

CONTINUED SENATE MEETING
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY
Friday, June 2, 1972

PRESENT: Mr. Livosky, Mr. Rand, Mr. Krill, ~~Mr.~~ Robinson, Mr. Wales, III, Mrs. Smith, ~~Mr.~~ Scriven, Mr. Swan, Mr. G. Jones, Mr. Looby, ~~Mr.~~ R. Jones, Mr. Mavrigian, Mr. Kramer, Mr. Spiegel, Mr. Naberezny, Mr. Siman, Mr. Aurand, Mr. Gould, Mr. Byo, Mr. McCracken (visitor), Mr. Hahn, Mr. O'Neill, Mr. Ives, Mr. Dillon, Mrs. Hotchkiss, Mr. Hotchkiss, Mr. Foldvary, Mr. von Ostwalden, Mr. Richley, Mr. Satre, Mr. Hoops, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Lepore, Mr. Laitman, Mr. Klasovsky, Mr. Abram, Mr. Blue, Mr. J.S. Zetts, Mr. Earnhart, Mr. Shipka, Mrs. Hoffman, Mr. Rondy, Mr. R. Morris, Mr. Kessler, Mr. B. Jones, Mr. Davis, Miss Kravskopf, Mr. Jonas, Mr. Baldino, Jr. Mr. Betres, Mr. Foster, Mr. Paraska, Mr. Salpietra, Miss Kennedy, Mrs. Foley, Mr. Deiderick, Mr. Petrych, Mrs. Niemi, Mr. Fortunato, Mr. Miller, Miss Boyer, Mr. Hovey, Mr. Shuster, Miss Shellock (Jambar), Mr. Lencyk (Jambar), Mr. Kost, Mr. Larene, Mr. Simko, Miss Sterenberg, Mr. Hanzely, Mr. Toskas, Mr. Koss, Mr. Slawecki, Mrs. Dykema, Mr. Hare, Mrs. Miner, Mr. Miner, Mr. C. Hankey, Mr. Henkel, Mr. Elser, Miss Reitano, Mr. Bronstrup, Mr. Bertelsen, Mr. D'Isa, Mr. Tarantine, Mr. Behen, Mr. Yozwiak, Mr. Pejack, Miss Jenkins, Vice President Rook, Vice President Edgar, and President Pugsley.

PRESIDING: PRESIDENT ALBERT L. PUGSLEY TIME: 4:00 p.m. SCHWEBEL AUD.

The President called the continued Senate meeting to order. He stated the Minutes cannot be approved until the conclusion of all three (3) sessions of the Senate meeting.

REPORT OF THE STUDENT ACADEMIC GUIDANCE AND REGISTRATION COMMITTEE:

This report was given by Vera Jenkins, Secretary of the Senate in the absence of E. Mark Evans.

The Student Academic Guidance and Registration Committee is concerned with three (3) particular areas:

- 1) Guidance;
- 2) Advisement;
- 3) Registration.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1) Suggest to the Administration to separate University orientation from the individual school orientation and advisement.
- 2) Have the individual school orientation and advisement first, to be followed by registration.
- 3) This would be climaxed by a single University Orientation or "Freshman Day",
- 4) Suggest the individual school orientation and registration start the middle of July on a more personalized basis within the academic areas.
- 5) This to be followed with a Freshman Day prior to the start of school, which would enable Student Affairs Office to organize and coordinate a program for the new students, parents and friends.
- 6) Preferable to hold this on campus and expanded to possible open house by schools, and invitations to social organizations.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

CONTINUED SENATE MEETING MINUTES CONT'D. : (Friday, June 2, 1972)
STUDENT ACADEMIC GUIDANCE AND REGISTRATION COMMITTEE CONT'D. :

7) This would allow a more dynamic and vigorous program to include participation by all elements of University community.

8) Eliminate duplication of effort on part of Student Affairs Office.

9) With decrease in applications and enrollment, this would provide an opportunity to present favorable image of Youngstown State University,

10) University would have greater personal and academic contact, both in time and attention, with their students.

11) Freshman Day would be on voluntary basis for those who wanted to attend.

MOTION: Vera Jenkins moved on behalf of E. Mark Evans for the Student Academic Guidance and Registration Committee that the Senate accept this report and recommend the suggestion to be considered by the Administration.

Seconded.

MOTION ACCEPTED.

(SEE APPENDIX I FOR TEXT OF ABOVE REPORT).

Dr. Pugsley: The Report refers to the decline in enrollments. Obviously this University located in a rather stable population area is going to be increasingly concerned about its enrollment picture. We are not alone in this.

You will recall last fall we had a drop of about 340 students. I bring to your attention "The Collegian", which is the student paper of Toledo University. On the lead story it reads as follows:

"If enrollment for the 1972-73 school year drop further as the trend this year seems to indicate Toledo University will face further cuts in its Budget adopted for next year."

"The Budget was based on enrollment figures for the present school year (which is identical to the policy we followed here. We used the same figures that we had **this** year as a projection for next year)."

"But University officials now estimate a decline (Toledo University) of some 500 Full-time students for next year. Total enrollment this year fell to 14,900 from 15,900 students last year. Much of the drop proved to be in Part-time enrollment figures."

Dean **Scriven** has been supplying an analysis of the applications coming in in comparison to last year. **It** appears that there is now a projection of some 450 to 500 students fewer for next Fall than we had for this Fall. So we are following exactly the same trend. That kind of trend is very likely to occur in the Municipal Universities located in cities such as Youngstown, **Wright, State,** etc.

I bring this to your attention at this time because it seems to me to emphasize the necessity for any and all steps that not only the Administration but the Faculty and others can take to provide for a turn-around in this enrollment picture, It is an obligation that you all **share; we** all share it together.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

CONTINUED SENATE MEETING MINUTES CONT'D. : (Friday, June 2, 1972)
DR. PUGSLEY CONT'D.:

In all probability it seems to me we must consider for the future the following:

1) If we find ourselves this Fall with an enrollment drop and, therefore, for the coming year with something of an oversupply of faculty, as appears very likely relative to the enrollment expectations, I think we should consider using those faculty members in an aggressive campaign of recruitment and contacts with the Schools in the interest of enrollments for the year following.

2) Along this same line, if there are services needed from employed faculty members, anything that we can do in the way of providing a better Orientation would be a proper thing to do.

3) I would suggest that if we have a surplus of faculty that there are Remedial Programs that can require or benefit from tutoring; benefit from the Minority group encouragement; that an expansion and use of these faculty services in those areas would be both prudent and wise and in the interest of the Institution as a whole.

Think about these things if you will. They are very important to your future and to the future of the University.

REPORT OF COMPUTER COMMITTEE:

This report was given by the Chairman, Dr. Lauren Schroeder. Dr. Schroeder reported:

1) Reorganization of Computer Center last summer resulted in improved services.

2) Newsletter, edited by Dr. Jonas now published quarterly.

3) Computer Committee considered proposed Budget for Computer Center. First time Committee asked to evaluate the budget and make recommendations.

Committee's recommendations sent to Vice President Edgar and Budget Committee included following guidelines:

1) university should continue to develop a single "central" computer, serving university's primary computer needs;

2) development of substantial on-line terminal capability serving both academic and administrative needs;

3) establishment of contract sale of computer service to public agencies in surrounding community.

Expect soon a detailed policy statement on utilization of programming and other software services.

University Senate received above Report at today's meeting.

(SEE APPENDIX II FOR FULL TEXT OF COMPUTER REPORT)

Dr. Pugsley: The negotiations for provision of Computer Service to the Public Schools were under way this Spring and through the campaign of a limited contract for administrative service to the Youngstown Public Schools we were able to approve in the Budget an expanded capacity of the Computer service without changing the major Computer. I bring this to your attention.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

CONTINUED SENATE MEETING MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, June 2, 1972)
DR. PUGSLEY CONT'D.:

Dr. Edgar is a member of a **Committee**, other members being counterpart from Kent and Akron. One of the items they are thinking about on their agenda is a regional **computer**. The Ohio Board of Regents and the last Legislature provided funding for Bowling Green and the University of Toledo for a regional **computer**. I received that report just this week. I am providing this to Dr. Edgar for use with this Committee,

It may very well be that in the development of computer facilities that lower costs can be achieved and better service provided. For example Kent, Youngstown and Akron were to join and get a much larger and more sophisticated operation which would provide terminals for all campuses. There should be a thorough discussion and investigation of this matter,

REPORT OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH COUNCIL:

This report was given by Chairman **Karl Krill**, Dean of the Graduate School.

