



2-13-1969

**February 13, 1969**

University of North Dakota

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/und-senate-minutes>

---

#### **Recommended Citation**

University of North Dakota. "February 13, 1969" (1969). *University Senate Meeting Minutes*. 75.  
<https://commons.und.edu/und-senate-minutes/75>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Elwyn B. Robinson Department of Special Collections at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Senate Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [und.common@library.und.edu](mailto:und.common@library.und.edu).

## MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING

February 13, 1969

(NOT TO BE MADE AVAILABLE TO NON-FACULTY MEMBERS)

1.

A meeting of the University Senate was held at 4:00 p.m. Thursday, February 13, 1969, in Room 415 of Twamley Hall.

2.

The following members of the Senate were present:

Starcher, George W.	Facey, Vera	O'Kelly, Bernard
Apanian, Ronald	Hampsten, Richard F.	Oslund, Valborg
Behsman, Ervin A.	Hershbelle, Jackson P.	Penn, John S.
Brommel, Bernard J.	Heyse, Margaret	Potter, Gerald
Brumleve, Stanley	Jacobson, Harvey	Reid, John R.
Bullard, Charles W.	Johnson, A. William	Robertson, Donald J.
Bzoch, Ronald C.	Kannowski, Paul B.	Rognlie, Philip A.
Caldwell, Robert A.	Kolstoe, Ralph	Rykken, Marjorie
Cornatzer, William	Laird, Wilson M.	Skidmore, Duane
Cunningham, Harold	McKenzie, Ruby M.	Smith, Glen
Curry, Myron	Naismith, D. P.	Stenberg, Virgil
Cushman, Martelle L.	Nordlie, Robert C.	Whalen, Cornelius

The following members of the Senate were absent:

Boehle, William	Harwood, Theodore H.	Perrone, Vito
Clifford, Thomas	Koenker, William E.	Tomasek, Henry J.
Ford, Donald H.	Margulies, Martin B.	Tweton, D. Jerome
Golseth, Anne	Pearce, Donald J.	Witmer, Robert B.
Gustafson, Ben G.		Wynne, John R.

3.

There being no corrections, the minutes of the January 9, 1969, meeting were ordered approved as submitted.

4.

The Chair announced the presence of Dr. Warren Strandberg in the audience and his availability to answer questions which might normally be directed to Dean Perrone, who was out of the city.

5.

The Chair announced that there had been a request to add an item regarding academic freedom and tenure to the agenda. There being no objection, the item was added as Item #3 on the agenda.

6.

Mr. Naismith moved that the Senate adopt the attached recommendations from the Academic Policies Committee concerning the Satisfactory-Unsatisfactory (S/U) Grading System. The motion was seconded. Discussion followed. Mr. Reid moved to amend the motion to read: "That the Senate accept the content of the recommendation and that a committee be appointed by the Chair to assist in rewording the recommendation. The amendment was seconded. Mr. Reid then withdrew his amendment with the unanimous consent of the Senate. Mr. Laird moved that the recommendations be referred back to the Academic Policies Committee. The motion was seconded, voted upon, and carried. (See Attachment #1)

7.

Mr. Naismith moved that the New School be allowed to adopt the attached system of evaluation presented by it to the Senate at the January 9 meeting. The motion was seconded. Discussion followed. Mr. O'Kelly moved to amend the motion to make it subject to the approval of the Graduate Committee with regard to that part of the program under the jurisdiction of the Graduate Committee. The motion to amend was seconded, voted upon, and carried.

The amended motion was then voted upon and carried.

The Senate went into executive session.

8.

Miss Oslund presented the report of the Honorary Degrees Committee and moved that the Senate recommend to the President and the State Board of Higher Education that an Honorary LL.D. degree be awarded to a candidate.\* The motion was seconded, voted upon, and carried.

Miss Oslund moved that the Senate recommend to the President and the Board of Higher Education that an Honorary LL.D. degree be awarded to a candidate.\* The motion was seconded, voted upon, and carried.

The Senate resumed as a regular meeting.

9.

