THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

College of Law

Tucson, Arizona

June 26, 1968

TO: President Richard A. Harvill

FROM: Charles E. Ares
Dean, College of Law

IN RE: Law College Curriculum

The law faculty has completed a thorough revision of its curriculum. In light of the magnitude of the changes, it has been thought advisable to simply submit new course proposals for every course in the new curriculum and to abolish all former courses. It may be noted that most of the "new courses" are reincarnations of former courses; in many cases names are changed, in some the credit value is different.

All courses in the law curriculum have been renumbered in the 300 series to conform to the fact of graduate level work.

As an aid to understanding, we attach descriptions of the former curriculum and the revised versions. The following basic changes will be noticed: (a) The first year courses are rearranged in order to complete each course in one semester rather than spreading several courses over the academic year. (b) The number of required courses in the second and third years is reduced drastically on the premise that the law is so varied that no single course of study realistically can be prescribed. Students will be allowed to select widely and, to a limited degree, to concentrate in chosen areas. (c) The number of seminars and problem method (as distinguished from casebook method) courses is substantially increased. This follows from our belief that law students should receive much greater experience in research, writing and problem solving. The stage is also set for the creation of a legal clinical program.

Finally, the law faculty will permit qualified third year students to take up to 6 units of work in other colleges. We also invite seniors and graduate students, with appropriate approval, to take law courses relevant to their current programs. (We do not intend this to be a means of getting a head start on law school.)

CHARLES E. ARES
Dean, College of Law

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

COLLEGE OF LAW

Former Curriculum

FIRST YEAR

The first year of law study is entirely prescribed:

First Semester		Second Semester	
Subject	Units	Subject	Units
Contracts (Law 102a)	3	Contracts (Law 102b)	3
Torts (Law 105a)	3	Torts (Law 105b)	2
Property (Law 107a)	3	Property (Law 107b)	3
Criminal Law (Law 108)	3	Judicial Remedies (Law 110)	3
Research and Writing (Law 116)	2	Appellate Practice & Moot Court (Law 135) [pass-fail]	1
		Civil Procedure (Law 146a)	3
Total.	14	Total.	15

SECOND YEAR

The following are required:

First Semester		Second Semester	
Subject	Units	Subject	Units
Criminal Procedure (Law 109)	2	Trusts and Estates (Law 140b)	3
Trusts & Estates (Law 140a)	2	Private Corporations (Law 182)	3
Agency (Law 114)	2	Federal Income Taxation (Law 193)	3
Civil Procedure (Law 146b)	2		
Constitutional Law (Law 181)	4		
Total.	12	Total.	9

THIRD YEAR

In the third year, students are encouraged to elect as wide a variety of courses as possible. The following are required:

Subject	Units
Evidence (Law 128)	4
Professional Responsibility (Law 142)	1
Trial Practice (Law 187)	3
Total.	8

ELECTIVE COURSES - SECOND AND THIRD YEAR

COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

Arizona Law Review (Law 155a -155b, 1-3) I, II.
Bankruptcy (Law 277, 2) II.
Bills and Notes (Law 150, 3) II.
Creditors' Remedies (Law 192, 2) I.
Family Law (Law 157, 3) I.
Federal Estate and Gift Taxation (Law 194, 2) I.
Insurance (Law 164, 2) II.
International Law (Law 200, 3) II.
Legislation (Law 276, 3) II.
Modern Real Estate Transactions (Law 259, 3) II.
Mining Law (Law 174, 2) II.
Sales (Law 166, 3) I.
Security Transactions (Law 168, 3) II.
State and Local Taxation (Law 189, 2) II.
Water Law (Law 172, 2) I.

ELECTIVE COURSES - THIRD YEAR

COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

Administrative Law (Law 190, 2) II.
Conflict of Laws (Law 170, 3) II.
Estate Planning (Law 195, 2) II.
Federal Courts (Law 169, 3) I.
Future Interests (Law 149, 2) I.
Government Regulation of Business (Law 191, 2) I.
Labor Law (Law 158, 2) II.
Legal Drafting (Law 175, 1) I.
Legal Process (Law 271, 3) II.
Municipal Corporations (Law 163, 2) II.
Research (Law 198, 1-3) II.

SEMINARS

Advanced Corporate Problems (Law 199d, 2) I.
Land Development Seminar (Law 199c, 2) I.
Legal Aid Seminar (Law 199b, 2) I.
Selected Problems in the Law of Torts (Law 199a, 2) I.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

COLLEGE OF LAW

Proposed Curriculum

FIRST YEAR

The first year of law study is entirely prescribed:

First Semester		Second Semester	
Subject	Units	Subject	Units
Contracts (Law 300)	5	Torts (Law 304)	5
Introduction to Legal Process & Civil Procedure (Law 301)	4	Constitutional Law (Law 306)	4
Criminal Law Process (Law 302)	4	Property (Law 305)	5
Research & Writing (Law 303)	2	Appellate Practice & Moot Court (Law 307) [pass-fail]	1
Total.	15	Total.	15

SECOND YEAR

Required course:

Subject	Units
Evidence (Law 308)	4

THIRD YEAR

Required course:

Subject	Units
The Legal Profession (Law 309)	2

ELECTIVE COURSES - SECOND & THIRD YEAR

Decedents' Estates

Decedents' Estates (Law 310, 2) I.
Trusts and Fiduciary Administration (Law 311, 4) II.
(Includes Future Interests)
Future Interests (Law 313, 2) I.