Dean Krill reported:

1) Explained why the dates do not correspond with the fiscal year; the University Research Council fiscal year is slightly out of phase with its reporting to the University Senate.

For example: The report last year was made on June 4 and it covered awards up through #135.

Our current year begins with award #136 which actually was made June 14 of last year. It carries through award #164 which was made on April 24 of this year. That was our last meeting before the pending Senate meeting on May 5, 1972.

Since that time Council has continued to approve grants and actually has exhausted its entire allocation for the 1971-72 year.

(SEE APPENDIX III FOR LIST OF AWARDS GIVEN AND AMOUNTS).

REPORT OF AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON PASS/FAIL:

This report was given by the Chairman, **Dr. Matthew Siman**.

We have received many magazine articles from outside the University community regarding this subject; guests brought their **ideas** and information to the committee; also **had two** (2) Open Hearings on the subject.

Dr. Siman stated the committee had instructed him to thank all those who have contributed their time and their work on this. He also thanked the Secretary of the Senate for preparing the material sent to Senate members, also the Registrar's Office for its help.

Dr. Siman stated the Committee first approached this problem by asking:

1) should we have a nontraditional grading policy.

We **all** agreed there should be one.

Reasons for **having** one are listed in the Report in Appendix IV.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

CONTINUED SENATE MEETING MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, June 2, 1972)
REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE ON PASS/FAIL CONT:

2) The committee realized there are many factors in a grade that may jeopardize a student's chances of getting into Graduate School. Those universities that have a nontraditional grading policy but have a Graduate School like University of Michigan - those students from there had no trouble getting into their own graduate school, for example.

3) The fact that may jeopardize student's accountability of course work for employment - we could not come out with hard and fast rules on which courses could be taken for CR/NC and which could not be taken.

Who is to decide? The Dean in consultation with his faculty and if he wishes to, bring students, alumni, people from industry and this would certainly give him the input so that the Committee could place the burden of the application of the CR/NC on the faculty.

MOTION: Dr. Matthew Siman, on behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee on Pass/Fail moved that the university Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees that the following nontraditional grade policy be adopted at Youngstown State University.

Seconded. (SEE APPENDIX IV FOR DETAILS).

(SEE APPENDIX IV FOR DISCUSSION).

Mr. Toskas: Approximately four (4) weeks ago when this current Senate session began there was distributed to Senate members a Proposed Addendum to the Committee Report.

This was the Minority Report from the Committee, It proposed that no courses may be designated as being closed to traditional grading.

Then it listed five (5) changes of wording.

AMENDMENT: Mr. Charles Toskas moved an Amendment to the Committee Report. Wished to have this Proposal adopted and added to the Committee Report so that no courses may be closed to traditional grading.
 Seconded,

NOTE: (SEE APPENDIX IVa POX MINORITY REPORT (PROPOSED ADDENDUM TO COMMITTEE REPORT AND REASONS FOR PROPOSED ADDENDUM)).

Dr. Pugsley: How does this affect the original Report?

Dr. Siman: This would mean that a School or a Program (for example - let's take Student Teaching - say they decided they wanted it on CR/NC only) merely because administrators and teachers out in the School system find it a lot easier to evaluate a prospective teacher that way -- by saying that he or she qualifies to be a teacher and fills out a Profile.

This Proposal would be noted that students might say, I do not want to be evaluated that way: I want a letter grade such as A, B, C or F evaluation,

(CONT'D, NEXT PAGE)

CONTINUED SENATE MEETING MXNITES CONT'D.: (Friday, June 2, 1972)
REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE ON PASS/FAIL CONT'D.:

Mr. Toskas: MOVED THE PREVIOUS QUESTION ON THE ADDENDUM.
Seconded.
AYES: 46 NO: 10

Dr. Pugsley: (The above takes 2/3 vote for passage).
This is just for the Addendum. The vote is whether
or not the Question shall be voted upon.)

NOW VOTING ON THE ADDENDUM,
AYES HAVE IT. ADDENDUM PASSED.

Dr. Swan:

MOTION: Dr. Swan moved to return Report back to Committee
because of the deficiencies that are in it.
Seconded.

COMMENT: **MOVED THE PREVIOUS QUESTION. THIS IS TO CLOSE DEBATE,**
AND TO VOTE WITHOUT FURTHER DEBATE ON THE MOTION TO
REFER BACK TO COMMITTEE.
Seconded. (Needs 2/3 vote).
AYES: 44 NO: 29
MOTION FAILS. (This is not 2/3 vote).

Dr. C. Hankey: Point of Order.

Dr. Hankey then withdrew his point of order as he wished to speak.

QUESTION CALLED FOR. VOTING ON WHETHER OR NOT TO SEND IT BACK
TO COMMITTEE.

AYES: 37 NO: 35
IT GOES BACK TO-COMMITTEE.

MOTION: Dr. C. Hankey moved that the Senate instruct the
Committee to work entirely on the objections raised
by Dr. Swan in line with the Amendment made and
having completed whatever possible reworking of the
Proposal is necessary to make some adjustment **before**
reporting back to the Senate at the first Senate
meeting in the Fall (first Friday in **October**).
Seconded.

Dr. Pugsley: It has been moved and seconded that the work
of the Committee **be** limited to the issues con-
sidered here on the **floor**.

Dr. Hare: Point of Order.
Are we to interpret Dr. Clyde Hankey's Motion as
limiting the Committee's deliberations.

Dr. Pugsley: I would say "yes".

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

CONTINUED SENATE MEETING MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, June 2, 1972)
REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE ON PASS/FAIL CONTD.:

Dr. Pugsley: If you, Dr. Hankey and your seconder were willing to withdraw the Motion the Committee then would be free not only to take into account the discussions that **had** taken place relative to the original Motion and the Amendment but also the discussion that **has** taken place since that time,

It would seem to me a useful purpose might be served.

Dr. Hankey: I am willing if the seconder is willing.

Parliamentarian: You do not need the seconder's approval.
(Mrs. Dykema)

Dr. Pugsley: The Motion is withdrawn.

MOTION: Dr. Charles Bronstrup moved that the Committee resubmit this **Pass/Fail** consideration at the next Senate meeting which will be the first Friday in October (Friday, October 6, 1972),
Seconded
AYES HAVE IT.

REPORT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE:

This report was given by the Chairman, Dr. Victor A. Richley.

MOTION: Dr. Victor A. Richley moved approval of the following Motion:
A **Credit/No Credit (CR/NC)** grading system is to be implemented for courses:
Education 704 and 705--Professional **Lab** Experiences and Education 841, 842, 843 and 860--Student Teaching. The student grade card for these courses will show only one of the symbols, CR, NC, W, or I.
Seconded.

NOTE: (SEE APPENDIX Va FOR DISCUSSION OF REPORT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE).

AMENDMENT: Dr. Cohen made the following Amendment:
To change this Proposal to read 'Credit-No Entry'.
Seconded.

QUESTION CALLED FOR: The Motion to Amend is only for 'Credit-No **Entry**'.

NOS HAVE IT.
AMENDMENT FAILS.

(CONT'D., NEXT PAGE)

CONTINUED SENATE MEETING MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, June 2, 1972)
REPORT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE CONT'D.:

AMENDMENT: Dr. Cohen offered the following change:
Have Amendment now read 'Credit- No Entry',
W or I.
Seconded.

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT: Mr. Charles Toskas moved that the
course be open to traditional grading.

NOTE: At 5:50 p.m. Secretary informed the President the Senate
has lost its Quorum.

MEETING ADJOURNED!

Respectfully submitted,

Vera Jenkins
SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

APPENDIX I—REPORT OF STUDENT ACADEMIC GUIDANCE AND REGISTRATION COMMITTEE
CONTINUED SENATE MEETING--FRIDAY, JUNE 2, 1972
by Secretary of Senate for E. Mark Evans

REPORT:

The Student Academic Guidance and Registration Committee is concerned with three (3) particular areas: GUIDANCE, ADVISEMENT AND REGISTRATION. The Committee received reports from the individual schools on their procedures in these particular areas and have reviewed them,

GUIDANCE: Several schools have their own personnel for Guidance purposes, and the University has a Guidance Department.