Mr. Caldwell moved the adoption of the following resolution: Resolved: That the University Senate in its concern for academic freedom and tenure does call attention to and affirm that often neglected section of the AAUP statement on academic freedom and tenure which reads as follows:

"The college or university teacher is a citizen, a member of a learned profession, and an officer of an educational institution. When he speaks or writes as a citizen, he should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but his special position in the community imposes special obligations. As a man of learning and an educational officer, he should at all times be accurate, should exercise proper restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that he is not an institutional spokesman."

The motion was seconded and discussion followed. Mr. Skidmore moved to amend the resolution by adding that section of the AAUP statement pertaining to recognition

by the non-academic community of the freedom from interference in the academic community. Some uncertainty as to the wording of this section was expressed. There was no second. Mr. Cunningham moved to amend by inserting the section identification (C). It was seconded, voted upon and carried. Mr. Starcher moved to amend the motion by stating that it must appear in the Faculty Handbook. The motion was seconded and discussion followed. Mr. Starcher requested and was granted permission by unanimous consent to withdraw his motion.

The amended resolution was voted upon and carried.

10.

By unanimous consent the meeting was adjourned.

R. M. McKenzie  
Secretary

\*The recipient will be announced upon completion of necessary arrangements.

## Recommended Satisfactory-Unsatisfactory (S/U) Grading System

## ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE

13 Feb. 1969

## ELECTIVE S/U ENROLLMENT

The following regulations shall apply to credit given for a course in which the student elects to enroll for a satisfactory/unsatisfactory grade:

1. Any student of sophomore, junior or senior standing, (as determined by the registrar), may elect to enroll in one or more courses per semester for a s/u grade.
2. A course taken for a s/u grade will not count toward the thirty hours residency requirement.
3. No more than thirty hours taken for a s/u grade may be counted toward a baccalaureate degree.
4. Required courses in the major field may not be taken for a s/u grade. A student may take extra-departmental major requirements for a s/u grade with the approval of his major department chairman and his academic dean.
5. A student must declare his intention to enroll in a course for a s/u grade at the time of registration. Class lists shall not indicate those students taking the course for a s/u grade and transference from the letter grade to the s/u grade shall be made by the registrar's office.
6. In the event a student wishes to major in a field in which he has taken a required course for a s/u grade, and the department will not accept this as fulfilling its requirements, the student may, with the approval of his department chairman and academic dean, select another course to fulfill the requirement.
7. A student may change his enrollment to or from a s/u course on or before the last day which a new course may be added. (tentatively approved, pending confirmation of necessity by the registrar.)

## REQUIRED ENROLLMENT

The following regulations shall apply to credit given for a course which is only offered for a s/u grade:

1. A course offered exclusively for a s/u grade will normally be open only to those students for whom said course is a major or minor requirement and shall be permitted over and above the thirty hours limitation of elective s/u enrollment.

2. A student who enrolls in a course that is offered exclusively for a s/u grade and for whom said course is neither a major nor a minor requirement must comply with the regulations under, "Elective s/u enrollment."

3. Credit earned in a course offered exclusively for a s/u grade by a student for whom said course is a major or minor requirement shall fulfill all degree requirements which would be fulfilled by the same course if it were taken for a letter grade.

## A NEW SCHOOL PROPOSAL FOR A SYSTEM OF EVALUATION

The New School has as its major task the preparation of a new kind of elementary teacher. It strives to educate students to acquire the qualities of mind and behavior which will assist them in nurturing the creative tendencies in the young and in introducing a more individualized mode of instruction into the schools of North Dakota.

The faculty and student body recognize that any institution of higher learning, if it is to be effective in contributing to a change in the educational fabric of its society, must itself become a model of the kind of educational environment it is promoting. The New School in all its educational endeavors will strive to be such a model. To be an effective model, the New School must have a system of evaluation which is compatible with its educational philosophy.

Evaluation patterns can be justified on many grounds. But the ultimate test of any evaluation or grading system ought to be its effectiveness in the promotion of learning. Any discussion of grading ought to keep this concern central. The New School believes that there are alternatives to the established grading system that will contribute more effectively to an improvement in the environment for learning.