Persons

Family Law (Law 312, 3) I.
The Employment Relation (Law 314, 2) I.

Business Associations

Agency and Partnership (Law 315, 3) I.
Private Corporations (Law 316, 3) II.
Corporate Finance (Law 317, 2) I.

Government Regulation of Economic Activity

Antitrust (Law 318, 3) I.
Unfair Trade Practices (Law 319, 2) I.
Regulated Industries (Law 320, 2) II.

Public Law

Administrative Law (Law 321, 3) I.
Law Review (Law 322, 1-3) I, II.
Conflict of Laws (Law 323, 3) II.
Labor Law (Law 324, 3) II.
Local Government Law (Law 325, 2) II.
Jurisprudence (Law 326, 3) I
International Law (Law 327, 3) II.
Comparative Law (Law 328, 3) II.
Legal History (Law 329, 3) I.
Legal Process (Law 330, 3) II.
Legislation (Law 331, 3) II.
Independent Research (Law 332, 1-3) I, II.

Commercial Law

Commercial Transactions (Law 333, 4) I.
Problems Under the Uniform Commercial Code (Law 334, 2) II.
Insurance (Law 335, 2) I.
Bankruptcy and Creditors' Rights (Law 336, 3) I.
International Commercial Transactions (Law 337, 3) I.

Real Property

Real Estate Transactions (Law 338, 3) I.
Community Property (Law 339, 2) II.
Mining and Public Land Law (Law 340, 3) I.
Water Law (Law 341, 2) II.

Litigation

Federal Jurisdiction (Law 342, 3) I.
Federal and Arizona Procedure (Law 343, 3) I.
Remedies (Law 344, 3) II.
Trial Practice (Law 345, 3) I, II.

Taxation

Federal Income Tax (Law 346, 3) II.
Corporate Taxation (Law 347, 3) I.
Federal Estate and Gift Taxation (Law 348, 3) I.
State and Local Taxation (Law 349, 2) II.

Criminal Law

Problems in Criminal Law (Law 350, 3) I.

SEMINARS

Estate Planning (Law 399a, 2) II.
Problems in the Law of Torts (Law 399b, 2) I.
Juvenile Delinquency (Law 399c, 2) II.
Securities Regulation (Law 399d, 2) I.
Business Planning (Law 399e, 3) II.
Current Constitutional Problems (Law 399f, 2) II.
Legal Aid (Clinical) (Law 399g, 2) I, II.
Law and Social Problems (Law 399h, 2) I.
Law and Medicine (Law 399i, 2) I.
Consumer Credit Problems (Law 399j, 2) I.
Problems of Land Development (Law 399k, 2) I.
Natural Resources (Law 3991, 2) II.
Landlord and Tenant (Law 399m, 2) II.
Problems in Litigation (Law 399n, 2) II.
Law and Psychiatry (Law 399o, 2) II.
Law and Economics (Law 399p, 2) I, II.
Criminal Procedure (Law 399q, 2) II.
Administration of the Criminal Process (Law 399r, 2) I.
Current Contract Problems (Law 399s, 2) I.
The Language of the Law (Law 399t, 2) II.

GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS

1. Each student as a condition of graduation must satisfactorily complete at least one of the following courses: Jurisprudence, International Law, Legal History, Legal Process and Comparative Law.

2. Each student must satisfactorily complete at least one seminar and must, either in conjunction with a seminar or through independent research, present a research paper of substantial quality.

3. A minimum of 85 semester hours of course work must be completed with a cumulative grade average of 3.0000.

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC ADVISING AND COUNSELING

An advisory Council Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Advising and Counseling submitted its report to the Advisory Council on October 16, 1968. The report was approved by the Advisory Council. The Council further directed that the report should be furnished members of the Faculty Senate for their information.

The full report follows:

1. The policy of the University is to provide individual counseling by professors and counselors to meet all student problems. It is the prime responsibility of each college and an essential responsibility of each professor to counsel and advise students in their respective major fields of study.

2. A printed brochure containing a statement of the philosophy of the University concerning counseling and advising should be developed and made available to all high school seniors in the state. The brochure should describe the various counseling and advising services available to students or prospective students and provide specific instructions as to how the student may acquire the benefits of these services.

Students should be informed, at the time of registration and orientation and in the classroom, of the value of seeking out advice from their counselors and advisers.

3. In the smaller colleges, freshmen should be assigned to individual professors to serve as advisers throughout the students' undergraduate years. Lower-division students in the larger colleges, Liberal Arts and Business Administration, should be advised centrally by professional counselors housed in or near the college office. Each student should, however, have access to department heads and major professors for consultations regarding the selection of a major field of study. Upon attaining upper-division status, all students should be assigned to major professors in their chosen areas of specialization.

Each student should be given a written notice at the time of registration or in correspondence prior to registration containing the name, office number, and telephone number of his assigned academic adviser.