ADVISEMENT: Advisement is aimed mainly with the pre-registration periods. Again, several of the schools have individuals responsible for advising,

REGISTRATION: The Committee working with the individual schools have made recommendations to Mr. Tufts of the Registrar's Office, throughout the year to improve routines. Changes have been made and we feel that the present procedures are improving each registration.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Student Academic Guidance and Registration Committee's suggestion to the Administration is to separate the University orientation from the individual school orientation and advisement. It is our recommendation to have the individual school orientation and advisement first, to be followed by their registration. This would be climaxed by a single University Orientation or "Freshman Day".

It is the suggestion of this Committee to have the individual school orientation and registration start the middle of July on a more personalized basis within the academic areas. This would then be followed with a Freshman Day prior to the start of school, and would enable the Student Affairs Office to organize and coordinate a program for the new students, parents and friends. Preferably this would be held on campus and expanded to a possible open house by the schools, and invitations to social organizations.

We feel this would allow a more dynamic and vigorous program to include participation by all elements of the University community. It would eliminate a lot of duplication of effort on the part of the Student Affairs Office by repeating this same general orientation. With the decrease in applications and enrollment, this would provide an opportunity to present a favorable image of Youngstown State University. It would permit the University to have a greater personal and academic contact, both in time and attention, with their students. Freshman Day would be on a voluntary basis for those who wanted to attend.

This recommendation has been sent to the Dean of Student Affairs, and at this time, no response has been received.

We respectfully submit to the Faculty Senate this report for acceptance and recommend the suggestion to be considered by the Administration.

NOTE REPORT RECEIVED BY SENATE FRIDAY, JUNE 2, 1972.

NOTE:: The following Report received by Senate Friday, June 2, 1972.

APPENDIX II -- REPORT OF THE COMPUTER COMMITTEE
CONTINUED SENATE MEETING--FRIDAY, JUNE 2, 1972
(by Lauren Schroeder)

Reorganization of the Computer Center last summer has resulted in improved service. A newsletter, edited by Dr. R. Jonas, is now published quarterly. The third issue was distributed last month. This **newsletter** along with a forthcoming Users Manual will provide the University **community** with much needed information on how to most effectively use the services available at the Center, Anyone wishing to receive the newsletter should contact the **Computer** Center secretary.

One of the most important new activities undertaken by the Computer *Committee* was consideration of the proposed budget for the **Computer** Center. For the first time the *Committee* was asked to **evaluate** the budget and **make recommendations** to the Budget Committee.

The **Committee's recommendations** transmitted to Vice President Edgar and the Budget Committee included the following **guidelines** for the continued development of computer facilities and services at YSU.

I) The university should continue to develop a single "**central**" computer, serving the **university's** primary computer needs,

2) The development of a substantial on-line **terminal** capability serving both academic and administrative needs.

3) **Establishment** of contract sale of computer service to public agencies in the surrounding community,

Availability and utilization of software facilities has been, for many people, a nebulous area of service provided by the Computer Center. Both **Dr.** Jonas, as director of the **Computer** Center, and the Computer **committee** have submitted to Vice President Edgar a "**Proposed Policy for Computer Center Programming Services**". We expect that there will soon be a detailed policy statement on utilization of programming and other software services.

Respectfully submitted,

SIGNED: LAUREN SCHROEDER
CHAIRMAN - COMPUTER COMMITTEE

REPORT

to the

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY SENATE

by the

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH COUNCIL

Council's report for 1970-71, presented to University Senate at the June 4, 1971 meeting, included awards through that date. Grants approved for the period June 14, 1971-April 24, 1972 are as follows:

136 - Charles Lovas	Mechan. Engineering	\$ 35
137 - Irwin Cohen	Chemistry	200
138 - Saul S. Friedman	History	250
139 - Friedrich Koknat	Chemistry	250
140 - Gary Fry	Sociology/Anthropology	250
141 - William Moorhead	Physics	75
142 - Stephen Graf, Joel) Henkel, Mark Masaki)	Psychology & Physics	435
143 - James Henke	English	20
144 - James Adovasio, Gary Fry)	Sociology/Anthropology	755
145 - Anthony Sobota	Biology	930
146 - Leslie Domonkos	History	781
147 - Edward Mooney, Jr.,) Everette Abram)	Physics & Geology	1653
148 - Leslie Szirmay	Chemical Engineering	508
149 - Francis Redburn	Political Science	170
150 - Hasaan Ronaghy	Economics	634
151 - Henry P. Sheng	Chemical Engineering	700
152 - Eugene Santos	Mathematics	900
153 - William Binning	Political Science	350
154 - Russell Maddick	Art	250
155 - Paul Peterson	Biology	1050
156 - Daniel J. O'Neill	Speech/Drama	20
157 - Stephen A. Graf	Psychology	231
158 - George Filatovs	Metallurgical Engin.	700
159 - Allan Zuckerwar	Electrical Engineering	155
150 - Arthur Perkins	Metallurgical Engin.	2610
161 - Pei Huang	History	250
162 - Frank J. Tarantine	Mechanical Engineering	150
163 - John J. Yemma	Biology	4372
164 - James G. Karas	Biology	1300
Total for new grants		\$19,984
Previous Grant (130) with delayed funding)		1,647
Page costs and reprint charges		<u>1,685</u>
Total obligations against 1971-72 Funds		<u>\$23,316</u>

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

May 5, 1972 (ACADEMIC YEAR 1971-72)
REPORT TO SENATE CONT'D. -- UNIVERSITY RESEARCH COUNCIL

Since the first grant made by Council on October 25, 1968, one hundred ten (110) faculty persons have been awarded funds in support of research. About 15% of the awards are never used, for a variety of reasons; another 15% are less than half used.

Thirty-nine (39) faculty members have had more than a single award, with four (4) persons having had five (5) grants each.

COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP—1971-72

George L. Almond, Marketing
Samuel F. Barger, Mathematics
William O. Barsch, Mechanical Engineering Technology
Frank D'Isa, Mechanical Engineering
Sally M. Hotchkiss, Psychology
Ronald W. Jonas, Computer Center
William D. Moorhead, Physics
Leon Rand, Chemistry
Pierson Syring, Chief Accountant
Mark F. Walker, Music
Dwight G. Watkins, Education
Karl Krill, Graduate School (CHAIRMAN)

SIGNED: KARL KRILL
GRADUATE SCHOOL
CHAIRMAN

KFK: ar

APPENDIX IV -- REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE ON PASS/FAIL
by Matthew Siman--CONTINUED SENATE MEETING FRIDAY, JUNE 2, 1972

Youngstown State University presently has nontraditional grades in such areas as proficiency requirements in **Communications** for certain types of students, proficiency requirements in foreign **languages** for certain majors, and an English proficiency is a degree requirement for a **certain** baccalaureate degree. The policy of credit by **examination** must be considered as a nontraditional grade.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Pass/Fail recommends the expansion of nontraditional grades to other areas. The **nontraditional** grades will allow students at Youngstown State University to have the opportunity to explore other academic areas without incurring academic penalty. **Nontraditional** grades can be used in those courses at Youngstown State University in which two or more instructors are involved in the **evaluation** of a **student's** performance. **Nontraditional** grades can be used in those courses in which an acceptable level of proficiency is graded A or B. Finally, it will insure that all students at Youngstown State University may have available to them **courses** that they can take for a **nontraditional** grade rather than for the **traditional** grades of A, B, C, D, or F.

In order to preserve the academic standards and traditions of Youngstown State University, to prevent the **loss** of accreditation of **any** of the various programs of study at Youngstown State University, and to prevent the student from jeopardizing his chances of meeting the **minimum** graduating requirements of the university and his program, the following nontraditional grade policy is moved:

MOTION: That the University Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees that the following nontraditional grade policy be adopted at Youngstown State University.

NONTRADITIONAL GRADE POLICY

The **nontraditional** grading system at Youngstown State University shall be Credit (CR)/No Credit (NC). Credit (CR) will represent an earned grade of A, B, or C in the course. No Credit (NC) will represent an earned grade of D or F.

