Ricci's family.

The Chair asked that the Senate stand for a moment of silence in recognition of Professor Ricci.

Chairman Cox recognized Professor Gretchen LaGodna for a Special Resolution.

University Senate Resolution

WHEREAS: Dr. Robert E. Hemenway has been chosen as the next Chancellor of the University of Kansas and, thus, is leaving his position as Chancellor of the Lexington campus, University of Kentucky.

WHEREAS: Dr. Hemenway has very ably and faithfully served our university as a faculty member in the Department of English, as Chair of that Department, and as Chancellor, establishing along the way an outstanding record as teacher, researcher, administrator, and most valuable University citizen.

WHEREAS: Dr. Hemenway has provided excellent leadership to the faculty, students, and staff of the Lexington campus as evidenced by restructuring and development of new programs, significantly increasing the number of national merit finalists, successfully recruiting diverse faculty, and formally recognizing staff and their contributions.

WHEREAS: Dr. Hemenway has constantly used his intellect, energy, vision, and his great talent for communication to make this a better university and to make us, collectively, a better faculty.

BE IT RESOLVED: The University Senate thank Robert Hemenway for his many contributions and wish him well in his continuing efforts on behalf of higher education. The University of Kansas is indeed fortunate and the Senate sincerely hopes that Dr. Hemenway's tenure at the University of Kentucky prepared him well for his new responsibilities.

Professor LaGodna stated that Chancellor could not be in attendance to hear the resolution, but he would receive a copy.

The Chair stated the first item on the agenda was to change some application deadlines. The circulation did not get circulated due to a postal problem. Chairman Cox asked for a motion to do away with the 10 day circulation rule. Motion was made and seconded. In a voice vote, the motion was unanimously passed. Copies were handed out today.

Chairman Cox said he had a report from Allison Carll from the Admissions Advisory Committee. They are going to propose uniform application deadlines for all programs. Specifically they will propose:

February 1 - Fall Application deadline for professional programs including Pharmacy, Nursing, Clinical Laboratory Sciences, Communication Disorders, Physician Assistant Studies, Health Administration, Interior Design, and the Coordinated Undergraduate Program in Dietetics, with the exception of Architecture which will use March 1 for a deadline.

August 1 - Fall Application deadline for selective admissions programs; Business and Economics, Communications, and Computer Science.

October 1 - Spring Semester application deadline for Computer Science, Communications, and Clinical Laboratories

If this proposal passes, the committee recommendation will be circulated as soon

as it is available. Anyone who has any problems or concerns should respond to the Senate Council. Based on that response, the Senate Council will be asked to take it up on an emergency basis and presumably approve it. The implementation date should be Fall of 1996, but the various application forms need to go to the printers by June.

The Chair recognized Professor Gretchen LaGodna, Chair-elect of the Senate Council, for the first action item. Professor LaGodna stated the proposals apply to three specific programs: Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and the College of Business and Economics. Each has a particular reason for the change of deadlines.

Professor Hans Gesund (Engineering) asked if the Colleges of Architecture and Business and Economics were aware that the other application deadlines were going to change. The Chair answered yes they were involved in the committee process. Professor Gesund said he was under the impression that when the colleges agreed to the new deadlines it was in order to come into line with the other colleges. Chairman

Cox said that Business and Economics was the same. February 1st applies to Pharmacy, Nursing, Clinical Laboratory Sciences, Communication Disorders, Physician Assistant Studies, Health Administration, Interior Design, and Coordinated Undergraduate Programs, not any on this list.

Professor Gesund said he was under the impression that Architecture, for instance, wanted to get in line with everyone else and this would put them out of line.