4. Professors should be provided with complete up-to-date records of the students for whom they have counseling and advising responsibility. This information should include academic records, ACT scores, mid-term grade reports, grade slips, notification of attendance warnings, administrative drop actions, and if possible, selected reports from the Student Health Service and the Student Counseling Bureau. Sufficient clerical support for maintaining these records must be provided by each individual college and department.

5. Each college should develop written statements detailing its policies and procedures for the counseling and advising program. These policies and procedures should be approved by the Advisory Council of the University. College faculty and staff should receive copies of the approved policies and procedures and should be made aware of the importance of their individual responsibility for the success of the college counseling and advisement program.

6. Professors and counselors should be informed by the department heads and the dean of the significance of successful advising. Success as an adviser should be a portion of the complete performance by the professor. Merit increases and promotions should be made after an analysis of the performance level of the individual professor or counselor in advising as well as in the other factors such as teaching, research, writing, etc.

7. A University-wide Committee on Counseling and Advisement should be established to be composed of one member from each college including the Graduate College and the Division of Continuing Education. Representatives are to be appointed by the Dean of the College or Division. The Vice President for Academic Affairs should serve as Chairman of the Committee. Regular meetings should be held to facilitate the exchange of ideas and to maintain some degree of consistency between colleges.

Comparative reports concerning counseling and advisement should be submitted to this committee for evaluation and suggestions for remedial action if necessary.

8. The individual colleges should establish special summer counseling programs for freshman students from Arizona. This will relieve the pressure and congestion at the regular registration and orientation week. The time set aside during the summer for this kind of counseling would be for academic counseling only with the exception that parents should be invited for evening programs concerning the entire University.

The Ad Hoc Committee on
Advisement and Counseling

Dean Willis R. Brewer
Dean Robert A. Crowell
Dean Francis A. Roy
Dean William Voris, Chairman

Consultants

Dr. Walter H. Delaplane
Dr. Richard M. Edwards
Mr. David L. Windsor

Secretary

Dean Gary M. Munsinger

November 1, 1968

The University of Arizona
Proceedings of the Faculty Senate

Meeting of Monday November 18, 1968

PRESENT: Ares, Bingham, Blecha, Bok, Burton, Damon, Davis, Delaplane, Dewhirst, Forrester, Gegenheimer, Gould, Hall, Harris, Hetrick, Hull, Johnson, Joyner, Krebs, Krutzsch, Leonard, Little, Lynn, Marcoux, Martin, McMillan, Myers, Paylore, Resnick, Rhodes, Roy, Shields, Spicer, Steelink, Thompson, Voris, and Wilson. Also in attendance were Professor Louis Myers, Dr. G.D. Percy, Dr. Albert Picchioni, Dr. Mitchell Vavich, and Mr. David Butler.

ABSENT: Armstrong, Brewer, Carlson, Cockrum, DuVal, Gaines, Green, Harvill, Kassander, Kemmerer, McDonald, Mees, Murphy, Patrick, Paulsen, Skinner, Sorensen, Svob, and Windsor.

CATALOGUE MATERIAL: The following catalogue material was accepted:

New Courses

Community Medicine 301a-301b, Community Medicine (2-2) Yr. Abrams and Staff
Geochronology 281, Quaternary Palynology (4) II Fee $15.00 Mehringer (Identical with Geology 281)

Internal Medicine 302a-302b, Principles of Medicine (10-10) Yr. Staff (effective for academic year 1968-69)

Physics 5, Elements of Physics (3) I, II Fee $5.00 Blitzer, Kalbach, Tomizuka (approved to take effect 2nd Sem. 1968-69)

Public Administration 298s Comparative Penology (6) Summer Morrison

Changes

Civil Engineering 130, Structural Engineering, change unit value from 4 to 3.
Civil Engineering 235, Structural Systems (5) I change to 236, Structural Engineering III (3) II, and 237, Structural Engineering IV (3) I
Pharmacy 112a-112b, Institutional Pharmacy Practice, change unit value from 1-1 to 1-3 - 1-3 (to take effect 2nd Sem. 1968-69)
Pharmacy - Change of second year pharmacy curriculum to permit a choice between Chemistry 160 (Biochemistry) and Agricultural Biochemistry 211a (Physiological Biochemistry). (effective 2nd Sem. 1968-69)
Psychology 42, Personality in College, Delete $5.00 Fee (effective 2nd Sem. 1968-69)

REPORT ON TAX-SHELTERED ANNUITY PROGRAM: Vice President McMillan announced that the Arizona State Tax Commission had ruled that Tax-Sheltered Annuities are subject to state income tax. The State Attorney General had previously stated that these annuities were exempt from state income tax. However, the Tax Commission has now ruled that these annuities are not exempt from state income tax. It appears that the only way to get this resolved would be to take the matter to court.

If this were done, the participants in the Annuity Program would be required to pay the legal fees involved. There are currently over 340 faculty and staff members participating in the program from the University of Arizona. In addition to these, there are some faculty and staff members from Arizona State University and Northern Arizona University who are also participating. Vice President McMillan indicated that this would bring the total participants to over 500, and the legal fees would not amount to more than $8.00 to $10.00 per person.