The instructor of a class will not be informed by the Registrar as to who in his class is taking the course under the CR/NC option. The instructor will turn in **traditional** grades on the scan sheet for **all** of the students on the class roster. The computer will identify those students taking the course under the CR/NC option and record the appropriate CR or NC grade in the **student's** record.

The CR/NC and the quarter hours that it represents will not be included in the calculation of the **student's** point average. The quarter hours of applicable CR will count in the satisfaction of degree requirements.

For a student to be eligible to elect the CR/NC option, he must have completed at least 12 quarter hours of college credit at Youngstown State University and be in good academic standing.

The student shall have not more than one-fourth ($\frac{1}{4}$) of the total quarter hours earned by degree granting date listed as CR/NC quarter hours (including any **courses** required to be taken on a CR/NC basis); The student shall not enroll for more than one course per quarter under the CR/NC option.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

APPENDIX IV CONT'D. --- REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE ON PASS/FAIL (Matthew Simon)

CR/NC courses shall be identified during the registration process as follows:

- A) The student will **make** the course selections and get the **advisor's approval as usual**.
- B) If the student has elected a course that is identified as a course that must be taken for CR/NC, no **additional approval or identification** of the course is required,
- C) If the student has elected a course that is identified as a course that can be taken under the CR/NC option, the student must **designate** this course as being taken under the CR/NC option so that the computer will enter on his record the appropriate CR/NC upon completion of the course. It is the **student's** responsibility that he not have more CR/NC entries on his record by the **time** of graduation than the **maximum** of one-fourth ($\frac{1}{4}$) of the total quarter hours earned by degree granting date, that he not **register** for more than one course per **quarter** under the CR/NC option, and that he not **select** or have taken a course under the CR/NC option that is not on the allowed list of courses to be taken under the CR/NC option,
- D) The student **may** seek advice on CR/NC option courses or on the total CR/NC quarter hours **through** the regular **advisement** process,
- E) Students electing the CR/NC option for a course **may** not **change** their selection to **the** traditional grade for the course after the **last day** to add a class.
- F) Students electing the **traditional grade** for a course **may** not change their selection to the CR/NC option **after** the last day to add a class.

All courses in the University are open for CR/NC option except those courses identified as required to be taken for CR/NC. Courses may be closed to the CR/NC option by the **department** chairman who approves the **student's** major.

Courses that must be taken for CR/NC, are determined by the department in which they are offered, and **may** include:

- A) field experience courses in which the **amount** of **learning** is open-ended and conditionally dependent on **variables**, e.g., location, current **stresses** of economies, **philosophical** basis of **operational** practices, **extent** of available resources, and time space **context**.
- B) experimental or developmental courses wherein the content of the course has not been specifically controlled, identified, or quantified.
- C) courses designed particularly as human **interaction** experiences exploring group **thought** and readings in **some areas** of perceived social **value**.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

APPENDIX IV CONT'D. --- REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE ON PASS/FAIL (Matthew Siman)

- D) courses in which more than one **instructor** is involved in evaluating the performance of the student.
- E) courses designed for the critical investigation of certain ideas underlying civilization, embracing and integrating the particular studies of science, society, and the **humanities**.
- F) courses in which the material studied extends in quality **and** quantity **beyond** that required of the student in the traditional course,
- G) courses offered to satisfy pre-college requirements,

The dean of each **school/college** will coordinate the activities between his various **departments** for consistency and compatibility of policies on identification and/or restriction procedures. **The Academic Vice President**, will coordinate the policies of and among the respective **schools/colleges** of the **University**.

APPENDIX IV CONT'D. -- PROPOSED ADDENDUM TO COMMITTEE REPORT
MINORITY REPORT (AD HOC COMMITTEE ON PASS/FAIL)

No courses may be designated as being closed to traditional grading.

To facilitate the report's consistency after the incorporation of the Addendum, five (5) changes of wording should be effected:

- 1) Delete "including any courses required to be taken on a **CR/NC** basis" from the last paragraph on page one.
- 2) Delete "except those courses identified as required to be taken for **CR/NC** grade" from the first unlettered paragraph, page two.
- 3) Substitute "should be most seriously considered" for "must be taken" in the second unlettered paragraph on page two.
- 4) Delete "required to be taken for **CR/NC** grade" from the first unlettered paragraph on page two..
- 5) Delete paragraph B, top of page #2.

(NOTE: Above retyped from copy that was distributed on long paper).

REASONS, IN BRIEF, FOR THE PROPOSED ADDENDUM:

- A) The present proposal could serve to reduce the hours a student elects under **CR/NC**; hence, reducing the usefulness of the proposal for student.
- B) Some students would wish to use traditional grades as personal motivating tools so that they may transcend proficiency and receive notice and reward for their efforts.
- C) It is probable that a student might face a competitive disadvantage if forced to take courses **CR/NC** that others had previously taken with traditional grading.
- D) The proposal's adoption will evidence the University's trust in the self-actualizing potential of its students.

This Proposal in no way compromises the purposes of the Majority Report or in any way jeopardizes the usefulness of the policies recommended in that report.

NOTE: (SEE MINUTES FOR **RESULTS** OF **ABOVE** ADDENDUM).

APPENDIX IV -- DISCUSSION ON REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE ON PASS/FAIL

1) Dr. Hare: 1) This NO/CR will involve a recording in the Registrar's Office that will show on the transcript that the student did take the course but received NO CREDIT. Is that correct?

Ans.: YES,

2) The identification of these courses. If I understand this correctly it means that all courses in the University are open to this nontraditional grading policy with the only proviso that a Department Chairman advising a major student in his or her Department can tell the student that he or she can or cannot take some particular course on the CR/NC basis? It is limited to that?

The Department Chairman speaking to the major in that Department may limit it in his own Department?

Dr. Siman: There is another restriction; only one-quarter ($\frac{1}{4}$) of total hours. It was our idea that the Dean in consultation with the faculty in a particular curriculum that offers a degree in that curriculum will publish in the Catalog under that Program which courses can be or cannot be taken for CR/NC.

2) Dr. Hare: Even though the student is a major in another Department?

Dr. Siman: No. Only for the major of your own Department.

3) Dr. Hare: A major in English, for example, can go to another Department and request that any course in any other Department he may take for CR/NC?

Dr. Siman: No. He comes to your Department if approved by the Major Department.

4) Dr. Hare: The English Department Chairman could tell an English Department major that if he takes a course in History he may not take it on a P/F basis even though it is generally available for the History Department major on a P/F basis.

It seems to me it is crucial to the Program.

5) Dr. Richley: If a course is marked in the Catalog as being one which will be taken as CR/NC does this mean that anyone taking that course must take it under CR/NC?

Dr. Siman: Yes,

6) Dr. Hare: I am talking about courses that students may elect to take one way or the other.

I am having problems understanding this.

Dr. Siman: Are you saying Dr. Hare that you force him to take (for example, History - that is listed as traditional)?

7) Dr. Hare: For example - the course is listed as available for CR/NC or traditional.,

I presume all courses are available on a traditional basis?

Dr. Siman: There will be some courses that the Department or School offering the course will say that the course can only be taken for CR/NC.

8) Dr. Hare: May the English Department Chairman tell an English major that he may not take a History course on a P/F basis?

Dr. Siman: Yes.

9) Dr. Hare: This would apply to all other Department?

Dr. Siman: All Departments have the same privilege.

NOTE: (SEE APPENDIX IV FOR PROPOSED MINORITY REPORT OF THIS COMMITTEE & REASONS)

10) Comment: One thing that might help to distinguish between the original Proposal and the Amendment that has been proposed would relate to those courses which

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

APPENDIX IVc -- DISCUSSION - AD HOC COMMITTEE ON PASS/FAIL (June 2, 1972)

would be offered on a CR/NC basis only.

What was the rationale of the Committee in suggesting that some courses should be available only on a CR/NC basis rather than on a choice between that and the traditional grading?

Dr. Siman: 1) The University Seminar became defunct, because of lack of enrollment. I was on the Honors Subcommittee and I was Chairman of it and all the students I talked with stated they did not want to jeopardize their point average,

2) In Mathematics: In an Honors first course of a 3-course sequence the enrollment at first was quite high and all of a sudden student realizes how hard he has to work to get an "A".

They discontinued the Honors sequence.