Joe Fink (Admissions) said that he could give some background. The Admissions Advisory Committee has been discussing the issue of trying to get more uniformity to the deadlines. As part of that, these three programs went ahead and formulated a proposal because of the discussion. At the same time the Admissions Advisory Committee had a meeting in which representatives from Nursing, Business and Economics, Allied Health Professions, Architecture, Communications were present. There was a variety of discussion, and those present reached an agreement about moving towards more uniform dates. All of the discussions focused on application deadlines for fall; they did not discuss application deadlines for the spring semester. Although it involves small numbers of applicants, there is still a desirable endpoint of having uniform dates for spring as well as for fall. The proposal that is not up for vote relates to uniform deadlines for spring semester as well as some of the other colleges that are not in this action item for today.

There was no other discussion. In a voice vote, the proposal unanimously passed and reads as follows:

Proposals:

Change the deadlines for application to the College/program as follows:

4.2.2.7 Landscape Architecture Program

- 1) Delete application deadlines from A. (Freshmen), B (Transfers from Other Degree Programs), and C. (Transfers from Other Landscape Architecture Programs)

4.2.2.8 College of Architecture

- 1) Freshman Admissions: from February 1 to March 1
- 2) Transfer Students: from February 1 to April 1

4.2.2.9 College of Business & Economics

- 1) Fall Admissions: From June 1 to August 1
- 2) Spring Admissions: From October 15 to December 1
- 3) Summer Admissions: From April 1 to May 1

Rationale:

Landscape Architecture Program: The Landscape Architecture department has worked with admissions to develop a Pre-Landscape Architecture code for those students applying to the Landscape Architecture program. Once the requirements have been met to the admitted to the program, the student's record is updated by the Associate Dean for Instruction's office in the College of Agriculture. Therefore, the department feels there is no longer a need for an application deadline with the Pre-Landscape Architecture code in place.

College of Architecture: The College of Architecture, as a selective admission program, offers the Architecture Admission Test on the first Saturday in March each year for entrance into the program for the following Fall semester.

Selection

of the entering class takes place during the two week period following the test.

The two week period reserved for accumulation of data including that from the University Admissions Office can easily be accommodated through the second week in March through the use of the SIS information system. The proposed change of dates will not significantly alter the process of admission to the college

but simplify the deadlines within the university.

College of Business & Economics: The College of Business and Economics feels that making their deadlines correspond with the general University deadlines

is both more efficient and fairer to students.

These changes have the approval of the Senate Council and Admissions Advisory Committee

Implementation Date: Fall Applicants, 1995.

Note: If approved, the proposed changes will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for codification.

Chairman Cox thanked the Senate for their cooperation. He had asked many of them to be on committees and also chair them; they had all responded wonderfully, and he appreciated that. He also thanked the Senate Council. They have been a constant source of support, inspiration, and encouragement. Thanks to the sergeants at arms (Michelle Sohner and Jacquie Hager) and to Gifford Blyton, the

parliamentarian, who could not be here today. Thanks to Susan Caldwell, the recording secretary, and a special thanks to Cindy Todd. It has been wonderful working for her; she is a good boss. It has been a good year; he has learned a lot and appreciates all the support he received.

The Chair stated that the next agenda item was for discussion only. Arts and Sciences had made a formal proposal last fall for a plus/minus system for the undergraduate courses in that college. The Admissions and Academic Standards Committee discussed the issue and came to the conclusion that if Arts and Sciences were going to have a plus/minus system, it was nearly tantamount to the whole university's having a general plus/minus system. This was the issue the Senate Council wanted discussed, and after the discussion, a straw vote would be taken. Based on the discussion, the Senate Council would move ahead, and a formal proposal would be made sometime next year either for a university-wide plus/minus system or a plus/minus system for Arts and Sciences.

The Chair recognized Professor Gretchen LaGodna to introduce the item. Professor LaGodna noted that the proposal had to do with instituting a plus/minus grading system and was not to be confused with a Pass/Fail system. The proposal dealt with the pros and cons of introducing the system for the entire undergraduate student body.