Dr. Blecha asked if the deferred annuity were taxed now, would it be taxed later when it was withdrawn? Vice President McMillan replied that it would not if it were withdrawn while the individual were still living in Arizona. However, there is a possibility that if the individual moved to another state, it might be taxed by that state when the annuity was withdrawn. Dr. Steelink stated that he felt it was best to be sure that the state does not tax the annuity now and it possibly would be a wise idea to take the matter to court. Dean Ares asked if the Regents could employ legal counsel outside the Attorney General's office. Vice President McMillan replied that apparently the Regents cannot use state funds for this purpose. He indicated that he had brought the matter to the Senate to try to get the feeling of the faculty, and he now felt that the faculty would be in favor of taking this matter to court.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF THE AD HOC FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON ROTC: Professor Marcoux reminded the Senate that at their meeting of October 7, they had asked his committee to reconvene and bring further recommendations concerning the ROTC question to the November Senate meeting. He then presented the supplemental report from his committee and moved its acceptance. The motion was seconded by Dean Hull.

Dean Rhodes said that he questioned the wording of the second recommendation of the supplemental report. He felt that the program should become optional for all male students rather than just freshmen at the beginning of the fall semester 1969-70. Dean Roy stated that if the proposed change were included in the new catalogue, the student would have his choice under which catalogue to graduate and therefore could make the selection as to whether to be under the catalogue that had mandatory ROTC or not. Dr. Thompson stated that perhaps this was just a failure on the committee's part to consider this question. He suggested that the wording of the second recommendation be changed to read "....become effective for all male students at the beginning..." Dr. Thompson then moved that this amendment be made to the supplemental report. This was seconded by Vice President Johnson.

Dean Ares asked about the propriety of phasing this program out too quickly. He stated there might be some difficulty with established programs and existing staff. Dr. Gegenheimer replied that if the proposal were not made effective for all male students at the same time, there would be much ducking of the requirement via the petition method, and he was in favor of its becoming optional for all male students. Dr. Damon stated that by increasing the semester hours of credit the program would become more attractive and more justified due to the amount of time which is now required. The question was then called for on the amendment and it passed unanimously. The Senate then voted to accept the supplemental report of the Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Committee on ROTC as amended. The report is listed below.

> "The Faculty Senate, at its meeting of October 7, 1968, requested the Ad Hoc Faculty Committee on ROTC to review the recommendations it submitted to the Senate on March 4, 1968. On the basis of such a

review, which has included the collection and examination of new information, the Committee re-affirms its basic recommendation. Specific recommendations which are considered to be consistent with national policy, sound trends in higher education, and widely held social and educational goals are restated as follows:

1) The basic ROTC training program at the University of Arizona be changed from a required to an optional program of study.

2) The optional ROTC program become effective for all male students at the beginning of the fall semester 1969-70.

3) Neither the minimum nor maximum number of credit hours required for graduation in any degree program be changed as a result of the inception of the optional ROTC program.

4) The specific adjustments in programs of study and degree programs within the existing minimum and maximum number of credit hours required for graduation that will be needed to replace the credit hours now given for the required ROTC program must be developed by the college faculties responsible for these degree programs.

5) The credit hours assigned to the specific courses in the ROTC program, both basic and advanced, must be calculated on the basis of the same formula that is used for courses in other academic programs. While it is expected that the faculty of Departments of Military Science and Aerospace Studies will present specific recommendations for individual course offerings, the Committee recommends that the total number of credit hours assigned to the two-year basic ROTC program be increased from 4 to 8 hours, an average of 2 per semester.

6) The University should provide special orientation to prospective male students in order to present the values and advantages of the ROTC teaching program as preparation for a professional career.

/s/ H.A. Marcoux, Chairman
/s/ Robert L. Hull
/s/ Paul E. Damon
/s/ Robert S. Svob
/s/ Raymond H. Thompson

November 4, 1968"

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC ADVISING AND COUNSELING: The Senate accepted the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Advising and Counseling a copy of which is attached to these proceedings.

REPORT OF FACULTY COMMITTEE TO STUDY PASS-FAIL GRADING PROPOSAL: Vice President McMillan recognized Dr. Picchioni, Chairman of the Faculty Committee to Study the Pass-Fail Grading System. Dr. Picchioni indicated that he and his committee had conferred with students, faculty, and other universities in preparation of the recommendation which he was now presenting, a copy of which had earlier been mailed to each senator. He moved that the report of the Faculty Committee to Study Pass-Fail Grading Proposal be accepted. Dean Voris seconded. Dean Roy referred to Paragraph 5 and asked why the individual departments should decide which courses should be offered under the pass-fail option. He felt as long as the student had met the requirements, i.e., a course outside of his major, minor, and group requirements, any course should be open to the pass-fail option. Dr. Picchioni replied that the original proposal from the student committee to consider a pass-fail grading procedure had been that the instructor not know which students in his class were taking the course for pass-fail. It was the opinion of the students that if the instructor had knowledge of this, it would prejudice him against those students. However, if the instructor and the department beforehand had indicated that their course would be available for pass-fail, then no adverse effects would be felt by the students concerned.

Dr. Gegenheimer and Dr. Steelink both stated that if departments eliminated some courses from the pass-fail system, this would defeat the purpose of the proposal, the proposal being to allow the students to explore all areas of the academic continuum.