3) We felt that for this University to grow - there would be Professional Schools and possibility exists that Programs will be set up in this and student will work in industry or will be under the supervision of somebody in industry. Student may not have thought about just A, B, or C work. They think of it as acceptable or non-acceptable; to encourage this sort of thing - to have a CR/NC only course.

11) Dr. Swan: I am not opposed to a CR/NC system but I am opposed to it as it appears here,

You assign responsibility to the Department Chairman which it seems to me to be almost impossible to carry out because you say courses may be closed to the CR/NC option by the Department Chairman who approves the student's major.

This means that the Department Chairman who approves the student's major is going to have to check each advisement sheet for all courses and decide which can be for credit and which cannot be for NC. Which are you going to close? It seems to me that is unworkable,

Another element: You say he may not register for more than one (1) course per quarter under the CR/NC option.

We run Programs in Summer School for School Administrators, (in School of Education), for teachers and quite often they are of a work-shop nature and therefore, we don't want a credit or a grade involved,

You are saying they can only register for one of these. It may well be that we want to run 2 or 3 and they may wish to take part in all of them. It seems to me that is unworkable.

The next part: Why must a student have 12 quarter hours of college credit at Youngstown State University to be in good standing?

Suppose we are catering to business people. The Business Administration might be catering to those in the educational professions and they come in from another school to take a work-shop dealing with Collective Bargaining. They wouldn't be able to take this on a CR/NC basis which might be the only way they wanted to offer it.

This in turn cuts down the possibility of attracting personnel to the courses, I speak against it not because I am opposed to CR/NC but because I think this is unworkable.

12) Mr. Ives: Is the fact that some students don't want to jeopardize their grade average a reason for denying to any student the right to get credit for a course if he wants to?

13) Dr. Cohen: Want to speak on the nontraditional aspect of the Amendment and the Proposal.

The Amendment on the floor right now is a detailed change of a very complex Proposal. There are really a lot of tangles one can get into and the Proposal is described as though it were a nontraditional grading policy.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

APPENDIX IV_a -- DISCUSSION ON AD HOC COMMITTEE PASS/FAIL (June 2, 1972)Dr. Cohen cont'd.:

Grading policies over the years change fast.

Some start with 0 to 100. Anybody who institutes that usually changes it to a 50-point grading scale where 50 to 60 is "F", 60 to 70 "D", etc. After a while people who do that usually change their grading because they feel you usually cannot tell the difference between a 78 and 79 and they change to perhaps a 15-point scale with A+, A, A-, B+, B, B-, etc. After while, when people do that (there was a time when that was done here at this University) they decide it is too hard to find the difference between the B and B+ (and we are drawing too fine a borderline) so we change to a 5-point grading scale which is the stage we are now in.

After that the general change is to a 2 point grading scale which is not at all nontraditional; which after all is the other end of the scale -- and it is P/F by any other name.

People who went to the 2-point grading scale - this is done and has been done over the years regularly -- almost immediately change to a 3-point grading scale because they find out you have to have an Honors Pass/Fail. After while the 3-point gets beyond us.

There has been in recent years great effort on the part of many people to introduce truly nontraditional educational policies including nontraditional grading.

The Campus Action Project which I am associated with at the University has uncovered several good ideas which I hope can be looked into next Fall.

Credit for work done elsewhere, work experience, credit perhaps by examination, perhaps special placement, special programs being tailored for the individual, working with the community in special ways for the tailoring of programs for the individual and making his record reflect him more accurately than any grade will do.

These are way I think we should study. These are things that should be investigated. Really not traditional methods in grading. One concept is really nontraditional. I heard about this one a couple years ago from Mrs. Mary Smith. Some place in Ohio has done it (and other places have too) and it is: A, B, C, No Entry.

The "No Entry" method is really something new. With A, B, C, No Entry method you have a grade that can be used and for someone who did not make the "C" you have "No Entry" at all, not a "W" or an "I". This, of course, goes against the grain of a lot of people who say that if the student didn't pass the course and didn't do well enough we have to have that on his record.

I used to think so too but when you stop and look at it, Why?

I cannot think of any other field where you punish failure. If you fail at something you try again. If you don't get to the Moon the first time you try again.

Why punish a person by putting something on his record as failure? I cannot find an answer to it at this time,

I think there is an opportunity here this time to do the really nontraditional investigation of our grading policies. This system has a lot of complications to me and is not truly nontraditional. If we put it in we are going to get bogged down in a lot of details.

I urge that the Amendment and the Motion be tabled or defeated. I am no Parliamentarian.

14) Mr. Toskas: I am speaking for the Proposed Addendum. There are 4 reasons for this.

(SEE APPENDIX IV_a FOR LIST OF REASONS AND ALSO PROPOSED ADDENDUM).

I agree with Dr. Cohen in what he says that there are other areas to be explored. What is probably funny is -- Dr. Siman who sat with me for 2 days at the Open Hearings heard me propose many of the things that Dr. Cohen just talked about.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

APPENDIX IV₃ -- DISCUSSION - AD HOC COMMITTEE ON PASS/FAIL (June 2, 1972)

Mr. Toskas cont'd.:

This Proposal is a very specific one, **What it is** meant to accomplish is to **preserve** the **option** for students to take courses for a grade if they feel that is the best **option** for them.

It eliminates any part that might be done through the adoption of the CR/NC Proposal for **individual** students. **I**, for one will not be taking courses in terms of traditional grades once CR/NC is indeed effective. But, **I** think for those students who wish to use grades in a **personal** way should have an option of electing a course to take that grade.

We have in the present Committee Proposal the set-up whereby the student can be closed to a traditional grade in a course thus making a CR/NC grade mandatory in certain courses, That kind of thing is one which limits the effectiveness and usefulness of the Proposal for students **who** signed to benefit solely in the first place.

I think the adoption is a very specific Resolution.

It does no **harm** to any academic endeavor; it does merely preserve and increase the **extended** integrity of this institution; the integrity of this institution **stems** from the Students.

MR. TOSKAS: MOVED THE PREVIOUS QUESTION ON THE ADDENDUM.

Seconded.

AYES: 46 NO: 10

Dr. Pugsley: This takes a 2/3 vote for passage.

This is just for the Addendum, The vote is whether or not the Question **shall** be voted upon,

NOW VOTING ON THE ADDENDUM.

AYES HAVE IT. ADDENDUM PASSED.

MOTION: Dr. Swan moved to return Report **back** to Committee because of the deficiencies that are in it,

Seconded.

MOVED THE PREVIOUS QUESTION. THIS IS TO CLOSE DEBATE, AND TO VOIE WI THOUT FURTHER DEBATE ON THE MOTION TO REFER BACK TO COMMITTEE,

Seconded. (Needs 2/3 vote).

AYES: 44 No: 29

MOTION FAILS. (This is not 2/3 vote).

15) Dr. Hare: The Motion on the floor is to return to Committee, I supported the attempt here to keep the debate open **although I am** very much in favor of returning this Motion back to **Committee** but it seems to me Lo return it to **Committee** without further debate is **hardly** useful for the **Committee** which could not have any possible idea of what direction the **Senate's** thinking is **taking** on the subject;, In short, to send it back to Committee without debate leaves it exactly where they were 6 months or more ago,

Mrs. Dykema:

(Parliamentarian)

It seems to me the debate on this Motion can only be on the desirability or not of sending it to **Committee**. You cannot debate on the main subject of the Proposal.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

APPENDIX IV: DISCUSSION - AD HOC COMMITTEE PASS/FAIL (June 2, 1972)

16) Dr. Hare: We are in a Parliamentary impasse and it would perhaps be appropriate for the maker of the Motion to Refer to Committee to withdraw it so that we can debate this question some before we send it back to Committee.

Dr. Pugsley: Does the maker of the Motion and the seconder wish to do this?

Ans.: NO.

You can debate only the question of referring back to Committee.

17) Dr. Baldino: If the Motion to refer back to Committee were to pass this does not in any way preclude the Committee from considering those questions which are now being postponed.

18) Dr. Foster: I am going to speak against the Motion to refer back to Committee. I agree with Dr. Cohen's position, I went before the Committee and they gave me 45 minutes to expound on my support for it and had come up with some good reasons why it ought to be done.