Greg Watkins (Student Senator) asked what would happen if the proposal applied only to Arts and Sciences. If students in Business and Economics took a class in Arts and Sciences, would the grading system apply to them? If it did not, the system seemed unfair because it singles out certain students. Also, what about the students who transfer from Arts and Sciences to Communications? What happens to their plus/minus grades? Will their GPA change? What occurs if a student transfers into Arts and Sciences? Will their grades be changed? He argued that the proposal would create a lot of paperwork problems for the Registrar's Office as well as for the students. He had talked with quite a lot of students in the past two weeks and found many of them opposed to the concept. However, the student advisory board in Arts and Sciences had supported it.

Dr. Cox said that in order to prevent any confusion, the Senate Council thought that the proposal should apply to everyone. It was his understanding that if a student from Arts and Sciences currently takes a Fine Arts class, the pluses and minuses are removed. There is the potential of having two students take the same courses and doing the same work but having a different GPA because the plus/minus would be removed from one and not the other.

Hans Gesund (Engineering) said that this was a non-issue because the computer program could easily be adjusted to record the grades no matter what college the student is in. If Arts and Sciences faculty believe they can evaluate people

very precisely, he was unhappy that everyone else would have to follow suit.

He was familiar with both systems since he teaches in Architecture where there is a plus/minus

system and in Engineering where there is none. He personally felt that each college

faculty should be allowed to make up its own mind. Inconvenience to the Registrar's Office in having to change slightly their program was not a valid reason for forcing the

entire university to adapt a plus/minus system.

Horst Schach (Academic Ombud) indicated that he was an advocate of the plus/minus system. Currently, if students from different schools enroll in his class, and

if he awards one a minus, that person is penalized.

In addition Professor Schach indicated that 90% of the ombuds' business has to do with complaints about grades. Grades are a yardstick and the more precise they

are, the less debate there is about what is being measured. He argued that one of the

main reasons for going to the plus/minus system in Landscape Architecture was that

some of the courses are six credit offerings, and it is terribly unfair if a student who gets a 79% receives a C, and a student who gets an 80% receives a B. The only sensible thing to do is to go to a plus/minus system for the entire University.

Chairman Cox presumed that if the university did go to a plus/minus system, any

particular college which did not like the plus/minus could decide to use the regular

letter grade.

Bradley Canon (Political Science) felt that it should be made clear that faculty

would not be required to use the plus/minus system.

Heather Hennel (Student Government) pointed out that she had talked with several students and that less than 50% were in favor of the plus/minus system.

Students do not like to be thought of as lazy individuals who go to class and do the

minimal amount of work to receive an A, B, or C. They are trying their hardest and

working for an A; if they score in the low 90's, they still believe they deserve an A.

Another argument against the change is that teachers have a limited focus.

Who is to say that a teacher can decide whether a student writes an essay that is worth 95% or

94% and whether that should be an A or A-? There will be discrepancies in the way

teachers grade and subjective elements frequently enter in. Another argument has to

do with mixed classes. Some students with a numerical grade of 87 will receive a 3.0 and others a 3.8.

Students have also indicated to her that if the proposal is approved only for Arts and Sciences, some individuals will decide on a major earlier than they feel they should have to in order to avoid the plus/minus system. Heather also stated she would like Student Government to handle this matter from the students' side, possibly through a resolution by Student Government which would be forwarded to the Senate Council. She believed that if students were in favor of it, they would be in favor of a University wide system.

Dan Rowland (History) argued that the plus/minus system would actually produce less arbitrary arrangements and would provide more categories. He indicated that the College of Arts and Science Council considered the proposal quite carefully, polled all the faculty, and came out very decisively in favor of the plus/minus system.

The Chair stated that he had a letter from Dick Ulack, Chair of the Arts and Science Faculty Council, which indicated that Arts and Sciences was quite strongly in favor of the plus/minus system. One of the votes taken was 151 in favor and 57 opposed.

Louis Swift (Dean, Undergraduate Studies) asked Horst Schach if there were fewer conflicts when there is a plus/minus system in place and whether there is any information from other institutions? Are there fewer conflicts between a person getting an A- with a 93% and an A with a 94%, as opposed to getting a B with an 89% and an A with a 90%? Professor Schach replied he had no empirical data along those lines. However, his experience indicated that most challenges to grades involved individuals at the lower end of the grading scale. For those at the upper end, especially those trying to get into some competitive programs, the proposed change to a plus/minus system would be helpful because it would give a more accurate indication of academic performance.