Dr. Damon raised a question concerning major, minor, and group requirements. He felt that technical electives indicated in the catalogue would also be eliminated from the pass-fail proposal, and he further felt that technical electives should not be eliminated, but that any course not specifically defined as required for the student's degree should be eligible for the pass-fail option.

Dr. Blecha asked why required courses were to be exempted from the pass-fail grading system. Dean Rhodes replied that the objective of the pass-fail grading system was to encourage students to go outside their major fields of study.

Dr. Blecha then stated that some required courses are better suited to a pass-fail grading system rather than the existing system, for example, practice teaching. Dr. Gegenheimer stated that these courses could be offered under our present S, P, 3, 4, 5, 6,etc. grading system.

Dr. Thompson said that since this is to be an experimental effort, he felt that the restriction imposed by having departments determine which courses were to be offered would not provide a valid basis for making a future permanent decision. This could result in second-class courses being offered.

Dr. Gegenheimer stated that most students, in particular those in the College of Liberal Arts, are still bound by the list of courses indicated in the catalogue as to requirements. He then moved that Paragraph 5 of the report be omitted and the subsequent paragraphs renumbered. Several seconds to this motion were heard.

Dean Hull stated that in the College of Fine Arts there are a large number of performance-participation courses where the grade depends mainly on attendance. He asked if these courses should not be exempt from the pass-fail option. Dr. Lynn replied that if a student did not attend he should be failed immediately.

Dr. Percy stated that he was speaking for himself now and not as a member of the committee, but he had the impression from speaking with several students that they were not interested in taking beginning courses to expand their interests. They did want to take advanced courses without having fulfilled the prerequisites.

Dr. Thompson stated that the instructor still had the responsibility for enforcing or waiving the prerequisites. Dr. Vavich stated that he agreed with Dr. Percy and that the reason that Recommendation 5 had been made was to eliminate any prejudice or bias towards students. This put the burden on the instructor of telling the students which classes he would be welcome in.

Dean Rhodes stated that although he had originally been in favor of the proposal, the turn of the discussion left him quite disturbed. He stated that prerequisites must be enforced if this system is to be successful. If students are not required to meet prerequisites, it will unquestionably dilute the strength of graduate courses. Nothing in the recommendation indicates that prerequisites will be waived. Dr. Steelink stated that there seemed to be a basic inconsistency in the proposal in that many courses have prerequisites that require a minor in that field. If prerequisites were enforced, the students could not take these courses. Therefore the proposal would not meet the objectives desired.

Dr. Krutzsch said that he could not imagine an instructor teaching his course in a different manner because students had not met the requirements for admission to the course. Dean Rhodes stated that without a doubt courses are weakened when students have not met prerequisites. Dr. Thompson felt that a specific recommendation regarding prerequisites being waived must be included in this report if the prerequisites are in fact to be waived.

Dr. Martin said that students should be included in this discussion. Dr. Thompson said that if a student wanted to sample an advanced course without having met the prerequisites, he should register for "no credit." This would be a different matter from this proposal. Dean Ares asked if the fears of Dean Rhodes were justified. He wondered how many students will enroll in advanced courses. He thought that two years of trial would not irreparably damage the academic content of a course. Dr. Lynn asked how we could justify enforcing the prerequisite for a student taking the course under the regular system and not enforcing it for a student taking it under the pass-fail. Dr. Thompson once again reiterated that the proposal does not state elimination of the prerequisites.

Dr. Picchioni said that possibly a statement should be included in the recommendation indicating that students must be required to meet prerequisites. He did not think that students have thought of avoiding the prerequisites. At this point the question was called for and the motion on the amendment to the recommendation, that is, the deletion of Paragraph 5 was carried with several dissenting votes heard.

Dr. Damon then asked to return to a discussion of Recommendation 4 and stated that in the College of Mines 144 units are required for a degree, and this includes technical electives which are not specified. If technical electives are eliminated from the pass-fail option, the students in his college would have very little opportunity to take courses for pass-fail. He felt that technical elective courses not specified as a requirement should be open to pass-fail. Dr. Picchioni said that he felt that this could be handled by the various colleges. Dr. Damon replied that he felt that the statement in Paragraph 4 should be that only required courses are exempt from the pass-fail option.

Dr. Bok moved that since there was so much controversy concerning this matter, this motion be tabled. This was seconded by Dr. Damon and carried with some dissension.

Dr. Gegenheimer then moved that the committee be instructed to re-examine the report, along with the points which had been raised by the Faculty Senate,

specifically the question of prerequisites and required courses, and he also included in his motion that students from the Pass-Fail Committee be invited to the Faculty Senate meeting when this proposal would be discussed again. This motion was carried. Dean Hull then asked a question concerning Recommendation 8. He stated that there was some confusion in the wording of the second sentence. He felt it should read that neither the P or F would be considered in the computation of the graduation grade average.