I later inquired what had happened to the ideas and they explained it very practically. We cannot do too much at one time. You make progress a little at a time and would I be happy if we made at least some progress even if we didn't go as far as I wanted them to.

I think that is where we stand right now, I am not happy with this either; School of Education is obviously not happy with it either because they would like to see, as I understand it, the Teacher Internship Program on a NC basis.

Let's come back later with some specific kind of Amendment that might make exclusion of some specific course. At least let's get some progress.

Give the students at least something of what they have been looking for.

It is not a package I am totally satisfied with. I would like to see this Motion to refer back to Committee defeated, I would like to see the policy adopted not as though it were the last word but at least it is a move in the right direction and perhaps the Committee can be continued for further study of this problem.

19) Mr. Ives: I'm puzzled because I did not hear Dr. Hare say anything that wasn't pertaining to the Motion on the floor.

20) Dean Robinson: I would speak in favor of referring this Proposal back to Committee since with the Addendum it does not at all meet the needs of the School ~ a " Education.

21) Dr. Sanford Hotchkiss: I would like to speak in favor of referring it to Committee again because of the Addendum.

22) Mr. Toskas: I am speaking in favor of passing the Motion as amended.

The fact is that indeed rather than continual process progress goes by leaps and starts. This is certainly a start and a very competent one at that. That it does not meet some peoples needs I will certainly speak to that. It certainly doesn't meet mine.

Yet it is a very competent Proposal. It has been thought through. The fact is that it is workable. The fact is that the Committee cannot do that much for it. Progress goes by leaps and starts rather than by process.

23) Dr. C. Hankeg: Point of Order.

24) Dr. Swan: I would like to speak in favor of returning it back to Committee because if it is adopted it is simply an unworkable device. All of the discussion here and all of the Amending here will lead to nothing but a chaotic mess that no one will understand.

Refer it to Committee.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

APPENDIX IVa -- DISCUSSION - AD HOC COMMITTEE PASS/FAIL (June 2, 1972)

Dr. C. Hankey withdrew his Point of Order, as he wished to speak,

25) Dr. C. Hankey wished to raise Point of Order which he stated probably is not now relevant,

There is he stated in **Robert's** Rules of Order an item that says that a **Motion** to refer to Committee should be **ruled** out of order if it is dilatory and seeks to merely achieve defeat of the **main** motion,

I think this comes very close, I would agree that the Amendment was sort of stupid,

I think it should not be referred to **Committee** because that in fact would destroy the effect of the **main Motion**. It would be equivalent to a negative vote and if it is not in fact then it is in general out of line with Parliamentary procedure. It should not be referred back to **Committee**.

QUESTION CALLED FOR VOTING ON WHETHER OR NOT TO SEND IT BACK TO COMMITTEE.

AYES: 37 NO: 35

IT GOES BACK TO COMMITTEE

MOTION: Dr. C. Hankey moved that the Senate instruct the **Committee** to work entirely on the objections raised by Dr. **Swan** in line with the Amendment made and having completed whatever possible reworking of the Proposal is necessary to make some adjustment before reporting **back** to the **Senate** at the first Senate meeting in the **Fall** (first **Friday** in **October**).
Seconded,

Dr. Pugsley: It has been moved and seconded that the work of the Committee be limited to the issues **considered** here on the floor,

26) Dr. Cohen: I think the objections raised by Dr. **Swan** are very important, The committee should direct its attention to them, Do you want this in the form of limitations? Consider other possibilities also,

27) Dr. Hare: It seems to me that what Dr. Cohen is saying is a **proper** thing to **say**.

I think this business that we have talked about here about **making progress** very slowly is founded upon an illusion about this campus which should have been properly destroyed by the events of the last couple of weeks.

I think it is time that the Senate recognizes that the students do not want in general a **CR/NC** system, They want a **"NO RECORD"** system,

I attended both the **Open** Hearings at great length and this was the sole message that I got from the students that came to testify; and the sole message that I get from my own students on the subject and this is all I hear; and for the faculty to instruct a Committee to proceed along the lines of a **CR/NC** system when this is plainly at variance with what the students want it seems to me **folly**.

Either don't **do it** at **all** or do the thing right,

28) Mr. Toskas: Dr. **Hare** is perfectly right, The majority of the student opinion is **"NO ENTRY"**.

I do on the other hand support Dr. C. **Hankey's** Motion instructing the Committee.

REASONS: I think the Committee **has** done their work excellently and I think the Proposal very positive and a **very beneficial** one,

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

APPENDIX IVa -- DISCUSSION -- AD-HOC COMMITTEE PASS/FAIL (June 2, 1972)

Mr. Toskas cont'd.:

I think that with the elimination of **certain** minor administrative hassles that Dr. Swan has pointed out, **the** Proposal is a **very beneficial** one, for both students and the University as a whole.

I would like to see some immediate benefit **come** from CR/NC and the immediate benefits come and accrue to the students as **it** would were the administrative hassles here cleared **up**.

Consequently, I support Dr. Clyde Hankey's Motion.

29) Dr. Hare: Point of Order.
Are we to interpret Dr, **Hankey's** motion as limiting the **Com-
mittee's** deliberations?

Dr. Pugsley: I would say **yes**.

30) Dr. Swan: It was **simply** a reaction to **minor** administrative difficulties, There is nothing minor about the administration difficulties that I raise.

You are telling a **Chairman** he has 700 schedules to look at and approve all the courses for CR/NC basis. This is not minor in any way, shape or **form**.

31) Dr. C. Hankey: Defeat of this Motion is tantamount to allowing **Parliamentary** showmanship and getting **away** with it.

I suggest **it** was a Motion in **defense** of **proper** **Parliamentary** procedure.

The Motion returned to Committee **while** the gentleman came very close to **destroying** the Motion the Committee represented,

I do not **think** **it** would be a good idea to try to kill the **results** of the **Committee's** work by postponing **the Committee's** work or getting rid of it indefinitely.

Dr. Pugsley: If you, Dr. Hankey and your seconder were willing to **withdraw** the Motion the Committee then would be free not only to take into account the **discussions** that had **taken** place **relative** to the original Motion and the Amendment but also the discussion that **has** taken place since that time.
It would seem to me a useful purpose might be **served**,

32) Dr. C. Hankey: I will if the **seconder** is willing.

33) Mr. Toskas: Was the **seconder**. I want to see **the** Proposal reported out as soon as possible,

Parliamentarian: You do not need the **seconder's** approval.

(Mrs. Dykema)

Dr. Pugsley: The Motion is **withdrawn**.

MOTION: Dr. Charles Bronstrup moved that **the Committee** resubmit this **Pass/Fail** consideration at the next Senate meeting which will be the first Friday in October (**Friday**, October 6, 1972).

Seconded.

AYE3 HAVE IT.

APPENDIX V--REPORT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE TO THE SENATE, FRIDAY, JUNE 2, 1972
(By Victor A. Richley)

PROPOSED CHANGE IN GRADING PRACTICES
FOR
SUPERVISED STUDENT TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES

The Academic Affairs Committee has studied a request by the faculty of the School of Education to abandon the traditional A,B,C,D grading system for its Student Teaching and Laboratory courses and to implement instead, a Credit/No Credit (CR/NC) system. The new system would result in the assignment of one of the following symbols:

- "Cr" -- To indicate satisfactory completion
- "NC" -- To indicate unsatisfactory completion
- "W" --- To be used as currently specified
- "I" --- To be used as currently specified

to those students enrolled in the following courses:

- Education 704 - Professional Laboratory Experiences: High School
- Education 705 - Professional Laboratory Experiences: Elementary
- Education 841 - Supervised Student Teaching: Elementary
- Education 842 - Supervised Student Teaching: High School
- Education 843 - Supervised Student Teaching: Special Field and Special Education
- Education 860 - Supervised Student Teaching: Educable Mentally Retarded

RATIONALE:

The Academic Affairs Committee agrees that present practice in grading for student amounts to a double jeopardy for the student:

- 1) it may affect his future employment--where prospective employers examine the grade for student teaching;
- 2) it simultaneously affects his university grade point average more importantly than any other course (student teaching receives 15 hours of credit).