Gretchen LaGodna indicated every grade dispute she was involved in had to do with full grades (i.e. A, B, C etc.).

Professor Monica Harris (Psychology) felt that she was able to make distinctions between students who perform very well and those who do not. In her class there is a world of difference between an individual who gets an 89% and one who gets an 81%. She would like to reward the better students, but under the current system she is unable to do so; thus, the plus/minus system would benefit students.

Professor Eric Christianson (History) argued from his experience with large sections of History courses that there are quite a few students interested in having plus/minus. He would like to have the ability to differentiate between the student who did fairly well and the student who did much better.

Alan Aha (Student Government) asked if the students were polled and what was the reason given by the Student Advisory Board for the endorsement of the proposal.

Ted Tauchert indicated that the people from Arts and Sciences assured him that students had been involved. However, the three students on the Committee never came to the meetings.

Horst Schach suggested that instead of a poll, a meeting should be held with the students in Architecture and Landscape Architecture to determine their views on a plus/minus system.

Greg Watkins indicated that he had spoken with some students from the College of Law and that they seemed to think the professional programs needed a plus/minus system because there is intense competition within programs. He did not think that a new system was really needed, but if the students wanted plus/minus, he would support the proposal. From the people he had talked with he concluded that there is not very much support for a change.

Professor Loys Mather (Agriculture Economics) said that he polled his classes and found that those who favor plus/minus favor it quite strongly; those who oppose it quite strongly. The result was 60% in favor, 36% opposed, and 4% not sure. Professor Mather argued that the University needed to make sure that there is an opportunity for dialogue in order to get the students' feedback.

Mary Moore (Freshman Representative) asked whether the university would go back and change past grades if the proposal were implemented. Chairman Cox answered no; the system would not be retroactive.

Brad Canon stated that there were really two issues under debate. One was the merit of the system itself; the other was whether it should be university-wide or should be proposed as an Arts and Sciences arrangement. Thus, when the straw vote is taken, one could be favor of the system for Arts and Sciences but not necessarily in favor of it for the rest of the university.

Professor Hans Gesund asked whether a faculty member could opt out of the new system if a plus/minus policy were adopted. He noted this because each syllabus has to state the grade policy. The Chair indicated that if faculty members were to state in their syllabi their particular policy, they would not have to give plus/minus grades. Professor Gesund wondered what the opinion of the Deans, the Chancellor, the

President, and the Ombud would be on that point.

Professor Larry Grabau (Agriculture) stated that he could see how some professors within a college could use the plus/minus system and some not.

However,
a plus/minus system could cause some students to do as little as possible to get the higher grade. Also, an A plus could be a problem for some students who are compulsive about being the best at anything they do. Chairman Cox stated that the

Arts and Science proposal had not included an A plus.

Enid Waldhart (Communications) indicated that she was concerned about a statement from the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee indicating that the

plus/minus system would, indeed, result in more precise and accurate grading. The Committee then went on to suggest, however, that the greater the number of grade categories, the greater the discrepancy in grades by different instructors.

Professor Waldhart felt that the issue of discrepancy should be a major consideration in any discussion about adopting a plus/minus system.

Gretchen LaGodna indicated that there are problems with discrepancies in the current system and that there are ways to deal with that issue.

Tom Garrity (Medicine) stated that he would be very much opposed to the imposition of a plus/minus system University wide. He indicated that for many years

the College of Medicine had debated what grade categories they should have. For a considerable period of time the faculty used Pass, Fail, and Honors in order to diminish the extent of student competition within classes. However, the College was now using a whole letter grade system. There would be many people in the College of Medicine who would not be in favor of a finer grading system and would not like to have it imposed upon them. Professor Garrity indicated that he would support the system for Arts and Sciences but would not want to see it imposed broadly.