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE GRADING SYSTEM OF THE UNIVERSITY: Professor Myers presented the report of the ad hoc committee which had been appointed to study the grading system of the University. A copy of the report had been mailed to each senator in advance of this meeting. He stated that his committee had considered two problems in approaching this matter. The first was the basic grading system. Should we retain the logical system which we now have or change to a more common ABC grading system? It is well agreed that we have a logical, well-understood system. However, we are one of the few universities in the country to have this type of system, and our transcripts and grading system are not easily understood by other colleges and universities. It was a value judgment on the part of the committee as to whether or not to recommend that we change this system. The second problem considered was the use of intermediate grades. Many divisions of the University had felt that additional passing grades are needed. Additional flexibility would be useful in the School of Music, the Law College, and the Graduate College. However, others feel that grading cannot be that accurate, and the present four passing marks are satisfactory. Once again it was a question of valid judgment on the part of the Committee, which submitted its report as follows:

"Appointment of the Committee

The Faculty Senate at its February 5, 1968 meeting approved a recommendation that the President appoint a committee to study the grading system of the University of Arizona and to report to the Senate on any proposed revision.

President Harvill appointed this committee soon thereafter and recommended that it solicit advice and counsel from faculty members who have data concerning the grading system of this and other institutions.

Present Grading System of the University

Final grades awarded in courses of study at the University are given on the basis of relative position in a series. These grades are 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Grade 1 is the highest; grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 indicate varying degrees of passing work; and grade 5 is a failure. No other intermediate grades are now given.

The present grading system has been in effect at the University for many years and is well understood by the faculty and administration. Arizona high schools and institutions of higher learning within the state (except Arizona State University and Prescott College) use the system currently in effect at the University.

At the request of the committee, Dr. Robert Crowell, Associate Dean of the College of Education, made inquiry of the Arizona State Committee on Accreditation and of secondary principals and school superintendents who are members of the High School-College Relations Council concerning a possible change in our system. They favor retention of the current system of grading.

The Registrar's Office and the Graduate College have expressed no difficulty in evaluating transcripts from other institutions and in explaining our grading system to other schools. Several instances have been called to the attention of the committee, however, where persons at other schools have misunderstood our system; there also exists possibility for misunderstanding on the part of business organizations who might employ our graduates.

Grading Systems Used in Other Colleges and Universities

Mr. Windsor reported to the committee that 80% or more of universities throughout the country use the A, B, C, D, F system of grading. Of these schools, around three-fourths assign the numerical value of 4 to the grade of A, and most of the rest assign the value of 3 to A. The trend is toward assigning the value of 4. It is clear, in any case, that our system is a minority one.

Committee Deliberations

In its deliberations, the committee considered two basic problems: (1) projected change to letter grade system where A = 4; and (2) provision for more flexibility in the grading system by adding intermediate grades. The committee did not specifically explore problems concerning fairness in grading and difficulties attached to grading in multisectioned courses. Nor did the committee explore the proposal for pass-fail grading since that problem has been referred to another faculty committee.

At the suggestion of President Harvill the committee invited several persons to meet with it. They included Dean Francis A. Roy, who served as chairman of the faculty committee which studied the grading system at the University twenty years ago; Mr. David L. Windsor, Registrar and Director of Admissions; Dean Herbert D. Rhodes of the Graduate College; and Vice President Walter H. Delaplane. The committee also interviewed Mr. David Butler, Associate Registrar; Dr. Curtis B. Merritt, Associate Dean of the Graduate College; and Mr. Thomas E. Rowe, Assistant Registrar for Data Processing. Additionally, communications were received from a number of faculty members at the University.

Change to Letter Grade System Where A Equals Four Points

The committee believes that eventually the University will have to change its grading system in order to get in step with a majority of the institutions in the country. The Graduate College already has been forced to use the 4.0 system on its application forms sent to students coming from other institutions. The Law College also has found it necessary to convert all grades coming to it into the 4.0 system. There probably will be more of this in the future. Hence, since change is coming the committee feels that it would be advisable to make it as soon as possible. It is quite likely that high schools and other educational institutions in the state will fall into line with whatever the University does.

The committee found no resistance to alteration of the present grading system. The various faculty members and administrators with whom committee members consulted felt that it would be no great hurdle to change the system. It, of course, will require lead time for the Registrar's Office and possible employment of additional personnel, transcripts and records will have to be marked to indicate that there has been a shift

in the grading system, and various scholarship requirements must be rewritten to reflect any change in the basic grading system. These matters, however, can be adequately handled.

Provision for More Flexibility in the Grading System

Under the present grading system, instructors at the University have four passing categories and one failing category into which they can divide their students. In some colleges this has created a problem because of bunching of students at various levels of performance. In the Graduate College, for example, most grades fall into the A and B categories. Some feel that an intermediate grade between an A and B would be helpful to instructors who now must agonize over whether they should issue an A or a B to the student. In the Music Department many students are given A's in individual lessons, overloading their transcripts in that particular regard. It would be helpful to the instructors to be able to give a B+ grade. The College of Law has a problem of bunching of grades at the C level. It would greatly facilitate the operations of that college if instructors there could give a grade of above the level of C and another below the level of C.

A number of persons with whom the committee consulted felt that it would be difficult for instructors to make fine-enough evaluations in order to award such intermediate grades. However, it follows that should some instructors wish to do so, it would be appropriate to make such grades available to them. Because of the difficulty in making fine distinctions, the committee recommends the addition of only one intermediate grade between the grades of A and B, B and C, and C and D, rather than adding two intermediate grades.