The New School proposal which follows is described in three parts. The first part identifies the actual marks which would be entered into a student's academic record along with an interpretation of those marks. The second part outlines the procedure the New School would use in arriving

at a determination of course marks as well as some justification for that procedure. The third part is a response to some of the questions that are often raised when a non-traditional marking system is proposed.

## I

The New School proposes that at the end of each semester, and after assessment of the student's progress (as described in section II), one of three marks will be entered into the student's academic record for each course in which he is enrolled:

- (a) If, at the end of the semester, the student has completed the objectives of the course, a mark of CR is recorded. This mark indicates that credit for the course is received.
- (b) If, at the end of the semester, a student's progress in a course is such as to warrant further work, a mark of CD is recorded. This mark signifies that the course is still in progress for that student and that credit for the course is deferred until the objectives for the course have been completed. The student will have one calendar year to complete the work necessary for credit to be received. If objectives are completed during this extended period then the course mark shall be changed from CD to CR. If work is not completed during this period, credit for the course is withdrawn [see (c) below]. This mark should not be associated in any way with course failure. It should be interpreted only as a means by which students can be given increased flexibility in the period of time needed to achieve course objectives.
- (c) If, at the end of the semester, a student has not completed the



objectives of the course and, by mutual agreement between student and teacher, it is thought that the student should not continue in the course, then a mark of CW is recorded. This mark indicates that the opportunity to receive credit is withdrawn. Withdrawal of credit does not prohibit a student from enrolling again in the same course. Because of the many possible reasons surrounding a student's withdrawal from a course, this mark should not be associated in any way with failure.

## II

### Grades and Motivation for Learning

Course grades act as powerful incentives which satisfy many strong and varied motives not directly associated with learning, e.g., teacher and parental approval, career or monetary pursuits, and the feeling of accomplishment. The anticipation of being graded greatly influences the material a student studies and learns. One psychologist thinks that grades are so strong a motivating force that they are responsible for our inability to establish the superiority of one teaching approach over another.

The traditional letter grading system is often justified as an effective instrument for motivating students to learn. However, this type of motivation tends to be extrinsic to the learning process. Traditional grading practices encourage students more toward satisfying the formal course requirements set by the instructor than in developing an intrinsic motivation for learning. Satisfaction is often found in the grade itself rather than in the sense of joy and accomplishment inherent in the learning situation.

The New School proposal on grading is designed to minimize the "external" appeals of grades while at the same time contributing to the creation of an environment where learning is intrinsically motivated.

### Teacher-Student Relationships

In designing a system of evaluation, consideration must be given to the effect of "grades" upon the teacher-student relationships. The New School would like to encourage the development of more cooperative, non-threatening relationships between faculty and students. If a system of evaluation is being designed for educational purposes, then it ought to promote better communication and cooperation between teacher and student. The traditional letter grading system is limited in this regard. If a system of evaluation can encourage greater assumption of responsibility by the student for his own learning then there is a greater chance for more positive teacher-student relationships to develop.

### Grades and Creativity

There is the indication from several sources<sup>1</sup> that the correlation of grades with creative achievement is generally very low. "There is the further argument that the structured constraints of a 'system' of grading have not merely a neutral but actually a deleterious effect on creative performance." Some of these studies also indicate that certain non-intellectual factors usually associated with academic achievement (as determined

---

<sup>1</sup> ACT Research Report, No. 7, September, 1965, The Relationship Between College Grades and Adult Achievement: A Review of the Literature.

by traditional grading practices) are factors more often found in persons with less potential for creativity. Most grading systems by their very nature tend to reward the hardworking but conforming student while penalizing the more unconventional and imaginative student. The New School wishes to adopt a system of evaluation which, if not actually promoting creativity, at least does not have a deleterious effect upon student creativity.

#### Creativity and Self-appraisal

Carl Rogers, writing on creativity, argues that "creativity in learning is best facilitated when self-criticism and self-evaluation are basic.... The best research organizations in industry, as well as the academic world, have learned that external evaluation is largely fruitless if the goal is creative work."<sup>2</sup> In order to facilitate creative expression in its students, the New School plans to initiate a procedure of evaluation which will allow each student to assume a larger share of the responsibility for defining and evaluating his educational efforts in each course. The student and faculty member will jointly work toward increasing the student's ability to intelligently evaluate his own academic progress. All evaluation procedures will be structured so as to make student self-appraisal an essential part of the student's educational experience in the New School.