Dr. Cox pointed out that the proposal was actually for undergraduate courses.

Kirby Hancock (Student Agriculture) supported a plus/minus system if it applied across the University; he thought it was unfair, however, for students enrolled in a course from different colleges to receive different grades.

Hans Gesund said that it would not make a difference what college a student was in. If someone received a 3.3, he or she would receive a 3.3 regardless of what college they belonged to. It was the course that carried the grade and influenced the GPA.

Doug Poe (Business and Economics) said that if the point of the plus/minus was

to allow finer gradations among students in order to enable them to keep their scholarships, the new system would not be unfair. Students from the College of Agriculture are only competing against students from that college. The issue regarding a faculty member's obligation to adhere to the policy if it were passed, seemed clear. Individuals would have to make a good case for not adopting the new system. The Chair stated that the plus/minus would presumably be up to the instructors' discretion. Professor Pope stated he would like a legal opinion on the issue. He did not feel that if the University went to plus/minus, the instructor could decide not to use the system.

Brad Canon stated that the University Senate Rules would govern the policy if it were written into the rules.

Mary Shake (Education) stated that transcript analyses for students applying for graduate schools were an important issue. She found it difficult to imagine what kind of explanation would have to accompany transcripts if the university had a mixed system.

Heather Hennel (Student Government) believed that the plus/minus system should be applied university-wide because it would give more integrity and legitimacy to the grades. An additional concern was that students still do not always know their grades before the withdrawal date. If plus/minus were applied across the university, the policy of informing students would have to be enforced.

Greg Watkins wanted to clarify Professor Gesund's statement concerning students who take a class in the College of Arts and Sciences if the policy is instituted only for that College. Would students get the plus/minus grade regardless of the college they are in?

Dr. Cox answered in the affirmative.

Ted Tauchert said that the Registrar's Office reported that the plus/minus could be removed or not; the decision would be up to the individual college. Engineering could keep the grades from Arts and Science if it chose to do so.

Susan DeCarvalho (Spanish and Italian) asked what this change would do to the students' transcripts when they apply to graduate and professional schools. She asked how many other institutions use the plus/minus system and whether the University of Kentucky is in line with the majority or not?

Professor Waldhart indicated that she was not sure that taking a straw vote at the meeting was a good idea. Because several different kinds of questions had been

raised, people might vote differently from the way they would when considering an actual proposal. Chairman Cox indicated that it would be good to know whether the Senate favored a university-wide plus/minus system or a mixed system.

Loys Mather asked if it would be better to inquire whether the Senate favored having the Senate Council bring a proposal back.

Chairman Cox said that none of the discussion or vote had any authority. Nothing was being decided. He was only trying to get information for the Senate Council.

Professor Cox put the question: "If the university had an undergraduate university-wide plus/minus grading system, how many would be in favor?" The result of the straw vote was 25 in favor, 5 opposed. He then asked, "Should Arts and Sciences be allowed to have a plus/minus system that is applicable to that college but not to the whole university?" The result was 20 in favor, 9 opposed.

The proposal reads as follows:

Proposal:

Last Fall the College of Arts & Sciences asked Senate approval for a +/- grading system for undergraduates similar to that which the Colleges of Architecture and Fine Arts as well as the Landscape Architecture program now have (USR, 5.1.2.4). The Senate Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards, to whom the proposal was sent, have discussed the matter at some length. Their concern is that, due to the size and centrality of A&S, such a marking system for the College is nearly tantamount to a University wide +/- system. The committee recommended that the Senate should debate and decide this issue.

The Admissions and Academic Standards Committee points out that a general lack of uniformity and consistency could result if A&S has a +/- system and most other colleges do not.

At the end of the discussion today, a straw vote will be taken. If there appears to be strong support for a +/- system, the Senate Council will bring back a proposal at a later date. If not, the A&S proposal will be brought before the Senate.

Chairman Cox thanked the Senate and adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Louis J. Swift
Acting University Registrar