Committee members discussed the advisability of issuing a .5 grade, the numerical equivalent of an F+. It was suggested, however, that a failure ought to be recorded only as a zero and that there should be no intermediate grade between zero and one.

Summary of Recommendations

The committee recommends:

(1) Reversal of the present numerical equivalency with 4.0 being the high grade of A and zero representing the equivalent of F. Professors will report letter grades, and they will be recorded in the Registrar's Office as such; but averages will be computed under the 4-point system.

(2) Intermediate grades of B+, C+, and D+ be made available to those faculty members who care to use them.

The changes proposed by the committee are summarized in the following table:

Letter Grade	Proposed Numerical Equivalent	Present Numerical Equivalent
A	4	1
B+	3.5	---
B	3	2
C+	2.5	---
C	2	3
D+	1.5	---
D	1	4
F	0	5

Should the University decide to undertake a change to the 4.0 system, the committee believes that this change should be made effective as soon as practicable. The longer it is put off, the more difficult the shift will become. It would appear logical to make a change in the next biennial catalog and put it into effect the fall of 1969, subject to the feasibility of programming the computer and preparing new forms. In order to effect the changes that are planned for next fall concerning freshman grades and F's in lower division work, it will be necessary to change computer programs. Perhaps, changes suggested by this committee could well be put into effect at the same time, including any change in design of report cards and in computer programming.

Professor Diran Akmajian
Professor Manfred Bottaccini
Professor Edgar J. McCullough
Professor Ray Jay Davis, Secretary
Professor Louis A. Myers, Chairman"

Dr. Gegenheimer moved that the Senate adopt this report. The motion was seconded by Dean Voris.

Dr. Thompson stated that Recommendation 1 is excellent. However, Recommendation 2 seems to be illogical. It opens the door for differing treatment by different departments. We must have a uniform grading system whereby all students are treated equally. He wanted to know if intermediate grades would be calculated in the grade average (answer: yes). Dr. Gegenheimer asked if the committee intended to imply that the instructor must state in advance whether he intends to use the intermediate grades or not. Professor Myers stated that this was not implied. The intermediate grades were just there to be used at the option of the instructor. Dr. Gegenheimer said that he felt that more flexibility in grading would be a definite advantage.

Mr. Butler then stated that the Registrar's Office had always felt that if a proposal were academically sound and would be of benefit to the University, their office would not object to it. However, in this instance there are many factors which must be considered before such a proposal could be implemented. He then read the statement given below:

"Everyone concerned should be aware that there is a definite limit in how fast basic changes in procedures in the work of the Registrar's Office can be implemented.

If the proposed new grading system were adopted, either the simple A, B, C, D, F scheme or the more elaborate system with intermediate

grades of B+, C+, and D+, it must be realized that the changes would be difficult to implement. To indicate just one of the problems that would arise, how would the present grading system of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 be reconciled with the new system where the values are in reverse order? Many students would be continuing in the University at the time the change took place. The change would have to apply to everyone at the same time since we obviously could not operate concurrently under two different grading systems. Thus, many students would have part of their record under the old system, part under the new. How would an average be calculated for students in school under first the old, then the new system? This is only one of a number of problems which would have to be solved.

The Senate should be interested in certain other projects which the Registrar's Office faces. 1. A major job is the reprogramming of 170 different operational programs from the old IBM 1401 computer to the new CDC 6400 computer. This reprogramming conversion operation is a tremendous one. The conversion has been underway for nearly a year. An absolute deadline of the summer of 1970 has been set for this operation and this deadline must be met, for the 1401 computer will be removed from the campus at that time.

2. Our staff is already struggling to find the appropriate way to program the new procedure adopted by the Senate last year whereby the graduation grade average will be calculated on the basis of grades received beginning with the semester after that semester in which the student completed his 25th semester hour of degree credit. This adjustment is requiring major programming effort and is a slow, laborious process.

3. The new pass-fail option will present real problems for the Registrar's Office.

4. The change from use of student matriculation number to student's Social Security number will be a major project of conversion. For example, all of our operations are tooled to a six-digit number. The Social Security number is a nine-digit number.

When changes of the magnitude of those listed above are made, they involve not only machine programming problems but the redesign of literally scores of various registration and record forms.

There is a limit to how much the Registrar's Office can handle in a given period of time. It is therefore imperative that we be realistic in facing up to what will be involved in changes of this sort. They will require a considerable outlay of additional funds for additional personnel. Even with additional personnel considerable lead time will be required. It is estimated that to implement the new grading system, for example, will require 1) a minimum of $30,000 per year for additional systems analysts and programmers and 2) a minimum of two full calendar years lead time.

In other words, we could not begin using the proposed new grading system before September, 1971."

Professor Myers stated that other schools have made changes in their grading system and seemed to have survived. He also indicated that there was no binding date for implementation of this proposal included in their recommendation, but that it simply should be made effective as soon as practicable. Dean Ares stated that he was emphatically in favor of this report. He suggested that we adopt the report and then let the administration and registrar decide upon the date of implementation.