The New School is aware that there may be some cases where a significant

---

<sup>2</sup> Rogers, C. The Facilitation of Significant Learning, in L. Siegel (ed.), Instruction: Some Contemporary Viewpoints.

discrepancy will develop between student and faculty evaluations of student progress in a course. Where these cases do occur and the student and faculty member cannot, between them, resolve their differences, the issue will be referred to a student-faculty evaluation committee for resolution.

There may also be instances where a student is successful in his academic endeavors but has certain traits that would make him unsuitable as an elementary teacher. The faculty will be continually alert to such students and will recommend, where necessary, that a student not be continued in the program.

#### Self-appraisal and the Determination of Educational Goals

Because the New School wishes to encourage student evaluation, it is imperative that goals of the total instructional program and of each course be clear to the student. If self-appraisal is to be successful, students must participate to a greater degree in the determination of the educational objectives of the New School program. To accomplish both objectives the whole process of evaluation must begin at the beginning of each course in which the student enrolls. The structuring of student activities within each course area will be made only after the student and instructor have engaged in thoughtful examination of the student's academic and professional background, his present needs and expectations, and the educational objectives of the New School. Special attention will be given to increasing the flexibility in the way a student reaches his goals and the period of time needed to achieve those goals.

## III

Grades and Teaching Success

Letter grades are sometimes justified as a necessary means for predicting and selecting successful teachers. In the review referred to earlier (p.4) of forty-six studies on the relationship of college grades to adult achievement, it is stated that "present evidence strongly suggests that college grades bear little or no relationship to any measures of adult achievement." In studies specifically related to teaching, it was found that grades are not significantly related to any overall measure of teaching success. From these studies it would appear that the traditionally-used grade point average is of little value in trying to identify teaching personnel of high quality. Other measures such as jointly written student-faculty evaluations, covering a broad spectrum of student qualities of "academic" ability and achievement, might serve as a more accurate predictor.

Grades and Standards

Some persons may feel that any change in the established grading pattern will somehow endanger the institution's academic standards. Associated with this feeling is the belief that there is some logical or causal connection between grading and standards. However, a university may have only one grading system, yet have differing standards among its many faculty and several academic divisions. Inconsistencies can be noted in faculty use of a common grading system. Even though two instructors may agree on the performance level of the same group of students, one might give a

grade of A to only the top 5 percent while the other gives the same grade to the top 30 percent. One faculty member may choose to grade "on a curve" while the other grades on some preconceived standard. Or possibly both will grade on different curves or upon different standards.

It is quite possible for a university to have alternative patterns of evaluation while maintaining a single standard of quality in all programs. The only problem is in defining the standard in terms other than those of a single evaluation pattern. It is rare to find a college that has created any really acceptable definition of academic achievement that could be used for this purpose.

The New School, in proposing its marking system, has no intention of lowering standards. Instead, the New School hopes that through its system of evaluation it can contribute to the development of a broader conception of educational standards. There is certainly a great need for the educational community to encourage and stimulate more individualization of academic standards. The New School in proposing its evaluation program plans to meet that need.

#### Grades and School Transfer

Other concerns about non-traditional grading systems include the problems of transfer to other schools and admission to graduate school. The variability of grading patterns around the country is increasing rapidly. The pass-fail system has gained increased popularity. As long as any non-traditional grading pattern is clearly articulated, no college seems to

have serious difficulty in translating the record of a transfer student into the college's own terms.

Perhaps the more potentially serious problem is adopting a non-traditional grading pattern to established graduate school admission policies. Some graduate schools do have difficulty in determining superior student achievement from the observation of a non-traditional student transcript. But this difficulty, whether recognized or not, also exists with the traditional grading pattern. The reason is that there is simply no evidence that college grades can effectively predict success in graduate school. This situation, however, is not a problem if the graduate schools will take the time to read the comprehensive dossiers submitted for each prospective student.

The problem of graduate school enrollment for New School undergraduates is not a serious one, for the New School program spans the undergraduate and graduate years. Most entering students will continue through to the completion of their master's degree program.