As supervisors from the university have the primary responsibility for assigning grades in student teaching, their burden is obvious. Regardless of what evaluation instrument the supervisor uses to determine what "excellent potential"

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

APPENDIX V CONT'D. -- REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (June 2, 1972)

(proposed Change in Grading Practices for Supervised Student Teaching and Professional Laboratory Experiences) -- by Victor A. Richley

may be for student teachers, he feels forced to consider the extraneous criteria of grade point average and future employment in assigning grades. Verification of this is made obvious through the following data provided for 1,046 regular Student Teachers for the academic years 1968-69 and 1969-70:

A's	763	72.9%
B's	267	25.5%
C's	15	1.4%
F's	1	.1%
	<u>1046</u>	<u>99.9%</u>

The dilemma for the student also becomes obvious. He feels that too much chance rests upon such an important matter for him. Inappropriate placement, the particular style and attitude of a given cooperating teacher or university supervisor - combined with the student teacher's concern for grade point average requirements - can provide far too many variables for him to cope with. Those variables work against the goal he is trying to achieve. The purpose of student teaching is in part to provide an extended practicum whereby students are encouraged to "apply techniques and methods learned in prerequisite courses to actual classroom teaching situations", (University Catalog, pg. 157) centering on "process" rather than "product". Within those guidelines the student teacher needs to experiment, make mistakes, and determine whether he is suited for teaching. All of these practices need to occur in an atmosphere free from threat or penalty if they are to be achieved. Satisfactory work in student teaching can represent a wide range of behaviors, but the present grading system was not built to reflect them,

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

APPENDIX V CONT'D. -- REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (June 2, 1972)
 (Proposed Changes in Grading Practices for Supervised Student Teaching and
 Professional Laboratory Experiences) -- by Victor A. Richley

SUPPORTING DATA:

- 1) The faculty of the School of Education **has** had this matter under consideration for more than one year.
 In a recent poll. (32) of (41) **faculty** voting, 80% favored the proposed **system.**
- 2) Forty-eight (48) undergraduate **students** working for teacher certification and representing both the elementary and secondary areas were polled during early February on preference of traditional letter grade **vs.** Cr only in student **teaching:**
 - 43 students favored Cr, system
 - 5 students favored traditional system
- 3) Twenty-eight (28) graduate **students** (all of **whom** were teachers or teaching aides) **surveyed** during the winter and current quarters favored Cr system of reporting,
- 4) Only three (3) of the twelve (12) state related universities in Ohio (Ohio State University, Ohio University, and Youngstown State University) continue to **use** the traditional grade reporting system in student teaching. Others **are** using P/F or Cr/NC or variations thereof,

Mr. President, for the Academic Affairs Committee, I move approval of the following Motion:

MOTION: A Credit/No Credit (CR/NC) grading system is to be implemented for courses: Education 704 and 70s--Professional Laboratory Experiences and Education 841, 842, 843 and 860--Student Teaching.
 The student grade card for these courses will show only one of the symbols: CR, NC, W or I,

NOTE: SEE SENATE MINUTES FOR RESULTS OF ABOVE MOTION.

APPENDIX Va -- DISCUSSION - ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT

MOTION: Dr. Victor A. Richley moved approval of the following:
 A **Credit/No Credit (CR/NC)** grading system is to be implemented for courses:
 Education 704 and 705--Professional Lab Experiences and Education 841, 842, 843 and EGO--Student Teaching.
 The student grade card for these courses will show only one of the symbols, CR, NC, W or I.
 Seconded.

DISCUSSION:

1) Mr. Simko: Before a decision or any judgment is made concerning the value of this Motion I think we all should have for our examination the questions specifically asked of the students. What do they want?

A NC grade on a student teaching report would be construed as a failure,

2) Mr. Ives: When grades are made so meaningless as this shows, what else can we do but abandon them?

3) Dean Robinson: I would like to point out that the "No Entry;" is not entirely appropriate in an experience of the most important single professional experience in the student teacher's or student's career.

If a student has simply a "No Entry" he can, after he gets his degree, go and get a teaching certificate even though he is unqualified.

Therefore, I think "No Entry" is not an appropriate or an ethical entry in this case.

Thirty-five (35) School Superintendents in our Personnel Office in the Youngstown area School System were surveyed in January 1971 on the significance of Student Teaching Reporting system in the employment decisions.

26 of them replied, The replies indicated that out of 7 preferences that the letter grade recorded for Student Teaching was the next to least important criteria they considered.

The most important were the qualitative evaluations made between the cooperating teacher and the campus supervisor.

Dr. McCracken, who is on the English faculty and also on the faculty in the School of Education, will speak briefly on this.

4) Dr. McCracken: As architect of this Proposal with the support of the Director of Student Teaching and the School of Education, I want to point out that the original Proposal was "Credit-No Entry".

One of the reasons we felt it should be modified - we thought the Senate probably wouldn't even consider a "Credit-No Entry".

That is one thing I wanted to say. There is some disagreement on my part with some in the School of Education on this but I do want to point out that everything here was supported up to a certain point and then we felt we could not get it on the Senate floor without "Credit-No Entry".

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

APPENDIX Va - DISCUSSION - ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT

5) Dr. Dillon: This obviously connects with Pass/Fail recommendation, They are going to be back with another recommendation in October, I wonder if there is really sufficient need to rush this through

ANS.: YES.

6) Dean Robinson: It was the exact intent of asking this to be considered separately if the other Proposal did not pass.

This has been under consideration now for two (2) years.

Dr. Richley: Materials that were used in the survey are available. I am sure Dr. Hammaker will be glad to furnish all the questions and the results of the survey, etc.

We have included those aspects that we feel are pertinent.

There is no way if we use a 'Credit-No Entry', "W", or "I" system - there is no way the performance of the student, who after the 6th week simply fizzles out, simply does not return, simply does not show.

He may not qualify for an 'Incomplete' because he may not have been passing the course up to that time, etc.

He does not qualify for the 'W' because it is after the 6th week.

At that point you must have some symbol to assign the student and it would seem that "No Credit" is the symbol that we would have to utilize.

For this reason the Academic Affairs Committee did not support the original Proposal that was presented by the School of Education because it did not allow for a student who after 6 weeks has obviously not completed the course.

7) Dr. McCracken: There is some urgency in this, even though there is the loophole. That is why it came to the floor as 'Credit-No Entry'. There is that loophole, I admit that.

It is an administrative one. We checked the last 2000 student teachers and not one case occurred but even so it is theoretically a Loophole.

The urgency is on educational grounds. The present system is totally antiquated. I was surprised, frankly, to find it when I came here. We need to change it for this reason: Students tend to act as robots in the Student Teaching situation when they know there is punishment, A, B, C over their heads. B's and C's are punishment whether you think they are or not in Student Teaching.

We need to get that out of the way. The Student teacher is following this: I am simply going to do whatever I am told to do. I have to get that "A".

It is urgent beginning in the fall that we have CR/NC. I personally will continue to work for that 'Credit-No Entry' but we have to have this. It is Better than the present system.

8) Dr. Cohen: A 'non-credit' entry will be viewed as Mr. Simko pointed out, essentially as a failure of some sort.

Having CR/NC then puts the instructor of either giving a grade or failure and all the pressures this brings to bear,

A 'Credit-No Entry' makes it easier for an Instructor to say you have to take it over again and do a better job.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

APPENDIX Va - DISCUSSION - ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT:Dr. Cohen cont'd. :

I am really at a loss sometimes to hear the arguments presented so often, We could not do it because people will not go along with us. How do we know people will not go along with us until we try it?

AMENDMENT: Dr. Cohen made the following Amendment:
To change this Proposal to read 'Credit-No Entry'.
Seconded.

9) Dr. Siman: What would be the symbol?

10) Dr. Cohen: Credit is 'CR'; otherwise, no symbol for 'No Entry'.

11) Dr. Bronstrup: Point of Order.

Dr. Cohen, are you saying there would be 'No withdrawal' or 'Incomplete' also?

Ans. Yes:

12) Dr. Hare: In urgent favor of this Motion, to lay the ghost once and for all that people cannot bring sensible and progressive Proposals to this senate and get them passed.

I would also like to reassure Dr. McCracken that if this Amendment fails that we will pass the Motion as it was originally offered by the Academic Affairs Committee in the vivid expectation that this Fall a 'Pass-No Entry' system will blanket the whole University and take care of his particular problem any way.