Dr. Hetrick said that he has difficulty now agonizing over the awarding of a grade of a 2 or a 3, and feels that the use of intermediate grades will make his task even more difficult. He asked how common are the use of intermediate grades among other colleges and universities. Professor Myers stated that it was rather uncommon, but a minority of schools do use intermediate grades. Dean Ares said that he felt that it was a substantial minority.

Dr. Harris asked if there had been thought given to raising the graduation average since more passing grades will be available under this new proposal. Professor Myers said that no, the committee had not considered this possibility. Dr. Harris stated that it appeared to him as though grades would probably be higher under the new system.

Dr. Wilson stated that he liked the logic of the present system. He further stated that he felt that on one hand when we are moving toward a pass-fail system, we should not be going the other direction, i.e., making our grade system more diverse than it is now.

Dr. Damon stated that he favors the use of intermediate grades because it is easier "to temper justice with mercy." He further stated that in his viewpoint the computer conversion would not be as difficult as had been indicated by the Registrar's Office.

Professor Myers stated that in the life history of the University this change would be insignificant. In other words, the number of students which we will have in the future will be so much greater than those we have had in the past that the number we are talking about involved in the conversion is not significant.

Dr. Hetrick then moved that we divide the question and consider the two recommendations separately. Professor Wilson seconded this motion. The motion was carried. The Senate then voted on the two recommendations separately and Recommendation 1 was passed with several dissenting votes. Recommendation 2 concerning intermediate grades was carried with a substantial number of dissenting votes.

ADJUSTMENT IN ACADEMIC CALENDAR FOR 1970-71: Mr. Butler presented the recommendation to the Faculty Senate that the Academic Calendar for 1970-71 be adjusted as follows: Orientation Week and the registration days should be compressed into a five-day period instead of six, the dates being September 8 through the 12, with registration being confined to two days, Friday and Saturday, September 11 and 12. The Senate voted to approve this change.

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC ADVISING AND COUNSELING

An advisory Council Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Advising and Counseling submitted its report to the Advisory Council on October 16, 1968. The report was approved by the Advisory Council. The Council further directed that the report should be furnished members of the Faculty Senate for their information.

The full report follows:

1. The policy of the University is to provide individual counseling by professors and counselors to meet all student problems. It is the prime responsibility of each college and an essential responsibility of each professor to counsel and advise students in their respective major fields of study.

2. A printed brochure containing a statement of the philosophy of the University concerning counseling and advising should be developed and made available to all high school seniors in the state. The brochure should describe the various counseling and advising services available to students or prospective students and provide specific instructions as to how the student may acquire the benefits of these services.

Students should be informed, at the time of registration and orientation and in the classroom, of the value of seeking out advice from their counselors and advisers.

3. In the smaller colleges, freshmen should be assigned to individual professors to serve as advisers throughout the students' undergraduate years. Lower-division students in the larger colleges, Liberal Arts and Business Administration, should be advised centrally by professional counselors housed in or near the college office. Each student should, however, have access to department heads and major professors for consultations regarding the selection of a major field of study. Upon attaining upper-division status, all students should be assigned to major professors in their chosen areas of specialization.

Each student should be given a written notice at the time of registration or in correspondence prior to registration containing the name, office number, and telephone number of his assigned academic adviser.

4. Professors should be provided with complete up-to-date records of the students for whom they have counseling and advising responsibility. This information should include academic records, ACT scores, mid-term grade reports, grade slips, notification of attendance warnings, administrative drop actions, and if possible, selected reports from the Student Health Service and the Student Counseling Bureau. Sufficient clerical support for maintaining these records must be provided by each individual college and department.

5. Each college should develop written statements detailing its policies and procedures for the counseling and advising program. These policies and procedures should be approved by the Advisory Council of the University. College faculty and staff should receive copies of the approved policies and procedures and should be made aware of the importance of their individual responsibility for the success of the college counseling and advisement program.

6. Professors and counselors should be informed by the department heads and the dean of the significance of successful advising. Success as an adviser should be a portion of the complete performance by the professor. Merit increases and promotions should be made after an analysis of the performance level of the individual professor or counselor in advising as well as in the other factors such as teaching, research, writing, etc.

7. A University-wide Committee on Counseling and Advisement should be established to be composed of one member from each college including the Graduate College and the Division of Continuing Education. Representatives are to be appointed by the Dean of the College or Division. The Vice President for Academic Affairs should serve as Chairman of the Committee. Regular meetings should be held to facilitate the exchange of ideas and to maintain some degree of consistency between colleges.

Comparative reports concerning counseling and advisement should be submitted to this committee for evaluation and suggestions for remedial action if necessary.

8. The individual colleges should establish special summer counseling programs for freshman students from Arizona. This will relieve the pressure and congestion at the regular registration and orientation week. The time set aside during the summer for this kind of counseling would be for academic counseling only with the exception that parents should be invited for evening programs concerning the entire University.

The Ad Hoc Committee on
Advisement and Counseling

Dean Willis R. Brewer
Dean Robert A. Crowell
Dean Francis A. Roy
Dean William Voris, Chairman

Consultants

Dr. Walter H. Delaplane
Dr. Richard M. Edwards
Mr. David L. Windsor

Secretary

Dean Gary M. Munsinger

November 1, 1968