It seems to me that this Proposal needs action on it immediately. If anybody ever saw any full support for a situation in these particular courses it is time that we wipe out the illusion that giving A's, B's, and C's solve the problem in this particular type of course.

If you are going to have to give A's to support the students anyway what they need is credit and not A's.

13) Dean Scriven: In favor of the original Motion, Before we would pass the Amendment that we need to take into consideration other items.

We report to the Board of Regents of the State of Ohio our enrollment as of the 14th day and the University is subsidized as of the 14th day for those enrollments.

We are then subsequently audited to make sure that what we reported and what appears on the student's record is the same thing.

I don't know - there might be some way to implement what you have said and suggested but I do not know and cannot think of it on the spur of the moment.

I would certainly urge that we Defeat the Amendment until study on the subsidy question can be made.

14) Dr. Cohen: There are some State Schools in Ohio that have a 'No entry' system so there is a way of doing it.

Dr. Pugsley: Are you sure they get the money?

I wrote to the Chancellor when this Pass/Fail came along. I was told in his response that the Proposal on the Pass/Fail would create no problems in terms of subsidy because there was a record.

Rut this Amendment is something again. I did not ask him about a 'Credit-No entry'. If there is 'No Entry' it may very well be a different problem.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

June 2, 1972

APPENDIX Va - DISCUSSION - ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT.

15) Mrs. Smith: I know that at Ohio university, which I am sure is the School Dr. Cohen is talking about, they keep two (2) sets of records.

16) Dean Robinson: Ohio University is one of the schools who maintains a traditional grading system in Student Teaching.

The Faculty in the School of Education voted for the original Proposal of Cr, W, and I; but there is also another point in the National Council of Accreditation of Teachers Educational Association and that is whether or not we would then be able to satisfy the requirements of evaluation of our students.

17) Dr. McCracken: All of these issues take much time.

We have considered all of these issues. I have spent three (3) months talking to all the administrators here concerning these issues. The reason this was set up for Cr, W and I was to avoid the very thing that Dean Scriven pointed out in the first place, this matter of the 14th day. I backed off with his advice and included "W" and "I". That solves all the problems except the administrative one that Dr. Richley and his committee brought up.

I argue that Cr, W and I will raise standards in Student Teaching, because the student would be less liable to penalty by initiating the Withdrawal himself, and our asking him to Withdraw. It is easier for him to Withdraw without penalty. This is the present Proposal.

I much prefer the Amendment as 'CR-No Entry' but I wish you had said when you said the other things, Cr, W and I.

Frankly, I am very pleased and amazed that the Senate is even considering this issue because this is the one I have spent months trying to get to the Senate floor.

I thought your Amendment included Cr, W, and I. I am sorry it doesn't.

QUESTION CALLED FOR THE MOTION TO AMEND IS ONLY FOR 'CR-NO ENTRY'. NO'S HAVE IT. AMENDMENT FAILS.

AMENDMENT: Dr. Cohen offered the following change:
Have Amendment now read 'Credit-No Entry',
W or I.
Seconded.

DISCUSSION:

1) Mr. Toskas: About a half hour or 45 minutes ago this Senate body affirmed in principal, and in fact, the right of a student to take traditional grades for a subject if he wished to do so.

Now, I am certainly very much in favor of the present Amendment and I am speaking in favor of it.

I am also going to add that those students who wish, so to speak to cut their own throat, by electing to take an A,B,C,D, or F be permitted to do so.

The reason for that largely is the same basis that the members of the Senate body passed my original Addendum to the Committee Report on Pass/Fail; that is, every single argument that has been presented for the nontraditional grading system maintained that the grading system as it now stands in Student Teaching and Laboratory Observation works to the detriment of the student.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

June 2, 1972

APPENDIX Va - DISCUSSION - ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT:
Mr. Toskas cont'd.:

Indeed it does. I am perfectly willing and indeed forcefully maintaining that the student should decide what is for his own benefit and indeed what is for **his** own detriment.

If he wants to take the **chance** of getting 15 hours of C, etc., he should have every option to do so. If we are proposing things for the benefit of the students then we should give the option to the students to see their own benefit.

Dr. Hare: Do you want us to lose our Quorum?

Ans. (by several): Yes, if necessary.

2) Dr. Behen: Dr. Hare has been on the floor at least four times and I appreciated everything he had to say.

We have spoken of the fact that this is a Point of Order. We **have** spoken of the fact we can bring anything **before** this senate and fail,

I uphold the right of this Senator to speak on this floor until this meeting is adjourned.

3) Mr. Toskas: I am going to assume a student has the right to **self determination**. He certainly has the right to take the course any way he sees fit; if **it** is to his detriment then he has the right to take it to his detriment if he so wishes,

I am rather **tired** of seeing things done for people. I think the student **who** wants to take the **course** for traditional **grades** should be allowed the **option** to do so, **This is what I propose.**

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT: Mr. Charles Toskas moved that the course be open to traditional grading.

4) Dr. Sally Hotchkiss: Would argue **against** this latest Proposal.

5) Dr. Baldino: As obnoxious as **Mr. Toskas'** proposed motion to some, if this body were to go on record as against anything but the current motion, I would **daresay** this would be **somewhat** embarrassing to the Committee **coming** back with a recommendation or Proposal in October resembling anything of the one this **Spring**.

6) Mr. Toskas: I am interested in seeing self-determination by the students, purely and simple,

Dr. Fugsley: You are not recognized by the Chair, sir.

7) I think this course is very touchy. It is different. There is good reason for having credit as **opposed** to **A,B,C**. If some people think **A,B,C**, system as has been pointed out they very likely will receive **A's**; and people who have 'Credit' will have something **that** looks like a 'C'.

We may assume then a situation to **A,B,C**, instead of 'Credit-No Entry'.

This is a special course. I would like, of course, to get away from the idea that we have to have one rule for everything.

Let's treat this as a special course. This can be handled separately, 'Credit-No Entry', **W** or **I**.

(Comment #7 above was by Dr. Cohen).

Secretary informed the President the **senate** had **now** lost its Quorum.

MEETING ADJOURNED

CONTINUED SENATE MEETING
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY
Friday, June 2, 1972

IN ATTENDANCE:

W. Lookey
 G. Rind
 J.C. Hill
 Earl E. Edgar
~~J.P. Robinson~~
~~John Smith~~
 Mary Smith
 Jim Scriven
 Wm Swan
 George Jones
 L. Long
 P. Wilson
 G. MAVRIGIAN
 B. Kramer
 Edward B. Spiegel
 J. Vukobratovic
 Matthew Salmar
 J. Brown
 Prof. Howell
 R. J. J. J.
 H. Thomas Mc Cracken - VISITOR
 Philip Helm
 Dan O'Neill
 David S. Ives
 Thad Dillon
 Sally Hotchkiss
 Sanford N. Hotchkiss

Elmer Faldvany
 Peter W. von Ostwalden
 Victor A. Rieckley
 Lowell J. Latre
 M. Dean Acopy
 Edwin Cohen
 James Lepore
 Ben Saitman
 Michael Klasovsky
 Cverette Abram
 Fred Blesie
 John A. Zetts
 J. G. Canhart
 Thomas A. Shipka
 Leonard Koffmann
 Gilbert & Rondey
 Robert G. Morris
 Ronald H. Kessler
 Bill Jones
 William Davis
 Wanda Kermok-off
 Ronald Jonay
 P. H. Baldino Jr.
 J. Bettes
 Jack O. Foster
 J. Parpaska
 Tom Jelfietra
 Dorothy Kennedy

IN ATTENDANCE CONT'D.:

Marguerite Foley
E. Pederiali
W. Kelych
Esther Dennis
Frank G. Kosturko
Anita
Boggs
R. Hovey
R. Hunter
Marie Shillock (gambar)
John D. Hencyk (gambar)
Richard Root
James Laine
Helen Linko
Elizabeth Sterenberg
Stephen Flanzely
Charles J. Forkas
J. J. Foss
W. J. Stamerki
Christine R. Lykema
Albert R. Hare
Helma S. Miner
Harold Z. Miner
Lloyd Harper
Paul Kishel
Delser
Mary Ann Pitano

Charles Bronstuy
C. David Butcher
Frank Arba
Frank Jarantine
Joseph Paul
Baker
B. Yozwian
E. Pejack
Vera Jenkins